

Unsettling Governance: From Bark Petition to YouTube

Morgan Brigg and Sarah Maddison

On a chilly Canberra day in August 1963, Jock Nelson, the Member for the Northern Territory, rose in the House of Representatives to present a petition from the Yolngu people of Northeast Arnhem Land protesting the excision of 300 square kilometres of their land to be leased to a bauxite mining company. The petition sought recognition of Yolngu rights to the land that had been theirs since 'time immemorial' and requested that a committee of inquiry be convened to hear their views before any mining lease was granted. The following day *The Age* in Melbourne reported under the headline 'House Hears Plea in Strange Tongue' that the 'strangest petition yet received by the House of Representatives - written in the aboriginal language [sic] on a length of stringy bark - was presented to the House' (*The Age* 15 August 1963: 3). Indeed, the two bark petitions (a second was presented by Opposition Leader Arthur Calwell on 28 August) were unlike anything the Parliament of Australia had seen before. The typed text of the petitions, in both English and Gumatj languages (reproduced at the end of this chapter), were framed by paintings of sacred clan designs communicating ancestral narratives of creation and of the land and sea estates of the Yolngu. The petitions were the first traditional documents to be recognised by the Commonwealth Parliament and thus represent the earliest signs of the recognition of Indigenous rights and title under Australian law (Langton and Loos 2008: 349).

The Yolngu petitions were not the first petitions from Indigenous people to Australian governments. In the late 1880s, for example, members of the Kulin nation resident at Coranderrk made repeated protests and petitions to government that asserted their right to

govern themselves and control the Coranderrk reserve (Attwood 2003: 18). And in 1937 William Cooper gathered (on foot!) 2000 signatures for his petition to the King calling for Aboriginal representation in parliament – a labour frustrated by the then federal government, which declined to forward the petition to the King given that, in their view, appointing an Aboriginal representative to parliament was ‘a constitutional impossibility’ (Atkinson 2008: 307). These and many other instances are evidence that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have been unrelenting in making claims for rights and justice to the Settler State.

However, the bark petitions were the first to straddle two laws, with the petitions presented in both English and Gumatj, and both conforming to the requirements for parliamentary petitions and presenting visual evidence in the form of paintings that, far from being merely decorative, were the essence of their statement of claim to land. The petitions were a deliberate effort at bicultural political communication that drew on the strengths and resources of Yolngu political life. Further, as Howard Morphy has argued, the creation of the artwork on the petitions not only was directed at outsiders but also reflected the creation of a regional Yolngu polity at Yirrkala (Morphy 2009), a polity still very much in evidence in national politics and in public events such as the annual Garma Festival.

In a practical sense, we might say that the petitions failed. Although a parliamentary committee of inquiry was convened, which in its final report both acknowledged the rights of Yolngu as articulated in the petitions and recommended that compensation be paid and sacred sites be protected, these recommendations were ignored (Langton and Loos 2008: 349). These events provided the spark for the subsequent case *Milirrpum v Nabalco Pty Ltd* (1971), which also failed when Blackburn J determined – erroneously, as was later found – that there could be no recognition of native title under Australian law (Ritter 2009: 14).

Yet in some significant ways the petitions were a profound success. The *Milirrpum* case became the catalyst for the Woodward Commission into Aboriginal Land Rights, which eventually resulted in the *Aboriginal Land Rights Act 1976* (NT). Media reporting of the *Milirrpum* case expressed shock at the ‘brutal exposure of colonial doctrine’ evident in the decision (Russell 2006: 158). More broadly, presentation of the bark petitions, along with the 1966 Wave Hill walk-off by the Gurindji people, created a surge of national mobilisation

and pan-Aboriginal sentiment (Merlan 2005: 484). Urban-dwelling Aboriginal people were at the forefront of the more militant expressions of this movement, linking these struggles in the north to protest events such as the establishment of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra in 1972, considered to be the first nation-wide Aboriginal political protest (Jones and Hill-Burnett 1982: 222). The debate and legal actions that flowed from these events culminated many years later in the 1992 *Mabo* decision in the High Court of Australia, which determined that, although the communal ownership of land by Aboriginal people could not be recognised as a proprietary interest in common law, it did constitute a unique form of title to land that had existed before colonisation. The 1993 *Native Title Act* (Cth), the legislative response to the *Mabo* decision, created the first collective rights to land in the Australian legal system (Davis 2006: 37).

