

WHAT'S NEW IN NATIVE TITLE

SEPTEMBER 2012

1. Case Summaries.....	1
2. Legislation	3
3. Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUA)	4
4. Native Title Determinations	6
5. Registered Native Title Bodies Corporate (RNTBC).....	6
6. Public Notices	6
7. Native Title in the News	6
8. Native Title Publications	7
9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities.....	9
10. Events.....	9

1. Case Summaries

Graham on behalf of the Ngadju People v State of Western Australia [2012] FCA 1003

**27 August 2012, Application for joinder as respondents, Federal Court of Australia – Melbourne
 Marshall J**

The Federal Court dismissed applications by Mr Laing, Mr Lawrie and Ms Miller, who each sought to be joined as respondents to the Ngadju native title claim.

Under s 84(5) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth), a person may be added as a party to proceedings, if their interests may be affected by the determination and it is in the interests of justice to do so.

The Ngadju claim area covers over 100,000 square kilometres in Western Australia. An agreement in 1996 between the Ngadju and Mirning peoples resolved a border overlap on the eastern border of the current Ngadju claim and the western border of the Mirning claim. Mr Lawrie and Ms Miller, applicants for the original Mirning claim lodged in 1995, sought to be joined as respondent parties, in order to protect Mirning land and interests in the Ngadju claim area. Mr Laing is the applicant for the Naley claim, which was filed in April 2012 and dismissed on 7 September 2012 (see *Laing v State of South Australia (No 2) [2012] FCA 980* below). He argued that his descendants have maintained a physical and spiritual connection to Mirning lands and that Mirning sites and country extends into the Ngadju claim area.

Marshall J emphasised that the Court has discretion to determine whether or not a party should be added to proceedings and, in this case, the interlocutory applications were made too late. The Ngadju claim had already progressed to an advanced stage, as evidence had been heard, final written submissions filed and the parties were due to address the court on 24 September 2012. Mr Laing, Mr Lawrie and Ms Miller provided no explanation for

their delay in making an application and, as Marshall J stated, allowing them to join the proceedings would ‘severely jeopardise the efficient conduct of the trial.’

Marshall J acknowledged that even if there is substantial delay, it may still be appropriate to allow an application. However, in this case, the applicants were relying on ‘skeletal affidavits’ and had not filed any extensive evidence.

Sandy on behalf of the Yugara/Yugarapul People v State of Queensland [2012] FCA 978

6 September 2012, Interlocutory application seeking fresh authorization process, Federal Court of Australia – Brisbane

Reeves J

The Federal Court dismissed an interlocutory application by the Turrbal People, who sought an order for a fresh authorisation process in the Yugara/Yugarapul claim. The Turrbal People and the Yugara/ Yugarapul people have competing and overlapping native title determination applications over an area of land and waters covering the City of Brisbane and its immediate surrounds.

Under s 84D(4)(b) of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA), the Federal Court may make any order it considers appropriate, if a native title applicant has not been properly authorised by the native title claim group. The Turrbal People contended that the Yugara/ Yugarapul People’s claim was not properly authorised, as notice of the authorisation meeting was not widely distributed to the claim group.

Reeves J recognised that there are some doubts as to whether the applicants were validly authorised, given the limited nature and extent of the circulation of notice and the lack of evidence about the decision-making process adopted.

However, his Honour noted that there is no particular authorisation process prescribed in the NTA and a ‘practical approach’ to this issue should be adopted. It was significant that no member of the Yugara/ Yugarapul claim group had come forward to complain about the authorisation process and the only complainant was the Turrbal People, who are currently involved in a substantive border dispute with the applicant.

Reeves J emphasised that the Federal Court is bound to conduct civil litigation as justly, quickly, inexpensively and efficiently as possible. In this case, requiring the Yugarapul People to conduct a fresh authorisation process would result in considerable expense and would do nothing to resolve the boundary dispute between the Turrbal and Yugara/ Yugarapul peoples’ claims.

Although weighing up the need for valid authorisation, Reeves J concluded that the substantive dispute between both native title groups should be determined and no further delay and expense should be devoted to the validity of the authorisation process.

Torres v State of Western Australia [2012] FCA 972

6 September 2012, Application to amend claim, Federal Court of Australia – Perth

Gilmour J

In this matter, the Court granted leave to amend the Djabera Djabera native title application to reduce the claim area covered by the original application.

The applicant filed an affidavit of Principal Legal Officer of Kimberley Land Council (KLC) in support of the amended application. The affidavit states that the purpose of the amendment is to allow the Nyul Nyul People – a neighbouring native title claim group – to lodge a native title claim over land and water that would otherwise overlap with the Djabera Djabera claim area.

