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Abstract
This transnational study investigates the impact of forced removal policies and practises on the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous peoples in Australia, Canada and New Zealand and their peoples’ attitudes towards reconciliation in the wake of each of their government’s apologies.

Ethnographic and Indigenous research methodologies have been used and developed, and are employed throughout the investigation to draw out themes around issues associated with removal from family and culture, and the acceptance or not of the apology.

As part of this methodology, I interviewed 90 participants from 15 sites across three countries. My findings include that most Indigenous people support reconciliation. The ratio of acceptance to rejection of an apology was almost even, with a slight leaning towards acceptance. People who rejected the national apology offered by governments did so because the apology did not meet their expectations of an apology. As the apology aged, many participants felt that promises contained within it had been broken and a new relationship between the wrongdoer and the victim had not been developed. It was at this point that many people rejected the apology. As a result, this has led to growing resentment and disregard for the reconciliation apology, and poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing especially among those who were forcibly removed from their families, communities and culture.
Glossary
Indigenous: is used throughout the thesis instead of Aboriginal. This is due to the Australian Aboriginal peoples having the designated term Aboriginal. The word Indigenous is used when referring to the research population in the collective (Māori, First Nations, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples). However, where possible the following terms are used to identify each group:
- *Māori* for New Zealand’s Indigenous peoples
- *Aboriginal* for Australia’s Indigenous peoples
- *First Nations* for Canada’s Indigenous peoples.

When referring to policy and practice that affect the research population in Australia and Canada the following terms are used:
- *Aboriginal* for Australia, this includes both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- *First Nations* for Canada, this includes First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples.

The dominant group name is used to aid in brevity and enhance readability. It is acknowledged that condensing these groups is not ideal as it takes away power and identity from the Torres Strait Islander, Inuit and Métis peoples, and for this I apologise.
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1. Introduction

In this thesis I set out to answer questions about whether or not public apologies issued by governments made a difference to the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous peoples affected by past forced removal policies and practices in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Further to this, I investigated the relationship between reconciliation activities, specifically Government-led apologies, and the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of this population.

*Social and Emotional Wellbeing* is used instead of the term healing, which appears more commonly within the reviewed literature. To emphasise Indigenous peoples' holistic view of physical, mental, emotional and environmental health, I therefore use Social and Emotional Wellbeing rather than the generic term healing to give this thesis a stronger Indigenous voice.

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is currently defined in a growing body of literature under the discipline of Mental Health (AIHW, 2009a; Dudgeon, Milroy, Walker, 2014) as a collection of themes. In this study I will further explain and build on this definition, and distance it from its current discipline.

1.1. What is to be achieved

Research from this study, and others revealed through the literature review, support the following two assertions I make about the impact of reconciliation and apologies on the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous peoples in this study.

1. Neither the style of an apology, nor the information contained within it, appear to make a positive difference to the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of the research population. Current evidence points to a negative impact on Social and Emotional Wellbeing leading to feelings of
anger and resentment (Govier and Verwoerd, 2002a, 2002b). My study adds evidence and further weight to this claim.

2. Although reconciliation is supported among Indigenous peoples, they are often confused as to what reconciliation is trying to achieve. Many would like to be reconciled with family first and foremost, before they turn their attention to efforts within the wider community. Many Indigenous people are tired of trying to build new and equal partnerships with non-Indigenous people only to constantly face racism.

1.2. Rationale: the need for this research

Previous research demonstrated that attitudes towards Indigenous Australians and reconciliation play an important part in improving the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous Australians (Halloran, 2007; Tutu, 2000a). However, there is little work published from an Indigenous perspective in relation to reconciliation and apologies, and their relationship to Social and Emotional Wellbeing. This is particularly apparent in respect to the trauma experienced by people affected by forced removal policies and practices of past governments in Australia, New Zealand and Canada (Libesman, 2004; Phillips and O’Brien, 2009).

In the context of this study, an apology is an acknowledgment that some wrong has been committed and needs to be redressed while working towards building better relationships. However, the question remains, is an apology enough to close the divide between non-Indigenous and Indigenous peoples? Is an apology enough for a country’s Indigenous peoples, affected by forced removal policies, to become truly reconciled?

Forced removal is not the only factor impacting Indigenous disadvantage. British/European occupation and settlement, combined with policies and practice of forced separation of Indigenous children from their parents, and the forced relocation from homelands to settlements (Halloran, 2007) has been clearly linked to Indigenous disadvantage. These types of policies are
common in countries where colonisation has occurred—including Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

Indigenous peoples of these countries share many similarities. As they were invaded and colonised, the Indigenous peoples were effectively made to conform to a British style of living and comply with an alien government and legal structures. They share similar experiences of policies and practices on a number of issues including forced removal of Indigenous children and their assimilation into a western cultural system. At the same time, each country's different social and cultural constructs have led to noticeable differences in reconciliation practices and policies, and the related government health policy and implementation. There are also differences in Indigenous cultural practices including Social and Emotional Wellbeing models. In this study, I investigate and draw conclusions from the similarities and differences in these processes.

Australia, Canada and New Zealand have all conducted inquiries and reports into forced child removal. These reports will be relied on for historical evidence in relation to policies, trauma and treatment of children while in care. In Australia, I have focused on information relating to reconciliation and Social and Emotional Wellbeing completed since 2000. This corresponds with the establishment of Reconciliation Australia following the release of the Reconciliation: Australia’s Challenge: Final Report of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Parliament (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, 2000).

Originally, only literature written after the Reconciliation: Australia's Challenge: Final Report of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Parliament (2000) was handed down to the Australian parliament was going to be used and scrutinised for this study. However, due to the relatively small quantity of available literature on reconciliation, after this time point, and given that New Zealand views reconciliation in terms of the Waitangi Tribunal (established in 1987), I
extended the literature time frame to allow for the inclusion of all relevant literature regardless of the year.

1.3. **Transnational reconciliation strategies**

Most literature frames reconciliation as a government strategy for how a nation will move forward and overcome the act of settlement, and the associated injustices that followed. I frame reconciliation within the Context of a civil movement, led by Indigenous people. This would, at least in part explains the differences in the way governments view reconciliation in their region and the different reconciliation models.

New Zealand has taken a very broad definition of reconciliation, through the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal. The Waitangi Tribunal is a commission of inquiry to hear Māori claims of breaches to the Waitangi Treaty by the Crown and make recommendations as to how to rectify these breaches. This is considered reconciliation, because the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal has meant that Māori and non-Māori peoples have a system to move forward, overcome past injustices and build a new relationship (Consedine and Consedine, 2012).

Canada's reconciliation movement is a relatively recent occurrence. The first reconciliation march occurred in September 2013 in Vancouver and was attended by 70,000 people (Sutherland et al., 2014). The relative infancy of the reconciliation movement is reflected in the paucity of literature dealing with either Social and Emotional Wellbeing or reconciliation. There is, however, a raft of useful literature available in relation to Indigenous Residential Schools in Canada and the treatment of their students.

In contrast to Canada, Australia's reconciliation movement is quite mature. However, impartial literature about reconciliation in Australia is scarce. The search of literature revealed only a few articles, journals and research studies on Indigenous/Aboriginal reconciliation that were not influenced by a government body, or was not government funded or commissioned. In other
words, while the organisation writing the report may have been autonomous, the government still sets the agenda and terms of reference of the report. Moreover, governments could ultimately choose whether or not to publish the report and if so, which parts. Thus the impartiality of these items is questionable.

Further bias was revealed in the literature when it became obvious that most of these articles focused on only one side of the equation that is, concentrating on a non-Indigenous perspective of reconciliation. This bias created a one-sided view of reconciliation. Without having balanced perspectives, key evidence may be missed and a comprehensive understanding of the complexity of reconciliation may not be achieved. As a result, the desirable integrated reconciliation model, where both Indigenous and non-Indigenous people work together to inform government, cannot occur (Gooda and Calma, 2011).

The Commonwealth of Australia argues that reconciliation is a standalone tool to bridge the divide between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (Australia), 2000). Yet works from notable activist commentators, such as Desmond Tutu (2000a), argue that without truth there can never be reconciliation. Works by Grishman and Sundheim (1996) and Fukuyama and Bloom (1989), make it clear that the truth on any given subject is the recounting of what is considered a common understanding of the events. When the majority, the victor or the wrongdoer, tells history from their viewpoint, often the truth is a casualty (Skinner, 2003). My study questions whether reconciliation policies and apologies can facilitate this truth making process.

Works by Pederson et al. (2005, 2004) and Halloran (2007) on reconciliation and education concur with Tutu’s conclusions regarding truth through reaching common understandings, and the results of misunderstandings. Pederson et al. (2005), in the study titled ‘Attitudes toward Indigenous Australians and Asylum Seekers: The role of false beliefs and other social-psychological variables’, showed that false beliefs about what benefits
Indigenous people and asylum seekers received from the government negatively influenced people’s perceptions. Truth making, it would seem, is a necessary component of the reconciliation process in order to build a bridge between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

It is clear that reconciliation requires an equal relationship between all parties to create common understandings and a shared truth. It is also important that wrongdoers are able to make amends without fear of compounding negative Indigenous Social and Emotional Wellbeing. By conducting research in the areas of reconciliation and apologies, I am establishing evidence for use in effective Indigenous policy modelling.

1.4. Defining Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is regarded as an important topic within Indigenous health and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and the Australian Government has identified it as a critical research area.

The AIHW (2009a) undertook a study into the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, titled *Measuring the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*, because little work had been completed in this area (AIHW, 2009a, p76). The study used data from the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (NATSIHS) 2004-05 (Trewin, 2006), as well as developing an administrative dataset to measure the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

While the AIHW study title states that it is on Social and Emotional Wellbeing, it is in fact a psychological study based on a subset of the psychological distress scale known as Kessler 10 (Browne et al., 2010), which had formed part of the National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (NATSIHS). However, it does acknowledge other aspects of health when it recommends:
‘...that the feasibility of defining and measuring a number of additional concepts (self-efficacy, resilience, and identity, isolation and loneliness, and social wellbeing) should be further explored’ (AIHW, 2009a, p xi).

I argue that the measurement of Social and Emotional Wellbeing is distorted and manipulated to focus on non-Indigenous indicators in these government reports, and this grounds my motivation to explore this area of study. I believe new research, independent of government influence, into this subject is needed. It is especially important that this research has an Indigenous voice.

This Indigenous voice is represented in the NATSIHS, but it is removed from Social and Emotional Wellbeing from an Indigenous perspective. My research asserts that Indigenous peoples should direct government studies in this area, not the other way around. This self-deterministic viewpoint is also supported by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Orange, 2011; United Nations, 2012) and various ethical research pathways such as the one developed by the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

The importance of self-determination is evident and demonstrated by the New Zealand Māori’s and Canada’s First Nations peoples’ fight to keep control of their own education and by Australia’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples struggle to keep Aboriginal community controlled health services strong. In the latter, self-determination of health means they have the ability to decide what, where and how health care is delivered and from what viewpoint: Indigenous or Western models.
2. Thesis Design

2.1. Introduction

Key to the design of this thesis is its transnational nature, especially the impact of cultural similarities and differences. I used various terms to address the research foci: Indigenous groups (Aboriginal, Māori and First Nations), reconciliation, Social and Emotional Wellbeing, trauma, and policies of forced removal. However, because a large number of key terms do not directly transfer between countries, the investigation addressed not only the policies of a country associated with each thematic area, but also how each of these areas are viewed by its population.

It was also necessary to dissect healing, mental health and Social and Emotional Wellbeing, as the three terms often get used interchangeably, yet they have distinct and separate meanings. This dissection will contribute to a new understanding of reconciliation and its relationship to Indigenous Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

In writing this thesis, I have been influenced by the style of the Bringing Them Home (BTH) report (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [HREOC], 1997). It is written in an easy-to-read format, and features a narrative style that highlights the reporting of oral stories. Interviewee’s narrated stories are used to reinforce important personal experiences and viewpoints. While this, to date has been uncommon in academic writing (Van Hout and Jacobs, 2010), ethical considerations and community research partnerships, are making readability an important factor. The use of narrative evidence will help my readers who may not have English as a first language and are not used to reading academic works, able to make sense of this work.
2.2. A study of policies of forced removal

When investigating policies related to forced removal, not only was the policy content analysed but also the intent behind the policy. The intent influenced the implementation of the policy and often mirrored the views of the wider community at the time. These attitudes led to, for example, the mistreatment and abuse of Indigenous people, especially children, while they were in care as wards of the state (HREOC, 1997; Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2012)

The impact of forced removal on the Indigenous people was also explored. Trauma that children experienced while in care is explored through quantitative and qualitative research methods, as is Social and Emotional Wellbeing and reconciliation. Collecting qualitative data in the form of stories allows participants to tell their experiences their way, and to filter what information they shared.

To this end participants were very giving and shared stories of loneliness, cultural disenfranchisement and trauma—sexual, physical and emotional. Yet some were able to find the good in the situation, and shared hope and forgiveness.

The qualitative data was backed by a quantitative questionnaire. The quantitative data is treated as secondary evidence, in that it is used to strengthen the qualitative data. This is due to the small sample size of 93 people, which is at the lowest possible number for quantitative data to be used (Creswell and Clark, 2007, p. 388).

2.3. Background to reconciliation and apologies

In Australia, various aspects of reconciliation and collective social guilt towards Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have been studied, mostly from a non-Indigenous perspective (Halloran, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2005). Little research has been conducted on reconciliation since early 2000
and the formation of Reconciliation Australia (Johnstone, 2007). However, there has been a lot of work on the impact of apologies since the Australian and Canadian Governments gave them.

In 1991, the Commonwealth Parliament unanimously passed the Council For Aboriginal Reconciliation Act (Cth) 1991 (CAR Act). The process that the CAR Act endorsed was intended to reconcile Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, in time for the centenary of the foundation of the Commonwealth of Australia 2001 (Gunstone, 2007). Gunstone (2007, p2) argues that reconciliation within Australia has three main issues which affect its uptake by the wide community: ‘There is confusion within the wider Australian community over the managing of ‘reconciliation; the influence of nationalism that encouraged the sharing of Indigenous and non-Indigenous identities, cultures; and histories and discouraged discussions on issues such as sovereignty, a treaty and power relationships’. Halloran’s work in education supports this argument.

Halloran (2007) worked with non-Indigenous students, exploring the use of education to inform views about Aboriginal peoples, and to gauge the non-Indigenous movement along the reconciliation scale. Reconciliation scales measure five factors, race relation, equality and equity, institutional integrity, national unity and historical acceptance. Such research, however, does nothing to gauge the position of Indigenous people on the reconciliation scale or more importantly those who were forcibly removed.

The BTH Report (1997) addresses the impact on the Australian Government policy of the removal of Indigenous people. It argues that this policy contributed to the symptoms of drug and alcohol misuse, poor educational and health outcomes, and higher than average incarceration rates of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people (HREOC, 1997). Indigenous people were removed from their families and placed in state and/or church missions/homes, adopted or raised through foster care. This occurred for no other reason than they were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander and the governments of the time felt that they could destroy or even breed out the
race and culture (HREOC, 1997). This was known as assimilation and formed part of the White Australia policies, between 1908 and 1973. The survivors of these policies, in Australia, are known as the Stolen Generations (Read, 2010).

Reconciliation Week, National Sorry Day and the Apology have been credited with enhancing our national wellbeing (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (Australia), 2000), yet there is no mention of the Stolen Generations and their wellbeing within the Government's reconciliation agenda. Reconciliation and its associated activities should have the Stolen Generations in the forefront, as it is they who have suffered the most in terms of loss of family and culture. As such, Social and Emotional Wellbeing should be a major component in any consideration of reconciliation. This is also true of the Māori Welfare experience and Canadian Residential Schools systems and their respective countries.

When looking at apologies, New Zealand was the first of the three countries to offer an apology. On 22 May 1995, Queen Elizabeth signed the Deed of Settlement to the Waikato-Tainui claim. It was the first time that the Queen had personally signed any New Zealand Government legislation (Geary, 1995; Gill, 2000; Vines, 1995). Prior to this the Governor General signed on her behalf. Another first was that the deed contained an apology. This effectively meant that the Queen was apologising to the Māori people for colonisation. The Crown does not use the word sorry instead stating:

‘The Crown expresses its profound regret and apologises unreservedly for the loss of life because of the hostilities arising from its invasion, and at the devastation of property and social life which resulted.’ (The Crown, 1995, p. 5)

This was not well publicised or accepted throughout Māoridom, yet the Crown stands on the moral high ground of having given the apology (Gill, 2000).
Some 13 years later, on 13 February 2008 the then Prime Minister, the Hon. Kevin Rudd, MP, addressed the nation giving the Apology to Australia’s Indigenous Peoples with specific reference to the Stolen Generations. In relation to the Stolen Generations Mr. Rudd said,

‘For the pain, suffering and hurt of these Stolen Generations, their descendants and for their families left behind, we say sorry’ (Parliament of Australia, 2008, p. 1).

He then later described the occasion as

‘the nation [turning] a new page in Australia’s history by righting the wrongs of the past and so moving forward with confidence in the future’ (Parliament of Australia, 2008).

Nearly eight years after the Apology, I seek to investigate the impact it has had on the Stolen Generations in terms of their Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

Four months after the Australian apology, On 11 June 2008, the Right Hon. Steven Harper, PC, MP, Prime Minister of Canada apologised on behalf of Canadians to the Residential School Survivors and their families,

‘The government recognises that the absence of an apology has been an impediment to healing and reconciliation. Therefore, on behalf of the Government of Canada and all Canadians, I stand before you, in this Chamber so central to our life as a country, to apologize to Aboriginal peoples for Canada’s role in the Indian Residential Schools system’ (S. Harper, 2008, p. 1).

As with Australian Aboriginal peoples, I seek to investigate the impact of the Canadian Residential School Survivors and also Māori people who were removed under welfare polices.
2.4. Reconciliation

Reconciliation is not just a matter of an apology and forgiveness, as Sir Gustav Nossal eloquently stated in the *Council For Aboriginal Reconciliation* report, when he uttered:

‘Australia can achieve reconciliation because of the nobility of spirit and generosity of forgiveness of the Aboriginal people and because of the many Australians who also desire a united Australia, at peace with itself and its peoples.’ (*Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (Australia), 2000, Forward*)

If it is true that most Indigenous peoples do want, and in fact seek, a harmonious and reconciled country, it would not be possible to do so without resolving the issues of mistrust, trauma and hurt caused by these past policies and practices. This would also be true of Canada and New Zealand.

As well as the social impact of reconciliation discussed above, there is documented evidence of its impact on physical health. It is widely accepted that Māori, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, and First Nations peoples have inequities in health outcomes. The BTH Report shows that the Stolen Generations of Australia have even poorer Social and Emotional Wellbeing outcomes (HREOC, 1997), than that of other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. Canadian and New Zealand Indigenous peoples (Robson and Harris, 2007) have similar low health outcomes as shown by the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreements (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008a, p. 88).

Without an understanding of the damage caused to Indigenous individuals and communities by the assimilation policies, the loss of culture, language and self can never be repaired. My study hypothesis is that reconciliation positively affects the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous people effected by past forced removal policies. By comparing Australia, Canada and New Zealand, a comprehensive understanding of the different reconciliation models and apologies can be achieved, and how they affect the Indigenous populations. Therefore, my research will contribute to an
understanding of how effective these past reconciliation measures, and apologies have been and how they will contribute to the development of new models of reconciliation in the future.

2.5. Methodological approach

Ethnography research is a qualitative methodology that has its beginning with anthropological studies. Ethnographic methods are concerned with the perceptions of people, including their interactions and behaviours, with and towards each other (Silverman, 2010). The fundamental aim of ethnography research is to give a rich, holistic picture of the people within the study. This is primarily accomplished through conducting interviews and observations as the ethnographer tries to get inside the group to understand their perspectives and practices. The researcher’s focus is to explore the nature of certain social occurrences, as opposed to the testing of hypotheses (Warner and Karner, 2005).

Due to the exploratory nature of ethnographic methodology, researchers can effectively work with relatively small samples (Reeve et al., 2014, p. 534) and unstructured data. Unstructured data has not been coded at the point of gathering, for example at interview. However, it also leads to findings that are thick with detailed descriptions from field note entries and interview transcriptions. Embedding the thesis with this descriptive data enables the researcher to develop a complex picture of the sample and enrich development of discussion and evidence-based conclusions.

In ethnographic studies, the researcher is usually the instrument of the study and not part of it. Past ethnographic research involving Indigenous people has been criticised as disempowering and biased (Henry et al., 2004; Kidman, 2007; Putt and Clearinghouse, 2013; Sherwood, 2010). Authors such as Sherwood (2010) argue the researchers should be acknowledging Indigenous peoples as experts within the study. I agree with this premise. As an Aboriginal researcher, the close ties to my cultural and social background places me in a position to secure insights into Indigenous
perspectives regarding reconciliation, Social and Emotional Wellbeing and forced removals. I possess cultural, family links and associations with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and as such have been able to gain trust that non-Indigenous people may not. I therefore am not only a tool of the research but also a part of it.

I had to develop the Culturally Situated Researcher approach, to undertake this study. This method builds on the research practise known as the *situated researcher* (Jensen and Glasmeier, 2010), allowing for cultural continuity to remain and, in fact, develop. The cultural aspects of the participants and their communities are an important theme in the methodology as community involvement is key to any Indigenous research. This methodology aims to minimise barriers to community participation and is described in detail at Section 2.2.

**2.6. The study’s aims**

The main aim of this study is to investigate whether the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by past forced removal policies and practices has improved due to reconciliation activities—primarily the apologies.

Australia, New Zealand and Canada have all taken different pathways towards reconciliation. I am interested in the impact of these pathways on an Indigenous individual’s Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Key to this is determining how Indigenous peoples feel towards those responsible for their trauma as well as towards the reconciliation measures used so far.

It is important to note that there have been a number of comparisons drawn between the three countries on healing, culture, and settlement history (Armitage, 1995; Curthoys, 2002; Ward and Masgoret, 2008). However to date, little research has been conducted in making correlations and connections between reconciliation and Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by past forced removal policies and practices. This thesis will therefore make a significant contribution to original knowledge in this area.
2.6.1. The key questions

I designed this study using an interdisciplinary research approach to include an ethnographic approach with elements of psychology. To guide the study, I formulated five main questions and two subsidiary questions.

Primary Questions
1. Have major reconciliation activities (mainly apologies) affected the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by past government policy?
2. Do Indigenous peoples accept the apology offered to them?
3. What policies and practices have been employed?
4. Have Indigenous peoples moved past the hurt, trauma and racism of forced removal?
5. Do Indigenous people who were removed from their family and culture support reconciliation?

Secondary questions
6. What is reconciliation/trauma/Social and Emotional Wellbeing/healing in the context of this research?
7. Without all of the population (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) engaging in the process of reconciliation, can reconciliation occur?

2.7. Researching with cultural sensitivity

In developing the research plan I have kept true to the BTH Report and used, where possible, an Indigenous perspective to guide this research. In addition, it is my aim and ethical duty as a researcher and as member of the Indigenous community, to respect and honour the people willing to tell their stories as participants in this research.

The key to making this research study a success is in treating the subject matter and participants with the utmost respect and sensitivity. Little will be achieved without building a good rapport with each of the participants. It is essential to gain their confidence and ensure that no harm is caused to them.
I must therefore do everything within my power to minimise the distress to participants that results from recounting past traumatic events. The research plan takes into account the expected levels of distress and provides steps to minimise the impact on participants.

As an ethical researcher it is expected that I will behave in a certain way. As a situated cultural researcher and a member of the Wiradjuri nation, it is demanded that I honour and respect all Indigenous peoples and their culture. I use a number of strategies to demonstrate my respect. Examples of these strategies include learning and following the cultural practices of Indigenous communities, such as small culturally appropriate gift, or when required offering a prayer. To reduce trauma triggered at interview, I will take time to form relationships before conducting interviews and, where necessary, participants will be referred to a counsellor.

2.7.1. Ethics approval

Primary ethics approval was granted by the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. Secondary approval was granted though the Australian National University.

2.7.2. Beneficiaries of the study

Governments and non-government organisations will gain a better understanding of the positive and negative impacts of their reconciliation and apology strategies. Using this research, they will have a better evidence base to develop reconciliation models, formulate policy and develop programs that help resolve the current issues associated with past policies and practices.

Indigenous people, both individuals and communities, will also benefit from access to the research. In line with the culturally situated researcher model, copies of the research will be returned to the communities from which the data was collected. This will be achieved through a series of seminars and
via electronic copies. Communities can then act on the findings at the local level or as they see fit.

2.8. Document and conclusion

This research study is ambitious in its scope, aims, methodologies and operational targets, due not only to the complexities of the study but also to the limited existing research and unique challenges in this field. Much of the research study is breaking new territory, which is both exciting and stressful at the same time.

This is important work not only for Indigenous people affected by past policies but also for non-Indigenous Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders who also suffer the wounds of the past that must be healed before true reconciliation can occur. The question that should be foremost is how best can reconciliation be achieved? We need to understand the emotions and feelings still felt by the people affected by the forced removal policies of past governments, and the physical manifestations of the trauma that they have suffered. At the same time, we need to look at other models of reconciliation adopted by different counties, so we can foster reconciliation in our own. We can only hope. It all starts with truth and understanding.
3. Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The research study has a number of distinct thematic areas, as discussed in Chapter 2. Each of these foci will be treated as individual parts of the whole and drawn together to form the review and defined arguments. This study spans various Indigenous nationalities and cultures, within and external to Australia. There are distinct cultural practices that apply to the different Indigenous communities who have contributed to this study. These are discussed in their own chapters as this area is complex and requires its own section of discussion.

In the past, non-Indigenous researchers have conducted research on Indigenous communities. By so doing, they have effectively exacerbated Indigenous disenfranchisement now and into the future. More recently, Indigenous communities are restricting research done on and about them. Section 4.2 draws on work compiled under the heading Situated Research to formulate Indigenous research practices for the Indigenous researcher.

Given that this study explores themes and ideas emerging since 2001, it was initially expected that most secondary literature reviewed would be contemporary. While there is a body of scholarly literature for popular areas of research, for example trauma, other areas such as apologies and reconciliation are not as well serviced. I have been forced to rely largely on older literature and often less scholarly sources such as government reports, media, and anecdotal evidence from grey literature available online. My work will then contribute to what will become a new body of scholarly literature.
3.2. The situated cultural researcher

3.2.1. Definition of situated cultural researcher

What makes the situated cultural researchers different?

The situated cultural researcher refers to a researcher’s ability and opportunity to be involved in the research through situated action (Hermes, 1998). Miller and Goodnow (1995) define the term situated cultural researcher as:

‘...actions that are repeated, shared with others in a social group, and invested with normative expectations and with meanings or significances that go beyond the immediate goals of the action’ (Miller and Goodnow, 1995, p 7).

This definition has also been adopted by Arzubiaga, King, and Harris (2008) and is also used in this study.

In the past, research has predominantly involved looking-in on a particular subject matter while the researcher remains distant, never getting involved in or with the subject (Hermes, 1998). In Indigenous communities, past researchers have entered a community, conducted the research and left, removing the research and often taking artefacts or other cultural material (Wilson, 2008).

In response, many Indigenous communities have become suspicious of researchers and refused to participate in research studies unless there is some tangible benefit for themselves and their community (Coburn et al., 2013; Troy and Sutherland, 2012). Other Indigenous communities have started taking charge of research and conducting various studies within their own community – a process known as participatory action research. The later conforms with a decolonising views of Tuhiwai Smith (1999).

Authors such as Nakata (2002, 2007) and Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argue that research within Indigenous communities struggles with the limitations of
Western sciences and practices. By staying within these models true insights are lost as they are formed and held within an Indigenous framework.

As a situated cultural researcher, I was able to overcome attitudinal barriers presented by Indigenous communities. I connected with people by openly discussing my Australian Aboriginal background and my Wiradjuri tribal community. As a result I gained a level of trust with my study contacts and participants, because of this they were willing to share their personal, and often traumatic, histories. Without this trust, the study could not have been conducted because, under their own inception and direction, many individuals would have closed ranks (Henderson et al., 2002; Putt and Clearinghouse, 2013; Rigney, 1999).

A personal example of closing ranks is my experience when undertaking preliminary fieldwork in New Zealand. During my preliminary contact, many people who might have helped to identify potential case studies would not enter into discussion. Before commencing fieldwork I had sent letters to organisations disclosing that I am Wiradjuri but did not think any more of it. Once I travelled to New Zealand and started talking to people, they seemed reserved and I initially thought it was the subject matter. However, once I was able to discuss this with a Māori friend, I came to understand that this reserved attitude was due to my generally non-Australian Aboriginal appearance and the failed message about my Indigeneity. To overcome this barrier I included a sentence, pointing out that I am Wiradjuri, in the plain English statement that participants received. From this point forward, people would ask about where I came from in Australia and about my Indigenous background. This discussion allowed people to become comfortable and then discuss their removal experiences more openly and honestly.

This example demonstrates the point that some people will not discuss their experiences in any depth with non-Indigenous researchers or anyone they do not trust. Situated cultural research—based on respect and dignity—is an important tool in contemporary Indigenous research.
3.2.2. Ethical standards for the situated cultural researcher

What ethical standards are important to the situated cultural researcher? The fact that some past researchers have abused Indigenous peoples and communities (Ball and Janyst, 2008), has led to a new subset of ethics standards for research conducted on or within Indigenous communities, at least in Australia. In New Zealand and Canada the Indigenous community have designed their own (Assembly of Treaty Chiefs, 2010; HealthInfoNet, 2012) set of ethical standards.

An example of community enforcing their own ethical standards is: On formulating my research I sent letters to all Canadian organisations participating in the research project, asking if I needed any special ethics clearance. At the time of writing, all organisations replied ‘no’, as I had ethics clearance in Australia. The following excerpt from my field notes clearly demonstrates the ethics pathway change.

‘On travelling to Canada, Treaty 7, out of Calgary had started asking researchers to gain ethic clearance through the Assembly of Treaty Chiefs. I had to re-write my previous ethics application, used for AIATSIS, for submission to the Assembly of Treaty Chiefs. Due to being an Australian Aboriginal this process was expedited and clearance was given within two weeks’ (Fieldwork Notes, March 2013).

The standards ask in part that the researcher inform and consult the Indigenous community about the research study. This means that in essence the community becomes a partner to the study (NHMRC, 2003). However, these standards do not address community or cultural norms, which Indigenous researchers are required to follow (Castellano, 2014).

Non-Indigenous researchers may not be aware of the importance of meeting community expectations but this is an important part of Indigenous culture. Regardless of their vocation, all people in an Indigenous group are required to follow cultural norms (Beck and Sznaider, 2006). This includes visiting researchers. A strategy I used to address community standards when
planning this research was to consult Elders from three different Indigenous communities.

One of the Elder’s instructions was that for any community from which I collected data, the data should be returned. When I put this request in the ethics application I was applauded. However, when seeking funding to return this data I was informed time and time again that the data could be returned via electronic media. This is not the way in which the data was collected and hence not the correct way in which to return it. It is these subtleties that form the basis of cultural differences and in turn determine how researchers are perceived in Indigenous communities.

3.2.3. The insider

How can the researcher look-in to a subject where they are intimately involved or at least have a history of past involvement?

Unfortunately, there has been no-one in Australia who has published substantially in the area of Aboriginal situated research using an Aboriginal viewpoint. (While this is important work and needs further examination, I will not be conducting this work in this thesis.) The closest and most recent research being Judd (2014). Judd’s (2014) work talks to the difficulties an Indigenous academic has with returning to their communities. This is due to the community’s expectations and review of the academics work. However, in the past few decades, academics such as Cormode and Hughes (1999) and more recently, Jensen and Glasmeier (2010) have looked into what is now termed the situated researcher. As a member of the Australian Aboriginal community and an academic, I am keen to use this type of research and see the results returned to Indigenous communities.

As previously discussed, there is a growing concern for Indigenous peoples to have control over Indigenous knowledge, culture and research. This is evidenced by the growing number of international Indigenous bodies including; International Indigenous Librarians Forum (Sinclair-Sparvier,
Contrary to how research was conducted in the past (Ball and Janyst, 2008), the situated cultural researcher can be involved in their own research study without skewing the results. Involvement does not mean that the researcher is actively participating in the research. It could be as simple as having a former relationship with a participant or living within the community where the research is conducted. Managing this involvement includes ensuring that data is not skewed to the researcher’s own opinions and biases, and acknowledging that the researcher is situated within the study. In 1969, Nader (1972) discussed this style of research and called it *studying up*. Nader states about studying up that:

‘...in reinventing anthropology, anthropologists were to study the colonisers rather than the colonised, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather that the culture of poverty’ (Nader, 1972, p5).

Therefore studying up refers to being situated within a research study.

The situated cultural researcher needs to be vigilant about imposing their own values, however well meaning, and causing barriers to communication and so skewing research results. This need for vigilance can be illustrated from events during my Canadian research.

Before undertaking fieldwork in Canada, I consulted a colleague in AIATSIS, who is Cree to ask him what cultural gifting I needed to follow when in Canada. He informed me that I needed to give a blanket and tobacco. This caused me difficulties because I could not carry 40 odd blankets to Canada from Australia, nor afford them for that matter. I also know that the tobacco was related to poor health outcomes, so I was also not comfortable giving it as a gift.
On arriving in Canada I carried on as planned and met with the first 7 people, all of who were warm and caring. However, while giving their story I felt they were holding back. Afterwards I was invited on a tour of the area and one of the Reservations. During this tour I mentioned that I felt people had held back. I was asked if I had given tobacco, and replied I had not and gave my reasons.

I was then given a lesson on the cultural importance of tobacco. Pre - contact tobacco was traded extensively throughout North America. Traditionally it was not chewed or smoked commonly as it is today. Tobacco's primary use was in ceremony where it was either burnt in ceremonial fires or smoked in ceremonial pipes. In some communities such as Keteganunseebee (Garden River) it is not the commercial tobacco of today but the bark of the Red Willow that is used in ceremony. The tobacco is used to communicate with the creator and for prayer. Understanding my mistake, I trekked through thigh deep snow to harvest the bark and make bundles. From that point forward I offered all participants tobacco before asking if they would participate in the study. Once I was accepted, the participants gave their story freely and in more depth than I had expected.

Although I had asked about gifting, I had not really understood it. I was expected to follow and understand, at least in part, First Nations cultural protocols especially because I had shared my Aboriginal heritage. It was my responsibility as the situational researcher to consciously confirm and follow cultural protocols so that my study would not be skewed or biased. For the situated cultural researcher, there is an ongoing tension between research integrity, and understanding and meeting community expectations. However, this should not distract from the researcher's ability to learn and respond to the research situation, and to activate and integrate knowledge from their involvement, previous situations, or technical expertise.
3.2.4. My qualifications

What qualifies me to be a culturally situated researcher for this research study?

As previously stated, I am a Wiradjuri (Australian Aboriginal) man from mid-west New South Wales. I have been surround by people who have been removed from their families (the Stolen Generations) most of my life. I have worked for the funding organisation, Department of Health and Aging, managing contracts for organisations that deliver services to Stolen Generations, and worked on Prime Minister Rudd’s Apology (if only in part). Finally, I am on a number of Aboriginal organisational boards.

These experiences place me firmly in the position as a situated cultural researcher and means that I have a common link and can relate to the subject matter. Being Aboriginal means that I have a relationship with the research population, which in turn means that the research population automatically give me a certain amount of trust. While I was not removed from my family, there are enough personal, professional and academic markers to triangulate my position as firmly being a situated cultural researcher.

Situated cultural researchers are a relatively new phenomenon. As discussed above, Judd (2014) talks of his situation as a Western trained academic returning to work in his Papunya community and the obstacles he had to overcome. As an Australian Aboriginal, I have defined my study design and methodology as a situated cultural researcher investigating issues within an Indigenous space. However, I strongly feel that further work in this area needs to be conducted to formulate the best model for Indigenous academics to undertake research within Indigenous communities.

3.2.5. Maintaining integrity

How did I ensure that the research study was not slanted to my own biases?
Having acknowledged that the researcher is culturally situated, strategies for dealing with internal biases are incorporated into the study design. The research panel are aware of the possible biases of the research. This will ensure that the panel monitors and challenges findings against my personal biases. The community, who is monitoring the study, will also ensure that they are fairly represented within the study.

While I cannot guarantee that personal biases will not creep into the study due to being culturally situated, this should not lessen the research validity. Most researchers are in fact situated within their own research. Their passion, study design, and knowledge of the subject can place biases on the research outcomes. Thus the culturally situated research approach itself is no less valid than any other approach.

3.2.6. Summary

The Indigenous peoples and communities I consulted wanted control over research conducted with them. They informed me that they want to ensure that they are part of the decision-making process and benefit from the research being undertaken.

Many Indigenous peoples and communities will not relate to, or deal with, people they do not trust. As a culturally situated researcher, my role was to ensure that the community were involved in the research design and were comfortable in fully participating in the research study. I also structured my research design to include a research panel with Indigenous people and cultural advisers. This should limit or extinguish my personal biases throughout the research study.

3.3. Australia’s current reconciliation: the beginning, growth and current position

The BTH Report provided evidence of the impact on the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous people forcibly removed from their
families. They were removed for no other reason than they were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, and the governments of the time felt that they could destroy the problem and breed out the race and culture (HREOC, 1997). This was known as assimilation and formed part of the White Australia policies (Haebich, 2000). The survivors of this long process of forced removals and destruction of family and community have been known as the Stolen Generations since 1981, when Read (1981) first published a report for the New South Wales Government.

At about the same time as Edwards’ and Read’s report (1989), Aboriginal peoples formed their own support groups in the form of Link Up Services. Link Up Services consists of many organisations and individuals advocating for the rights of Stolen Generations. These services and the newly voiced Stolen Generations are the foundation for the Stolen Generations movement.

The release of the BTH Report saw a groundswell of people supporting the Stolen Generations movement. This movement was instrumental in the formation of National Sorry Day, the Sydney Harbour Bridge march, and other promotional activities around reconciliation and healing. Yet, there seems to be no forward movement in health, education or other social outcomes for Indigenous peoples (Nunkuwarrin yunti, 2010; Sheehan, 2012).

My study has not investigated current policies such as the Howard governments, with bipartisan support, Northern Territory Intervention on child sex abuse (Hunter, 2008). Or more recent policies of child removal from any country involved in the study. As the research focus is on past removal policies of assimilation.

1 Link Up services are community controlled services designed to provide family history and tracing, family reunion and support for people forcibly removed. Link-Up (NSW) Aboriginal Corporation was the first to be established in 1980, followed by Link-Up services in Brisbane (1984), Darwin (1989), Tasmania (1991), Victoria (1992), South Australia (1999), Alice Springs (2000), and across seven sites in Western Australia (2001) (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2012; Sheehan, 2012).
Under the *Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation Act 1991*, the focus of the Australian Government’s policy firmly moved Australia away from assimilation to reconciliation. Reconciliation is referred to as better relationships between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and non-Indigenous Australians. Additionally, that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage and culture become a valued part of Australia's continued heritage, so that Australia can have a shared history.

The remaining functions of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation Act were related to healing, not in terms of the individual but of the nation (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (Australia), 2000). This healing related to reducing the causes of disadvantage in housing, employment and education and disproportionate levels of incarceration rates.

The first report from an Australian reconciliation body, *The Council of Aboriginal Reconciliation Report* (2000, p. 257), had six recommendations, including recommendation two that stated:

‘That all parliaments and local governments pass formal motions of support for the Australian Declaration Towards Reconciliation and the Roadmap for Reconciliation, enshrine their basic principles in appropriate legislation, and determine how their key recommendations can best be implemented in their jurisdictions.

*The Roadmap referred to within this report includes eleven (11) statements, with one referring to healing: Our nation must have the courage to own the truth, to heal the wounds of its past so that we can move on together at peace with ourselves.’

In the years since this report and its roadmap were published, it has become a faded memory without policy impact. While Reconciliation Australia has been doing a fine job of keeping reconciliation alive in Australia, it does not truly support Indigenous Social and Emotional Wellbeing. This is especially
so within the context of the Stolen Generations, and the truth about past policies and practices of forced removal. Without this focus, not only do Indigenous people continue to suffer, but also, non-Indigenous people cannot gain an appreciation of Australia’s Indigenous history.

In my attempt to look for answers, I have extended my investigation to Canada and New Zealand as they both have similar, but slightly different, policies and practices to what we have experienced in Australia. These countries have provided comparative material, shedding light on the experiences of Australia in the context of international policies.

3.4. Social Emotional and Wellbeing vs healing

The term Social and Emotional Wellbeing fits best with the way that Indigenous peoples of Australia see and treat, health and healing (Social Health Reference Group for et al., 2004). Social and Emotional Wellbeing is a holistic view, which encompasses everything in and around the person including: family, environment, land, sea, and waterways, as well as spirituality and culture. Aborigines believe that without all facets of the individual’s life being in order, they cannot have complete wellbeing (Gee et al., 2014; Kelly et al., 2009; Social Health Reference Group for et al., 2004).

Canada’s First Nations peoples and New Zealand’s Māori have the same approach, but use different terminology to express their ideas (Minde, 2008; Selin and Davey, 2012). In Canada, this concept is discussed in terms of the medicine wheel, which outlines the importance of fauna and flora, environment, colour and direction (Dapice, 2006; Lavallee, 2007). While in New Zealand, Mauri Ora is a concept that includes spirituality, family, land and sea. These concepts are further explored in chapter 7.

Healing is such a finite word implying that you are or are not healed, there is no middle ground. For many people the memories and underlying issues of regaining culture and being linked to country or even finding family will never be resolved, yet they have worked hard to overcome many of the issues and are generally well (Feeney and Alliance, 2009; Kennedy, 2002), but there
remains an underlying feeling of grief and loss that will never be healed (HREOC, 1997).

3.5. Reconciliation as a tool for Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Reconciliation within Australia was initiated in 1991 with the Federal Government creating the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation. The Council was given funding for only nine years. The Federal Government assigned an important role for the Council; to resolve the issues that cause conflict between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians and to develop a way forward for reconciliation within this country (Steinberg, 2007).

In 2000 the Reconciliation Australia’s Challenge: Final report of the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation to the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Parliament (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation Australia, 2000) was tabled in the Federal Parliament. This was just after the success of the Sydney Olympics and its magnificent opening and closing ceremonies, which were full of Indigenous cultural content. For a short time, most Australians seemed proud of the nation’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation Australia, 2000; Godwell, 2000; Heinz Housel, 2007). However, despite all the excitement and reconciliation efforts, there has been little improvement in any of the social determinants of health, housing, education, language or land acquisition for Indigenous Australians.

Canada’s reconciliation work is still relatively new; however, the First Nations population had similar issues with persistent inequities (Truth and Reconciliation Commission [TRC], 2012).

For the past 30 years the Waitangi Tribunal has been attempting to right the wrongs committed against Māori people, and is viewed as New Zealand’s reconciliation effort (Gibbs, 2006; Orange, 2011). However, according to Craig, Dell, Reddington, Adams, Oben, Wicken, and Simpson (2014) in Te Ohonga Ake The Determinants of Health for Māori Children and Young People in New Zealand, Māori children are still experiencing poor social
determinants across areas of health, housing and education. Factors affecting adults such as, employment and land, were not discussed in the Craig et al. (2014) study.

