

Is the new media agenda essentially colonising, or has it simply reflected a lack of participation to date from indigenous perspectives? Jason De Santolo sees a unique strategic opportunity to develop creative research interventions that enhance indigenous self-determination, and believes this can be achieved by giving attention to the indigenous cultural rights agenda. De Santolo's evaluation of cultural rights emphasises the importance of context in the production and dissemination of cultural material. He shows how new media interfaces can provide an affective and inspirational dimension—the conditions for Friere's "revolutionary leadership." For non-indigenous peoples, such interfaces offer the potential to gain a closer understanding of the integrated sense of land, community, and politics that are characteristic of indigenous struggles—the "rhythm of rights." Against an environment which is often thought of as terra nullius or empty, De Santolo shows that new media forms can provide a platform for an undeniable cultural presence.

...fluid lines...

Jason De Santolo

Indigenous struggles are fluid in nature, and form around diverse aspirations, strategies and sites of engagement. Emerging nodes of protest and voice have activated exciting new media dimensions to these struggles—dimensions that still speak from the land and communities, and yet travel to new places in new ways. These digital trajectories have laid vast transformative networks of solidarity, and are now manifest within dynamic expressions of cultural heritage. The complex nature of these multiple convergences requires that disciplines and the general community rethink and reshape extant practices and perspectives (Nakata et. al 2005, Nakata 2003). This chapter explores Indigenous presence within an emerging new media environment, drawing attention to a critical Indigenous heritage rights agenda. The discussion is contextualised through key Australian manifestations of innovation within research-driven agendas for change.

New media dimensions

A place both is here and there—from outstations on traditional lands to the steps of the local post office. But these engagement lines are blurred, often silenced and subject to remarkable systemic influences. A danger lies in a continued perception of emptiness—a certain lacking of “deadliness”¹, the so-called empty space—turned empty land, *terra nullius*, simple yet effective lies about the lack of “Indigenous presence”. Indigenous forms of new media are unique and evoke challenging aspects within the recognition of presence and the development of cultural principles and protocols within negotiated space/s of undefined potential (Janke 2002, 2006). This is why Indigenous heritage rights are articulated here at the frontline of the digital frontier. These intersections continue to stimulate debate and dynamic Indigenous engagement despite significant “digital divide” issues.²

Indigenous flavours traverse and imbue virtual realms. The National Indigenous New Media Labs have held substantial residencies for Indigenous peoples in new media, providing participants from around the country with engaging learning environments in digital media and new media arts skills.³ From such backgrounds, an artist such as Jenny Fraser continues to produce innovative collaborative works. A recent interactive work celebrated the lives of Yugambeh family members who were moved north from South East Queensland to Gulf of Carpentaria properties to work. This exploration of how many Aboriginal people experience family histories provided viewers with opportunities to experience this “fragmentation” of history and how “they might think about their own relationship to place and times”⁴. Fraser founded and is online curator for *Cybertribe*, an online gallery that promotes Indigenous art internationally. *Cybertribe* provides a window into the work of some of the most dynamic Indigenous new media artists from around Australia, including work from Destiny Deacon, r e a, Cameron Goold, Jason Davidson, Christian Thompson and many others⁵. Projects such as these evoke contemplation of place, identity and belonging. In speaking from the land—Indigenous country/s and communities, many of these works provide insight into complex manifestations of Indigenous place as it morphs alongside virtual realms. New media’s hybrid nature seems to hold an innate facility for a deep reflection on Indigenous perspective, especially in terms of its fluid collaborative capacity.

Scholarship in this emerging field critically explores the nexus between art and emerging science and technology fields, as for instance between “performance, digital technologies and cross-disciplinary artforms [and how they come] to produce a range of performance, installation and screen based artworks” (Janke 2006). This convergence of disciplines has led to innovation around forms of transmission, representation and material culture. Transmission of knowledge and experience is strongly connected to aspirational and knowledge-centred Indigenous rights strategies. Indigenous heritage rights strategically reflect this urgent agenda and hold influence in developing new media protocols and principles of engagement. Reciprocity is fundamental to this celebration—exchanging, sharing, nurturing. As Terri Janke (2002, 1) has pointed out, Indigenous heritage transcends mundane perceptions of knowledge, but rather encapsulates “all objects, sites and knowledge transmitted from generation to generation” for “Indigenous people’s heritage is a living heritage.”