The most profound effect of the presentation and reception of the bark petitions, however, was their 'unsettling' effect on the Settler-Colonial order in Australia. When Prime Minister Menzies announced the granting of the mining lease on Yolngu land, he could not have foreseen the challenge to Settler sovereignty that he would unleash. One of the key supporters of the petitions, Labor MP Kim Beazley (Senior), proclaimed that, from the moment the petitions had been presented to the parliament, both the parliament and the Australian nation were 'on trial' concerning the moral implications of white settlement raised by Aboriginal claims to their ongoing rights to land (quoted in Atwood 2003: 233). The *Milirrpum* case was to be the first instance of Aboriginal people seeking to use the laws of the Settler State to achieve recognition of their pre-existing rights and title (Curthoys et al 2008: 3). Even this courtroom battle was not conducted solely on Settler terms, despite gross disparities in the ability to exercise power and influence the final outcome. During the proceedings, Yolngu leaders revealed to their interrogators some of the ancient 'title deeds' that established their ownership of the Yolngu estate since the beginning of time according to their customary laws. That the Settler court was unable to see or to recognise the system of law embodied in the valuable and sacred objects it was shown caused great despair among the Yolngu Elders (Trudgen 2000: 41-2), but the attempt to enter into respectful engagement with the Settler order still stands. Despite the pain and frustration of these struggles, the years have shown that the unsettling winds first stirred by the bark petitions have continued to blow through the corridors

of Settler institutions. Never again can ignorance be claimed as an excuse when Indigenous rights are trampled, nor can Settlers on this land feel quite as settled as they might wish.

Settler anxiety

Mainstream Australia invests significant energy in debate and discussion about contemporary Indigenous affairs. Ongoing interventions into Indigenous life are based in what Diane Smith describes as a 'deep-seated lack of confidence' in Indigenous culture and in associated modes of governance (Smith 2008: 75). This continues a pattern, since the invaders first strode ashore in 1788, of Settler anxiety and consternation about the governance arrangements for an Indigenous minority constituted in the course of colonisation. Indigenous culture is often seen as some kind of 'inherited virus that will inevitably contaminate and undermine western standards of "good governance"' (Smith 2008: 75). Bill Ivory goes further, suggesting that 'politicians and public commentators regularly question whether there is, in fact, any extant Indigenous governance and leadership', with some even arguing that 'if it once existed, it has since become valueless or has disintegrated altogether' (Ivory 2008: 233). In the face of such claims, however, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continue to work hard in developing effective and culturally appropriate modes of governance and organisation and, in the process, continue to unsettle Settlers and Settler institutions.

A central contention of this book is that to engage with the work of decolonisation more productively than we have in the past – that is, to reconcile, heal and grow as a more just nation – the Australian political community must make much more of this sense of being unsettled by Indigenous Australia. Only by allowing ourselves to be unsettled, and to embrace the associated issues in an open and unapologetic way, will we be able to address the anxieties associated with Indigenous governance and contribute to healing the persistent sore of wider Indigenous-Settler relations that continue to trouble the Australian community. This openness to becoming unsettled is an essential component of any commitment to the decolonising process (Rose 2004: 22).

To embrace the experience of being unsettled and explore the inter-cultural spaces of interaction and contestation between Indigenous and Settler Australia (Smith 2008: 76) represents a break

with the cacophonous discussions in contemporary Indigenous affairs. Amid the rhetoric of crisis and the documentation of program and policy failure, questions are rarely asked of the Settler State framework and its accompanying institutions and processes. Our debates are often circular, running the treadmill of European-derived Settler-liberalism without asking questions about the social and political values that inform the terms of debate. Amid the noise there is a silence on the values and ideas that inform Indigenous governance and Settler-Indigenous relations. The fact that there are (at least) two sets of political systems and values upon which we might draw to make our future together in Australia is bypassed in the hubbub of Settler-liberal prescriptions to 'the Aboriginal problem' (Dodson 2000: 13). The chapters in this book suggest that turning to ask questions of the Settler State framework and putting this in exchange with Indigenous frameworks promises new clarity for building a different future.

