What's New – July 2012

1. Case Summaries

Barnes v Northern Territory of Australia [2012] FCA 699

28 June 2012
Application for extension of time to file notice of appeal
Federal Court of Australia – Darwin
Lander J

In this judgment, Lander J refused the Janba Gardalanji group's application for an extension of time to appeal against an earlier decision by Mansfield J.

In August 2011 Mansfield J determined that the Janba Gardalanji group does not exclusively hold native title rights and interests over a particular part of its claim area (called the 'overlap area'), but is instead part of a wider group that may hold native title in that area. Rodney Barnes, on behalf of the Janba Gardalanji group, wanted to appeal against this decision and applied for an extension of the time limit for filing an appeal, in order to obtain legal advice.

At the first hearing of the application for an extension of time, Mr Barnes raised six grounds of appeal but asked for more time to obtain legal advice. Finn J adjourned the hearing so that Mr Barnes could amend the notice of appeal, provide further written submissions and explain why the six grounds of appeal demonstrated that Mansfield J had made an arguable error. At the next hearing, Mr Barnes asked for more time to seek further legal advice, but was refused by Finn J. His application for an extension of time to appeal was also dismissed, because he had not been able to demonstrate any arguable error by Mansfield J.

Mr Barnes made a second application for an extension of time to appeal against Mansfield J's decision, and asked for more time to obtain a Court-appointed solicitor or legal funding, to properly present his case before the Court. Lander J refused Mr Barnes' request for more time to prepare, and asked Mr Barnes to explain (a) why he should be allowed to make a second application for an extension of time to appeal; and (b) what was the error he claimed Mansfield J had committed. Mr Barnes did not give an answer. His Honour considered it 'inappropriate' to grant an extension of time to appeal, since Mr Barnes had failed to identify any errors in Mansfield J's reasoning and Finn J had already dismissed Mr Barnes' application. Lander J described the second application as 'almost… vexatious.'

Lander J further ruled that the Registry of the Federal Court should not accept any further applications by Mr Barnes, unless a judge first gives leave to do so. His Honour urged Mr Barnes to stop filing any further applications and to realise that 'he has exhausted all avenues in relation to his claim for exclusive native title over the Brunette Downs pastoral lease.'

Garth Agius and Others v State of South Australia and Others [2012] FCA 714

5 July 2012
Interlocutory Application
Federal Court of Australia – South Australia District Registry General Division
Mansfield J

In this matter, the Court refused to make an order that s47B *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA), which allows the extinguishment of native title to be disregarded in some circumstances, did not apply to a particular area of land in the Adelaide Plains area.

Two private landowners had applied to the South Australian government to have a small allotment of land between their property and a beach merged with their existing property. However, because the allotment is part of the claim area, the state would be precluded from considering their application unless native title in the allotment had been clearly and wholly extinguished. Since s47B NTA could potentially allow any extinguishment to be disregarded, the landowners wanted the Court to rule that s47B NTA did not apply. They argued that when the native title application was filed, the allotment was subject to a resumption process, meaning that the state was in the process of acquiring the land for a public purpose.

Mansfield J held that for the land to have been subject to a resumption process, the state must have had had a bona fide intention to use the allotment for a public purpose or a particular purpose before the native title determination is made. His Honour held that on the evidence presented he could not find that the State had that intention – while land had originally been set aside to build a protective rock wall, the actual area of the allotment had not been held for any particular public purpose. Therefore, the land had not been subject to a resumption process and so s47B NTA still applied. The allotment was still subject to the native title claim, with any prior extinguishment of native title potentially capable of being disregarded. In effect, this meant that the private landowners would need to wait until the native title claim had been determined before they could proceed with merging the allotment into their land.

Far West Coast Native Title Claim v State of South Australia [2012] FCA 733

10 July 2012
Application to separate native title claims
Federal Court of Australia – Adelaide
Mansfield J

In this decision, Mansfield J refused an application to separate the Mirning People's native title claim from the Far West Coast Native Title Claim (a consolidated claim which combined two previously separate but overlapping claims, the Mirning People and the Far West Coast People).

