

Colour not Civilisation: Contesting Boundaries of Citizenship and Rights in Inter-War Australia

Alison Holland
Macquarie University

In 1938, Aboriginal rights advocate and critic of Aboriginal policy, Mary Bennett, accused the Western Australian administration of making 'colour' and not 'civilisation' the basis of Aboriginal citizenship. This statement followed the enactment of extensive amendments to the Aboriginal protection legislation in that State which massively increased the native commissioner's power over Aboriginal people's lives and denied them citizen rights. It was a curious statement, which assumed a distinction between colour and civilisation. It seems that in Bennett's mind colour meant race, blackness, part-blackness or, more precisely, Aboriginality. Civilisation was somehow colourless. It certainly did not seem to connote whiteness but, rather, humanness. At the same time Indigenous activists across the south of the country invoked notions of civilisation and humanity in their demands for citizenship. This paper explores the discourses on citizenship that circulated during inter-war Australia and, in particular, the developing political language of Indigenous equality. It contends that Aboriginal peoples' demands for citizenship in these years were confounded by an ideal of citizenship which entrenched colour (whiteness) as 'the' category of inclusion and promoted assimilation as the end result. Indigenous activists repudiated the former and sought an equality, which was not necessarily one and the same as assimilation.

Keywords: *Citizenship, Indigenous Australians, Rights, Civilisation, Equality*

Paper presented at the 'Historicising Whiteness Conference', University of Melbourne, 22-24 November, 2006 ¹

In February 1938, prominent Aboriginal rights advocate, Mary Bennett, wrote a lengthy letter to the Commissioner of Native Affairs in Western Australia, Mr A.O. Neville. It followed a previous correspondence wherein she had accused him of unreasonably withholding money from Aboriginal people and arbitrarily refusing permission to them to marry. He asked her to supply specific cases and her opening missive in response was:

At this time when the whole world is revising interracial legislation, and there is noticeably throughout Australia a growing spirit of goodwill and fairplay towards the native race, it is most unfortunate that Western Australia is discredited by legislation undertaken at the instance of the Commissioner of Native Affairs, making colour and not civilisation the basis of citizenship—contrary both to the spirit and letter of our laws.²

She went on to cite nine cases where the Department had refused to allow marriage between half-caste couples and between half-caste women and white men, including one which she claimed led to the suicide of a young half-caste man. She cited the words of one of her colleagues, a missionary involved in one of these cases, who, like her, disapproved of such intervention:

Those who profess to have the welfare of the native at heart are not always seized with the idea of the value of the liberty of the subject and perhaps the

words written into the American Declaration of Independence would make a fitting conclusion: we hold these things to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights Governments are instituted among men.³

To claim that the administration was making colour and not civilisation the basis of citizenship was an intriguing statement. It appears to both disavow and reinstate whiteness. That civilisation was the basis of citizenship was a fundamental tenet of western liberal democratic societies with a philosophic lineage to ancient Greece and Rome. As James Walter argues, citizenship rested on ideas about what it meant to be civilised.⁴ Civilisation was the antithesis of savagery implying the refined social order and manners of educated, well-governed, individuals. It was, therefore, as much a behavioural ideal as a political form. Citizenship would thus be reserved only for those worthy of membership in civilisation.

The issue, then, was how to test or measure one's worthiness. In Australia, an a priori assumption of worthiness was whiteness or, more generally, race and ethnicity. White racial exclusivity and superiority were the sacrosanct principles of Australian citizenship.⁵ Even before the legislative enactment of the White Australia policy in 1901, which was designed to exclude all non-Europeans, citizenship was defined in terms of identification in a common culture. In the nineteenth century this meant the culture of the British protestant majority. Where the Chinese had long been a target for restriction and exclusion, by the turn of the nineteenth century, all 'Asiatic' races were identified as problematic.⁶ The White Australia policy was built on a desire to build a modern, white British nation-state.⁷