3.6. Why focus on forced removal of Indigenous children?

Much research has been undertaken in the area of children removed from families under welfare and adoption (HREOC, 1997; Sheehan, 2012; TRC, 2012). Yet there is little research completed on children who were removed from their families because of their skin colour, race or culture, and as part of assimilation and genocidal policies. In Australia, through the Bringing Them Home Oral Histories study (National Library of Australia, 2015) and Canada’s Truth and Reconciliation National Events (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015), some survivors stories have been captured. My research study will further help to capture these stories before they are lost.

Research on the New Zealand experience is missing, which reflects how little work in this area has been undertaken in that country. While New Zealand policies have some clear differences from those of Australia and Canada, the practices of the New Zealand welfare system look very similar. To date, little work has been compiled on Māori children who lost their culture by being removed. A compressive overview and comparison of each countries policy is discussed at chapter 6.

3.7. Why follow the structure of the BTH Report?

There are a number of features of the BTH Report that make it a model worthy of emulation. These features include: the appropriateness of recording oral testimony in Indigenous research; the emotional power of these narratives, and the act of capturing oral history for posterity.

The Bringing Them Home: National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families report was released
by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) in April 1997. This was the first report of its kind. It was organised around a national program of recorded testimonies by Indigenous people who experienced or wished to comment on their experiences, the impact of forced removals and the destruction of family networks. It is the first large-scale commission of inquiry to recognise oral history and to present individual testimony within case studies as evidence and as structure. Each chapter is peppered with individual stories from participants, bringing their experiences to the forefront of the report.

By structuring the report in this way, the reader can hear individual’s stories of their experiences, memories and the emotion of their remembering, and it is this that makes the report standout and be memorable. It is these elements of the report that have made the BTH Report the corner stone to the Stolen Generations sector, cited and referred to by Indigenous organisations, health sector researchers, academics and government (Moran, 2011).

The opening paragraph of the BTH Report sums up the report’s character and strongly resonates with my own study.

‘Grief and loss are the predominant themes of this report. Tenacity and survival are also acknowledged. It is no ordinary report. Much of its subject matter is so personal and intimate that ordinarily it would not be discussed. These matters have only been discussed with the inquiry with great difficulty and much personal distress. The suffering and the courage of those who have told their stories inspire sensitivity and respect’ (HREOC, 1997, p. 1).

In line with the report’s structure, snippets of stories from fieldwork notes will be spread throughout my thesis and will similarly help the reader understand the pain, anguish and trauma that the Stolen Generations, Residential School Survivors and Māori (who have been removed) have endured. The narrative style of the BTH Report is also a powerful structure and worthwhile emulating. My study combines oral testimony and case studies with
secondary references in a narrative style in such a way that it retains a connection to the people and their experiences.

Furthermore, a narrative writing style that incorporates peoples’ experiences and memories is a better fit to the Indigenous cultural way of passing information from one generation to the next. It gives a closer tie for Indigenous peoples of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada who have handed down their histories through storytelling and dance for thousands of years (Paterson and Karjala, 2003; Struthers and Peden-McAlpine, 2005). The passing on of an oral history by the participants is a comfortable and culturally acceptable way of giving a voice to their story, while allowing for the emergence of national and international themes through analysis of the stories’ thematic areas.

Another reason to use the BTH Report is that it contains data on the number of self-reported physical symptoms of trauma within the case studies. This data was used as a yardstick against data collected from interviews for my research, measuring the quality of interviews across the three countries ensuring they met a standard before the study began. The BTH Report’s data can also be used to compare a number of different measures, such as sexual, physical and emotional abuse, to see how the data within this study compares to my own.

Finally, the BTH Report is easily read. The use of jargon is limited and the language within the document is simple and easily followed by all members of Indigenous communities, in most cases where English language is not a first language. While the Flesch–Kincaid readability scale (Flesch and Gould, 1949) for the BTH Report is unknown, I have kept the readability scale to 12. This means that anyone who has at least 12 years schooling will be able to read and understand this thesis.
3.8. Why not compare South Africa?

Dr Desmond Tutu was widely recognised as one of the world’s foremost advocates for, and expert on, reconciliation (Flourney and Pan, 2002; Graybill, 2002) and in leading the reconciliation movement in South Africa (Tutu, 2000a). As a result, reconciliation has achieved amazing results within that country and has helped lead South Africa out of, and away from, apartheid by developing a new power structure (Gibson, 2004; Wilson, 2001).

Apartheid (1948 – 1994) was the legal system that forced the segregation of non-white from white South Africans (Wolpe, 1972). After apartheid, Tutu was the chair of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Allan and Allan, 2000; Allen, 2008). It is for this purpose that his work is used throughout my thesis. This raises the question of why South Africa is not included in the comparative study of reconciliation.

While we can observe many similarities between South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, there are also many differences that set our three nations apart. For example, South Africa was governed by the minority not the majority, as is the case with Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

Australia, New Zealand and Canada were primarily colonised by the British, who brought with them a British cultural belief system that they imposed on the Indigenous populations. However, South Africa was colonised by the Dutch and British, which resulted in the Boer Wars (1880-81 and 1899-1902 respectively). This meant that both British and Dutch cultures heavily influenced the formation of South Africa. In the South African territories that were under Dutch control, the movement of Indigenous people were limited under the Native Location Act of 1879, (1) and Pass Law (1, 2, 3) (Bickford-Smith, 2003; Bond, 2000; Zealand, 1909). These served as the forerunners to the Apartheid system once the colonies had gained independence in 1910 as the Union of South Africa. As a result, settlement, culture, parliament and legal systems are very different, and Apartheid was codified in law. In many
ways Apartheid went further than comparable systems in: Australia, New Zealand and Canada (Coombes, 2006).

As noted, another key factor for excluding South Africa is that the colonising rulers were in the minority. Indigenous South Africans far outnumbered the non-Indigenous inhabitants. This is contrary to Australia, New Zealand and Canada, where the Indigenous populations were small and, in the case of Australia and Canada, spread over larger areas of land.

Due to variations in access to records, cultural development, government policy and types of colonisation, South Africa was therefore excluded from the study. In addition it was necessary to limit the number of countries for practical reasons in terms of time and access.

**3.9. Research aims**

The research aims are linked to the research questions, which are outlined in section 3.5. The aims of the research study are to investigate reconciliation and the part it plays in improving the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous peoples affected by past government forced removal policies and practices in the wake of the Apology.

It is important to state that while there have been a number of comparisons drawn between the three countries on healing, culture and settlement history; little research has been conducted in the area of analysing and bringing together reconciliation and Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by past forced removal policies and practices.

This would seem to be an important oversight. Reconciliation requires an understanding of how people affected by past forced removal policies and practices feel towards the people and culture (past and present) that have caused the trauma and pain. How can evidence based programs on reconciliation or Social and Emotional Wellbeing be developed and a state of equilibrium within the individual reached?
Social and Emotional Wellbeing is much more than forgiveness, it is about healing, about culture and identity, and about moving past the trauma of settlement and past racial policies (HREOC, 1997; TRC (2012). Is reconciliation the tool? Is apologising enough? There is some evidence that over time apologies can cause damage to the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of the population receiving the apology, due to subsequent action or inaction by the apologiser (Dhami, 2011; Verdeja, 2010).

3.10. Research population issues

The population for this research is Indigenous peoples from Australia, Canada and New Zealand, who have been affected by past governments' forced removal policies and practices. This particular population brings with it a number of difficulties, due to their past experiences. Many have a deep distrust for any form of authority, and experienced trauma in the form of physical, emotional and sexual abuse. They may also have identity issues, which can lead to poor self-esteem and/or a poor understanding of their role within society. These issues can lead to a mistrust of anyone, particularly a stranger asking questions.

This mistrust could influence the way in which they respond to interviews or questionnaires. To help overcome this, the interviewees were selected by a managed process using an Indigenous service. The service introduced the interviewee to the study, interviews were conducted at the same service; the interviewee received an outline of the study; and I identified myself as an Australian Aboriginal. These steps minimised mistrust, allowing the interviewee to feel comfortable at the interview.

3.10.1. Organisational support aspect

The most important tool to help with population issues was partner organisations. Indigenous health, healing, family and educational organisations have already built trusting relationship with participants. The participants were recruited from members of the stolen generation
(Australia), First Nations survivors from residential schools (Canada) and Māori children removed from parents under the New Zealand Welfare Act (New Zealand).

Once a partner organisation was found, they received an overview of the study, which gave them a full understanding of the study and any foreseeable risks to their clients. It also outlined that participants must enter into the study freely without persuasion or coercion, and that all information received from the participant is confidential (Quinn-Patton and Cochran, 2002). Once this was understood by the participating organisation, they were able to identify possible participants.

Utilising these services prepared the participants by giving them information about the research study, such as what their participation would involve, and in a very broad sense what the intended outcomes of the research study would be. Working in this way also served as a way for me to be introduced, which is important as Indigenous relationships are formulated by an introduction. This can be by the two having a relationship with other Indigenous people in common (such as the host organisation), through kinship laws, or even by reputation. Without these, building a relationship in a short timeframe is much more difficult. The partner services helped address this by giving the necessary introduction, and validating the Indigenous status of the researcher and the importance of the research —hence endorsing the study. All this helped build rapport and trust in the researcher/participant relationship, leading to helping the participant to speak freely.

The interview and recounting of their stories was traumatic for some participants. To help minimise the trauma, participants were informed about the reactions they might experience when telling their stories. By using the services and preparing the participants, trauma could be addressed and counselling support offered should it be needed.
3.10.2. Characteristics of participating populations

As mentioned my research population were recruited from Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Apart from the measurable factors such as age and gender for example, each of the three populations had some very different characteristics.

The New Zealand population were hard to interview because they would not talk a lot about the abuse they suffered while in care, and sexual abuse was especially hard for them to discuss. Instead they would talk about this in the third person or about others who were abused slowly bringing their abuse into the conversation. This is the individual trying to defuse their discomfort and normalise the abuse. Most would not spend time with idle conversation, instead wanting to say what they had to say and move on.

I theorise this attitude was due to the Māori experience having less domestic and global attention, and therefore Māori not having the experience of the Aborigines and First Nations peoples, in the telling of their experiences while under the care of the Crown after being removed from their families and culture. Another factor could be the age of the people, with the New Zealand population being the youngest. Younger people often have trouble expressing pain, as pain often turns into anger, which is discussed in the paragraphs below. However, I dismiss age as the defining reason for this anger, as the average age of the New Zealand population was old enough to have developed some level of anger reasoning, and therefore should have been able to moderate their anger while telling their story.

The Canadians were more genial during interviews. They were happy to have a chat about general issues of First Nations communities over coffee before the interview started and, in most cases, once finished. Some would invite me to visit their reservation. On one occasion a participant brought along a cake that she had baked. While most of the stories were full of abuse, the First Nations participants would find a warm and kind way to move through the interview. This is not to say that there were not tears or
anger expressed, but in general this was expressed at the appropriate time and for an appropriate length as described by Cook, Spinazzola, Ford and Lanktree (2005) and Liberzon and Martis (2006). This demonstrates a maturity that neither Māori nor Aboriginals displayed. I am still developing theories on this and believe it worthy of post thesis work. However, Chancellor’s (2003) work on cultural protective factors could at least partly explain the First Nations participants’ attitude, with many of this population living on reservations.

In regards to the Australian population, they sat somewhere in between the New Zealanders and the Canadians in terms of the way they told and expressed their stories. Like the Canadians, the story telling was full of emotional reactions, and the Aboriginal participants would use actions such as walking or pacing to help control their building anger. They were less warm than the First Nations participants, but not as edgy as the Māori in their story telling.

There were also gender differences in how people approached the interview and their story telling. As a generalisation women were more graceful leading you through their lives in a logical way; beginning, middle and end. They would talk about experiences as they occurred within the time line of the story. Generally, men would jump around and often recounted the same abuse more than once, even finishing with it. This is congruent to the gender discourse, ideology and identity as put forward by Wodak (1997).

Anger was a common theme throughout the study. Anger in relation to reconciliation is discussed in section 8.2 in depth. The anger discussed here is the way in which participants expressed anger while telling recounting their story at interview. It gives us insights into how, as a population, people are processing their lived experiences.

The New Zealand population as a whole was very angry and gender was not a moderator. Both male and female expressed their anger throughout the interview. It was common for this population to hit the table they were sitting
at, clenching their fists, teeth and other muscle groups, and to prime themselves with alcohol before attending the interview and on occasion to be drinking alcohol throughout.

Participants were less likely to want to have their interviews in a service, but instead they wanted to have them in private, and often this occurred in my motel room. Many used avoidance behaviour and often not show for their interview, rescheduling, often two or three times. While one cannot state that this was out of anger toward any particular subject, avoidance behaviour is associated with anger (Burton et al., 2012, p. 277).

3.11. Ethics

3.11.1. Ethical processes

This research study followed ethics guidelines as laid out under the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans*, and the *Values and Ethics - Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research*, developed by AIATSIS, due to its obvious Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander content. High on both of their priorities are ethical issues of consent and confidentiality. Other ethical concerns are harm-minimisation and non-malicious behaviour, and beneficence—the research has to have some positive benefit to the community, respect the rights of the individual, and justice—particularly equity. These issues were addressed in both the AIATSIS and ANU ethical processes. Ethics approval letters from AIATSIS and ANU are at Attachment 1 and 2 respectively. To ensure that participants were well informed a plain English statement and a release of information form were given to all participants before any information was gathered.

3.11.2. Forms under ethical pathways

Research participants freely consented to enter into the study, without being coerced or unfairly pressured in anyway. Participants were well informed about what their participation would entail. They were comforted that if they
wished to decline there were no penalties, as per AIATSIS ethics guidelines (AIATSIS, 2012).

Each person who participated in the study was given a plain English statement and a release form which contained information on informed consent. These forms served to inform participants of their rights in relation to the research study and a number of ethical issues.

3.11.3. The plain English statement

As part of the AIATSIS ethics approval pathway, I prepared a plain English statement to explain what the study was about, who was eligible to participate, what was going to be collected, and what the results would be used for. The statement was written in plain English so that participants could read and understand it. For people who were unable to read the document, it could be read to them.

The plain English statement also served as a permission to contact. As discussed in section 2.7, partner organisations were approached to help find participants, and when a potential participant was identified, the organisation gave the person a copy of the plain English statement. Participants were asked if they were comfortable to provide their contact details on the form, and for the partner organisation to pass their contact details onto me, so an appointment could be arranged.

3.11.4. Release of information

All participants were presented with, and asked to sign, a release of information form. This is a standard type form as set out under the Privacy Act 1988, which details a number of requirements that must be observed when designing a release of information form. All these requirements were met in the form’s design, including name and address of participant, duration that the release is valid for, what is covered under the release of information, and what the information/data will be used for.
3.11.5. *Informed consent form*

Informed consent addressed the AIATSIS ethics guidelines by informing participants that participation in the study was voluntary and that there would be no payment for their service. The informed consent form addressed their rights associated with: having their personal information treated with respect and confidentiality; authorship and distribution of research results and intellectual property; culturally restricted information that would not be collected; withdrawing from the research study at any time; the complaints process for the study; and the perceived benefits of the study.

Participants were encouraged to ask questions about any subsection or the whole document. This helped ensure they understood what they had read before signing. The informed consent form can be found at Attachment 6.

3.11.6. *Community negotiations*

Apart from listing community consultation to define the research parameters, ethical guidelines also contain principles on the need for the research to benefit the community, and access and use of the research results (AIATSIS, 2012; NHMRC, 2007).

This study considered each community and organisation that engaged in the consultation, by assisting to plan, guide and inform the study, as partners, in much the same way as the research panel. There has been an undertaking to return the results to each organisation once the study is completed. Further to this, to help benefit communities, data will be treated as three data sets, so that each country can maximize the findings for their own use. Where professional and academic relationships are similar, ongoing and future partnerships in this field have been flagged.

Individuals are also treated as partners, but a number of participants have been given a different undertaking. Each participant received a copy of their
recorded story, as an MP3 file on a USB stick, as it is and will always remain their story.

Participants who wished to remain informed about the study were asked to leave an email address, so that where possible an electronic copy of information could be sent. Where email addresses were unable to be given people will be able to receive information through the organisation that referred the person to the study. By giving this undertaking, individuals remain informed and can see how this research can make a difference.

3.11.7. Ethics approval pathways

The Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies has developed best practice Guidelines for Ethical Research in Australian Indigenous Studies (AIATSIS, 2012). Contained with these guidelines are a number of points that researchers should follow when researching Indigenous Australians. Clauses include consultation, negotiation and mutual understanding:

1. Consultation, negotiation and free and informed consent are the foundations for research with or about Indigenous peoples.
2. The responsibility for consultation and negotiation is ongoing.
3. Consultation and negotiation should achieve mutual understanding about the proposed research (AIATSIS, 2012).

The Values and Ethics - Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research, have a number of other steps that complement AIATSIS ethics pathways. Research must be culturally appropriate and be able to adjust the research methodology to conform to participating community values and aspirations. It also states that:

Where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander institutional structures exist; these should be used as the best means of community and institutional engagement by researchers, both in dealing with communities and in seeking Human Research Ethics Committee approval. (NHMRC, 2003, p. 15)
With both ethics pathways in mind, letters were sent to a number of Indigenous health, healing, and Social and Emotional Wellbeing organisations in the three countries of interest. The purpose of these letters was to introduce the researcher and the intended research study, including an outline of the proposed aims and methodologies. The letters then went on to ask each organisation for their support, and who they considered the best institution, apart from ANU and AIATSIS, to gain ethics approval through, if they were needed. It also asked for an opinion on the purpose and need for such research, and for endorsement of the study. Of those organisations that responded, all supported the study, without any clarification or amendments. The Assembly of First Nations, Canada’s peak First Nations representative organisation and the New Zealand National Ethics Advisory Committee, an independent body advising the New Zealand’s Minister of Health and Ethics, informed me that only one ethics clearance was needed.

Ethics approval was sought and approved at The Australian National University and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.

On undertaking fieldwork in Canada’s Alberta province with Treaty 7 Management Corporation, they had just started seeking ethics clearance pathways for any research conducted within the treaty area. This was not discovered until the first meeting with the Treaty Management group in Calgary. The clearance process took two weeks and as I was already known to Treaty 7, due to months of emailing and phone contact, they allowed me to present a shortened ethics application with an out of session verbal presentation to the ethics committee.

### 3.12. Survey

Halloran (2007); Pedersen, Clarke, Dudgeon and Griffiths (2005); and Pedersen, Beven, Walker and Griffiths et al. (2004); have in the past used surveys to establish Australians’ views on reconciliation, collective guilt, and empathy. Pedersen, Clarke, Dudgeon and Griffiths (2005), for example,
asked the question ‘do you know any Aboriginal people?’ The questions asked within these surveys were directed at non-indigenous Australians in relation to how they felt about Indigenous Australians, reconciliation and the past treatment of Aboriginal Australians.

While my study is looking into Social and Emotional Wellbeing and apologies, I thought it would be important to gain Indigenous perspectives. Using Halloran’s reconciliation working through the Apology, and Pederson et al. (2004) National Empathy and Racism questionnaires for reference, I compiled my own set of question for Indigenous peoples about Social and Emotional wellbeing and apologies, and their relationship to reconciliation (Barkan and Karn, 2006; De Grieff, 2008; Hatch, 2006).

While the data was collected across three countries, there were minimal changes to the survey between countries except for country name and the name of the country’s Indigenous peoples. This was due to the similarities in each country’s policies on its Indigenous populations and the outcomes of the policies on that population. Given this and the comparative nature of the study, the survey was kept as close as possible for each country.

The resulting survey tool consisted of four different subsets of questions: personal information (8 questions), reconciliation (10 questions), national empathy (5 questions), and racism (5 questions). A copy of the Australian questionnaire is at Attachment 5.

**Personal information**
General personal information was requested from each participant, gender, age group, Indigenous identity, the area where they lived, and if they and/or a sibling were removed. Given that only people who were removed from their family could participate in the study, the last two questions were qualifiers: if they did not identify as being removed then they were removed from the study.
Racism
Questions were asked about perceptions of how non-Indigenous people treated the participant and the closeness and working relationship of any contact.

Participants used a seven point scale based on the Schwartz value system (Bilsky and Schwartz, 1994; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). For each subset of questions the scale values were reversed. This should have stopped participants from using the same numbers from previous subsets of questions, in much the way that the Halloran (2007) survey did on the same subject. As Halloran (2007) had used this method of scaling, it was important to also use this scaling, as I had designed the study using this subset of questions. However, many people became confused by it and sort clarification on how to the complete the survey.

Reconciliation
This section asked 10 questions about views on reconciliation, how they feel and felt about the apology, and the national view on Indigenous contributions to the national identity. They were asked to answer using a five point sliding scale similar to the previous questions: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, and 5 = Strongly Disagree.

National empathy
This section concerned itself with the perception of their nation’s regret for the past treatment of Indigenous people and how best to repair the damage of past treatment. The use of the reverse scale was again employed, using a five point sliding scale, as above.

3.13. Sample size
Whether using quantitative and qualitative research methods, the aim of the sample size is the same: to gain a large enough group to test questions within a population (Punch, 2013). In terms of sample size, quantitative
research tends to require large samples, while qualitative is the opposite and requires only small population samples (Punch, 2013).

As it would not be possible within the scope of this study to survey the entire study population, a sample survey method was employed. Participants taking part in the survey were recruited from members of the Stolen Generations in Adelaide, Alice Springs, Canada, Sydney and Melbourne, and Residential Schools Survivors in Winnipeg, Fort Frances, Sault Ste Marie, Montreal and Vancouver, and New Zealand welfare victims in Auckland, Rotorua, Wellington, Hamilton and Dunedin.

Due to the nature of data collection tools used in this research study (qualitative and quantitative) a compromise on sample size was required. Typically qualitative research sample size is small at around 10 to 15 people. One way of identifying the saturation point of a qualitative research study is to keep interviewing until no new themes emerge. (Bricki and Green, 2007; Savenye and Robinson, 2005). However, with quantitative sampling there is no real way to gauge an acceptable sample size. Statistically it is beneficial to understand that unless you survey the entire population, the people in your sample will not represent all the people in the chosen population. Therefore, in terms of minimising sample bias, the larger the sample size in comparison to any given population the smaller the bias.

Bacchetti, Wolf, Segal and McCulloch (2005a, 2005b) have undertaken work on research sample size and lower power. Under conventional statistical (qualitative) research the power level goal is between 80% or 90% (Bacchetti et al., 2005a, p. 105). Bacchetti et al. (2005a) go against the conventional principle of large qualitative samples, as when the issue of mean reliability and power were studied they determined that power above 80% is flawed. They argue that the value estimates, confidence intervals, or potential meta-

---

2 Statistical power is the likelihood that a study will detect a relationship difference (effect) when there is an effect there to be detected. If statistical power is high, the probability of making an error, or concluding there is no effect when, in fact, there is one, is less likely.
analysis, are a balance between studies value and the burdens accepted by the existence, do not get better when sample size is larger. Therefore the argument for large sample size for ethical reasons is flawed.

Due to these factors and the nature of the study, I determined a suitable sample size was 30 people from each of the three countries. Bacchetti et al. (2005a), state that this is the lowest sample size possible to collect quantitative data. This figure is also close to that of an acceptable qualitative sample size. This will allow for each country to have its own minimum sample, so that the results can be used as a standalone data set. Once the three populations are joined it will equal a 90 sample dataset, which will improve the bias limitation further (Bacchetti et al., 2005a, 2005b).

The sample selection method was determined by a number of factors including, the questions posed and what data needed to be collected (Savenye and Robinson, 2005; Taylor et al., 1998). Sample selection was purposive in that only Indigenous Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders who were removed from their family and culture were eligible to participate in the study.

3.14. Data analysis

3.14.1. Data analysis tools

Due to the mixed methodology of this study, two data analysis tools were utilised to mine the data collected. They are, SPSS to analyse the survey results and Nvivo to analyse the ethnographic data.

The reason for the choice of data tools was determined by the fact that this research uses in part, the works of Halloran (2007) and Pederson et al. (2005). Therefore the same data analysis tool was also used, that is SPSS.

As the quantitative side of this study has no comparative database, Nvivo has been used to assist with the analysis of the ethnographic data. This
organisational tool has been used to select and quantify themes out of the long narrative structure of the in-depth interviews. Further discussion on these databases can be found at the point of data analysis.

3.14.2. Participants' demographic data

This section presents the demographic findings of the 93 (30 Australia, 30 New Zealand, 33 Canada) research participants.

Gender
The gender distribution of male to female participants was not statically different to that of the nations they represented. Canada’s participant gender percentage for participants was male 60%: females 40%, compared to the Canadian national average for First Nations male 59% and female 41% (Government of Canada, 2013). New Zealand participant gender ratio of male 60%: female 40%, compared favourably with the New Zealand Māori gender distribution.

For Australia, the participants gender distribution was different and showed that the gender percentage of participants was male 27%: female 73%, compared to the Australian Aboriginal gender distribution of 50:50 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010). The sample gender imbalance was expected, as more females than males were removed under Australian Policies (Edwards and Read, 1989; Kamien, 1978; Read, 2010). Another reason for this is the age of the participants (discussed in section 2.14.2.2) and the difference in life expectancy between Aboriginal males, at 69.1 years, and for women at 73.7 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013)

Age
Participants for Canada and Australia were older than their respective national averages. For example, 51% of First Nations and 30% of Aboriginal participants were aged over 65 years, whereas, the national average for First
Nations Canadians is 6% over 65 years, and 5% of Aboriginal Australians over 65 years (Australian Bureau of Statistic, 2010).

Differences in average ages between the two countries, is due to two factors: policy age and population increases. The first is the age of the policies. The research population has to be at least the same age as the end date of the policies or older, to participate in the research. For example, in Australia the policies finished in 1973 (HREOC, 1997), so participants need to be 40 years old or older. In Canada, the last residential school closed in 1989 (TRC, 2012), meaning that the Canadian participants could be as young as 26 years old. The second is that the size of the Indigenous Canadian and Australian populations have been increasing over the last few decades, bringing down the average age of the population as a whole (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013; Statistics Canada, 2011).

The percentage of Māori participant over 65 years was the same as the national average (Statistics New Zealand, 2012).

Regionality
The regional distribution of the participants varied. In Australia and New Zealand, there was a similar regional distribution with the majority of participants living in city areas. However, Canada has a more even distribution across city, rural and remote regions.

This distribution is in contrast to the national regional distribution data for each country. In Australia, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population is spread across the country fairly evenly with 32% of people living in major cities, 43% in regional areas, and 25% in remote areas (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2012). In New Zealand, the national Māori distribution revealed that 85% lived predominantly in an urban setting, with 12% in rural and only 3% in remote (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a, 2013b).
In Canada, however, the Indigenous population distribution is difficult to sort into urban, rural and remote areas. This is due to the way Canadian First Nations’ peoples are categorised. For example, First Nations is broken into on-reservation and off-reservation, with 62% of First Nations’ peoples living on reservations. At the time the living arrangement data was collected, there were no urban reservations. Of the 38% of First Nations living off reservations 21% were in an urban setting, 17% rural and 10% remote (Statistics Canada, 2007).

3.14.3. Why not investigate current religious affiliations?

This research study is looking at five key questions as outlined in section 1.1.2. The key questions are primarily concerned with how the apology has affected the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of the research population. While religious groups have played an integral part in the removal and treatment of children, they are not investigated as part of this study and this is identified as research that should be undertaken in the future.

3.15. Conclusion regarding methodology

I have developed an Indigenous culturally situated research methodology that addresses the characteristics unique to an Indigenous research project. Issues that were addressed in this design included the lack of existing scholarly literature, impact of government policy on cultural groups and individuals, variations in ethical processes, and overcoming the impact of previous culturally insensitive research conducted in Indigenous communities across three countries and multiple Indigenous cultures.

As a culturally situated researcher, I am embedded in the research process rather than looking in on it. This required the development of strategies to minimise internal bias and maintain research integrity while conducting research within the subject groups. Additionally, I designed qualitative and quantitative research methods for data collection and analysis tools, sample populations, and ethical processes to address the Indigenous cross-cultural contexts. These were modeled on the BTH Report model, and focus on
narrative text. Return of research to Indigenous communities, means that the document must be able to be easily read by non-academics.

My status as Wiradjuri enabled me to design and implement strategies to show the appropriate respect for Indigenous peoples and their culture, and to overcome a number of communication and attitudinal barriers. I structured the research to gain a level of trust so that participants were confident in providing information and relating personal histories and events that were traumatic and highly personal.
4. Policies of removal

This chapter describes some incidents that will provide insight for future Indigenous and culturally situated researchers in terms of methodology and practice. A description of the early contact of Indigenous and settler groups provides a background for the intent of removal policies by each country’s governing body. Limitations of space mean that the overviews are necessarily brief. Readers within each country may find that they are basic sketches containing very familiar material but this will not necessarily be true for those living in other sites. In adopting a general narrative approach I am mindful again of the need for the thesis to be accessible to the indigenous participants in the research and their communities.

The interactions and impact of early settlers\(^3\) with the Indigenous peoples of each of the three countries, Canada, New Zealand and Australia was different for each country. Canada’s First Nations, Inuit and Métis were relatively peaceful. By the time colonisation occurred, the Métis’ were already an established culture in their own right (Peterson and Brown, 1985). New Zealand had seal and whaling trade (Taonga, 2010) before the Waitangi Treaty was signed. Australia fared more poorly, with settlers’ main interaction was to massacre or forcibly remove the Aboriginal peoples (Elder, 2002). Each country eventually moved to a point where the policy makers and the general public viewed Indigenous peoples as inferior to the settlers. Consequently, settler governments developed policies of removal from traditional lands and finally the removal of children from their parents, in an effort to destroy Indigenous culture. Understanding the intent behind the policies is as important as understanding the mental, emotional and sexual trauma caused to individuals and communities.

\(^{3}\) The term Settlers is used through this section for constancy. In New Zealand there were settlers under the Treaty of Waitangi. Under the treaty the Crown purchased land form settlement.
4.1. Assimilation

The Oxford Dictionary (2014a) definition of assimilation is: ‘regard as or become similar, of the same kind in appearance, character, or quantity, without being identical’. At various times since settlement, forced assimilation policies have been implemented in all three countries: Australia (Merging and Assimilation Policies, and the White Australia), New Zealand (White New Zealand Policy) and Canada (Indian Act). These policies are outlined in detail later in this chapter.

The aims of these policies were to have Indigenous people become more British, by taking away cultural and linguistic knowledge and educating Indigenous children in the western education system. The policies stripped away feelings of empowerment, identity, efficacy and social position and safety. The BTH Report (1997) and the Response, Responsibility, and Renewal Report (2009), both resulting from independent inquiry, called the policies and practices genocidal.

The inquiry process of consultation and research has revealed that the predominant aim of Indigenous child removals was the absorption or assimilation of the children into the wider, non-Indigenous, community so that their unique cultural values and ethnic identities would disappear, giving way to models of Western culture. In other words, the objective was `the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, and the economical existence of Indigenous peoples (Monchalin, 2016, p. 131)`. Removal of children with this objective in mind is genocidal because it aims to destroy the cultural unit which the convention is concerned to preserve (HREOC, 1997, p171).

*The genocidal practices range from outright attempts at physical extermination to residential school imprisonment, involuntary sterilisation, destruction of our food sources and land bases, endured segregation through incarceration, and the perpetration of ethnocide* (The Aboriginal Healing Foundation et al., 2009, p. 94).
This is an important point, and goes to the three assumptions put forward by Janoff-Bulman (2002), ‘the world is benevolent’; the world is meaningful and the self-worthy’. It also speaks to the intent behind the policies that is to assimilate Indigenous culture into British culture in an effort to erase it from the society.

4.2. Canadian policies

In Canada, as in Australia, civilisation of Indigenous adults was considered futile. Residential schools were the policy of choice, as they could reshape the identity of First Nations, Inuit and Métis children (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008b) making them more like the British that had colonised Canada. Residential schools worked under the assumption of colonial superiority. Children were not allowed to speak their native languages or practice spiritual or cultural ways of life (TRC, 2012).

Religious organisations were running residential schools before confederation in 1867 without any formal agreement. From 1867 they were run under The Indian Act (Branch, 2012). Residential schools were managed by four main religious organisations: Methodists, Catholic, Anglican and Presbyterian churches (Dickason, 1992; TRC, 2012). The last of the residential schools closed in 1996.

Children in residential schools were often traumatised by not being able to practise their cultural beliefs, but also through sexual and physical abuse, fear, exhaustion, degradation, and threats (Brant-Castellano et al., 2011). It is hard to accurately predict the number of children who passed through the

---

4 In today’s society benevolent usually refers to some form of charity. Benevolent when referring to society’s values is so much deeper. It refers to kindness, understanding, sympathy love and general good. ‘The world is benevolent’ therefore refers to a society that has a disposition that loves, is kind and values the individual.

5 Self-worth is more commonly known as self-esteem. It refers to the way a person sees and evaluates their position in society as an individual. Psychodynamic theories link self-worth to personality traits and other psychopathological personality disorders. These affect how the individual interacts with the world.

Weiten, W., Burton, I., Kowalski, R. 2004. Psychology: Themes and Variation and Thomson/Wiley (chapters 11 and 17) provide more detail about ‘self worth and personality traits’.
Canadian residential school system. However, the Aboriginal Healing Foundation Canada (2005) estimates that between 105,000 and 207,000 children were removed and placed into the schooling system. Other estimates place it at approximately 150,000 (TRC, 2012).

4.2.1. Residential schools

The boarding schools system in Canada has a long history, starting in the early 1600s (Willow, 2012). These schools were established by the missionaries and operated out of small Indigenous settlements. However, it was not until the mid-1800s that Indian residential schools as we now know them began operation. These schools ran until as late as the 1980s (Sutherland et al., 2014). During this period police were given the power to remove children from their homes and force them to attend school (Wasserman, 2005; Willow, 2012). This was governed by the 1877 Indian Act, which made all First Nations children wards of the state (Miller, 2013), making the Crown responsible for their education (Claes and Clifton, 1998; Willow, 2012).

In setting up the residential school system, the government formed a partnership with a variety of religious groups (Morrissette, 2003, 2008). These were established on the premise that First Nations peoples were a substandard population (Willow, 2012). The main process was built on assimilation, and civilisation (Wasserman, 2005). After studying the American day system, Duncan Campbell Scott, the Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs, came to believe that the influence of the ‘wigwam’ was too great. He was convinced that if the federal government was to assimilate Indians they would need to be removed from their families and culture (MacDonald, 2007; Wasserman, 2005), and that this must be done when they are very young (Willow, 2012).

The partnership agreement between the federal government and the churches provided the churches with the responsibility to administer the day-to-day running of the schools (MacDonald, 2007). While this agreement also
covered operational funding, churches would ‘economise on expenditure’ (Morrissette, 2008). This practice meant that the government could save on their expenditure of items such as food, which meant that children were be deprived of adequate nourishment and consequently subjected to cruelty (Morrissette, 2008; Wasserman, 2005).

The government and the churches could ignore these economising measures as they were trying to rid Canada of the ‘Indian problem’ (Miller, 1996). In 1920, Duncan Campbell Scott contended that ‘in order to get rid of the Indian problem, the objective would continue until there is not a single Indian living’ (Wasserman, 2005). Amendments to the Indian Act 1920, made it compulsory for all children aged between 7 and 15 to attend school. The amendments also gave power to clergy, government agents, and the Royal Mounted Police to remove children from their homes (Wasserman, 2005). This policy lasted until 1951, when the Indian Act was again amended. This new amendment marked the end of compulsory attendance at residential schools and allowed for First Nations children to attend integrated public schools (Wasserman, 2005).

Due to poor record keeping there has been some debate as to how many First Nations children actually passed through the residential school system. As noted, the numbers vary. Miller (2004, 2013) has estimated 100,000; Wasserman (2005), 250,000. Many children did not return home (Simon, 2010).

All this occurred to fix the Indian problem and as a result, Indian children were deprived of their culture, language, spirituality, and identity (Morrissette, 2003, 2008). Many commentators agree this was responsible for the creation of a ‘multitude of social ills’ and intergenerational trauma faced by First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples (MacDonald, 2007).
4.2.2. Inquiries

The Indian problem in Canada has, for most of Canada’s history, remained unspoken and even kept secret. Celia Haig-Brown is credited with being the first academic to give voice to Residential School Survivors in 1988 (Wasserman, 2005). Haig-Brown’s (1988) Resistance and Renewal: Surviving the Residential School System was based on First Nations peoples’ experiences and memories of residential school.

Haig-Brown was not the first to write about residential schools. In 1993, the Canadian Royal Commission on Aboriginal People had a staggering 60,000 complaints about residential school abuse (Wasserman, 2005). However, it took the Canadian Government five years to respond to the Royal Commission’s report. In 1998, Minister Jane Stewart read a statement of reconciliation; included in this statement was the announcement of the Aboriginal Action Plan, which was meant to address these complaints (Willow, 2012).

Even with the Aboriginal Action Plan, it took a decade and a legal class action against the government for an agreement of compensation to residential schools survivors to be reached (Wasserman, 2005). The Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement as it is called cost a total expenditure of C$1.9 billion. This funding went to common experience payments for former students, compensation to those experiencing the most horrendous levels of abuse and violation, and the formation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission for a period of five years (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008a; Willow, 2012). The closing chapter of the class action occurred in June 2008, the Government of Canada, led by Prime Minister Harper, gave a formal apology to the residential school survivors of Canada (Willow, 2012).

4.2.3. Education

Milloy (1999) cites multiple correspondence and reports between the government and churches, stating that government offices and clergy clearly
understood the issues of trauma and poor education within the residential school system. Churches complained of inadequate funding to keep qualified personnel, upkeep and maintain buildings and other assets, and/or the inability to feed and clothe students. Milloy (1999), states that the formal response made it clear that the government’s primary focus was to save money, not to educate or maintain student health. As a result, there was poor management and neglect on both sides (Milloy, 1999). Even in the face of this evidence, non-Indigenous Canadians still thought that ‘they were superior’ and that they knew what was best for First Nations Canadians (Milloy, 1999; Milloy and Angel, 1999) and the status of First Nations children did not change.

Most of the available literature is littered with findings of residential school students having suffered various forms of abuse (Milloy, 1999; Wasserman, 2005). Once they had completed schooling, many students were released and sent home without their language or culture, and furthermore most did not possess any real vocational or academic qualification. The education of these children also did not include basic social, parenting, or other life skills (Wasserman, 2005) that would have been passed on through the parents and community.

4.2.4. Abuses

As mentioned, Canadian authorities and religious groups removed First Nations children from their homes, community and culture, forcing them to relinquish their languages (Miller, 2004, 2013; Milloy, 1999) and spirituality, placing them in institutions where they were subjected to loneliness and disintegrated from their way of life. Evidence suggests that many of the children were exposed to, and suffered, verbal, physical, and sexual abuse at the hands of the authorities and other internees.

The official school age for Canadian children was 7 to 15 years, however many children were sent to residential school much younger than this (Miller, 1996, p. 289). The abuse did not stop once children arrived at school, where
they had their heads shaved (boys), their clothes removed and they were deloused, and given a uniform. This uniform most often had been previously used (Wasserman, 2005).

Over the course of the year in the residential schools, many children would receive severe punishment such as being locked in cupboards and surviving on bread and water for days at a time (Willow, 2012). Conditions and punishment were so harsh that ‘some never returned’ home (Simon, 2010). In 1913 the then Indian Affairs Minister Duncan Campbell Scott, acknowledged that a staggering 50% of children who passed through the Residential School system did not live to see the benefit of the education they received’ (Schwartz and CBC News, 2015). The Honourable Chief Justice Murray Sinclair, head commissioner of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation commission, stated that the Federal government stopped recording the deaths around 1920 after the chief medical officer at Indian Affairs suggested children were dying at an alarming rate (Goodman and Gonzalez, 2015; Puxley, 2015).

4.2.5. The 60s Scoop

The residential schools were not the only assimilation policy or practice within Canada; the 60s Scoop as it is known, was another. In 1951 the Canadian Government amended the Indian Act, giving responsibility for First Nations peoples’ health and welfare to the provinces (Milner, 2001). This resulted in welfare workers coercing First Nations mothers to give up children deemed to be neglected and adopting them into white families (Milner 2001). Children who were adopted would often be sent to a different province or to families in the United States of America and even overseas to countries in the United Kingdom and Europe (Carniol, 2005; Goldstein, 2013; Harper, 2003; Sinclair, 2003; Smith, 2009). While it may be called the 60s Scoop, it began in earnest in 1959 and did not end until the 1980s (Marshall, 2015).

In many instances, children were removed from their families and sent to work in various institutions. Milloy (1999) estimates that up to 40% of children
in residential care were forced to work at Children’s Aid Societies during holidays instead of returning home to loved ones. By the end of the 1980s as many as one in three First Nations children had spent years working for the State (TRC, 2012).

Supporters of the 60s Scoop argued that there were high levels of alcoholism and child sexual abuse within reservations (Milner, 2001). However, given that in 1951 the Indian Act was amended to rescind compulsory attendance at residential schools, I would argue that the time frame between the amendment and the start of the 60s scoop was too short a period for people to adjust their thinking about the Indian problem and therefore the 60s Scoop was another form of assimilation policy and practice.

Political measures started long before the 60s scoop. From the 1600s under the British Imperial Crown (Waite, 2006) and then later the ‘Crown in the right of Canada’ kept strict political and legal control over First Nation peoples. During the 1950s, and especially the 60s and 70s, the relationship between euro-Canadian and First Nations was grossly one sided. First Nations peoples experienced loss of control over their decision making processes, and for the environment with which they had coexisted and lived off for thousands of years (Carriere, 2005; Simon, 2010, 2011).

My contention is further supported by Sinclair (2007, p. 1) who states that First Nations children were removed an adopted in European families, who could offer the child a better life, under the ‘assumption that native people were culturally inferior and unable to adequately provide for the needs of the children’. Nowhere is culture linked to this better life. Sinclair (2007) points out what these white families could not teach or maintain the children’s identity as an Indigenous person. The loss of identity, and culture, combined with many children being subjected to emotional, physical and sexual abuse, and racism from adoptive families and schoolmates, has left many feeling confused of not knowing if they belong in Indigenous or mainstream society (Sinclair, 2003, 2007).
4.2.6. **Control**

Many have referred to the residential school and other policies and practices of assimilation within Canada as cultural genocide (Churchill, 2004; Grant, 1996; MacDonald, 2007; Miller, 1996, 2004). MacDonnell (2007) focuses his work on the similarity in treatment of First Nations Canadians to that of Jews under the Nazi policies. MacDonnell’s work is backed by Smith (2007) and Stannard (1993).

During the Canadian colonial era, all First Nations peoples living along the Newfoundland coast were forced to flee due to conflict and starvation (Marshall, 1996). The Micmac people of Nova Scotia were massacred by the spread of poisoned food (Miller, 2004) and MacDonnell (2007) also argues that diseases, such as measles, were not introduced by accident. Slave labour, forced marches, and poor working conditions were also engineered to cause death.