In 1998, two separate but overlapping claims were filed, one by the Mirning People and the other by the Far West Coast People. In 2005, following mediation between the two groups, the groups decided to authorise the consolidation of the two claims into a single combined claim. One of the six named applicants on this combined claim was a Mirning man, Clem Lawrie. The combined Far West Coast claim is now at a point where a consent determination is a real possibility. Robert Victor Miller, a Mirning man, is concerned that the Mirning people are not adequately represented in the combined claim, and that their interests are not adequately protected. He applied to the Court to have the Mirning claim re-instated as a separate claim – that is, for the combined Far West Coast claim to be de-consolidated. He also sought to become a respondent party to the Far West Coast People's claim, since the Mirning claim would again overlap with the Far West Coast People's claim.

Mansfield J held that Mr Miller did not have the necessary legal standing to make this application. Mr Miller was not claiming to represent the views of the entire combined claim group, and did not claim to represent the views of the entire Mirning people. Instead, he claimed to represent only a portion of the Mirning people. Mansfield J said that native title claims are unavoidably conducted through representatives, and if members of a claim group are not satisfied with their representatives, then they can replace them under s66B of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth). Mr Miller, however, had not been authorised by either the combined Far West Coast claim group, or the separate Mirning claim group. Accordingly, Mansfield J held that Mr Miller did not have the authority to re-instate the separate Mirning claim.

A second argument by Mr Miller was that the current combined Far West Coast claim was not properly authorised by the claim group, because the original authorisation of the combined claim had been subject to a number of conditions. He said that the authorisation of the combined claim was conditional on adequate ongoing communication with the Mirning claim group members and the establishment of appropriate decision-making processes for decisions affecting Mirning land. He argued that because these conditions had not been met, there was a defect in the authorisation of the combined claim. Mansfield J decided to hear further evidence on this argument at a future date. At the future hearing Mansfield J would also hear argument about whether Mr Miller should be joined as a respondent to the Far West Coast claim, despite already being a member of the claim group.

***NC (deceased) v State of Western Australia* [2012] FCA 773**

20 July 2012
Application for joinder as respondents to a native title determination
Federal Court of Australia – Perth
McKerracher J

In this decision, McKerracher J made orders for three companies in the Fortescue Metals group to be joined as parties to the Yindjibarndi native title claim proceedings.

Three companies applied to become respondent parties to the Yindjibarndi claim: Fortescue Metals Group Ltd, The Pilbara Infrastructure Pty Ltd, and FMG Pilbara Pty Ltd. The companies hold a range of licences and tenements within the claim area, including special rail license, mining tenements, and an exploration licence. The Court has the power under s84(5) *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA) to join a person as a party to proceedings if the Court is satisfied that the person's interest may be affected by a determination in the proceedings and it is in the interests of justice to do so.

McKerracher J held that a person need not have a 'proprietary' interest of the kind described in s253 NTA in order to be joined as a party. His Honour held that a broader range of interests will be considered in applying s84(5) – any interest that is 'not indirect, remote or lacking in substance… [and that is] capable of clear definition and [is] of such a character that it may be affected in a demonstrable way' by a native title determination.

The native title party submitted that the FMG companies' interests could not be affected by a determination of native title rights, and so there was no reason for them to be joined as parties. Its argument was that the FMG companies' interests would prevail over any native title rights anyway, and the mining leases were granted subject to the condition that the native title parties be granted access in the claim area, so there is nothing that a native title determination could do to affect the interests of the FMG companies. It further argued that a greater number of parties would make a negotiated settlement more difficult.

McKerracher J, however, found that the FMG companies had interests that would be affected by a determination of native title. A positive native title determination could oblige them to pay compensation to the native title holders under the *Mining Act 1978* (WA). A determination that the native title claimants *do not* hold native title in the claim area, by contrast, would mean that the access conditions imposed in the mining tenements would be nullified (since these conditions oblige the companies to give the 'native title party' access to the land, if the native title claimants were found not to hold native title, the obligation would be removed). There are also future act considerations – a determination one way or the other will affect the rights and obligations of the companies. His Honour considered that it was in the interests of justice that the companies be given the opportunities to protect these interests. He also considered that the Court would benefit from having a 'contradictor' to help test the claimants' case. He held that the ongoing disputation between the claimants and the FMG companies was not a factor that ought to prevent them from becoming parties.

