

1 *The Temporalities of Waste: Out of Sight, Out of Time*. Edited by Fiona Allon, Ruth
2 Barcan, and Karma Eddison-Cogan. Routledge. Environmental Humanities Series. 978-
3 0-367-32179-6 (hbk), 978-0-429-31717-0 (ebk)

5. Housing Waste in Remote Indigenous Australia

6 *Liam Grealy and Tess Lea*

7
8 Houses dilapidate, deteriorate and decay, managing waste as they move toward its status.
9 Repairs and maintenance (R&M) of anticipated or manifest failure points can help stave off
10 this entropy. Drawing on literatures of infrastructural breakdown and repair to complicate
11 theories of use and waste, this chapter examines policy cultures surrounding Indigenous
12 housing and maintenance. It objectifies the property and tenancy management systems
13 recently introduced to govern Indigenous public housing in the Northern Territory (NT) of
14 Australia, which is an area of high housing need and erratic housing attention. The absence or
15 delay of R&M under bureaucratic regimes responsible for maintaining the productivity of NT
16 housing stock is itself a matter (and cause) of waste—of time, resources and effort.

17
18 This chapter describes how such a situation emerges in spite of broadly shared desires for
19 better outcomes among key stakeholders—tenants and governments included. We argue that
20 just as waste is materially recalcitrant (Bennett 2009), so too is policy. The pronouncement of
21 new policy artefacts, task forces or directions contend with the infrastructural and social
22 residuals of former regimes, as policies and programs also transition between novel,
23 discarded and resurrected states. Recent recommendations for R&M are situated here within
24 a larger historical field in which remote Indigenous housing is perennially both in crisis and
25 inadequately addressed, oscillating across a spectrum of use values, and becoming in turn a
26 cause of wasted time, labour and public funding. We draw on alliances with Healthhabitat, a
27 not-for-profit company dedicated to fixing dysfunctional “health hardware” (taps, showers,
28 pipes, wiring, power points, sewage disposal) in Indigenous and other disadvantaged housing
29 contexts, in order to emphasise the material breakdown and decomposition of housing subject
30 to inconsistent attention.

31
32 The chapter is divided into two parts. To begin, we reflect on the applicability of recent
33 literature on waste and temporality for understanding entropic housing in regional and remote
34 communities and urban town camps. We then analyse a recent legal decision, *Various*

1 *Applicants from Santa Teresa v Chief Executive Officer (Housing)*, which awarded
2 compensation to Indigenous litigants living in remote public housing for the government’s
3 failure to undertake timely repairs in their homes. This case highlights the often wasted time
4 and labour required from residents to have their public housing maintained and how narrow
5 determinations of safety enable housing to remain at low standards, hastening their wasting
6 journey.

7

8 **Repair, Waste, Time**

9

10 In her photographic series, “My Country, No Home,” Yanyuwa Garrwa artist Miriam Charlie
11 (2016) represents the frustrations of Borroloola residents with government inaction over
12 housing: “the government comes, has a look and goes back to their air-conditioned office.”
13 Until 2019, the last houses built in Borroloola’s town camps were built in 2006. Charlie
14 composes portraits in which Indigenous householders stand in front of tidy homes—ranging
15 from tin sheds never connected to municipal services to three-bedroom fibro buildings—in
16 various states of disrepair. The artist states she “wanted to take these photos to show the
17 world how my people are living,” complementing pictures of dilapidated houses with images
18 of family photographs on living room walls and hat collections. These curated personal
19 objects convey shared attachments, memories and quotidian routines of domestic world-
20 making, in public housing spaces otherwise subject to processes of material “*unmaking*”
21 through policy effect and neglect (Arrigoitia 2014).

22

23 Charlie’s series can be contrasted with Healthabitat’s photographic archive. Healthabitat’s
24 images are decidedly de-aestheticised: typically close-up, decontextualised photographs of
25 failure points in Indigenous housing. For over three decades, Healthabitat has conducted
26 repair and maintenance work according to its licensed Housing for Health (HFH)
27 methodology, which emphasises the importance of health hardware for residents’ abilities to
28 enact what the company calls “healthy living practices”: washing oneself and one’s
29 dependents; disposing of waste; storing and preparing food safely; and so on. Data collected
30 from over 9000 houses has shown the main causes of health hardware failure are a lack of
31 routine maintenance and poor initial construction (Commonwealth 2017). Healthabitat’s
32 archive provides visual evidence for this: cracked pipes that leak and drains that clog;
33 exposed wires and blackened powerpoints; misplaced power outlets, taps, and exhaust fans;

1 and inappropriately installed particle boards, insulation and appliances that rot, degrade and
2 calcify.