The fact that such silence exists around our political forms and values is all the more remarkable for the fact that Indigenous people have consistently tried to engage the Settler order through repeated calls for treaties, constitutional change, self-determination and better representation on the national political stage. These claims for recognition are articulated in a colonial context and hence in an asymmetric relationship with mainstream society. For this reason such claims, especially those designed to reach a wider audience, are frequently articulated in the language of liberalism – through appeals to rights, justice, equity, freedom from discrimination and so on. As Diane Smith and Janet Hunt have argued, 'the contemporary exercise of Indigenous governance is a process that must constantly attempt to renegotiate the balance of domination, subordination and contestation in its interactions with the Australian state' (2008: 4). By definition, Indigenous claims on the Settler State represent a form of compromise on the part of Aboriginal people, prepared to accept the presence of the interlopers on their land while working through what are often perceived as alien and flawed European political notions and institutions to extract more in the way of recognition and respect for Indigenous people and their political values and systems.

Indigenous efforts to enter into dialogue with mainstream Australia have thus far received little or no reciprocal movement from the Settler State and its associated institutions. The progress that has been made in Indigenous affairs has typically come in forms

that are palatable to mainstream liberalism rather than arising out of serious and fundamental negotiation. Indigenous Australians have been invited to take up mainstream(ing) values and lifestyles through citizenship, rights, housing, education, and employment. This is most obvious in more explicitly assimilatory policy approaches, including the ongoing 'intervention' in the Northern Territory, but it is also true, despite the rhetoric, of the self-determination era. Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2005) has suggested that government policies of self-determination were always more concerned with organisational and community *management* than with placing meaningful political and economic power in Aboriginal hands (2005: 63). Here Indigenous people were invited to participate in and drive programs and services predominantly designed, auspiced or managed by government agencies (Maddison 2009: 26-8). This amounts to a 'take it or leave it' approach to shared existence; it is no basis for building an open and confident shared future.

Meanwhile, a virulent assimilationist strain of thinking about Indigenous affairs has lain dormant, only just concealed beneath the hollow rhetoric of self-determination. This assimilationism has recently sprung forth with renewed confidence, sweeping up both sides of mainstream formal politics in Australia and developing a new 'top-down approach to problems framed by the powerful' (Hunt 2008: 44). We have already been down this path and, despite the enlistment of some high-profile Indigenous support, we know that it cannot work. Despite suggestions to the contrary, debates about Indigenous policy and governance are far from resolved. The current policy emphases on 'intervention' and 'closing the gap' have not moved Australia from its paternalistic, assimilationist approach which assumes that the 'Settler knows best'. The bravado of muscular paternalism and hackneyed recommitment to addressing social indicators has some time to run, but it provides no thoroughgoing answer to a challenge that has been with us since settlement: how are we to negotiate to live and manage our affairs together?

Alongside the dominance and intransigence of Settler political institutions, much has been written about Indigenous people in Australia that documents their culture, ways of life and political practice. Yet the dominant understandings of Indigenous Australia in mainstream politics and media either romanticise an 'ancient culture' or emphasise its imagined deficits and contemporary difficulties. What these views miss is the vibrancy and depth of Indigenous

political systems and the efforts of Aboriginal people to engage creatively with the Settler State, often on their own terms. In what Sarah Holcombe describes as the 'grey cultural in-between' interface between Settler and Indigenous cultures, Indigenous peoples have appropriated some aspects of Settler culture and rejected others (Holcombe 2005: 224). At the same time, in a challenge to Settler dominance in a diversity of contexts, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continue to express their political claims through local, independent and challenging articulations of their capacity to govern themselves. In documenting this work and Indigenous engagement with the Settler State and its institutions, this book aims to contribute to debate about how to advance Indigenous governance and Indigenous-Settler relations in Australia.

Our contention is that recent political developments and the simple passage of time since colonisation mean that the mainstream Australian community is becoming more attuned to the underlying and thoroughgoing challenge of Settler-Indigenous relations and hence better placed to engage with Indigenous people on questions of governance – that we have been sufficiently unsettled for a sufficiently long time to realise that we now must turn to directly and seriously address governance. The Prime Minister's 2008 apology to members of the Stolen Generation – coming after more than a decade of remarkable difficulty in Settler-Indigenous relations – seemed an important opening for moving forward, although little has happened since that moment to reward such optimism. Grassroots reconciliation efforts also contribute important momentum, but of themselves these developments have not been enough. There is also little prospect that governments can lead the way on reforming our approaches to Indigenous governance, for they are particularly tied to the institutions, values and ideas imported with colonisation. They can be more or less flexible partners, but moving to address the challenges of Indigenous governance and Settler-Indigenous relations will require the support and participation of the wider Australian community.