***Velickovic v State of Western Australia* [2012] FCA 782**

24 July 2012
Interlocutory application to strike out native title application
Federal Court of Australia – Perth
McKerracher J

The Widji people's native title claim was dismissed, on the grounds that it was not properly authorised by the claim group.

The Widji claim overlaps with four other claims in the Goldfields region. The Goldfields Land and Sea Council (GLSC) represents the claimants in two of these but not the Widji claim. GLSC asked the Court to dismiss the Widji claim for three reasons:

- There was no evidence that the Widji claim was ever authorised at all by the claim group (as required by s61 and s251B *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA).
- The description of the claim group in the native title application did not cover all of the people said to make up the Widji people, and s61 and s251B NTA require every native title claim to be authorised by *all* of the people said to hold the native title rights and interests in the claim area.
- All of the people said to be members of the Widji claim group already fell within the definition of the Ngadju claim group, and the Ngadju claim was filed before the Widji claim. Section 190C NTA prevents a claim being registered if any of its claim group members are also members of an existing claim over the same area

The Widji applicants accepted that their claim was not properly authorised, and asked for more time so that they could fix the problems. McKerracher J, however, decided that an extension of time was not appropriate. Firstly, his Honour noted that the representatives of the Widji claimants had for a long time denied that there was any problem in the authorisation of their claim, and when they finally accepted that there was a problem, they delayed any action that could address the problem. His Honour considered that this behaviour, in combination with the negative effects that the delayed resolution of these issues had on other parties, made it difficult to justify an extension of time. Secondly, and more importantly, McKerracher J found that it would be impossible for the Widji claimants to cure the problems. This was because the original claim had never been authorised by *any* claim group, and so it was not a case of a claim-group re-authorising an amended claim but rather some new group of people purporting to give validity to a claim that had been unauthorised from the beginning. Further, the definition of the newly-constituted claim group was held to be too uncertain: there were some people who were descendants of the named apical ancestors but who were not included in the list of claim group members, and key elders (whose decisions were said to determine group membership) were also not included.

Even though their claim had been dismissed, McKerracher J noted that the Widji people were free to hold an authorisation meeting and file a new native title claim. They would, however, lose some future acts rights and potentially some payments as a result of the dismissal.

***Lightning Ridge Local Aboriginal Land Council v Premier of New South Wales in his capacity as the State Minister pursuant to the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth)* [2012] FCA 792**

31 July 2012
Extinguishment of native title
Federal Court of Australia
Perram J

In a non-claimant application, Lightening Ridge Local Aboriginal Land Council sought a declaration that certain parcels of land it claimed under the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (NSW), and subsequently held in fee simple, are not subject to native title rights and interests.

Section 42(1) of the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (NSW) prohibits a Local Aboriginal Land Council from 'dealing' with land vested in it unless there is an approved determination of no native title on that land. In conjunction with the New South Wales Department of Family and Community Services (FaHCSIA), Lightening Ridge Local Aboriginal Land Council sought to develop one lot of the land into an Aboriginal child and family centre.

Before concluding that past actions of government taken under the *Western Lands Act 1901* (NSW) extinguished native title, Perram J said the prohibition restricting Local Aboriginal Land Councils from 'dealing' with land, in the absence of an approved determination of no native title, burdens those whom it was designed to assist.

In comparison, Perram J, said the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) contemplates a procedure where unopposed non-claimant applications seeking s24FA(1) protection ('future act' protection) need not obtain an approved determination of no native title. His Honour said non-claimants seeking future act protection may have security of title merely by making a non-claimant application that is properly notified. Non-claimant applications seeking future act protection are withdrawn after certain extinguishing acts are done on the land. Whereas s42(1) of the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (NSW) requires a Local Aboriginal Land Council to pursue a non-claimant application for a determination of no native title to its finality.