3

4 Targeted R&M staves off various forms of waste: deteriorations in people’s bodies from
5 unhealthy homes, in material components, and in the usefulness of the property for
6 accommodating fluctuating households. Yet such targeted scrutiny of Indigenous housing, if
7 it happens at all, is more typically preoccupied with novelty, not age or condition. It is at the
8 planning, promising and pre-handover stages that construction must meet certain building
9 standards and codes, while post-occupancy, it is householders who become the primary
10 objects of surveillance and superintendence. Reflecting this latter emphasis, the
11 Commonwealth’s *National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing* (NPARIH
12 2008-2018) sought to improve the sustainability of government housing investments by
13 insisting upon standardised remote area property and tenancy management arrangements
14 (ANAO 2012). NPARIH increased total stock and marginally reduced overcrowding
15 (Commonwealth 2017), but the general picture remains one of significant shortage and
16 neglect, and Indigenous residents continue to live with broken things. Having already
17 expended 5.4 billion dollars, the recent *Remote Housing Review* (hereafter *Review*) of
18 NPARIH recommended that “A recurrent program must be funded to maintain existing
19 houses, preserve functionality and increase the life of housing assets” (Commonwealth of
20 Australia 2017, 75).

21

22 This key, yet-to-be-mandated recommendation identifies the dynamic materiality of housing.
23 As Stephen Graham and Nigel Thrift (2007) write, “Architectures are morphogenetic figures
24 forged in time, tacking against a general entropic tendency” (6). Over time, things wear out,
25 break and fall apart. Without careful intervention, this process accelerates. Repair and
26 maintenance are broad categories of intervention, on a wide spectrum that extends from
27 practices of upkeep, mending, cleaning, tinkering and workaround to upgrading, repurposing,
28 renovation, deconstruction, demolition and rebuilding. Such practices respond to dynamic
29 material situations that we might variously call deterioration, dilapidation, entropic decay
30 and, in legal terms, “reasonable wear and tear.” Ethnographies of infrastructure frequently
31 note that infrastructures become visible when inoperable, with R&M performing a necessary
32 role “between breakdown and restoration of the practical equilibrium” (Graham and Thrift
33 2007, 3), and as practices of “mending order” (Sormani et al. 2018, 13). Healthabitat (2019)
34 data of Indigenous housing prior to their repair intervention records notably low “practical

1 equilibria” for housing function: thirty-seven per cent of houses have a working shower;
2 twenty-nine per cent have laundry services working; and fifty-nine per cent a working toilet.
3 While Graham and Thrift (2007) acknowledge that breakdowns offer “the means by which
4 societies learn and learn to re-produce,” this is simply optimistic potential (5). There is
5 nothing inevitable about breakdowns generating innovative or effective solutions, nor to such
6 solutions being repeated in some progressivist model of iterative improvement. Further, that
7 something is repaired does not make it a good original installation. Acknowledging instances
8 of repair as human labour and ingenuity, we should also examine impediments to repair
9 practices, and systems that oversee relative dysfunction before, as, and after infrastructures
10 are installed.

11
12 But first, let us briefly examine how the poor state of public housing in Australian Indigenous
13 communities justifies the conceptual framing of housing (as) waste. On the one hand, we can
14 provide numerous examples of modern housing’s literal function, and failings, to remove
15 wastewater (including sewage) along with rubbish, chemicals, gases and so on, to municipal
16 pipes, septic tanks and leach fields. On the other hand, we can draw on work in waste and
17 discard studies that emphasises the dynamism of matter in relation to complex circular
18 economies of value and use. In John Frow’s (2001) terms, “Waste is the degree zero of value,
19 or it is the opposite of value, or it is whatever stands in excess of value systems grounded in
20 use” (21). But such a status as waste does not foreclose an object’s incorporation into
21 commodity markets (such as via waste management), and nor is it immutable. As Joshua
22 Reno (2017) writes, “value is a mutable social relation and not an inherent characteristic of
23 things themselves” (vii). In Michael Thompson’s important book, *Rubbish Theory* (1979),
24 rubbish is characterised by its potential for an abrupt shift in value: “The rubbish to durable
25 transition is an all-or-nothing transfer . . . across two boundaries, that separating the worthless
26 from the valuable and that between the covert and the overt” (26). Rundown housing can re-
27 emerge with new values, as when dilapidated inner-city housing stock undergoes a process of
28 transformation via gentrification.