This book aims to build upon what the editors and contributors to this volume perceive as a renewed sense of urgency among 'ordinary Australians' to develop some fresh possibilities for working through longstanding issues between Indigenous and other Australians. Our goal is to rethink, in a positive mode, governance and broader Settler-Indigenous relations, restoring mainstream confidence in

Indigenous competence, resilience and ingenuity. Many organisations and individuals, only some of them represented in this book, are already working in complex inter-cultural spaces to unsettle the complacency of the Settler State. To lay the foundation for analysing and extending upon this work we want to provide an indicative conceptual frame for reading the following chapters.

Engaging the Settler State: 'Asking you to share that power'

In dealings with the Settler State and its institutions, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are typically required, due to an asymmetric relationship with the mainstream, to work through the media and forms of the contemporary western society. As will become apparent in subsequent chapters, this can involve transforming and modifying (as well as complementing and adding to) Indigenous values through contact with values and ideas introduced by Settlers. This is tremendously difficult work. The language of contemporary liberalism might stress the importance of free and informed consent in such processes, but this is very difficult to achieve in a Settler-dominated context. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people constantly face difficult strategic choices about how to best engage with a Settler mainstream broadly unaware of Indigenous issues or nervous about being challenged by Indigenous people.

In difficult circumstances Indigenous people have nonetheless consistently made strong claims in innovative and vibrant ways to further inter-cultural engagement and promote better Indigenous-Settler futures. The example of the bark petitions that opened this chapter is just one among many such challenges to the legitimacy of the Settler State. The Gurindji walk-off, the Tent Embassy, the Treaty '88 campaign, the Barunga statement, the *Mabo* case, Camp Sovereignty – all had as their genesis the persistent belief among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples that their original political status remains unchanged despite two centuries of Settler occupation, dispossession and subjugation. In each of these examples, those making a claim on the Settler State deployed aspects of Indigenous culture, customary law and the expression of their inherent rights, combining them with the strategies and Settler technologies available to them in ways that they believed would be recognised by the Settler, whether through strike action, petition, public protest or legal action.

One of the most recent sets of claims and responses by Aboriginal people arises in the context of the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER). Here again, resistance to the neo-paternalism of the Settler State has used available tools and technologies. To catalogue even a representative sample of the responses is beyond our scope here. Instead we want to bring out one quite remarkable response posted on YouTube. The clip, prepared out of Milingimbi by the Riyawarray (2008) group and based around ceremony performed by Yirritja clan nations from across Northeast Arnhem Land, makes strong Indigenous claims in innovative and vibrant ways that are geared to further inter-cultural engagement and promoting improved joint Indigenous-Settler futures. Four themes that are particularly evident in the clip are also taken up in the chapters of this book.

The clip opens with a short text proclaiming that 'Riyawarray or Common Ground is an ancient and unbroken Yirritja Ngarra Law ritual'. From the beginning, the clip makes a firm claim to political autonomy and standing, sometimes framed as a claim to sovereignty by Indigenous people. This Law is framed as 'ancient', so precedes the arrival of Europeans, and it has not been broken by colonisation. The next section of text makes clear the expectation the film has of non-Yolngu viewers: 'We aim to have Yolngu Rom recognised as a credible justice system ...'. This is a very direct expression of the Yolngu claim that they are able to govern themselves, and a demand that their ways of organising social and political life be accorded respect. This theme is carried throughout, partly through a direct challenge at several points to the imposition of the NTER upon Aboriginal people, including a demand that the federal government reconsider the NTER and its approach. Ceremony is at the centre of the clip, underlying the importance of Yolngu values and their ongoing relevance for addressing and advancing political concerns. Keith Lapulung seems to know that Settler audiences struggle to accept the power and force of ceremony and, perhaps because of this, he makes the point about recognition of Indigenous political systems and claims very directly: 'we are not pretending here ... we want you mob out there in Canberra to recognise our Law'.

A second and related theme is the use of creative resistance in ways that demonstrate the vibrancy and depth of Indigenous political systems. The use of video, and of YouTube, is perhaps the most obvious illustration of creative engagement, but the Riyawarray group is also on Facebook. Such innovation is at odds with how

much of the mainstream Australia views – or imagines – Indigenous Australia, and in quite a paradoxical way. While white Australia frequently places Indigenous people as ‘Traditional’ with a capital T – and thus as tribal mystics who are either sources of ancient wisdom or victims of the march of progress who are unable to cope with the modern world – Yolngu and other Indigenous peoples are blending the latest technology with their political and social values to pursue serious political engagement. Matthew Dhulumburrk seems to understand this challenge, informing viewers that ‘this is not a ceremony for ceremony ... [we are] talking to Balanda people, government ...’. At the same time, Aboriginal people often make strong claims for the power and reach of Aboriginal values, in this case through the integrative power of ceremony. Keith Lapulung appeals for a coming-together of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australia through the ‘deep essence of our heart with this device of ceremony’. The combination of film and ceremony through YouTube is perhaps a striking instance of creative engagement by Indigenous people, but throughout the country people are innovating in a wide range of governance approaches, some of which are discussed in the following chapters.

