CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSION

Villages like Junjuwa have resulted from white settlement in the north-west of Western Australia, the development of the cattle industry and successive state and federal Aboriginal policies. These town based settlements have Aboriginal populations from diverse linguistic groups which have gradually come to co-reside permanently. In this thesis I have shown how the Aboriginal groups and sub-groups that made up Junjuwa’s population have progressively developed and maintained a somewhat fragile group identity at the community level. Despite their differences, Junjuwa residents have a lot in common that has facilitated the development of a level of community sentiment. Several factors have combined to make possible the notion of Junjuwa as one group, in particular: a shared history; kinship ties connecting members of different linguistic and territorial groups; the distinct nature of the village and its administration; the appointment of a council and the cooperation between group leaders and appointed community leaders.

The idea of Junjuwa as one group is an emergent phenomenon. It is not something which only existed at the discourse level or an ‘ideology supporting nothing’ (Trigger 1987:235), even if it is true that groupings of a similar size did not exist outside brief ceremonial gatherings prior to the establishment of the village at Junjuwa. It seems that for Junjuwa residents the ideology was definitely supporting something. I see in the ideology of the Junjuwa discourse a support and justification of all collective actions aimed at preserving community cohesion. The maintenance of a minimal level of cohesion among Junjuwa seems to have been the main purpose of the public discourse. Other types of discourses existed as well, and I identify them as ‘private’ discourses, in the sense that they were opposed to the public one: the latter reified the notion of Junjuwa as one group, one ‘mixed mob’; but the former exposed differences that existed between the various components of Junjuwa: languages, sub-groups within languages, households clusters, ceremonial groups, kin groups as well as
other permanent or occasional association such as those presented in Chapter Seven which were all claimed as the basis of distinctive identities in different contexts.

Each of the subdivisions, groupings and associations which existed prior to the start of the community persisted in Junjuwa as resources to be drawn on or fallen back on in times of conflict and competition. These types of association did not necessarily contradict the idea of Junjuwa as a group but were part of its dynamic. At the community level, many links bound individuals, and families and were extended to sub-groups and groups within Junjuwa. These links were of two kinds: some, such as inter-group marriages or ceremonial cooperation, existed prior to settlement and were intensified; others were new, for example ties growing out of shared work experience or birth of children away from their parents' country. Both combined to set up an overall framework that has become the basis for the emergence of a more coherent group, the community or 'mixed mob'. This development was no doubt facilitated by the settlement in town of Aboriginal population from various cattle stations of the Fitzroy Valley, their permanent association on the mission reserve and firmly up by the government desire to work through incorporated communities. It seems that this period of local history favoured the formation of a kind of community identity expressed in the 'mixed group' ideology. At least, this is how it was perceived by Junjuwa people who experienced it.

The fact that both the public and private discourses co-existed shows that Junjuwa residents were fully aware of differences that existed amongst them, as demonstrated in daily activities when people identified with a particular group or sub-group, but nonetheless the two discourses were also part of the 'mixed mob' ideology. Constant efforts from Junjuwa residents to preserve and maintain its cohesion against internal or/and external disruptive factors indicated their willingness to belong to this 'mixed mob' and to perpetuate it.

Both types of discourse were used inside as well as outside the community, to sustain collective action, and decisions taken by one particular sub-group or by Junjuwa representatives. Thus, Junjuwa residents could usually justify their behaviour either by appealing to the 'public' or 'private' discourses, which could be adapted to almost any circumstance.

The mixed nature of Junjuwa and the persistence of acknowledged differences amongst its residents were factors which caused conflicts both within and between internal grouping that existed within the community. Conflicts were sometimes limited to the groups where they had arisen but often, as a result of alliances and kin solidarity, they expanded to unify several sub-groups and ultimately create a threat to Junjuwa's unity. When this happened, the public discourse came to the fore as community leaders sought to restore community harmony. Using the 'mixed mob' public discourse was usually sufficient to settle conflicts, but sometimes leaders and councillors had to stress
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as well major elements people shared: history, descent, countrymanship, kinship and finally the cooperation of various forms of leadership at the community level. All these efforts demonstrated leaders' and councillors' concerns, as well as the residents' willingness to maintain Junjuwa coherences as a 'mixed mob'.

Thus despite having its unity challenged by numerous internal conflicts, Junjuwa survived throughout the years, and it seems that the ideology of a 'mixed mob' was even reinforced. The survival of Junjuwa was made possible by several factors: the limited number of its residents, despite seasonal fluctuations in the core population; a core of residents remaining the same throughout the years; the capacity, at community level, for absorbing internal conflict by tightening and reaffirming what made Junjuwa as a group; the concessions made by both leaders and councillors to preserve community autonomy from external interventions; and finally the ways in which government funds and resource like housing were made available through the incorporated body.

External interventions in Junjuwa's affairs were numerous, and of various origins. They introduced a further element which put Junjuwa's coherence at risk. External interventions, regardless of their origin, were difficult to ignore for Junjuwa residents and their leaders. Because of the nature of its population and its location, Junjuwa was bound to be the target of external interventions: from other Aboriginal settlements, from Aboriginal-controlled organisation and from non-Aboriginal people. As long as these interventions did not contradict the 'mixed mob' ideology and its fragile unity, they were tolerated. But as soon as the cohesion of Junjuwa was threatened as a result of some external interventions, leaders and councillors worked towards limiting these interferences.

The result of internal and external challenges to Junjuwa unity, and the constant efforts from the community leadership to overcome these challenges, resulted in Junjuwa cohesion being a fragile one which had to be continually stabilized. The perpetuation of that delicate balance is what structured the overall dynamic of Junjuwa's unity as a 'mixed mob'. It is through a combination of traditional elements, adaptability and willingness to preserve Junjuwa unity and specificity that this dynamic worked efficiently. Paradoxically, Junjuwa residents built upon their differences to create the settlement cohesion. All those who lived in Junjuwa had little alternative but to do so, although for different reasons according to their origin. They spoke about their differences and the inadequacy of the settlement but they rationalised their situation by bringing up the 'shared history' that had brought them together in that place and made it a unique and specific one in order to sustain the 'mixed mob' ideology.

By contrast, Noonkanbah residents, after a five year self-imposed exile that showed the group's coherence, and its strength, found themselves in the turmoil of a nationwide crisis which ultimately, amongst other consequences, resulted in the breaking up of the community. It seems that prior to the
Noonkanbah crisis the community preserved its unity in spite of internal conflicts and external interventions (Kolig 1990:244-245), but it did not survive the Noonkanbah crisis. Several of Noonkanbah's sub-groups were split off during the crisis, mainly because they have privileged external interventions. Then, during the course of the events, these external interventions grew further, and reached a point which could not be controlled any longer by community leaders, resulting in the fragmentation of Noonkanbah into several groups.

After the Noonkanbah crisis, once the drilling had gone ahead, the failure of the Aboriginal people to stop the white people from taking over their significant sites was attributed locally to Noonkanbah's lack of cohesion: people had failed because they failed to remain together as one group. Later on, the original community which had moved back to Noonkanbah in 1976 split into four discrete settlements. Amongst the group that still lived near the Noonkanbah homestead in 1987, the lack of cohesion was obvious: individual interests were privileged over community based actions and decisions, and gradually many residents moved out of the community.

Initiatives taken by groups internal to the Noonkanbah community during the crisis were channelled towards the outside. As a result, cohesive factors, needed to maintain the community as a group, were neglected. Ultimately, this failure to preserve community coherence resulted in a loss of credibility in the eyes of nearby settlements, despite the national dimension of the crisis. Many Junjuwa residents spoke negatively of the Noonkanbah events because, in their view, the external events had precipitated the collapse of Noonkanbah community.

The regional movement that had emerged in the West Kimberley in support of the Yungnora group during the Noonkanbah crisis did not survive the crisis. This movement sought to bring together too many people from too many different backgrounds and settlements, making it impossible to develop an ideology to sustain a regional identity and political consciousness. These component groups of the KLC did not share a common history, or belong to inter-connected kin groups, nor even, in some cases, did they have kin connections. There was thus no grounds on which they could identify themselves as a group of 'countrymen', nor could any people emerge as leaders to maintain a coherent group sentiment at a such a broad level.

Thus the development of a regional political consciousness in the West Kimberley failed largely because of the ways in which people construct community identities. Further, no real and sustained material interests underwrite this type of grouping at such a large scale. Although many people in the West Kimberley shared "common experience", mainly as a result of their involvement in the cattle industry, only limited numbers combined this with lengthy periods of co-residence. It is only when the two are combined that they represent a significant element in the formation of community identity. In the
case of Junjuwa, most of the people co-resided on stations, then were grouped permanently at the UAM Reserve for several years prior to the start of Junjuwa community. Intermarriages and alliances partially link many Aboriginal communities across the West Kimberley, but insufficiently to form a cohesive set of interrelated groups as in the case of Junjuwa.

Although there is no doubt about Junjuwa’s coherence as a group, this kind of grouping is fragile and it is at the limit to which community identity can be extended at the present. Thus, attempts such as that by the KLC to develop regional forms of identity, by bringing communities together, seem destined to fail in this area in the short term. Further, the notion of representativeness was even more divisive. The KLC wanted to re-group all the Aboriginal communities behind one organisation, which would represent them all, when one of the bases of community identity is precisely the opposite (differentiation from other communities). This was the aspect of the KLC project that Junjuwa leaders had most trouble with: they used it to explain the KLC’s failure to bring people from the West Kimberley together:

They KLC blokes, them wanta to talk for us Junjuwa mob, alright. But them wanta to talk for all the Kimberley mob too, well this is no good, they can’t do it. Them mob, us mob, we’re not all the same. We’re different, all of us proper different all the way (Arthur).

