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Territories of the Nine Tasmanian Aboriginal Nations

Map of Tasmania showing the boundaries of tribal areas at the time of contact. Based on L. Ryan, The Aboriginal Tasmanians
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Indigenous LifeWorlds

Meaning we make of lived reality contextual and inseparable from our social, cultural and physical world and our relational positioning within that world.

Distinctive Indigenous life circumstances + Indigenous relational positioning = dual intersubjectivities of the Indigenous Lifeworld

- intersubjectivity within peoplehood; inclusive of traditional and continuing culture, belief systems, ways of understanding the world and our own place, as a people, within it: and

- intersubjectivity as Indigenous peoples whose everyday life is framed through and impacted, by our historical and ongoing relationship with the dominant non-Indigenous society.

(Walter & Suina in press 2018):
Indigenous data refers to information or knowledge, in any format, inclusive of statistics, that is about Indigenous people and that impacts Indigenous lives at the collective and/or individual level.

Indigenous Data

Data on Our Resources/Environments land history, geological information, titles, water information

Data about Us Demographic or social data - legal, health, education, use of services, including our own data

Data from Us traditional cultural data, archives oral literature, ancestral knowledge, community stories

Indigenous Statistics are powerful influencers and persuaders. They portray, define and create meaning. What portrayals and meaning depends on:

- what questions are asked
- why they are asked
- how they are asked
- who is doing the asking

Hierarchy of Indigenous Data:

1. Data by Us
2. Data With Us
3. Data for Us
4. Data about us
5. Data Desert

Source: Kukatai and Walter presentation 2016
The ‘B.A.D.D.R.’ Sins of Indigenous Statistics

Most current statistics positions Indigenous peoples as:

- Blameworthy
- Aggregate
- Decontextualised
- Deficit
- Reductive

= Deficit Data/Problematic People Correlation
Data about us frequently portray us as complicit in our own unequal position.

Imply that our gross inequality is related to undeservingness.
Which Native American people – Native Americans live in a wide set of spaces and places. How useful is aggregate data?
Decontextualised

Lots and Lots of descriptive ‘What’ - Rarely any theoretically sound ‘Why’

Team-based and population approaches reduce kidney failure from diabetes in Native Americans: can be a model for other groups.

Native American adults have more diabetes than any other race or ethnicity.

- Whites: 8%
- Asian Americans: 9%
- Hispanics: 13%
- Blacks: 13%
- Native Americans: 16%

Kidney failure from diabetes in Native Americans has dropped more than any other race or ethnicity.

- Native Americans: 1996: 70, 2013: 30
- Blacks: 1996: 60, 2013: 40

SOURCE: National Health Interview Survey and Indian Health Service, 2010-2012.

SOURCE: United States Renal Data System (USRDS), 1996-2013, adults 18 and older.
Deficit: 5 D Data

Positioned pejoratively as:
Deficit, Different, Disparity, Disadvantaged, Dysfunctional

Native American defendants in federal courts

- Share of state population
- Share of federal-offense caseload

S. Dakota, Montana, N. Dakota, Minnesota, Oklahoma

Quartz | qz.com
US Census Bureau, US Sentencing Commission
Indigeneity is a concept = what it means to be an Indigenous person in this society at this time in this place – inclusive of our diversity, life chances, our histories, our political, economic and cultural marginalization our traditions, our cultural realities, our community strengths etc etc. – Ignores our Lifeworlds
Statistics are Socio-Cultural Artefacts:

Whose Cultural Framework
Whose social cultural and political realities determine what data are perceived as important and why they are important

Controls Process
Cultural Framework determines:
- Data collection design & process
- Analysis process to produces results
- How results are interpreted

Determines Content
Topics of interest will always reflect the priorities and interests of those who control the data process and reflects the dominant cultural framework

= real life consequences for Indigenous peoples
Data for Governance – Governance for Data

What would Indigenous statistics look like if Indigenous peoples:

1. Were the data instigators and process determiners?
2. Had our values and socio-cultural realities (Lifeworlds) reflected in the data ecosystem?
3. Defined what was important to know about Indigenous peoples?
4. Decided what content best met Indigenous needs, priorities and aspirations?
5. Were the intended audience?

Indigenous Data Governance is the starting point
1. Binary comparative model
2. Indigeneity as categorical variable
3. Aggregate data as the norm
4. Consultation/Advice as engagement
5. Prioritisation of Govt data needs
6. Measures derived from NIA cultural values
7. Monitoring as key activity

1. Data valid to tell a story of themselves
2. Indigeneity as concept
3. Diversity reflected in data collection
4. Governance not consultation
5. Prioritisation of our data needs
6. Measures that reflect our cultural values
7. Two way exchange role of data
The need for, and achievement of, ID-SOV revolve around twin issues:

1. Indigenous governance of data - ending domination of data of disregard

2. Supporting data for governance – the data required by Indigenous peoples, at all level to support/inform nation building according or our aspirations

Addressing of both points begins with Indigenous data decision making

**Indigenous Governance** is the mechanism by which Indigenous Data Sovereignty is achieved
**Indigenous Data Sovereignty** is the right of Indigenous peoples to determine the means of collection, access, analysis, interpretation, management, dissemination and reuse of data pertaining to the Indigenous peoples from whom it has been derived, or to whom it relates (Kukutai & Taylor 2016; Snipp 2016).