Whether or not the First Nations’ experience should be compared to that of the holocaust, the results are the same. However, unlike the Jews suffering under the Nazis, First Nations Canadians have never been presented with the opportunity to regain their full statehood (MacDonnell 2007).

4.2.7. **Treaty**

From first contact between First Nations Canadians and European settlers, there has been a one sided relationship, at least at the highest levels. Consequently the Indigenous peoples’ way of life and culture has been affected badly, due to European-style laws being forced upon them (The making of Canada, 2014) through the Indian Act. The Indian Act was not the only policy tool and, over the period from 1871 to 1975, minor and major treaties were used to manipulate First Nations peoples. The first treaty, *Faye and Northern Welbeck agreement*, was a simple farming agreement. However as time passed, the treaties became more complex. Eventually the government had treaties in all territories; with the last treaty being the Inuit agreement in 2005 (Simon, 2010).
The Inuit treaty, in the far North West of Canada, gave rise to the province of the Nunavut Territory and other regional and municipal governments. With a majority of Inuit people in these structures, the treaties gave power over land, water and wildlife (Simon, 2010) back to the First Nations.

While treaties have been redesigned and reshaped, or even broken and ignored by the government, they have at least given a set of rules that form the basis for the relationship between First Nations peoples and euro-Canadians. Where they have been maintained and honoured, they have enabled self-determination of First Nations people.

During this discussion of treaties, I have referred to First Nations peoples that include Inuit and Métis peoples. However, it should be noted that the Métis peoples of Canada have not yet been offered a treaty.

4.3. New Zealand policies

4.3.1. Treaty

The Treaty of Waitangi (the Treaty) was signed on 6 February 1840, (Lauder and Wylie, 2011; Ross, 1972). The Treaty was engineered and written by James Busby who represented the British Crown and was able to negotiate with Māori people because he was fluent in the Māori language. Busby wrote two documents, one in English and the other in Māori language. The treaty was collectively written because the Crown representatives did not speak or read Māori and the Māori Chiefs could not speak or read English (Belgrave et al., 2004; Orange, 2011). Thus two documents comprised the Treaty: an English version and a Māori version.

Busby sought acceptance of the Treaty of Waitangi documents by obtaining signatures from Māori chiefs. Although Busby conducted negotiations with 500 Māori chiefs, many of them declined and refuse to sign the Māori version of the Treaty (May, 2002). In addition, once the Treaty was endorsed, the entire territory of Aotearoa New Zealand was proclaimed a British colony and
all Māori people were considered British subjects, whether they had signed or refused to sign the presented Treaty document (May, 2002; Orange, 2011). This assimilation procedure was reinforced by the Native Rights Act of 1865 (Belgrave et al., 2004; Bourassa and Strong, 2002; Orange, 2011).

The Treaty of Waitangi had three clauses that promised that:

- the values of Māori must be respected and protected (the Article ii promise); and
- affirmed the rights of Māori to be Māori and upheld Mauri Ora.

Guarantees were therefore made in the Treaty about the role of Māori cultural identity, and the Māori rights to participate in society. (Kawharu, 1989; Orange, 2011; Stokes, 1992). There remains a great deal of uncertainty and differences of opinion about what this Māori sovereignty meant. The English version of the Treaty has Māori yielding sovereignty to the Crown. The Māori version has Māori protecting Tino Rangatiranga, Māori government, ownership of land and cultural sites (May, 2002).

As more and more settlers arrived, breaches in the treaty became evident; land became an issue because the Māori refused to sell. This resulted in the land wars, which ran from 1843 through to 1872 (Wairau 1843-46, Hutt Valley 1846, Whanganui 1847, North Taranaki 1860-61, Waikato 1863-64, Tauranga 1864, South Taranaki 1864-69, East Coast/Central Plateau 1865-72)(Lange, 1999; Sinclair, 2013).

A hundred years later, Māori people had little traditional land left, their language and culture had started to decline (Hooper and Kearins, 2004; Sinclair, 2013). As a result of the spread of infectious diseases and the musket (1807-1845) and land wars, the Māori population had declined by approximately 40,000 people. This sparked a new era in Aotearoa New Zealand when Māori people and their culture was dwindling away and they were no longer the majority of the population (Lange, 1999; Sinclair, 2013; Sorrenson, 1956; Zodgekar, 1975).
The Waitangi Tribunal was established in 1975, to hear claims of breaches of the Treaty (May, 2002; Wyeth et al., 2010). This quasi-judicial body was given power to investigate breaches by the Crown of the principles of the Treaty. These principles were ‘partnership, reasonableness, acting in good faith and obligations binding the Crown’ (Wyeth et al., 2010, p. 306). Many claims against the Crown resulted in the return of land, rights to natural resources and compensation (Tribunal, 1985, 1986, 1987).

4.3.2. Policies

Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi, Tino Rangatiratanga, gave the Māori the right to self-government and to be equals to the Crown. For most settlers, the notion of equality and power sharing of this new land with the Māori was inconceivable despite what the Treaty stated. This led to breaches of the Treaty by settlers, almost immediately upon arrival, and many more breaches occurred in subsequent years.

For the most part, Māori peoples were expected to leave their language, culture and traditions behind to become assimilated into the new British society (Consedine and Consedine, 2012). Evidence of this is seen in the number of policies passed by government that ensured British rule. Between 1865 and 1890, some 360 Acts were past in parliament which affected Māori land, a further 199 Acts were past between 1891 and 1908 which affected a wide range of issues all relating to Māori (Maaka, 2003; Walkinton, 1998).

Unlike Australia and Canada, New Zealand had no racially based laws that specified for children to be removed from their families and culture just because they were Māori (this is not to say that Māori children were not removed). However, in 1907 the policy of assimilation was put in place. This forced Māori to move away from their culture and language (Armitage, 1995; Cooke et al., 2007). Like Australia and Canada, the government used education as the tool for integration and assimilation; this will be discussed later in this chapter.
European settlers regarded Māori people as being a substandard population (Ballara, 1986). Similar to attitudes to First Nations Canadians and Aboriginal Australians, most New Zealand settlers viewed Māori people as being lazy, dirty and depraved (Blaut, 1993). The following interview extract from a Hamilton woman suggests that this thinking continued in the 1960s and 1970s. Her pakeha (non-Indigenous) family, the one that she was adopted into, had the same stereotypical views that influenced her attitude to her own race.

…for me, was probably - the fitting in was easier with my pakeha family, but the fitting in with Māori, my own culture, wasn't. I was always seen as though they're untrustworthy, they're dirty, they don't have flash houses. So those were my judgments already set up (Māori Female, Wellington).

4.3.3. Land and war

Before 1840, whalers, sealers, missionaries and loggers came to Aotearoa New Zealand to exploit its rich resources. Trade developed between the Māori people and the Europeans and some Europeans decided to stay and live alongside Māori communities (McNab, 1913; Ryan, 1997).

The trading of guns to the Māori changed relations between Māori tribes. This led to the Musket Wars (Ballara, 2003; Crosby, 2012). These wars dramatically changed tribal boundaries and allowed the Crown to take Māori land. In this early period muskets were not the only thing taking Māori lives. Over the next two decades the introduction of diseases (similar to those which decimated Aboriginal Australians and First Nations Canadians) led to a sharp decline in the Māori population. Wyeth, Derrett, Hokowhitu, Hall and Langley, (2010), state that as many as one in five Māori people died during this period. However Taonga and Pool (2015) states that in 1841 there were 80,000 Māori people, this declined to just over 40,000 by 1891.

Conflict between Māori and the Crown over land began as early as 1849, just nine years after the signing of the Treaty. The Crown purchased three blocks of land: Port Cooper, Port Levy, and Akaroa. Under this agreement Māori
thought that they retained ownership of the land, but under English interpretation they had relinquished title (Consedine and Consedine, 2012). Māori have a custom of Tuku Whenua, which consists of the terms Tuku, Hook and Hoko. Tuku means, to let go, Hook, to sell and Hoko was a temporary gift. The confusion was the differences in the meaning of these terms (McLean, 1990). Land was often the spark that led to skirmishes due to Māori and non-Māori interpretations of land ownership and use.

From the mid-1850s, land became an issue in Aotearoa New Zealand, because Māori people refused to sell land. In 1858, new settlers formed the majority of the population for the first time. They expected more land to be made available to them. When Māori refused to sell, the Land Wars began (Ballara, 2003; Ryan, 1997).

A short time later in 1865 the Native Land Act was created. Under this Act large amounts of land were sequestered from the Māori people and sold to the new settlers (Bourassa and Strong, 2002). In 1909 the Act was amended to make land acquisition from Māori even easier (Boast, 1999; Bourassa and Strong, 2002).

4.3.4. Early education and removal

From the first wave of settlers and the development of a new society, the missionaries and the churches started to remove young Māori children from their families and culture to attend schooling. The intention of the church was to teach a Western way of life under Christianity and that the children would return to Kainga (home) taking with them their new found lifestyles (Durie, 1998).

Apart from religion at these church-based boarding schools, girls were also taught domestic duties, such as cooking, cleaning and other domestic labour skills. These skills were reinforced when the girls would work within the school in areas such as the kitchen and laundry. The Māori boys would be potential breadwinners and therefore were employed in fulltime low paid
work, fitting to their lower class status. Children received an English middle class Victorian education (Jenkins and Matthews, 1998) that fitted in with their daily work regime.

From the 1800s until the 1940s, the Crown entered into education with the church in a combined effort to assimilate Māori to the Western way of life (Jenkins and Matthews, 1998). While there was no enforced length of time a child had to stay at school, many of the children were removed from distant locations, and could not go home to be with their families on weekends or during other holidays. Given the relatively small volume of research in the area of Māori child removal for education, it is difficult to measure what impact these boarding schools had on the Māori children and their culture. However, the New Zealand system of assimilation and child removal for education had similarities to those in Australia and Canada. Durie (1998, p300) states that; ‘Schools were to prove one of the principle agents of this assimilative intent’. Here children were taught ideologies of European culture and language, (Jenkins and Matthews, 1998), and Māori culture was suppressed (Durie, 1998).

In 1844, the New Zealand Government introduced the Native Trust Ordinance, which outlined the Crowns obligation to Māori. In part the Ordinance read:

‘…whereas great disaster have fallen upon uncivilised nations on being brought into contact with Colonists from the nations of Europe, and in undertaking the colonisation of New Zealand her Majesty’s Government have recognised the duty of endeavouring by all practicable means to avert the like disasters from the Native people of these islands [New Zealand] which object may be best obtained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the Native to those of the European population’ (Native Trust Ordinance., 1844, article 10).

The Native Trust Ordinance was New Zealand’s formalised assimilation policy. Its aim was to establish a new class of native that followed the English cultural and moral norms of the day (Jenkins and Matthews, 1998; Smith,
2001). It is worth noting that the Crown used the word native until 1947, when it replaced it with Māori. Jenkins and Matthews (1998, p. 86), reported that schools for Māori were not truly for education but as a vessel to fast track assimilation.

The New Zealand Government introduced the Native School Act in 1867. Under this Act, English language was compulsory for all Māori students as part of the Department of Education policy when it became responsible for ‘Māori assimilation through education’ (Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974; Smith and Simon, 1998).

Jenkins and Matthews (1998, p. 89) state that there is good evidence that the Crown wanted the education of Māori girls to focus on domestic work while they attended denominational boarding and native schools. This set them apart from non-Indigenous girls in state schools. In 1931, the Inspector of Native Schools stated:

*It does not appear that any attempt to teach all the subjects prescribed for the public schools is likely to be beneficial for the Natives…. They have a good deal of instruction in health, hygiene, and moral teaching that is not necessary in most public schools. Again, it is also advisable that an adequate amount of time should be given to manual training that there is little time available for such subjects as history and geography* (Government of New Zealand, 1931, p. 2).

As shown, there was no attempt to teach the same set of subjects across native schools as were taught in non-Māori state schools. The extract provides evidence that the Crown treated Māori through the distorted lens of racism. The intent of teaching Māori students was to focus on the need for hygiene and moral lessons, and to prepare them for their station in life as domestic workers (Jenkins and Matthews, 1998).

In the years after the Musket and Land wars, the New Zealand Government moved its interest in Māori education away from middle aged children to kindergarten educational programs. The rationale at the time was that the
education of young Māori children was the way to make them undertake moral reforms (this is much the same thinking as in Australia and Canada). The attention to early childhood education created an ever changing shift in perceptions of social status. In the 1950s,

....children not attending preschool came to be regarded as unfortunate, by the 1960s deprived or disadvantage, by the 70s disenfranchised and by the end of the century at risk as a potential problem for society (May, 2002, p. 2).

These social attitudes reflect the shifts in social thinking and give some insight into how Māori children were regarded, noting too that all Māori children attended preschool (May, 2002).

4.3.5. Welfare payments and racism

Māori have been discriminated against since the signing of the Treaty. For example, in 1898 the New Zealand Government started the first aged pension, for over 65 year olds. The pension was means tested, and only given to people of good character (Carpenter and Riley, 2014). Accordingly many Māori were not deemed eligible because people regarded them to be dirty and poor. In 1904, New Plymouth magistrate Thomas Hutchinson made a decision to pay a reduced rate of the pension for Māori from a standard rate of £18, to £12, a reduction of a third of their entitlement (Consedine, 2012). This demonstrated that these Māori people were not considered of good character and were considered below the standard recognised within the euro-New Zealand society of the time (Evans et al., 1996; John and Willmore, 2001).

4.3.6. Child welfare

The management and protection of children within New Zealand falls under Department of Child Youth and Family (CYF) services. CYF has been shaped through government policies which reflect the political, social and cultural norms of euro-New Zealand society (Families Commission, 2014).
Before the 1960s, Māori whanau (family) were seen to be accountable for the welfare of the child and there was no removal of Māori children from the family under welfare legislation. Peppering began in the 1960s and is a term used to describe the practice of scattering individual Māori throughout suburban New Zealand. Removing Māori individuals and family units away from their tribal housing conditions caused a break in tribal customs and support because the Māori extended tribal unit were no longer able to support and rely on each other. As part of New Zealand’s assimilation policy, peppering brought Māori families to the attention of CYF services because Māori were left to raise their children outside the Māori tribal unit (Libesman, 2004).

Other government policies failed to consider Māori culture during their design or implementation. The Adoption Act 1955, the Guardianship Act 1968, and Children and Young Persons Act 1974 did not take into account Māori childrearing customs, nor were they designed to do so (Mikaere, 2002). These Acts all focus on the idea of the mono-cultural child, in which the child comes first. This way of thinking contrasts with Māori culture in which the child is an important member of the whanau, and iwi (tribe) and should never be separated from it. This placed Māori people at a disadvantage in the welfare system (Love, 2002; Mikaere, 2002).

4.3.7. Childrearing

Trocme’, Knoke and Blackstock (2004) found that Māori people are more likely to be investigated for child abuse and maltreatment than the non-Māori populations, and that these investigations were more likely to be substantiated. Māori children who have been removed are placed in care for longer periods with their files kept open. Fischler (1980) states that the Native American population experienced similar injustices due to the fact that state agencies did not understand Indigenous childrearing customs and practises.
The cultural differences between Māori and Euro-New Zealander lifestyle, behaviours, family models and childcare meant that psychological modelling and interventions of the early 1940 and 1950s should not have been applied to Māori. From the late 1960s armed with a misguided understanding of Māori child care, and overlaid with poor psychological and political understanding (May, 2002) of Māori welfare, government agencies started removing Māori children from their homes and culture (The Māori Perspective Advisory Committee, 1988). By 1981, 12.3% of Māori children had been removed from family care. Investigation suggests that under state guardianship, Māori made up a staggering 53% of all children 0-17 years had been assigned to foster care or adopted out, and most were placed in pakeha homes (Families Commission, 2014; May, 2002).

*The Puao-Te-ata-Tu* (1988) was a report commissioned by the Ministerial Advisory Committee for the New Zealand Department of Welfare. It identifies *institutionalised racism* as a key issue in the Department of Social Security and their practices. They state that 'at the heart of the issue is a profound misunderstanding or ignorance of the place of the child in Māori society and its relationship with the whanau, hapu and iwi structures' (The Māori Perspective Advisory Committee, 1988).

### 4.3.8. Breast feeding

Historical accounts demonstrate that Māori infants were looked after by extended family members within the tribal unit. Babies were always breastfed and if for some reason the mother could not, other mothers within the unit would wet-nurse the child. There were even cultural ways of fostering and adopting children, or *whangai* as it is known in Māori society (Glover et al., 2007).

Following overseas trends, breastfeeding began to decline in the early 1900s as it was seen as being unfashionable among middle and upper class women. In the early 1900s, two pieces of legislation affected the breastfeeding patterns of Māori women. The Infant Act 1908 made it illegal for
others to breast feed for more than seven consecutive days without a licence to be a foster parent. This stopped the cultural practice of wet nursing (Breastfeeding New Zealand, 2014; Glover et al., 2007). Furthermore, this legislation gave rise to a number of false beliefs among Māori woman, such as it is illegal for Māori to breastfeed. This belief is still widely held among Māori today (Glover et al., 2007).

The other piece of legislation was the Native Land Act 1909, which stopped the Māori custom of whangai. These new laws influenced the way that Māori raised their children (Gemmell, 2013; Hart, 2007). These Acts did not take Māori customs into account, and hence contributed to racist practices and formed part of the assimilation policies. Some traditional Māori practices of infant care still prevail, for example the ritual burial of the placenta. This practice reinforces the relationship between the newborn child and the land (Glover et al., 2007).

Trocme’, Knoke and Blackstock (2004) states that welfare workers and others employed in the welfare system do not have the necessary skills to address the symptomatic problems faced by Indigenous people in colonised countries. As a result they remove children from their families and culture. This practise is supported by the political reluctance to address the primary drives of poverty, disempowerment, loss of parenting practice, intergenerational trauma and grief (Trocmé et al., 2004).

Another factor that contributes to the removal of children from their families and culture is what McIntosh (1989) calls white privilege. White privilege is a set of euro-Western assumptions that dictate the universal and normal behaviours within New Zealand social structures. McIntosh (1989) describes white privilege as ‘an invisible package of unearned assets. White privilege is like an invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, code books, visas, codes, tools and blank cheques’. In essence, as the coloniser and majority population non-Indigenous people use their cultural and moral norms as an advantage over Indigenous peoples. In New Zealand white privilege influenced immigration, assimilation and integration policies,
all of which benefited euro-New Zealanders and marginalised Māori (Consedine and Consedine, 2012).

4.4. Australian policies

Pre-federation colonial governments and missionaries removed children from their homes, and placed them into the service of settlers (HREOC, 1997). In 1814, Governor Macquarie funded the first Aboriginal children’s school. At first the reaction by Indigenous peoples in the area was positive and supported the school, however, this was short lived. Aboriginal families became hostile when they realised that the purpose of the school was to distance its students from their families and culture (HREOC, 1997).

The influx of settlers and the movement across traditional lands meant that Aboriginal people were more visible. Settlers believed they had a right to the land and were authorised to take it by force. The quest for land resulted in many Aboriginal people being massacred. When news of the treatment of Aboriginals by the settlers reached the British Government, it formed a select committee in 1837 to look into the treatment of Aboriginal people in the colonies (Elbourne, 2004; Neu, 1999; Shaw, 1992). This resulted in the formation of a protectorate system. The system was based on the assumption that Aboriginal people would become self-sufficient through farming small agricultural blocks. These parcels of land, based on small English villages, became known as missions. It was thought that once Aboriginal people were moved onto these missions they would not interfere with the settlers and their land claims. The missions were set up with educational facilities for young Aboriginal boys and girls. These were to be run by missionaries, hence the name missions (HREOC, 1997).

By the middle of the nineteenth century, this protectorate experiment had failed. Aboriginal people had been forced off their traditional lands, without the resources to remain self-reliant, and therefore Aboriginal peoples became dependant on government rations. They were unable to find paid work, and as malnutrition and the introduced diseases increased, Aboriginal
populations declined across the colonies. The general thinking was that Aboriginal people were in decline and the survival of the race was being questioned (HREOC, 1997; Peterson, 1998).

The gradual separation of Australia from British rule did not improve the Aboriginal peoples’ situation. On 1 January 1901, Australia combined the six colonies to become a nation, with rights of self-government under the Commonwealth (Grimshaw, 2002; Meaney, 2001). Under the newly formed Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, the federal government did not make legislation in regards to Aboriginal as people nor would Aboriginal people be counted in the census (Korff, 2014), and in 1902, the Franchise Act took the vote away from Aboriginal people at the federal level (Korff, 2014). Every state and territory, except Tasmania, introduced protective legislation giving the Chief Protector or Protection Board extensive power to control Aboriginal peoples (HREOC, 1997).

This failure of governments to acknowledge Aborigines as people led to practices that undermined Indigenous culture. In most states and the Northern Territory, the legislation displaced the parents’ rights and made the Chief Protector or Protection Board the legal guardian of all Aboriginal children. The government also funded and appointed managers to run the missions. Once established, the government relied on its legislation to monitor the missions. Monitoring and enforcement of this legislation fell to the local level, which were most often the policemen. This meant that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples were ruled in every way; their movements on and off the missions were regulated, as was employment. This also extended to who could marry who, which interfered with the Aboriginal kinship system—a long held system of marriage that stopped bloodlines from being crossed. The mission area resulted in its own loss of culture and Identity.

6 Policemen, is used in this way, to represent the time period in which this occurred.
4.4.1. Control

From the time of invasion, the colonial authorities developed laws that controlled Aboriginal peoples. This came out of the assumption that ‘Aboriginal people were the lowest form of life’ (Elder, 2002, p. 75), and that ‘…the abject state in which the Aborigines live should place them at the zero of civilisation’ (Elder, 2002, p. 75). It is not surprising that in many of Australia’s states (New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia) Aboriginal people were managed under the Fauna and Flora Act (HREOC, 1997; Pearlman and Gibson, 2007).

In Australian states and territories, many laws meant that white people could go in and just take the land for farming and other agricultural endeavours (Elder, 2002). When this occurred, Aboriginal people were displaced from their traditional ceremonial and hunting grounds, that is if they were not shot (Elder, 2002).

Additionally, Australian legislation affected Aboriginal people by being designed to segregate the blacks and the whites in towns across Australia. As a result, Aboriginal people were segregated in swimming pools, public transport and other public areas, such as hotels and meeting rooms (Elder, 2002; Neu, 1999; Peterson, 1998; Shaw, 1992).

4.4.2. Separation

Missions were not the only mechanism for controlling Aboriginal people. Legislation was developed to remove children from their families under both merger and assimilation policies (HREOC, 1997). By 1937, children of mixed descent were routinely removed from their families and culture and placed in church operated institutions or were adopted-out to euro-Australian families (similar to Māori and First Nations children). This was dependant on the colour of the child’s skin, as it was believed that fair skinned children could more easily be assimilated into modern euro-Australian society (HREOC, 1997). These children became known as the Stolen Generations (as discussed in section 3.2 and 5.4.7).
4.4.3. **Stolen wages**

Over the period of a hundred years, between the late 1800s into the 1970s, many Aboriginal people were for all intents and purposes treated as slaves. The *Aborigines Act 1905* (Western Australia) and the *Native Welfare Act 1963* (Victoria) (Affairs, 2013), enforced that working-aged Aboriginal people were made to work, with their wages and land holdings held in a complex system of trust accounts (Affairs, 2013). ‘There is little or no evidence that these wages were ever returned’ (Affairs, 2013). Wages never made it to the individual, as they were stolen by corrupt state and territory government officers, and or the employer and the church (Demosthenous et al., 2006; Kidd, 2006).

Reparation was made difficult because the government and the churches blocked access to personal records at every turn. The ‘reluctance to pay the monies withheld’ locked Aboriginal people ‘into a cycle of poverty’ (Korff, 2014).

4.4.4. **Lands**

The inland movement of settlers encroached on traditional Aboriginal hunting grounds across the country, compounding the pressures for the survival of the Aboriginal race. Having limited access to clean water and traditional food sources, vast numbers of Aboriginal people became malnourished. Disease then spread as the body’s immune system were suppressed because of their poor state of health (Elder, 2002; HREOC, 1997).

The dispossession of traditional lands was unrelenting and continued for generations. By the late 19th Century and into the 20th Century, missions had become overcrowded. By the middle of the 20th Century, the government started closing down the missions due to the overcrowding and increasing costs of maintaining the reserve system. Mission residents were forced to move to the outskirts of towns and cities, or to live in government subsidised
housing (Peterson, 1998), these relocations came to form part of the merging policies (HREOC, 1997), which are discussed further in sections 4.4.7 and 4.4.9.

Land theft has had a profound effect on Aboriginal people across Australia. The process of taking the land, removal of children, establishment of missions and the massacres of Aboriginal people led to the reduction of the Indigenous population, loss of culture and language, and has disrupted their relationship with the land.

4.4.5. Disease

British settlers brought epidemic diseases that were not previously known on the continent that decimated the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population. Aboriginal people had no immunity to measles, smallpox, influenza, chickenpox and typhoid. Another introduced infection was venereal disease, (Elder, 2002) this lowered the fertility and birth rates of the Aboriginal population (Campbell, et al, 2007; Gracey and King, 2009). The prevalence of diseases helped with the rapid decline of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations.

There is continuing debate as to whether these diseases were introduced into Australia intentionally or non-intentionally. The evidence presented in regards to Canada would suggest that the British at least knew of the devastation these introduced diseases would bring. Not only in death rates, but also in terms of fertility and wellness. What is evidentially certain from the available literature is that the introduction of diseases rapidly reduced the Aboriginal population, contributing to the opinion that the Aboriginal people would die out (Elder, 2002; Gracey and King, 2009).

4.4.6. Massacres

The available literature suggests that from the landing of the first British ships on Australian shores there was violent conflict leading to many massacres. No state or territory within Australia can claim they are without such incidents
While Aboriginal people fought back, the firepower and other warfare tactics (Elder, 2002) of the British were too overwhelming for the Aboriginal peoples. Initially there was some curiosity and peaceful interaction between the local Aboriginal people and the people of the First Fleet. This soon turned into conflict as the British settlers made claims over land, especially by clearing it (Butlin, 1983; Elder, 2002). Elder (2002, p. 75) cites the story of Mahroot of the Botany Bay tribe as evidence of the impact of this conflict. When Mahroot was born, around 1795 there were approximately 500 members of his tribe, however by 1845 there were just four.

Over the course of the first hundred years of colonialism there were many massacres of Aboriginal peoples across Australia. Elder (2002) lists 18 massacres within his work *Blood on the Wattle*. Of these, at least four meet the criteria of genocide; genocide of Van Diemen’s Land or the Black Line, Massacre of the Wiradjuri, Nunn’s Campaign and Mahroot’s story. Elder (2002) states that the last recorded massacre of Aboriginal people occurred in 1928, 27 years after the Commonwealth of Australia was formed.

### 4.4.7. Stolen Generations

The BTH Report distinguishes between merging and absorption policies (discussed further in section 4.4.9) and practices which saw Aboriginal children separated from the parent’s culture and communities and placed into institutions, where schooling and forced work occurred. Or, there are the assimilation policies (discussed further in section 4.4.10) where Aboriginal children were fostered and adopted into middle class European families. Regardless of the type of policy, the result was the same—the Stolen Generations. This phrase can be traced back to Peter Read (2010) when he released his pamphlet on the subject.

While the removal of Aboriginal children from their families dates back to the start of British settlement (Elder, 2002), under Federation it is commonly accepted that merging and assimilation of Aboriginal children started in 1910.
Similar to situations in Canada and New Zealand, the children of the Stolen Generations were removed from their families, and placed in state/church run institutions, or in foster care and adopted into euro-Australian families (Hudson, 1999; Read, 1981). While no-one has been able to give an accurate number, the BTH Report (1997) states that between 10-30% of Aboriginal children were removed and placed into out-of-home care over this period. It does not matter whether the number of children removed was large or small, all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in Australia have been affected by the policies of forced removal.

4.4.8. **Tasmania**

Tasmania did not follow the other states and territories in the practice of merging and assimilation. By the beginning of the 1900s, Tasmania had relocated most Aboriginal families off the Tasmanian mainland. Most were separated from non-Aboriginal people and removed from their traditional lands to be effectively jailed at Cape Barren Island (HREOC, 1997).

However there are two points in Tasmanian history where Aboriginal children were stolen. Between 1814 and 1819, the kidnapping of Aboriginal children was common, as settlers used children for slave labour (Ryan, 1981). Again in 1930, Aboriginal children were removed from Cape Barren Island and from their parents under welfare legislation and this practice continued until the late 1990s (HREOC, 1997).

4.4.9. **Merging and absorption**

By the end of the nineteenth century, while the Aboriginal population of *full descent* were in decline, the population of mixed descent was increasing. It was decided that children of mixed heritage, due to their European blood line, could have a place in modern Australia (Elder, 2002; HREOC, 1997). It was also evident that Aboriginal Australians of mixed heritage were becoming a drain on government resources. Forcing mixed heritage people

---

7 The use of the term full and mixed descent is used as this is the terminology used within the Bringing Them Home report.
into work was seen as a way to address two issues; it would stop the drain on government resources and would add to the new Australian economy by introducing a source of cheap labour (HREOC, 1997). Culture and identity were never considered.

However, Aboriginal Australians do not identify as European but stay strongly linked to their Aboriginality, no matter what the mix of blood they have—an attitude that is still prevalent today, not only in Australia, it is in line with the United Nations Declaration and criterion on Indigeneity. The government of the day was fixated on merging Aboriginal children of mixed descent with that of the European population; however this proved to be very difficult. ‘Clearly they recognised the strength of the family bonds they were trying to break’ (HREOC, 1997, p 28). And they did.

Much care was taken to ensure that Aboriginal children never again saw their parents or families. New names and identities were often given to the children; children were moved great distances away from the families, and in many cases they were removed from the state (Van Krieken, 1992). It was thought that by forcibly removing Aboriginal children from their families and culture, to work for non-Indigenous people, that this mixed descent population would eventually merge with the mainstream population (HREOC, 1997).

It was the view of the government that the colour of the skin was the key to merging; the lighter the skin of the child, the more likely it would be for them to be merged into non-indigenous society (Buti, 1995). There was debate about the correct age for removal of the child, so that it was able to merge move effectively. The South Australian Royal Commission of 1913 could not agree on whether children should be removed at birth or to wait until they reached the age of two years (HREOC, 1997).

Another method of making Aboriginal people merge was to change the definition of Aboriginality. Anyone who had more than a fraction of European blood was classed as non-Aboriginal, and forced off the mission, away from
their family and culture. This tactic was used in Victoria and New South Wales. In fact it was used so often that McCorquodale (1986, p. 1) found 67 definitions of ‘Aboriginality’ in 700 pieces of legislation.

This forced absorption of the newly non-Aboriginal did not take into account discrimination by the euro-Australian against the Aboriginal person. People were denied social security benefits or the ability to find work. This led to the rise of shanty towns on the edge of townships and missions (HREOC, 1997).

To top this off, New South Wales and the Northern Territory governments separated children of mixed descent from their families by placing them into ‘training institution’s before sending them to work’ (Indigenous Law Centre, 2006). In South Australia, children of mixed descent were either sent to institutions that had been established for euro-Australian children, or missionaries would take the children into their own schools, due to the uneasy relationship at the time between the church and the state government (Hampton and Mattingley, 1992).

The ultimate goal of the merging and absorption policies for children of mixed descent was the removal of culture and reproductive control from Aboriginal people. This meant that Indigenous girls were especially targeted. Once removed, they were sent to work as domestic servants as cheap labour (Read, 1981). They were made to work long hours with little financial reward and were shunned by non-Indigenous workers.

Due to a lack of funding from the federal government, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples on mission were ‘constantly hungry, denied basic facilities and medical treatment and as a result were likely to die prematurely’ (HREOC, 1997, p. 31).

4.4.10. Assimilation

The first time that that Aboriginal affairs was discussed at a national level was in 1937 at the Commonwealth-State Native Welfare Conference
(HREOC, 1997). While state and territory Chief Protectors would seek advice from each other about the *Aboriginal problem*, until this point there had been no national gathering.

The BTH Report (1997) states that, the Western Australian, Queensland and the Northern Territory Chief Protectors controlled and dominated the discussions. By the end of the conference all states and territories, except Tasmania (as they did not attend), agreed with the Western Australian Chief Protector A. O’Neville, that the focus of Aboriginal affairs should be on mixed heritage Aboriginal people, as they could ‘ultimately be absorbed’ into white society (HREOC, 1997). Children of mixed heritage would be educated to the same standard as mainstream white children and were expected to take their place in society.

This marked a new era as states and territories started to drop the merging and absorption policies in favour of assimilation. The difference between the two policies is that merging and absorption policies denied Aboriginal peoples access to the land so that cultural practices could not be performed, in the hope that they would merge with the euro-Australia. Assimilation, on the other hand is a more aggressive and intensive process, where the government would scrutinise Aboriginal peoples’ lives and judge them from a Western viewpoint (their heritage). Assimilation was considered from a socio-economic model (Australian Human Rights Commission, 1997, p32), as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander culture and peoples were seen as having nothing of value.

### 4.4.11. Removal under child welfare legislation

According to the BTH Report (1997), the first state to move on the outcomes of the conference and develop child welfare laws of Aboriginal children was New South Wales. From 1940, Aboriginal children were removed from their families under general child welfare legislation and had to go through the court system. However, once separated, children were treated differently to non-Indigenous children, as they then became wards of the ‘board’ (referring
to the NSW child protection board) and not of the ‘state’ (Parliamentary debates on the 1940 Act quoted by NSW Government submission, BTH Report )(HREOC, 1997).

The Board was given powers to ‘establish … homes for the reception, maintenance and training of wards’ (HREOC, 1997, p31). Any Aboriginal child that left these homes or left employment was punishable by the children’s court of NSW. Under these new laws, it was also illegal for parents of Aboriginal children to make contact with their children (HREOC, 1997).

The Australian Capital Territory (ACT) engaged NSW and the board to manage their Aboriginal children, under the auspices of the 1905 Neglected Children and Juvenile Offenders Act - which ran until 1954. After 1954, and up until 1968, children in the ACT were managed under the Commonwealth Child Welfare Ordinance 1954. However, children were still placed in foster care or board run institutions within NSW (ACT Government interim submission, Australian Human Rights Commission, 1997) (HREOC, 1997).

In 1941, the Commonwealth permitted the child endowment to be paid for Aboriginal children. Instead of Aboriginal parents receiving this endowment, it was given to institutions and foster parents (HREOC, 1997, p31). This allowed state run institutions to receive funding from the Commonwealth, which they previously did not have access to.

By the late 1940s, all other states and territories had followed NSW and were applying child welfare laws to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island children, while still treating these children differently to non-Indigenous children. Not much had changed; the same people (that is police officers) and the same welfare staff and protectors, were still removing children from their families—just under neglect laws, which were divided from a Western family viewpoint. Aboriginal parents still had their children removed. Due to poor socio-economic factors, these children remained marginalised and living on the edge of society, while efforts were seemingly made to ‘absorb their children into non-Aboriginal society’ (Armitage, 1995, p67).
In 1951, the third Native Welfare Conference was held. This conference agreed that assimilation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island was still the aim and that it needed to be hastened (Hasluck, 1953). From this time on until the 1960s, Aboriginal assimilation was increased and greater numbers of children were removed from their families. Removal was not only for neglect; children were also removed to attend school. These schools were located in different towns, as far away from the parents as possible. Children were also removed for ‘medical treatment and to be adopted out at birth’ (HREOC, 1997, p 34.).

Due to the increased removal rate, institutions could not cope and therefore Aboriginal children were increasingly placed in foster care with non-Indigenous families. ‘A baby placed with white parents would obviously be more quickly assimilated than one placed with black parents’ (HREOC, 1997, p. 34). At least, this was the thinking of the time (Edwards and Read, 1989).

The result of the 1967 constitutional referendum saw Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people counted in the Australian Census and given the right to vote, and gave power to the Commonwealth to make legislation in Aboriginal affairs (HREOC, 1997). That same year, the Federal Office of Aboriginal Affairs was established in Canberra. This office was set up to administer and allocate grants for Aboriginal welfare programs to each state and territory.

Integration was the new system, at least in theory, if not in practice. As with the move from protector to welfare legislation, the practices remained the same and established organisations and structures were used for this new integration system. Another reason that the same systems remained was that the states and territories were unsure of what integration was to be achieved (Altman and Sanders, 2002).

It is commonly accepted that the policies of assimilation finished in 1973 (HREOC, 1997; Sheehan, 2012), though there is some anecdotal evidence
to suggest that some states were still removing children from their families after this date (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2012; Lateline, 2003).

4.5. Concluding statements on policies

As I have outlined in the above overviews, each country's policies of forced removal were implemented during different periods of history and vary greatly between nations. As each country began to become aware of the issues of trauma, pain and guilt suffered, not only by those who were removed but also by the nation, new policies were designed.

While Australia and Canada had defined removal policies aimed solely at Indigenous people, New Zealand did not. Instead New Zealand chose to use a number of policies to manipulate Māori away from their culture family practices. This relied on the general brief that Māori were morally inferior and family units did not raise child in the appropriate Western model. This led to Māori children being placed in foster care and institutions under welfare policies. The initiative used to remove children from their families and culture though is somewhat moot.

What is important is that in all three countries, the disconnection of family and culture has given way to trauma. This trauma is compounded by the way in which children were treated while in the care of the state, with physical, emotional and sexual abuse being common. This has culminated in generations of Indigenous people suffering from the scars of these policies and practices and experiencing diminished Social and Emotional Wellbeing.
5. Trauma and its impacts

5.1. Introduction

This chapter will discuss anxiety disorders and their symptoms, as outlined by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM V) (Association and others, 2013, p. 5). It will also investigate research into disorders not covered under formal diagnostic guidelines, including the impacts of trauma on children, adolescents, and adults. Understanding trauma will help bring into perspective why Indigenous individuals and communities harbour feelings of mistrust, anger towards government and authorities such as the police.

Working through the many layers of trauma is complex, as communities and individuals suffered global trauma under the removal policies. From the outset, Indigenous peoples suffered under assimilation policies (Canada, 2012). While in care, many suffered physical and emotional abuse. I argue that many have been traumatised by the knowledge and the aims of the policies. For example, the BTH Report states that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were aware of the government intention of genocide (HREOC, 1997). This also affected the emotional stability of the wider Indigenous community, not just those removed from their families. This, I believe is an important consideration for reconciliation, as the majority of Indigenous peoples will view reconciliation through a lens of trauma and mistrust.

5.1.1. Defining trauma

Fiddly (1985) and Atkinson (2007) define two clearly different but related areas of trauma. 1) Psychological trauma is an emotional state of discomfort and stress resulting in memories of an extraordinarily catastrophic experience, which shattered the survival centres of invulnerability to harm. 2) Trauma behaviours are a set of conscious or unconscious actions and
behaviours associated with dealing with the stresses of catastrophic trauma. This includes the period immediately after the event.

5.1.2. **Theories in framing trauma**

Derrick Silove is a key writer in the field of trauma analysis. His work on post conflict trauma and mental health treatment models also form the basis for my thinking around the consequences for people affected by assimilation.

Developing his work around healing following trauma in the mid-1990s (Silove et al., 1995), Silove (2005) finalised his decade long research with the *Survival and Adaptational* framework. The framework hinges on his concept of five things that need to be addressed in order for a person or a community of people to heal following a traumatic experience. These are: 1) safety, 2) attachment, 3) identity and role, 4) justice and 5) existential meaning. I find it very concerning that only the concept of justice is partly addressed in the apologies offered to the Australian, Canadian and New Zealand’s Indigenous peoples.

Indeed, when discussing elements of an apology, it will become clear that justice is the only element that correlates with Silove’s healing framework. This would indicate that apologies are about addressing reconciliation and not healing. Healing would be addressed within the construct of the new relationship.

5.1.3. **Betrayal trauma theory**

Betrayal trauma theory as theorised by Freyd (Freyd, 1994, 1998; Freyd et al., 2007), builds on Silvove’s trauma analysis. However, it places the importance of the child/caregiver relationship over other psychological responses to trauma. Betrayal trauma theory deals with the practical matters of forgetting (a type of amnesia) over the more cognitive principles of memory retention (DePrince et al., 2012). Forgetting allows the victim to remain attached to the caregiver who is vital to the child’s development,
ability to thrive, and ultimately its survival (Becker et al., 2003). An example of this theory would be: a person who breaks a leg while hunting with friends. They will lay and wait for help, as the pain tells the body not to move and therefore do more damage. But if the same break occurs while alone, the body would override the pain to allow the person to seek help. The person would be able to move to find help. The need to survive overrides the pain intended to limit further damage.

Fraser’s (1997) work also informs my thinking about this study. In order for a child that has been removed under welfare policies to fit back into society and operate as a whole person, the safety, justice and identity issues of that child must be addressed.

Litz, Orsillo, Friedman, Ehlich and Batres (1997) and Roathbrum (2001) investigated how patterns of betrayal lead to the development of persistent negative behaviour. They suggest that the trauma of betrayal as experienced through forced removal cannot be looked at on a plane with a single axis as outlined in the DSM V (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Freyd (2007) explains that the relationship between a child and its care giver/s is critical to that child’s capacity to maintain an inherent trust in their safety and security in broader society, for Indigenous people this is non-indigenous people. If there is a significant breach in this trust, the child will withdraw to protect its survival goals, which is the basic mechanism of human survival. This is an emotional survival mechanism in children, which will cause them to withdraw and retreat from society in order to maintain life. These works have common themes of; safety; and when the individuals cannot physically protect themselves, they do so through a psychological method.
Becker et al. (2003, p.185) describes this as:

*analysis of the evolutionary pressures, mental models, social cognition and developmental needs suggest that the degree to which the most fundamental human ethics of violating can influence the nature, form, and process of trauma and responses to trauma.*
Becker et al. (2003) work on the premise that betrayal trauma theory is logical, as the issue of memory is a fundamental question when relating to child trauma. ‘What would we expect to happen to information about child trauma’ (Becker et al., 2003)? To be highly motivated by trauma and betrayal when we have the option to choose who to further interact or socialise with, is a positive psychological motivator. But, when an individual does not have that choice and needs to engage with the perpetrator in order to survive, forgetting\(^8\) then becomes the mechanism for survival (Becker et al., 2003).

Betrayal trauma theory assumes that where trauma is inflicted by the child’s caregiver, the trauma is much more likely to create environments conducive to memory recovery. This means that the victim may relive the trauma or induced memory loss, or forget where trauma is inflicted by a stranger (DePrince et al., 2012). This forgetting is reasonably common. It explains why victims of assimilation policies either forget or recall vividly their experiences depending on which response was conducive to survival, and if the perpetrator was the primary caregiver who inflicted the trauma.

Kestenbaum and Brenner’s (1996) work on child and adolescent trauma found that, of the studies on child/adolescent trauma, infants suffer more devastating effects due to trauma than do their older adolescent counterparts. This is due to the separation of the child from the primary caregiver. Adolescents and older children have experienced a longer period of healthy development before they went into care, which provides a protective quality. Adolescents also have a greater sense of invulnerability, rebelliousness and willingness to explore, making them more resourceful.