The role of government policy has been crucial and remained so in the origin, nature and perpetuation of contemporary Aboriginal groupings. The way successive policies allocated money and resources to Aboriginal people created large scale settlement which persisted mainly because it was impossible for sub-groups to have their own funding. When such opportunities emerged as a result of changes in government policies, small groups pulled out of large scale settlements because they were given the means to exist on their own (see Arthur’s and Stanley’s comments in Appendix Two).

In the light of changes that have occurred in Fitzroy Crossing from mid-1988 onwards, it is possible to foresee the development of an Aboriginal grouping at the town level. First, all the town based, and surrounding, settlements that were part of a local Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) scheme, implemented in May 1988, had to cooperate. They shared some equipment, and smaller settlements could only be involved in the scheme through affiliation with Junjuwa Community (see Appendix Two). In order to improve relationships between the various settlements of the Fitzroy Crossing area, an Aboriginal initiative led to the creation of an inter-community council which included representatives from all the settlements as well as from some of their internal groupings. A year later, this council, in response to a suggestion from the Aboriginal Development Commission (ADC), decided to found an Aboriginal cooperative which would assess local business and enterprises which might be purchased by ADC and run by local Aboriginal communities. This wider cooperation would have been doomed to failure a few years ago, maybe because it has no real reason for existence at that time (funds
allocated on the basis of each incorporated community and social security benefits paid individually). Apparently this cooperation had some chance of success, on the basis of information I received in mid-1990, since people had something real to make any decisions about: by getting together they could be eligible to purchase local enterprises through ADC and thus create employment opportunities that will secure their involvement in the CDEP scheme (see Appendix Two).

Junjuwa council had elected two chairpersons, a Walmajarri and a Bunuba men, who in turn appointed for the first time an Aboriginal project officer. These radical changes at the level of Junjuwa leadership had influenced community attitudes towards other town-based settlements: it seems that in some contexts collective Aboriginal interests at the town level could become a priority over community led initiatives.

One may see in what happened at Fitzroy Crossing between 1988 and 1990 a parallel to the development of the Junjuwa mixed identity: various settlements, with the incentive of funds and resources offered by government programs, were keen to cooperate and overcome their differences in order to benefit from them, while they nevertheless sought to maintain their autonomy and specificity at the community level.

The development of community grouping and identity is ultimately the result of a complex interplay of government policy and material interests which necessitate a certain cooperation at the level defined according to government's criteria on one side, and the ever present tendency amongst Aboriginal people to fracture into more localised groupings on the other.

Nevertheless if Aboriginal communities from the Fitzroy Crossing area do cooperate and get together instead of competing with one another, such an attitude would greatly benefit local Aboriginal interests, reinforce their self-determination and give them a fairer access to resources. Of course, it is too early to know whether such a situation has some prospect of survival, considering the mixed nature and various origins of town based settlements. It is also premature to say that the Fitzroy Crossing Aboriginal people will be able to develop a town identity while preserving a 'mixed mob' ideology.

The hypothesis at the origin of this thesis was to question the rather unclear concept of 'Aboriginal community'. Some of the questions I addressed, in order to explore this concept, were: what is an Aboriginal community in contemporary Aboriginal Australia? How did it come into being? What held the community together as a group? How was community identity formed, expressed and maintained, and how did it operate? What was the basis of the community's leadership, and how far did external influences interfere with the community as a group?
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Instead of organising the presentation of my data within a theoretical framework relating to other areas in Aboriginal Australia, I have chosen to concentrate on giving a detailed ethnography to show how Junjuwa's residents lived this type of grouping (the community) on a daily basis, and how contradictions inherent to this particular situation were overcome, and then turned into a coercive rather than divisive force. My main aim, in doing so, was to identify in Junjuwa all elements, both past and present, that come into play to form a very complex and fragile grouping common to most contemporary Aboriginal settlements in the North of Australia: the community. The concept of 'Aboriginal community' has been, far too often, taken for granted while implementing States and Federal policies which has led to the neglect of regional and local differences that prevailed behind the notion of such groupings.

There is a major contradiction in Federal Aboriginal policies: they are drafted for the Aboriginal people on the basis that they are a single coherent group and, as such, regional and local differences are ignored. Therefore, once implemented these policies are often inadequate, but nevertheless remain in place for several years. A comparable discrepancy exists at the States' level. Both attitudes, in the light of this thesis, ought to be changed in order to make policies more relevant to the contemporary Aboriginal social reality. I am not saying that each form of contemporary Aboriginal grouping should have its own policy, but on the basis of similarities in the origin, form and nature of Aboriginal settlements, like Junjuwa, for example, settlements described by Chase (1980) and Trigger (1987), an attempt could be made for a broad classification of Aboriginal contemporary social groups as a guide-line for the drafting and implementation of government policies in better congruence with the nature of these settlements and Aboriginal people's needs.

To suggest such changes may be very idealistic and quite impossible to put into practice. Although, I hope that, what I have presented in this thesis, and more particularly when I discussed the discrepancy between the outsider view of Junjuwa and its internal organisation, makes it of potential use to the people in Aboriginal administration who sought to meet, in their work, the social reality of contemporary Aboriginal communities.

In this thesis, I have emphasized the various factors that made Junjuwa's specificity and showed how people used these factors to build a 'mixed mob' identity and put it into practice despite all internal and external contradictions inherent in Junjuwa. Such a process is by no means unique to Junjuwa and it suggests a basic core of elements, despite regional and local variations, which contribute to group formation, maintenance and dissolution amongst contemporary Aboriginal people, and the expression of new forms of identities.

The historical context cannot be overlooked in this process, nor the intervention of Federal and State governments through their policies and various agencies. Some other preponderant elements in the development of the
'mixed mob' ideology in Junjuwa were: the village and community sentiment formation, the complexity of Aboriginal leadership and the interference of non-Aboriginal people in community leadership, the variable use of kinship and subsection membership, the emergence of more inclusive forms of associations that could lead to new expressions of identities (Christian people, people of mixed descent, gangs). Most of which are common to many remote Aboriginal settlements in Northern Australia, and exist sometimes as well amongst urban Aboriginal groupings elsewhere, making of Junjuwa a starting point for a wider discussion of contemporary social Aboriginal groupings.

With rapid changes in Aboriginal people's living conditions, and the growing awareness of political consciousness amongst younger Aboriginal people, it is possible that a movement similar to the one that led to the development of 'mixed mob identity' could be expanded at the regional level more successfully than after the Noonkanbah events. Younger Aboriginal people in the Fitzroy Valley area recognize, more than their forefathers did in the past, the likeness of various situations as well as the needs for regional based action in order to improve it.

In the Kimberleys, the dissolution of Noonkanbah was caused ultimately when the community closed in on itself. In the light of this outcome, the dissolution of Junjuwa could eventuate if Bunuba people find themselves on their own in the village, as a result of State and/or Federal policies that give opportunities to smaller groupings to establish settlements on their own and ultimately drive non-Bunuba people away from the community. Then, as I have exposed in this thesis, the closeness of Bunuba more inclusive groupings would prevent the maintenance of Junjuwa 'mixed mob ideology', which is based on a playing up of people differences, and did not operate as successfully within language group as it did at the community level.

The KLC's attempt to bring Aboriginal settlements from the Kimberleys area together did not last partly because the Aboriginal-controlled organisation was not seen, by the Aboriginal people from the Kimberleys, as representative of the spectrum of cultural and linguistic diversity that existed in the area as it ought to be but rather perceived as controlled by a few and serving the interests of these people only. The downfall of this attempt does not necessarily mean that any future similar initiatives are doomed to failure.

For example, the East Kimberley Council, formed a decade after the KLC, enjoyed a regional recognition from nearly all the Aboriginal settlements in the East Kimberley area. Thus, an alternative could be a 'central' or West Kimberley Land Council located at Fitzroy Crossing. Such an organisation would be more representative and better accepted than Marra Worra Worra ever was, because it was identified, by Fitzroy Crossing Aboriginal people, as a branch of the KLC and as such not suitable, in their view, to promote the development of a regional-based grouping.
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The implementation of such an organisation in Fitzroy Crossing should be left to Aboriginal's initiative and to some extents supported by Aboriginal funding. In order to be able to do so, and thus to improve Aboriginal self-determination in the area, communities like Junjuwa should be given real opportunities to generate income through scheme similar to CDEP, which so far have contributed to increase Aboriginal dependency on non-Aboriginal skills. Only if the Aboriginal people from the Fitzroy area are actively involved in the setting and funding of an Aboriginal-controlled organisation would they then be likely to develop some enduring regional based-sentiments and groupings as it has occurred amongst Junjuwa's residents for whom the village was, above all, their own achievement.

The creation, in mid-1991, of an Aboriginal co-operative in Fitzroy Crossing, as a potential group-purchaser of non-Aboriginal enterprises and an umbrella-organisation representative of the local Aboriginal people's interests, which included most of the Aboriginal settlements from the Fitzroy Crossing area, could be a step toward the coming into being of such a type of more independent and autonomous Aboriginal-controlled organisation; but, in order to achieve this goal, further legislative changes are needed regarding Aboriginal government policies both at the State and Federal levels.
APPENDIX ONE

CONSTITUTION OF JUNJUWA COMMUNITY INCORPORATED

NAME:

1. The name of the Association is JUNJUWA COMMUNITY INCORPORATED

DEFINITIONS:

2. In this Constitution

"THE ASSOCIATION" means Junjuwa Community Incorporated.
"THE COUNCIL" means the Council of Leaders. "LEADER" means a member of the Council.