There are important protocols and principles to be respected when dealing with Indigenous Heritage, and indigenous new media practitioners are well aware of the intricacies of working in a hybrid form. Their perspectives are critical for a number of reasons including the obvious fact that artists and practitioners have on-the-ground—hands on experience of new media processes and community dynamics. Janke (2002, 1) also recognises that “[w]riting, performing, song, the visual arts and more recently, new media, are ways of transmitting cultural heritage” This articulated multiplicity reflects a powerful convergence of interest across the community. Elders, lawyers, anthropologists, geographers, biologists, economists (amongst many others) all realise the different cultural, social and commercial implications of this ancient heritage.

True protection of Indigenous heritage rights requires recognition of diverse manifestations of dynamic Indigenous cultures, and a number of writers have highlighted the complex issues at stake. Janke’s report *Our Culture Our Future, Proposals for the Recognition and Protection of Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property* provided Australia with significant articulation of issues and strategies for the recognition of such rights referring to them as “Indigenous people’s rights to heritage”—heritage including everything from literary, performing and artistic works to human remains and tissues (Janke 1998, 25). Marcia Langton (1993) has

also provided some of the key intellectual catalysts for recognition of Indigenous cultural values and protocols when dealing with mediums such as film, video and new media. Others have also highlighted the role of the media in the context of political culture. Hartley and McKee (2000, 12) discuss the Royal Commission of Aboriginal Deaths in Custody recommendations on media, pointing out that they see this as a “calling for the establishment of an Indigenous public sphere in the context of mediated political culture”.

Systemic issues also influence the ability of local communities to fully exercise Indigenous heritage rights. Janke (1999, 632) highlights that:

commercialisation of Indigenous intellectual and cultural property has often been done without respect for Indigenous cultures, without consent or legal Indigenous control and without sharing of benefits with Indigenous communities. Indigenous cultural heritage has been distorted for commercial interests. This in turn is leading to its erosion.

In 1999 she advocated for the sharing of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property based on the legally focused principles such as informed consent, right to negotiate and full and proper attribution. These principles have subsequently been developed into an important set of protocols that act as a foundational framework for working with Indigenous communities and/or heritage. The most pertinent articulation of these is specifically written with new media cultures in mind (Janke 2002). In this changing world, technologies are providing both tools for cultural revitalisation as well as catalysts for digitised exploitation in a globalised marketplace. Customary law protections continue to be critical in maintaining a harmonious balance within communities and ensure that only appropriately “qualified” people are privy to key knowledge systems. These levels of access are being recognised and implemented into some of the more innovative database design projects happening in Australia.

The violence of colonisation has disrupted customary law in Indigenous communities. Continued failure to fully recognise and protect Indigenous heritage rights is akin to what McHugh (2004) terms “a wilful blindness”. Posey (1996) points out that the responsibility

for developing and implementing equitable and effective *sui generis* (unique) systems that support Indigenous peoples, traditional peoples and local communities lies with nation states. The benefits of recognition will inevitably transcend Indigenous interests and potentially impact on sustainable future ecologies. This remains dependent on effective change and reform. At a broader level Behrendt (2003) argues for outcome-focused liberalism and effective participation that allows for institutional forms to take on the recognition of difference and hence alter institutions imbued with “psychological *terra nullius*” or what could be termed as a denial of unique Indigenous status and presence.

New media’s interactive nature enhances the ability for sharing worldviews. Indigenous peoples have been utilising these tools to develop diverse strategic language for rights recognition. It is here also where some take up the challenge of seeking to articulate and negotiate collaborative new media principles and protocols within innovative research approaches. Creative research practice holds true potential in enhancing research and project outcomes for the benefit of participating communities. Creative processes hold innate ability for dynamic transformation and transmission of information. These fresh approaches allow for greater epistemological diversity in the process of research. Photography and video installation are two common creative mediums that have been infused into research processes and project outcomes (Banks 2001), with implications for considering decolonising methodologies and collaboration with Indigenous communities. Academic spaces have historically fuelled knowledge economies, often to the detriment of Indigenous communities. However, strategic responses have emerged to reclaim space and authority for Indigenous-driven research agendas. From within these intellectual camps we now see a proliferation of Indigenous work that influences and informs theory, methodology and enhanced research methods.