\(^8\)I use the word forgetting instead of amnesia throughout this chapter. This is because both words have different meanings within psychology. For further reading on this you may choose to look to Larry Squires 1981, Two forms of Human Amnesia: an Analysis of Forgetting; or, RD McKee & LR Squires 1992 works in the Journal of Neuroscience, Equivalent forgetting Rates in Long Term Memory for Diencephalic and Medial Temporal Lobe.
5.1.4. Post-traumatic stress disorder

Generalised anxiety disorders are a group of disorders that are common and often diagnosed among trauma victims (Burton et al., 2012). Perhaps the most well-known disorder under anxiety is post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). PTSD is a potentially debilitating anxiety disorder triggered by exposure to traumatic experience such as an interpersonal event of physical or sexual assault, or finding a body or someone who has committed suicide. It has also been described as occurring among individuals from foster homes and residential institutions.

PTSD is commonly diagnosed among trauma victims, due to its definition. According to the American Psychiatric Association, PTSD develops after someone is exposed to an extremely traumatic event and they react to the event with intense fear, horror or hopelessness (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

People who were placed into institutional care, such as survivors of the Stolen Generations, residential schools and institutionalised Māori, are often given a diagnosis of PTSD; a diagnosis similarly given to Vietnam Veterans (Brasfield, 2001). The available literature informs us that the rates of PTSD were 15% male and 12% female for Vietnam survivors (Douglas, 1993; King et al., 1998), yet I could find very little information on the rates of diagnosis on the Stolen Generations or residential school survivors. There is data on PTSD and childhood sexual assault, single event trauma and general population data that could be used to apply a comparison. Within the general child population, Cohen (2010) argues that at any time 9.2% of the children (0-18 years) would meet the criteria for PTSD. McClosky and Walker (2000) reported that 24.6% of children who suffered a single event trauma meet the criteria for PTSD. Wolfe et al. (1994) found that 48.9% of children had been sexual assaulted and met the criteria of PTSD.

Intrusive symptoms of people with PTSD include: distressing thoughts or images; nightmares about the event; acting as if the traumatic event is re-
occurring; intense psychological distress; and physical symptoms such as sweating, muscle tension and rapid heartbeat when exposed to things that trigger memories of the traumatic event (Jones et al., 2003). PSTD sufferers may resort to alcohol or illicit drugs to block out unwanted memories and feelings associated with the trauma (Browne et al., 2010; Kessler et al., 1995).

There are several other symptoms and behavioural patterns of PTSD that are worth noting. People may lose interest in the everyday activities of life such as employment and or leisure activities (Perry, 2001). These feelings may also extend to future events (Dominquex et al., 2002). This detachment may also affect feelings of joy, love and other feelings of happiness, leading to withdrawal from society and other people (Cohen, 2010; Dominquex et al., 2002; Perry, 2000). PSTD sufferers may not see themselves getting married or having a family, or living into old age, and these feeling of hopelessness may become overwhelming (Vorvick and Rogge, 2012). The symptoms also extend to the physical, with many sufferers unable to sleep well, are angry, have impaired concentration, are always on the lookout and/or are often easily startled (Cohen, 2010; Dominquex et al., 2002; Perry, 2001; Pham et al., 2004). Changes in mood and feelings, altered state of thinking and behaviour may also change due to the traumatic event (Perry and Azad, 1999; Perry, 2000). There is also evidence that sufferers of PTSD may be sexually dysfunctional in both the physical and emotional levels (Cosgrove et al., 2002; Kotler et al., 2000) and that men, more often, may commit domestic violence (Cloitre et al., 2009).

It is common for people with trauma to have other psychological disorders. The most common psychological disorders that accompany PTSD are: drug and alcohol issues, depression, panic disorders, bipolar mood disorder and generalised anxiety disorder (Brady et al., 2000; Saladin et al., 1995).
5.1.5. *Developmental trauma*

The traumatic stress field has adopted the term *complex trauma* to describe the experience of multiple and/or chronic developmental and first traumatic events, most often of an interpersonal nature, for example sexual or physical abuse (Teplin et al., 2002).

These associated disorders must be viewed as part of a scale of diffuse psychological changes brought on by dramatic events, and associated initially with PTSD. In real life, expression of trauma is not rigidly set but can comprise a continuum based on the type and severity of the trauma, past experiences of the victim, the prevalence of this association, age, gender, and many other factors (Moroz, 2005).

Atkinson (2002) and O’Shane (1993) argue that anxiety disorders such as PTSD and acute stress disorder are unable to accurately capture the levels of chronic ongoing stress that Indigenous people experience in their everyday lives. Nor do these diagnoses take into consideration trans-generational trauma, racism, or the ongoing stresses that continue as part of the effects of colonisation.

Developmental trauma disorder was developed in the belief that multiple exposures to interpersonal trauma, such as abandonment and betrayal, physical or sexual assaults have predictable outcomes that affect many areas of functioning. A diagnosis of developmental disorder is given when symptoms do not meet the DSM V diagnostic criteria (Acton, 2012; Stein et al., 2009).

Developmental trauma disorder may cause many of the same symptoms as PTSD but cannot be diagnosed under the DSM V (2000), as it does not meet the criterion (Van der Kolk, 1985; van der Kolk, 2003). While there are many reasons why a PTSD diagnosis may not be given, one is cultural. That is the DSM V does not take into account cultural backgrounds or practises, and treats everyone from a western (American) viewpoint. Which is one of the
reasons Social and Emotional Wellbeing frameworks were established (Social Health Reference Group for et al., 2004)

Yet many of the symptoms are the same: the complex distributions of affect regulation; an inability to form personal attachments; the rapid behaviour regression; mood swings; little to no admissions; aggressive behaviour against self and others; poor sleep; food and self-care, poor world view; physical responses from gastrointestinal distress to headaches; self-endangering behaviours; the self-hatred and self-blame; and chronic feelings of ineffectiveness (Van der Kolk, 1985; van der Kolk, 2003).

Developmental trauma sets the stage for unfocused responses to subsequent stresses leading to a dramatic increase in the use of medical, social and mental health services, and the criminal justice system (Teplin et al., 2002; Van der Kolk, 1985).

### 5.2. Impacts of trauma

#### 5.2.1. Impact of trauma in children

The ground-breaking work of Terr, Bloch, Michel, Shi, Reinhardt and Metnyer (1999) in child trauma has determined that more than 30% of children exposed to traumatic events will develop serious and chronic psychotic problems. Babies are particularly attuned to their primary caregiver and sense their fear and traumatic stresses (Victoria Department of Human Services, 2014).

Van Der Kolk (2005, 2003) explains that children learn to regulate their behaviour in anticipation of the caregiver’s responses to them. This interaction allows them to construct a profile of the world around them. As a child the internal working model is defined as the internalisation of the effect and cognitive characteristics of the primary relationships. Because early experiences occur in the context of the developing brain, their development and social interactions are excessively intertwined. In the human brain, the
most important information for successful development is conveyed by the social rather than the physical environment (Perry, 2000).

When repeated trauma occurs in the presence of a supportive, if helpless, caregiver, the child is likely to respond by withdrawing from the parent. The more disorganised the parent, the more disorganised the child (Bernstein et al., 1994; Herman et al., 1989).

Histories of childhood physical and sexual assault are associated with a host of other psychiatric diagnoses in adolescents and adulthood: substance abuse; borderline and antisocial personality disorder; and eating, associative, effective, cardiovascular, metabolic, immunological and sexual disorders (van der Kolk, 2003).

5.2.2. Adolescent trauma and its effects

The development of the child from between 12 to 18 years is significant physically as well as psychologically. From 12 to 18 the body undertakes significant change in growth, motor function skills, puberty and sexuality. During this stage psychological growth is also occurring. The child begins to: develop a sense of self; acquires relationship skills; develops an understanding their own sexuality; and develops their identity based on gender and culture norms.

In adolescents who have been removed from their original culture and language environment, these interpersonal functions become blurred as the adolescents have conflicting cultural norms to base development on. At the same time, there are a number of social and emotional factors that are also developing such as empathy, morality, and an understanding of peers in social groups, boundaries, reciprocity, and appropriate behaviour, and lack the insight and control to act. The adolescent will explore sexuality and intimate relationships, develop wider interests in society, become responsible for themselves and independent from family, have mood swings, and
develop cognitive and creative skills (Victoria department of Human Services, 2014).

The quote below from my research demonstrates this point and how a disruption in psychological and social development in adolescents, can continue into adult life.

*It was a terrible thing and my wife and I had trouble with the sex part. I had to go to counselling for sex, to really have this feeling...It took a long time to get back. I got three kids and they seem to be all right but they suffered on account of my illness because one of the things I went through is I started drinking. But I want to finish this story about...Him knowing all about me, my medical records and saying that I was a schizophrenic (First Nations Male, Winnipeg Canada).*

In the last decade neuroscientists studying the brain have learned how fear and trauma influence the mature brain. Recently scientists have been working with trauma in the developing brain. It is increasingly clear that experiences in childhood have relatively more impact on the developing child than experiences later in life. This is because the brain is designed to change (brain plasticity) in response to parent receptive stimuli. Where the parent or caregiver is responsible for trauma, forgetting information associated with this trauma changes the brain allowing for the child to remain close to the caregiver (Kolb and Gibb, 2011).

As stated above, cultural norms are important to the developing brain. An individual’s brain develops for the type of environment he/she is raised in. Children reflect the world in which they are raised. If that world is categorised by threat, chaos, unpredictability, fear and sexual and physical abuse, such as the environments described by participants, the brain will reflect that by altering the development of the neural systems involved in stress and fear responses. When a child is threatened various brain responses are inherent.
5.2.3. **Trauma and adolescence**

Trauma may affect development during adolescence in that trauma creates tension, irritability, reactivity and the inability to relax in the individual. These patterns include sleep disturbance, and distancing themselves from the family, development of eating disorders, substance abuse, becoming aggressive and violent, self-harming or thoughts around suicide. These patterns also prevent normal physical and emotional growth in the adolescent. They may lead to feelings of shame and humiliation, loss of self-esteem and self-confidence, increased self-focusing and withdrawal from society, personality changes and relationship impairments. Feelings of revenge for the trauma, sexual promiscuity, reduced capacity to feel, and feeling of numbness are common as is a need to grow up faster. Other common affects include poor peer-group relationships, teenage pregnancy and dropping out of school (Cook et al., 2005; Saltzman et al., 2001).

To understand how adolescents are affected and cope with trauma, an understanding of what is considered normal adolescent development is needed. This age group has three stages: early adolescence (11-13 years); middle adolescence (14-18 years); and late adolescence (19-21 years). The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Development (‘Normal Adolescent Development Part I,’ n.d.) has listed a number of other sub-stages across the three developmental areas: physical, cognitive and social – emotional (Cole et al., 2004; Headspace, 2014; Howes et al., 1992). Howes, Phillips and Whitebook (1992) created a nine stage model of adolescent development, focusing across the three stage of development. These are:

1. Coping with the physical changes of puberty
2. Mastering an upsurge of sexual and aggressive impulses
3. Developing autonomy from parents
4. Forging sustaining ties with peers and adults outside the family
5. Developing the capacity for intimacy with romantic others
6. Establishing a desirable sense of personal values
7 Consolidating a coherent identity (including gender, vocational, and ethnic roles)
8 Achieving a sense of competency and industry in work or school
9 Planning realistically for eventual economic self-sufficiency.

These developmental processes help adolescents make sense of the world in which they live (Cole et al., 2004; Howes et al., 1992). While the adolescent is moving from the paradigm of parental care to that of independence, the physical, sexual and emotional trauma they experience or witness can have profound consequences on the developing mind (Cole et al., 2004; Headspace, 2014).

Emotional or physical trauma may cause a number of reactions within the adolescent, including: feelings of self-doubt, shame, anxiety, mistrust and poor self-esteem may emerge. These may lead to assertiveness problems, anger, sexual arousal or poor social skills, along with poor academic and/or vocational outcomes and mistrust in people. All of these factors contribute to a deficit in identity (Kidron, 2003; Williams, 1994).

Adolescents may re-experience, rethink or experience for the first time, trauma that occurred earlier in their lives. This is due to the development of cognitive/mental processes, leading to organised thought and abstract thinking (Headspace, 2014). This advanced cognitive and emotional development gives the adolescent a new sense of understanding and perception, allowing them to understand the trauma that they have experienced in a different way (Steinberg, 2005).

5.3. Range of responses to trauma
Van De Kolk (1985) was one of the first to study PTSD in adolescents, and found that adolescent soldiers in the Vietnam War suffered PTSD at greater rates than older solders. Van De Kolk (1985) hypothesised that this was due to the intensity of the bonds to their peers.
A study by Terr et al. (1999), with adolescents who witnessed the explosion of the Challenger spacecraft, found that only 5.4% of participants developed PTSD relative to this event. However, approximately half developed the psychological disorders of anxiety and depression. Both conditions are overlaying symptoms of PTSD.

The work of Brent et al. (Brent, 1995; Brent et al., 1996) suggests that most adolescents who experience trauma do not go on to develop PTSD, which would seem to reflect the work of Terr et al. (1999). Of the adolescents that do develop the disorder, the symptoms are the same as those in adults. While most adolescents that experience trauma do not go on to develop PTSD, most will still experience substantial distress and long term impairment. The effect of this can present as a lack of respect for, or insolence towards, authority and the adolescent will see their outlook for their future as bleak. It is common for adolescents to have multiple disorders at the same time such as depression, substance abuse, and conduct disorders (Brent, 1995; Brent et al., 1996).

### 5.4. Trauma, removal and the community

The assimilation policies and resulting institutionalisation of children has caused trauma to the immediate and extended family and community, due to the compounding effect of the trauma (HREOC 1997). This is primarily due to forced and often traumatic removal method of child from their parents and community. This diminishes the role of parents and community as the child’s protectors, in turn coursing psychological trauma (Miller, 1996). As a result, parents and community members remained hyper-vigilant and guard their children from this threat. While the BTH Report details the Australian experience, Miller (1996), Fontaine (2011), and Consedine and Consedine (2012) identify similar experiences reported by the First Nations of Canadian and the Māori of New Zealand.

Physical and emotional trauma as suffered by individuals while in care, can only be described as systematic torture by the state (HREOC, 1997;
Libesman, 2004). The BTH Report (1997) as well as Miller (1996) and Milloy (1999) argue that the unjust treatment of children while in these institutions constitutes cultural genocide and ethnocide, as they meet a number of articles under the United Nation, Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide:

*In the present convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group* (United Nations and Schabas, 1948).

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the knowledge of the intent of the policies created its own trauma and compounded other traumatic events. This builds on the complexity of the diagnosis, as the DSM V does not take this into account.

5.5. *Conclusion- relevance to Indigenous people forcibly removed*

Freyd (Freyd et al., 2007) in a rebuttal to McNally (2007) states that people never truly forget a traumatic experience, and argues that sexual abuse is one of the more common trauma forms of betrayal trauma, in that ‘knowledge isolation about the event’ needs to occur so that attachment to the primary caregiver can continue. This means that the event in the mind of the victim becomes separated from the emotional responses to the care giver, in order for the relationship to continue.

Since invasion, Indigenous peoples have faced a range of traumatic events, such as enslavement, being forced off land, and the policies and practises of assimilation. The effects of this trauma continue long after the traumatic event. The 2010 Health and Welfare of Australia’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (2010) found that 31% of Aboriginal people reported
psychological distress, at high or very high levels, in everyday life. The rate of reported psychological distress within Māori (26%) (Krynen et al., 2013) and First Nations (30%) (Caron and Liu, 2010), mirrors the Australian results. This means that between 26% and 31% of the Indigenous population will display symptoms as listed under the DSM V or other emerging theories of trauma.

Physical and emotional states can prohibit people from positively engaging outside of the community in which they feel safe (Dyregrov et al., 2003), which in turn limits their interaction with people that they do not know. In many cases people can summon the ability to interact and be pleasant, for a brief period of time, but then retreat within themselves. This may be one reason why Indigenous people find it hard to move forward in the healing and reconciliation processes.

According to some Indigenous people, they have a predisposition that drives them to this contact. The trauma of colonisation, the establishment and forced relocation onto missions, and past forced removal policies account for the over representation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice systems across the three jurisdictions within the study. The two major contributors of people facing the courts today are drug use and mental health issues. The following chapter has presented alcohol and other drugs misuse as being the results of or symptoms of trauma.
6. Social and Emotional Wellbeing

In this chapter I outline the historic and current concepts of Social and Emotional Wellbeing as depicted from an Indigenous viewpoint. Through exploring the elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, insights to a modern definition are developed. Social and Emotional Wellbeing as a cultural whole of life concept, as opposed to Western psychological frameworks, are discussed and compared. Later in the chapter, social and emotional wellbeing is compared to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Gorman, 2010; Maslow, 1943), in that without all elements, an individual and or community will never be able to reach their full potential.

There is a body of literature on Social and Emotional Wellbeing, which dates back some decades (Buti, 1995; Hunter, 1993). Even so, to date there is no single agreed definition of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Instead, authors rely on describing elements to define Social and Emotional Wellbeing (Dudgeon et al., 2010; Zubrick et al., 2004). Using these elements, Chandler and Lalonde (1998) and Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol, Hallett and Marcia (2003) investigated the protective elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Gorman (2010) in an innovative construct uses Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to show that each element is needed for individuals to reach their full potential. Zalenski and Raspa (2006) support Gorman (2010) by describing how individuals increase their sense of cultural importance as they move within the hierarchy, and are closer to reaching their full potential as each element of Social and Emotional Wellbeing is addressed. This is addressed in detail later in the chapter.

6.1. Western approach to conceptualising Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Like trauma, deficits in Social and Emotional Wellbeing can lead to a love/hate relationship with the wider community and a withdrawal from it.
The historical forced removal from the family distanced children from their languages, homeland and other factors/facets that are associated with culture. Although language and culture may not be regarded as essential to an individual’s survival in the same sense as Maslow (1943) describes food, water and shelter, language and culture are essential and imperative to the social and emotional wellbeing of Indigenous individuals and their communities (Troy and Sutherland, 2012).

As discussed previously, Social and Emotional Wellbeing is not a new concept Social and Emotional Wellbeing was introduced in Australia in early 2000 to remove the stigma associated with mental health. The Commonwealth Government acknowledged the new terminology as evident in the 2004 release of the Social and Emotional Wellbeing Framework (Social Health Reference Group et al., 2004). This framework was the first of its kind. Since the interchange of terminology and development of the framework, Indigenous peoples around the world have driven their own Social and Emotional Wellbeing agendas.

However, in relation to governments and health professionals the concept is still emerging. Evidence to this is the relatively low volume of literature on the subject (Australian Institute Health and Welfare, 2009). The Western way of thinking about health is to compartmentalise, so that each part can be measured in terms of percentage of the population, an example is the Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013). The concept of whole of life wellbeing may well be out of the scope of Western models.

The way mental illness is currently defined relies on the Western psychomedical model, as evidenced by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, American Psychiatric Association (American Psychological Association, 2013, p. 5; Kutchins and Kirk, 1997). The Western perspective of mental illness essentially refuses to acknowledge cultural differences. As a result, a number of assumptions are made in relation to diagnosing mental health. These assumptions include: causality and control; the different ways
emotional distress are expressed and communicated; different ways of thinking and feeling about others; and objective life circumstances. However, these factors vary within Indigenous populations, cultural differences mean that a generic method of identifying, what is mental health is invalid (Vicary and Westerman, 2004; Westerman, 2004).

What Indigenous peoples consider as a mental health illness, may not be considered as such from a Western psychological framework. As a result, mental distress in the Indigenous community often goes unnoticed, undiagnosed and untreated (Swan and Raphael, 1995).

An Indigenous way of looking at health, including mental health, is Social and Emotional Wellbeing. The notion of wellbeing is common to the countries of interest within this study (Libesman, 2004). Each individual culture has its own nuances in how it sees Social and Emotional Wellbeing, yet they all share some commonalities. These commonalities include that health is not limited to the individual but includes the environment, connectedness to the land and to cultural and intellectual traditions, spirituality, and the extended family and community (Anderson, 1995; Social Health Reference Group for et al., 2004). Anderson also argues that resource management should be included in Social and Emotional Wellbeing as it is part of the land and environment (Anderson, 1995).

The concept of Social and Emotional Wellbeing is culturally orientated, that is, each culture has its own philosophies and framework in which they have built and developed their own concepts.

How do the above-mentioned components of Social and Emotional Wellbeing differ from the more mainstream social determinants of health, such as housing and employment? Under the Western health system, social determinants of health are designed around an individual, a standalone

---

9Throughout this document Social and Emotional Wellbeing will be used across all three cultures. Where a specific culture’s own version is used then its correct terminology will be used.
viewpoint and set apart from all other systems. In an Indigenous model they would be considered as one part of many (Dudgeon et al., 2010).

Social determinants are also culturally specific, which could be a factor as to why little work has been compiled in this area. Non-Indigenous researchers working from an outside perspective of the culture would find it difficult to perform and evaluate a research study without first understanding Social and Emotional Wellbeing and its cultural nuances. Using situated cultural research methodology may prove one way to progress research in this area.

I have outlined the elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing in previous paragraphs. I believe that if these elements are not in harmony, individuals and communities suffer adversely. The Social Health Reference Group (2004) lists symptoms of poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing as: unresolved grief and loss, trauma and abuse, domestic violence, removal from family, substance misuse, family breakdown, cultural dislocation, racism and discrimination, and social disadvantage. Subsequently, Kelly, Dudgeon, Gee and Glaskin’s (2009) work has added colonisation to the list.

These negative factors were a constant theme throughout the interviews I conducted. I have included three examples that represent grief and loss, removal from family, substance misuse, trauma and colonisation:

…our family was separated. My other three siblings were in different homes. So I was pretty much by myself so I just took to what I learnt in the homes; drinking and smoking dope and taking pills. I ended up doing a lot of driving and petty crime. I ended up in prison the first time for that. Then it just sort of escalated from there. I came out and just kept on drinking and driving. Had total disrespect for the law, just totally rebelled and kept offending (Māori man, Wellington).

or

I became a chief at a relatively young age in my reserve but I became an alcoholic at that time because that’s all there to do when I was there. But also I was part of the problem in the reserve. I was abusive with my own
people and they were abusive with me - that connects things (First Nation man, Calgary).

and

There was no contact during the growing up so it just left us numb thinking where's our real mother, where's our brother and sisters, how are we going to contact them? So that was repeating in my mind all the time (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

For those people removed from their families, Social and Emotional Wellbeing is especially important as a concept in the healing process and must be considered in health and healing as it allows for the re-connection back to community and families, culture, homelands and self-identity. It also addresses the person's need for family, ancestry, culture and community. Individuals and communities will then to start to heal in accordance with Silove’s (2005) and Fraser’s (1997) frameworks.

Silove’s (2005) five elements of survival and adaptational framework are consistent with the identity and community elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Silove (2005) developed the framework in response to mass disasters and civil unrest and he theorises that for healing to occur the following must be present:

….re-establishment of livelihoods, the pursuit of education, training and other opportunities, the establishment of national and other identities; and re-creating institutions that facilitate the practice of religion, cultural traditions and participation in the governance of emerging societies, thereby establishing a sense of social coherence and meaning (Silove et al., 2006 p123).

Fraser’s (1997), 'whole person' theory works alongside the interpersonal elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, such as the intellectual, moral, emotions and feelings, physical, and social.

Zubrick et al. (2014) are of the view that social determinants of health are a means to an end and are useful at the individual level. They also argue that
practitioners are not often aware of the complexities within the social
determinants and if they were, they may be more compassionate. In having
Social and Emotional Wellbeing at the individual level, it is being treated as a
social determinant and does not consider the cultural context or the whole
person, community and environment.

6.2. Concepts of wellbeing by nation

6.2.1. Mother Earth

Australian Aboriginals, Canadian First Nations and New Zealand Māori have
a common teaching, which is that everyone originates from the Great Mother
Earth. The earth provides everything that is needed to survive: medicines,
clothing, food, water, and shelter (Mascarenhas, 2012; McNab, 1999; Sizoo,
2010).

Accordingly, the earth and the environment are sacred. Each country uses
different mythologies to teach its people how to manage the environment and
how to treat each other. Aboriginal Australia uses the Rainbow Serpent as
the underpinning mythology, while New Zealand Māori use forest and ocean
mythology and Canada’s First Nations use animals to symbolise humanistic
behaviours. All mythologies teach the same lessons of respect to treat each
other and the land.

These teachings were evident in how the participants felt, while many are
returning to their culture and mythology stories, there are clues within the
text. The following examples provide insight into how important Mother Earth
is to them.

_We were removed from [Māori language spoken], from our lands. We were
removed from what we call our marae to grow up alienated to those places.
We were put into a nucleus family. We are removed from their idea of what
is a whanau, a family. We think that a family now is our mum, our dad, our
 brothers and sisters, and our aunties (Māori man, Auckland)._
…I was getting to that - I wanted to go back to Ceduna, I wanted to go back home. That was my country. I felt that; as soon as I went there, that was my country. I knew it was my country. As much as I've been brought up in the city, I just loved that idea of going back in the country (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

and

We're still bush people. We're still walkers of the land. We're still walkers of the land. We still can own the land. We must walk the land. Then you can make the connection to see who we are, because [unclear] any pictures [unclear] even though I didn't see them - again, they can have this part of me connected to you, because I am connected to the land. That's just something I have, the connection to somebody (First Nations man, Winnipeg).

The following is a more detailed expression of how each country's Indigenous peoples perceive Social and Emotional Wellbeing, from a traditional viewpoint.

6.2.2. Australian perspective

Aboriginal Australia builds its Social and Emotional Wellbeing around its obligation to nature, protecting and caring for people, family, country and the law (Franks and Curr, 1996). This also provides a platform on which to connect the concepts to spirituality (Randal, 2003). Kanyini is a Pitjantjatjara\textsuperscript{10} word for the principle of Social and Emotional Wellbeing or way of life (Kanjini Co-Op, 2014), and includes: the aspects of creation and a place for mother earth; lore, dreaming, spirituality, soul, psyche; family and kinship; and land, country (Randal, 2003).

This concept relates to the whole family, including the environment. The child walks through a particular songline\textsuperscript{11} of the earth where conception took place, and this in turn becomes their totemic story. Everything with the same

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{10}Pitjantjatjara are an Aboriginal language group from Central Australia. Their traditional lands are vast, taking in the Great Victoria and Gibson Deserts.
  \item \textsuperscript{11}A songline is a way of passing on a teaching, much like a chapter in a book. Each songline is a single part of a bigger story.
\end{itemize}
surname connects with the songlines becoming the totem and connecting the person back to the fauna and flora of that area (Lee, 1994).

The forced eviction of Aboriginal peoples from their lands and removal from family and community has resulted in an imbalance of body and soul in the separation of personal songlines. The effect of this imbalance was clearly expressed by one participant:

*Oh, it makes me feel like I’m an animal or something, you know, or something. It doesn’t make you feel very human. It makes you feel like you’re a product, you know, you were just born and that was it. There was no significance to your life, I guess. You’re just there, and they just placed you as a number, or whatever. Yeah, it didn’t make me feel good to be under observation, when I think about it, when I think of my own (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).*

Recent Aboriginal history is one of loss of land and forced separation resulting in poverty and loss of self-determination. However, central Australian Aboriginal elder Mr B. Randall (deceased) considers that by his family, which consists of humans, nature and animals, practicing Kanyini, they will enable Aboriginal culture to be revealed as having meaning, wisdom and durability (Randall and Newbury, 2003).

### 6.2.3. Aotearoa New Zealand perspective

From a Māori perspective, health is holistic, including wellbeing across spiritual, mental and physical dimensions. In contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand there are several Māori models of health, however, traditionally the most prominent identities are Haurora [the four-sided house] and *Te Wheke* [the octopus].

The *Hauora* has been compared to the four walls of a *whare*, the Māori house. Each wall represents a different dimension. All four dimensions are necessary for *shrek* [wellbeing]. The four walls, represent the *whanau* [family], *hinengaro* [mental], *tinana* [physical], and *wairua* [spirit], all of which
are interrelated, working in harmony to enable good health. In addition to the four walls is a fifth *whenua* or connectedness to land, which like many other cultures is the key to Social and Emotional Wellbeing (Mark and Lyons, 2010).

*Te Wheke* is an octopus metaphor illustrating the interdependence of the child/family (the Head). The tentacles represent spirituality, mental, physical, extended family, emotional, life principle in people and object, unique identity, inherited strengths, and individual *iwi* Māori concepts (Jones, 2000).

Each of these concepts uses an item that has many parts to form a whole representing the need for the tribe, family and individual to work together.

### 6.2.4. Canadian perspective

Like Australian Aboriginal peoples, First Nations Canadians define wellbeing as being far broader than merely physical health or the absence of disease.

Using the Ojibwe concept as an example, the *mno bmaadis*, which translates into *being alive well*, is the essence of wellbeing (King et al., 2009). All four elements of life - the physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual - are represented in the four directions of the medicine wheel. They are intertwined and interact to balance the person and the community.

The medicine wheel extends past the physical to the ancestors, so that all can live in harmony (Chartrand and Chartrand, 2013). The medicine wheel contains the seven sacred teachings.

*Seven sacred teachings*
In conjunction with the medicine wheel the First Nations follow the seven sacred laws that act as a spiritual foundation. Each teaching values and honours a basic virtue. Following these virtues will lead to a full and healthy life (Lyndsay, 2012).

**Animals**

The seven sacred teaching uses animals as representations: turtle (truth), eagle (love), buffalo (respect), bear (courage), glooscap-sasquatch (honesty), wolf (humility) and beaver (wisdom). The teaching or laws offer direction for achieving a life in balance with oneself and the environment. The animals live close to the earth and give reminders of the connection to nature (Calgary Board of Education, 2014; Chartrand and Chartrand, 2013; Lyndsay, 2012).

**6.3. Modern Social and Emotional Wellbeing**

The World Health Organisation (2014), described health and wellbeing as:

> To reach a state of complete physical, mental and social wellbeing, an individual or group must be able to realise aspirations, to satisfy needs, and to change or cope with the environment. Health is, therefore, seen as a resource for everyday life, not the objective of living. Health is a positive concept emphasising social and personal resources as well as physical capacities.

Since WHO developed this charter, the concept of Social and Emotional Wellbeing have governments grappling with this definition. Modern Social and Emotional Wellbeing as a health concept is relatively new and in many ways is still evolving. The Commonwealth of Australia through its Department of Health and Aging was the first to develop a Social and Emotional Well-Being framework (Social Health Reference Group for et al., 2004) for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander populations. This was
such a new concept that the framework was never implemented (Milroy, 2011), nor extended or to-date redeveloped.

Modern Social and Emotional Wellbeing has had to evolve since colonisation, to include a number of elements that were not necessarily within the traditional models. For example before colonisation and the policies of cultural genocide, Indigenous people had no need to consider language as part of their Social and Emotional Wellbeing. After these policies were enforced, many Indigenous languages across the study are asleep\(^{12}\), and those remaining have dramatically declined (Schmidt, 1990). With this in mind a number of new elements have been incorporated into traditional models.

6.4. Other elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Social and Emotional Wellbeing as a concept is difficult to explain in words, as it is an holistic view of health and wellbeing (Waldram et al., 2008) and contains a number of elements. If one component of Social and Emotional Wellbeing is lacking then the person can never fully reach their potential. This is discussed later in section 6.6.

What constitutes the traditional model of Social and Emotional Wellbeing and its approach to the individual and community, is different in a contemporary society. Modern Social and Emotional Wellbeing has mental, physical, social, and cultural adaptations. What is important is that it provides a platform for connectedness to culture while providing emotional safety and kinship for individuals and their communities (Waldram et al., 2008). Waldram et al. (2008) argues that its origin is irrelevant, however, its importance lies in its symbolic nature and therefore support of a positive legacy.

\(^{12}\) In the field of linguistics, when a language is no longer spoken it is referred to as asleep. For further information on this topic read (Walsh and Troy, 2015; Zuckermann and Walsh, 2011)
I disagree with the analysis of Waldram et al.: the origin does matter, otherwise, Social and Emotional Wellbeing should simply be called health. The differentiating factor is culture, and culture is the pivoting point on which Social and Emotional Wellbeing and its elements are derived. This is why Social and Emotional Wellbeing is important as an Indigenous concept (Gee et al., 2014).

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is a complex mix of the community and individual's relationship to land, culture, spirituality, and ancestry (Anderson, 1995; Berndt, 1988; Waldram et al., 2008; Zalenski and Raspa, 2006). The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Healing Foundation (2009) defines wellbeing as:

Wellbeing is an existence in which we, as individuals and as a community are strong, proud, happy and healthy on physical, spiritual emotional and social levels (Healing Foundation, 2015).

While this would appear to be a strong definition, when deconstructed it becomes clear that the Healing Foundations (2015) definition is somewhat lacking. This is due to the elements strong and proud. Strength is not an element of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, as even the feeblest can have good Social and Emotional Wellbeing. The same applies to happy. People go through periods of being unhappy, for example during sorry business; this is a part of life and culture. If a person and community has good Social and Emotional Wellbeing, then they will become proud and strong (Chandler and Lalonde, 1998). It is because of this complexity that most academics have not tried to define Social and Emotional Wellbeing but instead describing it as a concept. This has also contributed to the confusion and debate about the importance of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, as discussed later in this chapter.
6.4.1. Land

Anderson (1995, p2), a renowned Aboriginal academic, draws pathways between access to traditional lands and good Social and Emotional Wellbeing stating that, ‘our identities as humans and as Indigenous people are grounded in our land’. Land as a concept in Social and Emotional Wellbeing are so much more than just dirt. As my description of Indigenous mythologies demonstrated previously, we should include Mother Earth as part of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, that is, the soil, earth, sea, air, waterways and the trees and animals, which inhabit the world. Land could never be owned, as people belonged to the land not the other way around. For Indigenous peoples, the land is spiritual and has many symbolic metaphors for life; it is not just a physical environment (Berry et al., 2010; Mark and Lyons, 2010; Rigby et al., 2011).

Ownership of land was a foreign concept for most Indigenous cultures, with the Māori the exception as they have a different view from Australian and Canadian first peoples. Māori had land that they viewed as tribal, and farmed within walled villages, called pa, while still worshipping the forest and environment. Australian and Canadian traditional lands were fixed based on creation stories (Berndt, 1988) with small tribal groups working within the environment, hunting and gathering, moving from summer to winter grounds, taking no more than needed to survive and always giving back to the land/water. Common to all, the environment was never disrespected by over-hunting or farming (Oliver, 1989, p. 175).

6.4.2. Spirituality

Spirituality connected people to the land. It is based on a ‘philosophy of oneness with the natural environment’ (Berndt, 1988). Traditionally men and women have distinct but interconnected roles in the spiritual life within the group. Men were for the most part the hunters, the lore enforcers and the keepers of men’s business (Rohrlich-Leavitt et al., 1979).
Women’s roles were just as important and in unison with the men. Women provided food for the group. They were responsible for kinship or bloodlines, child rearing until the coming of age, provided input into the lore making and were the keepers of women’s business (Layton, 1985). Both men and women are responsible for teaching and maintaining the song and storylines, and customary laws.

Milroy, as quoted in the BTH Report (HREOC, 1997), poetically captures the importance of Aboriginal Dreaming and its relationship to the Aboriginal culture and its connectedness to the land. This quote also demonstrates that for Indigenous peoples within Australia, their traditional stories will always be the centre point for which other domains develop. This is also true for New Zealand and Canada.

*We are part of the Dreaming. We have been in the Dreaming for a long time before we are born on this earth and we will return to this vast landscape at the end of our days. It provides for us during our time on earth, a place to heal, to restore purpose and hope, and to continue our destiny.*

### 6.4.3. Kinship

Aboriginal peoples have a complex kinship system that connects each person and gives relationships within and across tribal groupings. In many nations it also determines the behaviour of an individual in regards to others both internal and external to the group (Berndt, 1988; Fejo-King, 2013).

Kinship relations would determine the division of food and other commodities such clothing and gifts, based on tribal customs. It informed individuals of the teacher/student relationship, who one could marry, and placed people within the community. Perhaps most importantly, it gave an individual a sense of belonging and self, as kinship laws defined a person’s place within the group (Berndt, 1988).
Kinship defined roles according to age and gender. For example, a man had responsibilities to his nephews (Gee et al., 2014); he taught them hunting skills and led them through initiation (Fejo-King, 2013; Wafer, 1982). The Māori equivalent to kinship is the marae, whanau and whakapapa.

6.4.4. Ancestry

Ancestry for many Indigenous nations is a defining factor. The Māori whakapapa is the ‘genealogical descent of all living things from the gods to the present time’ (Barlow, 1991). Since all living things are connected whakapapa includes rocks and animals and all in-between. It is believed that all people possess whakapapa. Barlow (1991) further defines it as ‘the basis for the organisation of knowledge in respect of the creation and development of all things’.

Furthermore whakapapa is a fundamental principle that guides Māori relationships. It provides the basis for establishing, enhancing, and even challenging relationships between individuals, the family (whanau) local (hapu) and regional (iwi) tribes. It gives each person and community a sense of belonging and self, through the connectedness of ancestry (Burford and Hudson, 2007).

While whakapapa is a Māori perspective of ancestry, Australian and Canadian Indigenous peoples have similar viewpoints. Ancestors are also acknowledged in ceremony and in the course of day-to-day life. It is common for visions of people past to deliver messages (Clarke, 2003).

The extracts below show the importance of ancestry to Maroi peoples:

……and society I tend to think being a half-caste, it’s too one-sided and it still has its undertones of racism. All I need to know is that I’ve got to be strong inside myself, learning my whakapapa, because learning my whakapapa taught me how to stand on my own two feet to be responsible for my own actions and to take things differently and grasp it and run with the right tools and not the wrong. (Māori woman, Otago).
The connectedness to the past is never lost and gives guidance in the present.

They said yeah, no worries. So I went up to Wee Jasper for the first time. I fell in love with the place. I saw visions of it and what I didn't realise just where all my people come from. I didn't know that. My grandfather - two grandfathers worked out there ringbarking and working with stock and doing all that shit. I had visions of it and I didn't know what that was all about it. You know, you're only 11 or 12 years of age. So a big shock to the system there (Aboriginal man, Canberra).

6.4.5. Language

There has been much debate as to what part language plays within definition of culture and any cultural grouping (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004; Walsh and others, 1993). What is clear, is that people use language to bond social groups and to transmit cultural knowledge, histories and shared belief systems (Troy and Sutherland, 2012). Language is an important tool within a culture (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004); it helps to pass on the subtle nuances of culture, giving depth that cannot be obtained in any other way. Indigenous languages do not translate well into English, this therefore must have a detrimental effect on the sub structure within the culture.

Differences in languages used are an important factor in determining how we fit in and communicate. Without language, societies would be unable to express the uniqueness of their identities (Eades and others, 2013; Walsh and others, 1993). Language is therefore essential to help inform individual and social identities (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). It places the person, family, community and nation within a construct of a shared understanding of values and beliefs.

Learning in the mother tongue, that is the traditional language of the Indigenous nation to which you belong helps to develop self-esteem and sense of self (Troy and Sutherland, 2012). The extract below shows how
important language is as an element of Social and Emotional Wellbeing to Indigenous people.

This is why you're like you are. You have to ask questions like can you speak your language? Do you know who you are whakapapa to genealogy wise? Do you know your stories? Do you know your waka? Do you know your mountain - the sacred mountains? Do you know all of what we call the pepeha which introduces a person to - you know we stand up and we'll do something like tena koutou, ko Hinewirangi toku ingoa (Māori woman, Hamilton).

6.4.6. Culture

The Oxford dictionary defines culture as: ‘The arts and other manifestations of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively [they are] the ideas, customs, and social behaviour of a particular people or society’ (Oxford Dictionaries, 2015a). Within any cultural group there may be cultural identifiers that are familiar however, until one is firmly entrenched within a culture, it is very difficult to understand what is similar and what subtle differences there are.

Culture is a way of life. In modern Indigenous Australian, New Zealand and Canadian cultures there are still coming of age ceremonies; potlatch, powwows, corroborees and powhiri. These ceremonies are based on a belief system and common values within that particular social group, tribe or nation. An example of this from my participants is:

I had a little feather, he made me dance when they had their band and he'd have a little drum. I would do the [pahawa] [laughs]. I would do that a lot of times and almost like he repaid me (First Nations man, Montreal).

and

So they’ve grown up not knowing what family is. Then being thrust back into the Māori world and slapped around in the Māori world, because when you go to powhiri, that's an official welcome. When you got to tanighanga, that's our ceremonial birth - not birth [unclear] - our ceremonial burial, which
depending on the importance of the person, can take from three to five days. In the old days, it used to take a couple of weeks, but we’ve maybe come a bit more civilised (Māori man, Wellington).

Culture ties people within a region or community together, it gives a shared standard of behaviour which in turn gives a system of social control to which are attached cultural values. These factors give a nation a sense of identity, which in turn filters down through communities to the individual beliefs, behaviours and attitudes.

6.4.7. The debate for Social Emotional Wellbeing

The concepts of Social and Emotional Wellbeing are well defined within Indigenous societies. It has been a part of practice since the dawn of time (Dudgeon et al., 2010). Contemporary Social and Emotional Wellbeing may have to be added to and verbalised as concepts, but all cultures change and adapt; this is Darwinism (Alexander, 1980) and is important for the survival of cultural principles in the modern world (Grant and Grant, 1996). However, debate within the wider community still continues about the importance of Social and Emotional Wellbeing to physical and mental health, wellbeing, healing within the structure of westernised models.

The Australian Government published the Social and Emotional Well Being Framework, a National Strategic Framework for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, Mental Health and Social and Emotional Well Being (2004-2009) This document was distributed widely; however, unlike other strategic plans financial support for implementation across the sector was not made available. Accordingly, without the support and drive for the framework’s implementation, the importance of Social and Emotional Wellbeing within mainstream health organisation will never reach full potential.

While this is an Australian example, I observed this as a common problem within the countries studied. The changing of terminology when referring to Social and Emotional Wellbeing, for example health and wellbeing, or
wellbeing, would indicate that there is a poor understanding and interpretation of Social and Emotional Wellbeing as an Indigenous concept.

This may be due to the relatively small number of published articles available to promote the subject (Australian Insitute Health Welfare, 2009). The articles that have been published to highlight the essence of Social and Emotional Wellbeing are variable in meaning, vague and fuzzy, and very idiosyncratic (Adelson, 2000; Waldram et al., 2008). Waldram (2008) argues that the concept of Social and Emotional Wellbeing is proving to be ‘somewhat vague’; suggesting that within both public and professional discourse the idea of healing has become pervasive. There has rarely been an attempt to define the term or otherwise operationalise the Indigenous viewpoint.