"ABORIGINAL" means any person who is a "native", "aborigine", "Aboriginal" or "person of Aboriginal descent" under any law of Western Australia or of the Commonwealth of Australia.

"THE COMMUNITY" means the members of the Association.

OBJECTS:

3. The objects of the Association are:-

(1). to support the development of the community in all ways

(2). to help to bring about the self support of the community by the development of economic projects and industries.
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(3). to hold shares in any company formed to carry out the objects of the Association

(4). to support education, job training, health services, work and housing for the community

(5). to help and encourage the community to manage its affairs upon its own land

(6). to help and encourage the community to keep and renew its traditional culture

(7). to help to build trust and friendship between the community and other people

(8). to receive and spend grants of money from the Government of the State of the Commonwealth

OFFICE:

4. The office of the Association shall be at Fitzroy Crossing or at such other place as the council may decide.

MEMBERSHIP:

5. The members of the Association shall be those Aboriginals who are of the....... 

(a) Bunaba tribe, or are related.

(b) Other tribes of the Fitzroy Crossing area, or are related, and who are not members of any other Association, and who live by the rules of the Community.

6. There shall be a register of Members in which shall be recorded the names of all persons who are recognized by the Council as being members of the Association. The name of any person who ceases to be recognized by the Council as a member shall be removed from the Register.

COUNCIL:

7. The objects of the Association shall be carried out by the Council of Leaders.

8. Any member may be a Leader.

9. Leaders shall be chosen by the Consensus of the Community at the Annual Meeting. They shall hold office for one year but may be chosen for further years. In the choice of leaders there shall be an equal number of those
chosen from the Bunaba tribe as the total of those chosen from the other tribal groups of the Fitzroy Crossing area.

MEETINGS AND PROCEEDINGS:

10. The Council shall meet for business as often as necessary at such time and place as it may fix.

11. A meeting of the Council shall be held whenever any Leader asks for one to be held.

12. There shall be no limit to the number of leaders but unless and until the members decide that more are needed at least three Bunaba and at least three from the other tribal groups of the Fitzroy Crossing area, shall form a quorum at any meeting of the Council. Whenever the numbers of Leaders is less than the number needed for a quorum the remaining members of the Council may act to convince a meeting of the members to appoint new Leaders.

13. At the Annual Meeting, after the Leaders have been chosen the members shall choose one of the Leaders to be the Chairman of Community.

14. The Chairman shall preside at all meetings at which he is present but if he is not present or does not wish to take the chair, the members present shall choose a chairman for the meeting.

15. The Council may make rules for meetings of the Council and of the Community.

ANNUAL MEETING:

16. Once in every year during October a meeting of the Community (to be called the annual meeting) shall be held at the village site established by the Community.

17. All members shall be invited and entitled to attend the annual meeting.

18. The business to be conducted at the annual meeting shall be:-

(a) to hear from the Council of the Association’s affairs and activities since the last annual meeting.

(b) to hear from the treasurer on the finances of the Association for the year ending on the preceding 30 June.

(c) to chose Leaders and Chairman for the next year

(d) such other items of business as the members may wish to deal with
MANAGEMENT:

19. The Council shall be responsible for the management of the affairs of the Association and shall control its funds and property.

20. The Council shall observe the established traditions and customs of the Community and consult with the members on all matters of importance.

21. The Council may give any of its powers and functions to sub-committees consisting of such one or more Leaders and/or other persons as the Council thinks fit. Any sub-committees so formed shall abide by any directions which may be given to it by the Council.

22. The meetings of any sub-committee shall, unless otherwise directed by the Council, be controlled by the provisions in this constitution for regulating the meetings and proceedings of the Council.

FINANCES:

23. All money of the Association shall be deposited in the first instance to the credit of a bank account or accounts, kept in the name of the Association at such bank as the Council shall decide.

24. All cheques and withdrawal forms shall be signed by not less than two persons (whether Leader or not) appointed by the Council for the purpose.

25. Accounts shall be passed for payment at any meeting of the Council or of a committee appointed by the Council for that purpose.

26. Official receipts shall be issued for all money received by the Association.

27. All money or property of the Association not subject to any special trust may be used to carry out the objects of the Association but no part shall be paid or used directly or indirectly by way of dividend, bonus or otherwise by way of profit to any members excepting any proper payment to any Leader, Officer, or employee of the Association for services actually done for the Association.

28. True accounts shall be kept by the Treasurer of all money received and spent by the Association and of the affairs of Association.

29. The books of account of the Association shall be kept at the office or at such other place as the Council may decide and shall be open to inspection by any Leader at all reasonable times.

30. The financial year of the Association shall be from 1st July to 30th June.
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31. At every Annual Meeting the Council shall give members present a certified profit and loss or income and expenditure account and a certified balance sheet containing a summary of the affairs of the Association made up to 30th June in that year and prepared by a qualified accountant.

OFFICERS:

32. The Council may appoint a suitable person or persons (who may be a member but need not be one) to carry out the duties of Secretary and/or Treasurer.

33. The Secretary and/or Treasurer shall hold office for such times and on such other conditions as the Council may fix.

MINUTES:

34. The Council and any sub-committees shall keep minutes in books to record:

(a) the name of all persons who are Leaders

(b) the names of the Leaders present at each meeting of the Council and the names of the persons present at any meeting of a sub-committee

(c) all decisions of the Council and sub-committees.

COMMON SEAL:

35. The Association shall have a common seal upon which shall be inscribed the name of the Association and the word "Common Seal".

36. The Common Seal shall be kept by the Secretary and shall not be used on any document except following a resolution of the Council. Every document to which the Common Seal is affixed shall be counter-signed by the Chairman and the Secretary or such other persons as the Council shall appoint for that purpose.

AMENDMENTS:

37. The Association may from time to time upon a resolution passed by a majority vote of members of the Council present and voting at a meeting of the Council called for the purpose, change its name or vary, rescind, or add to the objects or any of the other provisions of this constitution but no such resolution shall be valid until such time as it has been considered by and approved by a
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consensus of members present at a meeting of the Community specially called for the purpose.

WINDING UP:

38. In the event of the Association being wound up or dissolved and there remaining after payment of all of its debts any property whatsoever, this may be given or transferred to another institution or association having objects similar to the Association (being an institution or association the constitution of which prohibits the distribution or funds or assets to its members) or may be distributed in such manner as the Council shall consider to be in the best interests of the Community PROVIDED THAT no payment shall be made to any individual member of the Association except to the extent permitted by paragraph 27.
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JUNJUWA UNDER THE CDEP SCHEME

During September 1988 and October 1988, I made a seven week visit to Fitzroy Crossing. The purpose of this particular visit was to evaluate the impact of a recently implemented Community Development Employment Projects (CDEP) scheme in Junjuwa.

CDEP schemes have been operating since 1977, they are aimed at creating jobs for Aboriginal people who previously received unemployment benefits. The right to receive UB is surrendered by all eligible members of the community and in its place a bulk payment of the same amount plus a 20% loading is made to the community council. People work on community controlled projects paid for out of the grant.

I started my field research by conducting a community census in order to compare Junjuwa's population with figures I had collected every second month between December 1985 and March 1987. Census figures indicated that a few groups of people (three groups of about ten people each) had left Junjuwa since the CDEP scheme had been introduced. Although these groups had left Junjuwa, they remained in the vicinity of Fitzroy Crossing. The first group was made up of Gooniyandi people and had moved to Muludja; members of the second group were Wangkajunga who had gone to Christmas Creek, by then known as 'Wangkatjungka' (Hudson & Yu 1987:21); The last group included Walmajarri and Jaru who had started an outstation near the old Cherrabun homestead at a place called Ngalungadjji. This movement seems to have been precipitated by the CDEP scheme, for which small communities are eligible providing they are incorporated. Thus, people moved from larger communities to smaller ones since they had the opportunity to be financially autonomous; such opportunity did not exist under the unemployment benefits era. Indeed, this type of social security benefits was not sufficient to support small groups,
and many past attempts had aborted partly because of this but also due to the lack of support from DAA, whose policy at the time promoted settlements such as Junjuwa. All of those who moved out of Junjuwa were members of small groupings for whom the CDEP scheme offered an avenue to affirm their own identity and independence from the larger ones. In the opinion of members of these small groups, those who spoke dominant languages already had more privileges than they did in Junjuwa and the CDEP scheme provided a further opportunity to increase these privileges (access to vehicles, leadership of workers teams see below). Small non-incorporated communities, willing to join the CDEP, could do so but only under incorporated ones because funds from the scheme cannot be paid through a resource agency like MWW, like Social Security benefits. For example, six small settlements were getting their wages through the Junjuwa office which took also care of their paper work in exchange for a 3% levy. It is a fact that expectations from the small communities may have been unrealistic for some, but such dependency on the large communities was interpreted by members of the smaller ones as a strategy to force them to remain in large settlements:

I don’t know what’s wrong with them government people. First them bin say, alright you can go longa your country start them new places for your mob. Us we bin thinkin, alright let’s go. Now look, we bin sittin there long time already, we got nothin: no house, no motokar, nothin. Look them Junjuwa mob, them got plenty, them got us money too in that Junjuwa office. This one money us money, not them mob money, still all the same we can’t get him our place we have to get him longa that Junjuwa office like them pension and UB days, I don’t know what’s wrong with them government people, maybe them want us mob to sit down in Junjuwa again, but us mob like other mobs too we bin finish from that place now (Stanley).