29
30 However, these frameworks need adjusting for understanding Indigenous public housing in
31 the NT. For a start, the drivers for a housing market where many Indigenous people live are
32 rarely present, much to the dismay of conservative commentators bent on encouraging
33 individual mortgages. More importantly, despite the poor condition of many houses, as
34 Miriam Charlie shows, acute shortages provide few alternatives for residents but to continue

1 living with broken things. This ongoing utility signals the “transient” value that Thompson
2 attributes to most objects as they decrease in use and exchange value over time, even if,
3 through the attachments residents maintain to family homes, the building is also durably
4 valued, even invaluable. Certain (disposal) categories employed by the NT Department of
5 Housing, such as “Legacy housing” and “Beyond Economic Repair” (examined below), can
6 variously reduce the forms of ongoing governmental attention that individual houses might
7 receive or establish a temporal finitude by removing them from stock altogether. But such
8 categorisations do not guarantee the removal of houses from effective circulation, nor their
9 move towards demolition or renewal. Such buildings may well continue to be lived in, even if
10 functionally they are “non-houses” (Lea and Pholeros 2010).

11
12 To what extent, then, is the concept of waste an appropriate analytic for understanding
13 housing in Indigenous communities? We propose that it is useful first for recognising the
14 dynamic materiality of objects and the related flexibility of value determinations, including as
15 other regimes of value (time and labour) come into play. If, as William Viney (2014) writes,
16 waste is “matter out of time” (2), as time “provides a measure of our uses, our projects and
17 our ambitions” (3), then how houses transition into waste through differently valued temporal
18 registers of attention, speed and labour warrants analysis. Even if wasted houses are pulled
19 into continuing use, their deterioration and dysfunction signal wasted potential, through
20 shortened lifespans for public infrastructure. The failure to provide for cyclical repairs and
21 maintenance is further exacerbated by a prevailing conception of much Indigenous housing as
22 unprofitable stock. Its potential to generate capital is presumed to be exhausted from the point
23 of installation, before which profit can be turned through bureaucratic, design, procurement,
24 and construction work, and after which money is presumed wasted. Public housing is often
25 allowed to waste through disinvestment when it escapes settler capitalist cycles of exchange
26 and value creation.

27
28 The dilapidation of housing proceeds alongside publication of serial government reviews and
29 announcements of new funding programs and partnerships. Here, assembly recommendations
30 are invariably cast in the future perfect tense: proposing new or revised approaches and
31 promising new housing construction within defined budget periods. The eventfulness of such
32 publications, including their speculative futures, are otherwise experienced as ongoing
33 deferral and delay by those with pressing needs to sleep safely tonight or to return to country
34 yesterday. Unlike political announcements, housing decay is rarely a swift or spectacular

1 process. A drain clogs, a stove element breaks, a fence collapses, a floor tile cracks and lifts.
2 This is a normalised wasting within differentiated regimes of value, and it is difficult to
3 intercept.

4
5 Speaking of the ongoing resistance mustered against proposals to release toxic particulate
6 matter over their Baltimore neighbourhood, an informant in Chloe Ahmann's (2018)
7 ethnography notes "[i]t's exhausting to create an event out of nothing" (146). The class action
8 studied below and the complaints that it describes are events constructed in the necessary
9 genres of the state, in order to demand recognition of situations that are otherwise deemed
10 acceptable, as normalised wasting. As legal proceedings, the class action is a visible,
11 crystallised event that narrates and infers the everyday, cumulative responses to the
12 unremitting experience of housing failure that residents endure: phone calls, complaints,
13 reports, scheduling, follow-ups, appointments, fines, inspections, and more reports. As a
14 multi-staged event coordinated by residents and their legal allies to concentrate an urgent
15 focus on long-term, policy-tolerated crudeness, the class action is what Ahmann (2018)
16 characterises as a form of "*moral punctuation*: an explicit marking of time that condenses
17 protracted suffering and demands an ethical [or legal] response, eschewing the delays of
18 political caution and the painstaking work of ensuring scientific certainty" (144). Pursuing
19 such action, including the demands it placed on the housing department to make submissions
20 and meet deadlines, frames time as not simply a container for events, but as a strategy to
21 enforce recognition and remediation. The legal proceedings also provided a contest for media
22 narration in a context otherwise represented through "incremental and accretive" suffering
23 around relatedly normalised wasting (Nixon 2011, 4).