The applicant submitted that s 64 of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) gives the applicant a statutory right to amend a native title application to reduce the claim area, without requiring the leave of the Court: *Walker v State of*

Queensland [2004] FCA 640. The respondents to the matter were put on notice of the filing of the interlocutory application. The State of Western Australia informed KLC that they did not oppose the proposed amendment and no other respondent took an active role in the determination of the interlocutory application.

The Court made orders allowing the application to be amended.

Laing v State of South Australia (No 2) [2012] FCA 980

7 September 2012, Interlocutory application to strike out native title application, Federal Court of Australia- Adelaide Manfield J

The Federal Court dismissed the Naley descendants' native title application, on the basis that they are a subset or subgroup of the Mirning People.

The Naley claim partially overlapped with the Ngadju claim in Western Australia, the Mirning claim in Western Australia and the Far West Coast Claim in South Australia. Under s 67 of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) (NTA), the Federal Court is required to deal with overlapping native title claims in the same proceeding. The overlapping Ngadju claim thus had significance for the progress and resolution of the three other long-standing claims.

The Ngadju applicants, supported by the Far West Coast applicants and by the State of South Australia, applied to have the Naley claim struck out under s 84C(1) NTA. Section 84C(1) provides that a native title application may be dismissed if it fails to comply with requirements under sections 61, 61A or 62 NTA.

Mansfield J affirmed that an application will breach s 61 if it is not made by a native title claim group, consisting of 'all the persons who, according to their traditional law and customs, hold the common law or group rights comprising the native title claim.' His Honour emphasised that a court will not readily reach this conclusion, but may strike out an application where it is clear that the claimant is only a 'subgroup or subset of a native title claim group'.

Mansfield J concluded that the Naley descendants did not seek to claim native title interests exclusively, but instead as part of a wider native title claim group comprising the Mirning People. In their application and proposed amendment, Naley descendants recognised that other Mirning People had native title rights and interests in the claim area and that the Naley descendants are part of the Mirning People. The native title application by the Naley descendants was therefore struck down, as it was made on behalf of a subset or subgroup of the Mirning People and was not authorised by the wider claim group.

Mansfield J found it unnecessary to deal with the Ngadju applicants' other contentions. However, his Honour remarked that the Court is unlikely to dismiss a native title application merely due to its recent filing, compared to the history and evolution of other overlapping claims. The Court will only have discretion to dismiss a claim for lateness under se 31A of the *Federal Court of Australia Act 1976* if the lateness amounts to abuse of process. Mansfield J did not find it necessary to comment upon this issue or to explore in detail whether the Naley descendants are in fact members of the claim group constituting the Mirning People.

2. Legislation

Native Title Amendment Bill 2012

The exposure draft of the *Native Title Amendment Bill 2012* (Cth) was released by the Attorney-General's Department on 21 September 2012. It introduces proposed changes to the requirement of 'good faith' negotiations; disregarding of historical extinguishment in respect of parks and reserves; and the authorisation process for Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUAs).

'Good faith' negotiations

Under the proposed Bill, the meaning of 'good faith' negotiations will be clarified and guidance given as to the type of conduct and effort expected of negotiating parties. Courts would be required to consider factors such as whether the party has attended meetings at reasonable times; disclosed relevant information; made reasonable offers; given

genuine consideration to proposals; and refrained from capricious or unfair conduct. The minimum duration of negotiations would be extended to 8 months and the onus would be placed on the party seeking an arbitral determination to show that they have negotiated in good faith.

Disregarding historical extinguishment

The proposed amendment would allow a government party and native title applicants to reach an agreement about the disregarding of historical extinguishment over parks and reserves.

Authorisation process for ILUAs

Under the operation of the current Act, where parties agree to amend an existing ILUA, they may be required to freshly lodge an application for registration of the ILUA with the Registrar. The Bill would remove the registration requirement in the case of certain minor amendments to ILUAs, provided that parties inform the Registrar of such changes.

Comments on the exposure draft are due by the close of business on Friday 19 October 2012 via an [online survey or email to native.title@ag.gov.au](mailto:native.title@ag.gov.au).

- Visit the Attorney- General’s Department website to download the [explanatory cover sheet](#) and [exposure draft legislation](#).
- View the [media release](#) issued by the Attorney-General and Minister for Emergency Management.

Petroleum and Geothermal Energy (Transitional Licences) Amendment Bill 2012 (SA)

The *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy (Transitional Licences) Amendment Bill 2012 (SA)* entered into force on 27 September 2012. The amendments are designed to ensure the retrospective validity of certain grants, consolidations and renewals of past petroleum production licences held by Santos Limited, Delhi Petroleum Pty Ltd and Origin Energy Resources Ltd in the Cooper Basin.