There have been criticisms of the terminology of Social and Emotional Wellbeing as it is described in broad terms (Waldram et al., 2008). One reason for this is that to be able to write about Social and Emotional Wellbeing, all cultural nuances within the group you are writing about must be fully understood. Too often when governments commission reports they are written or edited by bureaucrats who have no cultural knowledge, but who try to write across cultural boundaries. The same applies for academics who have written about cultures without having an intimate knowledge of a culture. They therefore have no choice but to be vague and fuzzy, as the cultural nuances still elude them and a full and critical understanding is not yet present (Adelson, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999).

Another reason that Social and Emotional Wellbeing is written about in such terms is that governments and government advisory committees want to place Social and Emotional Wellbeing within mainstream policies (Prout, 2009; Smye and Browne, 2002). They want a common understanding that is related to health, because they are familiar with what mental health is or what healing looks like. They are comfortable with the tools used to measure such models without acknowledging that Social and Emotional Wellbeing sits outside of this framework. For example, a general practitioner does not
measure a person’s wellness against connectedness to land, and a psychologist does not work with spirituality, as these concepts are too confronting for most health professionals and there are no standardised tools to measure them (Gozu et al., 2007; Price et al., 2005).

However, the uniqueness of Social and Emotional Wellbeing has become recognised in palliative care, for instance, and not just for Indigenous peoples. The gathering of family, friends and neighbours to give emotional, loving and practical support to people in the final stages of life is well established (Poroch et al., 2013). McGrath (2010) highlights the importance of ‘Indigenous health workers to provide palliative care due to cultural, linguistic, ceremonial and spiritual differences’. The understanding of cultural needs is an important factor in the sensitive and distressing period when one is facing death.

While there are many factors of Social and Emotional Wellbeing that intertwine with health and healing, it should not primarily be looked at from that viewpoint. Instead it should only be looked at on a hierarchy; if all factors are present then the individual and community will have the opportunity to reach all their goals (Chandler et al., 2003; King et al., 2009). If this is not available, then the risks of not obtaining these goals increase.

**6.5. Maslow**

Abraham Maslow (1943) theorised that for humans to develop to their full potential, they needed to fulfil five steps in progressive order, or a ‘hierarchy of needs’. These are often illustrated in a pyramid, which represents the most basic or lower level needs on the bottom moving to higher level needs at the top.
Maslow (1943) used the terms physiological, safety, belongingness and love, self-esteem, self-actualisation and self-transcendence to describe the levels within the pyramid and as motivations for human growth and fulfilment. He described the individual as an integrated whole motivated by need to move through the unfulfilled hierarchy of needs, starting with the lower needs of food, water, shelter and warmth which dominate thinking and behaviour.

Only when lower needs that sustain and nourish the organic body are met is the individual free to move to higher levels of fulfilment (Maslow, 1943; Zalenski and Raspa, 2006). Once reached, the next level can then be pursued. Maslow argued that all five levels of the hierarchy must be met for an individual to achieve their full potential, and that many people never reach the higher or even mid-levels of the pyramid.

Zalenka and Raspa's (2006) description of the individual at each level of need gives an indication of the increasing importance of culture within the hierarchy and how cultural needs can be met. For example, law and order gives individuals a sense of safety, which is an important basic need within Maslow's hierarchy (Maslow, 1943). Culture gives individuals pathways of acceptable ways to behave, which in turn ensures safety, as defined by that particular society.
Gorman (2010) argues that there is a relationship between Garvey’s (2008)\(^\text{13}\) definition of mental health and Maslow's hierarchy of needs, as the ‘level of Social and Emotional Wellbeing of an individual corresponds to the level achieved on Maslow's hierarchy’ (Gorman, 2010, p. 4). To move through the levels of Social and Emotional Wellbeing to achieve the highest level, one must first fulfill the lower levels, including the survival needs, in much the same way that Maslow describes (Gorman, 2010). A person does not need to remain at the highest point of self-actualisation to be able to achieve their full potential, they just need to know that it is possible to achieve this at times (Gorman, 2010; Maslow, 1943).

In Indigenous societies, culture determines an individual’s roles within the community (kinship), makes judgment about behaviours appropriate to those roles and to internalise ideas, allowing for growth of the individual (Austin-Broos, 2003; Peters and Andersen, 2013). This in turn builds an individual’s self-esteem which can be defined as: ‘...a person’s overall assessment of his or her personal adequacy or worth’ (Weiten, 2013, p479). This assessment is built on meeting the performance criteria and can only be made through meeting, or exceeding the expectations of society (Weiten, 2013). Society’s expectations are based on values and beliefs determined by the culture of that particular society. Looking through the higher levels within the hierarchy, self-actualisation and self-transcendence, the importance of culture becomes apparent (Gorman, 2010). Within any given community individual function is contained by established norms, understanding rules of inclusion and exclusion, which are based around performance (Weiten, 2013).

As stated above, culture defines social behaviours, expectations of those behaviours, social controls and values and goals for a way of life within a community. Culture goes deeper than just behaviours and controls, it

\(^{13}\) Garvey (2008, p3) defines mental health as ‘a state of emotional and social well-being in which individuals can cope with normal stresses of life and achieve their potential’. When such a state has been reached, individuals will contribute more to community, and engage in relationships in a positive manner (Garvey, 2008).
includes written or common experiences, what we eat and how we communicate and use language. How people connect with others, nature, the perception of beauty, truth, goodness, (Gorman, 2010) are also important factors that guide people and communities to be able to reach their full potential (Weiten, 2013).

Culture provides a context within which individuals and communities view the world. It gives a platform for the development of self-identity, defining who we are. In classic Freudian terms, it enables us to form a culturally enriched ego, that we internalise (Freud, 1928) and which is essential to psychological health (Gorman and Best, 2005).

Culture provides the environment within which we develop our self-esteem and become self-aware, as well as defining the motivators of both the individual and the community (Chandler et al., 2003; Chandler and Lalonde, 1998). Therefore, the logical conclusion for people who have been disconnected from their culture is that they are inhibited from achieving the higher levels within the hierarchy of cultural needs. Hunter (1993) presents a comprehensive view on the impact of colonisation and the possible effects of cultural dislocation, to the construction of identity and culture. He links this to the poor social determinants of education, work force participation and unemployment, home ownership, incarceration, and health status.

The higher up the pyramid, the more relevant culture becomes. For example, if a person is disconnected from their culture and once the lower two levels have been met (shelter, water, food and sleep, and safety and security), they then would need to work through the remaining levels without all the critical information.

On a scale of disconnection, those people at the extreme would find it difficult to move beyond the first two levels (Gorman, 2010). This is not to say that they could not have a happy, or lead a productive fulfilling life. It simply
means that they can never reach their full potential, meaning that their Social and Emotional Wellbeing would be affected and in deficit (Lear, 2006).

6.6. Inhibitors of good Social and Emotional Wellbeing

While culture, spirituality, connectedness to land, kinship, ancestors, and language all have both protective and risk factors to Social and Emotional Wellbeing (Dudgeon et al., 2010), there are other factors outside of these that can negatively influence Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

Hunter (1993) mentioned incarceration and economics, while others include racism, identity issues, violence, continuing child removal, grief and loss (Chandler et al., 2003; Milloy, 1999; Dudgeon et al., 2010). As is evident by the themes arising from the quantitative data (see chapter 7). These issues normally sit outside of what is considered Social and Emotional Wellbeing. However, they are the antithesis of good Social and Emotional Wellbeing. For many Indigenous people, especially those who were removed from their family and culture, in part or totally, these factors are the norm not the exception, and should be considered within the context of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, at least in terms of moving towards positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

6.7. Summary and conclusions regarding Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is a multi-axle Indigenous concept, which has a symbiotic relationship between the community and individual. The two cannot be excised from each other; even in modern Indigenous lifestyles the individual and community are interconnected.

When all elements of land, spirituality, kinship, ancestry, language and culture are in balance, there is good Social and Emotional Wellbeing. If any

---

14 For further reading on how deficits in culture effects our understanding of self, the meaning of live, individually and collectively, and how this generates problems in achieving goals, read Jonathan Lear (2006) Radical Hope.
one element is out of balance or disrupted, negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing will result until balance is restored.

Due to the multi-axle, multi-elemental nature of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, a single comprehensive definition has not been formulated. Definitions are also culturally specific, which could be a factor as to why little work has been complied in this area (Australian Institute Health Welfare, 2009). This could take decades and would be hard to achieve without having the knowledge and being a part of the culture. Using situated cultural research methodology may prove one way to progress research in this area.

A lack of definition led to confusion within policy making and in mainstream organisations, with many poorly describing the term. However, there are two pieces of work that clearly demonstrate the importance of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. The first is Gorman’s (2010) work that compares Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1943) to Social and Emotional Wellbeing and self-actualisation. The second is Chandler’s (2003) work with First Nations communities in Canada that demonstrates the importance of each of the elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing to the community and individuals alike. These works have created evidence around Social and Emotional Wellbeing, which this research contributes to.

In concluding, I believe that it is all too often that Social and Emotional Wellbeing is limited to a discussion within the health disciplines. It would be more appropriate if all disciplines focused on Indigenous politics and policy were to adopt Social and Emotional Wellbeing as a framework.

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is especially important for the people removed from their families under past government removal policies and/or practices. It must be considered as it allows for the re-connectedness back to community and families, culture, homelands and self-identity, and addresses the individual’s need for family, ancestry, culture and community. This will allow individuals and communities to start to heal in accordance with Silove’s (2005) five elements of survival and adaptational framework, and Fraser’s
(Fraser, 1997) whole person theory under the Indigenous concepts of Social and Emotional Wellbeing.
7. Social and Emotional Wellbeing data

This chapter details the authors original findings on Social and Emotional Wellbeing from the three field sites. This chapter identifies and analyses data on positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors, such as land, family, culture and language of participants. It also explores the negative factors of mental ill health, drug and alcohol use, and anger and resentment.

7.1. Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors

As noted, for each of the three countries within the research study, Social and Emotional Wellbeing contains different interpretations. However, they also share some commonalities such as the connection to the land and environment, tribal customs and language, family, extended family and community.

Table 1 shows different aspects of Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors collected from the qualitative data, and show the percentage of people, by country that have kept, lost and reconnected to with language, family and culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEBW Factors</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kept Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept Name</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnected with Family</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained Near Country</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Kept together</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Parents</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Home</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnect with</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnt Language</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate the policy not</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.2. Land and Environment**

Indigenous people globally have a deep connection to the land, water and air. Traditional mythology and storytelling tells groups how to manage and respect the environment and the animals that live in it. This deep connection is important to not only their survival, but also for their spirituality.

Of the people contacted, only 6.2% of Canadians and no one from Australia and New Zealand reported remaining on their homelands. This would translate to 93.8% of people interviewed having a disconnection with this element of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, or that 93.8% of people forcibly removed not having land as a protective factor in their Social and Emotional Wellbeing toolkit. The following quote demonstrates this point.

…..and went into a wharenui. It blew me away and I mean, just walking on the land that my ancestors walked around on was just amazing. I just used to enjoy just walking around. People must have thought I was weird or something and, just the feel of the carvings and just to - I really could imagine the history that's gone down in all these years - hundreds of years - to get where I am (Māori man, Hamilton).

Since early colonisation, land has been an issue for Indigenous people. Settlers wanted the land for agriculture. As development started to transpire, conflicts between traditional landowners and white settlers over land began to take place. I postulate that this would have motivated the establishment of the removal practices.
In each of the countries represented in the study, governments have treated land differently, and there have been different levels of Indigenous re-engagement with it. For example, New Zealand has the Waitangi Treaty which also includes Māori ownership of lands, the Waitangi Tribunal and the New Zealand Land Court preside over disputes regarding breaches of the treaty (Boast, 1999; Smith, 1960). Where land is returned to a Māori iwi, they then have full control over it as outlined in the settlement agreement. Māori have also used the Waitangi Tribunal to protect the environment from over fishing and pollution (Hayward and Wheen, 2004; Ruru, 2012).

In Canada, First Nations affairs are governed under the Indian Act 1876 (Reynolds, 1996; Weaver, 1981). The Indian Act oversees the Indian reserves, which are land tracts that have been set aside by the Crown for the use of the band. Reservations were formed after settlement and are included in treaties. Canadian land claims are much bigger than the reserve as they are First Nations traditional lands. Land claims are a legal declaration giving title and control over areas of land and/or water.

In Australia, as with Canada, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders have two parcels of land they can attach themselves to. Missions are small parcels of land the Aboriginal peoples were placed on to make land available for white settlement. Australian land claims have also yielded large tracts of traditional lands (Altman and Sanders, 2002).

While I have not set out to address land claims in this body of work, it is important to point out the issue regarding land for people removed from their families and culture in that they have been restricted and denied the connections to tribal rights. Many people removed have never reconnected with their families. Some have tried and were successful in being accepted into the family and tribe, while others have not and therefore experienced rejection. For others it has been too painful to even try. For many Indigenous

---

15 An Iwi is the largest grouping in Māoridom. Meaning tribe or nation.
16 A band, sometimes referred to as Indian Band, First Nations Band or even just First Nations, is the First Nations governance structure for managing tribe affairs.
peoples who were removed, it is not possible for them to experience that real connection to their tribal lands! The impact of loss is expressed by this Fort Frances man.

My experience personally, and I think the worst thing about the whole experience, was loneliness. I was within sight of my home and I couldn’t go there. We was allowed to go home Sunday afternoon for, oh, maybe three or four hours and, of course, summer holidays and winter holidays, we was allowed to go home (First Nation man, Fort Frances).

The quote above demonstrates that being just on or near one’s homeland, is not a protective factor. In other words, being on or near your traditional homelands does not prevent the individual from suffering negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Individuals have to be able to live freely on that land.

By being removed from their family and culture, most people were disconnected from traditional lands. One of the themes emerging from the data (Table 1) is that of those interviewed, all Māori and Aboriginal people were moved off their traditional home land and 6.2% of First Nations Canadians remained on or near their homelands. This is due to some residential schools being placed on reservations, and one such site, Couchiching (Fort Frances), was one of the fieldwork sites.

The removal from homelands breaks the connection to creation stories and other cultural ceremonies and rights, thus making it harder for removed individuals to reconnect with not only the culture, but also family and community.

7.3. Family

Family connection is important to all people. It allows us to look into the future and see what our genetic makeup looks like, and informs us of what illnesses we may receive from our parent’s genetics (Lichtenstein et al., 2009; Wells and Hasel, 2007). It is also human nature to try and compare
ourselves to others in our family, giving rise to such comments as ‘I have my father’s nose’.

Apart from genetics and normal parent-child bonding, Indigenous people lose so much more as stories of spirituality, kinship, lore and culture are all passed down from parent to child verbally (King et al., 2009) (see extract three paragraphs below). In the case of Aboriginal participants, many stories are gender based so children miss out on not only the stories but also the correct cultural nuances.

The importance of family to an Indigenous child’s Social and Emotional Wellbeing cannot be stressed strongly enough. To indigenous people, family is an important part of cultural life within the tribal unit. This is a separate part of the nature and physical aspects of raising a child. Family is considered parents, uncles and aunties, older cousins and others within the tribal group (King et al., 2009; Kirmayer et al., 2003).

Family is responsible for teaching the moral and ethical ways of living. Once children came of age, lore and other customs and ceremony were then passed down from elders within the group (Johnson, 1992; King et al., 2009). Learning to live off and with the land was an important way of life. Male and female initiation ceremonial rites of passage into adulthood, and bloodlines regarding marriage were also important teachings passed down through the generations within the family group (Keen, 2002; Van Kirk, 2003).

The follow extract from an interview demonstrates just how important extended family is. The example shows how grandparents teach survival skills as well as important moral lessons such as how to care for each (rabbit blanket) and work ethics.

I was over to grandfathers and grandmothers all, mostly all the time when I wasn't taking care of my siblings. They took me hunting with them, like in the fall. I used to go hunting with them and trapping, they used to have a cabin, a few down the track. Like we'd had a railroad to go on at that time - CPR
Railroad and we would take - jump on the train and get off at their trapping grounds or hunting grounds, wherever you know.

It was beautiful there and I remember - it still sticks in my mind that time we went - we went to trap. It was like, it was in - near Christmas time and we stayed there for Christ - we were there for Christmas but I remember going and they had the dog team. They put the dog team in the baggage car with the sleigh and all their possessions that they took when they went trapping. So they set up the dog team and everything and when we went oh, it was just so beautiful.

I just remember them going along the lake, along the shore you know, and you could hear the wolves in the background howling. It was really - probably had just snowed maybe - because the moon was out full and I could see just the snow shining, you know like when the moon's shining on it and you could hear the crunch of the snow where the dogs were running you know. We were all tucked in the sleigh, all warm and everything [laughs], we were cosy.

Because my grandmother made rabbit skin blankets and we all had a rabbit skin blanket so that was all tucked around us and we were pretty warm in there. My grandfather ran behind our sleigh and took care of that so, anyways we got to the cabin there and we were all tired so we just went to bed [laughs]. Then the next morning we - I went with my grandfather to look at the traps and he said I could have a little trap that I could have myself that if anything was caught in there I could have that, and it was a little weasel trap [laughs].

I must have had about - maybe after the season - I must have had about six little weasels that were mine ay, so he probably took them over to the - when he had his first take-in to the store and so - but that was one episode there that I went with my grandparents. (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Marie)

The reported themes within this data set, shows that a high number (70%) of Māori knew or had knowledge of their parents when they were removed. Interestingly 56% of First Nations peoples were removed once they came of
school age, (Canada, 2012). At five years old, a child has developed memory of knowing their parents. Aboriginals have the poorest knowledge of parents with just over one third (34.6%) of people reporting they knew or had knowledge of their parents before they were removed. This would reflect the policy, which was to remove the child for assimilation and cultural reprogramming (Clark, 2008; Thomas, 2001; Cultural Survival 2014). The following quote is an example of how Indigenous people use the extended family to pass on cultural knowledge.

But I spent a lot of time with my direct family, my grandparents, my uncles and aunts. Ever since I can remember, even as far back as - things will come back when I’m about three years old. It was a wonderful, wonderful beginning to my life here. The interaction I had was incredible, not just with my mum and dad but more particularly with my uncles, my aunts and my grandparents.

I learnt all the skills I required to survive. As early as four and five years old I remember being in charge of providing, first of all, water, providing fire wood, the little things that are required to make a household run. Of course, we didn’t have any electricity, we didn’t have any running water, we didn’t have any - we had outhouses. So basically you lived to be able to live (First Nations woman, Winnipeg).

This quote demonstrates just how Indigenous families globally use the extended family to raise and teach their children. It also demonstrates how Indigenous children are educated early so that they are part of the family group and are given skills to survive in their environment.

Another way of keeping Indigenous children disconnected from their families and to enforce integration and assimilation was to separate siblings from each other. When siblings were removed from their families, only just over 3% of siblings remained together within Canada and New Zealand. This rose slightly to 7.7% in Australia, (see Table 1). The following quote is an example of family disconnection.
We used to be all happy because on the girls side there was my sister and me and ...... and .......... there was three of us on the girl's side. On the boys side was - and we would only see our brothers about once a month for maybe a half an hour, even though we were in the same school we couldn't have no family relations (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Maire)

This demonstrates just how the schooling system managed to break family bonds. This policy was very effective with 26.7% of New Zealanders, 6.25% of Canadians and 34.6% of Australians reporting that they felt rejected by their families as children.

Once they reached adulthood many removed people tried to reconnect with their families (see Table 1) but most were not successful. About 12.5% First Nations, 26.75% Māori and 46% of Aboriginal removal policy survivors were rejected by either their families (see Table 2), or tribal units. This has caused further emotional distress. Rejection affects the identity of the individual, as they do not get the opportunity to connect with their culture as well as immediate and extended family. Many who did reconnect have strained relationships, as the follow extract illustrates.

Like one woman, she was entering all her information and she was speaking to me in Ojibwe. I goes I'm sorry, I don't know the tongue. Her husband goes she just introduced herself and told you where she's from. I said well thank you, and then she talked Ojibwe in a stern voice. I'm going what am I in trouble for? He goes she said you're not Indian until you learn your language (First Nations man, Sault Saint Marie).

and

I found that my community was probably more harsher than [one] non-aboriginal community but the rejection was still the same. Having to work out once again well where do I fit in, it's like well I can only do what I need to do for my kids. But it's been really hard to - 20 years of trying to be part of something that at times never wanted you and is your right to belong has been a journey that I have not enjoyed all that much (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs).
These extracts demonstrate the rejection that some Indigenous adults experience from their families and communities. The first quote also demonstrates just how important language is to identity.

7.4. Language

Chandler et al. (Chandler et al., 2003; Chandler and Lalonde, 1998) stated that language is an important part of keeping the community safe. That is, communities that spoke their native language had fewer suicides. Additionally, as discussed in section 7.5, language is an important element for good Social and Emotional Wellbeing, because it allows for cultural groups to bond, confer ideas and other cultural massages, and are essential to kinship lore.

The Canadian experience of removing children at school age is one possible reason that First Nations peoples reported having lost or kept their first language. Children were removed from their parents after they had gained language skills.

My name is [redacted]. [Redacted] is my family name and my husband's name is [redacted]. I come from the Northern Region of Manitoba. Island Lake it's called, there's four reserves there. I'm from the Catholic community of St Theresa Point. I speak Cree and Ojibwe. The whole area of Island Lake is called Oji-Cree. Most of us speak both. The younger ones don't because of obvious reasons that their families didn't learn the language’ (First Nations woman, Winnipeg).

What is clear from the data is the importance of cultural and language to the reconnection process. The levels of language reconnection in all three countries are relatively similar.

It is difficult to give an accurate percentage of people who no longer speak their traditional language due to being removed, as it was not a direct question of this study17. However, what is clear from the data is that most

17Further work in this area should be conducted.
people no longer have the ability to speak their traditional language. The number of people trying to reconnect with their language is evidence of this.

7.5. Culture

Culture is an important part of who a person is, not only to the individual identity but also in regards to how they fit into a particular cultural group and the broader social structure. The aim of the removal policies was to strip away the child’s cultural identity and replace it with another, in other words cultural reprogramming and assimilation.

While this was largely unsuccessful, what was achieved was a population that do not have a complete identity. ‘I still feel like I’m not good enough’ was a statement made by a successful, Aboriginal woman, who is in middle management of the Australian Public Service (Troy, 2014), in relation to herself. Further evidence from the study supports this view:

First of all they have to - they don't even know what that word means right? Well that happened ages ago, it didn't just happen then. No, you're a product of it. This is why you're like you are. You have to ask questions like can you speak your language? Do you know who you are whakapapa to genealogy wise? Do you know your stories? Do you know your waka? Do you know your mountain - the sacred mountains? Do you know all of what we call the pepeha which introduces a person to - you know we stand up and we'll do something like tena koutou, ko Hinewirangi toku ingoa (Māori woman, Hamilton)

In this way we can see the importance of culture to identity. The woman explains how family and the tribal unit are effectively who you are, and therefore you must know your whakapapa or family line. The importance of language is not missed out in this quote either, as a person needs to know their traditional language as this forms part of their identity (in this case Māori). It is part of your culture as this is how you learn your whakapapa, stories, including your mountain, and your tena koutou, ko Hinewirangi toku ingoawho, this is who you are and where you fit in within Māoridom.
The study found that 53% of Māori undertook some form of cultural activities to relearn the culture they had lost. This percentage was somewhat reduced in Canada and Australia, with both having close to 20% of people undertaking activities to reconnect with their culture in some way.

This demonstrates that there is an inherent drive for people to understand their dominant culture and where they fit in. It also reflects Indigenous communities’ need to have their returning children conform to their own cultural norms, as illustrated below.

Then when I had my three boys it was like who do they look like. It was like well I can't see me in you and that was really daunting. So I went on a journey, I left my husband and thought well I need to find out who I am because the last time I'd seen my mum when I was 15 and I was probably a really condescending teenager at that time, knew it all. I think back and I went oh yeah payback (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs).

or

I also had to find what was missing. What was missing was that part of me that knew - where my - me came from. That was being traditional, and following the ceremonies, and learning from the ceremonies, because that was like an awakening. Slowly realising that this is where I belong. It fit. I didn't have to try and figure out why they were living that way. This is the way I was (First Nations woman, Montreal).

and

So as soon as I moved up, I learnt a lot about the culture, got involved pretty much in learning about Māori stuff more; the language and pronunciation was a great big thing. For once I wanted to get it right. So I worked hard at all that, and I learnt a few stories and I really enjoyed more stories, I'm starting to understand - both me and my wife are starting to understand what it was all about (Māori woman, Hamilton).

This research did not set out to measure each element of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. This field of investigation is for another piece of work after completion of my research study. What can be said from the elements that this research did capture, however, is that work on the reconnection of
people removed from their families back to culture, language, family and land needs to occur. New Zealand has started some work in the area of language. The New Zealand language targets are a good starting point, and Australia and Canada should adopt similar targets, to that of New Zealand’s 80% Māori and 20% non-Māori speaking Māori. One way of connecting these elements together is to reconnect the community, not just various families, in a cultural program around a traditional event. This would need to be undertaken from within the community and supported by government.

7.6. Negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing

As with most facets in life there is a negative side to Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing often leads to drug and alcohol use, crime and incarceration, self-harm and suicide, anger and resentment, sleeping issues, poor self-esteem, guilt and shame. Understanding these elements and the interplay between positive and negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing will allow for interventions to be developed.
Table 2 (below) is a consolidated representation of the data of negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing Factors again from interviews.

Table 2: Negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing outcome factors, as a result of being removed and as reported by participants</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger &amp; Resentment</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
<td>57.70%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Issues</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>11.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Activities/Jail</td>
<td>56.60%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Guilt</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame of Indigeneity</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug &amp; Alcohol</td>
<td>36.60%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grief &amp; Loss</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Self-Esteem</td>
<td>16.60%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Harm</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal Thoughts</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy Sad</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>14.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping Issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reject/Feeling family rejected them</td>
<td>26.70%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>46.10%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6.1. Australia

Australia has a national suicide rate of 11 per 100,000 people or 0.0112% of the population. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people have a much
higher average with men being 2.5 times higher and females 3.4 times more likely to commit suicide than the national average figure (Australian Insitute Health Welfare, 2009; Statistics, 2013).

7.6.2. Canada

Canada has a national suicide rate of 12 people per 100,000 or an average percentage of 0.012% (Mental Health Commission Canada, 2014). In First Nations, youth suicide jumps by a staggering 11 times to a 13.2% range (Walker, 2014). Among First Nation and Inuit groups, the Inuit suicide rate is 135 per 100,000 or 11.25 times the national average, and First Nations are 24 per 100,00, or twice the national average figure (Elias et al., 2012).

7.6.3. New Zealand

New Zealand has a national suicide rate of 11.5 people per 100,000. While Māori women had no discernible difference in suicide rates, Māori men were 26 per 100,000 or twice as likely to commit suicide as the national average figure (Statistics New Zealand, 2011).

7.7. Study data on suicide

As outlined in Table 2 suicidal thoughts are very high, with 11.4% compared to the respective national suicide rate. It is acknowledged that this study is looking at thoughts not acts. Even so this rate is still concerning.

The data collected found that there was a higher than average suicidal thoughts ratio from people that were removed from their families and culture. At figures of Australia 15.4%, New Zealand 6.6%, and Canada 6.25%, all Indigenous groups have a higher than average rate for people thinking about suicide than the relevant countries’ national averages.

In Canada and New Zealand self-harm were also themes. This is where someone has tried to commit suicide and failed. The study shows that among those First Nations people interviewed, the rate of self-harm is 6.25%
compared to the national average for Canada being 125/100,000. Among the Māori, the rate was 6.6 %, with a national average for New Zealand being 61.1/100,000. These averages are higher than that of the national averages.

The Canadian Institute of Health Research published on its website the Pathways to Health Equity for Aboriginal Peoples report, which states the ‘the erosion of traditional cultural practise, family structure and community network have contributed to poor mental health and high suicide rates in some Aboriginal Communities’ (Government of Canada, 2011). The report’s assertion is supported by evidence in my study:

A lot of times I fell into the worse state and on the verge of certain things. I remember contemplating doing away with myself one time. My brother, I don't know why, I think it was a call for help. Somehow my brother picked me up (First Nation man, Winnipeg).

and

I think I was about 10 when I first wanted to kill myself (Māori woman, Wellington New Zealand)

and

Have - had tried self-harm a couple of times. Didn't work. I'm still here (Aboriginal woman, Sydney)

There has been and still is concern about suicide, and the lack of spending on suicide prevention programs. This data shows that people removed from their families and culture still carry these burdensome thoughts.

What would be interesting to find is those protective elements that prevented people from acting on these thoughts. The more Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors a person and community have, the lower the suicidal thoughts would be.
7.8. Incarceration Rates

Australia has a national average of 170 per 100,000 people in prison. For Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, this jumps to 1,959 per 100,000 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014) or about 12 times the national average. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people make up 2.7% of the prison population (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2014).

The Canadian incarceration rates is the lowest of the three countries within the study with 117 people per 100,000 (TEARA, 2011). Indigenous Canadians make up 25% of the total federal prison population (The Correctional Investigator Canada, 2014). As First Nations peoples make up just 4.3% of the Canadian population, the incarceration rate is approximately 13 times that of other Canadians (Canadian Government, 2011).

New Zealand has the highest figures of the three countries with an average national incarceration rate of 199 per 100,000 (Teara, 2011). Māori are over represented within this population, making up just over 50% of the population (Corrections Department NZ, 2014). However, given that Māori make up 15.4% of the New Zealand population, this percentage is lower than Australia and Canada at approximately 8 times the national average (Statistics New Zealand, 2012).

7.9. Criminal Activity

One would expect that the incarceration rate of the Indigenous population would mirror its respective population size. However, this is not so. While Indigenous peoples are over represented within the criminal justice system in all three countries, people who were forcibly removed have an even higher representation, as Table 2 demonstrates. Evidence in the BTH Report (1997) states that children who were forcibly removed were 22 times more likely to be incarcerated than those who were not.
The criminal element is difficult to evaluate, as there are so many factors that can lead a person down a criminal path. Drugs and alcohol is one such factor. This element is high in this population and is definitely a factor, which is exacerbated by the increased feeling of need to be connected to a group, especially among young men. The quotes below illustrate, that some people in this population were looking to be a part of a family or group,

That went on till I was about 15 years old - 15, 16 years of age. I was a ward of the State so I was in and out of all the boys' homes, institutions. Got out of there - I was discharged from being a ward of the State when I was 16. Ended up joining a gang after that and ended up joining a gang (Māori man, Dunedin).

and

I'm a, I say I'm a stolen generation. I say I'm assimilated. I say I'm a correctionalised government-made man. That's what I say because 10 years of institution, [next] 13 years in and out of prison; 23 years of my life has been - had quite to do with police and government but yeah, with the police and government yeah, over that period from '56 to '79. So there was a lot of victimisation. I got pages of disagreeing with the police, like I've got quite a lot of [I just might have the] smell of alcohol sometimes but you know, I was targeted (Aboriginal man, Melbourne).

7.10. Mental Health Issues

This study only looked at symptoms of mental ill health, except where people stated they had a formal diagnosis. Symptoms of depression, such as poor eating and sleeping, sadness, attachment issues, grief and loss and poor self-esteem, have all been combined into this category. The following statements look at these symptoms.

I wrote some of my memories I said, I came out of that school full of anger, hatred and trusting nobody. That's what happened. That's what I found out when I talk more to my therapist about the type of character I was. I mean I've been alcohol free for 38 years. I was 34 years old when I stopped. I didn't start until I was really about 19 when I really got into it. I got married at
24 and I still apologise to myself, what my wife must have went through for the first 10 years of our marriage’ (First Nations male, Winnipeg)

and

I had terrible, terrible times of just feeling totally depressed and others feeling quite alone and I'm trying to make the most of what we had, which was not very much at that stage because I was working then studying then I got another job in a library. So you know, it was still always hard going and still trying to understand who I was (Aboriginal Female, Sydney).

Anger and resentment, should be expected as people removed would have trouble reconciling their childhood, with the policies and practices, shaped their ideologies, morals and self. Freud (1928) would have called this a conflict of the super ego. This could well be true of all symptoms listed above. Anger and resentment will be treated separately but in conjunction with the other poor symptoms of Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

Table 2 shows the symptoms of mental ill health as a combined group of symptoms: self- guilt, sleeping issues, unhappiness and sadness. Māori have a slightly higher rate of symptoms at 11.9%, followed by Australia with 8.3% and Canada with 6.3% of people removed having some symptoms of mental ill health.

In Australia, Canada and New Zealand, 20% of people have experienced depression in the last 12 months. This jumps to 45% (Australia, 2013; Browne and MA, 2006; Elisabeth Wells et al., 2006) when there is an association with other problems such as alcohol. However, the percentage decreases to 11% of Australians and 8% of Canadians developing severe depression (Australia, 2013; Canadian Government, 2011; Wells et al., 2006).

While the symptoms within the data are minor, they are chronic, lasting many years. Therefore, they are pervasive and should be treated in the same category as severe depression (Association and others, 2013). There is no statistical difference between combined symptoms percentages between this study (8%) and the national averages in Australia and New Zealand (8%)
(Beyondblue, 2015; New Zealand Government, 2015) and Canada (12%) (Canadian Mental Health Association, 2015). This low percentage may be due to anger and resentment at having been removed, which may cause episodic mental issues that were not captured.

7.11. Anger and resentment

There is no national data kept on anger and resentment. However, anger and resentment among participants would appear to be high, with New Zealand having 60%, Australia 57.7% and Canada 34.4% of interviewee's still experiencing anger and resentment towards the government and/or the church for their removal, as well as towards people who were responsible for their treatment within institutions. The anger and resentment towards government is a combination of past policies and treatment, as well as of the failed apologies.

The following quotes demonstrates anger and resentment.

_I was very angry. The government and the people that done that to our mob. I was real angry at I went to a lot of rallies and demonstrations and protests. I was down Sydney for one anniversary of the tent embassy and [Gary Foley] and all the likes of them mob (Aboriginal man, Canberra)._

_or_

_Why am I the way I am? Well, it's because of what happened to me. So I have to forgive myself for what I've done to my family, my friends, my wife, everything. I have make amends to them, okay? Once I've done that - it didn't feel like I've reconciled myself to what happened to me. I still have difficult time with it today but I'm working on it because now I know. Now, I know where these things are coming from, my anger, my resentments (First Nations man, Vancouver)._

_and_

_To get that reaction was like, what the fuck - sorry, am I allowed to swear? Sorry. It was like, what the hell. So I got quite upset and that upset turned to into anger and I said that's it, I'm out of here (Māori man, Wellington)._
The reason that First Nations peoples currently to have less anger and resentment issues is the recent awarding of the Residential Schools Survivors Settlement Agreement and the recent Truth and Reconciliation Commissions National Events. Both these have brought the residential school system, and the treatment of First Nations peoples while attending them to the attention of all Canadians and even the world. No longer can the Canadian Government or the church back away from the unresolved issues that Residential School Survivors still face. It is for these reasons that Canadians are reporting less anger and resentment.

The Residential Schools Survivors Settlement Agreement also came with compensation package. This also meant that the court held the Canadian Government to account. Continuing anger and resentment is an issue, as it can lead to poor judgment in social situations and criminal actions, such as drug and excessive alcohol consumption (Smith, 2000). It is also one of the reasons that this population received the apologies so poorly. This is discussed in chapter 13, Apology Data.

7.12. Shame of Indigeneity (Aboriginality)

One of the most disturbing statistics collected in this study is shame of Aboriginality, with 16.60% of Māori, 11.5% of Australian Aboriginals and 3.1% of First Nations peoples stating they were ashamed of being Indigenous.

So I had nice things and these other Māori kids at school, they weren't at all. I identified very much with pakeha people, right up until when I was an adult and I can look back now and I see that I just had this huge sense of shame. Of [cries]. It's a tough thing, because it's not like - these people love me and I love them. But it was the absence of my people that I think made me feel like that. know and I didn't understand those feelings. I didn't get that (Māori woman, Wellington).

and

It doesn't make you feel too good about, you know, when people ask you. Especially the Aboriginal community, everybody knows. When you come
across people they say, ‘This is my uncle’, or ‘That’s a relation.’ Then when they ask you, you don’t know. It makes you feel like you’re a real idiot because, you know. And it makes you feel like you’ve really lost, you know. Yeah, you’ve had it taken away from you, I guess, the chance. It doesn’t make you feel Aboriginal, if you know what I mean (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

The concept of shame needs further investigation into the underlying reasons that this occurred but also into how this can be remedied and treated. This is one of the contributing factors for those who have considered suicide or self-harm. It is also probable that the thoughts on identity can be passed from parent to child in the form of trans-generational trauma.

7.13. Drug and alcohol

The alcohol and other drug abuse use patterns between Australia and New Zealand are similar to national levels of alcohol use: Australia 18.2%; and New Zealand 19% (Ministry of Health, 2013.; NHMRC, 2009) for levels for high-risk drinking. The Canadian national level for high-risk alcohol use is 31%.

In Australia, drug use for all illicit drugs is: 18.1% for males and 12.1% for females. However, this drops for people over 50 years with 8.7% for males and 11.1% for females. In New Zealand, the national level of illicit drug use for those 25 years and over is 16% (Ministry of Health, 2010); and in Canada, for those over 25 years illicit drugs use is shown as cannabis 9.1% (Marshall, 2015) and other illicit drugs at 15% (Government of Canada, 2014).

Across all three countries, high-risk levels of alcohol and drug use among Indigenous peoples are higher than their non-Indigenous counterparts. Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander alcohol consumption was 17% (AIHW, 2013a, 2013b), Māori 24.9% (Ministry of Health, 2013) and First Nations peoples at 63.3% (Government of Canada, 2014).
Illicit drug use for Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is 23%, (AIHW, 2013a, 2013b), while 13% of Māori have an illicit drug problem and 7.3% of First Nations people have had a drug problem in the last year (CoDA, 2012).

This study found (Table 2) that Māori (36.6%) and Aboriginal Australian’s (46.2%) who had been removed from their families and culture had higher combined alcohol and drug use than their respective Indigenous counterparts. First Nations Canadians population had lower levels of high-risk alcohol consumption than the national average for First Nations and similar to the national average; however this could be skewed due to not interviewing people from Inuit communities. High-risk alcohol consumption is evident:

*I'm 48 now so in between this time and then I've been all around Australia because I was in a confined space for 18 years. So from 1980 to '83, '84 I was just doing drugs, alcohol, women, break and enters, anything to get money in those days. Got in a lot of trouble with my brother and other people. We paid our dues for it and moved on (Aboriginal man, Canberra).*

*or*

*I have like a - after I finished university I did play around with being involved with alcohol for about five, eight years abut again I found out that's something that I wasn't good at, so I quit [laughs]. So I've essentially been free of - I've never gone for drugs, I've never tried drugs, just been alcohol, so it's been 35 years now, that's the last time I had any alcohol (First Nation man, Fort Frances).*

*and*

*I had fallen off the wagon, got back into drugs when I was at school and I was on the program in hospital. The principal of the school came to see me and said, here's your books, I want you to study for the exam, and, you know, next month, you'll be out, come and do the exam. I think he thought I thought, well, that's it, I'm not going back to school, you know (Māori man, Hamilton).*

These extracts demonstrate some of the drug and alcohol issues within the
focus population.


As discussed in Apology (Chapter 12), most Māori have not heard of the apology that the Queen offered in Christchurch. Table 3 demonstrates this with Māori not having any references to the apology within their interviews.

Table 3: Outcomes of Social and Emotional Wellbeing and apology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes of Social and Emotional Wellbeing and apology</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apology and SEWB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement that removal is true</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National forgiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apology as healing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of purpose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing’s changed</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>19.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the themes around positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing outcomes due to the apology, people’s reactions were subdued. In each category, all levels were less than 6.5% except for three: acknowledgement that removal was true; apology as healing; and nothing’s changed (nothing’s changed is a negative social and emotional factor). These include a sense of purpose, improved relationships, and national forgiveness, which were insignificant, and did not rate mentioning for most of the study population.

With regards to an apology acknowledging that the removal of people was genuine and apology is healing, 11.5% of Aboriginal Australians reported this to be an outcome of the apology. This mirrors the percentage of people who accepted the apology. (See chapter 13, Apology Data). This implies that
many of the Stolen Generations believed that Australians were in denial that the Stolen Generation policies occurred before the apology.

Extracts from interviews support this view.

As for the apology, I remember watching that live on the news in a group with a bunch of Aboriginal people as well and it was just - it was almost like an unbelievable event that took place. I'm still shocked by it. I started crying, as well as other people in the room, just finally the government acknowledges that they agree that this did take place and I think it was almost like a sign for Aboriginal people to be able to move forward now (First Nations woman, Winnipeg).

or

I’m glad people are starting to realise now. It’s made me feel a lot better that it has happened, that people are understanding a bit better. Because I’ve actually had a woman come up to me. A couple of people have said to me out of the blue in the shops that they’re sorry. So that makes you feel a bit better (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

The notion that nothing has changed is an important one. With all apologies having occurred before July 2008, at least 6 years had passed when the research population was interviewed. Nearly 20% of Aboriginal Australians do not think that anything has changed, the government has not entered into a new relationship and nor has there been any behavioural change. This is much lower than for Canadians and New Zealanders. For Canada, this may be due to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission still holding national events at the time of the interview. It would be an interesting study to revisit the Canadian population in two years’ time after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC, 2012) has been closed, to evaluate how people feel. Even so, the percentage of Canadians stating that there has been an improved relationship between First Nations peoples and the Government is still low.
Extracts from interviews support this view:

It was good that he did say sorry, but nothing else has happened since that, you know, ah, for compensation or something, you know, for the Stolen Generation….. has the apology impacted on your life at all since it was given? A: No, not really. Q: Has anything changed? A: Nothing’s changed (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

or

But now, over the years since that apology, the actions of the Government do not coincide with the apology. They’re getting more antagonistic against the Indian people than they ever have been. So in my mind and in my belief system, I have concluded that the apology wasn’t made from the heart. That’s where these things have to be dealt with - from the heart level - in order for them to be any good. That’s where I am today (First Nations man, Winnipeg).

7.15. Does the rejection of the apology affect wellbeing

One of the questions I am investigating in this research study is ‘Has Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people forcibly removed from their family and culture, improved as a result of reconciliation activities (apologies)?’ Table 1 demonstrates at there has been some improvement in some elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, especially in the areas of reconnection to land, family and language.

While a small number of people have acknowledged that the apology has allowed them to start to heal (8.1%), and their relationships with loved ones and family have improved (5.9%), this would not necessarily transfer to positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing. This is due to the nature of how Indigenous healing and Social and Emotional Wellbeing occurs, King, Smith and Gracey (2009) describe this as resilience-recovery; the connection between the individual, community and culture.

I felt good that I went through it but like I said it really did things to me in a very bad way. I had a hard time. I had a really hard time because it took me
a long time to build up that relationship feeling, that partnership feeling towards a non-Aboriginal people (First Nations man, Calgary).

or

To use our language today, that's exactly what happened and people felt okay saying about healing and stuff like that and even men sort of in their strong-ness sort of said, well, it's - I'm really thinking about my own healing and stuff like that (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

7.15.1.  **Negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing data**

Positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing has to be balanced with the evidence acquired on negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Anger and resentment levels are very high, as are grief and loss and suicidal thoughts. While there are a number of other negative Social and Emotional and Wellbeing factors, such as criminal activities and drug and alcohol use, one of the most disturbing is shame of indigeneity. If a person is ashamed of whom they are, how can they truly reach their full potential? As stated in section 5.16 (Maslow) all elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing are needed for a person to be able to reach their full potential.