24

25 **Legal Protections for Habitable Housing**

26

27 On 27 February 2019 Les McCrimmon, Presiding Member of the Northern Territory Civil
28 and Administrative Tribunal (NTCAT), ruled that litigants living in public housing in the
29 remote community of Santa Teresa (also known as Ltyentye Apurte) should be awarded
30 compensation for the government's failure to provide necessary and timely repairs to their
31 homes. This is especially pertinent given the policy insistence that centrally-governed
32 property management would automatically improve conditions for residents. A former
33 mission, Santa Teresa is now an Arrernte community eighty-five kilometres south-east of

1 Alice Springs towards the Simpson Desert in Central Australia, where houses are mostly
2 ageing cinder block structures built in the 1970s and 80s.

3

4 The decision in *Various Applicants from Santa Teresa v Chief Executive Officer (Housing)*
5 [2019] NTCAT 7 (hereafter *Various*) confirmed that the NT government has a legal
6 obligation to ensure remote public housing is habitable and in good repair. Legal action
7 began in 2016 with the lawsuit brought by seventy individual tenants demanding action for
8 over 600 repairs. Residents were represented by the Australian Lawyers for Remote
9 Aboriginal Rights (ALRAR), following initial consultation by ALRAR in late 2015 and a
10 survey of the condition of housing in early 2016. This prompted the delivery of seventy
11 Initiating Applications to NTCAT on 5 February 2016 after initial communications with the
12 NT Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) outlining serial repair
13 and maintenance issues received no response. At the time of filing, “78 per cent of tenants’
14 households did not have fully functioning facilities required for personal hygiene and the safe
15 removal of human waste” (Patira 2016, 3). Once this class action was lodged, the DHCD
16 hired private contractors to complete a number of the specified repairs, while also
17 countersuing the Applicants for unpaid rent and for the costs of unapproved repairs.
18 McCrimmon eventually dismissed the government’s counter claim, ruling that the DHCD had
19 breached its obligations as a landlord under the *Residential Tenancies Act 1999* (NT) (*RTA*).
20 While four Applicant-households were examined in the decision, negotiations for settlements
21 of the remaining sixty-six cases are still underway.

22

23 Media and advocate commentaries on this case repeatedly turned to Applicant Jasmine
24 Cavanagh’s situation, as her account of neglect was the most clearly eventful. Cavanagh
25 described a leaking shower and a blocked toilet which spread raw sewage through her home.
26 Waste water would also leak out of the sink and through the wall into her kitchen:

27

28 When it was leaking, we would have to mop up dirty water about every four
29 hours. I would mop it up at 8pm, then get up at midnight and mop it up again,
30 and then get up in the early morning and mop it up again. (Bickley 2019)

31

32 The house of fellow applicant, Charlie Lynch, the father of an eight-year-old son with a
33 congenital intestinal disease, lacked an indoor toilet and bathroom. He notes the patience
34 required by Indigenous residents: “We are waiting, waiting, waiting. We get frustrated. We

1 need a better house to live in for our sick kid, to help him grow stronger” (Ryan 2018).
2 Enforced waiting and deferral are techniques of contemporary settler colonial
3 (administrative) violence. In worlds where state processes assume both the time-availability
4 and passivity of Indigenous people, a calculus of who and what will or will not wait is in
5 constant operation. While a valued chance to jump on a licensed, fully fuelled vehicle for a
6 necessary trip cannot wait; making a complaint, given the infinite ways such an act meets
7 accumulating constraints and obstacles, might be put off. Such reluctance becomes relevant
8 when deciding who is to blame for the house-becoming-waste.

9

10 Under the 1982 *Housing Act* (NT), the Chief Executive Officer (Housing) is established as
11 the landlord of public housing tenancies. The *Housing Act* outlines the tenant’s obligations
12 over the maintenance of their dwelling:

13

14 The tenant of a dwelling must keep the dwelling and its equipment in the
15 condition that, in the opinion of the Chief Executive Officer (Housing), it was
16 in when that person became the tenant of that dwelling or as improved from
17 time to time by the Chief Executive Officer (Housing), *fair wear and tear*, and
18 damage by, or arising out of, fire, storm and tempest, flood or earthquake
19 excepted. (s19[1], emphasis added).

20

21 Together with the other Applicant cases, Cavanagh’s testimony was scrutinised for the
22 instances when she punctuated her endurance of the human faecal waste that was laying
23 waste to her house with literate and clearly date-stamped complaints. This is the
24 administrative pivot required for routine neglect to become a recognised event. The “fair
25 wear and tear” clause is important for determining the acceptable condition of housing stock
26 and responsibility for specific defects, but the *Housing Act* is not the chief legislation
27 governing tenancies: the *Residential Tenancies Act 1999* (NT) is. The *RTA* specifies that
28 premises are not to be let unless habitable and safe, with section 48 specifying that:

29

30 ...the landlord must ensure that the premises and ancillary property to which
31 an agreement relates:

32

(a) are habitable;

33

(b) meet all health and safety requirements specified under an Act that apply

34

to residential premises or the ancillary property; and

1 (c) are reasonably clean when the tenant enters into occupation of the
2 premise.

3
4 The class action launched by the Santa Teresa Applicants was the first time remote
5 Aboriginal tenants sought to collectively enforce their rights to housing at a safe and
6 habitable standard under the *RTA* (Patira 2016). It also pulled the issue of wasted time into
7 view. While wanting emergency repairs undertaken was the initial prompt for action, by the
8 time of the NTCAT hearing, the Applicants were also seeking compensation for what they
9 had endured in the interim.

10
11 Determining culpability for houses going to waste was both a matter of fact and significant
12 legislative interpretation. Since the key claims for compensation concerned whether the
13 premises and ancillary property were indeed habitable, and that the NT Government had
14 failed to maintain the premises accordingly, much depended on defining habitability.
15 Presiding Member McCrimmon noted that “habitable” is not defined in the *RTA*. He turned to
16 a common law meaning, determining that habitability is not met if the premises and ancillary
17 property posed “a threat to the tenant’s safety, going to both structural and health issues”
18 (*Various* 2019, 120). Tenants needed to demonstrate that repairs were neglected by the
19 landlord and that the repairs were a corporeal safety threat. The determination then turned on
20 whether and when specific hardware failures made individual dwellings uninhabitable and
21 when complaints were administratively legible. The *RTA* requires that, once notified, the
22 landlord “act with reasonable diligence in carrying out the repair or maintenance” (s22).
23 Notably, “reasonable diligence,” like habitability, is also not defined.

24
25 Again drawing on common law, the Presiding Member determined that “reasonable
26 diligence” depends on the nature of the defect being repaired. In terms of theories of waste,
27 McCrimmon was acknowledging that the category of dysfunction is determined by the
28 significance of the object to impeding or enabling healthy living practices for residents—that
29 is, by its apparent capacity to lay waste to a tenant’s physical body, or its value as a threat.
30 This is also judged in temporal terms: slow injury is insufficient. In Cavanagh’s case,
31 McCrimmon eventually found “that the leaking shower, combined with the blocked toilet,
32 *did* pose a threat to the health of Ms Cavanagh and the other occupants of the premises so as
33 to render the premises not habitable” (*Various* 2019, 143, emphasis added). However, the
34 ruling shows the arbitrariness of wasting effects. Despite over six years of complaint and

1 insufficient fix-work, McCrimmon determined the injury period existed for a total of 269
2 days. Conversely, other parts of Cavanagh’s claim, including that “the electrical powerpoint
3 near the oven was broken and had exposed wires from about 2014,” did not constitute a
4 “self-evident” claim of a safety threat. That is, Cavanagh could not find that these items
5 rendered her premises uninhabitable (*Various* 2019, 49).