The third theme we want to draw out is the importance of inter-cultural engagement through respect. Early on in the clip, the first speaker, Matthew Dhulumburrk, sharply informs viewers that the ceremony is calling upon the federal government in Canberra to begin to treat Yolngu as people rather than as animals. ‘Let’s treat each other equally as human beings.’ This is a relatively straightforward appeal, but it belies a subtle understanding of complex inter-cultural issues and cultural differences between Yolngu and Settlers. Keith Lapulung, referring to the ceremony, states that ‘our knowledge is not calculated, our knowledge is a cosmic knowledge ... it has strong interconnectedness through our forefathers’. He continues, ‘our knowledge is like the knowledge when you look out through the clear evening stars ... only Yolngu mind has got the knowledge to know what these people are presenting’. Most Indigenous people want to be treated equally and with respect, much like other people, but this does not mean being treated exactly the same as Settlers, or without recognition of the uniqueness of their humanness. Respectful inter-cultural engagement picks up the last theme we want to highlight in the clip: the possibility for recognition of shared humanness and future which simultaneously respects uniqueness.

In one sense, the clip is responding to the NTER and thus a particular government action. Ganygulpa Dhurrkay, senior cultural advisor at Milingimbi, for instance, asks the government to reconsider the NTER and she highlights its disempowering effects. But the clip is also working on a much larger canvas to extend an open hand to Settler Australia to work towards a shared, positive and respectful future. As Dhurrkay refers to the NTER as disempowering, she simultaneously invites viewers to participate in the power of the ceremony. She says 'through this ceremony ... [we are] asking you to share that power, [asking] ... for both of us to *see* from another perspective, a perspective that is full of grace, a perspective full of richness, and we come together as one'. The clip is partly directed, then, to the challenges of Indigenous-Settler relations for future nationhood. As Matthew Dhulumburk says, 'today, now, time for change ... everybody change, everybody change'. The speakers are very clear and cautious about the framing of this as a shared future: it is shared but respects difference. As Keith Lapulung says, 'we need to find a solution and a way ... we would like to appeal common ground, common understanding from the non-Indigenous Australians and Yolngu ... clear up our pathway and together we achieve our destiny ... have those two Laws ... meeting together and find a good way of presenting a betterment for all Australians'. Lapulung is clearly talking about a shared future, but he also refers to 'your Australia, our Australia'. As will be clear in many of the following chapters, this formulation is not paradoxical, for there are two or more parties to a dialogue, two or more parts to a whole.

Boundary riding

Many of the contributors to this volume are, in a sense, boundary riders protecting Indigenous spaces from recolonisation in the face of persistent pressures from the Settler interlopers. Some of the governance practices that are documented here represent the patrolling of boundaries, the mending of fences and, wherever possible, the expansion of political space that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples can claim as their own. Despite the fact that Indigenous Australians still enjoy only limited jurisdictional authority, they are prepared to both defend this authority and find ways of working within the broader inter-cultural governance environment where there is an inevitable 'interplay of relationships, practice and

agency' that gives some limit to the boundaries they are working to protect (Smith and Hunt 2008: 3).

Indigenous governance is an important site for 'the unfinished business of post-colonial struggle' in which the 'balance of power and relationships between Indigenous Australians and the Australian state' are constantly contested and renegotiated (Smith and Hunt 2008: 11). The chapters in this book explore the ways in which, in a diversity of contexts, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people continue to express their prior claims to political autonomy through local, independent and challenging articulations of their capacity to govern themselves. The authors demonstrate the vibrancy and depth of Indigenous political values and systems, and the efforts of Aboriginal people to engage creatively with the Settler State, often on their own terms. In this work they need mainstream Settler society recognition and support. This brings Indigenous governance into a space of inter-cultural engagement, and several of the chapters that follow consider questions about how we acknowledge and understand what is Indigenous and what is European and the overlap, fusion, differentiation and negotiation between these ways of being and governing. Finally, the book considers the challenges of Indigenous-Settler political relations at the beginning of the 21st century by explicitly attending to the relationship between Settler State and Indigenous forms of governance and political engagement. These are vital issues for the future of this nation, and we hope this book helps to deepen, broaden and instigate some of the conversations that we desperately need to have.