I found that the changes in Junjuwa since I left in 1987 were astonishing. All the houses had been transformed and fixed (see Chapter Four), and were freshly painted; streets and backyards were rubbish free; piles of firewood were lying in various spots; there were five new community vehicles, as well as two trucks, a grader and a tractor; the garage and workshop had been upgraded and many tools purchased; new office space had been built and equipped with modern facilities, and so on. Furthermore, many Junjuwa residents were keen to comment on the community’s improvements, which were all attributed to the CDEP scheme. I gathered many enthusiastic statements about the scheme from Aboriginal people, especially amongst the older ones. Junjuwa’s residents’ positive attitudes were shared by non-Aboriginal people from town. At the police station, at the hospital and at the school, those of the non-Aboriginal staff who had known Junjuwa prior to the implementation of the CDEP scheme acknowledged that the place had undergone positive changes since it had started.

I subsequently examined the organisation of the CDEP scheme in Junjuwa. The scheme was gradually implemented during a three month trial period beginning in March 1988. The full scheme started in May 1988. The aim of the trial period was to reduce progressively the number of people on
unemployment benefits in order to have them all off that type of benefits by May 1988. During these three months people were asked to do several hours of work per week in order to get the same amount of money as they would if on unemployment benefits. After May 1988, no one living in Junjuwa was eligible for unemployment benefits, therefore people had either to be part of the scheme and work or to move out of Junjuwa if they wish to apply for unemployment benefit. Junjuwa council met several times to discuss wages under the scheme. Finally, council leaders agreed that during the first six months of the scheme people on CDEF will get paid the same as they would get on unemployment benefit: that is, $115 a week for a single person with no dependents. Under the national minimum wage per hour at the time (around $9), this amount corresponded to three hours of work per day.

In September 1988 there were 99 people under CDEF in Junjuwa, grouped into male and female teams, although one mixed team existed (see below 'store team'). This is how the six male workers teams were organised:

a/ one team in charge of collecting rubbish;

b/ one team in charge of fixing taps and toilets;

c/ one team in charge of upgrading and fixing house fences;

d/ one team in charge of firewood collection;

e/ one team in charge of the overall cleaning.

f/ one contract team

Each team was staffed with anything between eight and twelve male workers, under the supervision of a team leader. The contract team worked either for Junjuwa, for local enterprises or for cattle stations. Workers of that particular team received an extra one third of the contract money divided amongst workers, another third was put into one of the community cheque accounts, and the remaining third was for the team leader. This team's leader was Russell (see Chapters Eight and Nine), the only non-Aboriginal team leader, who also acted as the Junjuwa CDEF coordinator.

There were five appointed Aboriginal team leaders, who received an extra $50 per week. Each of them was responsible for the work carried out by his own team, as well as for work attendance. Each team had been allocated a community vehicle, of which the team leader had full use. All these four teams, except the contract team, were organised along language affiliation lines and according to sub-divisions that existed within each language. Three team leaders were Bunuba men (teams b,c,e); the leader of the first team (a) was a Wangkajunga and the last team leader was a Walmajarri (d), all Aboriginal team leaders were councillors. All workers in three teams were from the same language as their team leaders (a,d,e), and the remaining two teams grouped workers of mixed linguistic origin: Bunuba and Walmajarri (b), Bunuba,
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Goonyandy and Jaru (d). Internally, these teams were organised alongside sub-group divisions, with non-appointed co-team leaders in charge of workers from their sub-group.

The contract team was made up of eight workers who were either people of mixed Aboriginal descent or belonged to a sub-group whose members were of mixed linguistic origin (cf Robin Chapter Six). There was a sixth team of male workers, in charge of the upgrading housing program. It was made up of about twelve to fifteen young men of various linguistic backgrounds, some of them external to Junjuwa. The workers were paid partly by the CDEP scheme (2/3 of the average wage) and the rest by Homewest\(^7\) at a much higher wage. This made this team particularly attractive since in a few days of work a young man could make much more than working full time under the scheme in any other team (but the contract team). But the rapid turn over of workers slowed working progress since some specific construction skills were needed and took time to be acquired.

In addition to these six teams there was a seventh one, called the 'store team' which included twelve people, male and female, who were either Andrew's (Junjuwa chairman) close relatives or Jaru. Four of them worked in each of the following places:

- Burawa store, formerly owned by the United Aboriginal Mission and known as the 'Mission store'. This store together with the entire United Aboriginal Mission lease was transferred to Junjuwa in February 1987, and subsequently given an Aboriginal name.


- Junjuwa Community store, an outlet of Burawa store conveniently located in the bakery building in order to offer shopping opportunities within the community.

Female teams were organised differently. The Community Council had decided that married women with under school age children would be paid but not required to do any work as long as they kept their house clean and in 'good order'. Single women were asked to clean houses of elderly people living next to their house or related to them as well as to do their washing at the 'mum's and kids' centre which had been set up in one of the empty houses\(^8\), in which three heavy duty washing machines that had been installed. Married women also got together there and did their washing; meanwhile, their children could play together in the nearby community playground. In the same house, five women, all Wangkajungu, employed by the 'meals on wheels' program, cooked meals twice a day for about 30 of the 53 Junjuwa residents on old age pensions. This program was a community enterprise which has started alongside the CDEP scheme; it also supported the school canteen which was then controlled by Junjuwa. Meals were served to pensioners and others in the centre at the coast of $2 per meal which could be deducted directly from pension or wages.
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Junjuwa under the CDEP Scheme

There were three women (one per main language: Bunuba, Walmajarri, Wangkajunga), appointed by the council to oversee women's working activities.

I accompanied each male team in their daily working activities and attempted to obtain views on the CDEP (other than those expressed in public and/or general statements) from the team workers. Nearly all the workers were disappointed with their wages. Basically they did not understand why they were getting less money under the CDEP scheme, even though they were employed, compared with what they used to get when paid unemployment benefits. Indeed, it was true that weekly wages were, for most of the people under the scheme, less than half of their fortnightly UB cheques.

The reduced level of income was partly due to tax deduction but was also due to their being penalized for non-attendance at work, which did not exist under the UB scheme. Thus the social life that had developed under the UB era (1976-1988) was no longer available without financial penalties. Two young men were in charge of checking male workers' names every morning and those who were not attending work would lose one day's pay. This system was both unfair and unreliable; besides, many workers tried to have their names ticked off even though they did not turn up at work. This reinforced tensions between groups since the two young men were affiliated to the two dominant languages (Bunuba and Walmajarri). Furthermore, CDEP workers who had previously been employed elsewhere in recent years, particularly on cattle stations, found the CDEP wages low and pointed out to me that 'it was not worth working to get sit down money' (unemployment benefit). Further, as I have indicated (see Chapter Four), Junjuwa residents who had seasonal employment in the cattle industry, or worked for the community, remained on UB despite the fact they received wages. Consequently, many of Junjuwa workers under the CDEP expected to get their UB cheques on top of CDEP wages. Other complaints were against the type of work people were asked to do under the scheme. Most Kimberley Aborigines are skilled at station work and under the CDEP they were doing jobs they found low status.

I spent several days with the women workers and conducted interviews in order to compare their views with the men's. Older and married women were satisfied overall with the CDEP, especially in regards to facilities that had been made available to them at the 'kids and mums' centre. Single women found it 'boring' to have to stay in Junjuwa and to clean other people's house for at least 'half a day'. Further, work attendance for women was estimated on the quality of the work done rather than on worker attendance, since most of them worked in their own house. Thus, it was a subjective criterion which single workers said was used by the three women 'supervisors' to give them a 'hard time'.

I discussed all these issues with Mark, the community adviser, who shared people's concerns about low wages, the poor quality of work available, and the inadequacy of the scheme, but he argued that the CDEP could not be improved on at this stage. Junjuwa was allocated only sufficient funds under the scheme to cover the cost of current wages paid to workers and Junjuwa enterprises were
Appendix Two

not making enough profit\textsuperscript{11} for increasing wages or for starting new projects in order to diversify positions. Many of the community councillors, including Andrew, the chairman, were willing to increase wages and workers were also keen to work more but none of this was possible yet. The only possibility for generating profit and thus to change the current scheme would have been for Junjuwa to acquire other types of local enterprises such as a supermarket, video shop or even the local hotel. These were all available for sale, since current owners saw a way of making substantial profits, should they be able to sell to the Aboriginal Development Commission\textsuperscript{12}. However, such enterprises required specific skills, both in business and office work, but local Aborigines did not possess such skills. Consequently, if Junjuwa acquired any of these enterprises, it would need to employ more non-Aboriginal staff. The main aim of the CDEP scheme was precisely to increase Aboriginal employment and self-determination. In order to increase Aboriginal employment opportunities in town an Aboriginal co-operative had been created with Junjuwa, Bayulu and Noonkanbah. This co-operative was keen to purchase the roadhouse and had put aside a $20,000 deposit for that purpose but according to Mark this initiative was supported neither by DAA nor ADC. It seems that ADC studied this option but for Kurnangki Community since this would give it access to the CDEP scheme\textsuperscript{13}.

As far as employment of non-Aboriginals as part of the scheme is concerned, Junjuwa employed seven full-time non-Aboriginal people compared to two full-time and one part-time the previous year. The employment situation for non-Aborigines in Junjuwa is summarized as follows:

1985-1987: one community adviser, one baker both full-time; one part-time bookkeeper (community adviser’s wife).

1988: one community adviser, one bookkeeper, one store manager, one CDEP coordinator, one team supervisor and two bakers, all full-time.

The fact that Junjuwa employed several non-Aboriginals was not a problem in itself. Most of the non-Aboriginal people employed had skills that none of Junjuwa residents possessed and therefore the non-Aboriginal employees were not taking positions away from Aboriginal people. But on the basis of non-Aboriginal interventions described in Chapter Nine, the situation could create divisions among Junjuwa residents. For example, Russell and the team supervisor had different views on the working organisation. One of the bakers refused to take orders from the store manager if they were not channelled through the community adviser. The non-Aboriginal employees’ conflicts were a potential threat to Junjuwa community whose members were regularly dragged into them (Tonkinson 1978:101).