The following are a set of negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing statements collected from my interviews:

*I wrote some of my memories I said, I came out of that school full of anger, hatred and trusting nobody. That's what happened. That's what I found out when I talk more to my therapist about the type of character I was. I mean I've been alcohol free for 38 years. I was 34 years old when I stopped. I didn't start until I was really about 19 when I really got into it. I got married at 24 and I still apologise to myself, what my wife must have went through for the first 10 years of our marriage (First Nations man, Fort Frances).*

*My great grandfather was a grand chief of the Great Lakes and so when I look at how he lived his life in the area that he lived it in, I look at freedom. I know what freedom, in my heart - I can understand freedom. In the last couple of years I have just come to feel the loss of that freedom that my*
people endured through the residential school (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Marie).

I was doing sewing that the homes got me into. I didn't sort of settle into the job because I was worried about family, of things that I missed out of, on being around family. I just took the - I didn't realise how much that it took from me [cries] and what I missed out on, being around my own culture. I felt ashamed of my colour. I was always just trying to find out why I felt like I did was wrong, didn't know the truth behind a lot of the stuff why, why I couldn't go back home (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

I'm 48 now so in between this time and then I've been all around Australia because I was in a confined space for 18 years. So from 1980 to '83, '84 I was just doing drugs, alcohol, women, break and enters, anything to get money in those days. Got in a lot of trouble with my brother and other people. We paid our dues for it and moved on (Aboriginal man, Canberra).

That was kind of their answer to everything. I didn't like being put in the cells so I just kept absconding, kept running away, hence I ended up in Auckland. Auckland I did three weeks and I took off. I took off with four others and ended up - that was the beginning of my - start of my life into a lot of alcohol and drugs and a life of gangs and a life of shit really to be honest (Māori woman, Auckland).

I'm a master of their production. They made me who - if I hadn't known about any of this or - what do you call it - how would you put it? The institutions, I wouldn't be here. So yeah, I reconciled with the Blacks because that was my family, that's who I knew. Pushing drugs, whatever, that was me. I'm not going to bullshit, I'm not going to say, you know, I'm a gang member that thing. Shit, my tattoos tell the story, you know what I mean? That's part of it, trying to disguise who I was. Do you understand what I'm saying, what I'm trying to disguise it (Māori man, Wellington)?

But I fucking hated them. I couldn't trust anyone, not anyone. I'm still that way a little bit these days. (First Nations man, Vancouver)
Reaching one’s full potential is not possible with the type of deficits mentioned above. It is important that negativity concerning Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors be addressed before positive change can occur within the individual, community and country.

In regard to the official government apologies and improving Social and Emotional Wellbeing, there is some evidence of improvement. This is small improvement and not across all elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing, however, as discussed earlier an apology is the start of an ongoing process.

Given the amount of negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing, there is evidence that this process has faltered. Previous research has demonstrated that the more positive elements of Social and Emotional Wellbeing an individual and community process, the fewer negative elements are present. It is therefore imperative that governments follow up on their apologies, and initiate a new and equal relationship with their Indigenous populations.

7.16. **Social and Emotional Wellbeing conclusions**

This chapter explored and reported on the protective and negative factors of Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Chandler and Lalonde (2008) found that cultural knowledge had a direct influence on suicide rates in First Nations communities. While this research did not set out to emulate Chandler and Lalonde’s work, there are some elements that are similar.

Cultural elements relating to Social and Emotional Wellbeing, such as kept first language (NZ 0%, CA 6.2%, AU 0%), knowledge of family and parents (NZ 70%, CA 56%, AU 34%), and keep family name (NZ 33.3%, CA 6.2%, AU 7.7%) and stayed with sibling (NZ 70%, CA 50%, AU 35%) were positively related to Social and Emotional Wellbeing, but not surprisingly, relatively low in the populations interviewed.

Land was a significant factor with most people (93%) being removed from their traditional lands (being near it was not enough; people had to live freely
Consequently this inhibited positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors such as connection to family (many never reconnected) and cultural learning (including language).

On leaving institutional care, 93% of people interviewed re-established some sort of connection with the homelands. However, this dropped for cultural connections, with only 20% of First Nations and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and 53% of Māori connecting back to culture. These low numbers may be due to the disenfranchisement of the individuals.

Except for the reconnection to land, Social and Emotional Wellbeing protective factors are relatively low. This corresponds with poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing, which is high across all categories. This would indicate that while reconnection to land is good (mean = 30%) the presence of one protective factor alone is not enough to promote positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

Conversely, many of those interviewed reported negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors as a result of being forcibly removed. These included high rates of suicidal thoughts, self-harm, incarceration, symptoms of poor mental health, shame of indigeneity, drug and alcohol usage, and very high rates of anger and resentment.

While the apologies had led to an increase sense of positive factors in some areas (such as supporting reconnection to family and culture by enabling healing), a considerable portion (particularly Aboriginal people) reported a sense that nothing had changed.
8. Reconciliation

8.1. Overview of the chapter

This chapter is designed to give an overview of reconciliation and the different models within each country. Starting with the role it plays in uniting a nation in a common understanding of historical events, and the treatment of its Indigenous peoples. Moving forward, a number of different definitions are offered, allowing for an understanding of reconciliation to be formed. The reconciliation models of each country are explored, ending in a comparison of these. It is then drawn together to offer some final throughs on the topic.

8.2. The literature

Scholars of reconciliation argue that a necessary component of reconciliation is its ability for differences to coexist within a population rather than being suppressed (Blackburn, 2007). Desmond Tutu (2000b) describes reconciliation as ‘a process where perpetrators of gruesome atrocities received amnesty in exchange of truth’. In other words, reconciliation is a confession for forgiveness. Blackburn (2007) states that people are using reconciliation as a means of correcting past mistakes and creating new relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. These examples demonstrate that reconciliation is about past wrongs and could be considered the start of justice.

What these scholars have not addressed is the human psychology behind reconciliation. If the purpose of reconciliation is to address unresolved issues caused through conflict, the human psyche must be considered. I believe that in order for reconciliation to be entered into from the victim’s viewpoint Janoff-Bulman’s (1992) three basic and fundamental assumptions (see section 4.1) must be addressed.

Scholars such as Pedersen et al. (Pedersen et al., 2004, 2005) and Halloran (2007), view reconciliation in the form of empathy and attitudes towards
Indigenous peoples from the perspective of the perpetrator. Pederson et al. (Pedersen et al., 2004, 2005) argue that people's perception of Indigenous Australians is governed by false beliefs and that if these beliefs are challenged and positive outcomes are reached, perceptions will change accordingly. Once this occurs, people become more accepting of the Indigenous population. While the work of Pederson et al. (2005, 2004) was conducted in Australia, the principles would hold true for all countries working on reconciliation.

This argument is backed by Halloran's (2007) work on collective guilt. Halloran's (2007) work uncovered that collective guilt is stronger when unfavourable conditions of history are known. He argues that views of reconciliation will change when the truth about Indigenous history is established. He further states that reconciliation conditions are better when the perpetrators of these events can distance themselves from them. That is, people find it hard to empathise with victims of trauma if they feel responsible in any way for the trauma.

I theorise, that due to the recent historical nature of Stolen Generations (1908-1973), residential schools (Early1800s-1989) and Māori welfare (1950-1970), not enough time has passed for non-Indigenous people to have distanced themselves from these events. It would be difficult for anyone to accept their parents and/or grandparents played any part in the abuse of a child or the genocide of a culture. It would be far easier to ignore and/or deny any involvement in past practices. What the data shows is that most Indigenous peoples are willing to forgive individuals who were not directly involved in the mistreatment they received, and in fact many have forgiven those people as well.

As an Aboriginal woman member of the Stolen Generation states:

*I said to her, well, forgiveness has never really been in my vocabulary. Her eyes looked straight through to my soul and she said you'd best put it there. With that instruction from an elder, which you know we take seriously, I*
thought long and hard and I thought how does one go about forgiveness? I'm not a Christian, so I can't do it through God. But do you know what, I worked on it for some time and she was right. When I learned to forgive the people who had, well, perpetrated against me, I found a sense of freedom and I handed it all back (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

Janoff-Bulman’s (1992) three assumptions, as discussed in Section 4.1 and Silove’s (2005) and Fraser’s (1997) theories of safety, justice and identity, link the victim and the wrongdoers together. Deprince and Freyd (2012) encourage practitioners to consider the individual as a whole when taking into account the trauma experienced, but also the event itself including the socio-political context and community responses. While these scholars’ models are based on a psychological framework, the underpinning concepts are adaptable to reconciliation models.

8.3. Reconciliation and accepting culpability

Some scholars argue (Cairns and Roe, 2003; Cole, 2007; Humphrey, 2003; Jeffery, 2000) that state government apologies and the formation of truth and/or reconciliation commissions are ‘examples of accepting culpability for historical wrongdoings and are proof of an improved international morality in greater respect for the enforcement of human rights’ (Cairns and Roe, 2003). In doing so, they link political legitimacy with the states’ liability to recognise and overcome its colonial history. This theory reinforces Halloran’s (2007) and Pederson’s et al. (2005, 2004) work on false beliefs.

On the flip side, others argue that governments perform apologies and establish truth and reconciliation commissions in the interest of the world order, of growing inequality rather than involving standards of justice and respect for human rights (Sundar, 2004). These works raise the question of purpose, what is the intent of government apologies and the desire behind the establishment of truth and/or reconciliation commissions. Are they truly designed to provide justice for the people who the government sees in some way as wronged? A clue to the intent of apologies may be found in the time
taken between acknowledging the wrong of forced removal policies, and making the formal apology or establishing truth/reconciliation commissions. I do not intend to focus arguments on these themes in this chapter, except to say that reconciliation is a mixture of both the acceptance of wrongdoing and equality. These themes lead into the question of how an individual may accept or reject an apology, and this will lead to a positive or negative effect on an individual's Social and Emotional Wellbeing and how they view reconciliation (Halloran, 2007).

8.3.1. Collective guilt

Pedersen, Bevan, Walker, and Griffiths (2004) found that 48% of their Australian sample had comparatively negative attitudes and expressed some form of resentment towards Indigenous staff in the workplace. They also found that age, education, empathy, and collective guilt were significant in shaping attitudes.

This guilt over the past treatment of Indigenous Australians is a controversial issue. Williams (2000) suggests that collective guilt produces resentment, and ultimately counter-productive attitudes. Williams (Williams, 2000) found that only 14% of the Australians reported feeling a sense of guilt about past treatment of Indigenous Australians. Rogers’ (1999) work with high school students has shown that collective guilt was highly correlated to various means of repairing harm done to Indigenous Australians. Similar in McGarty et al. (2005) collective guilt was found to be a good predictor of support for an official Australian government sanctioned apology to Indigenous Australians. As yet, however, I could not find any literature that investigated whether collective guilt predicts support for more general attitudes towards reconciliation.

It is also likely that the strongly held values of a population will predict their reconciliation attitudes. Cross-cultural research has shown that a population will endorse individualistic values with a relative degree of strength
As such, it is not surprising that group empathy and collective values are lower.

### 8.4. Definitions of reconciliation

Note: While I offer some thoughts and opinions through this next section (8.4-8.8), the main reason for this section is to provide some context to the reader and inform them of how each country works towards reconciliation. For this reason, much of the following is paraphrased from public material and organisational website and program material.

It is a common experience throughout the world that Indigenous people experience disproportionate levels of social, economic, physical, emotional and psychological issues (Adelson, 2005; Anderson et al., 2006). This is particularly disturbing when this occurs within a society that is wealthy and socially progressive, such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Efforts to address these issues by government policies, funding and social initiatives have largely been ineffective (Halloran, 2007). Halloran (2007, p.2) also states that, ‘one promising approach to merge in recent times is the move towards Indigenous reconciliation’.

One definition of Indigenous reconciliation is a general desire to acknowledge past injustices inflicted on Indigenous peoples as a result of European colonisation (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (Australia), 2000). These injustices included land dispossession by force, theft of women, slavery, introduced diseases, suppression of culture and cultural (Aboriginal) law, language and spirituality (Annett, 2010; Elder, 2002; Schmidt, 1990).

Some examples of language, cultural loss and trauma from my interviews are as follows:

*Colonisation on them; First of all they have to - they don’t even know what that word means right? Well that happened ages ago, it didn't just happen then. No, you're a product of it. This is why you're like you are. You have to*
ask questions like can you speak your language? Do you know who you are whakapapa to genealogy wise? Do you know your stories? Do you know your waka? Do you know your mountain - the sacred mountains? Do you know all of what we call the pepeha which introduces a person to - you know we stand up and we'll do something like tena koutou, ko Hinewirangi toku ingoa (Māori woman, Hamilton).

But it's all this crap that they put in their head that their parents don't love them, they don't care. Yeah and they have no siblings or anything and they find that they [got other] siblings. They try and figure out what line they [unclear], the pecking order they come in. Can't speak the culture, the language, [unclear] towards differently to what they were taught and I mean it's [really hard] (Aboriginal man, Canberra).

My name is [Noel Augustine] and I went to the residential school between '60 and '67. Now, first of all I guess you want to hear about the abuses and there was a lot of abuses, sexual abuse, physical abuse, a lot of beatings we got for even talking our own language, having soap stuck into your mouth when you speak Mi'kmaq. A lot of times I thought I would never speak Mi'kmaq again (First Nations man, Montreal).

What is considered to be reconciliation differs from country to country and even from individual to individual, and is discussed further in chapter 11, Reconciliation Data. Steinberg (2007) builds his definition of reconciliation on the premise that it will settle or resolve an issue that causes conflict between people. May (2012) describes reconciliation as a means of building better relationships between Australia's Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous people.

What is missing from this literature is a focus on the importance of equality, between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, in terms of economic, health and social equity.
8.5. Celebrations of culture by nations

In the 20th Century, governments moved from an overt system of genocide to a covert system called assimilation. The main tool used for assimilation was the forced removal of children from their culture and families (referred to in Australia as Stolen Generations, residential school in Canada and in New Zealand through state welfare) (Annett, 2010; Brant-Castellano et al., 2011; HREOC, 1997). Reconciliation models show an effort to acknowledge this past and to address the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples (Beazley, 2006; Belli, 2011).

In the last two decades, reconciliation events have been established in Australia, and Canada. New Zealand has had Waitangi Day since 1974 (McAllister, 2008).


While not considered an event, New Zealand has a network of Māori language revitalisation programs. Language is taught in schools with an aim of having 20% of non-Māori and 80% of Māori speaking and communicating in Māori, by 2020 (Policy, 2013).

Canada’s Reconciliation week is held in September. This celebration is spasmodic and has only just begun on the Canadian event calendar (Reconciliation, 2015). Reconciliation studies and events have been funded through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission; are community and regionally based (Canada, 2012); and are focused on commemorating the anniversary of the apology. This funding was terminated when the Truth and Reconciliation Commission closed in November 2015. As reconciliation in Canada is in its infancy, starting in 2013, it will take time for national events to be established.
In Australia, 26th May – 3rd June is National Reconciliation Week (NRW), which celebrates the rich culture and history of the first Australians. Another reconciliation event, recommended in the BTH Report, is to establish a national Sorry Day:

7a. That the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, in consultation with the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, arrange for a national ‘Sorry Day’ to be celebrated each year to commemorate the history of forcible removals and its effects (HREOC, 1997. p654).

Since 1998, Sorry Day has been commemorated on the 26 May each year. Commemorations have included ceremony, marching and presentations at the national and community levels (National Sorry Day Committee, 2014).

Apology Day is held on 13th February. Since the Australian Apology to the Stolen Generations, on the 13th February 2008, the Australian Government has given out small grants to Aboriginal organisations that work with Stolen Generations (Healing Foundation, 2014; National Sorry Day Committee, 2014) to hold commemoration events.

This list of reconciliation events has been limited to those that are sanctioned by the governments of each country, and/or have been established by the reconciliation organisations that drive reconciliation in each country.

While they are a starting point and have provided some education and social activities, have they been successful in moving the respective country towards reconciliation? Quite simply put no they have not. In my opinion, this is due to the constrictive nature of events and the fact that they are limited to just a few days a year.
8.6. Overview of reconciliation by country

Reconciliation events build the populations’ general awareness of Indigenous affairs, culture and rights. This awareness helps reinforce positive relationships. However, reconciliation needs to be driven from the top down so that it remains in the forefront of thinking.

8.6.1. Canadian reconciliation

According to the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission,

‘Collective efforts from all peoples are necessary to revitalise the relationship between Aboriginal peoples and Canadian society – reconciliation is the goal. It is a goal that will take the commitment of multiple generations but when it is achieved, when we have reconciliation - it will make for a better, stronger Canada’ (Sinclair, 2014)

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission was established in 2009 as a result of the Canada’s largest class-action lawsuit. In the mid-1990s, thousands of Residential Schools Survivors sought compensation, through the Canadian legal system, for the loss of language and culture as a result of the Canadian Government’s assimilation policy of removing First Nation, Inuit, and Métis children from families (Branch, 2008) and placing them into residential schools.

Following an agreement from all involved in the class-action (survivors, government and churches), the Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement started its implementation in September 2007 with the Government of Canada looking at this agreement as, ‘a fair and lasting resolution of the legacy of Indian Residential Schools’ (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008a; Branch, 2008).

The Settlement Agreement has a five element approach to addressing the legacy of Indian Residential Schools:

1. A common experience payment (CEP) for all eligible former students of Indian residential schools
2. An independent assessment process (IAP) for claims of sexual or serious physical abuse
3. Measures to support healing
4. Commemorative activities

The Canadian Government (2008) states that, ‘bringing closure to the legacy of Indian Residential Schools, lies at the heart of reconciliation and a renewal of the relationships between the Canadian Aboriginal people who attended these schools, their families and communities, and all Canadians’. The TRC originally had a five year term, however, this was extended by a year, due to the slowness of the Canadian government to release relevant records (Williams, 2013).

The Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission is mandated with the following:

- Reveal to Canadians the complex truth about the history and the ongoing legacy of the church-run residential schools, in a manner that fully documents the individual and collective harms perpetrated against Aboriginal peoples, and honours the resilience and courage of former students, their families, and communities.

- Guide and inspire a process of truth and healing, leading towards reconciliation within Canadian Aboriginal families, and between Canadian Aboriginal peoples and non-Aboriginal communities, churches, governments, and Canadians generally. The process will be to renew relationships on a basis of inclusion, mutual understanding, and respect (Sinclair, 2001).

Sinclair (2001) expressed his hopes for the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission. He hopes that it will inspire First Nations, Inuit,
and Métis peoples and non-Indigenous Canadians towards truth and reconciliation and renewed relationships, which will lead to healing.

The TRC definition of reconciliation is:

*an ongoing individual and collective process that will require participation from all those affected by the residential school experience. This includes First Nations, Inuit, and Métis former students, their families, communities, religious groups, former Indian Residential School employees, government, and the people of Canada (TRC, 2012).*

By the end of the TRC’s six-year program of truth and reconciliation, it had prepared a complete historical record of the policies and operations of residential schools. This report titled Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future, was released on the final day (3 June 2015) of the TRC closing event (Sutherland, 2015).

They will also complete a public report, including recommendations to the parties of the *Indian Residential Schools Settlement Agreement*. In 2010, the TRC published the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Interim Report. If this report is an indication of the final report, there should be no surprises, as it is quite comprehensive (TRC, 2012).

At the September 2013 *Vancouver National Event*, the TRC announced that the University of Manitoba (Winnipeg) will house the National Research Centre for Residential Schools. The national research centre will be a lasting resource about the Indian residential schools legacy. Once the TRC has completed operations, all materials held by the commission would be transferred to the university (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2013).

*National and outreach events*

As part of the truth gathering, the TRC held seven national events in seven provinces across Canada. (Vancouver BC, Edmonton AL, Montreal QC, Winnipeg MB Halifax NS, Saskatoon SK, and Inuvik NT) (TRC, 2012).
In addition to these national events, the TRC held 400 community events between 2009 and 2011. These small gatherings were able to be tailored to meet community needs (TRC, 2015). See the map of TRC event sites at appendix 7.

When I attended the Truth and Reconciliation Commission Vancouver national event held in September 2013, I made a number of observations, apart from the amount of good will and the honest and open statements. I met a *progressive* nun. While I am not sure if she was a nun, she wore a blue habit with white collar. I say that she was progressive due to her bright hair, which was dyed red with a single rat tail plait. She was helping people find photos at the church stand. The woman was kind; people did not appear apprehensive or afraid of her and warmed easily to her welcoming way.

On the other hand there was a group of five or six men in full cassocks. They walked with such authority that people would part to let them through. The reaction to this group of priests was the opposite to that of the nun. This caused hysteria, people burst into tears and some fled, causing the event managers to ask the group to leave (Sutherland, 2013).

This comparison clearly shows that good intention, as in attending a reconciliation event, is not enough. Reconciliation requires an understanding of each other. It also demonstrates the need for words to be turned into action. Furthermore, it shows that reconciliation is possible when people are willing to judge others on face value not the past, when they are genuine, and offer the hand of friendship. This is not easily forgotten.

While not considered a reconciliation event, Canada celebrates a National Aboriginal Day which is held each year in June each on the Northern Summer Solstice. Although it is not being gazetted as a public holiday, it was established to celebrate the contribution of Canada’s First Nations to Canadian history.
Reconciliation Canada

Reconciliation Canada was established in 2012 as a charitable organisation, funded under a partnership arrangement in collaboration with the Indian Residential School Survivor’s Society (IRSSS) and Tides Canada Initiatives Society (Reconciliation, 2013). It has a vision to:

Promote an environment that fosters right relations and equal opportunities for Canadian Aboriginal peoples and all Canadians to achieve their optimum potential.

Reconciliation Canada’s first major activities were to host the welcoming canoe gathering, which preceded the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Vancouver National Event. This saw followed by the Canadian Walk for Reconciliation at the end of the event. This event (September 22nd 2013) saw 70,000 people demonstrate their desire for a reconciled Canada by the simple act of walking together.

I led a delegation of 8 Aboriginal Australians to the Truth and Reconciliation Vancouver Event. We were invited by Chief Robert Joseph Chair of Reconciliation Canada to walk in this event. We were all honoured to walk and show our support for reconciliation. The day was cold, windy and wet, within 10 minutes of walking I along with my fellow Australians were soaked through, this of course was a minor irritation shared by all the walkers, and did not dampen the enthusiasm for the course (Sutherland et al., 2014).

These activities have lead Reconciliation Canada to grow and explore other initiatives including:

- Community – Reconciliation dialogue sessions and action plans – This program opens a dialogue with the purpose of building relationships with a shared understanding of Canada’s collective history, leading to the development of stronger, more resilient families and communities (Reconciliation, 2014).
• Workplace and Community Training – *Reconciliation based leadership training* – This is a reconciliation based leadership program. It is designed with a different focus for community, business and youth (Reconciliation, 2014).

• Reconciliation Action Plans - *Community based economic reconciliation dialogue sessions and action plans* – Organisations and other parties are assisted in building collaborative economic reconciliation action plans, creating mutually beneficial economic opportunities for First Nations and non-Indigenous Canadians alike.

Combined, these programs will shape the relationships built across Canada and be the catalyst for social change. This new relationship is ‘among Canadian Aboriginal peoples and all other Canadians — relationships built on a foundation of openness, dignity, understanding and hope’ (Reconciliation Canada, 2014).

### 8.6.2. Reconciliation in New Zealand

In New Zealand, when referring to reconciliation, they talk of the Waitangi Tribunal. In creating the Waitangi Tribunal, the New Zealand Government saw the need for a good relationship between Māori and the Crown, which is in essence reconciliation (Ward, 1993).

In 1975, following a major protest by Māori, the New Zealand Government created the Tribunal to hear claims from Māori of breaches of the Waitangi Treaty by successive governments. At first, the Tribunal could only hear claims of breaches that occurred post October 1975 (Joseph, 2000).

The supporting legislation is the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1908, and the Treaty of Waitangi (State Enterprises) Act 1988. These situate the Waitangi Tribunal firmly within the New Zealand justice system (Stokes, 1992). There are other statutes that regulate or affect how the Tribunal works, including the Commissions of
Inquiry Act 1908, the Treaty of Waitangi, (State Enterprises) Act 1988, and the various statutes that give effect to treaty claim settlements.

Since 1975, the Tribunal has undergone change to try and meet the conflicting needs and demands of claimants, the public and the government. In 1985, the Tribunal mandate widened so that it could hear and investigate breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi dating back to the signing of the document in 1840 (Government of New Zealand, 2013; Taonga, 2010b; Te Papa Tongarewa, 2014, p. 2).

As time passes, the literal terms of the Treaty of Waitangi cannot be readily applied to New Zealand society. It is the responsibility of the Waitangi Tribunal to interpret and translate the treaty for a modern New Zealand (Stokes, 1992). The Tribunal considers claims where they consider the Crown has acted, or failed to act, and breached the Treaty. As mentioned, the Tribunal has had to keep reinventing itself due to the number of claims. In 1999, the government offered claimants a new option: to bypass the Waitangi Tribunal and enter into settlement negotiations directly. Due to the slowness of the Tribunal, this approach became very popular by 2005 (Amy, 2004).

The Tribunal again had a challenge of staying relevant to Māori peoples, as claimants sidestepped it completely or in many cases a settlement was reached between Government and Māori before the Tribunal’s reports were completed and handed to government. This created confusion between all parties (Amy, 2004; Joseph, 2000). The government then introduced the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act 2006, giving a deadline of 1 September 2008 for the lodging of historical claims. Claims were classified as historical if they concerned Crown policies or actions before 1992. By 2009, the Waitangi Tribunal had produced over 100 reports. The Crown did not always accept the Tribunal’s recommendations, but reports became the basis for negotiation between claimants and the Crown (Fox, 2014; Taonga, 2010b).
Conclusion

In 2004, the Fairfax media reported that it will be a good day when the grievances are settled fully and fairly. They also stated that the race relations, meaning Māori and non-Indigenous New Zealanders, would be an important factor in the political area (Tahana, 2008).

Since its inception, the Waitangi Tribunal has heard claims from a variety of breaches against the treaty. While a majority of claim are around land, many involve the environment, particularly water ways, and one by the Black Power Gang in relation to ‘colonisation providing social conditions in which gangs arose’ (Tahana, 2008). This could be considered the first claim that deals with the emotional side of the relationship between colonisers and the colonised. Others that fall into a more social side of Māoridom are the claims in relation to language (Joseph, 2000).

What the Tribunal does accomplish is Māori empowerment; no longer do Māori have to wait for the Crown to act. This has brought concrete benefits to iwis and Māoridom (Joseph, 2000). The Tribunal has also, as a matter of course, provided a public record of historical accountability for the Crown to up hold the Treaty of Waitangi in both its articles and intent.

8.7. Reconciliation Australia

Reconciliation in Australia has a long history; some would say that it started at the 1967 referendum, where Australia voted yes to including Aboriginal Australians under the Australian constitution to vote (Mitchell, 1968).

In 1991, the Royal Commission looking into Aboriginal deaths in custody made a final recommendation to say:

*That all political leaders and their parties recognise that reconciliation between the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities in Australia must be achieved if community division, discord and injustice to Aboriginal people are to be avoided. To this end the Commission recommends that political*
leaders use their best endeavours to ensure bi-partisan public support for the process of reconciliation and that the urgency and necessity of the process be acknowledged (Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody, 1991, p. 5:66).

After the report was released a new council was charged with ‘promotion of reconciliation between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and wider Australia’ (Australian Government, 1991). The Commonwealth was so keen for this to occur that they only gave the Council until 2000 for this to be achieved (Australian Government, 1991), they did not consider the complexities of the issues. In 2000, at the end of council’s life, Reconciliation Australia was established (Reconciliation Australia, 2014a). The intent was to develop reconciliation processes that involved the recognition of past hurts and injustices, and promote and respect Indigenous Australians and their culture in contemporary Australia (Council For Aboriginal Reconciliation, 2000).

Currently reconciliation in Australia is led by an independent, national not-for-profit organisation known simply as Reconciliation Australia (RA). Its vision is:

*For everyone to wake to a reconciled, just and equitable Australia. Our aim is to inspire and enable all Australians to contribute to reconciliation and break down stereotypes and discrimination* (Reconciliation Australia, 2014a).

To achieve this vision, Reconciliation Australia has promoted reconciliation through building relationships based on trust and respect between all sectors of Australian society, particularly with Indigenous Australians. While receiving some government funding, it conducts its work particularly in schools, the business sector and the broader community. Much of this work is based on the good will of those that Reconciliation Australia works with.

According to Reconciliation Australia’s website, it has six areas that are its core business:
1. Connect people and organisations
2. Provide frameworks for action
3. Provide resources and toolkits
4. Monitor our national progress towards reconciliation
5. Provide policy advice

Unlike Canada and New Zealand, Reconciliation Australia has no formal legislation which it operates under; organisations are not pressured to work with them (Short, 2003). Short (2003) argues that it is the lack of political will that is stopping the progression of reconciliation in Australia. I would have to agree with Short (2003) on the lack of political will. The fact that there is no legislation is evidence to political will.

Community
One community-focused program that Reconciliation Australia has committed to is the Indigenous Governance Awards. In partnership with mining giant BHP Billiton, Reconciliation Australia promotes leading Indigenous businesses through these awards. Effective Indigenous self-governance for their communities is the aim, and is celebrated each year at these awards. Through profiling role models of this type, other organisations and communities will be able to emulate the winners of these awards (Reconciliation Australia, 2014b).

Schools
The young are the future and the way for reconciliation, as each generation grows the divide between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples should decrease. Reconciliation Australia is currently trialling social media platforms to engage experts on the subject. This will allow for peer to peer conversations in schools to occur and the concepts of reconciliation, which in turn will trickle into the wider community (Reconciliation Australia, 2014c).
**Narragunnawali program**

Narragunnawali (Narra-gunna-wally) is the Ngunnawal Aboriginal people’s word for peace, alive, wellbeing and coming together (Reconciliation Australia, 2014c). This program is designed for schools from early childhood through to secondary schools. It aims to develop a setting that allows for the development of higher levels of Indigenous knowledge, which will lead the pride in Australia’s Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander heritage.

Reconciliation Australia assisted participating schools to develop meaningful pathways to ‘increase respect; reduce prejudice; and strengthen relationships between the wider Australian community and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ (Reconciliation Australia, n.d.).

**Workplace Ready program**

Reconciliation Australia has a Workplace Ready program toolkit that was developed based on experiences of many Australia businesses who have Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employment policies and programs, and who are willing to share these. This program is designed for top-level managers in the human resource department down to line supervisors and leads to the flagship program of Reconciliation Australia, the Reconciliation Action Plan or RAP (Reconciliation Australia, 2014e).

**Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP)**

In 2006, the RAP study was launched. This program assists organisations big and small to reach their vision of reconciliation through a RAP. The RAP is a practical ‘document that plans to develop relationships, show respect and increase opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples’ within the organisation (Reconciliation Australia, 2014e).

The organisational RAP is then lodged with and monitored by Reconciliation Australia. Each year, organisations report on how various aspects of their RAP are progressing. In turn, Reconciliation Australia posts the organisational RAP on its website as a measure of prestige (Reconciliation...
Australia, 2014e). Organisational RAP information is starting to appear in Annual Reports as a corporate social responsibility initiative (Qantas, 2014).

**Australian state-based reconciliation organisations**

While Reconciliation Australia has a national focus, most states have their own reconciliation organisations. The exceptions to this are Tasmania, and the Northern and Australian Capital Territories. Reconciliation organisations are independent and work alongside Reconciliation Australia helping to achieve its goals, while having their own state-based focus and activities (NSW Reconciliation Council, 2015; Reconciliation Western Australia, 2014; Reconciliation Queensland, 2015; Reconciliation South Australia, 2015; Reconciliation Victoria, 2015).

These organisations are self-funded, not-for-profits in much the same way that Reconciliation Australia is, the exception is that they do not receive Commonwealth funding as part of the federal budget process (NSW Reconciliation Council, 2015; Reconciliation Western Australia, 2014; Reconciliation Queensland, 2015; Reconciliation South Australia, 2015; Reconciliation Victoria, 2015).

**8.8. Comparison of reconciliation models**

The New Zealand model is far removed from the Australian and Canadian models of reconciliation. It is based on a formal legal process and is legislated to investigate and report on breaches of the Waitangi Treaty. The basis for this model is to address the injustices of past governments against Māori and the Waitangi Treaty (Joseph, 2000).

Common to all three models, at least in sprint if not in practise, is the intention to address past injustices. The Canadian and Australian reconciliation models seem somewhat aligned in that they both have a number of social programs that are aimed at schools, community and businesses. These programs are administered by not-for-profit organisations,
which rely on funding partners for operational costs (Reconciliation Australia, 2014a; Reconciliation, 2015). Each of these initiatives came out of government formed and sanctioned organisations, which had finite operations. In Australia, this was the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation (1991-2000); and in Canada, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2009-2015). Granted the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has not yet concluded, nevertheless, Reconciliation Canada is a result of the commission’s initiatives.

The major difference between the Australian and Canadian models is the concept of truth. Even the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation did not have truth in its mandate. This could be due to the Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody Report (1991) and the BTH (1997). Both these reports were released under the banner of a Royal Commission, which by their very nature deal with truth. Australia has not had a truth commission or Royal Commission in regard to forced removals, although it has a current Royal Commission underway for institutional sexual abuse.

Another difference is the legal support given to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, as established by the Canadian courts. As part of its establishment, the courts gave the commission the ability to direct the government to release all documentation relating to residential schools. This command was taken so seriously that when the Canadian Government refused to release documents to the Commission, the TRC sort and won court action. As a result, the court ordered the Canadian Government to release its files. This then lead to an extension of the commission by one year so that they could complete the collection of these files. In Australia’s case, there was no court decision to highlight reconciliation but rather a compelling report that captured public attention (Canadian Press, 2013).

Time is another distinction that goes to the way that people see reconciliation. The New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal having been established in 1985 is the oldest model of reconciliation of the three countries. Australia’s

As time passes all three models have had to undergo change. In the case of New Zealand, this was due to the legislation that opened up the timeframe of breaches that the Tribunal could investigate (Amy, 2004). This caused the Tribunal to be inundated with claims, causing a lengthy backlog (Amy, 2004). The Australian and Canadian Governments developed reconciliation organisations for a finite period of time (Government of Australia, 1991; TRC, 2012). Consequently, in each country not-for-profit community-based organisations have replaced the government organisations. The difference is in how these not-for-profit organisations were established. In Australia, the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation recommended that such an organisation to be established and funded by the government (Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation, 2000). In Canada, Reconciliation Canada has been established by the community, before the Truth and Reconciliation Commission has completed its final report (Reconciliation Canada, 2012).

Perhaps the most distinct difference between reconciliation models is, unlike Canada and New Zealand, Australia does not have a treaty nor does Australia’s Constitution recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as Australia’s first peoples (Sanders and others, 2002). This has led to what could be considered a long running reconciliation campaign. Currently this campaign is called Recognise.

This government campaign is an initiative that has arisen from the 2008-10 Commonwealth investigation into the likelihood that the recognition of Australian Indigenous people as the first peoples could win a YES vote for constitutional reform. It was found that if such a vote was put forward it would not get passed (Congress, 2014). The Australian Government under former Prime Minister Tony

Figure 3: Recognise Logo
Abbott had indicated Indigenous Constitutional recognition as a goal in this term of Government (which currently runs to 2016) (Borrello, 2014; Shanahan, 2014).

The length of time that each country’s reconciliation programs have been running has had no direct bearing on the activities that are run over the course of the year. With the exception of language and history, which in New Zealand are part of the school curricula (Benton, 1989), national events are limited to at best one week in the year (McAllister, 2008; Reconciliation Australia, 2014; Reconciliation Canada, 2012). These events raise the profile of reconciliation at the grass roots level and to some extent provide a message that the Indigenous population and their culture are an important and valued part of the of the collective community. However, the message is then lost for the other 51 weeks of the year. These factors contribute to the way that the business community, communities and individuals perceive and understand reconciliation.

8.9. Reconciliation Concluded

Reconciliation is considered to be important for its potential to heal the deep sense of hurt and rejection felt by the Indigenous peoples participating in this research study. Improved relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples would lead to better quality of life outcomes. Reconciliation should be a tool that is used in campaigns to bridge the divide between Indigenous and non-Indigenous social economic and health outcomes creating equity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations.

Empirical studies of reconciliation attitudes in Australia show that there are positive views towards Indigenous reconciliation which is supported by the aims of Reconciliation Council of Australia (Halloran, 2007; Pedersen et al., 2004). Furthermore, research has shown that Australians acknowledge the harsh treatment of Indigenous Australians in the past and the current disadvantages they endure. Some 90% of the surveys conducted by
Gomersall, et al., (2000) convey the view that Australian Aboriginal peoples' assessment of this treatment is legitimate.

However, this level of understanding and support has not manifested itself in any noticeable way. There has been minimal progress in relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples nor have the necessary outcomes for Indigenous people been achieved (Gomersall et al., 2000). Unlike Canada and New Zealand, I would in fact argue that Indigenous relations in Australia have deteriorated. There was significant and unequivocal support by most sectors of Australia for the findings of the BTH Report. However, the Stolen Generations National Working Partnership (2010) reported that only 9 of the 53 recommendations have been implemented (Sutherland and Brannigan, 2012). Furthermore, the refusal by the Australian and Canadian governments to give a formal apology until 2008 demonstrates their views towards addressing the wrongs of the past. Once the apology was given it was not bi-partisan, which in itself demonstrates a divide within the community.

The unity of a country is important. A reconciled country has a common understanding of the past, both Indigenous and European. This will lead to improvements in socio-economic factors of Indigenous peoples, which in turn will push nations forward in regards to national social and economic drivers. Ceremonial community events are one avenue to gain this common understanding of history and culture.

This is due to government led reconciliation processes being limited in structure, financing and inclusiveness of all peoples Indigenous and Non-Indigenous. It is also in part due to not recognising the special part that Stolen Generations, Residential School Survivors and Welfare victims play within reconciliation. Without this any reconciliation model will struggle to be fulfilled.
9. Reconciliation data

The data across Australia, New Zealand and Canada indicated a number of important perspectives on reconciliation. The need for Indigenous people to feel that they are accepted as the first people and traditional owners of a country and are equal partners within the country is an important issue, and is the driving ideology behind the general support for reconciliation.

The Australian Recognise campaign is an important conversation for the Australian reconciliation process. Whether by treaty or within the constitution reform, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples will become formal partners with the Australian Government and its people.

9.1. Reconciliation

The following data will address the questions of ‘Do Indigenous peoples removed from their family and cultures support reconciliation?’ and the secondary question of, ‘Without a wide focal point from the entire population, in the area of reconciliation, can reconciliation occur?’

As a base measure, means have been used to establish attitudes towards a theme. A scale of 1–5 was used, with range of 1–2.5 indicating positive attitudes to the question those between 3.5–5 indicate a negative attitude.

The ‘Combined Reconciliation Means’ graph, below, demonstrates that most Indigenous peoples who participated in the study accept and support the idea of reconciliation, with means from each country sitting between 1.3 and 2.2 for questions one and two, and four and five.

Question three was a negatively framed question, with means in the negative and neutral range supporting disagreement with the statement against reconciliation. Therefore, it can be concluded that Indigenous people from
across Australia, Canada and New Zealand who participated in the study support the notion of reconciliation.

Table 4: Combined Reconciliation Means
Table 5 Means of Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Item</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation is an important issue</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a positive attitude and support reconciliation</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the process of reconciliation is unnecessary</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal people have contributed to the national identity, and this should be recognised by all citizens</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the reconciliation process and what it means, is a good thing</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 (aggregated) and 5 (disaggregated), show the means and looks at the individual country’s attitudes towards reconciliation. It is clear that each country is supportive of reconciliation. What is interesting, is the increments between the three countries in question three. This clearly demonstrates the different way each country perceives reconciliation, as discussed in chapter 6 (Reconciliation).

**Canada**

The reason that Canada has responded this way is due to the fact that reconciliation being at the forefront of First Nations peoples’ minds, due to the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions national events. Two of these events were being held in 2013 at the time when my fieldwork was being conducted. The interviews were conducted in early 2013. The Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission were holding a national event in Montreal and Vancouver in this year.
conducted. As predicted, Canadian First Nations peoples felt the strongest about reconciliation, which is indicated by the means.

This is evident from qualitative data with 91% of Canadian First Nations peoples talking about reconciliation and/or the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. While not all comments were positive, it demonstrates that reconciliation is in the forefront of people’s minds. The fact that such a high percentage of people discussed it detailing their views on reconciliation proves it was a high priority topic in Canada at this point in time.

Below is an extract from one of the Canadian interviews which further supports this view:

*The reconciliation came. Well, reconciliation is always a good idea. It's always an option to deal with issues but it's got to be coming from both sides. Our people fell into the - I won't call it a trap but fell into the position of, we will accept reconciliation. That is the only way we can deal with a lot of the issues surrounding. But the other part of reconciliation is how are the other people going to take reconciliation? (First Nations man, Calgary)*

The sentiment within the statement is echoed throughout the Canadian interviews. First Nation Canadians feel reconciliation is a worthwhile pursuit, but are cautious of how mainstream Canadians will reciprocate.

The following extract further demonstrates reconciliation at the national level. However, it has the added element of people wanting to be reconciled with their own culture.

*My views on reconciliation are more or less twofold. The government's intent or whatever pertaining to the residential school survivors is reconciliation back into the mainstream society. It's fine that they say that but I don't see them doing anything about it. That's why I don't agree with that process.*

*The second part of reconciliation is that residential school survivors to reconcile back into the culture and the languages that they were forbidden to speak and practice the culture and that. That reconciliation has to happen*
as many of them found there is real healing that takes place when they learn about our culture, when they learn about the language and begin to speak it. There's a sense of identity and pride that's instilled in them as indigenous people of this land.

That's why I have a problem in trying to understand the government's reconciliation process and that and that's - I guess it's for the Average Low Yes No

Residential School Survivors to get back in mainstream society. Even I've heard the Truth and Reconciliation Commission talking about a need to identify what does reconciliation mean? Having heard that that's why I came up with the two pronged deal on reconciliation is that there is no mention of reconciliation back to the language or the traditional teachings and ceremonies of our people (First Nation man, Winnipeg).

Australia
As noted, the BTH Report has reconciliation as a recommendation. This report is well known by Stolen Generations (Sheehan, 2012). Australia has a range of active reconciliation organisations and activities, which keeps reconciliation as a topic in the spotlight, though at times it may be sporadic. This means that most Indigenous Australians have engaged in, or have heard about, reconciliation within social/media networks in the last 12 months.

The qualitative data for Australia had 29% for participants discussing reconciliation in some context. Of the 29% of Stolen Generations (Australians) who mentioned reconciliation, all comments were supportive.