**Petitions of the Aboriginal people of Yirrkala 14 August
and 28 August 1963, National Archives of Australia**

The Humble Petition of the Undersigned aboriginal people of Yirrkala, being members of the Balamumu, Narrkala, Gapiny, Miliwurrwurr people and Djapu, Mangalili, Madarrpa, MagarrwanaImirri, Djambarrpuynu, Gumaitj, Marrakulu, Galpu, Dhaluangu, Wangurri, Warramirri, Naymil, Riritjingu, tribes respectfully showeth.

1. That nearly 500 people of the above tribes are residents of the land excised from the Aboriginal Reserve in Arnhem Land.
2. That the procedures of the excision of this land and the fate of the people on it were never explained to them beforehand, and were kept secret from them.
3. That when Welfare Officers and Government officials came to inform them of decisions taken without them and against them, they did not undertake to convey to the Government in Canberra the views and feelings of the Yirrkala aboriginal people.
4. That the land in question has been hunting and food gathering land for the Yirrkala tribes from time immemorial: we were all born here.
5. That places sacred to the Yirrkala people, as well as vital to their livelihood are in the excised land, especially Melville Bay.
6. That the people of this area fear that their needs and interests will be completely ignored as they have been ignored in the past, and they fear that the fate which has overtaken the Larrakeah tribe will overtake them.
7. And they humbly pray that the Honourable the House of Representatives will appoint a Committee, accompanied by competent interpreters, to hear the views of the people of Yirrkala before permitting the excision of this land.
8. They humbly pray that no arrangements be entered into with any company which will destroy the livelihood and independence of the Yirrkala people.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray God to help you and us.

(English language translation.)

Bukudjulni gonga'yurri napurrunha Yirrkalalili yulnunha malanha Balamumu, Narrkala, Gapiny, Miliwurrwurr, nanapurru dhuwala mala, ga Djapu, Mangalili, Madarra, Magarrwanalmirri, Djambarrpuynu, Marrkulu, Gumaitj, Galpu, Dhaluangu, Wangurri, Warramirri, Naymil, Riritjingu malamanapanmirri djal dhunapa.

1. Dhuwala yolnu mala galki, 500 nhina ga dhiyala wanganura. Dhuwala wanga Arnhem Land yurru djaw'yunna naburrungala.
2. Dhuwala wanga djaw'yunna ga nhaltjana yurru yolnunundja dhiyala wanga nura nhaltjana dhu dharrpanna yolnu walandja yakana lakarama madayangumuna.
3. Dhuwala nunhi Welfare Officers ga Government bungawa lakarama yolnuwa malanuwa nhaltjarra nhuma gana wanganaminha yaka nula napurrungu lakarama, walala yaka lakarama, walala yaka lakarama Governmentgala nunhala Canberra nhaltjana napurru ga guyana yolnuyu Yirrkala.
4. Dhuwala wanga napurrnyu balanu larrunarawu napurrungu nathawu, guyawu, miyapunuwu, maypalwu nunhi napurru gana nhinana bitjarrayi nathilimirri, napurru dhawalguyanana dhiyala wanganura.
5. Dhuwala wanga yurru dharrpalnha yurru yolnuwalandja malawala, ga dharrpalnhadhuwala bala yolnuwuyndja nhinanharawu Melville Baythurru wanga balandayudjaw'yun nyumukunin.
6. Dhuwala yolnundja mala yurru nhamana balandawunu nha mulkurru nhama yurru momaga daranun yalalanumirrinha nhaltjana dhu napurru bitjarra nhakuna Larrakeahyumomara walalanguwuy wanga.
7. Nuli dhu bungawayu House of Representatives djaw'yun yolnuwala nathili yurru nha dhulakarama interpreteryu bungawawala yolnu matha, yurru nha dhu djaw'yun wangandja.
8. Nunhiyina dhu marrlayun marrama'ndja nhinanharawu yolnuwu marrnamathinyarawu.

Dhuwala napurru yolnu mala yurru liyamirriyama bitjan bili marr yurru napurru nhagonga'yunna wagarr'yu.

(Australian matha.)

PART I

Framing Contemporary Governance