As one would expect, alcoholism, violence and related problems, that plagued the social security benefits era had not disappeared with the introduction of CDEP. But, police station figures for July and August 1988 showed that charges had dropped by one third compared to the same period the
previous year. Similarly, unofficial figures from the hotel indicated that alcohol sales to Aborigines had dropped, but not as significantly as the charges\(^\text{14}\). The 'book down' had been reintroduced both at Burawa and Junjiwa community stores for Junjiwa residents only. Thus, less cash was available at the end of the week since what people owed to one of the two stores was deducted from their wages before payment. Consequently, there was a smaller amount of cash available to purchase alcohol and sales had dropped accordingly. It also seems that the Junjiwa Community Health was more efficient than before: the Aboriginal Medical Service had set up a base at Fitzroy and a second doctor was appointed in town. Further, several Junjiwa women, from different linguistic groups, had undergone a health training program focused on alcohol consumption, and other specific health problems faced by local Aboriginal people. Figures provided by the Burawa store manager indicate that people spent more than before on food, even though smaller amounts of cash were available at once. He also pointed out that vegetables and fruit sales had increased more significantly than others\(^\text{15}\), which indicates a positive change in dietary habits.

It was surprising to see the 'book down' system back in Junjiwa since it had been suppressed by popular demand in 1985. But in 1988 the system was different from what existed until 1985 when no credit limits were fixed and people bought on credit for more than they actually earned. This new 'book down' system was limited to Junjiwa residents under the scheme and to pensioners. These people could book down groceries but only up to one third of their weekly wages, Mondays and Wednesdays were days when shopping on credit was available, and only at one of the two community stores. With such restrictions, the system seemed to operate well and people were happy about it. Many local Aboriginal people would spend their wages within two days after getting them, and this system enabled them to purchase goods in the middle of the week even though cash within the community was very scarce. Thus, according to the community adviser, people were not tempted to ask for credit elsewhere and consequently money from Junjiwa people remained within the community. Figures available from the Junjiwa office show that all Junjiwa residents on CDEP and pensioners took full advantage of the credit facilities which provided Junjiwa's stores with a regular weekly income of around $4,000\(^\text{16}\). The main difficulty with the system was that credit limits were calculated every week for CDEP workers, thus if people had missed one or several days of work their credit limit was reduced accordingly; similarly, if someone had purchased goods on credit and did not work the following week, credit was no longer available to that person.

Pensioners were also paid weekly. This had been a community Council decision taken one month after the implementation of the CDEP scheme. During the first month that followed the start of the scheme, pensioners received their cheques fortnightly and cashed them accordingly. But since many workers did not have money when the pensioners got theirs, the pensioners
became an easy prey for unscrupulous workers to the point that several old people were left with nothing. Furthermore, work attendance had significantly dropped during pension week when workers were offered the possibility of gambling or drinking. Therefore at the following council meeting it was decided to split pension cheques in half and to pay pensioners every Friday.

In fact, the entire economic life of the town had switched from a fortnightly to a weekly rhythm ‘Busy’ nights at the pub, hospital and police station were Fridays and Saturdays, the town being more or less quiet the rest of the week. This change had been noticed by Aboriginal people as well, but for most of them things were not that different under the CDEP scheme compared to the UB era:

Before we used to have them pension days, you remember when all them people got drunk, really mad time that pension week, and we bin havin them biggest fights too. Well all that time we bin havin trouble for one full week, pension week trouble all the way, then nothin all quiet for one week, this one we call’im slack week, and that pension week was coming again. Now with that CDEP business, it’s different again, we got them two mad days, you know like Gardiya, two mad days after pay day, Fridays and Saturdays. Well some people reckon it’s different know, myself I reckon it’s all the same (Peter).

Hunting and gathering activities, visits to distant relatives and some ceremonial activities had declined amongst Junjuwa residents since the implementation of the CDEP. The former activities were then confined to the weekend since many people had to work during the week. Pensioners had no one to take them into the bush for foraging activities, except for a few hours a day which was not enough to reach places where bush products, and wildlife were largely available. Further, the Council had rejected the possibility of foraging activities as part of the scheme, arguing that this was not work, on the basis that they were strongly associated with the UB period. Visits to distant relatives and ceremonies that need long trips or require several days of ritual activities had become less frequent. Travel for ceremonial activity had been a major concern for community councillors in Junjuwa when they made the rules under which the CDEP scheme would operate. It was decided that a special two day leave could be given to attend a funeral but that was all. October is only a few months away from the period during which most initiation ceremonies were held some Junjuwa residents expressed their concerns about the incompatibility between these kinds of ceremonial activities, which require several days of preparation and of participation and the CDEP scheme.

There were twelve people in Junjuwa who were under the CDEP scheme but did not do any work. All of them were heavy drinkers who lived off their relatives’ incomes, no one blamed them for their behaviour but relatives wished that these people, who in their view were sick, could apply for UB instead, but this was impossible as long as they resided in Junjuwa.
I looked at work attendance over a three week period and was able to note differences between male and female workers as well as to connect external disruptive factors (Kurnangki pension day for example) with low work attendance. Table 2 shows the figures for these three weeks (28/09/1988 to 14/10/1988)

As expected, those who did not miss a day of work were: for the women, the three supervisors and the five employees of the meals on wheels project; for the men, the five team leaders and the eight workers from the contract teams, all those who had financial incentive to motivate them. Siblings of the same sex worked often alternatively: one week of full attendance and the next one with two or three working days, and vice versa. According to their numbers siblings had to work one full week out of two, three or four. Fewer women than men had a full work attendance over the three week period, but this may have been caused by the way supervision was done.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 days</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 14 days</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Attendance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OF WORKERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

**work attendance of Junjuwa workers**

28/09/1988 - 14/10/1988

At the end of my field trip I had a long discussion with one of Junjuwa's councillors. He was probably one of the first local Aborigines to ask for a CDEP scheme to be introduced in Junjuwa. Following is his view about the scheme:

Let me tell you something, that CDEP business, well it's not bad thing for us. We gotta lot of things, new cars, trucks, tools and that's good. Them young fella they don't sit down all the time like with the UB money, well they still drink and fight alright, but they are not shame now, they work for their money and this is good too. But you
see what we need now, it's a place on our own, for each mob, my mob, Colin mob, them Walmajarri too, you know some land, not much, just enough for a bit of cattle. Mine place I want'im next to my father country on the river, proper good place too this one. Then we will take them young fella, they will work for us and we gonna be alright. Because you see that CDEP business, he can't last long like that, the place is clean, we gotta big mobs of firewood, women got their place for washin them clothes, old people are fed everyday, what else can we do, nothin... Well if they do nothin the young fella will get mad again and we gonna be in the real shit again like with the sit down money. I tell you, we need places on our own and to look after community business by ourselves, there are too many Gardiya workin for us right now, I hope we can make it this time, we've been screwed too many times...(Arthur)

Whilst Junjuwa may have seemed a better place to live in for Aboriginal people than many others around Fitzroy Crossing, many problems remained. The CDEP scheme is only a temporary solution to the problems which confront Junjuwa residents. In many ways Junjuwa had taken steps which could be seen as retrogressive. For example, an increased number of non-Aboriginal people were employed, even though two young Aboriginal men had been trained community advisers for two years17. Also, with the credit system, the low wages and the poor quality and diversity of work available, some Junjuwa residents felt they were not getting out of the scheme as much as they had expected. Further, for most of them the 'CDEP business' was very mysterious and they felt they were cheated:

I tell you what, that CDEP money we don't know where he come from. Before, them UB cheques, alright we bin seen them, all the lot with us names and money, this one we knew it was money longa Perth way. But that CDEP him different, alright pay day you go longa Junjuwa office and you get your money, but that money him never come first to Junjuwa, us we don't know where that money come from. Maybe government, maybe Junjuwa, well if Junjuwa money it's us money too, then we should get more of that money, more money, how come Junjuwa got all that money for them motokar, truck and all that lot, and us we got little bit, I bin to that Burawa store, big mob fifties and hundreds ($50 and $100 banknotes), well that's our store our money, how come us we got only little bit. I reckon it's not fair we've bin cheated all the way, we listen them Gardiya all the way: station managers, missionaries, project officers, DAA and ADC mobs, we listen them alright and we gotta nothin out of it (Henry).

My last interview was with Mark who started Junjuwa's projects but nevertheless admitted on the shortcoming of the scheme. The construction worker team had still a lot of work to do: extension of the bakery, building of a basket-ball court and a play ground area next to it; upgrading of the community hall. The fencing team had about three more months of work to redo all the fences around Junjuwa and the former mission compound. Mark and the council had planned several projects: first they had approached the hospital and various enterprises to offer them a washing contract service that would be done by the women. Junjuwa was willing to purchase horses in order to organise
rides in the nearby bush during the tourist season. There were also plans for a market garden whose production would be sold to Burawa and Junjuwa stores, a poultry farm and a mohair goat farm. Finally Bunuba were keen to apply for a land excision somewhere on Brooking Springs or Leopold Station. None of this could be started prior to the end of 1989 and Mark feared that low wages and the poor quality of work could discourage people prior to that time. He blamed local non-Aboriginal people for their lack of support for Junjuwa enterprises and their lack of confidence in Aboriginal controlled projects. He concluded by saying that if many things had indeed changed in Fitzroy Crossing since the implementation of the scheme, but hostile and negative attitudes towards the Aboriginal population amongst local white certainly had not.