The quotes below demonstrate that Stolen Generations are actively involved in reconciliation and also are aware and support of the BTH Report’s recommendations. It further suggested that they would like all
recommendations of the BTH Report implemented\textsuperscript{19}. For this to be fully explored, future research would need to be conducted in this area. The following statements support this comment.

\begin{quote}
[Unclear] We're, with a few elders that I've been chatting to and I want to do a big march. I want to bring it back to the surface and go through all of those recommendations and go okay let's - if they can do something like recognition to help change constitution they can do something about our 54 recommendations. I guess this is the right time to go for reconciliation (Aboriginal woman, Melbourne).
\end{quote}

I suppose in terms of reconciliation or the Apology that happened, for me, I use that in that sense because I had my non-Aboriginal family with me during that process and they felt they were all part of it, even those breakdowns of families - my mum had left me. Even though my mum had left me, my dad and mum - and I call them dad and mum because they brought me up - they still have a relationship in that sense that we have our kids. So there's no bitterness. She left us and didn't leave on bad terms. We all had Christmases together. This is how - we'll have Christmases together; we'd do things all together. She's got another partner but we all do things together because of us kids (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).

The following statement shows how everyday people go about reconciliation. This person attends a school program to help educate primary schools children and she uses art to help get the message across to the class. This style of reconciliation as a theme was also expressed in Canada.

\begin{quote}
Reconciliation - I am going to Catholic schools I do every year. About my story and how things are changing now for me. I do art. Do painting (Aboriginal woman, Adelaide).
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{19} The Bringing Them Home Report has 54 recommendations, of which, until the Rudd Apology only 9 were enacted and only 4 in part.
**New Zealand**

As mentioned previously, New Zealand talks about reconciliation in terms of the Waitangi Treaty/Tribunal. This does not mean that they do not understand the concept of reconciliation as a relationship or want a reconciled New Zealand; it means that language is important when discussing reconciliation.

This is evident within the interview stage. One person talked about reconciliation (quote below) and what they wanted.

*I feel like I don't want other people to feel guilty about what happened to me. But on the other side of the coin I don't want them to ignore it either. Similarly - historically in this country with what happened to Māori and a lot of the laws that were anti-Māori, there are still people today that don't believe that happened (Māori man, Hamilton).*

The notion that non-Māori would be educated to understand past treatment and laws that affected Māori, and implemented the divide between the two, is in fact reconciliation. However, 23% of participants discussed the Waitangi Treaty and/or Tribunal.

*You know? You can understand. I understand why they hate the State, you know, which we did for years, eh? I mean, not that I'm keen on them now but now I just see that it's a figure you have to live with, eh?*

*So my understanding is that the Waitangi Tribunal is trying to make or hold the State responsible for upholding not only the words of the Treaty but the intent of the Treaty? (Māori woman, Rotorua)*

The following quotes establish that Māori people understand and want reconciliation, yet they consider that it is a whole of New Zealand problem and that all people need to engage in the reconciliation process. They see education as one of the key issues, and that people can come together under the right circumstance no matter their views. Finally, this person is engaging in reconciliation activities and therefore supports reconciliation.
I was recently at a Waitangi Treaty training program where one of the booklets that we had was quoting all these different acts that has come through parliament.

One of the ladies that was next to me who I actually considered - she was Pakeha, she was non-Māori - who I considered quite racist, she had quite racist views, she came to me and she goes … this can't be right. I went yeah I know, what sucks is it's still going to happen. She goes no, no, they can't have had that law. That's a wrong law. You can't do that because you're Māori. I said well they did and you know that kind of - that's how it happened. She goes oh my God, oh my God. When I saw her change her views about Māori in general, I just though this person that's delivering this training needs to deliver it to the government and government agencies (Māori man, Wellington).

### 9.2. Reconciliation is tired

What Australia and New Zealand interviews indicate is that whilst a relatively modest number spoke of reconciliation, there are indications that reconciliation is getting tired. That is, it has been around for over a decade (Australia 2000, New Zealand 1987) and not much has changed in the views of the participants, as demonstrated in the following extract.

> How do we sit with reconciliation if we're always getting this stuff happening to us all the time, where we can't correct the falsifying and we're always lying always not telling the truth. But things like you said finally census are happening, but it's just too late for a lot of people over 50, even our 40 year olds are very tired. I went to a reconciliation thing with Tim Costello is it, he's the main guy, well not the main guy, and there was Lina at a church happening in town here this year. How do we fight the reconciliation where it's still happening with us, it's crazy (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs).

The differences in the survey means and interview data, also tells a story. While Canada has very high support (mean 4.3 and 91% interview), New Zealand and Australia are relatively low, with means of 3.4 and 3.8 and interview data at 23% and 29% respectively. I interpret this as reconciliation...
being tired. In New Zealand and Australia the movement of reconciliation was established in 1975 and 1996 (the first reconciliation week). In this time, reconciliation has not moved forward in any great extent, as evident by negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing data and the poor social determinates of health outcomes in the Closing the Gap Report Card. This report shows no change in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health outcomes or other social determinants (Holland, 2012); and the work by Mulholland and McIntosh (2011) would give support to reconciliation as being tired.

More work in this area needs to be undertaken, with a view to developing a revitalised reconciliation plan. This would also benefit Canada to prevent reconciliation drop off, occurring once the Truth and Reconciliation Commission ceases to operate.

**9.3. Correlations**

So far the question has been tested by the use of statistical means, which has demonstrated that Indigenous people in Australia, Canada and New Zealand are supportive of reconciliation.

Working on the premise that factors of age, regionalism and the perception of guilt may also influence the support for reconciliation, these were tested using a two-sided T test (correlation).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>-.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.930</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>-.201</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.129</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 7: Correlation (B) Reconciliation and Guilt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Recon3</th>
<th>Guilt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age
There is correlation between age and reconciliation within Australia that is not demonstrated in Canada or New Zealand. This indicates that older people are inclined to want reconciliation or at least what it symbolises. This may be due to age mellowing them, or that with age comes a sense of community and nationalism that is not present in younger people, or that they just want more for future generations.

Region
There is no correlation between where people live city or country, and how they feel about reconciliation.

Perception of Guilt
There is no correlation between people’s perception of collective guilt and how they feel about reconciliation. This implies people don’t have to identify with guilt to support reconciliation.
This finding is contrary to Halloran (2007) and Pedersen et al. (2004) who both found that collective guilt had a direct correlation to the attitudes of non-Indigenous Australians and reconciliation.

There are two reasons that this has occurred. The first is that the Halloran’s (2007) and Pederson’s (2004) research population were non-Indigenous people. In contrast, my research population was made up of Indigenous peoples. They then moderated their answers to the scale so that a neutral mean was established. This mean then does not interact with reconciliation.

The second reason is that there was no education modifier in my study. Indigenous people have lived through forced removal practices, trauma, and racism; in other words, they experienced and therefore know what occurred. So education was not needed. It is this lived experienced that makes guilt relevant and the altruistic nature of Indigenous people (as discussed in chapter 8) significant.

9.4. Different forms of reconciliation

Below are further examples of people from Australia and Canada talking about reconciliation. They show the distinct range of people’s expressions about what reconciliation means to them, and the different ways reconciliation can be considered within this population.

I suppose in terms of reconciliation or the Apology that happened, for me, I use that in that sense because I had my non-Aboriginal family with me during that process and they felt they were all part of it (Aboriginal woman, Melbourne).

People ask me how long do you think that will take, ….? I say well, we had - on Walpole Island we had five generations of children go to residential school. So when you talk about reconciliation, how long will it take, I say it has to take at least five generations. So just using my family, my children did not go to residential school. I have grandchildren and I have great
grandchildren. So I think at least another generation before things even start to look around, not even reconciliation being completed.

So when you look at reconciliation, I believe we have to build a new relationship, not try and recapture anything that might have been. So I think that work needs to be done in all areas of Canada. It needs to be done with the people and then it spreads to things like the economy and the relationships and government and just everything. All we can hope to do, the survivors of the school, can hope to do their own little part. I think that's what Children of Shingwauk has done for 30 years. We came together as a group and we realised that we were all sisters and brothers (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Marie).

I have a hard time dealing even with my own brothers, even with my own family, even though we went to the same school. They talk about reconciliation and reconciling with churches and everything else. I even have a hard time reconciling with my own brothers and sisters. It's a terrible place this Indian residential school put us. It's not just the survivors that they put into a terrible place but our descendants, my children. I try to explain to them slowly of what happened to me in that place. I figure if I tell them too fast then they're just going to hate the Government, they're going to hate the Church, they're going to hate everything there is that had anything to do with this. My little grandchild. I don't know what I would do if I saw that kind of thing happening again (First Nations woman, Vancouver).

What these comments demonstrate is that reconciliation, as set out by Reconciliation Australia, Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Reconciliation Canada or even the way that New Zealand deals with reconciliation, have not fully taken account the experiences of Indigenous peoples. That is, different tools are not provided to Indigenous peoples forcibly removed to help them reconcile with their family, community and nations.

The three statements listed above demonstrate the need to have other models of reconciliation, which sit beside those already established, for Indigenous people to draw upon and use to their own advantage.
10. Apology

In this chapter I will address the current international trends in intergroup apologies, and why they are offered. While apologies do not need to follow a standard format, there are various elements—such as morality, guilt and redress—that must be included. Otherwise the apology may be rejected since the victim is not required to accept the apology.

I then explore each country's apology and discuss the various aspects of language used in each, and how the victims may interpret it. This interpretation may then be compounded due to the time lapse between the wrongdoing and the apology.

In the last two decades, scholars, not-for-profit organisations, governments, and religious leaders have actively sought to understand how to redress wrongdoings of the past, and to bridge the disparity in health and the other social determinants of Indigenous people affected by forced removals compared to non-Indigenous people (Blatz and Philpot, 2010; Tylim, 2005; Verdeja, 2010). This has led to an increased trend in apologies from religious groups, big business and governments, who express remorse for historical wrongdoings with an aim of repairing relationships (Verdeja, 2010).

In recent years it has become fashionable, even commonplace, for apologies to be given by governments for past policies and practices, to various groups within and external to the country they lead. Of interest are the apologies toward Indigenous peoples for assimilation policies and practices. In February 2008, the Australian, and later that year the Canadian Governments both apologised for their removal of Indigenous children from their families (Blatz and Philpot, 2010). New Zealand has been leading the way in apologies. When handing down findings of the Waitangi Tribunal, the Crown will apologise for its specific wrongdoing. In 1995, Queen Elizabeth gave royal assent from the Crown, to an apology to Māori peoples (The Crown, 1995; Vines, 1995).
A clue to why apologies have become so popular may be the emergence of medical apology laws in the 1990s. ‘This legislation was designed to reduce the liability risks associated with disclosing mistakes’ (Dresser, 2008). The laws allowed for medical staff to disclose errors and to apologise for them. A by-product of these laws was that the medical fraternity became more open and this allowed systemic change, leading to less mistakes (Dresser, 2008). Full disclosure of mistakes gives patients and families information so as to seek fair compensation for the wrongdoing. The giving of apologies has seen a reduction of people seeking legal claims against medical staff, as sometimes an apology is sufficient. When malpractice suits are sought, there has been a reduction in costs awarded to the victim (Dresser, 2008).

It is important that I define an apology, leading the reader through the elements that should be contained within any apologies of this type. I will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of why governments chose to apologise in the way that they have thus far, and compare the types of apologies - for example, comparing the extravagant apologies of Australia and Canada, to the more simple/refined apologies offered to Māori. Comments will not compare the wording of the apologies, but focus on what elements they have addressed. Discussion will follow the benefits to the respective populations of each country, and to more specific benefits to the Indigenous populations that they addressed.

As Lakoff (2000) has suggested, if you were to ask any person, they probably could give you a definition of what an apology is as they are common place in everyday life. Individuals give apologies all the time, for a variety of reasons. Some apologies are simple as the wrongdoing is minor, such as when you bump into someone at the supermarket, you say sorry. Some are more complex, and contain many elements: such as when you break a window. Apart from saying sorry, the wrongdoer needs to offer reparations (fixing the glass), compensation for any other damage that may have occurred, and a commitment that the wrongdoing will not occur again.
There is a large body of research that has investigated the practical and emotional elements of informal everyday apologies (Meier, 1998; Robinson, 2004). To date, there is little research completed on intergroup apologies. This is especially true in the area of psychological research, which has scrutinised what psychological requirements intergroup apologies must meet (Blatz and Philpot, 2010; Tylim, 2005). Most research in the area of apologies is embedded within religious writings (Tylim, 2005). Currently it is thought that for an apology to be effective, the apologiser needs to be sincere and remorseful. However, at present there is no empirical evidence of what constitutes an effective intergroup apology (Blatz, Philpot, 2010).

10.1. Definitions

An apology is defined by the OECD (Oxford Dictionaries, 2015b) as ‘a confession of regret, guilt, request for forgiveness, an explanation, an assurance or justification’.

In their work on official intergroup apologies, Harris, Grainger and Mullany (2006) have identified five elements which need to be present. Official intergroup apologies are usually highly mediated events. The apologiser will typically have designed the event to gain the widest possible media coverage domestically and internationally. Firstly, they need to be sincere and genuine. If apologies are not, or are even perceived as not sincere, they can lead to future resentment. In order to achieve this, the wrongdoer must say the word sorry and apologise for the wrongdoing. Responsibility must be taken for the wrongdoing and blame should not be shifted away from the wrongdoer. As official intergroup apologies are usually for past events, blame is normally held at the institutional level and not at a personal level. Finally, the most controversial aspect is reparation and compensation. Harris, Grainger and Mullany (2006) state that official intergroup apologies are symbolic and not an attempt at material reconciliation, so that reparation and compensation may not be needed.
10.2. The purpose of an apology

The politics of apologies, and the acknowledgment of pain, has taken centre stage in Australia and other colonised countries over the last decade. The public presentation of pain and anguish has come together with collective regret to highlight reconciliation, as part of the atonement for Australia’s past practice in child welfare and assimilation policies (Cuthbert and Quartly, 2012).

Verdeja (2010) rightly states that there can be no standard model of apologising when official intergroup apologies are concerned. However, an apology does need to contain certain elements to be considered an apology, and more importantly to elicit acceptance and forgiveness (Gibney and Roxstrom, 2001; Harris et al., 2006; Verdeja, 2010).

10.3. Elements needed in an apology

The verbs apologise and/or sorry, are words that have been identified by Olshtain and Cohen (1981; 1983) and later La Couteur (2002) as being necessary in articulation of interpersonal and political apologies. Without this verbalisation, the apology may be heard as insincere. This is due to an official intergroup apology having to recognise the state obligation for grave moral wrongdoing that remains outstanding in current political and or social life.

Verdeja (2010) strongly argues that an apology needs to have both moral and practical elements. The first part of an apology is to recognise the victim as a person with legitimate claims against the wrongdoer. Once this is established, the wrongdoer must then make some sort of reparation, making apologies both past-oriented and future-oriented. By acknowledging past wrongdoing the apology places attention on past acts, then turning its attention to the future by establishing some form of reparation for future relationships (Verdeja, 2010).
A moral apology is more than a list of the wrongdoer’s transgressions. There needs to be commentary on why the wrongdoing occurred, and what the ‘moral and social consequences’ (Verdeja, 2010) were and are, and this needs to be done publically. This will allow for debate at a national level to continue, and in turn will feed into behavioural change and the development of a new relationship (Govier and Verwoerd, 2002a)

Understanding that there has been a moral wrong committed also means that the wrongdoer understands that there is a victim, who in themselves carries a moral value. An apology should recognise the value of the victim by acknowledging the harm that the victim has suffered (Petrucci, 2002; Verdeja, 2010).

*Moral emotions* are emotions that stimulate people to act within expectations of the communities in which they live (Tangney et al., 2007; Tylim, 2005). If the moral aspect of an apology is left unaddressed, it signals to the victim that they are unworthy as individuals and they do not follow the same moral norms as the rest of the community (Hutcherson and Gross, 2011; Verdeja, 2010).

These emotional states move people within a particular community to act in a particular way, which is considered morally right. When behaviour and/or actions violate the moral compass of the community, resentment and humiliation occur. This leads to a cycle of revenge and violence, which apologies may not be able to undo (Nytagodien and Neal, 2004; Tylim, 2005).

It is therefore very important that, within the apology there is recognition of the moral status of victims, through a public communication of guilt, regret and remorse. On top of this, the wrongdoer must accept responsibility for the wrongdoing and commit to changing the relationship, including some from of reparation and justice for the victims (Gibney and Roxstrom, 2001; Minow, 2009; Verdeja, 2010).
### 10.3.1. Guilt and Remorse

An apology is just that, an apology, it is not an excuse. An excuse tries to justify why a situation occurred, through the use of external factors, implying that it was unintended and limiting the liability of the wrongdoer (Kramer-Moore and Moore, 2003). An apology should convey guilt and regret for the wrongdoing. It should then move through to remorse and, if the event was serious enough, self-reproach. An apology acknowledges the moral that was breached and accepts responsibility for the wrongdoing (Verdeja, 2010).

Tavuchis (1991) claims that remorse is not required in intergroup apologies due the nature of the apology. Intergroup apologies are normally officiated by leaders, publically, in a formal and highly ceremonial process. Under these conditions it is hard for true sorrow and remorse to be conveyed. However without remorse, victims will view the apology as insincere.

Guilt and remorse are two very distinct expressions of feeling. Guilt is a cognitive emotion that is experienced when a person realises they have violated the norms (social or other) of the society in which they reside (Iyer et al., 2003; Tylim, 2005). It is further associated with the comprehension that a wrongdoing has caused damage, which may be beyond forgiveness. As with guilt, remorse is an emotional response for a wrongdoing. However, remorse can be swept away with forgiveness (Tylim, 2005). It should be noted that both guilt and remorse are derived from the violation of what is considered a cultural norm. This consideration will change from culture to culture. Therefore, when seeking forgiveness, an understanding of the cultural group to which the norm belongs is important.

When seeking forgiveness, two factors must be acknowledged: first, the belief that a wrongdoing has been committed; and second, that the wrongdoing goes against moral norms. If an apology is to be consummated, then it should freely and without limitation acknowledge the wrongdoing. It is simply not good enough to suggest or hint at a wrongdoing, it must be
expressed clearly. By acknowledging the wrongdoing the perpetrator has identified the norms that they have broken (Davis, 2002).

A good apology includes the apologiser being affected by feelings of self-reproach (Davis, 2002). It is fair to say that if the victimisation was sufficient, then self-reproach will move to disgust or revulsion of one’s self (Davis, 2002). It is important that the level of feelings expressed match the level of guilt felt and expressed. If these are unaligned, the victims will view the apology as insincere. The following examples from the interviews in Canada and Australia show this disbelief occurring.

*Then as he went [unclear] then they become words. It becomes just words, because apology is just apology with a word [unclear]. I wanted to hear from him for these people - I wanted to hear not from here, the head. have done. Forgive me.*

*Then I would have believed him, that he was going to do something, because it was not coming from the head, it was coming from the spirit. When it comes from the spirit, it comes from above, then things, I wanted to hear from the spirit (First Nations man, Montreal).*

and

*White fellas use these words with double meaning - two prong - but it’s to emphasise they’re superior to everyone (Aboriginal man, Canberra).*

The effects of guilt and shame have been studied as part of the language of apologies. Shame is a belittling emotion, while guilt is considered to be associated with a one-off wrongdoing. It is therefore more advantageous to the apologiser to show guilt within the apology (Blatz and Philpot, 2010; Ohtsubo and Watanabe, 2009). This of course should be accompanied with the appropriate emotional response.

Without an emotional content, Giner-Sorolla et al. (2008) found that it was better for the perpetrator to offer an apology expressing shame, as shame with emotion was better accepted. Blatz and Philpot (2010) argue that when
redress was offered within an intergroup apology without the accompanying emotions, victims became insulted (Blatz and Philpot, 2010) and anger and resentment can form.

Tavuchis (1991) refutes this by arguing, that due to the ceremonious way in which official public apologies must be conducted, they lack the intimacy to show true remorse and this has led to apologies being ‘couched in abstract, remote, measured and emotionally neutral terms’ (Tavuchis, 1991, p. 97).

An apology should contain an explanation of the acts that explicitly underscores the government’s acceptance of responsibility. It is not sufficient merely to state passively that violations occurred. Specific acts must be stated (Verdeja, 2010) and the outcomes expressed.

**10.3.2. Justice, reparations and accountability**

Verdeja (2010) expresses the idea that, while trauma and suffering may somewhat be amended through an apology, without the expression of guilt and ownership of wrongdoing, this gesture alone is not enough. There needs to be a statement that addresses how reparations will be made and the wrongdoer punished under law (Verdeja, 2010).

What this means is that the apology itself is merely an offering of the olive branch that is the start of a new relationship. This then needs to be followed up with some form of material reparation, compensation or restitution, not only for past suffering and trauma but also demonstrating to the victims that the new relationship will be based on equality. Without this the apology becomes nothing more than a ‘hollow symbolic statement’ (Verdeja, 2010, p. 567).

An apology should contain a firm and unwavering commitment to hold the wrongdoer accountable. Reparations and compensation can form part of the accountability. Verdeja (2010) argues that as with reparations, the apology itself has an element of accountability as it indicates moral and behavioural
change. However, a statement of accountability that ends with the apology is not acceptable. There needs to ‘be a promise to prosecute the most egregious perpetrators as well, or at least ensure that they will not retain positions of power’ (Tylim, 2005; Verdeja, 2010). Indeed this is a theme and action emerging from Australia’s sexual abuse inquiry (Oriti, 2013).

Thompson (2008) surmises that the need for justice within an apology is not necessary, as justice can be served through other measures such as redress or through punishment of offenders through the judicial system. While this is true, without a statement within the apology victims may not be aware of what justice will be carried out on their behalf. This could lead to anger and resentment building within the individual (Struthers et al., 2008).

10.4. Future relationship

An intergroup apology needs to give a commitment to change the behaviour that caused the wrongdoing. If needed, it may include a statement guaranteeing to undertake system wide reforms of institutions under the apologiser’s control. By doing this, the government is promising future respect and tolerance in a new relationship between the perpetrator and victim (Verdeja, 2010). Govier and Verwoerd (2002b) argue that an apology should be ‘understood not simply as an act but as a process including a commitment to a future relationship’ (Govier and Verwoerd, 2002b).

The argument that a statement regarding future relationships is redundant within an apology, as they are explicit by the act of giving an apology, is simply not true. Without a statement of intent, the intention is open to change and no action to change the relationship may occur. This is evident within the data collected, as the need for the relationship to change is evident from the following extracts from interviews in Australia and Canada.

So there's a lot of for me I guess it's good and bad but you know five years on I don't think much has changed. It's like well we said sorry now build a bridge, get over it and I'm sorry I'm not ready to do that. You need to be held
accountable. You need to be - it was a bad Is there anything else you want
decision by a bad group of politicians or whatever they were at the time,
people that destroyed a hell of a lot of kids lives and family lives (Aboriginal
woman, Sydney).

and

But now, over the years since that apology, the actions of the government do
not coincide with the apology. They're getting more antagonistic against the
Indian people than they ever have been. So in my mind and in my belief
system, I have concluded that the apology wasn't made from the heart.
That's where these things have to be dealt with - from the heart level - in
order for them to be any good. That's where I am today (First Nations man,
Fort Frances).

Change within the state-based institutions of a government does not occur
unless there is a directive. By having a statement within the apology, the
government is giving that directive. For a new relationship to be forged, the
victim must know that the perpetrator is both willing and able to change its
behaviour. Without this, no relationship will recover and the status quo will
remain. This may lead to anger and resentment within the victim group
(Struthers et al., 2008).

10.4.1. Delivery and setting

For an intergroup apology to reach its full potential, it needs more than just
the right words. The apologiser needs to have the right official appointment,
and have been given the power to speak on behalf of the government in an
official capacity (Verdeja, 2010), as they both make symbolic and actual
amends for past wrongdoings. The delivery of an official intergroup apology
cannot be delegated to someone of a lesser designation within the political
party, as this would fundamentally undermine the message trying to be
delivered. It is therefore import that the highest person within the political
system deliver the apology (Verdeja, 2010).

As with the deliverer, the setting for the delivery of the apology is just as
important. The setting should reflect the importance of the occasion, the
seriousness of the wrongdoing and the commitment to future relationships (Rasso, 2013; Verdeja, 2010).

Intergroup apologies should be very public (Verdeja, 2010) so that they reach the widest possible audience outside of the victim group. An apology also needs to be as inclusive as possible, including as many people within the victim group, their family, friends and community. This elevates who is worthy and who is not. The facts within the apology need to be distributed to the general public and for this reason the setting and media coverage need to be addressed (Verdeja, 2010). By having the apologiser as the Head of State, and the setting matching the seriousness of the wrongdoing, this is more likely to occur.

10.5. Factors affecting acceptance

Many apologies fall short of delivering the fundamental elements of an apology. Davis’ (2002, p. 170) work on the *Consummate Apology*, states that at the core of any genuine public apology there is a need for the apologiser to accept that the perpetrator is in the wrong. An effective apology has elements of ‘doxastic, affective, and dispositional’. As it suggests, these elements and their interpretation are important to the acceptance and/or rejection of the apology (Davis, 2002).

10.5.1. Timing

The timing of intergroup apologies may also moderate their effectiveness. After an interpersonal transgression, apologies given after some time has passed elicit greater forgiveness than apologies delivered immediately after the event (Frantz and Bennigson, 2005). This is, in part, because victims can express their concerns and have their anger dissipate before the perpetrator apologises (Goffman, 1976).

If it is given too soon an apology could be seen as insincere. On the other hand, if delivered too late then it could be considered as too calm, growing
resentment and anger rather than an admission of guilt and remorse (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

10.5.2. **Trust**

Blatz and Philpot (2010) found that the relationship between the perpetrator and victim is an important element to an apology. If the relationship is a trusting one then the effectiveness of an apology is likely to be higher than if trust is not a factor. This is due to the victims viewing the apology as not sincerely remorseful, and as an attempt to manipulate them. When *trust* is present, victims are more likely to accept the apology as being genuinely remorseful (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

10.5.3. **Balance of power**

The balance of power is another element to an apology. Researchers have not yet fully considered how the balance of power between the perpetrator and victim affects how an apology is received. What is clear is that power and status between groups is not always equal (Nader, 1972). Models of reconciliation try to restore power to the victims. One way in which power does affect an apology is through trust. If the balance of power is too far from being equal, then trust will become an issue. The relationship between the two groups (perpetrator and victim) is important and will influence the effectiveness of any apology offered. Shnabel et al. (2009) states, that if *low power* groups do not feel respected then they will not accept the apology.

10.5.4. **Identification**

How much an individual victim group member identifies with the victim group may also influence apology effectiveness. Those who consider a group important to their identity think, feel and behave in ways that benefit and protect the group more than those who do not consider that group important to their identity (Spears et al., 1997). Accordingly, those who identify highly with a victim group tend to be suspicious of a perpetrator group’s intentions to atone for a past harm (Doosje et al., 2004).
10.5.5. **Individual versus collective**

Blatz and Philpot (2010) state that an apology offered by an individual is more likely to be accepted than one that is given by a group or collective. This is due to the emotion that an individual will place into an apology, whereas a group apology cannot contain the same emotional content. To illustrate this they use the following example.

> A full apology was given to Australia either by an individual Japanese soldier or by a representative of all Japanese soldiers involved in committing World War II offences. Despite the fact that the exact same apology and relatively similar offences were implicated in each case, participants felt greater forgiveness for the individual Japanese soldier after his apology, but no greater forgiveness for Japanese soldiers as a collective after the representative’s Apology (Blatz and Philpot, 2010, p. 1003).

Examples from the comments I collected throughout my research study would also suggest that apologies offered by governments are less likely to be accepted.

> In reference to the apology? I guess I’ll start off with the apology first. The apology itself was not of my liking, but I understand that there is a need to make an apology. Whether or not it was truthful and to the spirit of the apology, I did not [reach] it because it had a taintedness to it. When I say ‘taintedness’, it’s because the government of Canada had read the document, this apology, to the general public, to the First Nations people in Canada and to the people in Canada at the time (First Nations man, Vancouver).

10.5.6. **Sincerity**

Tylim (2005) argues that it is hard to ascertain if government apologies come from a place of heart-felt remorse and/or guilt, and differentiating between the two is just as hard. To do so would require people to look into the superego of the apologiser ‘in terms of its concrete, as opposed to abstract, dimensions’ (Tylim, 2005).
With this in mind, I must question the value of self-based or mandatory apologies, such as those delivered in New Zealand after the Waitangi Tribunal had found in favour of the victim.

### 10.5.7. Dignity

Tylim (2005, p. 264), when talking about De Kock\(^{20}\) states that the need to apologise was perhaps his way of reclaiming lost dignity and re-entering the moral community. This notion translates to any intergroup apology.

By apologising the perpetrator seeks forgiveness, and the victim can grant it in full or part. Either way the perpetrator gains dignity by offering and admitting guilt and blame, this is then translated into morality. This gives the apologising party the moral high ground and leaves the victims to work through whether they should accept or resist the apology. This is only true if the apology that is offered contains all necessary elements.

### 10.5.8. Generational responsibility

A number of authors have suggested that there are issues of generational responsibility surrounding apologies responding to historical injustices (Barkan, 2006; Gibney and Roxstrom, 2001; Thompson, 2008; Verdeja, 2010). However, an intergroup apology seeks to rebuild or to enter into a relationship between the government and the population which the wrong was committed against, and to illustrate a change in government policy and behaviour (Harvey, 1995; Marrus, 2006).

While relationship building is one aspect of an intergroup apology, there can be many motives behind them, as mentioned in 2.1.2 (Morals) it is not uncommon for political leaders to use apologies as a moral stance and as a

---

\(^{20}\)Prime Evil: Eugene Alexander De Kock (born 29 January 1949) was a Colonel in the South African police force. During apartheid De Kock was responsible for the kidnapping, torture and assassination of numerous anti-apartheid activists from the 1980s to the early 1990s (Kaminer and Stein, 2001).
political tool. Intergroup apologies need to show a sincere commitment for future norms and behaviours, while owning the injustices they committed in the past.

10.6. Forgiveness and closure

Griswold (2008) and Digeser (2001) have concluded that it is only when the state delivers on their promise to change, that some form of forgiveness can and will be given. Depending on the state’s behaviour, this forgiveness may come with other conditions and/or limitations (Verdeja, 2010). Forgiveness will take time as change takes time. People need to be reassured that the change is for the better and not just change for the sake of change. What cannot occur is for this time lapse to be considered to be closure (Verdeja, 2010).

The work of Griswold and Meninger (2008) and Digeser (2001) is validated in the following interview extracts: (this piece has been cited previously, however it is worth repeating in his section).

But now, over the years since that apology, the actions of the government do not coincide with the apology. They’re getting more antagonistic against the Indian people than they ever have been. So in my mind and in my belief system, I have concluded that the apology wasn’t made from the heart. That’s where these things have to be dealt with - from the heart level - in order for them to be any good. That’s where I am today (First Nations man, Fort Frances).

The apology? I feel the apology started off well but its unfinished business. What’s required of an apology has never really eventuated. It's not just saying I'm sorry but it’s also following up on - sorry, I've lost the words (Aboriginal woman, Canberra).

Premature closure of an apology could result in dislodging accountability into the future, as justice and responsibility loses political urgency once an apology has been made. Thus, an apology points toward a commitment to
change but it is not in itself change (Verdeja, 2010). The acceptance and/or rejection of an apology depends not only on the apology event, content, acknowledgement of guilt, and the expression of remorse, as well as statement on future behaviour and commitment, but also whether or not the apology speaker is perceived to be legitimate compared to the severity of the wrongdoing (Verdeja, 2010).

The interview extract below demonstrates this point, as the person does not believe the speaker speaks on behalf of the government.

That apology sat in such a way with the government of Canada and the people in Canada that it was not a government that apologised; it was a person that apologised. The reason why I say that, this government of Canada, when it sits in office, there’s protocols of when it’s in session and when it's not in session, and when it's for the public. What happened was when the government of Canada said, we apologise on behalf of Canada, they speak on behalf of Canadians. Our government, in other words, says, I apologise when we’re in session to the non-First Nations or to the First Nations in Canada about the residential schools; that's the government (First Nations man, Vancouver).

While apologies mark a new relationship with the wrongdoer and a promise for behavioural change, they also highlight normative vagueness encompassing elitist rights to validity, and thus to status. To remove the vagueness, apologies should be given in the name of the state, and the speaker of the apology must have the right to speak on behalf of the state (Verdeja, 2010). Apologies can be catalysts for change in individual and/or group behaviours, as they allow for the mourning and repair of that which was destroyed by the transgression of the wrongdoer (Tylim, 2005).

10.7. **New Zealand apology analysis**

While New Zealand has apologised many times through the history of the Waitangi Tribunal, there is one national apology that stands out, this is the 1995 apology, signed by Her Majesty the Queen. I have stated throughout
this thesis that the New Zealand Government has apologised to the Māori peoples. However, what they have not done is to apologise to all of Māoridom for past injustices (Hook and Raumati, 2008).

This does not affect the comparison between the apologies; this is due to the fact that apologies are given to right a wrong that has been committed. New Zealand apologised to Māori for the theft of land and for the mistreatment of their kin while doing so, this includes institutionalised children. Australia apologised to the Stolen Generations for removing them from family, culture and homelands and Canada apologised to the Residential Schools Survivors, for sending children away from their families and away from their lands and culture. All three have tried to in some way include all of the Indigenous population, while apologising to a particular group of Indigenous peoples.

In November 1995, the Tainui people, who are the descendants of the first people who travelled to New Zealand in the Tainui waka (canoe) (Pure New Zealand, 2014), agreed to settle on their claim before the Waitangi Tribunal. The claim was compensation for land taken by the Crown during the New Zealand Land Wars. One of the terms they insisted on was an apology from the Queen (Vines, 1995).

As the Queen had never given an apology, the New Zealand Government had to devise a way around this. The resolution was to have Queen Elizabeth II personally give royal assent to the New Zealand Act of Parliament which enacted the Waikato-Tainui Deed of Settlement (Talbot, 2008). On the signing of the Act, Queen Elizabeth II, gave the following apology:

*The Crown acknowledges its breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, including sending troops across the Mangataawhiri Stream and unjustly labelling the members of Waikato-Tainui as rebels. The Crown also acknowledges that the settlement is belated, that the Waikato land which was confiscated has contributed to the development of New Zealand (it is worth an estimated $12*
billion) and that the iwi is foregoing much of the redress it sought in this settlement.

The Crown apologises to Waikato-Tainui for invading their land and for the consequential loss of life, damage to property, taonga (artefacts) the welfare, economy and development of the iwi, as well as the enduring grief and distress this caused (The Crown, 1995, p. 6).

On reading this statement you could be forgiven in believing this was an apology. After all she is the Queen of New Zealand; therefore, she is an appropriate figurehead to deliver the apology. The event was draped in ceremony and the media was in attendance. Social justice and a redress package were addressed as part of the apology. The Tainui people, would receive $170M and 47,000 acres of land as part of the settlement (Talbot, 2008; The Crown, 1995)

On comparing this apology to the elements discussed in sections 10.1–10.7, this is no more than a statement. It is true that there is an acknowledgement of wrongdoing. However, the acknowledgement is vague with little in way of why an apology is warranted. Nor is there any remorse or regret expressed. It could be argued that the written apology is able to address elements in greater detail. However, one of the elements of an intergroup apology is that it needs to be voiced publicly, as the document it was never voiced, only signed, it does not meet this criteria.

It is worthwhile looking further at some of the written apology to gauge the real intent. The Waikato Deed of Settlement, 22 May 1995 (The Crown, 1995), contains within it the apology to the Waikato people. The Crown’s apology contains five themes, regret, wrongdoing, redress, atonement and acknowledgement of outcomes.

The Crown in the opening sentence distances itself from the wrongdoing in stating ‘its representative and advisers acted unjustly’ (The Crown 1995, p 6). The use of representative and advisers removes the Crown and the Queen away from any wrongdoing. The use of unjustly minimises the
wrongdoing, implying that the Crown’s treatment of the Waikato people was just a little one sided. Moving forward it does state its ‘profound regret and apologises unreservedly’ (The Crown 1995, p. 6). Gill (2000) states that for an apology to be effective, there needs to be an ‘expression of an attitude of regret and a feeling of remorse’. There is no evidence of remorse in the wording of this apology, revealing a disparity between the statement and the emotion.

The Crown apologises for the wrongdoing of ‘loss of life because of the hostilities arising from its invasion, and at the devastation of property and social life which resulted’ (The Crown 1995, p. 6). This is the heart of the apology. It informs the reader as to what wrongdoing occurred: the ‘invasion’ and the results of it. While the ‘devastation of property’ is expanded on throughout the apology, the devastation of social life is not, nor is it addressed in the redress. By composing the apology this way, emotions are avoided and so there is no connection to people or the suffering.

There is a lot of time dedicated to the acknowledgement of wrongdoing related to land. However, it is difficult to work out what that wrongdoing was.

The Crown acknowledges that the subsequent confiscation of land and resources under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 of the New Zealand Parliament were wrongful, have caused Waikato to the present time to suffer… (The Crown 1995, p6).

By referring to the New Zealand Government and its legislation, the apology distances any person from wrongdoing. The use of the New Zealand Settlement Act also distances the Crown from the invasion, making it hard to define what the wrongdoing was.

This vagueness allows the apologiser to take the high moral ground even as they apologise. As discussed previously, it is important that the community understands why the apology was issued and that it is sincere. Without this,
the general public may believe the victim group is getting special treatment (Tylim, 2005).

When talking about redress the Crown uses *atone* (The Crown 1995, p. 6). The word atone is interesting, as it clearly shows that the New Zealand Government wants to make amends for the wrongdoing. While atone means to compensate or give redress, it also has components of apology, and in this instance expedites these amends (Oxford Dictionary, 2014).

Overall the New Zealand apology to the Waikato tribes is fair; there is acknowledgement of wrongdoing, expression of regret, responsibility is taken for the wrongdoing and the harms caused, and social justice is addressed through compensation. Areas in which the apology fails could almost be overlooked. In some ways they are, the Waikato tribes accepted the Deed, on which the apology is held.

However, as a reconciliation tool, there is evidence that the poor social determinants of health or economic disadvantage of Māori people have not changed (Hawke et al., 2014; Peters and Andersen, 2013). It has been 19 years since the handing over of the Deed and the apology. If Māori and non-Māori relationships were strengthening and the Māori of Waikato had accepted the apology the divide between Māori and non-Māori in terms of socio-economic, health and education factors would have also started to disappear (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012).

### 10.8. Australian apology analysis

Mr Rudd the then Prime Minister of Australia, firmly placed Australia as apology friendly with his two national apologies. The first, on 13 February 2008, was at the first sitting of Parliament for his term as Prime Minister. This apology was to the Stolen Generations. The second apology, in November 2009, was to the Forgotten Australians, children who were transported to Australia after the war, and were then placed into homes and institutionalised (Cuthbert and Quarterly, 2012). Prime Minister Rudd had planned a third, to
the parents and children of forced adoptions, however, this was given by his successor, Prime Minister Julia Gillard, in 2012.

It could be argued that former Prime Minister Keating in his now famous speech acknowledging the year of World Indigenous Peoples (Keating, 1992), in December 1992 at Redfern was the first to offer a quasi-apology. It is true that the word sorry was not used. However, he did express guilt and regret for ‘devastation and demoralisation’ by European society to Indigenous Australia by ‘taking the lands, destroying the original ways of life, and taking the children from their mothers’ (Cuthbert and Quarterly, 2012). Australia also offered the formation of the Council of Aboriginal Reconciliation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission, as a form of redress. It was later in the 1990s at the tabling of the BTH Report that recommended all Australian Parliaments undertake an apology:

\[ \ldots \text{officially acknowledge the responsibility of their predecessors for the laws, policies and practices of forcible removal and offer official apologies to Indigenous individuals, families and communities and extend those apologies with wide and culturally appropriate publicity (HREOC, 1997).} \]

Since the release of the BTH Report (1997), there was a push from Stolen Generations and their supporters for the Commonwealth Government to apologise for the policies, practises and past treatment of assimilation. The Coalition Government lead by Prime Minister Howard was against such an apology, which led to fierce debate in both public and political arenas (Hastie, 2009).

The main augment against the apology according to Hastie and Augoustinos, (2012) was the weight placed on the \textit{practical over the symbolic} reconciliation, and the rejection that responsibility for past wrongdoing should not fall on the current generation (Augoustinos et al., 2002). These are flawed arguments as reconciliation involves practical changes in the way Australia thinks about its traditional owners and need to shift from a mostly negative to positive attitudes.
Over time, public support for an apology grew, each year Sorry Day (26th May) activities brought together supporters from all walks of life. In 2000, on Sorry Day over 100,000 people walked over Sydney Harbour Bridge to support reconciliation (National Sorry Day Committee, 2014), members of the Stolen Generations, and an apology. Non-Indigenous peoples were offering apologies, as evidenced by the Sorry Books, (held at the Australian Institute for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies). Churches and states also offered apologies to the Stolen Generations (Bird, 1998).

Western Australia, South Australia, New South Wales, Tasmania, Victoria, and the Australian Capital Territory governments have all given an apology in 1997, followed by Queensland in 1999. The Northern Territory was the last to apologise in 2001 (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). It is staggering that it took the Australian Government until 2008 to follow suit. The debate on whether the Commonwealth of Australia should or should not give an apology ended on 13 February 2008, with what is now known as the Rudd Apology (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012).

Gartrell (2008), Hagan (2008) and Manne (2008) all stated that the apology to the Stolen Generations ‘was a watershed’ moment in Australian history, due to the political, social and historical importance of the event. While this point may be true, was the apology an apology that contained all the elements of an apology (as discussed in 9.3), or merely a statement of regret? More importantly, what were the psychological benefits to the Stolen Generations for whom the Apology was for?

Hastie and Augoustinos (2012) argue that the apology was of great importance to the Stolen Generations and to all Indigenous Australians, because it put to bed the discourse around Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander identity, and they believed the apology undermined the ‘formal and informal arguments on race’ within Australia.

Whether or not this prompted Adam Goodes, of the Narungga Nation and 2014 Australian of the Year, to lead an anti-racism campaign is hard to say
without interviewing him\(^{21}\). Beyond Blue’s current campaign on racism and Indigenous depression and social and emotional wellbeing could be considered in the same way. This ‘highlights the importance of constructing shared, inclusive identities as a means of mobilising support for political action’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012, p. 2).

The apology was perceived as an essential first step, with not only the treatment of the Stolen Generations but also with reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Manne, 2008). Acknowledging the past and accepting responsibility for the forced removal and treatment of children is redefining the past and developing future relationships (Dodds, 2009; Nobles, 2008).

Former Prime Minister Howard’s (1996-2007) most used argument against an apology was that ‘present generations cannot be blamed for the mistakes of past generations’ and ‘Australians of this generation should not be required to accept guilt and blame for past actions and policies’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012, p. 3). However, a review of the BTH Report (HREOC, 1997) shows it covers the timeframe from 1901 (Federation) to 1970 and, if no allowances are made for the disparity between policies and practices, this timeframe is still within the lifetime of current living generations.