Justice Perram said s42(1) of the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1983* (NSW) should be amended to relieve the Federal Court from having to determine a 'constant stream of non-claimant applications from local aboriginal land councils' and that it is 'a matter which warrants attention from the New South Wales Parliament'.

2. Legislation

Amendments to tax legislation

On 6 June 2012, the Attorney-General announced that the Government will amend the tax legislation to make it clear that native title payments and other benefits are not subject to income tax (which includes capital gains tax). This change follows the 2010 Native Title, Indigenous Economic Development and Tax consultation paper. Subject to the passage of legislation, these changes are expected to apply retrospectively to native title benefits received on or after 1 July 2008. The draft legislation and explanatory material was released on 27 June 2012.

- Visit The Treasury website to download the explanatory material and exposure draft legislation
- View the joint media release issued by the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs; and the Attorney-General and Minister for Emergency Management

3. Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUA)

The Native Title Research Unit within AIATSIS maintains an ILUA summary which provides hyperlinks to information on the National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT) and the Agreements, Treaties, and Negotiated Settlements (ATNS) websites.

In June 2012, **1** ILUA was registered with the National Native Title Tribunal.

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
16/07/2012	Ngarluma Aboriginal Sustainable Housing (NASH) ILUA	WI2012/002	BCA	WA	Development Infrastructure Residential

For more information about ILUAs, see the NNTT Website and the ATNS Database.

4. Native Title Determinations

The Native Title Research Unit within AIATSIS maintains a determinations summary which provides hyperlinks to determination information on the Austlii, NNTT and ATNS websites.

In July 2012, **1** native title determinations was handed down.

Short Name (NNTT)	Case Name	Date (NNTT)	State	Outcome	Legal Process	Type
Lightning Ridge Local Aboriginal Land Council	*Lightning Ridge Local Aboriginal Land Council v Premier of New South Wales in his capacity as the State Minister pursuant to the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth)* [2012] FCA 792	31/07/2012	NSW	NATIVE TITLE DOES NOT EXIST	UNOPPPOSED DETERMINATION	NON-CLAIMANT

5. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate (RNTBC)

The Native Title Research Unit within AIATSIS maintains a RNTBC summary document which provides details about RNTBCs in each State/Territory including the RNTBC name, RNTBC type (agent or trustee) and relevant native title determination information.

Additional information about RNTBCs can be accessed through hyperlinks to corporation information on the Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations (ORIC) website; case law on the Austlii website; and native title determination information on the NNTT and ATNS websites.

6. Public Notices

The *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) requires that native title parties and the public must be notified of:

- proposed grants of mining leases and claims;
- proposed grants of exploration tenements;
- proposed addition of excluded land in exploration permits;
- proposed grant of authority to prospect; and
- proposed mineral development licences.

The public notice must occur in both:

- a newspaper that circulates generally throughout the area to which the notification relates; and
- a relevant special interest publication that is published at least once a month, which:
  - caters mainly or exclusively for the interests of Aboriginal peoples or Torres Strait Islanders; and
  - is circulated in the geographical area of the proposed activities.

To access the most recent public notices visit the NNTT website or the Koori Mail website.

7. Native Title in the News

The Native Title Research Unit within AIATSIS publishes Native Title in the News which contains summaries of newspaper articles and media releases relevant to native title.

8. Native Title Publications

Patti Miller, *The Mind of a Thief*, UQP, April 2012

When writer Patti Miller discovers that the first post-Mabo native title claim was made by the Wiradjuri in the Wellington Valley where she grew up, she begins to wonder where she belongs in the story of the town. It leads her to the question at the heart of Australian identity – who are we in relation to our cherished stolen country? Wiradjuri land is also where author Patti Miller was born and, mid-life, it begins to exert a compelling emotional pull, demanding her return. The Mind of a Thief is a memoir about identity, history, place and belonging and, perhaps most of all, about how we create ourselves through our stories.