The CDEP had largely contributed to the upgrading of living conditions to a reasonable standard in Junjuwa and in that sense the scheme has fulfilled its main objective. But the low wages, and the lack of interesting employment opportunities, leads one to think that the CDEP served more as a transfer of responsibility from the Welfare State to the Aboriginal settlements, for problems faced by Aboriginal people in Fitzroy Crossing, than an opportunity to create employment for Aboriginal people. The way the scheme was implemented in Junjuwa made it almost impossible to generate a profit or to purchase local enterprises so they could operate them through non-Aboriginal managers. As far as the settlements populations were concerned, there were two opposite dynamics that resulted from the six month old CDEP scheme: small coherent groups had moved out from large town-based settlements since the scheme offered them a possibility to subsist on their own. Large settlements initiated co-operative-like associations mainly to develop job opportunities. These two dynamics were once more prompted by government policies and the allocation of funds, two aspects which were at the origin of Junjuwa.
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1 This field trip was supported by a grant from the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

2 For a synthetic discussion of the CDEP scheme, see Altman and Sanders 1991.

3 Census data available at MWW confirmed similar movements of population in the Fitzroy Valley area: small groups leaving large communities either to join existing remote small communities, or to form new ones on their own in locations significant to them.

4 Following are the figures given by Mark, Junjuwa’s project officer, then in his last month at the position, for the total cost of upgrading Junjuwa houses and office as well as to purchase various equipment: for the former, $400,000 from DAA and a further $200,000 from the State Housing Commission. For the latter, a total amount of $131,000 from the CDEP equipment budget, being spent as follows: tip truck $41,000; six tons truck $10,000; tractor $8,000; grader $12,000; lawn mower $4,000; tools $4,000; five vehicles for team leaders $52,000.

5 Nearly all the Aboriginal settlements in the Fitzroy Valley were under the scheme, even those who had not been willing to be included, such as Christmas Creek and Bayulu. By contrast Kurnangki whose residents and council had expressed their interest in the scheme did not have CDEP in October 1998 on the basis that there was not enough work at Fitzroy Crossing to employ all residents of two large communities (Kurnangki, Junjuwa). A direct consequence was movements of population from Kurnangki to Junjuwa and vice versa; these affected community residential patterns, mainly among Walmajarri people.

6 The rate for the basic unemployment benefit for a single person over 21 years old with no dependents was $216.80 per fortnight plus a $14 extra zone allowance (Department of Social Security 1/1/1988).

7 Homewest was one of the main contractors employed by the State Housing Commission in Aboriginal settlements from the Kimberley area.

8 This was in fact the house where the ‘drop-in’ centre used to be. See Chapter Nine.

9 One day’s pay at the minimum wage was $23. All absences were penalised on the basis ‘no work, no pay’, but people unfit to work were paid providing they did not miss more than 2 days of work per month, if not seriously ill.

10 ‘Shame or rubbish work’ were the most commonly used expressions.

11 Burawa store made $100,000 profit during the previous fiscal year, 70% of which had been transferred to UAM on the basis of the agreement it had signed with Junjuwa in February 1987.

12 The Crossing Inn (pub, motel, caravan park) was for sale at $1,500,000; the shopping complex (Supermarket, take away shop, caravan park) was estimated at $1,200,000; the owner of Fitzroy Crossing’s second garage with the shop (see Chapter Three) asked for $1,200,000; and finally the video and electric appliances shop was on the market for $220,000. At this stage ADC was not prepared to invest so large an amount in one single Aboriginal community.

13 Personal communication from the local DCS officer.

14 In Fitzroy Crossing most of the charges are linked to alcohol consumption. Between 1985 and 1987, Police Station records show a correlation between alcohol sales at the hotel and the number of charges at the police station.
15 He also stressed that a particular effort had been made to offer cheaper and more fresh produce at the Burawa store than anywhere else in town.

16 The exact figures are $3,840 (30/09/88), $3,750 (7/10/88), and $3,865 (14/10/88), (Junjuwa Office Stores Records).

17 An Aboriginal project officer was appointed soon after I had left Junjuwa.
APPENDIX THREE

CENSUS DATA

In this Appendix I present and discuss data from a census conducted in Junjuwa between 10/05/1986 and 20/05/1986. I chose to conduct the census during this period because it would help define the core Junjuwa population, since people who moved to Junjuwa during the wet season generally returned to their own settlements in the dry season. In 1986, there were several families who lived outside Junjuwa although they were members of Junjuwa community. These people were included in the census, which explains the discrepancy between the census figures presented in Table 1 (Chapter Four), where only people living within the village were included.

Tables 3a to 3d show household composition information: total number of people living in one house and their relationships to the 'house boss'. Tables 4a to 4f give data on linguistic identity. These tables show people's linguistic affiliation in comparison to their parents'. Finally Table 5 sums up data on marriages within or/and between languages divisions in Junjuwa.

I provide information to help read these Tables and make some comments about the data and figures.
### Table 3a

Household Composition
Junjuwa village 1986
houses 4 to 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Childs</th>
<th>G Ch</th>
<th>FM/FF</th>
<th>NM/MF</th>
<th>Frel</th>
<th>Mrel</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ZD</td>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 SI</td>
<td>1 SE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ZS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1* Z</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1* SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1* SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>ZS</td>
<td>BD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1* SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

290
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Child.</th>
<th>G Ch</th>
<th>FM:FF:NM:MF</th>
<th>Frel</th>
<th>Mrel</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>2* SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1 SE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1* &quot;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1* &quot;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B BS(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1* SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ZD(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ZD(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1* &quot;1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 &quot;AU&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ZD(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3+1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FB B</td>
<td>STB</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 FB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3b**

Household Composition
Junjuwa village 1986
houses 21 to 45
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### Table 3c

**Household Composition**  
**Junjuwa Village 1986**  
**Houses 46 to 70**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Child.</th>
<th>G Ch</th>
<th>FM:FF:MM:MF</th>
<th>Frel</th>
<th>Mrel</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M2S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² MZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² BD SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² Z</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² SE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² SE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² WI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² Z</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² MZ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² Z SE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² WI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BS(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² STB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² STB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1² PO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;F&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.No.</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Child: G Ch: PM:FF:NM:MF:</th>
<th>Frel</th>
<th>Mrel</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1* Z SE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1* B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3d
Household Composition  
Junjuwa village 1986  
houses 71 to 80

### Information for Tables 3a to 3d

There are 12 columns that represent different fields of information related to household composition. In column one, H.No. stands for the house number (for location of houses see Map 6, Chapter Four). The next two columns are Male and Female; if a male and a female are on the same line it indicates that they are married: a married couple on the first line indicates the house’s main couple whose husband is the house boss. When a male or a female on the first line appears alone he or she is the house boss. The two letters that follow these people indicate their status: SI for single, SE for separated, and WI for widow(er). Male or Female on lines underneath the first one are people who shared the house with the main couple or the house boss. If the digit number is followed by an asterisk (*) it indicates that the person is related to the one immediately above; in cases where the kin relation is not to that person, an arrow indicates with whom it is (example Table 3d, house 71). If there are no other indications an asterisk means that the person immediately above is the father or the mother; other kin relations appear after the asterisk according to standard usage. For example, in Table 2c, in house 48 the person on the third line (1* MZ) is the mother’s sister of the woman above, the woman on line four (1* BD SE) is the brother’s daughter of 1* MZ, and she is separated; finally the woman on line five (1* Z) is the former’s sister. In the next column are the number of children belonging to the couple, or the person on the same line. Only single children will be in this column. Whenever a child is followed by the letters FO it indicates a fostered child, officially
recorded as such by the Department of Social Security. This is also indicated in the next column. When the number of children appears as follows: 3 + 1 (Table 3b, house 33) or 2 + 1 (Table 3b, house 41) it indicates that the children's mother had them to two men, the children of her current husband are indicated first. The next column is about grandchildren (G Ch). Individuals only appear under this category if their parents are not living in the house, otherwise they are in the previous column (children) on the same line as them. Thus, one of the children's parents is the main couple's or the house boss' son or daughter, their children are the former's grandchildren. The next two columns indicate whether the mother (FM) or father (FF) of the female on the same line, in column two, lives in the house. Similar data but for the male's mother (MM) or father (MF) appear in the next two columns. Under Frel, next column, are all of the female relatives that resided with her. The kin relation to the female on the same line is indicated according to standard symbols (eg B = brother, Z = sister, FB = father's brother etc.), except when in case of siblings one of their parents was different (example STB stands for step-brother, Table 3d, house 33). When kin relations were classificatory, they appear with inverted commas and correspond to the term of address used by the female: for example "AU" was a female's relative describe to me as her auntie (Table 3b, house 31). The number following the symbol for the female's relative indicates that several of them lived in the house, for example BS(2) means that two of a woman's brother's sons were living with her (Table 3c, House 54). The next column shows the male's relatives (Mrel) with the same symbols as those used in the previous column. The last column shows the total number of people living in the house at the time of the census.