According to the South Australian Government, the previous *Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000* may have ‘inadvertently’ excluded certain transitional licences from the normal renewal provisions of the *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth) and left them subject to the ‘right to negotiate’ requirements. The Government expressed concern that if the Bill was not passed, the recent consolidation of Cooper Basin permits signed before 1993 might be flawed, with consequences for business confidence and future investments in South Australia’s petroleum sector.

Concerns have been raised about the speed at which the Bill was passed through Parliament, the lack of consultation with relevant stakeholders, and the lost opportunity for native title holders to exercise their right to negotiate in relation to renewals of these transitional production licences.

- View the [Petroleum and Geothermal Energy \(Transitional Licences\) Amendment Bill 2012 \(SA\)](#)

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 September 2012, **23** ILUAs were registered with the National Native Title Tribunal.

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
24/09/2012	Arrow Darumbal LNG Project ILUA	QI2012/059	AA	Queensland	Infrastructure Petroleum/Gas Pipeline
21/09/2012	Yugunga-Nya People & Sandfire ILUA (Non-overlapping area)	WI2012/001	AA	Western Australia	Mining Exploration
21/09/2012	Bar Barrum #2-#7 and Tablelands Regional Council ILUA	QI2012/056	AA	Queensland	Access Government

Registration date	Name	Tribunal file no.	Type	State or Territory	Subject matter
21/09/2012	QGC, Barada Barna and Wiri ILUA	QI2012/063	AA	Queensland	Access Petroleum/Gas Exploration
21/09/2012	QGC and Barada Barna ILUA	QI2012/062	AA	Queensland	Access Petroleum/Gas Exploration
21/09/2012	QGC and Wiri ILUA	QI2012/061	AA	Queensland	Access Petroleum/Gas Exploration
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Stevenson Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/008	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Mount Sarah Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/009	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Eringa/Hamilton Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/010	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Crown Point Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/011	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Tieyon Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/012	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Eringa People - Macumba Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/013	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Irrwanyere Macumba Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/014	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
18/09/2012	Irrwanyere Stevenson Pastoral ILUA	SI2012/015	BCA	South Australia	Access Terms of Access Pastoral
07/09/2012	Mt Elsie Holding ILUA	QI2012/054	AA	Queensland	Access Consultation protocol Pastoral
07/09/2012	Gunggari People and Ergon Energy ILUA	QI2012/046	AA	Queensland	Consultation protocol Infrastructure
07/09/2012	Gunggari People and Leinster West ILUA	QI2012/047	AA	Queensland	Terms of Access Pastoral
07/09/2012	Gunggari People/Rundalua ILUA	QI2012/048	AA	Queensland	Terms of Access Pastoral
07/09/2012	Gunggari People/Ularunda ILUA	QI2012/049	AA	Queensland	Terms of Access Pastoral
07/09/2012	Gunggari People/Kalyan ILUA	QI2012/057	AA	Queensland	Access Terms of Access
07/09/2012	Gunggari People/Sherwood (aka Karatang) ILUA	QI2012/058	AA	Queensland	Access Terms of Access
07/09/2012	Dja Dja Wurrung Peoples and Hodges Resources Ltd (EL4907)	VI2012/02	AA	Victoria	Exploration
04/09/2012	IBIS/Mer Gedkem le Corporation/Aboriginal and Islander Affairs Corporation ILUA	QI2012/067	BCA	Queensland	Development Infrastructure Community

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 September 2012, 2 native title determinations were handed down.

Short Name (NNTT)	Case Name	Date (NNTT)	State	Outcome	Legal Process	Type
Glen Helen Pastoral Lease	<i>Inkamala v Northern Territory of Australia</i> [2012] FCA 1044	25/09/2012	Northern Territory	Native title exists in parts of the determination area	Consent determination	Claimant
Combined Mandingalbay Yidinji - Gunggandji	<i>Ggungandji Claim v State of Queensland</i> (unreported, FCA)	21/09/2012	Queensland	Native title exists in the entire determination area	Consent determination	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

Altman, J. and Kerins, S. (eds.), *People on Country: Vital Landscapes, Indigenous Futures*, Federation Press, October 2012

This book draws on a diversity of perspectives to document a significant social and environmental movement that is quietly gathering momentum across this vast Indigenous estate. It contains a series of essays, drawn from an unusual collaboration between university researchers and Indigenous land owners, and tells a little-known story about Aboriginal people who are living on, working on and caring for the lands and seas that they own and manage. The authors argue that ongoing struggles by Indigenous people to conserve and rehabilitate the outstanding natural and cultural values of their ancestral lands deserve wide recognition and acclaim.

