Full Country Report on Dispute-Resolution Practices in Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Overview and Purpose

Australia is home to two distinct Indigenous peoples—Aboriginal peoples of the mainland and Tasmania, and Torres Strait Islanders from the islands between Queensland and Papua New Guinea. Within these groups, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures are extremely diverse, comprising approximately 300 distinct nations and 600 language groups shaped by localised traditions and social norms. This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the customary dispute-resolution practices within these communities and examines their complex and often fraught interaction with Australia's contemporary legal system. The significance of this topic remains urgent, underscored by the ongoing need to reconcile the general state law with the persistent reality of Aboriginal customary laws. As the Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC) has long noted, acknowledging these customary systems is essential not only to support community order but also to advance the fundamental right of Indigenous self-determination. Understanding this interface begins with an appreciation of the deep cultural and historical foundations upon which these practices are built.

2.0 Cultural and Historical Foundations of Conflict Resolution

2.1 The Primacy of Kinship, Country, and Law

To comprehend dispute resolution in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander societies, one must first appreciate the cultural foundations from which it emerges. Conflict and its management cannot be separated from the core, interconnected principles of kinship, the spiritual connection to land (Country), and the overarching authority of customary law (the Law). These societies are composed of hundreds of distinct nations and language groups, creating a cultural landscape that is "extremely diverse, owing to localized differences in traditions and social norms." Despite this diversity, historical principles of collectivism, the restoration of social harmony, and adherence to spiritual norms derived from the Dreaming—the foundational era of creation—provide a common philosophical underpinning for customary dispute resolution.

Kinship structures are paramount and function differently from Western models. As legal scholar Prue Vines notes, these patterns define a web of obligations that extend far beyond the nuclear family. In many Aboriginal nations, for example, a person’s same-sex sibling's children are classified as that person’s own children, not as nieces or nephews, establishing a direct and powerful set of mutual responsibilities. This sense of collective identity is inseparably connected to land. Decisions about a particular area of Country were the

prerogative of "traditional owners," who held a custodial responsibility, rather than ownership in a Western sense, that was circumscribed by Aboriginal Law. This spiritual authority and custodial duty meant that disputes over resources often became matters of inter-group relationships, kinship obligations, and adherence to the Law itself.

2.2 Traditional Mechanisms for Resolving Conflict

In pre-colonial and early contact periods, Aboriginal societies employed a range of sophisticated mechanisms for managing grievances, designed primarily to restore social balance rather than to apportion blame in an adversarial manner. These practices, documented in anthropological sources such as the work of Helen Ross, reveal a preference for indirect and community-driven approaches.

- **Avoidance:** A primary mechanism to signal and resolve friction without direct confrontation was the practice of moving a dwelling away from those causing the tension. This act of physical separation was a clear, non-verbal communication that a difficulty existed and needed to be addressed.
- **Public Airing and "Shaming":** A grievance was often aired publicly, but typically only after the aggrieved person had tested for social support among kin and community members. This public airing could "shame" the offender into changing their behaviour and, just as importantly, allow the aggrieved to clear their feelings, paving the way for reconciliation.
- **Mediation by Kin:** Where a dispute threatened wider community interests—such as long-term obligations between clans for resource access—senior relatives or other respected community members would take the initiative to mediate. This could take the form of a "moot," where senior members of the involved clans would gather to affirm mutual interests and settle the grievance.
- **Physical Violence:** Physical violence was an accepted and understood means of both expressing a grievance and definitively settling an issue. Fights would often draw in relatives on both sides due to kinship loyalties—some to participate, and others to intervene to ensure the disputants were not hurt more than the circumstances warranted.

These historical foundations of dispute management continue to influence contemporary community dynamics and inform the ongoing dialogue about their place within the modern Australian legal system.