Shireen Morris, *Re-evaluating Mabo: the case for native title reform to remove discrimination and promote economic opportunity*, Land, Rights, Laws: Issues of Native Title, vol. 5, no. 3, Native Title Research Unit, AIATSIS, Canberra, June 2012

This paper seeks to reanalyse the Mabo case from the point of view of non-discrimination. It argues that the Mabo judgment may have been discriminatory in finding that pre-existing entitlements in surviving native title are restricted to the limited range of activities that can be proven by reference to traditional law and custom and that native title fails as a means of improving the economic and social opportunities of Indigenous Australians because of these restrictions. It suggests that native title law should be reformed on the basis of possession to recognise Indigenous peoples' full and beneficial ownership of their land where this has not been extinguished. The allocation of property rights to Indigenous people should not be limited by misguided and discriminatory assumptions about Indigenous culture and custom.

***Statement by the National Native Title Council on behalf of the Indigenous Peoples Organisations Network of Australia to the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, Geneva, 9-13 July 2012**

This statement discusses the complex and varied relationship between Indigenous peoples and the extractive industry in Australia has had a complex and varied history since the introduction of the *Native Title Act 1993*. The Statement encourages extractive industries to engage with Indigenous peoples to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Statement emphasises that the economic sustainability of Indigenous communities is critical to maintaining their cultural identity. Available on the Australian Human Rights Commission website.

Natasha Fijn, Ian Keen, Christopher Lloyd and Michael Pickering (eds.), *Indigenous Participation in Australian Economies II: Historical Engagements and Current Enterprises*, ANU E-press, July 2012

The present volume arises out of a conference in Canberra on Indigenous Participation in Australian Economies at the National Museum of Australia on 9–10 November 2009, which attracted more than thirty presenters. The diverse themes included histories of economic relations, the role of camels and dingoes in Indigenous–settler relations, material culture and the economy, the economies of communities from missions and stations to fringe camps and towns, the transitions from payment-in-kind to wage economies and Community Development Employment Projects, the issue of unpaid and stolen wages, local enterprises, and conflicts over development. Sixteen of those papers have been developed as chapters in this volume, together with a foreword by Professor Jon Altman. Available for download on ANU E Press website.

Robert A Williams, Jr, *Savage Anxieties: The Invention of Western Civilization*, Palgrave Macmillan, August 2012

From one of the world's leading experts on Native American law and indigenous peoples' human rights comes an original and striking intellectual history of the tribe and Western civilization that sheds new light on how we understand ourselves and our contemporary society. Throughout the centuries, conquest, war, and unspeakable acts of violence and dispossession have all been justified by citing civilization's opposition to these differences represented by the tribe. Robert Williams, award winning author, legal scholar, and member of the Lumbee Indian Tribe, proposes a wide-ranging reexamination of the history of the Western world, told from the perspective of civilization's war on tribalism as a way of life. Williams shows us how what we thought we knew about the rise of Western civilization over the tribe is in dire need of reappraisal.

Native Title Conference 2012 Papers:

- Keynote Address Papers available on the AIATSIS website.
- Session Papers and PowerPoints available on the AIATSIS website.
- 'Mabo and the Framework of Dominance', Les Malezer, co-chair of the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples for the occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the outcome of the High Court Mabo case, 3 June 2012.

Media releases

National Native Title Tribunal ('NNTT')

Native title recognition for the Gunggari People of Queensland – 22 June 2012
Native title rights for the Gunggari People in Queensland have today been recognised at a Federal Court hearing at the town of Mitchell, approximately 580 kilometres west of Brisbane. Both parts of the Gunggari People's native title claim have been the subject of mediation by the National Native Title Tribunal. See the NNTT website for more details.

National Native Title Tribunal ('NNTT')

Changes to future act determination application fee – 29 June 2012
As of 1 July 2012, the fee to lodge either an expedited procedure objection application or a future act determination application is $755. Please note that as of 15 June 2012, the Federal Court of Australia will administer the payment of all future act application fees on behalf of the National Native Title Tribunal. See the NNTT website for more details.