Berg, S. and Bell, D., 'Recognition of Aboriginal law systems', *Native Title News*, Vol. 10, Iss. 7, July 2012: 87-89

This short paper comments upon four different recognition regimes of Aboriginal rights and responsibilities to land by the State in Australia. Many of these comments will not be new to legal practitioners working in the field of Aboriginal rights; however, they may serve as a reminder of the different nature of acts of recognition by the State and generate reflection upon their consequences.

Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, 'Indigenous Women Rangers Talking - Sharing ideas and information about women rangers' work', September 2012

This booklet emerged from the second Indigenous women rangers workshop, which was held at the Australian National University on 23-27 April 2012. The book was written by and for Indigenous women rangers, talking about their work, insights, challenges and inspirations. Cherry Daniels writes, 'We want to share our stories, lessons and strategies to make strong Indigenous women rangers who are good role models in the community and who are proud to look after country and culture. We want to show people that women rangers are doing good things for their country and community so we can get more women ranger jobs.' Available for download on [CAEPR website](#).

Cleary, P., *Mine Field: The Dark Side of Australia's Resource Rush*, Black Inc. Publishing, August 2012

In *Mine-Field*, Paul Cleary counts the cost of Australia's mineral addiction. Whether it be coal-seam gas, LNG or coal mega-mines, a resources rush is happening in just about every productive corner of our country. Yet at the same time, Cleary argues, oversight and regulation have been hollowed out. High-risk projects are being approved without proper assessment of the long-term consequences. Water resources, farmland and national parks are under threat, and people, communities and industries are being steamrolled. *Mine-Field* plots the networks created by mining companies to get their projects through, and exposes regulatory gaps that, Cleary argues, must be addressed in order to prevent enormous and irreversible harm to both our society and the environment.

Glacken, S., 'Some aspects of native as compensable property', *Public Law Review*, Vol. 23, September 2012: 167

This article deals with certain aspects of the loss or impairment of native title through the extinguishment of native title. It considers the scheme provided by the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) for the validation of past acts that affect native title and whether such validation involves an acquisition of property within the scope of s 51(xxxi) of the Constitution. The article then examines the requirement to provide compensation for the effects of past acts under the Native Title Act, a matter yet to be determined by any court. The article deals with whether, in view of the character of the past act validation provisions, the just terms override in s 53 of the Act may require departure from compensation criteria in compulsory acquisition statutes and adoption of general law compensatory principles for trespass to land.

Hardie, C., 'Challenges to the registration of area ILUAs', *Native Title News*, Vol. 10, Iss. 7, July 2012: 90-95

Indigenous Land Use Agreements (ILUAs) and in particular area ILUAs are now the dominant means by which Indigenous groups provide consent for development projects and receive the benefits. While the number of ILUAs registered has increased, this does not mean that the negotiation and registration process for ILUAs has been without challenges both for proponents and Indigenous groups. The greatest problem, the authors argue, is not the overall fairness of the terms of agreement, but uncertainty regarding process.

Addresses

Mick Gooda, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission, '2012 Southgate Oration', Flinders University, Adelaide, 27 September 2012

Available on the [Australian Human Rights Commission website](#).

Media Releases

Attorney-General's Department

Native Title improvements out for comment – 21 September 2012

The Gillard Government is seeking feedback on an exposure draft of proposed legislative amendments which will improve the operation of native title. See the [Department's website](#) for more details.

Australian Human Rights Commission

Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples turns five years old – 13 September 2012

The Australian Government has taken some significant steps towards implementing the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples since formally supporting it but much more remained to be done, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Justice Commissioner Mick Gooda said on the fifth anniversary of the UN adoption of the Declaration. He said the Australian Human Rights Commission had commenced discussions with the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples, the Indigenous Peoples Organisations Network of Australia, and the Australian Government about progressing a National Strategy on the Implementation of the United Declaration. See the [Australian Human Rights Commission website](#) for more details.