3.0 Contemporary Legal Framework and Formal Dispute-Resolution Systems

3.1 Overview of the Australian Legal System

While customary law persists as a vital force, the Australian state subjects all Indigenous peoples to its general law, creating a complex environment of legal pluralism. The formal dispute-resolution systems that follow represent the state's attempts to manage—rather than fully embrace—this pluralism, often resulting in procedural adaptations that stop short of substantive recognition. Australia's legal structure is a federal system with courts at the state/territory and Commonwealth levels. Most criminal matters are handled in state and territory courts, from Magistrates or Local Courts for summary offences to District or

Supreme Courts for more serious indictable offences. However, for many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, these mainstream courts are, in the words of the Office of Crime Statistics and Research (SA) and the ALRC, "culturally alienating, isolating and unwelcoming," fostering a deep sense of "powerlessness and alienation."

3.2 State-Sanctioned ADR and Specialist Courts

In recognition of the mainstream system's failings, various states and territories have established alternative and specialist processes. State-sanctioned mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) programs offer a less adversarial path. Queensland's government-funded Dispute Resolution Centres (DRCs), for example, provide a free and confidential service that can be adapted for remote communities by working closely with community leaders to ensure the process is culturally sensitive and appropriate.

More formally, several jurisdictions have established specialist sentencing courts. These were established against the background of "the sense of powerlessness and alienation felt by many Aboriginal people caught up in the criminal justice system," as revealed by the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCIADIC). The Victorian Koori Court is a key example, functioning as a division of the Magistrates' Court. It is a sentencing court that operates after an offender has pleaded guilty. Its primary innovation is the inclusion of Aboriginal Elders or Respected Persons, who sit with the magistrate and provide cultural advice to help formulate a more appropriate and effective sentencing order. Other community justice mechanisms, such as circle sentencing, have also been trialled in jurisdictions like New South Wales, representing further attempts to make the justice process more inclusive and relevant for Indigenous offenders.

3.3 Key Legislation Governing the Role of Customary Law

Despite these procedural adaptations, key statutory provisions reveal a deep-seated legislative tension regarding the substantive role of customary law, particularly in the criminal justice system. The 2006 amendments to the federal *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth) represent a significant legislative retreat from recognising custom. Section 16A of the Act now explicitly prohibits a court from taking into account "any form of customary law or cultural practice as a reason for excusing, justifying, authorising, requiring or lessening the seriousness of the criminal behaviour".

This stands in stark contrast to the limited but formal statutory recognition afforded to customary law in some civil contexts. The New South Wales *Succession Act 2006*, for example, allows the court to make a distribution order for an intestate (a person who dies without a will) Indigenous person based on the "laws, customs, traditions and practices" of their specific community. This legislative divergence—embracing custom in matters of private inheritance while strictly prohibiting its mitigating role in criminal sentencing—highlights the inconsistent and contested space that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander law occupies within the broader Australian legal framework. This inconsistency shapes the complex relationship between these two systems of law.

4.0 Relationship Between Customary Practices and the Modern Legal System

4.1 Recognition, Friction, and Legal Pluralism

The interface between customary and state law in Australia is best understood as a state of managed legal pluralism. While formal, substantive recognition of customary law is highly limited and inconsistent, customary processes continue to operate both parallel to and, in some cases, within the formal system. There has been no wholesale displacement of the general law in favour of customary law. Rather, as the ALRC has long argued, recognition occurs through modifications and discretions on a case-by-case basis, involving the "modification rather than the displacement of criminal liability."

The primary area of friction lies in the criminal law. There is a direct conflict between the judicial desire to consider cultural context in sentencing—as articulated by Justice Muirhead, who noted that an offender may have believed he "had done what he believed was required to be done" by his own customary law—and the rigid statutory prohibitions in the *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth). Furthermore, the broader non-recognition of customary law has had significant adverse consequences. As the ALRC noted, it can render traditional marriages legally invalid for most purposes and subject individuals to a form of "double jeopardy," where they face punishment under their own customary law and are then punished again under the general law for the same act.

4.2 Hybrid Approaches and Their Limitations

The state has attempted to bridge this divide through hybrid approaches that incorporate customary mechanisms into formal processes. The Koori and Murri courts are the primary examples of this model. They represent a significant *procedural* adaptation by creating a more culturally safe environment and incorporating the wisdom of Elders into the sentencing conversation. However, this is not a *substantive* recognition of customary law, as the courts' jurisdiction is limited to sentencing after a guilty plea has been entered under the state's criminal code. The authority of customary law is not recognised; it is merely consulted.

In contrast to state-led procedural adaptations, a more authentic model of substantive customary law in practice can be seen in community-led initiatives. The Yuendumu Mediation and Justice Committee (YM&JC) in central Australia serves as a powerful case study. This grassroots Warlpiri initiative draws directly on traditional dispute-resolution practices and has proven not only highly effective in maintaining community peace but also exceptionally cost-beneficial. A formal cost-benefit analysis, as highlighted by Mary Spiers Williams, found that for every dollar invested in the program, the community reaped a benefit of $4.30 through reduced incarceration and improved social outcomes.

However, even the most well-intentioned hybrid models face limitations. A key critique, articulated by Prue Vines, is that they often treat customary law as a "cultural fact"—a piece of contextual information about the offender—rather than as a legitimate legal system with its own inherent authority. Furthermore, any proposal for greater recognition must navigate the friction between certain customary norms and international human rights standards. There is a broad consensus that any recognition must be consistent with these rights, particularly concerning the right of women and children to be free from violence. This tension demands a careful, case-by-case approach that respects both cultural integrity and universal human rights. This fundamental tension—between consulting custom as a 'cultural fact' and recognizing it as a system of law—is rooted in profound differences in worldview, which a

direct comparison between customary and Western mediation practices makes strikingly clear.

5.0 Comparative Analysis: Customary/Local Practices vs. Australian and Western Mediation

5.1 A Tale of Two Worldviews

The differences between Indigenous dispute resolution and conventional Western mediation are not merely procedural; they are rooted in fundamentally different worldviews regarding the nature of conflict, the role of the individual, the definition of community, and the ultimate purpose of justice itself. Where Western mediation often frames conflict as a negative problem between individuals to be managed efficiently, many Indigenous traditions see it as a relational issue requiring public resolution to restore communal harmony. The following table provides a comparative analysis of these two distinct approaches.

Feature	**Customary/Indigenous Dispute Resolution**	**Australian/Western Facilitative Mediation**
Core Values	Focus on restoring **collective harmony**, repairing relationships, and upholding kinship obligations. Community wellbeing is paramount.	Focus on **individual autonomy**, self-determination, and achieving a mutually acceptable settlement between discrete parties.
Role of Third Parties	Elders, respected persons, or senior relatives act as facilitators. They are not expected to be **'neutral'** (in the sense of having no prior relationship or interest in the outcome) but must be **impartial** (even-handed and objective in process). Their authority stems from social respect and cultural knowledge.	An accredited mediator acts as a neutral and impartial third party, with no prior relationship to the parties or interest in the outcome. Their role is to manage the process, not provide solutions.
Formality & Process	Informal, flexible, and narrative-based. "Yarning circles" create a space for all voices. The process is slow, deliberative, and requires extended timeframes with pauses for intracultural consultation.	Structured and time-efficient, with distinct stages (e.g., opening statements, exploration, negotiation). The process is private and separate from the community.
Key Principles	**Confidentiality** is not always desirable or appropriate, as public resolution may be necessary for community harmony. **Voluntariness** can be complex, influenced by community expectations and obligations.	**Confidentiality** is a core tenet, protecting what is said. **Voluntariness** is essential, meaning parties choose to participate and can leave at any time without penalty.
Communication Styles	Often indirect, narrative-based, and ritualized. Silence is a valid part of communication and does not signify assent. A speaker may give a long	Prefers direct, linear communication focused on facts, positions, and underlying interests. Silence is often seen as a vacuum to be filled.

	personal history to establish their credentials.	
Outcome Formation	Aims for **consensus**, reconciliation, apology, reintegration, and the restoration of relationships. Outcomes are enforced by social and kinship sanctions.	Aims for a **legally binding settlement agreement**. The outcome is transactional and focuses on resolving the specific dispute, not necessarily the underlying relationship.

This comparison highlights the need for profound adaptation and cultural sensitivity when applying mediation practices in an intercultural context, which has significant implications for practitioners.

6.0 Implications for Mediators Working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples

6.1 Principles for Culturally Safe and Effective Practice

For non-Indigenous mediators, adopting culturally safe and responsive practices is not an option but an ethical imperative. A failure to understand and respect the cultural norms, protocols, and worldviews of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander participants risks perpetuating historical harm, creating profound misunderstanding, and producing unjust outcomes. The following principles, based on established protocols from organisations like Oxfam Australia and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), provide a foundational guide for ethical engagement.

1. **Respect Cultural Protocols:** Every engagement must begin with respect. Perform an Acknowledgement of Traditional Custodians at the outset of any meeting. Always ask people how they wish to be addressed and only use familiar terms like "aunty" and "uncle" when explicitly invited to do so. Be mindful of the community calendar and avoid scheduling meetings during significant periods, such as Sorry Business or NAIDOC week, without consultation.
2. **Ensure Free, Prior, and Informed Consent:** Consultation is not a one-time event but an ongoing, two-way process. Mediators must never assume consent. They have a duty to ensure all participants fully understand the aims, methods, processes, and potential outcomes of the mediation, and that their agreement to participate is given freely and without pressure.
3. **Recognize Indigenous Control and Authority:** Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are the primary guardians and interpreters of their own cultures. Any dispute resolution process must be designed to accommodate their decision-making systems. This frequently requires building extended pauses into the timetable to allow for proper intracultural consultation among spokespeople, Traditional Owners, and their wider kin groups.
4. **Prioritize Pre-Negotiation and Relationship Building:** In many Western processes, the focus is on resolving the issue quickly. In an Indigenous context, the relationship is often the priority. Significant time must be invested in pre-negotiation phases to build trust and rapport. This includes allowing for extended personal familiarization before discussing substantive issues and, where welcomed, visiting communities on

their own Country, as people are often most comfortable explaining their values and concerns there.

6.2 Strategies for Adapting the Mediation Process

Beyond these guiding principles, mediators must be prepared to adapt the specific mechanics of the Western mediation process to ensure it is culturally congruent and procedurally fair.

- **Adapt the Physical Environment:** Formal city meeting rooms can be intimidating and reinforce power imbalances. Contrast this with "bush meetings," which can make Aboriginal people more at ease and encourage the use of their own communication norms. The choice of venue should be guided by the participants.
- **Adapt Communication Facilitation:** A mediator must be highly attuned to different communication styles. The meaning of eye contact (or its absence) varies across cultures. A common mistake is to fill silences, which can cut Aboriginal people off from speaking when they are simply taking time to formulate their thoughts. Critically, a mediator must never interpret silence as assent or agreement.
- **Involve the Right People:** Correctly identifying all relevant stakeholders is crucial. This must include the Traditional Owners for the land concerned, as well as others they have a customary duty to consult. The process must also allow for a trusted support person, Elder, or advisor to be present with a participant.
- **Respect "Non-Negotiables":** Mediators must recognize that for many Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, spiritual beliefs and custodial responsibilities for Country are absolute. These issues may be "non-negotiable." Pressuring people to compromise or abrogate these deeply held values is not only unethical but will inevitably lead to the failure of the process.
- **Use Culturally Congruent Mechanisms:** Where appropriate and agreed upon, the process should incorporate culturally familiar mechanisms. This can include using yarning circles for discussion, allowing for narrative-based storytelling to explain a position, and including rituals of apology or reconciliation as part of the resolution.

By embedding these principles and strategies into their practice, mediators can move beyond the culturally insensitive application of a Western model towards a more effective, just, and respectful approach to dispute resolution. This shift from procedural rigidity to cultural responsiveness is central to navigating the complex legal and social landscape this report has explored.

7.0 Conclusion

This report has illuminated the enduring presence and profound diversity of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander customary law in Australia. These sophisticated systems of dispute resolution, founded on principles of kinship, Country, and collective harmony, stand in stark contrast to the individualistic and adversarial nature of the mainstream Australian legal system. While state recognition of customary law remains limited, inconsistent, and often fraught with legislative restrictions, a vibrant legal pluralism persists on the ground. Hybrid models like the Koori Courts offer procedural improvements but fall short of substantive legal recognition, while community-controlled mechanisms like the Yuendumu Mediation and Justice Committee demonstrate the immense potential of grassroots, culturally-grounded initiatives. These community-led models face ongoing challenges, including systemic under-

resourcing and a lack of sustained government support. For legal and mediation practitioners across Australia, engaging deeply with this knowledge is not merely an academic exercise; it is a professional and ethical necessity. A commitment to understanding these different worldviews and adapting practices accordingly is critical to providing more just, equitable, and effective services, and in doing so, contributing to the broader and essential goal of Indigenous self-determination.

8.0 Full Citations

A Articles/Books/Reports

Australian Indigenous Governance Institute, 'Implement Peacemaking Processes' (Web Page)

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, *Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies* (Report, 2012)

Australian Judicial Officers Association, *ABORIGINAL CUSTOMARY LAW AND SENTENCING* (Paper)

Australian Law Reform Commission, *Arguments for the Recognition of Aboriginal Customary Laws* (Report No 31, 1986)

Australian Law Reform Commission, 'Specialist Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Sentencing Courts' (Report, 11 January 2018)

Australian Law Reform Commission, 'The Interaction of Aboriginal Customary Laws and the Criminal Law' (Report, 18 August 2010)

Bell, Catherine, 'Western ADR Processes and Indigenous Dispute Resolution' (Paper, National Aboriginal Lands Managers Association)

Brigg, Morgan, ‘Mediation, Power, and Cultural Difference’ (2003) 20(3) *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 287

Creative Workplaces, 'Culturally Informed Dispute Resolution' (Web Page)

Kelly, Loretta, ‘Mediation in Aboriginal Communities: Familiar Dilemmas, Fresh Developments’ (2002) 5(14) *Indigenous Law Bulletin* 7

Magistrates Court of Victoria, *Koori Court* (Web Page)

Oxfam Australia, *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Cultural Protocols* (Report)

Palmer, Kingsley, *Australian Native Title Anthropology: Strategic Practice, the Law and the State* (ANU Press, 2018)

Queensland Government, 'Mediation for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples' (Web Page)

Ross, Helen, 'Aboriginal Australians' Cultural Norms for Negotiating Natural Resources' (Web Page, Cultural Survival)

Simonds, Vanessa W and Suzanne Christopher, ‘Adapting Western Research Methods to Indigenous Ways of Knowing’ (2013) 103(12) *American Journal of Public Health* 2185

Spiers Williams, Mary, ‘JUSTICE REINVESTMENT: THE COST BENEFITS OF TRUSTING AND SUPPORTING INDIGENOUS PEOPLE TO MEDIATE THEIR TROUBLES’ (2016) 8(22) *Indigenous Law Bulletin* 21

Vines, Prue, ‘Australia’s (Slow) Experiment with Indigenous Customary Law in Intestacy’ (2023) 4 *Journal of Commonwealth Law* 43

B Submissions/Conference Papers

Australian Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 'Issue 3: Recognising Aboriginal Customary Law and Developments in Community Justice Mechanisms' (Submission to the Expert Seminar on Indigenous Peoples and the Administration of Justice, 12–14 November 2003)

San Francisco Institute for Criminal Justice, ‘Resolving Conflict: Dispute Settlement Mechanisms for Aboriginal Communities and Neighborhoods?’ (Paper presented at the Alternative Dispute Resolution Seminar, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, July 1986)

C Legislation

Crimes Act 1914 (Cth)

Succession Act 2006 (NSW)