However, according to Warwick Anderson, citizenship was understood as being more than colour. It also denoted a certain type of person or community. It was couched in notions of morality, independence and respectability. Colour, or whiteness, underscored these characteristics but was rarely dominant. Indeed, the *Immigration Restriction Act* also prohibited entry to paupers, idiots, the diseased, 'loathsome characters', criminals and prostitutes.⁸ On the other hand, an emphasis on good character could also allow an outstanding coloured person to be made an exemplary citizen. The classic example of the 1890s was Quong Tart, the Sydney-based, Chinese born, businessman, philanthropist and socialite who was lauded by the white colonial community as an exceptional citizen.⁹ On the flip side, Anderson tells us that fascination with the body of the white citizen sometimes seemed to stand for any corporeal feature other than colour or hue.¹⁰ Speaking of the white race could imply a range of physical and cultural signs with colour the least of this racial calculus.¹¹

In this schema of colour and character, Aboriginality occupied an ambiguous position: although British subjects, Aboriginal people were citizens without rights.¹² Classified 'protected persons' they were subject to special laws and in the first decades of the twentieth century their status and identity within the nation became a subject of intense debate. While interracial unrest in the north signalled a potential threat to white supremacy in the region and demanded new forms of governance, Indigenous protests and civil rights demands in the south signalled the development of a separate Indigenous political voice. A study of these demands shows that Indigenous activists, like many white Australians, believed that civilisation was the basis of citizenship. They understood their capacity for civilisation as their entrée to full rights and

membership in the nation state. After all, they had been told that as a backward people they were subject to special laws as protective measures and they were seeking freedom from such 'protection'. The catchcry was therefore to uplift themselves to the standard of British culture. Furthermore, they invoked the characteristics of whiteness: they were hard working, industrious, loyal and moral, able-bodied, law-abiding and Christian to claim improvement in their status. The government response was to completely ignore this discourse resolving instead, at a landmark inter-governmental conference in 1937, to absorb the mixed race population into the broader (white) population and for them to lose their 'colour' altogether.

Mary Bennett had been advocating Indigenous inclusion in the nation in terms of equality since 1930, arguing that the working out of a just relationship between the white and dark races was one of the most important tasks of the twentieth century. By 1938 she had developed a deep antipathy for the way Australian governments, particularly in Western Australia, administered their native policies and believed that the policy of absorption of the mixed race population constituted an attempt to eradicate the Aboriginal population altogether. She developed her ideas on the status of Indigenous people against the internationalist discourse of the League of Nations. After the First World War the League initiated an international discourse on the welfare of native races, which was defined in terms of western civilisation's duty to control the destinies of backward, dark-skinned races. The solution to this matter involved the 'strong' and 'advanced' races protecting the 'weak' and 'less advanced' races as a sacred trust of civilisation. This involved instituting fair and humane conditions of labour, ensuring the carriage of justice, giving Indigenous people a voice in their own government and rights to their land. In this formulation colour or race was less significant than social and cultural circumstance and opportunity. In the very least it implied an inheritance to be handled with care while not fundamentally altering the fact of white supremacy.

But this was merely one end of the ideological spectrum on questions of Indigeneity in these years. If, as Anderson suggests, colour or hue was subsumed in discourses around whiteness, the war did much to make colour, including hue, the dominant concern. Discussions around the national status of Indigenous people occurred against the backdrop of the western world's discovery of the so-called colour problem in the first decades of the twentieth century. In his, *The Rising Tide of Color: Against White World-Supremacy*, Harvard scholar, Lothrop Stoddard, prophesied that 'the world-wide struggle between the primary races of mankind, the conflict of color', was the fundamental problem of the twentieth century. Nations such as the United States, South Africa and Australia, he said, regarded the 'color question' as perhaps the gravest problem of the future.¹³ He wrote these words before the First World War, a war he characterised as the first white civil war. In his preface to the book, published in 1925, he argued that the war had strengthened his view that solving racial problems was of the utmost importance for the future of mankind. As for many influential colonial leaders and thinkers the problem, as Stoddard defined it, was the threat to white supremacy posed by the coloured races.

A.O. Neville's book, *Australia's Coloured Minority*, published in 1944, sat comfortably within this growing national and international literature on the broad theme of colour, race struggle, and history. It spoke directly to Stoddard's 'problem' in Australia. Essentially a work of propaganda, it was designed to encourage readers (white Australians) to think positively about the desirability of an absorptionist or assimilationist agenda for Aborigines, not as a matter of justice or recognition

of their inherent rights and equality, but as a national ideal. The only thing hampering the effective absorption of Aborigines into the white community, and thus the effective implementation of his plan, as Neville saw it, was the community's colour consciousness.