6
7 Applicant Ms Young similarly submitted repeated problems with her toilet: “The toilet did
8 not flush properly. Often, I could not get waste to flush down the pipe” (*Various* 2019, 192).
9 While McCrimmon acknowledged the Respondent’s failure to act with reasonable diligence
10 to have the toilet repaired on at least one occasion (this taking 76 days), the claim that this
11 rendered Ms Young’s residence uninhabitable was dismissed for lack of evidence. Critically,
12 Ms Young had not rendered her issues with waste a matter of record. What was an immediate
13 health risk for 269 days in one case, could not be registered in another without an associated
14 written and date-stamped complaint. The valued object shifts from case law definitions of
15 health threat to administrative registers of notation.

16
17 The proceedings elucidate a significant dimension of classifying actionable waste: that of
18 bureaucratic legibility. As Lisa Gitelman (2014) writes, documents are defined by “the know-
19 show function”: “if all documents share a ‘horizon of expectation,’ then [...] that horizon is
20 accountability” (1-2). But it was not only the Applicants’ records of individual housing
21 defects that faced harsh judgement. The Respondent’s record-keeping was demonstrably
22 inadequate. The department was not only denied its counterclaim of rental arrears because of
23 its faulty documentation, but the accuracy of its rental payment records overall were also
24 found wanting, together with its counterclaims for the cost of repairs. Here, the Presiding
25 Member found that repairs undertaken by the government’s contractors lacked appropriate
26 documentary evidence, including invoices and payment receipts. McCrimmon was scathing:
27 “For reasons which, again, were not adequately explained, the Respondent tendered almost
28 no evidence in support of its claim for costs of repair, and the evidence that was submitted
29 was woeful” (*Various II* 2019, 9). In subsequent proceedings to determine who was owed
30 what costs or compensation, the Respondent’s changing claims, apparent lack of rental
31 records, and failure to provide particulars to the Applicant and NTCAT on request were
32 considered. McCrimmon concluded that “the Respondent proceeded with what was
33 ultimately found to be unsustainable claims, resulting in a waste of both the Applicants’
34 money and time” (*Various II* 2019, 9).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

The waste of time and effort generated through the DHCD’s attempts to stall the proceedings, to lodge counterclaims, and to announce revised claims within the hearing and without prior notice or the required amended documents signal the tactics of “paperfare” (Lea et al. 2018). These tactics buy time for governments, but wear a complainant down, corroding wills to proceed by wasting time, even as the economic and temporal costs of enforcing one’s legal rights as a tenant accrue. This is not to assert, however, that neglect is straightforwardly intentional, even if the failure to reform waste-generating systems may be negligent. Rather than attributing intent to singular culprits, we are identifying a confederacy of causes, with differentiated valuations of time and decompositional housing among them.

Policy, Classification, Waste

Accounts of Indigenous housing often interpret defective houses as exemplary of tenant damage, reinscribing highly racialised conceptions of Indigenous pathology while rarely applying the same analysis to the policy worlds responsible for maintaining that housing. The high turnover of executive staff responsible for managing NT public housing, for instance, rarely comes into view:

Since the Department’s establishment in 2012, it has had four different Ministers, with the longest tenure being 16 months, and it has had a different Chief Executive for each of its three Annual Reports. . . Annual Reports show that at June 2015 only two of the 10 people listed in the executive team held positions in that team in the previous reporting year and no one in the executive team had been in the team for two years. (Public Accounts Committee 2016, 66)

This typically unremarked upon departmental instability accelerates entropic housing journeys. Shifting classifications of the state of housing—how wasted they are deemed to be—shapes the attention they receive. When the agency responsible fails to maintain, replace or repair houses in a timely manner, a house may be deemed “Beyond Economic Repair” (BER). Termite damage or corrosion may make a building structurally unsound, as might a decision that the property is “unlawful or obsolete, or for any other reason as determined by the Chief Executive Officer (Housing)” (DHCD 2018). Laying waste to a house is thus not

1 simply a function of its value as capital nor even its maintenance biography, but of other
2 judgements about time and value: whether a complaint is made in time, whether illness or
3 injury occurs fast or slow, and key to all this, whose time is most wasteable. The BER
4 classification masks a long series of prior determinations about what is worth attending to,
5 how, and to what standard, in the house's maintenance biography.