Additional information

Before I discuss the Tables in detail it is important to add information that does not appear in them. River people occupied houses 4 to 33 and desert people houses 41 to 80. Within these categories there were two sections: Houses 4 to 26 was the Bunuba section and houses 27 to 33 was the 'mixed' section for the river people. On the desert side there was the Walmajarri section (houses 41 to 54) and the Wangkajunga section (houses 67 to 80). Finally within each section existed 'transitional' or 'border' houses whose boss or main couple acted as mediators during conflicts between the various sections of Junjuwa. These houses were: house 6 (main couple: husband Gooniyandi, wife Walmajarri); house 12 (main couple: husband Bunuba, wife Walmajarri); house 19 (main couple: husband Bunuba, wife Gooniyandi); house 26 (boss: a Bunuba widow formerly married to a Wangkajunga); house 33 (main couple: husband Jaru, wife Kija); house 48 main couple: husband Walmajarri, wife Wangkajunga; house 72 (main couple: husband Wangkajunga, wife Walmajarri),

Second, house clusters were formed on the basis of kin ties between the house bosses. The main clusters were: houses 4, 11 and 12 (4 and 12 were
siblings and 11 was the daughter of the main couple in 12); houses 7, 8, 10 and
30 (8 and 10 were siblings, their mother was in 7 and her brother in 30); houses
16, 17, 18 and 19 (four male siblings); houses 13, 14, 27 and 31 (siblings); houses
18, 25, 29 and 33 (siblings); houses 20, 24 and 80 (siblings in 20 and 24, mother
in 80); houses 23, 67 and 68 (siblings); houses 41, and 44 (siblings and wife’s
relatives), house 46 and 47 (siblings); houses 49 and 57 (siblings); houses 48 and
50 (mother and daughter); houses 52 and 57 (siblings); houses 72 and 79
(siblings). Several houses belong to two and sometimes three clusters because
several of their occupants had relatives in different house clusters. Overall,
house clusters on the river people’s side linked more houses at a time (three
and four houses), and were more cohesive units than those on the desert
people’s side. Houses which do not appear in any of the above clusters were
not isolated on their own: houses occupants usually had relatives in other
settlements and, within Junjuwa they had kin ties of some sorts with other house
occupants, but of a different kinds to those which generate house clusters.

Comments on Tables 3a to 3d

Figures from these tables show that Junjuwa houses had any number of
occupants ranging between 1 (house 43) and 15 (house 31), with an average of
nearly 8 people per house. There were 27 houses under the average and the
same number over, including 18 house with 10 or more occupants. Most of
houses in Junjuwa were three bedroom type (see Map 7), so there is no
correlation between the size of the house and the number of occupants.

There were 13 houses (4, 7, 16, 24, 26, 27, 31, 45, 47, 51, 53, 70, 71), in
which the married men lived in the same house as their mothers-in-law. This
apparent breach of the ‘avoidance of the mother-in-law’ rule occurred in all
sections of Junjuwa. But internal organisation within all these houses made
possible the observance of that rule: a man would never be at the same time in
the same room with his mother-in-law, they did not talk to each other nor did
they look at each other1, they took their meals separately, and sleeping
arrangements were made accordingly. Nevertheless it sometimes happened
that the rule was breached and in that case people minimized the importance of
its non-respect stating that they ‘did not stick to old days’ rules’.

There were only five houses in which the main couple or the boss co-
resided with one of their parents (27, 31, 33, 44, 45). In two houses it was the
main couples’ wife’s mother (31, 45), in the third house it was the main couple’s
husband’s father (33), the fourth case was the second couple’s husband’s father
(27) and finally the main couple’s husband’s mother (45). The low incidence of
this arrangement is due to the fact that most of the main couples or bosses were
in their 40s or more and did not have their parents any longer. Most tables
show that unmarried children lived in their parents’ houses all the time, as did
married children very often.
Appendix Three

There were two houses for single men (17 and 43). The first one, located in the Bunuba section, was occupied by old and young single men alike who lived there on a permanent basis; the other house had only one occupant, but old single or separated Walmajarri male used to gather in the house every day. In Junjuwa there was no specific place for widows or women after they gave birth, but two houses served that purpose (14 and 69).

There were 21 houses in which relatives of the main or second couple lived. In three houses only, both the wife and husband had relatives staying with them (6, 18, 33). Occupants of 7 houses were related to the husband of the main or second couple (8, 10, 27, 42, 46, 53, 72). Thus, there was a higher incidence of women relatives. This arrangement occurred in 11 houses (12, 14, 25, 26, 29, 31, 32, 41, 47, 54, 69). Three comments can be made on the basis of other data which do not appeared in these tables. First, in the case of relatives of both the husbands and the wives, there were likely to be visitors amongst them. Second, relatives of either the husbands or the wives in houses located in the river people’s section were mostly permanent residents who moved between their relatives’ houses. Finally, relatives of people in the desert people section were short time residents or visitors.

Concluding remarks

In contemporary Aboriginal settlements household composition data cannot be interpreted out of their context. For example, in Junjuwa most of the houses seemed to be occupied by nuclear families but house clusters, internal movements of population and visits by different relatives cannot appear in simple census data. Household composition presented in the tables I have just commented on is only really informative if linked with the dynamics of the community, internal grouping of households and kinship links. Further, taboos associated with the death of a house occupant disrupt patterns of residence and modify house clusters composition. For example, the boss of house 31 died in February 1987 a few weeks before I had left Junjuwa. The house remained vacant for about a year, then people who formerly lived in house 7 moved in and the deceased family moved into their vacated house. But close relative of the deceased who previously lived in house 27, moved to house 11 because they did not want to remain close to the deceased’s house. Consequently, three house clusters were modified as follows: cluster one: 7, 8, 10 and 30 became 8, 10, 30 and 31; cluster two: 13, 14, 27 and 31 became 7, 11, 13 and 14; and finally the last cluster which previously grouped houses 4, 11 and 12 became 4, 11 and 27. This shifting of residence due to such taboos was limited to within the river/desert distinction, so the maintenance of these taboos sometimes forced people out of Junjuwa.
### Census data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 4a

Linguistic identity of parents of Walmajarri people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 4b

Linguistic identity of parents of Bunuba people

Total B

150
### TABLE 4c

**Linguistic identity of parents of Wangkajunga people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total V**

66

### TABLE 4d

**Linguistic identity of parents of Gooniyandi people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total G**

21
### TABLE 4e

**Linguistic identity of parents of Jaru people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total D
--------
17

### TABLE 4f

**Linguistic identity of parents of Kija people**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother\Father</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total H
--------
16
Information relating to Tables 4

Each of the 6 tables (4a to 4f), show data on the transmission of linguistic affiliation within the six larger language groups that were represented in Junjuwa. Those of the languages groups which had 10 members or less are not included in these tables because most of these people grouped themselves within larger linguistic units although their linguistic distinctiveness was admitted. The purpose of these tables is to identify the main trends of linguistic affiliation amongst Junjuwa residents from one language to another.

Each table provides data on parents' linguistic origin for all people affiliated to each language with more than 10 members in Junjuwa. The total number of members of each language appear at the bottom of each table. Languages are symbolised as follows: W for Walmajarri (table 4a), B for Bunuba (table 4b), V for Wangkajungu (table 4c), G for Gooniyandi (table 4d), D for Jaru (table 4e) and H for Kija (table 3f). The same symbols are used for the parents' language, but others need to be added: P for Nyikina, K for Kokatja, and Y for Warlipiri. Other symbols used are A, M and X. A was used for an Aboriginal person of mixed descent associated with a language spoken outside the Kimberley area. M indicates that a person was said to be of 'mixed' linguistic affiliation. Finally X means that linguistic information about one person was ignored, incomplete or conflicting. This was particularly the case amongst older Junjuwa residents who originally lived in the desert and knew little about their parents.

The fathers' linguistic groups are listed horizontally and the mothers' vertically. Each table is to be read as follows: in table 4a, out of 166 Walmajarri there were 85 whose parents were both Walmajarri. In the same table there were Six Walmajarri whose fathers were Walmajarri and mothers were Gooniyandi. In order to identify quickly the percentage of people of 'full' linguistic descent (same language group for both parents) I put the data at the top left corner of each table.

In commenting on the tables I will concentrate on the general trends in linguistic affiliation within each language, as well as evaluating the incidence of paternal or maternal affiliation. I will compare linguistic affiliation with cultural categories as defined by Junjuwa residents to see if they match. I will discuss the atypical cases by using personal data relating to the individuals concerned.

Table 4a: The parents of more than 50% of Walmajarri were of the same language. A large number of people ignored or had conflicting data on their parents' language. This was mainly amongst older people who often stated that they assumed that their parents were Walmajarri but could not guarantee it.
Census data

The very high percentage of mothers being Walmajarri (129 out 166) suggests that within that language group the maternal transmission of linguistic affiliation may have been predominant. The horizontal rectangular shape of the table indicates that Walmajarri people's fathers originated from more languages than their mothers (9 languages of origin for the fathers as opposed to 5 for the mothers). It has to be noted than none of the 166 Walmajarri had one of their parents being a Bunuba. This indicates that all children to couples of mixed linguistic origin (Bunuba & Walmajarri) were identified as Bunuba. There is an equal number of Walmajarri one of whose parents were affiliated to languages culturally classified as river people: mother W and father D (4), mother W and father D (2), mother W and father P (2); father W and mother G (6), father W and mother P (2). The high incidence of a Walmajarri linguistic affiliation when one of the parents was a Gooniyandi occurred mainly on Gogo Station. It can be said from interviews and Walmajarri individuals personal data that marriages into languages other than those associated with desert people is linked with Walmajarri settlement in the Fitzroy Valley area.

Table 4b: There were only one third of 150 registered Bunuba whose parents were both members of the same language. This indicates two tendencies: first, that matrimonial strategies covered a larger ranges of language groups compared to Walmajarri; second, that two thirds of the Bunuba were not of full Bunuba descent from a linguistic point of view. The closeness between the numbers of mothers (45) and fathers (42) being Bunuba when the other parents was from a different linguistic origin does not suggest that the Bunuba favour linguistic affiliation with either parent but suggests that having one parent identified as a Bunuba was sufficient to be affiliated with that language amongst Junjuwa residents. There is a greater range of origin groups in the vertical line as compared to the horizontal one; this may suggest that mothers of the Bunuba people were from a greater range of different linguistic origins than their fathers. The most favoured languages in which Bunuba females had married into while their children retained their mother's linguistic identity were Walmajarri (15), Gooniyandi (13) and Kija (10), whereas amongst the Bunuba whose fathers were Bunuba 13 had a Gooniyandi speaker mother, 12 a Walmajarri and 8 a Kija. These three language groups seemed to be those into which most of Bunuba married providing they did not marry another Bunuba. Although Walmajarri represent the largest of the non-Bunuba father category and the second largest of non-Bunuba mothers for people affiliated as Bunuba, there were still nearly twice as many Bunuba whose parents were both members of language classified as river people as those whose parents were affiliated to languages of other various cultural categories: mother B and father either D,G,H,P, (27), mother B and father W (15); father B and mother either D,G,H,N (26), father and mother either W or V (13).