- Supported by inherent rights of self-determination and governance as described in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).
- Includes the demand that data to be used in ways that support and enhance the collective wellbeing of Indigenous peoples.
Indigenous data sovereignty is practiced through **Indigenous data governance** which asserts Indigenous interests in relation to data by:

- informing the when, how and why our data are gathered, analysed accessed and used; and

- ensuring Indigenous data reflects our priorities, values, culture, lifeworlds and diversity
First Comes the Governance

**Governance** is the mechanism by which Indigenous Data Sovereignty is delivered. Core Components are:

- Indigenous leadership on what data and when, how and why those data are gathered and analysed
- Indigenous decision making on access/use of existing data
- Indigenous data capacity building
- Indigenous controlled Indigenous data storage
- Indigenous developed protocols to guide Indigenous data processes
A COMMITMENT TO INDIGENOUS DATA SOVEREIGNTY (IDS) SPANS THE GLOBE

NATION-STATE BASED, INDIGENOUS LED COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

• TE MANA RARAUNGA MAORI DATA SOVEREIGNTY NETWORK in Aotearoa/New Zealand

• UNITED STATES INDIGENOUS DATA SOVEREIGNTY NETWORK

• MAIAM NAYRI WINGARA ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER DATA SOVEREIGNTY COLLECTIVE in Australia

• OCAP (Ownership, Control, Access, Participation) principles in Canada

NASCENT: FIRST NATIONS, INUIT AND MÉTIS in, SAMI/SÁPMI in Sweden, Mexico

RDA INTERNATIONAL INDIGENOUS DATA SOVEREIGNTY INTEREST GROUP
The Summit delegates asserted that in Australia, Indigenous peoples have the right to:

Exercise control of the data ecosystem including creation, development, stewardship, analysis, dissemination and infrastructure.

Data that is contextual and disaggregated (available and accessible at individual, community and First Nations levels).

Data that is relevant and empowers sustainable self-determination and effective self-governance.

Data structures that are accountable to Indigenous peoples and First Nations.

Data that is protective and respects our individual and collective interests.
Telling It Like It is Project:

I’ve got the data – Now what do I do with it?
Race Relations Experienced at the Societal Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race Relations Now (n=471)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Better or Worse in Last 10 Years (n=469)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>A Lot Better</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>A Little Better</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Good</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>The Same</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty Bad</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>A Bit Worse</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Bad</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A Lot Worse</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No differences in view of race relations by gender, housing status or employment status.

- Those with higher education levels and those in older age groups (45+ more likely to say race relations are worse in the last 10 years
Race Relations Experienced at the Individual Level

- No differences by gender or level of education in likelihood of feeling disrespected, judged or treated unfairly. 70% of those with a degree or above felt they had been disrespected because they were Aboriginal in the last 6 months.
- More than 90% of those unhoused reported being treated unfairly or disrespected in the last 6 months.
Perceptions of Legal and Political Systems

Figure 1: Perceptions of the Legal System

- One law for White people and one law for Aboriginal people
  - Strongly Agree: 30, Agree: 48, Disagree: 18, Strongly Disagree: 4

- To keep traditional lore sometimes White law has to be ignored
  - Strongly Agree: 33, Agree: 59, Disagree: 71

- White law looks after what Aboriginal people thinks is important as much as what White people think is important
  - Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 18, Disagree: 60, Strongly Disagree: 17

- Need White Law to keep order
  - Strongly Agree: 6, Agree: 59, Disagree: 29, Strongly Disagree: 6

Figure 2: Perceptions of the Political System

- Keeping some seats in the NT Parliament just for Aboriginal people would be a good idea
  - Strongly Agree: 47, Agree: 47, Disagree: 51

- Politicians pay attention to what Aboriginal people think about Aboriginal issues
  - Strongly Agree: 3, Agree: 17, Disagree: 56, Strongly Disagree: 23

- Voting is a waste of time because things never change for Aboriginal people
  - Strongly Agree: 32, Agree: 44, Disagree: 20, Strongly Disagree: 4

- Political system looks after what Aboriginal people thinks is important as much as for things White people think is important
  - Strongly Agree: 3, Agree: 15, Disagree: 64, Strongly Disagree: 18

Figure 1: Perceptions of the Legal System

Figure 2: Perceptions of the Political System
Global Indigenous scholarship

Indigenous peoples’ rights to:

• maintain, control, protect and develop cultural heritage and traditional knowledges

• have governance over what data collected and how they are generated, analysed, interpreted & disseminated.

Download free at: