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High Court decision on Compensation for the Extinguishment of Native Title Rights

Clare Graham-Stewart for ANTaR

Northern Territory v Mr A. Griffiths (deceased) and Lorraine Jones on behalf of the Ngaliwurru and Nungali Peoples [2019] HCA 7 (‘Griffiths’), is the first High Court ruling regarding ‘just’ compensation for the extinguishment of native title rights.

In one of the most significant native title cases since Mabo, this was the first time that compensation for both economic and cultural loss had been measured and awarded under the Native Title Act. The case signals a huge development in native title law and sets an important legal precedent which may prove to have a profound impact on compensation claims and native title generally.

The claim was brought by the Nungali and Ngaliwurru peoples, whose Country encompasses Timber Creek in the Northern Territory, against the Northern Territory Government. Compensation was sought for the effect of acts by the government which ‘extinguished’ the group’s native title rights, including the building of infrastructure and roads. The High Court awarded a total sum of $2,530,350 in compensation.

The implications for groups who have seen their native rights ‘extinguished’ may be significant, and the case established a framework for assessing compensation that will be used and improved through further cases. The importance of the decision may also have implications for treaties, agreements and settlements more generally, enabling negotiation of future claims “without the expense and delay of litigation”.

---

Fig. 1. Alan Griffiths, ‘Timber Creek’, considered in evidence of connection to Country, and locations of sacred sites and Dreamings within the Timber Creek area.²

² Published in Chris Griffiths, Dora Griffiths and Alana Hunt, ‘Northern Territory of Australia v. Griffiths: The Landmark Native Title Compensation Case in the Tiny Town of Timber Creek’ (2019) 18(2) Arts Backbone 4, 4 (‘Backbone’)
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The context of Griffiths v Northern Territory

Fig. 1. A map showing the location of Timber Creek in the Northern Territory.³

Nungali and Ngaliwurru people’s native rights over the Timber Creek area:

The claim in Griffiths surrounded the locality of Makalamayi,⁴ encompassing what is known today to the Crown as the township of ‘Timber Creek’. Located 601km south of Darwin in the Northern Territory (‘NT’), between Katherine and Kununurra, the area spans and is crossed by multiple sacred sites and travelling Dreamings.⁵

In a fight won in 2006 by the late senior lawman Alan Griffiths, “one of the great Kimberley First Nations leaders”⁶, the courts found that the Ngaliwurru and Nungali peoples held non-exclusive native title rights existed over the area.⁷ These included rights to travel over and to share and exchange subsistence and traditional resources obtained from the land.⁸

---
⁵ Northern Territory v Mr A. Griffiths (deceased) and Lorraine Jones on behalf of the Ngaliwurru and Nungali Peoples [2019] HCA 7, [171] (‘Griffiths’).
⁸ See discussion regarding the Joint Statement of Factual Background [s23(3)] at Northern Territory v Griffiths [2017] FCAFC 106, [33].
Once native title rights over the area were recognised, this opened the door for a compensation claim for the ‘extinguishment’ of those rights.

The compensation claims in this case:

Alan Griffiths passed away before the case reached the High Court, so the compensation claim was carried forward by Alan’s son Chris Griffiths and Lorraine Jones, both native title holders, representing five clan groups from the Nungali and Ngaliwurru peoples. The native title rights for which they were seeking compensation were considered as partially extinguished by the historic grant of a pastoral lease in 1882. However, compensation is only available for acts that took place after the implementation of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975. On this basis, 53 acts that gave rise to a compensation entitlement were identified. These were acts for which the NT Government was responsible, including public works and the granting of leases. To address the impact of these acts, the group were seeking compensation for ‘tangible’ loss of value, but also most importantly for interference with connection to land and the “intangible disadvantages” flowing from the loss of rights.

The claim sits against a backdrop of a native title system in which native title rights can be, and are, legally extinguished. Extinguishment in this context is the effect of a grant of land or act by the government that is ‘inconsistent’ with native title rights. This ultimately means that the rights are destroyed and no longer exist under settler law. Acceptance within the law of extinguishment has led to “devastation” that traditional owner groups “have been trying to claw back from”. Addressing this, the claim sought monetary compensation as a way to partly address this loss. However, it is important to note that, as Chris Griffiths maintains, despite the finding of ‘extinguishment’ under settler law, culture has not been removed from the land:

"You can't remove the culture from the Country it belonged to... You can share it, but they don't own it".

9 Northern Territory v Griffiths [2017] FCAFC 106, [5], Griffiths (n5), [9] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), Griffiths v Northern Territory [2014] FCA 256 (Compensation Decision Part 1) [43], [46], [67].
10 Griffiths (n5), [6] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
11 Native Title Act 1993 (Cth), s51(4), Griffiths (n5), [155] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
12 See The Wik Peoples v The State of Queensland & Ors; The Thayorre People v The State of Queensland & Ors [1996] HCA 40
In *Griffiths,* compensation was considered for both economic and cultural loss. Under the terms of the *Native Title Act* (‘NTA’), compensation is to be awarded ‘on just terms’, for any loss, reduction, damage “or other effect of the act on their native title rights”. Until *Griffiths* these terms had never been fully tested or applied.

On the issue of economic loss, the trial judge used the value of full and unrestricted ownership under settler law (freehold) as a starting point. Then, a percentage calculation was used, comparing the non-exclusive native title rights to full freehold value. This method of calculation was endorsed by each court, but led to differing results:

1. Trial judge: awarded 80 percent of freehold value.
2. Full Court: lowered the award to 65 percent of freehold value.

In assessing cultural loss, the trial judge said the task was to “translate the spiritual hurt from the compensable acts into compensation”. The judge used a two-step process:

1. Identify the nature and extent of the relationship with the land and waters; and
2. Consider the impact of the acts on that connection.

Extensive evidence from both traditional owners and anthropologists was considered and deep cultural knowledge of the area was shared. The trial judge listened to accounts of the deep and lasting pain caused by interference with Country, such as that relating to the “*puru maring*”, or “gut-wrenching”, feeling brought on by some of the acts. On this basis the judge used a “complex”, but “essentially intuitive” process to arrive at a compensation amount of $1.3m for cultural and spiritual loss. This was upheld by the Full Court.

---

15 *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth), s51(1). Total compensation also cannot exceed the amount payable for a compulsory acquisition of freehold land. Compulsory acquisition of land describes the process by which a government can acquire land from a business or individual, despite lack of consent by the landowner, and the legal interest in the property is converted into a claim for compensation. The process is governed by statute in each state and in the Northern Territory context this is governed by the *Land Acquisitions Act 1978* (NT).

16 *Native Title Act 1993* (Cth), s51A.

17 *Griffiths v Northern Territory* [2014] FCA 256 (Compensation Decision Part 1) [232].

18 *Northern Territory v Griffiths* [2017] FCAFC 106, [139].

19 *Griffiths v Northern Territory* [2014] FCA 256 (Compensation Decision Part 1) [232], *Griffiths* (n5), [155] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).

20 *Griffiths* (n5), [159] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).

21 Ibid [191].

22 *Timber Creek* (2016) 337 ALR 362, [302], See discussion at *Griffiths* (n5), [237] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).

23 *Northern Territory v Griffiths* [2017] FCAFC 106. The Full Court agreed with the determination and looked to academic research and international examples to further confirm the suitability of the amount. See for example, Paul Burke, ‘How Can Judges Calculate Native Title Compensation?’ (Discussion Paper, Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, 2002), See *Timber Creek Appeal* (2017) 256 FCR 478,
The Legal Issues

On appeal, the High Court sought to answer three questions:

1. how to objectively calculate the economic value of the native title rights and interests which have been extinguished;
2. whether interest is available and, if so, how to calculate it
3. how the Claim Group's sense of loss is to be reflected in compensation, and whether the compensation previously awarded was too high.

Findings

In a majority judgement, five of seven judges, (including Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), confirmed that it was appropriate to consider the economic loss and cultural loss separately, and found that:

1. the economic value of native title rights is calculated in comparison with the value of freehold land calculated at the date of extinguishment, in this case 50 percent of freehold value or $320,250;
2. Simple interest is payable on compensation, calculated from the time the act took place, to compensate for loss of use of the money, in this case $910,000; and
3. Cultural loss is to be reflected in compensation, considering the effect of the acts on factors such as connection to land, in this case $1.3m.

The decision was welcomed by Chris Griffiths, as a step towards ‘recognition of the damage colonisation has done to our Country, law and ceremony… [of] our history and our pain’.

A. Economic loss

[397]-[405] for discussion of the hearing of the Paraguayan cases in the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, referred to by the Full Court.

24 *Griffiths* (n5), [2] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid [16]-[17].
27 Ibid [84].
28 Ibid [3].
29 *Backbone* (n2).
The High Court confirmed that economic loss is to be measured using a comparison to freehold value, as the “most ample estate which can exist in land”.\textsuperscript{30} The court said that the usual tools for valuing land should be used, but “adapted as necessary” in recognition of the unique character of native title rights.\textsuperscript{31} As in the lower courts, a percentage calculation was used.\textsuperscript{32} The court considered:

1. The nature and extent of the native title rights; and
2. How these rights compare to those enjoyed under full freehold title.\textsuperscript{33}

The rights in this case were “ceremonial” and allowed the holders ‘use’ of the property but did not extend to the right to prevent others from using or entering the land.\textsuperscript{34} The court concluded that the economic value of these rights could not be more than 50 percent of freehold value, amounting to $320,250.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{B. Interest}

The court awarded simple interest on the economic loss, to be calculated from the date of extinguishment to the date of judgement, to compensate for the group being “kept out” of the money for almost 40 years.\textsuperscript{36} The court left open the possibility of compound interest in future cases,\textsuperscript{37} however it was denied in this case on the grounds that there was not enough evidence to show that the group would have invested the compensation at a profit.\textsuperscript{38} The award of simple interest means that the court did not award for ‘interest on interest’ or on investment, denying access to “decades of sustained economic growth”.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Griffiths} (n5), [76] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), \textit{Spencer v Commonwealth} (1907) 5 CLR 418.
\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Griffiths} (n5), [56] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid [69].
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid [106].
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid [150], Simple interest refers to the calculation on interest based on the original amount which does not account for any ‘compounding’ and so is not affected by any interest accruing. Compound interest on the other hand allows for interest calculated on the interest already earned, therefore leading to a greater sum.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid [133], The court also concluded that there was nothing in this case that enlivened an award of compound interest in equity (such as unjust enrichment, breach of fiduciary duty), but the court left open the possibility that compound interest could be awarded on these grounds - See discussion at \textit{Griffiths}, Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ, at [108]-[151].
\textsuperscript{38} See discussion at \textit{Griffiths} (n5), [133] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
Cubillo, an Aboriginal man who has strong links throughout the Northern Territory, described the decision as “thinly veiled racism”.

C. Cultural loss

The High Court acknowledged the need to think outside of the terms familiar to the common lawyer when considering cultural loss. It is to be determined on a case by case basis, considering the effect of the acts of extinguishment on the group as a whole. The court agreed the impacts and losses are intergenerational and can build and accumulate over time, so consequences of each act should not be considered in isolation. Using the example of a large painting, the court compared the acts to a series of holes in the painting, where the resulting damage would be measured by reference to the entire work.

Relying largely on evidence provided by native title holders regarding their relationship with Country and the impact of interference with it, the task for the court is to:

1. Determine the “essentially spiritual relationship”; and
2. Translate the impact and “spiritual hurt” that followed from the acts into compensation.

Key considerations in this process include:

1. The effect on “the sense of a person’s engagement with the Dreamings”;
2. The feeling of failed responsibility when Country is damaged or impacted in “a way which cuts through the Dreamings”; physical damage to sacred sites, such as building concrete bridges, and the consequent and less tangible impacts that effect engagement with and perception of the Dreamings.

42 Griffiths (n5), [153] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), also see Ward v Western Australia (2002) 213 CLR 1 at 64-65 [14].
43 Griffiths (n5), [153], [157] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ), also see Ward v Western Australia (2002) 213 CLR 1 at 64-65 [14].
44 Griffiths (n5), [223] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).
46 Ibid [166], [154], [155].
47 Ibid [216].
48 Ibid [223].
49 Ibid [223].
50 Ibid [223].
In this case the court acknowledged that the Ngaliwurru and Nungali people had a unique responsibility to protect Country, recognising what the late Alan Griffiths had explained at the time of trial:

“I got all those sites, all that Dreaming, I have to make sure people don’t make a mess of it”.

The High Court confirmed the compensation award of $1.3m for this particular cultural loss, noting that this would be regarded by ‘society’ as an “appropriate award”. The application of this approach could lead to varying amounts of compensation in different cases and contexts, depending on the particular facts in each case.

### D. Compensation not manifestly excessive

The High Court rejected the NT’s argument that the amount awarded for cultural loss was too high. The court acknowledged that as this was the first determination of compensation decided by the court, the figure was a “result of a social judgement”. However, as the trial judge had the ‘substantial benefit’ of being on Country and hearing and seeing first hand evidence on which to base his decision, the award of $1.3m was appropriate. This, the court noted, would fit with community expectations of what is ‘fair or just’.

---


52 Griffiths (n5), [3] (Kiefel CJ, Bell, Keane, Nettle and Gordon JJ).

53 Ibid [217], Native Title Act, ss51(1).


55 Ibid [237].

56 Ibid [236].

57 Ibid [237].
**Minority Judgments**

Although all judges ultimately reached the same outcome, the approaches of Edelman J and Gageler J in their individual judgments could lead to varied outcomes if applied in a different case.

**A. Gageler J:**

Whilst agreeing with the ultimate decision, Gageler J proposed an adapted test for calculating economic loss in which the native title holder can be “hypothesised” to be a willing but not anxious seller.\(^{58}\)

**B. Edelman J:**

Edelman J also acknowledged that there are limitations in the *NTA* framework in determining compensation for value that exists outside the Western conception of title.\(^{59}\) Particularly, he disagreed with an approach that considers a hypothetical ‘reasonable person prepared to sell’.\(^{60}\) This approach fails, he argued, as considering the “immense” evidence it was clear that the Ngaliwurru and Nungali people were “not willing to surrender their native title rights”.\(^{61}\) Edelman J also emphasised that to prevent undervaluing of compensation, pain and suffering is to be measured at the time of judgement, recognising that it may occur slowly or gradually.\(^{62}\)

\(^{58}\) Ibid [246], The proposed test to determine amount of compensation for economic loss was an adapted version of the test established in *Spencer v The Commonwealth* (1907) 5 CLR 418; [1907 HCA 82. According to the *Spencer* test a fair market value can be calculated based on a hypothetical exercise in which the court considers what a ‘willing but not anxious’ seller would be prepared to accept, and what a ‘willing but not anxious’ purchaser would be prepared to pay for an interest in land.

\(^{59}\) Ibid [251], citing W.E.H Stanner, *After the Dreaming* (Boyer Lectures, 1968) 44.

\(^{60}\) *Griffiths (n5)*, [277] [Edelman J], *Spencer v The Commonwealth* (1907) 5 CLR 418, 432, *The Commonwealth v Arklay* (1952) 87 CLR 159, 170; [1952] HCA 76.

\(^{61}\) *Griffiths (n5)*, [274]-[284], [311] [Edelman J].

\(^{62}\) *Griffiths (n5)*, [254],[273] [Edelman J].
Implications:

There are now over 500 recognised native title determinations, and compensation claims for acts of extinguishment are increasing. These cases may be heard through the courts and under the NTA. Increasingly however, settlements will be resolved outside of these courts, as governments prepare to bring policies and agreements with traditional owners in to line with the principles established in the decision.

A. Compensation claims in the courts

A number of significant compensation claims have emerged since Griffiths, that seek to test, apply and extend the principles established in the decision. All are yet to be decided but contain immense potential.

Relying on the principles established in Griffiths, the Yindjibarndi people were able to achieve recognition of exclusive native title rights over an area of land in the NT. Following this, the Yindjibarndi Aboriginal Corporation confirmed that they will bring a compensation case against Fortescue Metals Group (FMG), for both economic loss and spiritual harm. FMG operate an iron ore mine in the area, so the claim will concern compensation for operation of the mine and use of the land without agreement. When decided, this claim may lead to an historic settlement, far greater than in Griffiths, and will test and expand the availability of compensation.

The Gumatj compensation claim, filed by Dr Gallarwuy Yunupingu, also relates to mining interests and mining companies “unmercifully” destroying Country and Dreaming sites without permission. The Gumatj claim includes acts that took place before the introduction of the Racial Discrimination Act, so may extend the availability of compensation awarded in Griffiths.


Similarly, the Tjiwarl compensation claim will apply the principles developed in *Griffiths* to a larger range of activities and a larger land area, and may clarify some ‘unanswered questions’.  

Tjiwarl Aboriginal Corporation chairman Brett Lewis says the claim is seeking to address impairment of rights and the “shame” caused by being unable to meet cultural responsibilities.

Although the process has been clarified by the court, access to compensation through the courts post-*Griffiths* is still strictly controlled. One significant compensation claim, brought by the Bigambul people in Queensland, was struck out by the Federal Court. The court cited *Griffiths* and said that the group had provided inadequate information about the claim area or the extinguishing acts.  

Despite *Griffiths* broadening of availability of compensation, the onus sits squarely with the applicant to establish their claim, and vague or uncertain applications will not be accepted. In many claims, groups are unable to have their native title rights recognised, let alone access compensation, “because of the dispossession”, enacted and upheld by settler law.

**B. Avoiding compensation litigation through settlement agreements**

Governments around Australia ‘intervened’ or joined as interested parties in the case, including the Commonwealth, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia and all governments watched the decision closely. Often, “negotiated settlement agreements are preferable to litigation outcomes”, so governments will prepare to ensure they are not acting ‘inconsistently’ with High Court decisions.

As the use of settlement agreements increases, they may increasingly be structured to preclude future claims for compensation, to ensure that compensation for extinguishment is

---

69 Ibid.  
70 *Saunders on behalf of the Bigambul People v State of Queensland* (No 2) [2021] FCA 190, [99], *Native Title Act* s65(1)(c).  
71 Mark Geritz, Tosin Aro, Georgia Davis and Matthew Hales, ‘Billions to Bust: Deficiencies in Native Title Compensation Applications’, *Clayton Utz* (Blog Post, 15 April 2021)  
72 Professor Megan Davis, ‘2021 Mabo Oration’, (Speech, IATSIS Summit, 3 June 2021)  
The Noongar settlement is an example of this, and included a package of benefits that initiated financial payments, but limited further compensation claims. However, the Single Noongar Land Claim has been lodged since and makes claim for a compensation amount of $290b, the largest ever seen for a claim of this type. Some observers have noted that, following Griffiths, it would not be hard to prove spiritual damage. The claim will likely be forcefully opposed by the WA Government as they seek to rely on the terms of the original Noongar settlement.

Similarly, in the Yamatji settlement, compensation is ‘full and final’, precluding further claims for compensation for any past actions, and any actions in the future done in accordance with the agreement.

C. Native title compensation frameworks in development

Since Griffiths, states and territories have addressed the need for a streamlined compensation process. Some emphasise the importance of moving beyond the framework of the NTA to reach better outcomes for Traditional Owners. There is, however, little evidence so far that the case has led to significant legislative amendments.

In 2019 the Queensland Government allocated responsibility for native title compensation to the Treasury, through the Native Title Compensation Project Management Office, to support consistency across claims, and “achieve settlement of compensation on ‘just terms’”.

The Northern Territory Government has committed to an Aboriginal Land and Sea Action Plan. The plan outlines an intention to create an overarching policy framework to streamline native title processes. Central to this will be a whole of government policy framework in the area of compensation, informed by the approach in Griffiths.

---

These streamlined frameworks demonstrate some willingness to build frameworks to support claimants. If governments commit to genuine engagement with traditional owners in this process, as claimed in proposals, this could enable greater opportunities for traditional owner control over the process. As Chris Griffiths says, the process should ensure that First Nations can “work things out the way we want to work it out.”

D. Treaty

In Victoria, where treaty negotiations are continuing, the High Court’s determination of compensation for non-economic loss has been ‘embraced’. Claims from the now former Attorney General Jill Hennessy indicated that negotiations should ensure the best outcomes for Traditional Owner groups, rather than limiting compensation available or imposing ‘bureaucratic barriers’. Victoria is aiming to create a framework that provides a “comprehensive alternative to the [NTA]”, to “plug gaps” in the Federal act and increase the accessibility of compensation through out of court settlements.

The Northern Territory released a Treaty Discussion Paper in 2020 and is actively working towards developing a framework. Key to the discussion surrounding settlement for and calculation of compensation are some of the principles developed in Griffith. The paper notes:

If a First Nation chose to negotiate, rather than litigate, for compensation… included in the negotiation of a treaty, there would now be a benchmark of ‘market value’ (Emphasis added).

---


84 Ibid.


This framework allows flexibility regarding the contents of treaty,\(^{87}\) and may relieve some of the “onerous burden” on the claim group to comply with the strict requirements of native title determinations in court.\(^{88}\) The paper also acknowledges that the litigation process requires reliving and recounting the trauma of cultural loss, as well as upholding the “artificial legal environment” of the NTA.\(^{89}\) Using the principles established in Griffiths, compensation can be pursued outside of that environment to assess the value of reparations for “any such injury” to “Aboriginal spiritual connection to their traditional land”.\(^{90}\)

The negotiation of compensation for native title within treaties is promising and those in development are “strong on rhetoric”. However, as Professor Megan Davis notes, State and Territory Treaties are not binding due to the ability and potential willingness of the Commonwealth to override State laws.\(^{91}\)

**E. Cultural Heritage**

There is potential for the decision in Griffiths to impact cultural heritage protections. Cultural heritage laws and policies could be amended to incorporate the High Court’s guidance on compensation to inform stronger remedies for breaches of heritage protections that cause cultural loss.\(^{92}\) This could send a clear message to parties such as land owners and mining companies and provide greater bargaining power to traditional owner groups.

---

\(^{87}\) Ibid.

\(^{88}\) Ibid, 36.

\(^{89}\) Ibid, 40.

\(^{90}\) Ibid.


\(^{92}\) See recommendations in Dr Kate Galloway, ‘An inquiry into the destruction of 46,000-year-old caves at the Juukan Gorge in the Pilbara region of Western Australia by The Joint Standing Committee on Northern Australia Parliament of Australia: Submission 27’, 3-4 [https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Northern_Australia/CavesatJuukanGorge/Submissions](https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Joint/Northern_Australia/CavesatJuukanGorge/Submissions)
Conclusion:

The High Court awarded a total of $2,530,350 to the Ngaliwurru and Nungali peoples in a case that represents one of the most important native title decisions since *Mabo*. Despite a statutory right to ‘just terms’ compensation existing in the *NTA*, the decision was the first time that the court had interpreted and ruled on compensation for the extinguishment of native title. The case provides guidance on the interpretation and award of ‘just compensation’, as well as a framework to remedy some of the wrongs caused by tides of extinguishment. There now at least exists a confirmed right to compensation for cultural loss and greater certainty and bargaining power for native title holders whose rights have already been extinguished. The decision potentially opens the door to more compensation awards, and the principles may be extended and developed through claims that are tested with a broader scope or against other bodies, such as mining companies. Although a monetary amount will never be adequate, the claimants in this case withstood the gruelling hearing process and felt that the message was “getting across”. According to Chris Griffiths and Lorraine Jones, the decision showed the court was finally beginning to understand the importance of connection to Country and recognise and compensate for the feeling of being deeply “emotionally hurt inside” when seeing damage to their land.

It is important to note that as a test case the claimants in *Griffiths* had a ‘strong’ and ‘provable’ connection to land, law and custom in the eyes of the settler law. Potential challenges are still very present for many claim groups that may be unable to meet this threshold, particularly where the impacts of acts of ‘extinguishment’ have supposedly ‘severed’ connection to country. Despite the gravity and importance of the decision in *Griffiths*, extinguishment, a “western legal concept”, remains a “deeply troubling issue for native title holders”. Native title holders often have little power to prevent extinguishment, after which the native title is “eliminated” and “gone forever under the western law”, arguably reinstating *Terra Nullius*. Promisingly however, the implications of the decision extend beyond the barriers of native title and shortfalls may be addressed through agreements such as settlements and treaty negotiations. As Chris Griffiths noted following the decision, it is only a part of recognising and compensating for the “loss and hurt caused by damage to country… a small step in the long continuing journey to set things right”.

---

94 Ibid.  
96 Ibid.  
97 *Backbone* (n2).
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