Australian Human Rights Commission

Act of Recognition is welcome progress but Constitutional recognition must remain the ultimate goal-- 20 September 2012

Social Justice Commissioner Mick Gooda has welcomed the Government's announcement that it will present an Act of Recognition in Parliament acknowledging the unique and special place of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, but says constitutional recognition must remain the ultimate goal. See the [Australian Human Rights Commission website](#) for more details

Office of the Registrar of Indigenous Corporations

Encouraging picture emerges for top 500 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporations— 7 September 2012

The Registrar of Indigenous Corporations, Anthony Beven, has released his fourth report on the top 500 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander corporations. The report covers the 2010-11 financial year and looks at the overall income, geographic distributions and sectoral information of the 500 highest earning corporations registered under the *Corporations (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander) Act 2006*. 'The picture emerging from the fourth report is very encouraging, especially in terms of the growth in income and employment. The trend towards self generated income is also positive,' Mr Beven said. The report and media statement can be downloaded from [ORIC's website](#).

Queensland South Native Title Service

Native Title Recognised for Northwest Queensland's Pitta Pitta People—28 August 2012

The Federal Court of Australia recognised the Pitta Pitta People's native title rights and interests over more than 30,000 square kilometres of land in northwest Queensland after a thirteen year battle. Barrister Tony McAvoy pointed to the "guidance and wisdom" of the Pitta Pitta Elders in filing the original application in 1999. "The resilience and strength of those Pitta Pitta ancestors has been carried forward to the Pitta Pitta People who now fill this Court and remain connected to these lands and waters," he said. See the [QSNTS website](#) for more details. The Queensland Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon Andrew Cripps, also issued a [media release](#) on the Pitta Pitta determination.

Audio News and Podcasts

SBS World News Australia

Native title holders 'could advise on climate change' – 20 September 2012

Presented by: Kate Stowell

Doctor Lisa Strelein from the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies presented evidence to a House of Representatives Committee on climate change adaptation. She discusses with Kate Stowell how native title holders may be able to advise on future climate change policy. Listen to this program on the [SBS website](#).

9. Training and Professional Development Opportunities

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.

Legal Masterclass 2012: A forum for senior NTRB lawyers

Convenor: The Aurora Project

Date: 16-18 October 2012

Time: 8:45 am for a 9 am start

Location: Coogee Bay Hotel and Conference Centre, New South Wales

Registration: participants must be currently employed by an NTRB or NTSP as a principal or senior legal officer or lawyer with at least two years of experience in native title. To register, please visit

<http://www.auroraproject.com.au/nativetitleprograms>. For more information, email darren.cabot@auroraproject.com.au or phone (02) 9469 8115.

The Legal Masterclass focuses on specific aspects of law which NTRB/NTSP senior lawyers have identified as pivotal to their native title work. The Masterclass enables experienced legal staff to further develop their knowledge and technical skills through sharing their experiences and insights, whilst drawing upon the specialist expertise of a diverse range of presenters and guest speakers. Presenters in 2012 will include Angus Frith, Vance Hughston SC, Tina Jowett, Emily Gerrard and Nick Duff.

10. Events

Launch of *People on Country: Vital Landscapes, Indigenous Futures*

Speaker: Jody Broun (Sydney), Dr Tom Calma (Canberra), Monica Morgan (Melbourne), Marion Scrymgour (Darwin), followed by contributions from Indigenous ranger partners and authors

Canberra: 10 October 2012, 5.30 pm, Finkel Lecture Theatre, Australian National University

Melbourne: 11 October 2012, 5.30 pm, BMW Edge Theatre, Federation Square

Darwin: 16 October 2012, 4.30 pm, Mal Nairn Auditorium, Charles Darwin University

Registration: To RSVP, please contact Elisabeth Yarbakhsh via email elisabeth.yarbakhsh@anu.edu.au or phone (02) 6125 0648 by October 2.

The Herbert and Valmae Freilich Foundation Annual Lecture on Bigotry and Intolerance

Speaker: Professor Megan Davis

Date: 18 October 2012

Time: 6 pm

Location: Sir Roland Wilson Building, McCoy Circuit, Australian National University, Canberra

Further information: please email Freilich.Foundation@anu.edu.au or visit <http://freilich.anu.edu.au/>

ANU Anthropology Seminar Series: The Practice of Indigenous Rights in Central Australia: The Politics of Indigeneity during the Rise of Intolerance

Speaker: Sarah Holcombe

Date: 24 October 2012

Time: 9:30am

Location: Seminar room A, Coombs Building, Australian National University, Canberra

Indigenous Studies Research Network Seminar Series: Professor Robert Miller

Speaker: Professor Robert Miller, Lewis & Clark School of Law, Portland, Oregon

Date: 26 October 2012

Time: 10:30 am

Location: B Block Room 309 and B301 Kelvin Grove, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane

Professor Miller will be presenting on his latest book, *Reservation 'Capitalism': Economic Development in Indian Country*. The book provides key background information on Indigenous economic systems and property rights regimes in the United States, as well as the present-day circumstances and potential future of Indigenous communities.