Northern Land Council ('NLC')

Native Title recognition for ten Territory stations and the town of Daly Waters – 27 June 2012
Northern Land Council Chief Executive Officer Mr Kim Hill welcomed the native title determination over the Northern Territory township of Daly Waters and ten surrounding pastoral stations. Mr Hill said celebrations like this one remind us that the land rights movement that began in earnest in the 60s and 70s is still alive and well all these years later. 'Sadly, many people who pioneer these claims don't live to see them come to fruition but that's what makes it so important for this generation to continue the fight,' he said. See the NLC website for more details.

NTSCORP

Fact Sheets – 11 July 2012
What Is Native Title Fact Sheet 2012.1
What is a Future Act Fact Sheet 2012.1
Genealogy Fact Sheet 2012.1

ANTaR and the National Native Title Council

ANTaR launches campaign for Native Title reform
Australians for Native Title and Reconciliation (ANTaR) and the National Native Title Council have launched an online campaign calling on the Attorney-General to commit to substantive native title reforms, including reversing the onus of proof. In particular, ANTaR and the National Native Title Council are calling for the following reforms to be made:

- Lower the bar for the recognition of Native Title, including by introducing a rebuttable presumption of continuity
- Redefine 'traditional culture' to recognise the dynamic and living nature of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures
- Raise the bar for proving extinguishment of native title rights (currently too low)
- Provide for recognition of commercial rights to land to support economic development
- Ensure consistency with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

To support the online campaign visit the ANTaR website.

The Australian Greens

Greens continue definitive action to improve Native Title – 12 July 2012
'The Greens have been very proactive about improving the native title system, including measures to reverse the onus of proof required for claims and ensuring traditional owners are able to benefit financially from their lands. We're committed to improving the native title system and have legislation before the Senate to achieve this.' Senator Rachel Siewert said. See the Greens website for more details.

Newsletters:

South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council (SWALSC), *Newsletter*, June 2012
Yamatji Marlpa Aboriginal Corporation (YMAC), *Newsletter*, July 2012

Anthropology Online:

- **ANTS Nest** is an online community for professionals working in the field of native title. The ANTS Nest aims to provide those working in the field of native title an area to communicate with others, and to share resources and information. If you are working in native title, and would like to join the member site, please follow the instructions found here.

9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities

Indigenous Research Protocols Workshop

Convenor: The School of Indigenous Australian Studies
Date: 17 August 2012
Time: 8:45am–1:00pm
Location: Building 33, Room 003, SIAS, James Cook University, Townsville
Registration: Registration available on James Cook University website
Cost: $50

The School of Indigenous Australian Studies (SIAS) is offering an Indigenous Research Protocols Workshop which is designed for researchers and/or those wishing to engage effectively Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander Peoples. The aim of the program is to provide participants with the knowledge to be able to apply relevant research protocols and/or ensure that relevant research protocols are applied to promote positive research outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, researchers and James Cook University. For more information see the James Cook University website.

The Aurora Project

See the Aurora Project: 2012 Program Calendar for information on training and personal development for staff of native title representative bodies, native title service providers, and RNTBCs.

Applications for the summer 2012/13 round of Aurora internships will be open from 9am AEDT 6 August through to 5pm AEDT **31 August 2012.**

10. Events

AIATSIS Seminar Series: Contextualising Social and Emotional Wellbeing as part of Indigenous Health and Healing

Speaker: Stewart Sutherland
Date: 27 August 2012
Time: 12:30pm
Location: The Mabo Room, AIATSIS, Lawson Crescent, Canberra, ACT
Seminars are free and open to public.

Social Emotional Wellbeing is an important aspect of Indigenous Health and Healing. It encompasses a whole-of-life health perspective, bringing together Land, Sea, Culture, Community and the Individual in both physical and mental health. The Australian Government is currently working on the revised Social and Emotional Wellbeing Framework; a national strategic framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people's mental health and social and emotional wellbeing. The Framework is due to be completed by the end of this calendar year. The Framework will feed into the Australian Mental Health road map.

This seminar series will look at the Social and Emotional Wellbeing Framework from a community perspective, giving insight into how the concept of Social Emotional Wellbeing from an Indigenous viewpoint has influenced services provision and programs, and how these have delivered incredible results.