Expression, reclamation and voice

Communities are now realising the true implications of evolving new media environments. For those operating within academic and research spaces it necessarily involves the navigating of research and collaborative practice within Indigenous protocols and principles. Nakata (2004: 2) has carefully pointed out that: “understanding the theoretical and

methodological issues are critical to producing new and more effective approaches to negotiating the intersections of different knowledge systems as they converge, circumscribe and condition possibilities for both understanding the past and its legacies, and improving indigenous futures". The growing body of discourse on Indigenous research methodologies is critical for researchers undertaking studies within or about Indigenous communities in Australia, providing guidance in overcoming some of the limitations of more traditional methodologies. This discourse is not confined to purely theoretical paradigms but forms part of a long fought "on the ground" struggle for the right of Indigenous communities to be in control of our own destinies. This includes asserting the right to define ourselves, and our cultures, as well as maintaining control of research agendas involving or influencing community.

Kera (2002) has further highlighted some of the issues arising in the search for new media methodologies stating that the question is more about "how to identify and how to do justice to creativity and becoming". Performative terminologies may be important to consider in this context (Manovich 2002) and foster development for performative methodologies for new media. These considerations provide a greater impetus for amplifying critical Indigenous perspectives and actions towards political change. Nakata's Indigenous Standpoint Theory highlights the importance of understanding the political nature of taking an Indigenous position within the context of contemporary society. He suggests that Indigenous peoples should be developing not just a view of the world but a critical view of the world, that is able to engage politically with knowledge that has formed around Indigenous positions (Nakata 1993: 9). Indigenous Standpoint Theory assists in the mapping of these influences and environments through articulation of what he has termed, the "Cultural Interface." This interface places unique demands on the researcher/s that manifest as particular puzzles that need to be solved through theoretical strategising, particularly in the context of new media practice. Hybrid interactions and manifestations of that process are complex to navigate in terms of communal rights management. It is here at the cultural interface that these intersecting discourses are politically positioned in relation to culturally respectful research approaches:

At the interface, traditional form and ways of knowing, or the residue of those, that we bring from the pre-contact historical trajectory inform how we think and act, and so do Western ways, and for many of us a blend of both has become our lifeworld. It is the most complex of intersections and the source of confusion for many. For in this space there are so many interwoven, competing and conflicting discourses, that distinguishing traditional from non-traditional in the day-to-day is difficult to sustain even if one were in a state of permanent reflection (Nakata 2003, 23).

Although daunting, there is also a degree of excitement building as these historical trajectories weave and mesh within freshly networked virtual spaces. If this is to form a new and enduring interface then there is an urgent need for critical literacy alongside effective, strategic engagement.

International developments also hold powerful implications for protection of localised knowledge systems. The World Summit on Information Society (WSIS) Declaration states: "In the evolution of the Information Society, particular attention must be given to the special situation of Indigenous peoples, as well as the preservation of their heritage and their cultural legacy".⁶ Teanau Tuiono concludes in his report that Information and Communication Technologies "are a means for us to achieve other ends. Efficient and appropriate use of ICTs can support the international work that is happening on national and local levels".⁷ Tuiono speaks from Aoteaora/New Zealand, where Maori have provided leading examples of both theoretical development and successful and appropriate use of ICT's.

Kaupapa Maori discourse (with a Maori purpose and agenda) articulates inspirational strategies around notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation (Smith 2004). Inherent cultural hierarchies are present in theoretical constructs. For example, even though some feminist theories are emancipatory in nature, they may also hold potential to silence Indigenous women's voices through universalising issues around gender (Pihama 2005). As Pihama, Smith and many others have highlighted—there is a need to take strategic control of theoretical spaces and allow our Indigenous stories to be heard within changing new media environments.

Special nature and emptiness

Indigenous heritage is magnificent in its ability to transcend and inform common perceptions of knowledge and ways of exchange. It is special in nature and as such manifests within unique spaces for this nurturing and sharing. Unfortunately this nature is often undetected by many who lack experience or understanding of its uniqueness in both context and form. In 1993 the Australian Law Reform Commission reported how difficult it is to use existing laws to protect Indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights or Indigenous heritage rights.⁸ These issues include copyright law limitations that favour individualistic authorship rights of artworks and recognised timeframes that span only fifty years. Authenticity is also a critical issue given the increased ability and economic viability of fake reproductions.

Traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) is a part of the Indigenous way of being, an experience of being a part of nature since time immeasurable. It is a dynamic body of knowledge and is strongest and perhaps most relevant when localised. Posey affirms this perspective noting that “the basis for TEK is holistic and forms the basis for local-level decision making in areas of contemporary life, including natural resource management, nutrition, food preparation, health, education, and community and social organisation” (Posey 1996, 110). Traditional ecological knowledge emerged in the literature of the 1980s and 1990s now informs diverse disciplines such as geography, social sciences, agriculture, pharmacology, ecology and ethnobotany (Berkes 1999, 1). Sciences were perhaps discovering what Indigenous peoples have always understood—the interconnected nature of life. It was in the post Enlightenment era that Western thought became trapped into Cartesian dualism of mind and matter, and humans distinct from their environment (Berkes, 34). Even now it seems that traditional ecological knowledge is susceptible to Eurocentric interpretation and viewed as a resource rather than a way of living, a view that is evidenced in the growth of knowledge-based trade economies, bioprospectors and genetic modifiers. Indigenous heritage is all too often rationalised as a valid “subject” of study because it can be used for environmental assessment, social development, conservation and health. Disturbingly, there is often a lack of consideration given to the custodians or owners of this knowledge and the impact of exploiting this knowledge. This is a genuine

issue at the digital frontier where innovative practices can involve anything from digitising of Indigenous heritage to genetic sampling. For example, in an audit of 38 Indigenous Knowledge Databases in Northern Australia it was found that only two organisations had “clear policies on returning data to the Aboriginal owners” (Scott 2004, 4).

One the flipside it is important to recognise the work being done in Australia that has shown commitment to building long term successful working relationships with Indigenous communities and elders.⁹ The School of Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems at Charles Darwin University has been involved in research that explores digital technologies and the intergenerational transmission of traditional ecological knowledge. In developing a system called TAMI they describe the various projects as being “arranged along a continuum with at one end, official archives with all their formal structure and metadata protocols, and at the other end a completely fluid file management and database system which bears with it no western assumptions about knowledge or the ecology”.¹⁰ Flexibility is clearly a prerequisite to any interface in this period of rapid growth and technological change.

Collectively owned, socially based, and continuously evolving Indigenous heritage rights, are a potent consideration for Indigenous new media. Danny Butt (2005) has critically highlighted that “embodied” aspects of oral traditions actually pose a threat to the Creative Commons and open source “movements” that have firmly based themselves within Euro-US epistemology. He goes further, asserting that anti-IP critiques which use class-bound abstract languages are doomed to fail as social movements. There is clearly much to be realised and negotiated in understanding and creating productive space/s for Indigenous peoples as we navigate complex Western legalese and languages of property (Anderson 2005). This brings us to the imperative for effective Indigenous-driven research agendas.

Indigenous engagement and a critical rights agenda

Creative research practice is providing new frameworks for Indigenous engagement and participation in enhanced research processes and outcomes. This is especially significant given that the history of research for Indigenous communities is fraught with disrespectful encounters. Positivist epistemologies produced research

outcomes aimed at continuing the status quo power relations for Indigenous communities. Bauman (2004) has spoken of a shifting from heavy to light modernity—a territorial expansion throughout “uncounted ‘hearts of darkness’ clamouring for light”.

There is a growing body of work, which seeks to incorporate Indigenous knowledge through participatory research approaches. Sillitoe and Narr (2003) advocate this incorporation through strategies that involve collaborative and interdisciplinary methods, producing a catalyst for rights recognition and effective interventions in communities. Innovative creative practice interventions are emerging in the Australian academic landscape new media research visible, in localised manifestations such as the Galiwin’ku Indigenous Knowledge Centre. Gumbala has noted the levels of complexity bound to Yolŋu knowledge systems and the issues apparent in strategic digitising of the Gupapuynu Yolŋu and the importance of research partnerships (Gumbala 2005).