As this suggests colour emerged in the first decades of the twentieth century as a term reserved to describe all peoples other than those who were white: black, brown, red and yellow. As A.P. Elkin wrote in the preface to Neville's book, 'the Australian population is divided into Australians proper (that is, our white selves); full-bloods and the Aboriginal castes and mixed bloods'.¹⁴ In Australia the term colour was almost always related to the so-called half-caste population, those regarded as having mixed blood or, much less commonly, half-blood. These words, 'caste' and 'blood' are, in themselves, interesting. Caste is suggestive of permeability and hence capacity for change and moulding, whereas blood signifies something more fixed, durable and essential. Perhaps this is why colour came to be associated with caste rather than blood or whiteness, for colour was never white in Australia. As A.O. Neville argued, coloured people were people of Aboriginal descent but not of full-blood while, full-bloods were defined as pure blooded Aborigines.¹⁵ The colour problem was not one to be fixed by the progressive advancement of the coloured person. Prevalent understandings of the nation as bound by purity of blood meant the only solution was its dissolution.

Given this formulation we see the hardening of ideas around citizenship, race and biology around the First World War. Included here was the idea, which took hold in racial science in the late nineteenth century, that culture derived from inherited racial capacities not from historical circumstance. Accordingly, Aborigines lost any remnant autonomy they might have had. Protection policies initiated in the late nineteenth century were, in part, recognition of the peculiar historic circumstances of Indigenous Australians. In his study of the the Dhan-Gadi of the Macleay region of New South Wales, Barry Morris talks about a form of legal custodianship which developed at this time which, while characterised by paternal control and governance, still allowed a degree of autonomy for Aboriginal people.¹⁶ During the mid to late nineteenth century, Morris writes, many Indigenous families maintained their own farms and thus a form of self-determination. However, changing views on race and the colour problem in the first decades of the twentieth century saw a switch to what Morris describes as bureaucratic custodianship, where Indigenous people lost their farms and become totally dependent on the state.

Demands by mostly mixed-race Indigenous activists for citizenship rights and non-Indigenous concerns about the national status of Indigenous people in Australia emerged in the context of these shifting national and international trends. Given the problematic figure of the half-caste in the creation and maintenance of a white citizenry in inter-war Australia, the radical basis of Indigenous demands for equality and rights was to actually subvert the taken-for-granted assumption of caste defect. Through their very activism they demonstrated that mixed-race populations constituted a viable and functioning political constituency rather than a dysfunctional threat to be eradicated. As Bennett maintained:

the native and coloured children are as good as white in intelligence and character and appearance. Intrinsicly they are the finest material for citizenship to be found anywhere. It is only opportunity, the chance of environment and education that they lack, that they are refused by white jealousy and greed ... There can be no reasonable objection to mixed marriages. Some of the greatest servants of the human race were children of

mixed marriages—Timothy, St David, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Booker Washington and many more.¹⁷

As this quote suggests, these exemplars also took citizenship seriously. Indeed, it was the much sought after goal and prize.

If one of the tasks of whiteness studies is to analyse the effect of racist inflection on the subject, the question in relation to the Indigenous activism of the interwar years is how to do this when the subject is an Indigenous person appearing to accept, indeed, embrace the norm of whiteness. After all, as I've already suggested, southern-based Indigenous activists claimed citizenship on the basis of their alleged capacity for civilisation. But did they? Russell McGregor has asserted that the political platform of these groups was assimilationist while Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus suggest that this is only partially right, arguing that they also expressed a vision of Aboriginal difference.¹⁸ On the other hand, John Maynard repudiates all claims of assimilation maintaining that demands for equality did not necessarily cancel out commitment to Aboriginality and self-determination.¹⁹ Nor do I think it useful to describe their politics as assimilationist. The activists of the inter-war years rarely used the term. They were demanding citizenship, equality, liberty, rights, autonomy and recognition. One of the leaders of the movement, William Cooper, frequently alluded to a Magna Carta: a recognition or guarantee of rights, privileges and liberties.²⁰

This was a language of human rights and citizenship. In fact citizenship and human rights are two philosophic traditions rooted in principles of equality. Yet they are distinct from one another. Citizenship links rights to membership in a nation-state whereas human rights disconnects this link, making rights universal. Indigenous activists and Mary Bennett invoked a universalist, enlightenment view of civilisation, a view which emphasised the natural rights or inalienable rights of man. They emphasised a history of progressive historical change and adaptation and a capacity for civilisation. Aborigines were no longer of the 'Stone Age'. They were to become modern citizens. Their right to this elevation in status resided in their right to compensation for loss of land and liberty.

The language of rights is interesting here. As Helen Irving has noted, in the first decades of the twentieth century citizenship revolved less around conceptions of rights, than duties and responsibilities; citizenship was about commitment, belonging and contribution.²¹ When white women lobbied for citizenship from the second half of the nineteenth century they did so on the basis of their good contributions to civil society.²² Similarly, Indigenous people claimed full citizenship rights in the inter-war years on the basis of their commitment and contribution.²³ Indeed, there was a sense in which they regarded the attainment of these things as the white man's citizen responsibility and duty. However, they clearly framed these demands within a discourse of rights.

It is worth pondering what the trajectory of twentieth century Indigenous rights would have been had the collective governments decided in 1937 that the destiny of the race was their freedom from protection and citizenship in the community with all that that connotes. What if, rather than wait another thirty years, they proactively dismantled the legislative edifice of protection and developed programs of education and support to deliver equal citizen rights to Aborigines? What is remarkable about the inter-war years is the prominence of Indigenous activism on the political landscape. It was as significant as white women's struggle for citizenship

had been some thirty to forty years previously. It was a social and political reality impossible to avoid. If this period was the golden age of the woman citizen it was the political coming of age of Indigenous activism where citizenship was their language of equality and liberty: rights not charity was their slogan.²⁴ Moreover the intimacy and immediacy of their protestations and communications with native affairs officials, ministers and bureaucrats, the publicity afforded their demands, together with the clamour of humanitarian organisations concerning the same, makes the silence and diametrically opposed solution to their requests all the more confounding. Instead of recognise and give meaning to their demands the agenda of the 1937 conference completely marginalised their contributions and in the words of William Cooper, merely 'confirmed their humiliation'.²⁵ Even where their existence was noted it was part of the undifferentiated mass of welfare groups which in the inter-war years demanded better policies.

Citizenship for Aborigines before the Second World War, as far as I can see, was not even a remote possibility; not even on the radar. Where white women's demands had been successful earlier on, Indigenous demands were a dismal failure. If nothing else white women managed to convince patriarchal leaders of their status as political actors.²⁶ Indigenous people had long been conceived of as being without politics or political identity. This is more confounding when we are reminded by many authors that the Indigenous demand for inclusion in the nation was and remained one of the continuous political discourses of twentieth century Australia, and, according to Clarke and Galligan, there was nothing constitutionally preventing it. At any point in time, the Commonwealth could have fully included all or some Aborigines, at least at the national level, in the Australian citizenry.²⁷ However, not even within humanitarian organisations was Indigenous citizenship a consideration, notwithstanding Bennett's appeals. It was taken up in 1938 by the short-lived Committee for Aboriginal Citizenship, which was formed as a breakaway group from the Association for the Protection of Native Races because of its silence on citizenship. As Indigenous member Pearl Gibbs put it, 'we all know that citizenship is the only thing which will lift these people from the depths of despair'.²⁸ Despite Gibbs' protestation, such targeted efforts for citizenship were dropped when the group was disbanded in 1941.

No other mention of citizenship was made until 1944, when anthropologist A.P. Elkin published *Citizenship for Aborigines*, the same year that the Western Australian government issued its *Natives (Citizenship Rights) Act*. While the Act premised citizenship on the eradication of Indigenous culture, Elkin's treatise argued citizenship for Aborigines as a future aim. While essentially a treatise on the desirability of implementing a national policy for Aborigines, Elkin's book reflected his ideological distance from the biological absorption propounded by many of his colleagues in the inter-war period. Rather than a clear exploration of the delivery of citizenship to Aborigines, it propounds a methodology which includes ten general principles, including the importance of group or community life to Aborigines, the status of women, education, health, justice, work, security and spirituality. In other words, in Elkin's schema, citizenship for Aborigines would rest on civilisation. Yet, the process was one of transition from nomadism to citizenship and for this, it seems, a protective regime was still needed. Despite his challenge to the official line, Elkin continued to play a key role in the bureaucracy virtually right up to the point that it was dismantled and citizenship finally bestowed on Aborigines in NSW. As Russell McGregor has argued, despite his leanings to social and cultural assimilation, Elkin did not

escape the reification of race dominant in the scientific discourses of the day.²⁹ Biologically determined, race was a taken-for-granted assumption underpinning the Aboriginal problem.

This not only demonstrates the embeddedness of whiteness but the inability of political leaders and the broader population in the inter-war years to conceive of a basis for citizenship other than colour, and more specifically, race. This is metaphorically demonstrated by the figure of the half-caste, represented as something other than human, a shadowy blemish, neither one thing or the other, contaminated and contaminating. Leaving them be was totally anathema. Nor could they be understood as rights-bearers, even potentially, as a group. Full-blood Aborigines were less of a worry because, as dark Caucasians, they could be left alone, their purity intact, to die out; a process which underwrote white pre-eminence which wasn't just about reinstating a unified and purified citizenry, it was about reinstating white dominance, without imperfections. It was conceived of in terms of conquest, as the worldwide colonial literature on the colour problem suggested.

Barry Morris has argued that the relationship, which emerged between Aborigines and the state under protection regimes in the first half of the twentieth century must be understood as one of dependency and domestication. Here, domestication denoted a form of internal colonialism, which sought to dissolve the cultural distinctiveness of the Indigenous population and force its integration into the dominant society, while at the same time making a distinction between its political status and that of all other groups within the nation-state.³⁰ In this case Bennett's argument for Australian exceptionalism falters as developments in Australia reflected trends elsewhere, including Germany.

What governments introduced after the war was assimilation not citizenship per se. It was a model of citizenship which governments adopted in the post-war era which did not amount to the recognition of Aboriginal rights such as equality, liberty and autonomy in the way Aborigines had articulated them. The protection legislation remained in place and the removal of children continued unabated. The only way to freedom and to gain access to the rights and privileges of citizenship was via the renunciation of Aboriginality. This was not what the inter-war activists envisaged, as William Cooper, one of the founders of Australian Aborigines League, made clear to the Minister for the Interior some six months after the 1937 conference:

The whole attitude of the administration is framed without regard to native opinion and from the assumption that the dark man admits the superiority of the White and desires incorporation in that race. This is most decidedly wrong. The two races [by which he meant half-caste and full-blood] side by side yet distinct, cannot be with any prejudice to the white race for our numbers are so inconsequential ... Equality in law will not mean actual equality as we know we must still suffer the disability of a minority and of colour but equality in law is what we are asking.³¹

What we see here is the recognition of colonial white dominance and the subjection of the Aborigines as a corollary of that. In asking for citizenship Cooper was asking for inclusion in the dominant society to enable, if not guarantee, protection within its bounds. What else could Indigenous people have done when the terms of Australian citizenship were themselves so narrowly defined on white peoples terms, and when so many of them were subscribing to citizenship in all but colour and law?

If, as Aileen Moreton-Robinson suggests, a key endeavour of whiteness studies is to interrogate the privileged subject position and the normative and dominant nature of whiteness, then historicising citizenship and, in particular, Indigenous citizenship seems a highly pertinent task.³² In particular historicising Indigenous citizenship may draw closer lines of connection between the citizen demands of the pre-war years and the Indigenous rights of the post-war years. Like whiteness, citizenship in Australia has played an elusive yet powerful role in constructing notions of belonging, community and identity. And, as Warwick Anderson has noted, Aboriginality has occupied an ambiguous and unsettling position in relation to the figure of whiteness.³³ It follows, then, that Aboriginal political activity has had an ambiguous relationship with the state and as ongoing debates concerning the national status of Indigenous people and their rights suggest, it still does. After over eighty years of demands for a definition of Indigenous citizenship, the terms of Aboriginal inclusion and status in the nation remain highly contested.

Notes

¹ All papers in this collection have been subject to double-blind peer review in accordance with DEST requirements.

² Mary Bennett to A.O. Neville, 14 February 1938, Department of Native Affairs and Native Welfare: Allegations by Mrs Bennett in regard to Native Slavery (hereafter Department of Native Affairs files), accession no. 993, file no. 116/1932, State Records Office (hereafter SRO) Perth, Western Australia.

³ Bennett to Neville, 14 February 1948, Department of Native Affairs files, SRO,

⁴ James Walter 'Federation, White Australia and Citizenship' in *The Citizen's Bargain: A Documentary History of Australian Views Since 1890*, eds James Walter and Margaret Macleod (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2002), 51.

⁵ David Dutton, *One of Us? A Century of Australian Citizenship* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2002).

⁶ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939* (St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1999).

⁷ Gwenda Tavan, *The Long, Slow Death of White Australia* (Melbourne: Scribe Publications, 2005), 7.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁹ Helen Irving, 'Citizenship Before 1949', in *Individual, Community, Nation. Fifty Years of Australian Citizenship*, ed. Kim Rubenstein (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2000), 12

¹⁰ Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health and Racial Destiny in Australia* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2002), 2.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² John Chesterman and Brian Galligan, *Citizens Without Rights: Aborigines and Australian Citizenship* (Cambridge/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹³ Lothrop Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* (London: 1925), v.

¹⁴ A.O. Neville, *Australia's Coloured Minority: Its Place in the Community* (Sydney: Currawong Publishing, 1944), 11.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ Barry Morris, *Domesticating Resistance: the Dhan-gadi Aborigines and the Australian State* (Oxford/New York: Berg, 1989), 90-124.

¹⁷ Mary Bennett to William Morley, 26 February 1939, Papers of the Association for the Protection of Native Races, Series 7, University of Sydney Archives.

¹⁸ Russell McGregor, 'Protest and Progress: Aboriginal Activism in the 1930s', *Australian Historical Studies* 101 (October, 1993): 555; Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus, *The Struggle for Aboriginal Rights: A History in Documents* (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 1999), 12. See also Bain Attwood, *Rights for Aborigines* (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 2003).

¹⁹ John Maynard, 'The Other Fellow: Fred Maynard and the 1920s Defence of Cultural Difference', in *Contesting Assimilation*, ed. Tim Rowse (Perth: API Network, 2005), 27-37.

²⁰ Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus, *Thinking Black: William Cooper and the Australian Aborigines League* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2004), 81.

²¹ Irving.

²² Marilyn Lake, 'Personality, Individuality, Nationality: Feminist Conceptions of Citizenship 1902-1940', *Australian Feminist Studies* 19 (Autumn 1994): 25-38.

²³ Irving; McGregor; Attwood and Markus *The Struggle for Aboriginal Rights*.

²⁴ Marilyn Lake, 'Feminist History as National History: Writing the Political History of Women', *Australian Historical Studies* 106 (1996): 166.

²⁵ Attwood and Markus, *Thinking Black*, 81.

²⁶ Marilyn Lake, *Getting Equal: The History of Australian Feminism* (St Leonards: Allen and Unwin, 1999).

²⁷ Tom Clarke and Brian Galligan, 'Protecting the Citizen Body: The Commonwealth's Role in Shaping and Defending an 'Australia' Population', *Australian Journal of Political Science* 30 (1995): 459.

²⁸ Victoria Haskins, "'Lovable natives" and "Tribal Sisters": Feminism, Maternalism and the Campaign for Aboriginal Citizenship in New South Wales in the Late 1930s', *Hecate* 24, no.2 (1998): 16-17.

²⁹ Russell McGregor, 'Representations of the 'Half-Caste' in the Australian Scientific Literature of the 1930s', *Journal of Australian Studies* 36 (1993): 63.

³⁰ Morris, 111.

³¹ Attwood and Markus, *Thinking Black*, 74.

³² Aileen Moreton-Robinson (ed.), *Whitening race: essays in social and cultural criticism* (Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press, 2002), vii.

³³ Anderson, 6.