6

7 Drawing on theoretical conceptions of waste, our analysis shows that how dysfunction is
8 measured, the status it is accorded, and the techniques for defining time and determining its
9 significance in law, affects how housing is tended on its entropic journey through states of
10 becoming waste. Within these somewhat arbitrary calculations, the risks to tenants' lives are
11 also attributed different values, and like the material surrounds of the house, are subject to
12 contradictory attention and neglect regimes. This is what Indigenous social policy is: an
13 encounter with disruption and uncertainty, with Indigenous people expected to endure the
14 perdition. It begs the question of what non-wasteful policy might look like.

1 **Reference list**

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

Ahmann, Chloe. 2018. “‘It’s exhausting to create an event out of nothing’: Slow violence and the manipulation of time.” *Cultural Anthropology* 33 (1): 142–171.

Arrigoitia, Melissa F. 2014. “Unmaking public housing towers: The role of lifts and stairs in the demolition of a Puerto Rican project.” *Home Cultures* 11 (2): 167–196.

Australian National Audit Office. 2012. *Implementation of the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing in the Northern Territory*. Audit Report No. 12 2011-12.

Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bickley, Ella. 2019. “Grata fund supports compensation win for remote Aboriginal residents.” *UNSW Newsroom*. 3 April. <https://newsroom.unsw.edu.au/news/business-law/grata-fund-supports-compensation-win-remote-aboriginal-residents>

Australian Aboriginal Legal Aid Service Inc to the Public Accounts Committee. May.

Charlie, Miriam. 2016. “Miriam Charlie: No country, no home.” *Artlink*. 1 June. <https://www.artlink.com.au/articles/4496/miriam-charlie-no-country-no-home/>

Commonwealth of Australia. 2017. *Remote Housing Review: A review of the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing and the Remote Housing Strategy (2008-2018)*. Canberra, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Department of Housing and Community Development. 2018. “Disposal of Housing Properties.” Northern Territory Government.

Estimates Committee Proceedings. 2019. 13 June. Northern Territory Government.

Frow, John. 2001. “Invidious distinction: Waste, difference, and classy stuff.” *UTS Review* 7 (2): 21–31.

Gitelman, Lisa. 2014. *Paper knowledge: Toward a media history of documents*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Graham, Stephen and Nigel Thrift. 2007. “Out of order: Understanding repair and maintenance.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 24 (3): 1–25.

Lea, Tess, Howey, Kirsty and Justin O’Brien. 2018. “Waging paperfare: Subverting the damage of extractive capitalism in Kakadu.” *Oceania* 88 (3): 305–319.

Lea, Tess and Paul Pholeros. 2010. “This is not a pipe: The treacheries of Indigenous housing.” *Public Culture* 22 (1): 187–209.

- 1 Nixon, Rob. 2011. *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Cambridge: Harvard
2 University Press.
- 3 Patira, Elly. 2016. “Cuts both ways: Tenants’ rights and the double-sided consequences of
4 “secure tenure” in remote Aboriginal communities.” *Indigenous Law Bulletin*. 8 (23): 3-
5 9.
- 6 Public Accounts Committee. 2016. *Report on Repairs and Maintenance of Housing on Town
7 Camps*. Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory.
- 8 Reno, Joshua. 2017. “Foreword.” In M. Thompson’s *Rubbish theory: The creation and
9 destruction of value*, vi–xiii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 10 Ryan, Hannah. 2018. “This 8-year-old boy’s house is making him sick. The NT Government
11 is his landlord.” *BuzzFeed News*. 2 December.
- 12 Sormani, Philippe, Alain Bovet, and Ignaz Strebel. 2018. “Introduction: When things break
13 down.” In *Repair work ethnographies: Revisiting breakdown, relocating materiality*,
14 edited by Ignaz Strebel, Alain Bovet, and Philippe Sormani, 1–27. Singapore: Palgrave
15 Macmillan.
- 16 *Various Applicants from Santa Teresa v Chief Executive Officer (Housing) [2019] NTCAT 7*
17 *Various Applicants from Santa Teresa v Chief Executive Officer (Housing) [2019] NTCAT 12*
- 18 Viney, William. 2014. *Waste: A philosophy of things*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
19