The Jumbunna Enhanced Research Media Project (JERMP) is a pilot project that utilises new media and creative research practice to appropriately enhance research and project outcomes for Indigenous peoples. (JERMP) is located in the Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning Research Unit focuses on developing Indigenous research-driven legal and policy advice and interventions. Jumbunna and Ngiya created a short documentary as a strategic response to the encroaching practical reconciliation policies of the Howard government in Australia.¹¹ *Our Rights* moves to experience creative research practice as a process that demystifies the fundamental tenets of the Indigenous rights agenda. A new media collaboration was devised as a way to reflect on the standard documentary experience and its interventionist outcomes. This *Creative Cut* reveals the “rhythm of rights” as it manifests within the documentary—*Our Rights* and its articulation of Indigenous struggle in Australia. Rhythm is explored through a reflective collaboration with performance artist (Ray Bud) who featured in the stylized dance and running man sequences of the original documentary.¹² Within this experimental five minute piece we see the struggle for rights in its fluid form, timeless and without shape—existent and nonexistent. This takes place in physical form as a reflective process—a kind of post (post) production. A spliced editing approach draws fluid timeless natural

forms from the documentary (ocean and sky). Ray Bud then composed contemporary beats and marks this flowing, silent narrative—giving light to the dynamic nature of Indigenous activism and its intersections with innovative art forms. Ray Bud is free styling with microphone in hand—eyes wide and painted up for dance. The viewer is forced to contemplate culture, dance and movement as a political expression and assertion of heritage. Ultimately the *Creative Cut* aims to inspire political and cultural action, recognising that Indigenous rights have powerful rhythms. It reached out from a collective vision—through a collaboration that speaks globally and in a strategic language of rights, evoking movement along a fluid line of engagement. Reflective expression echoes a reclamation of voice and the re-assertion of a hybrid presence in this conflicted and evocative atmosphere.

Fluidity and place—the blurred line

Indigenous struggles often fight for the ability to create or reclaim space and voice, or what Tuan (1977) refers to as freedom associated with spaciousness. These contested locations are not delimited by nuclear boundary lines. These blurred lines also become evident in, for example, the interwoven lines between protest, activism, and terrorism. Globalised convergences are constantly shifting and bearing influence to forms and methods of political engagement. These intersections involve human action, reaction and communication. At the end of virtual networks are our people, and the priority is to nurture wellbeing and support youth as visionaries for tomorrow. In filling the digital void with the light of Indigenous knowledge we have to be mindful of the dangers in moving into a “blinding” overload of information. Indigenous knowledge is shared at appropriate times and often through processes, regulated by reciprocity and the careful nomination of beneficiaries.

This notion of beneficiaries has become important in the face of globalisation and the continued oppression of minority groups, refugees and the poor in Australia. Memmi's (1974) investigations into the “beneficiaries of colonisation” highlight an important dual aspect to the illegitimate status arguments that many of us have alluded to. He points out that not only did the coloniser come to a land by the accidents of history (here in Australia by way of penal colony) and succeeded in creating a place for himself, but in the process has granted “himself

astounding privileges to the detriment of those rightfully entitled to them" (Memmi 1974, 9). Global markets have also influenced the actions of world powers in their self-anointed roles as "world police". The tragedies of the world have led to a newly defined terrorist threat that can never be attributed to the West. This is because the West is always (media) portrayed as the victim. Memmi might not have been surprised at this, pointing out how when the coloniser (or perhaps the State) uses terrorist style tactics the leftist coloniser is embarrassed (Memmi 1974, 31). Linda Smith (2004) has articulated this shifting of "the line" as having very real impacts on Indigenous leadership and activism.

I can also relate to Memmi's "cheeky" assertion of the right "after so many disastrous and useless colonial wars, to think that his book could have been useful to the coloniser as well as to the colonized?" In one instance Memmi (1974, xvii) equates the end of colonisation with the rebirth of the leftist coloniser—asking if the imagination can go that far? It is certainly an apt question for the parliamentary Left in Australia—who in supporting the demolition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Services (ATSIS) have landed themselves in entrenched and unimaginative political position in terms of Indigenous affairs.¹³ Indigenous places are under constant attack. The regimes and systems that are supposed to protect and support these "places" are vulnerable because they are often established within western legal frameworks, which continue to deny and revoke Indigenous people's, rights to self-determination.