Table 4c: There were 66 Wangkajunga people in Junjuwa, of whom 21 had parents who were both of the same language. Like the Bunuba, two thirds
of the Wangkajunga were of mixed linguistic origin, although a large majority of them were with Walmajarri: mother V and father W (8), father V and mother W (16). That is to say there were more Wangkajunga people of mixed linguistic origin (W & V) than there were of full Wangkajunga descent. There were an equal number of Wangkajunga whose fathers’ were affiliated to the same language and mothers’ of another one than vice versa (19). But there were more fathers for whom linguistic origin was not established (6), whereas linguistic identity of the Wangkajunga people’s mothers, whose fathers were Wangkajunga, was always identified. There were 7 people who did not know or could not establish precisely the linguistic identities of their parents, these concerned exclusively the older Wangkajunga people. The slightly horizontally rectangular shape to the table indicates that there was a greater variety of language groups amongst the Wangkajunga people’s fathers than mothers. In fact apart from Walmajarri who appear both horizontally and vertically, fathers’ and mothers’ language groups other than Wangkajunga are different. For example, Wangkajunga whose fathers were of another language groups were likely to be from Jaru (1), Gooniyandi (2), or from a language outside the Kimberley (2); by contrast, non-Wangkajunga mothers were from Bunuba (2) and Nyikina (1). This may reflect Wangkajunga patterns of migration: they were dispersed to several cattle stations and co-resided with several groups of people of different languages. These mixed linguistic origins amongst Wangkajunga characterise people born on stations, whilst older people born in the bush and young ones whose parents met in the post-cattle station era were for most of the former either of full Wangkajunga descent and for the latter of mixed linguistic descent within desert languages (W and V). There are Wangkajunga whose mothers were Bunuba (2). It is the only example of Bunuba mothers whose children were given the linguistic identity of the other cultural division (desert people).

Table 4d: There were 33 Gooniyandi people of whom less than one fourth were of full Gooniyandi descent. People affiliated to that language born to Gooniyandi mothers were likely to have a father from another language within the river people: Jaru (2), Kija (3), outside the area (2), unknown (6), whereas Gooniyandi whose fathers were Gooniyandi and mothers from other linguistic origins were more diversified: Bunuba (2), Jaru (2), mixed (1), Walmajarri (6), unknown (2). The high incidence of Walmajarri female who had children to Gooniyandi men, who were affiliated to their fathers language confirms earlier comments (table 4a), that Walmajarri and Gooniyandi intermarried while on Gogo Station. These two figures can be compared: there were the same number of Walmajarri whose fathers were Walmajarri and mothers Gooniyandi as Gooniyandi whose mothers were Walmajarri and fathers Gooniyandi (table 3a and 3d). The two Gooniyandi persons whose mothers were Bunuba, and fathers Gooniyandi, came from an area (junction of the Fitzroy and Margaret) where people of both languages are said to have mixed, even before white people came to the Kimberley (See Chapter Two).
Census data

Table 4e: The most interesting element of this table is that none of the 17 Jaru people were of full linguistic descent. This is not surprising because Jaru who live in Junjuwa identified themselves as river people (See Chapter Five) on the basis that they had moved into the river people’s country and had mixed with them. The mixed linguistic origin of the 17 Jaru confirms that statement. Once more the horizontally rectangular shape of the table indicates that more Jaru people’s fathers were of various linguistic origins that their mothers. Eleven of the Jaru had Jaru-speaking mothers, amongst which 2 married Goonyandyi men, 5 married Kija, 1 married a Nyikina and 3 married men whose linguistic identities were unknown. Only 3 Jaru had Jaru fathers, all of them married to Goonyandyi women. There are 3 Jaru for whom both parents’ linguistic identities are unknown. These figures seem to indicate that the Jaru linguistic affiliation is likely to be transmitted through the maternal line. Only those whose mothers and fathers were Jaru and had married into another minor language group affiliated to the river people were identified as Jaru.

Table 4f: 25% of the 16 registered Kija people were of full Kija descent, which is interesting considering it is a small group. For the remaining 9 Kija of mixed linguistic descent the non-Kija parents were all affiliated to languages associated with river people as was the case in the previous table. Amongst the 4 Kija who had a mother from another language, 2 were unknown, 1 was Goonyandyi and 1 was Jaru. The 5 Kija with Kija mothers had either Bunuba fathers (2), Jaru fathers (1) or Goonyandyi father. Kija was the only language with which children born to Bunuba speaking fathers remained identified. This seems to contradict information I collected based on Bunuba people statements according to which a child whose father is a Bunuba ‘becomes’ a Bunuba, as well as data in tables 4a, 4c, 4d, and 4e in which none of the members of languages other than Bunuba had Bunuba fathers. Personal data about these 2 Kija provide interesting information on a practice which suggests alternating the transmission of linguistic affiliation from one generation to another. For example these 2 male Kija had Kija mothers and Bunuba fathers, but both of their fathers were not of full Bunuba descent. Their father’s mothers were Bunuba and their father’s fathers Kija. Since their fathers were affiliated to the Bunuba language, when later they both married Kija women and their children were affiliated to the Kija language. These two male Kija were still single but they stated that they were likely to marry Bunuba and their children will be given Bunuba linguistic identity. This practice seems to have been used by small language group in order to perpetuate the transmission of language affiliation, even though the number of people of full linguistic descent were diminishing (cf previous table, with 17 Jaru, none of them being of full linguistic descent).
## Appendix Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total Number of Married Men per Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Married Women per Languages</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

Linguistic origins of married people
Information relating to Table 5

Table 5 provides data on the linguistic identity of married Junjuwa residents. The purpose of these data is to present the matrimonial dynamic that existed within and between linguistic groups in Junjuwa. Marriages across linguistic groups, transmission of linguistic affiliation and residence were elements used by Junjuwa residents to maintain a distinct identity or to adopt another. All marriages that had involved Junjuwa residents were registered and include in the analysis. Thus people who had married several times were counted. Symbols used to indicates languages are the same as those used in table 4. The horizontal left column shows the married men's linguistic identities and the total number of married men per language appear in the right hand column. The linguistic identities of married women are recorded horizontally and the total number of married women per language is shown at the bottom of the table. At the intersection of the horizontal and the vertical columns are shown the number of marriages between people affiliated to the two languages. The total in the vertical and the horizontal columns makes it possible to compare each figure with the total of married men or women of each language group and to evaluate the frequency of marriages between members of these languages.

Comments on table 5

The two largest linguistic groups in Junjuwa, Walmajarri and Bunuba, had more married women than men (Bunuba 23 to 17, Walmajarri 33 to 26) which was not the case for other languages. This means that more Bunuba and Walmajarri women married into other language groups than male of these languages. In each of these two languages endogamous marriages were the highest figures of the table (8 for the Bunuba and 17 for the Walmajarri). The vertical rectangular shape of the table shows that husbands were from a more diversified linguistic origins than the wives. The fact there was an excess of Bunuba and Walmajarri married women compared to the men may have caused this phenomenon. This is confirmed by figures that show Bunuba and Walmajarri women married into 7 other languages groups, which was not the case for the men (5 for the Bunuba and 4 for the Walmajarri). This particular situation put these two large group in a powerful position since both are spouse providers to men from other language groups. Bunuba and Walmajarri people did intermarry frequently as shown in the table since it is the second largest number of marriages for Bunuba men after endogamous marriages and the third for Walmajarri males. The movement of female members as spouse between these two types of grouping is balanced (4), and was not likely to change in the near future on the basis of the data I collected while at Fitzroy Crossing, mainly because the linguistic groups are not acting as units of
Appendix Three

exchange. Walmajarri provided male Bunuba with wives in the early stage of their settlement in the Fitzroy Valley and later Bunuba men had ‘paid them back’ evenly. Amongst recent marriages there was a trend to limit marriages within language groups if possible, otherwise with linguistic groups of the same cultural category. This dynamic has already appeared in the table for speakers of language who were minority groups in Junjuwa. For example, Wangkajunga males married mostly with Walmajarri and Wangkajunga (8 marriages out of 11), and females of the same language did the same (6 marriages out of 8 identified, and 2 unknown). This is also true for Gooniyandi: male Gooniyandi married mostly Bunuba and Gooniyandi (6 marriages out of 7 identified and 1 mixed), female Gooniyandi marrying mostly men of their own language, Bunuba and Jaru (6 marriages out of 7). This confirms overall figures of three time more endogamic marriages within river and desert people than exogamic to that type of grouping (see chapter Six).

Endnotes - Appendix Three

1 If for example a woman wanted to borrow her son-in-law’s car, she would ask her daughter to ask him for the car keys. Then she would put a blanket on the driver’s seat so her son-in-law would not sit where she had sat next time he drove his car. Similar arrangements were made with cooking utensils, plates and cups, for example.

2 The deceased’s family will not move back into the house but once the mourning taboo after the inside house has been re-painted and the end of the wet season that followed the death has been reached, a new occupant will move in.
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