Indigenous Lecture Series: Rethinking Social Justice

Speaker: Tim Rowse
Date: 27 August 2012
Time: 5:30-7:30pm
Location: Manning Clark House, 11 Tasmania Circle, Forrest, Canberra
Registration: RSVP to Jade by phone on 6295 1808 or Judith on 6295 9433
Cost: $20, $15 for members and $7 for students (refreshments will be available).

Tim Rowse will speak about one of the themes from his new book Rethinking Social Justice: From 'Peoples' to 'Population'. Specifically, he will discuss the recent emergence of diverse interpretations of the period of major reforms in Commonwealth Indigenous policy in the ten years following the 1967 referendum. Professor Rowse will argue that the contrasting historical interpretations of those crucial years align with contrasting prescriptions for government policy now and in the future.

Tim Rowse is a Professorial Fellow at the University of Western Sydney. He has taught at Macquarie University, ANU and Harvard University. Since the early 1980s, his research has focused on the relationship between Indigenous and other Australians.

Understanding and managing native title for PBCs

Date: 3-6 September 2012
Location: The Mangrove Resort Hotel, 47 Carnarvon Street, Broome
Registration: This program is currently open for registration. To express interest email the training and PD team.

This program aims to help PBCs better manage and protect their native title. It is very practical, with activities and group discussion centred on real situations faced by PBCs. The program is for people from Prescribed Bodies Corporate (PBCs) and Native Title Representative Bodies or Native Title Service Providers (NTRBs) who are involved in one or more PBCs.

Native Title Anthropology Pre-conference Assembly

Date: 25 September 2012
Time: 12:30–5:00pm
Location: Abel Smith Lecture Theatre (Building 23), University of Queensland, Brisbane
Registration: Registration is essential and places are limited, so confirm your interest early. To register, or contribute a topic for discussion, please contact Dr Pam McGrath, CNTA Research Officer, pam.mcgrath@anu.edu.au or (02) 6125 5859.

The Centre for Native Title Anthropology (CNTA) at The Australian National University, in partnership with Native Title Research Unit, The University of Queensland and The University of Adelaide, is convening a pre-Australian Anthropological Society (AAS) conference meeting of anthropologists and other research practitioners who work in the area of native title and Aboriginal cultural heritage.

The purpose of this forum is to provide the opportunity for anthropologists and interested others to meet and discuss current issues of practice, theory and policy in the fields of native title anthropology and Aboriginal cultural heritage. This year's assembly will include a panel of experienced practitioners who will discuss elements of applied anthropological practice in the context of native title and resource extraction projects. We encourage you to propose topics for discussion when you register your attendance.

Australian Anthropological Society Conference 2012: Culture and Contest in a Material World

Date: 26-28 September 2012
Location: St. Lucia campus, University of Queensland (UQ), Brisbane, Queensland
Registration: For registration information go to http://www.uq.edu.au/aasconf2012/registration
Cost: ranges between $220 and $450 for full conference registration

The University of Queensland's Anthropology Program will be hosting the AAS Conference for 2012. The 2012 conference takes place in a global context of increasing awareness that lives are interconnected across the globe. The aim of this conference is to prompt discussion of both stable and contested social and cultural forms evident in the multitude of settings being researched in anthropology. This conference will also encourage contributions focused on materiality as well as work that foregrounds idealist approaches to cultural continuities and change. For more information about the 2012 AAS conference see the UQ website.

Seventh Annual National Indigenous Legal Conference
Pathways to Tomorrow: Innovations and Intersections in Law, Land and Justice

Date: 5-6 October 2012
Location: University of Notre Dame, Fremantle and University of Western Australia, Perth
Registration: Please click here to view the registration form.

Key conference themes:

- New approaches to justice
- Cultural and natural resource management

Topics Include:

- UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
- Cultural heritage and native title (including the Noongar claim)
- The Kimberley Science and Conservation Strategy
- Criminal justice challenges and youth diversionary programs
- Stolen wages and contemporary credit issues
- Indigenous ecological knowledge
- Constitutional recognition and visions of the future
- Opportunities and careers in Indigenous law and policy