Nurturing the creative spirit

All over the world, many indigenous peoples live away from their traditional homelands, and yet survive within vibrant cultural communities that continue to show patient understanding towards a colonial society struggling for a legitimate identity. Colonisation has shifted understandings of localised place and perceptions of traditional or historical connections to land and waters. People are connected through relationships, stories and various modes of presence. Presence can be random and diasporic as reflected in resistance, struggle and the forced movement of peoples and their items of heritage. These powerful globalised linkages and exchanges are also realised in a virtual web

of relationships, altering ways for connecting and sharing while also attracting powerful systemic assaults.

Sometimes, these influences operate in a virtual vacuum, manifesting as colonising forms of digital governance. These issues are strengthening Indigenous voice and gaining recognition for the therapeutic qualities of sharing Indigenous experiences of survival and dislocation across community, academic and creative practices. These voices hold true auras of “deadliness”, ultimately imbuing space/s and place/s with a creative spirit that has often been labeled as radical. Martin Luther King Jr, for example expressed disappointment with “white moderates, white liberals and white Christians’ defining himself as a ‘creative extremist’ who stood paradoxically in ‘the middle’” (Bennet Jr. 1976, 147-148). These convergences must be dealt with in a strategic and positive way. Youth are the future for all of us and it seems that there is a need for creatively inspired strategies to engage and support them in their critical role as custodians of the future. Nerida Blair (2005) eloquently notes that our peoples have already created “powerful tantalisers, which demonstrate Indigenous people’s creativity and our ability to envisage and craft dynamic local solutions” (173). And yet these initiatives are often found in liminal spaces, transcending regular boundaries and emerging as a fluidly “organised coincidence”.¹⁴

Innovation in the new media environment will encapsulate both a commitment to Indigenous standpoints and research methodologies but also to the appropriate use of emerging technologies and processes that highlight broader dimensions to the research platform. This is reflected in part through creative research practice and its integration with culturally appropriate new media processes and outcomes. Hybrid forms provide a necessarily fluid engagement tool for action across contested spaces. It is suggested that creative research practice has genuine potential in supporting what Paulo Freire talks about as revolutionary leadership—a premise that exists in all of Indigenous communities for the very fact that we continue to assert our communal identities and cultures. Friere (2000) explains: “Both cultural action for freedom and cultural revolution are an effort to negate the dominating culture culturally, even before the new culture resulting from that negation has become reality” (65). There is no frontier that colonisation will not seek out and we are already aware of its history of feeding on

Indigenous lands, waters and bodies—both physical and in the realms of knowledge (Battiste, Marie and Youngblood-Henderson 2000). The kind of timelessness that is experienced in this virtual space is perhaps alluring for peoples who strategically assert contested rights and aspirations in constantly shifting, politically fragile environments. Multiple convergences of our living heritage manifest complex issues around protection and respectful recognition of ownership. If creative research practice is able to harness new media in appropriate ways, then we will fully witness the powerful role of Indigenous new media in our fluid, rights-driven struggle for change.

References

- Atkinson, Judy. 2000. Privileging Research Methodologies, Cairns. [Unpublished]
- Australian Law Reform Commission. 1993. Designs Issues Paper 11, <http://www.alrc.gov.au/publications/publist/ip.htm>
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Battiste, Marie and Youngblood-Henderson, Sakesh. 2000. *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage, A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon: Purich Publishing Ltd.
- Behrendt, Larissa. 2003. *Achieving social justice: Indigenous rights and Australia's future*. Annandale, N.S.W: Federation Press.
- Bennet Jr, Lerone. 2003. *What manner of man? A biography of Martin Luther King*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Berkes, Fikret. 1999. *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management*. Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.
- Blair, Nerida. 2005. Treaty review of *Achieving Social Justice*, by Larissa Behrendt. *Balayi: culture, law and colonialism*. 7
- Brady, Wendy. 1992. Beam me up, Scotty!—Communicating across World Views on Knowledge, Principles and Procedures for the Conduct of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Research. Paper presented at the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Higher Education Conference, Harvey Bay, Australia.
- Butt, Danny. 2005. *Contested Commons/Trespassing Publics—A Public Record*. Delhi: The Sarai Programme.
- Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Cultural Action for Freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard Educational Review.

- Grossman, Michele. 2003. *Blacklines: Contemporary Critical Writing by Indigenous Australians*. Carlton, Vic: Melbourne University Press.
- Janke, Terri. 1998. *Our Culture Our Future*. Canberra: Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.
- . 1999. "Respecting Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights." *University of New South Wales Law Journal* 22: no. 2.
- . 2006. "Captured Images: Film Archives and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights", *Journal of Indigenous Policy*. 6.
- Janke, Terri. and Australia Council Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts Board. 2002. *New Media Cultures: Protocols for Producing Indigenous Australian New Media*. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australia Council.
- Johnson, S. 1997. *Interface Culture: How New Technology Transforms the Way We Create and Communicate*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kera, D. 2002. The Genius Malignus of Methodology of New Media Research. *Southern Review* 35: no.3.
- Langton, Marcia. 2003. *Well, I heard it on the radio and I saw it on the television: an essay for the Australian Film Commission on the politics and aesthetics of filmmaking by and about Aboriginal people and things*. North Sydney: Australian Film Commission.
- Manovich, L. 2002. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- McHugh, Paul G. 2004. *Aboriginal Societies and the Common Law: A History of Sovereignty, Status, and Self-Determination*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Memmi, Albert. 1974. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Trans. Howard Greenfeld. London: Souvenir Press.
- Nakata, Martin. 1998. Anthropological texts and Indigenous Standpoints. *Journal of Aboriginal Studies*. 2.
- . 2004. *Indigenous Australian Studies and Higher Education (The Wentworth Lectures)*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies
- . 2003. Indigenous Knowledge and the Cultural Interface: Underlying issues at the intersection of knowledge and information systems. (reprint). In Hudson, Anne Hickling, Julie Matthews & Annette Woods (eds), *Disrupting Preconceptions: Postcolonialism and Education*.
- . "Ngoonjook." 1993. *Journal of Australian Indigenous Issues*. 9.

- Nakata, Martin, Byrne, A. A., Nakata, V. S. & Gardiner, G. 2005, Indigenous Knowledge, the Library and Information Service Sector, and Protocols, *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, 36: no.2. 9-24.
- Pihama, Leonie. 2005. Mana wahine theory: creating space for Maori women's theories, in *Cultural Studies: From Theory to Action*, ed Leistyana, Pepi. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Posey, Darrell A. 1996. *Traditional Resource Rights, International Instruments for Protection and Compensation for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN, The World Conservation Union.
- Radoll, P. 2005. "Information Communication Technology—Evidence from the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey". *Indigenous Socioeconomic Outcomes: Assessing Recent Evidence*. Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, Canberra: ANU Conference.
- Rigney, Lester. 2001 "A first perspective of Indigenous Australian participation in science: Framing Indigenous research towards Indigenous Australian intellectual sovereignty." *Kaurua Higher Education Journal*. 7.
- Scott, Gary. 2004. *Audit of Indigenous Knowledge Databases in Northern Australia*, (Draft). School of Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems, Charles Darwin University, Darwin. 7 April.
- Smith, Linda. 2004. "Activism, Leadership and the New Challenges for Indigenous Communities." Presentation at Dr Charles Perkins AO, Annual Memorial Oration and Prize. University of Sydney.
- Smith, Linda. 2004. "Kaupapa Maori Methodology: Our Power to Define Ourselves," Seminar presented at the School of Education, University of Columbia, New York.
- Smith, G H, "Kaupapa Maori Schooling: Implications for Educational Policy Making" Paper presented at the Royal Commission on Social Policy, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Sillitoe, Paul and Julian Barr. 2003. "A Decision Model for the Incorporation of Indigenous Knowledge into Development Projects: Investigating Local Knowledge, New Directions New approaches", In *Negotiating Local Knowledge*, ed. Pottier, Johan, Alan Bicker, Paul Sillitoe, London: Pluto Press.

- Tuan, Yi-fu. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tuiono, Teanau. 2005. Report on Indigenous Thematic Planning Conference for Tunisia (WSIS Phase II) and National Connecting Aboriginal Peoples in Canada Forum, April, Ottawa, Canada.

Notes

- 1 The term “deadly” is a term commonly used in indigenous Australian culture, and could be defined as effective, terrific, fantastic, or impressive. See <http://www1.aiatsis.gov.au/exhibitions/conference/libconf05/conf05.htm>
- 2 There are a number of aspects to the “Digital Divide”, in a definitional sense it can encapsulate gaps in access to ICTs (users), gaps in ability to use ICTs (skills), gaps in actual use (time use), and gap in the impact of use (economic returns). See Radoll, P, “Information Communication Technology—Evidence from the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Social Survey”. Indigenous Socioeconomic Outcomes: Assessing Recent Evidence. Canberra, August 2005.
- 3 See National New Media Labs, 1 June 2006 <http://www.anat.org.au/inmlo4/>.
- 4 See Jenny Fraser, *Other[wize]*, 1 June 2006 http://www.geocities.com/dot_ayu/
- 5 See *Cybertribe*, <http://www.fineartforum.org/Gallery/cybertribe/index.htm>, and *Blackout* <http://www.fineartforum.org/Gallery/cybertribe/blackout/> Examples include Destiny Deacon, http://www.roslynnoxley9.com.au/artists/2/Destiny_Deacon/profile/re_a, http://www.ozco.gov.au/arts_in_australia/projects/projects_new_media_arts/rea_-_gins_leapdubb_speak/ Cameron Goold, Indiginet website and links to “Propaganda Klann” and “videovault”, <http://www.indiginet.com.au/> Jason Davidson, “belonging” <http://www.fineartforum.org/Gallery/2000/belonging/index.htm> and Christian Thompson “kangaroo and boomerang jumper” 1 June 2006, <http://www.nga.gov.au/Exhibition/Tactility/Detail.cfm?IRN=120311>.
- 6 Tuiono, Teanau, Report on the Indigenous Thematic Planning Conference for Tunisia (WSIS Phase II) and the National Connecting Aboriginal Peoples in Canada Forum, Ottawa, April 2005. At another level agencies like UNESCO have recognised the “digital divide” and the impact of corporate driven media and have developed programmes for creative content that aim to boost local content in both traditional and new media disadvantaged communities of the developing world. See UNESCO Portal, 6 June 2006 http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3981&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- 7 Ibid. At another level agencies like UNESCO have recognised the “digital divide” and the impact of corporate driven media and have developed programmes for creative

- content that aim to boost local content in both traditional and new media disadvantaged communities of the developing world. See UNESCO Portal 6 June 2006 http://portal.unesco.org/ci/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3981&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- 8 Australian Law Reform Commission, 1993. *Designs Issues* 11.
 - 9 For example Dr Richard Baker has built up a strong relationship with Yanyuwa and Garawa peoples. http://sres.anu.edu.au/people/richard_baker/research/yanyuwa/index.html
 - 10 Software Requirement Document, Indigenous Knowledge and Resource Management in Northern Australia (IKRMNA)—ARC Linkage Project, (School of Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems—Charles Darwin University, Jan 2005).
 - 11 The Ngija National Institute of Indigenous Law, Policy and Practice has a commitment to bringing together Indigenous researchers and Indigenous people with experience in the public sector to discuss matters of importance for policy makers on Indigenous matters 1 June 2006 <http://www.jumbunna.uts.edu.au/ngiya.html>
 - 12 The Creative Cut collaboration involved Craybob Productions, Creative Combat, Jumbunna (UTS) and Ngija.
 - 13 For detailed analysis and discussion of ATSIC please refer to Jumbunna Research Unit's Submission to the Senate Inquiry 1 November 2005 <http://www.jumbunna.uts.edu.au/research/ngiya/papers.html>
 - 14 See interview with Creative Combat, TVNZ, November 2005.



Place

Local Knowledge and New Media Practice

edited by Danny Butt, Jon Bywater, and Nova Paul

Place: Local Knowledge and New Media Practice, Edited by Danny Butt, Jon Bywater
and Nova Paul

This book first published 2008 by

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

15 Angerton Gardens, Newcastle, NE5 2JA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2008 by Danny Butt, Jon Bywater and Nova Paul and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-84718-484-7, ISBN (13): 9781847184849