Prime Minister Howard’s argument made the use of an apology as a ‘prerequisite to moving’ the relationship of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians to a positive and equal one, moot (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). However, former Prime Minister Rudd’s (2007-2010) apology destroyed Howard’s argument by apologising specifically for the successive government policies that legislated and enacted the laws of forced removal of Indigenous children’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). He did this in two ways: first by ‘offering a collective apology on behalf of the Australian parliament’ and then by offering the apology in the first person as Prime Minister of Australia (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012).

\(^{21}\) This research should be conducted
Prime Minister Rudd also referred to ‘our parliaments’, ‘we the parliaments’, and ‘our laws’, to move blame for the Stolen Generations across not only the sitting members on all sides of politics, but to those of the past. By undertaking language of this kind he is negating Howard’s arguments of blame. This also means that Rudd limits blame to just the Government and not those who enforced it. Rudd clearly reinforces this with ‘not those who gave effect to our laws’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012).

However, by avoiding blaming those who were responsible for removing the children and for housing them in substandard accommodation and the suffering following the removal, Rudd has removed the element of justice from the apology. This strategy also protects non-Indigenous people by ‘limiting blame and accountability to legal and political institutions’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012).

The idea that past forced removal and mistreatment of children, should be addressed and that ‘injustices should be highlighted’, is a gripping argument for the apology and ‘injustices have to be recognised in order for the nation’ to ‘move forward’, so that acknowledging injustice is a precursor to ‘togetherness’ as a nation (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). Compensation and other forms of justice for these acts should also be forthcoming (Augoustinos et al., 2002; Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012; LeCouteur, 2002).

The construct of the apology is fundamental to dealing with the ‘unfinished business’ that is characterised by reconciliation within Australia and with the Stolen Generations. Rudd signifies this with the following: ‘a great stain on the nation’s soul’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). He equated apologising with ‘moving forward with confidence’. While Rudd was referring to the nation moving forward such a statement is presumptuous, as for this to occur, victims need to heal. Rudd is also assuming that people will forgive.
Rudd’s aim to ‘build bridges’\(^{22}\) permits the practical ‘action to be built on the symbolic act’ that carries true respect (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). He used both the practical and symbolic nature of reconciliation, positioning them as complementary issues. The importance he places on both the symbolic and practical acts of reconciliation is evidenced in how Rudd saw the current ‘relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians’ (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012) within the apology speech.

In this way, Rudd gives his vision of the Australian identity. Reicher, Cassidy, Wolpert, Hopkins and Levine, (2006, p53) state that ‘social identities are not simply perceptions about the world as it is now, but arguments intended to mobilise people to create the world as it should be in the future’. By giving his vision, Rudd accomplishes two things: he invites all Australians into a discussion on their identity and gives a statement on future government behaviour.

Rudd’s apology to the Stolen Generations was comprehensive, and has all but one element of an apology: the offering of redress and compensation. His moves to limit liability for those who enforced the acts of removal and those who caused harm to the members of the Stolen Generations, has also limited the availability of justice.

As these are key elements to an apology, the Australian Government should not expect forgiveness from the Stolen Generations. It is like building three quarters of a hospital—it can’t be expected to function as intended or can’t deliver all expected outcomes because vital compounds are missing rendering it ineffectual.

The following statements from Australian interviews demonstrate the need for redress to be a part of the apology.

---

\(^{22}\) Cameron (2007) states that the term ‘building bridges’ is a common metaphor for reconciliation.
There was crying and bending over backwards to meet Mr Rudd and – oh, it was a good atmosphere, you know. It was good that he did say sorry, but nothing else has happened since that, you know, ah, for compensation or something, you know, for the Stolen Generation. I felt – yeah, I felt happy, I felt good that, you know, I was going there to meet the Prime Minister. I was fortunate enough to go into the – the Government House, yeah. So, um, it was good. The – everybody seemed jubilant, is that the word? Yeah, and excited because they were expecting some sort of compensation. But nothing has happened (Aboriginal woman, Canberra).

and

‘No, I don’t think so. Um, except that what we’re mostly saying is ‘the apology; now what?’ People aren’t – you know, there was no compensation, there was no – it’s like somebody having a, um, a bad car accident – um, somebody having a bad car accident and, um, then sort of turning to the people who were injured and saying, ‘Oh, I say, I’m terribly sorry,’ and then just walking away. Well, accountability’s a bit more than that (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

10.9. Canadian apology analysis

On 11 June 2008, the Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper gave the apology (P. Harper, 2008) on behalf of the Canadian Government to Residential School Survivors. He did this in front of Cabinet and members of the Residential School Survivors. The apology was telecast by the media across Canada and the world.

Harper’s apology had seven themes: isolation, abuse, a legacy of trauma, new recognition, the continuing burden to country and government, a new relationship moving forward, the nature of diversity within Canada and Aboriginal cultures as a national strength (Anderson, 2012).

Over half of the apology was dedicated to painting a picture of the forced removal of children to residential schools, which were often far removed from their communities. This was a facet of the policy to remove and isolate the
child from any influence of their family, culture and traditions, so that they would be assimilated into the dominant westernised culture (Anderson, 2012; Ghaddar and Caidi, 2014).

The second theme recognised these policies had, and will continue to have, a damaging effect on Aboriginal language, culture and heritage for many years to come. The third seems to suggest that the Canadian Government has only recently learned of the negative effects of the residential schools system and policies. In the fourth theme, we see a change in responsibility by moving the burden from the Residential Schools Survivors to the government and the country. By doing this, Harper opens the way for the formation of a new relationship between First Nations and the rest of Canada. ‘A relationship based on the knowledge of our shared history, a respect for each other and a desire to move forward together’ (Anderson, 2012, p577).

Harper cites the ‘treatment of children as a sad chapter in Canadian history’. He went into the ‘emotional, physical and sexual abuse and neglect’. Here he did an interesting thing: he uses abuse and treatment as nouns. By not using them as verbs he removed the act of abuse, which then refrains from giving a face and name to the abuser (Willow, 2012). By concentrating on this abuse he was able to leave out statements referring to actual child murder and the allegations of genocide (Cooke, 2015; Regan, 2010; Starzyk et al., 2014)

Transitivity is the presentation of one reality over another, that is, it is used in research analyses to show how subjects and objects are connected and what consequences could occur due to this relationship or other manipulated relationships. Harper uses this tactic to sidestep blame for when he does admit that the residential school system was based on the assumption that Aboriginal culture and spiritual beliefs were inferior and unequal. He then shifts blame by stating, ‘that institutions gave rise to abuse’. The use of this allows the government to distance itself from the implication of violence, colonisation and racism, and move it to a ‘faceless villain’ (Willow, 2012)
Redress and compensation had already been established through the settlement agreement (Branch, 2008), so it is unsurprising that it was not included as part of the apology statement. What is interesting though, is that the Harper Government chose the same year to announce that the Canadian Healing Foundation would not be re-funded (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2015; Henderson and Wakeham, 2009).

The Canadian Healing Foundation is a not-for-profit organisation, established in 1998, with an 11-year mandate. It was Aboriginal managed, allowing for First Nations to set their own health agenda based on research (which they also conducted), and allowed for community-based healing initiatives that address the legacy of physical and sexual abuse suffered in residential schools to be addressed (Webster, 2012).

Harper talks about a new partnership:

> Years of work by survivors, communities, and Aboriginal organisations culminated in an agreement that gives us a new beginning and an opportunity to move forward together in partnership (S. Harper, 2008).

This partnership is one that has been brought about by the settlement agreement, not by the Government. There is no commitment to behavioural change in the apology. Nor are there any signs of remorse or guilt. Harper dealt with this by way of stating:

> The government now recognises that the consequences of the Indian Residential Schools policy were profoundly negative and that this policy has had a lasting and damaging impact on Aboriginal culture, heritage and language. While some former students have spoken positively about their experiences at residential schools, these stories are far overshadowed by tragic accounts of the emotional, physical and sexual abuse and neglect of helpless children, and their separation from powerless families and communities (S. Harper, 2008).
There is no explicit acknowledgement of wrongdoing by the Government here, nor is there any guilt or remorse.

In regard for the elements of a good official apology, Harper as Prime Minister and leader of the country was the appropriate person to give the apology. As the apology was delivered in front of a sitting cabinet, it was the correct and logical public setting. The apology reached the widest possible audience through the use of electronic media. Prime Minister Harper did say the word *sorry* in a number of languages, including French.

*Nous le regrettons*
*We are sorry*
*Nimitataynan*
*Niminchinowesamin*

However, saying sorry even if in five different languages is not enough by itself to elicit forgiveness. The government could not consider itself to have the higher moral ground and therefore could not expect the apology to be accepted. However, the Canadian apology did open up moral debate that has given a new and acceptable history for the nation, which includes First Nations as a people with equal moral and cultural rights. The Canadian apology had most of the elements of an apology. What was missing is taking blame for the events within residential schools, and the emotional response of regret. Without this, Prime Minister Harper could be reading a paper— as the following comment illustrates:

*From a piece of paper to it. He probably didn't even write the paper, you know what I mean? Because people are there working for him, writing stuff out for him, so he was just reading it. It didn't come spontaneously. When you apologise to somebody, it comes from here, not from' (First Nations man, Fort Frances).*
10.10. Do apologies mean forgiveness?

It is common for apology speeches to use language that gives an impression of having apologised (Davis, 2002) without having actually done so. As stated in section 9.2, it is not about the language of apology but whether or not the apology is accepted—if not, why not. A simple example will illustrate the point at which an apology is not always an apology. If I was to say that I regretted any offence my comments had caused, I would not be apologising. There is no acceptance of wrongdoing, nor is there any heart felt guilt or remorse. ‘It should be quite clear that one can regret an offence one has caused and not apologise. Indeed, regret is quite consistent with steadfast refusal to apologise’ (Davis, 2002). Davis (2002) also argues that this is due to the deliverer not believing they were in the wrong or in the need for an apology.

Further to this, an apology needs to have the wrongdoer acknowledge their transgression and accept responsibility for it, while showing the right emotional responses. It is considered fitting that the victim be at least receptive to accepting the apology if all elements are present in the apology statement. However, where there are unconvincing signals on these and other elements, it is only rational that acceptance is not forthcoming (Davis, 2002).

The severity of the wrongdoing also plays a part in the acceptance of an apology. As severity of the wrongdoing increases, so does the likelihood that forgiveness is not forthcoming (Bennett and Dewberry, 1994; Ohbuchi et al., 1989; Tomlinson et al., 2004). In contrast to acceptance, Ohbuchi, Kameda and Agarie (1989) found that victims of severe wrongdoing desire apologies. This would indicate that apologies are appropriate after a wrongdoing, even though they may be less effective when the wrongdoing is severe and less likely to be forgiven. Brooks (1999) proposed that when privity\textsuperscript{23} is high, an apology may help the victim group, especially if a considerable redress package is made available. This is primarily due to the victim group

\textsuperscript{23}Privity is the term used by the psychological and Legal professions to refer to the link between past wrongdoings and current trauma (Brooks, 1999).
questioning the wrongdoers' motives if they are unwilling to correct past events.

There is some evidence that extravagant intergroup apologies that are costly are more effective than less extravagant ones. This is due to the perception that the more costly an apology, the more sincere the perpetrator must be (Blatz and Philpot, 2010; Ohtsubo and Watanabe, 2009). There have been similar findings by political analysis in that the difference in successful and unsuccessful conflict resolution is for important players to give costly signals to the other parties; this is translated to an genuine interest in peace (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

If an apologiser gives no evidence that the behaviour that they are apologising for is going to stop, then it should be regarded that any apology offered will be inadequate (Davis, 2002). A promise to not commit the same wrongdoing is an important component of any apology. As discussed earlier, acceptance of an apology is often delayed, as the victims wait to see if the wrongdoer is capable of change.

As a result of the offering of an apology, a relationship can be formed through a new conversation, where a deeper understanding of the transgression can occur, and appropriate responses be put in place, and a common determination for moral standards to improve. Davis (2002) argues that for these reasons, an apology can be a catalyst for moral change.

It is only sensible to recognise that for there to be acceptance of an apology all elements of an apology must be present, what is not often understood is that these elements must be appropriate to the transgression and rational within themselves (Davis, 2002).

A number of studies have found varying outcomes of intergroup apologies. Blatz and Philpot (2010) found that Japan’s apology to ‘Australians, Malaysians, and Filipinos’ for its World War II transgressions, resulted in a level of forgiveness. Contrary to the findings of Philpot and Hornsey (2008)
and Brown et al. (2008) who, in separate studies, found that apologies offered by Australia for a variety of wrongdoings, such as environmental damage, human rights abuses, and corporate malpractice, did not elicit any responses of forgiveness. This indicates that intergroup apologies may or may not elicit responses of forgiveness. Blatz and Philpot (2010) suggest that where apologies are given for recent and unintentional events, they are more likely to be accepted.

Even though members of groups previously victimised by intentional injustices may be reluctant to forgive, they may still desire to have amicable relations with the perpetrator group. For example, present day victims of groups targeted in the holocaust could refuse to forgive the Nazi perpetrators but not hold present day Germans responsible for these events.

Forgiveness is not always the reason that apologies are given. Blatz and Philpot (2010, p. 998) state that: victim groups have a greater understanding of the wrongdoer after the presentation of a public and officially apology. Another benefit to public governmental apologies is they can build trust in societal institutions (Lavin and Carroll, 2014).

Tylim (2005) argues that the most important aspect of an apology is forgiveness, and secondary to this is the awarding of compensation and/or creating some sort of memorial. For forgiveness to occur, victims must move past the ‘moral emotion of resentment’. This allows for ‘moving forward towards overcoming resentment, fostering reparation, and completing a protracted mourning process’ (Tylim, 2005).

Gobodo-Madikizela, (2002., p. 118) states that:

> the question is no longer whether victims can forgive ‘evildoers’ but whether symbols, language, and politics, our legal, media, and academic institutions – are creating the conditions that encourage alternatives to revenge.
This is an interesting question, as it leads us away from not only the notion of forgiveness and letting go of one’s pain, which is what forgiveness allows. It also moves away from the formation of a new and equal relationship as well as the promises of behavioural changes. Work in this area is needed. If anger and resentment remain, it can be passed from one generation to the next (Bezo and Maggi, 2015). Trans-generational trauma will not allow for the relationship to change, leaving nations divided.

10.11. What do they hope to achieve?

Verdeja (2010) describes three main tasks that an intergroup apology performs:

1. Apologies encourage the rebuilding of victims’ sense of moral values, which is the first step in repairing the relationship between victim and wrongdoer (Verdeja, 2010, p566).

2. Apologies create a space for reflection on the wrongdoing and public discussion and debate round morals and social norms on the issue. This discussion and debate around the issues uncovered by the apology will bring about a new relationship. This occurs by focusing public discussion on their violation and requiring a new deliberation of how the relationship between the state and its citizens will move forward (Verdeja, 2010, p566).

3. Apologies create new histories by the state acknowledging their wrongdoing; history is often righted to include acts that had previously been ignored by the government (Verdeja, 2010, p566).

Apologies should also indicate assurance for applied material redress and reparations for victims of the transgression. Reparations can be wide ranging, from an offering of money for events of torture, abuse (sexual, physical, and emotional) and even death, restitution of the theft of property, the offering of medical care and assistance for ongoing physical and psychological effects of trauma, educational and employment provision to enable victims and communities to help adjust (Verdeja, 2010).
It is posed that intergroup apologies present difficulties and produce psychological motivations, which are not present for interpersonal apologies. If this is the case then what are these difficulties, and should all apologies be considered apologies or are they indeed something altogether different (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

10.12. Morality and values

Thompson (2008) and Lazare (2004) argue that intergroup apologies shift the power ratio back to a point of equilibrium, give dignity to the victim, and restore the belief that the perpetrator group believes and follows norms of fairness, and justice. This, in turn, gives power back to the victims.

Lazare, (2004) and Thompson (2008), argue that the main objective of an intergroup apology is to ‘restore victim’s belief that societal institutions are trustworthy’ (Lazare, 2004, p997). For this to occur, remorse needs to be expressed within the apology. This affirms to victims that the perpetrator group follow the same norms debased by the wrongdoing and helps trust to be re-established with institutions, such as governments, as people can see that they act in a fair and just manner.

Tylim (2005) states that, ‘apologies aim at obtaining forgiveness. However, once delivered, they may or may not produce their intended effect’. When apologies are accepted, they allow for a psychological shift to occur, which in turn removes the elements of anger, resentment and aggression towards having been wronged (Tylim, 2005). The following statement from an Australian man clearly shows that accepting an apology does not always leads to the dissipation of anger.

I reckon the apology was good even though it took them 200 years to fucking say sorry. It took - how long did it take them to proclaim us as citizens of our own fucking country (Aboriginal man, Canberra).
10.13. Reflections

Intergroup apologies set the foundation for reconciliation, as the perpetrator publicly takes the blame for past wrongdoings. Tylim (2005, P. 269) asks the following questions: ‘Is forgiving related to reconciliation? Could one forgive without reconciling? Can one reconcile without forgiving?’

By acknowledging a wrongdoing, and expressing regret, apologies realign the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim, leading to a shift in ‘pre-established assumptions’ (Tylim, 2005) around relationships.

Official intergroup apologies acknowledge accountability for severe wrongs committed against members of a particular population with the goal of rebuilding damaged relationships on a moral foundation (Tylim, 2005). For this reason, official intergroup apologies have become a popular political tool to help transition relationships, where in the recent past there has been mass violence and where the community is struggling with the moral and social legacies of the violence. Brooks (1999) and Verdeja (2010), argue that apologies can serve some political-moral functions provided they satisfy certain criteria, which include issues of presentation, content, and future commitment.

Apologies are often thought of as an easy fix, to allow a society to move forward or at least past a period of unrest, resentment and/or anger. They have also had a lot of criticism for being a quick fix simply to minimise guilt, and in many cases, minimise reparations and compensation while providing a sense of self-satisfaction for acknowledging wrongs (Bowman, 2009; Verdeja, 2010).

Victims, who regard them as a first step in the healing process by having the guilt and regret expressed for the wrongdoing, frequently want apologies. Through this expression, apologies by default have elements of truth telling, which is for the whole of the nation. The acknowledgement of the victim/s also vindicates the victim group, which gives the victims the moral higher
ground. Acknowledgement also makes the wrongdoer accountable for their actions. By their very nature, apologies mark the point of a new relationship between the wrongdoer and the victim. In the words of Cohen (2001, p. 858) it is a ritual cleaning giving moral space (Verdeja, 2010) in which a new relationship can emerge.

According to Verdeja, Christian theologians have dominated work on interpersonal apologies (Verdeja, 2010), arguing that apologies help rebuild damaged relationships, and this is also true for the social and political relationships. This signals how apologies are more than just a speech, marking a period of moving on (Verdeja, 2010). An apology may or may not restore a damaged relationship, however, it does provide a moral space to work through unresolved issues.

The following extract from interviews supports Verdeja (2010), as the woman expresses the notion that, though she has accepted the apology at least in part, time to work through issues is still needed.

> Well [pause] yes and no. It's not going to replace what you've lost. It will never replace that. But hopefully in time we all can heal. Yeah. So at last we've got recognition. But I think it all needed a bit more. Hm! Yeah! That's all I can say. Thank you’ (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs).

This time, or working space, is the reason that many people remain angry and resentful after accepting an apology. There has been no time for this moral work to be undertaken.

It would be wrong to think that an apology could: secure human rights for a particular subgroup; change the national accord on morality and values; and engage reconciliation. However, it does create public debate about morality and values, human rights, and reconciliation. This debate will drive change in the collective view of each (Harris et al., 2006; Verdeja, 2010).
This of course is what is currently occurring within Australia. The debate on constitutional change to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander in the Australian constitution is the moral change that has been catalysed by the Rudd apology.

10.14. Historical accuracy

Melissa Nobles (2008) argues that official intergroup apologies rewrite history by acknowledging victims and placing their versions of history centre stage.

The history of one’s nation resides in the collective memory of its citizens. It is what the history books state and what has been passed down within the schooling systems. It is one sided in that history is told by the dominant or ruling culture and this is evident in the history of Australia and New Zealand, which Nobles calls Political Whitening (Nobles, 2008, p. 21). Nobles (2008) confirms this with the statement that for most of the 20th-Century, governments paid little attention to Indigenous peoples. An official apology allows history to be told from the victim’s viewpoint. This often moves collective memory to a more centred position, and can bring emotional responses of disgust and, in some, disbelief. Therefore an apology is a lesson in history (Olick, 1999; Tsosie, 2006).

Cunningham (1999) works on the idea that an apology allows for the movement of community concepts and national identity through the acknowledgement of past wrongdoing and the commitment to change by the wrongdoer. This also allows for the reshaping of historical events opening the way for reconciliation, and an equal relationship to be formed.

10.15. Commitment

What is clear is that an apology is not just a single event, or act, that ends with the closing of a ceremony; it is an ongoing commitment. It gives direction to a new relationship (Tavuchis, 1991), and in such case a new
beginning (Verdeja, 2010). This requires behavioural change, which is a lengthy process. Behavioural change and the development of a new relationship are fragile things and there will be stumbles along the way, so this requires unwavering commitment from the state.

To date there has been no discussion as to an apology offering cultural legitimacy to Indigenous populations. This could be due to the lack of academic work in this area, or simply that in the plethora of apologies given, only a few are directed at Indigenous wrongdoing.

However, if an apology resets the historical accounts, it must also reset the way in which the government and communities view Indigenous cultures. That is, it affirms its place within the new relationship, and allows for cultural practises to be just that, practised in day-to-day life and not confined to weekends and commemorations.

**10.16. Intentionality**

Whether or not the perpetrators intended to harm the victims may determine whether an intergroup apology is effective (Blatz and Philpot, 2010; Branscombe, 2004; Oliner, 2005). Victims only felt more forgiving after an apology when the perpetrator did not intend harm. Struthers, Eaton, Santelli, Uchiyama and Shiruan (2008) found that this occurred because perpetrators who intended harm are viewed as undependable and their apologies are seen as disingenuous (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

**10.17. Acceptance**

Govier and Verwoerd (Govier and Verwoerd, 2002a, 2002b) acknowledged the challenge of who will accept, reject or ignore official intergroup apology. The challenge is about how victims will respond to the apology. With interpersonal apologies, there is a person that is apologised to, and who can give forgiveness. This person maintains the ability to accept or reject the
apology and thus retains the moral autonomy. In an intergroup apology this is not the case.

Minow (2009) argues that official apologies needed to give the victim room to accept, refuse or even ignore the apology. However, holding individuals to account for large scale, historical wrongdoing that they personally did not commit is challenging. Holding individuals to account is essentially what is occurring when an intergroup apology meeting all criteria is rejected24.

Many intergroup apologies are very public and surrounded in ceremony. Due to this, so-called heads of victim organisations and other leaders are often invited to represent other victims. Verdeja (2010) argues and I agree that while some victims may represent others, the idea that they can accept the apology on behalf of others is ridiculous.

Official intergroup apologies need to convince the victim to accept the words spoken and therefore the speaker’s sincerity, in other words accept the apology. They cannot force the victim to do so just by offering the apology speech. The lack of any one addressee virtually means that once spoken the wrongdoer can claim their apology was successful and accepted by the victims (Verdeja, 2010).

Verdeja (2010, p. 11) states that, ‘a public official can apologise, and argue that the apology itself is a first step toward reconciliation’. Governments and others who have given official intergroup apologies know that there can never be total acceptance of the apology offered. This provides a void which allows for political exploitation, which is an ‘ineradicable weaknesses of official apologies’ (Verdeja, 2010, p. 11).

Firstly, there is the problem that it is impossible to measure the response of all addressees, leaving success open to interpretation. The second problem

---

24 For further reading see Roht-Arriaza and Mariezcurren 2006; Mayer-Rieckh and De Greiff 2007; and Ernesto Verdeja, 2010.
is the perception that the apology has bestowed forgiveness on the wrongdoer, which will limit the victim’s ability to make genuine criticisms in the future (Verdeja, 2010).

People who were not victims may see the apology as an appropriate statement, which indicates the state’s recognition of responsibility. As this would seem to represent at least partial compensation for the past, an apology may solicit a response from non-victims that the victims should just move on. The comments below demonstrate that victims have experienced such attitudes.

I’m starting to understand - both me and my wife are starting to understand what it was all about. So in this questionnaire, you’ll see that I strongly believe that New Zealanders need to know about New Zealand history with Māori and the whole thing. Because I was brought up, as I say, in a Pakeha environment and none of them know anything about it. They don’t want to know, they don’t care about it. As far as they’re concerned, I’m shouldn’t have to pay for what my ancestors did years ago. Let’s move on (Māori man, Hamilton).

It’s going to take another long, long journey for us to accept the apology because I think we deserve another apology because what we have lived through and we’ve put up with a lot of pain and carried it and passed it on through our community and they are still carrying that load and crying today. We can’t just move on, move on to what we went through (Aboriginal woman, Sydney)?

I apologise to you. So forget it, then move on. It’s still there. They didn’t say forgive me, because if they would have said forgive me, and known where forgiveness comes, from a Christian doctrine, religion way of teaching, they’re going to answer to him (First Nations man, Fort Frances).

A few authors have submitted counter arguments to the above. If the Prime Minister or Head of State, sincerely and unequivocally apologises and seeks forgiveness, then why shouldn’t it be an obligation of the victim to give
forgiveness? North (1987) and Lerman (1999) also argue that forgiveness is the gaining of *dignity* through positive behaviour. If an apology is sincere, then there is no reason not to expect forgiveness or, at the very least, an explanation of why one is not forthcoming. Rigby (1999) agrees, as he argues that when an apology is sincere it should elicit forgiveness from the victim. This is especially true if the apology contains all the essential elements of a good intergroup apology.

These arguments are challenging, as they treat an apology as a standalone event, which is finalised when the speech has concluded (Verdeja, 2010). This ignores a number of mitigating factors such as the seriousness of the wrongdoing itself in instances of murder and rape. Not all wrongdoings can be apologised for, and even if an apology is offered, it will be rejected. Other factors influencing acceptance include: the time lapse between the wrongdoing and the apology; future behaviours; and the promise of a better relationship. Not to mention that the apology should contain elements of: ownership for the wrongdoing; expressions of remorse; asking for forgiveness; a commitment to behavioural change; and redress. There are many reasons that a victim may not accept, and even reject an apology.

**10.18. Harms**

Tylim (2005, p. 3) theorises that when apologies fail, the psychological shift is towards a ‘new resentment/aggression/violence cycle. The result is that nothing seems to change except for the worse’. Put simply, if the people do not accept a public government apology, then the cycle of resentment and hurt is compounded.

Intergroup apologies can be seen as patronising as well as providing limitations on the wrongdoing and any redress that may be forthcoming. In Rudd’s apology to the Australian Stolen Generation, he sets limits by setting the scene early in the apology speech that this is an ‘historical wrong’ (Rudd, 2008). He later contextualises the time frame, by giving the decade in which the removal policies finished—*the 1970s*. What Rudd does not consider is
there is anecdotal evidence that the practise of child removal due to race did not finish until the early 1980s (Cabinet, 2015; Staff and Wilson, 1997, p. 166) Further to this, Rudd uses partnerships as a way to move forward. This allows the government to sidestep any future responsibility, as they are not solely responsible for any study or actions, it is now a partnership.

10.19. Conclusion

There is no doubt that the deep symbolism of apologies, combined with their quick and easy public dissemination, makes them the tool of choice for political elites seeking a powerful way to respond to complex social issues (Verdeja, 2010).

The intergroup apologies in Canada, New Zealand and Australia had the correct physical elements of the speaker, setting and distribution – although the public settings inhibited the expression of true sorrow and remorse and they lack the ability to express personal emotional content such as regret. They had elements of morality in terms of mostly clear expression and recognition of historical injustice (and in Australia’s case more sincere) by citing examples of events, albeit unspecific. They even implied remorse, in that they explicitly said sorry. Arguably this should also indicate guilt, yet each has used various methods to distract the listener (such as packaging events clearly in the past), so that guilt was never fully expressed. New Zealand and Canada’s apologies included a form of redress through compensation, and all three sought to repair morality and dignity that comes with having apologised, but all three lacked strong commitment to behavioural change.

Forgiveness and acceptance (whether sought explicitly or by implication), has been more elusive. The primary reason for this is that governments know that it is difficult for their apology to be fully accepted. This is due to no one person or group being able to stand and accept the apology on behalf of every victim. The same situation applies for the rejection of an apology.
Perhaps the most important tangible element that has been lacking, is that of change (Scher and Darley, 1997) and the promise of a new future relationship. Clearly change takes time, and time is positive to a point (e.g. freshly after a transgression) but the simple passage of time itself, without change, does not ensure closure or forgiveness. Individuals, and various groups can monitor change, with 8 years passing from the last apology offer, but individuals interviewed had not seen evidence of a changing relationship (this is discussed in Chapter 11). Perhaps unsurprisingly then, linguistic analyses find that the vast majority of interpersonal apologies contain little more than a statement of remorse (Meier, 1998).

This however does not mean that the apologies had no positive outcomes. They act of apologising reset the historical records in that the government acknowledged the forced removal events occurred. This shifts the moral values systems, and gives power to the victims. It also re-establishes trust in governments and their institutions, at least for the general public. It remains to be seen whether change is simply a matter of more time elapsing and whether the positive and negative effects of incomplete or partial apologies improve or worsen with time respectively.
11. Apology data

This chapter looks at the qualitative and quantitative data collected through the study period in relation to apologies. The chapter discussion is based on the following question: *Do Indigenous people accept the apology offered to them?*

The initial acceptance of the respective apologies was lower than expected. The participants’ rejection of the apology occurred after there was an acknowledgement that *nothing has changed*. The data presented in this chapter leads me to the opinion that intergroup apologies, that do not contain all elements of an apology, as outlined in section 9.2, do not help improve the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people removed from their family and culture and are likely to be rejected by the victim group.

Many have theorised that forgiveness after an apology takes time to develop (McCullough et al., 2003; Scobie and Scobie, 1998; Sells and Hargrave, 1998). However, six years (as fieldwork was conducted in 2013) after the apology, participants were angry and rejected the apology, as they realised nothing had changed for them. This means that time not only allows for forgiveness to develop but it is also possible for the victim group to reject an apology as time passes.

The following extracts collected from participants demonstrate how, as time passes, people can reject apologies.

_But now, over the years since that apology, the actions of the government do not coincide with the apology. They’re getting more antagonistic against the Indian people than they ever have been. So in my mind and in my belief system, I have concluded that the apology wasn’t made from the heart. That’s where these things have to be dealt with - from the heart level - in order for them to be any good. That’s where I am today (First Nations woman, Fort Frances)._
So there's a lot of for me I guess it's good and bad but you know five years on I don't think much has changed. It's like well we said sorry now build a bridge, get over it and I'm sorry I'm not ready to do that. You need to be held accountable. You need to be - it was a bad (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

How people heard the apology, whether in person, on television, or on the radio, made no difference to the acceptance or rejection of the apology. This is also true if people were with friends and family while hearing the apology.

Blatz and Philpot (2010) found that people who remember apologies were more forgiving than those who could not remember or who did not realise that an apology was ever given. This would indicate that the apology given for intentional and historical acts could elicit forgiveness over time. My work is about remembering the apology event and therefore the content of the apology itself (Blatz and Philpot, 2010).

Table 8 shows the percentage of people who attending the apology. There are no Māori listed in the table as only one New Zealand participant knew of the Queen’s apology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attended</th>
<th>Listened</th>
<th>Informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11.1. Was the apology accepted?

The focus is on whether or not the apology offered was accepted or not by the victim group. This is an important part of an apology because without acceptance, forgiveness and moving forward in a relationship at a national level will not occur. This includes trust, which is a necessary part of any relationship. It is this acceptance or not, that will enable an apology to be used as a tool to drive positive change in Social and Emotional Wellbeing of the victim group.
As discussed in section 9.2, there are a number of elements that make an effective apology. From the comments within the interviews it is clear that individuals do not differentiate between political apologies and the interpersonal apology.

The following extracts from the qualitative data I collected support this view:

*The apology hasn't gone far enough, it's good to say it, but there was this movie called Love Story with Ryan O'Neill and another person. There's the sorry word, sorry means never having to say you're sorry, love, sorry, don't do it again. If we're going to say sorry or the apology and keep doing the same as we did yesterday, especially in white governments ways, and trying to keep us from our full potentials* (Aboriginal woman, Canberra).

*When I went to the apology in Ottawa and I was sitting in the gallery I didn't have any reaction to the apology. I still don't have too much faith in what it means. It wasn't for us. It was for a different purpose. It wasn't even for the people that abused us. It was for political’* (First Nations woman, Winnipeg).

*I'm sorry? I guess, for the ones of us that are still alive, my feelings of the apology - an apology are words. But in our culture, an apology has spirit. That spirit - that apology and that spirit is a collective spirit that helps heal. Where you look at white men, their system is an individual system. If they give you an apology, it's not really a collective apology. So, you don't feel it* (First Nations man, Calgary).

Davis (2002) talks about the essences of an apology: that there needs to be some level of self-reproach from the wrongdoing. Contrary to this, Tavuchis (1991) argues that self-reproach and remorse are not needed within intergroup apologies. This is due to the apologiser often not having committed the wrongdoing personally. Whether or not the apologiser is the wrongdoer or not, is somewhat irrelevant for intergroup apologies. For this type of apology, the apologiser is an official spokesperson and therefore needs to include all elements. However, showing genuine remorse is an
important element as it provides evidence that the wrongdoer understands why they are apologising.

The following extracts by Aboriginal women, collected under interview, demonstrate the importance of the emotion within an apology.

_How I feel about the apology, it was just words by mouth only. Not from the heart and nothing has been done to make us feel any better (Aboriginal woman, Melbourne)._ 

_Okay, the apology. When [Stephen Harper] apologised, I guess the first thing for me was, okay, what's this about? My opinion on that is at the time, it's like, is he really sincere about his apology? I didn’t see that at all (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Marie)._ 

_So there's a lot of for me I guess it's good and bad but you know five years on I don't think much has changed. It's like well we said sorry now build a bridge, get over it and I'm sorry I'm not ready to do that. You need to be held accountable. You need to be - it was a bad (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs)._ 

These examples demonstrate just how important Davis’ (2002) essences are. Without remorse, an apology has no essential quality and it is therefore rejected in part or full by the receiver.

Within the interviews, New Zealanders did not engage with apologies. This was for two reasons. The first is that most Māori who participated in the study, had not heard of the apologies that the Government of New Zealand had given. This was due to the apologies being individually offered to the iwi (tribe) due to the Government breaches of the Waitangi Treaty. Many Māori who were separated from their family and culture are still not engaging with their culture. By not engaging in the culture, Māori who were removed would not be aware of iwi matters of this nature.
The other reason is that the apology given by Queen Elizabeth II in November, 1995 was very low key (Geary, 1995). While this apology was given to all Māori, it was only delivered as part of a settlement agreement.

So was the apology accepted by the sample interviewed? The short answer is no. While the percentage of people stating outright that they did not accept the apology is limited to 51% Canadian and 46% Australian, in New Zealand no one made a statement either way, as 29 out of 30 people interviewed did not know Queen Elizabeth II gave an apology.

The following statements by Indigenous men and women, from within my research population, demonstrate the point I am referring to. Although this statement has been cited earlier it is worth quoting again here:

*In reference to the apology? I guess I'll start off with the apology first. The apology itself was not of my liking, but I understand that there is a need to make an apology. Whether or not it was truthful and to the spirit of the apology, I did not [reach] it because it had a taintedness to it. When I say ‘taintedness', it's because the government of Canada had read the document, this apology, to the general public, to the First Nations people in Canada and to the people in Canada at the time (First Nations man, Vancouver).*

*Not a blanket apology that reads, I'm sorry, okay? No. That's a written apology. That's not - somebody else wrote it for him so I don't believe in that and he hasn't really done anything, it appears, anyway, so show how sincere he is about what happened to us. So I don't accept the apologies of the Prime Minister and I really don't accept the apology of the Pope, either, because the Pope, I think, was - well, he's [laughs] either one side or behind it, the church (First Nations man, Montreal).*

*Well, for me the apology, well I will never accept that, I mean it may be good, and they should have done it, but what they did, they knew what they were doing trying to kill us off. You can't apologise for that (Aboriginal man, Alice Springs).*
That is just the beginning and it's an ongoing lifelong journey. So the apology for me work-wise, yep, but personal, no. At the end of the day, nothing will ever make up for me being taken from my Mum (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

A review of the data shows that a further 50% of Australians and 39% of Canadians interviewed did not accept or forgive the respective governments after the apology was given. The following themes emerged: disappointment in the real intent of the government's apology; no compensation; nothing has changed since the apology was given; and the government still has unmet obligations to people who were removed.

These points are demonstrated by the following extracts, from interviews:

…except that what we’re mostly saying is ‘the apology; now what?’ People aren’t – you know, there was no compensation, there was no – it’s like somebody having a, um, a bad car accident – um, somebody having a bad car accident and, um, then sort of turning to the people who were injured and saying, ‘Oh, I say, I'm terribly sorry,’ and then just walking away. Well, accountability’s a bit more than that (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

But I think in the Canadian Government it needs to continue putting its best foot forward. Like by going on a national stage or an international stage and saying I'm sorry, it's not enough really. You need to have other things going on, like mostly education. Educating people about what happened, but also educating the survivors (First Nations man, Fort Frances).

This means that 96% of Australians and 90% of Canadians have either not accepted the apology (46% Australia, 51% Canada), or have moved away from acceptance or forgiveness of the respective governments due to sincerity issues, nothing seems to have changed, or unmet obligations (50% Australia 39% Canada).

Below are some of the extracts from the interviews. These demonstrate some of the thoughts and feelings that people expressed.
Like if it were, if the population was the same population that was there 50 years ago then maybe it would really mean something. But, because we have people that are different, different mindset, some people are of the attitude well that's, those decisions were made by people 56 years ago' (First Nations man, Fort France).

….but personal, no. At the end of the day, nothing will ever make up for me being taken from my Mum’ (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).

11.2. Apologies, transgression type and duration of time from transgression to apology

The type of wrongdoing and the time delay between wrongdoing and apology are important factors when seeking forgiveness. Philpot and Hornsey (2008) stated that apologies offered by Australia for a variety of wrongdoings, such as environmental damage, human rights abuses, and corporate malpractice, did not elicit any responses of forgiveness. This indicates that intergroup apologies may or may not elicit a response of forgiveness. Blatz, and Philpot, (2010) suggest that where apologies are given for recent and unintentional events they are more likely to be accepted.

This indicates that the type of wrongdoing and time past between the wrongdoing and the offering of an apology play an important role in whether or not an apology is accepted. Given that forced separation policies and practices were intentional and were implemented over decades, and that the apologies in Australia and Canada, were offered decades after the practises stopped and harm was recognised, it is logical that a number of people would not have accepted the apology, from the onset based on these grounds.

Blatz, and Philpot (2010) support Philpot’s and Hornsey (2008) work, that for an apology to be effective they need to be delivered, as soon as possible, once the wrongdoing has been recognised. This is an important factor, for without understanding the wrongdoing, remorse will not be genuine and thus the apology not accepted.
One of the strong themes from the interviews is that the apologies *did not go far enough*. This is not in terms of compensation or redress, though these are themes from interviewees and they will be discussed later, but in terms of stopping the behaviour of the past. The statements below show four different but related issues that have affected people’s ability to accept the apology: healing treatments, truth and history, understanding the Aboriginal environment, and allowing true self determination. They also provide evidence to support peoples’ claims that the apologies did not go far enough.

…..and I don't think the apology has done enough for us. I think we should fight for more work on that. Because there's nothing being done about it. I'm still grieving and I just want my family to know the whole story of everything before I pass (Aboriginal woman, Melbourne).

*When I watch TV and when I watch the man that made the apology and things are getting worse for First Nations people instead of better he's not listening to them about the environment* (First Nations man, Fort Frances).

*The apology hasn't gone far enough, it's good to say it, but there was this movie called Love Story with Ryan O'Neill and another person. There's the sorry word, sorry means never having to say you're sorry, love, sorry, don't do it again. If we're going to say sorry or the apology and keep doing the same as we did yesterday, especially in white governments ways, and trying to keep us from our full potentials* (Aboriginal woman, Alice Springs).

*So, apology is words. I guess it's a step. But how do you culturally translate and culturally interpret those white man words of apology to who I was before I went to residential school, is what reconciliation would be to me, in my heart. They say - when I went to residential school hearing, they said, we'll give you a certain amount of money to get counselling for your experience at residential school; if you ask for any more than that, you're not going to get it, we only allow this much for every student. That's an individual approach* (First Nations man, Calgary).

*When that apology was made it was words and that was it and there's no*
attachment of dollars or funding of the healing process for that real healing to take place (First Nations man, Winnipeg).

In terms of acceptance, apologies need to consider and include other forms of accountability other than compensation and redress. It could be argued that redress has been included in the apology as there is funding for Aboriginal healing centres in both Canada and Australia. However, healing relates to Social and Emotional Wellbeing, which is a whole of life concept. Governments need to change their current relationship with Indigenous peoples, allowing for communities to design programs and projects that meet community objectives, which in turn provides self-determination.

Apologies are also used for educating the Australian, Canadian and New Zealand population about the policies. This education should not begin and end at the time of the apology. Education needs to be in concrete and exact forms and woven throughout society. Commemoration days that celebrate the events need to occur in much the same way that wars and other historical events are marked. Yes, we have Anzac day, Remembrance Day, countless memorials, Returned Servicemen’s League clubs, marches, parades and special events. These events apart from educating also bring together and unify the community.

Education on past policies informs part of our shared and common history and should be part of any immigration package, and part of the education system more generally (McLellan, 2007; Meyers et al., 2009; Zangrando et al., 2010). This should then be crowned with a memorial day to celebrate the triumph of people and cultures that survived this period of history.

Continuing as before, with the majority non-Indigenous people having control over Indigenous people, indicates that there have been no acknowledgements of the issue of assimilation (Corntassel and Holder, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). For this to change, true self-determination for Indigenous peoples needs to occur. In Australia, the government funds the Aboriginal-community controlled health services but the funding must be
used for conventional *Western* medical models. This is not self-
determination. The same is true for Indigenous educational systems in
Canada and New Zealand, they must operate under a Western system
(Humphery, 2001).

Understanding the Indigenous environment incorporates the actual
environment. The environment is connected to Indigenous mythology and to
the people. However, the Indigenous environment is more than this as it
includes cultural knowledge and ceremony, including hunting and gathering,
which are still very important in today’s society (Andrew et al., 2002). It is
becoming harder for Indigenous communities to educate and to practise
ceremony as the wider community closes in. You could compare this with the
Golden Bell Frog or the Cooroboree Frog and their fight to survive (Hunter et
al., 2010). Parcels of land are put aside for them to live but this means they
can never thrive. First Nations Canadians have reserves and Māori have
marae, but many of their traditional customs cannot be carried out on these
lands, as they require access to the wider environment.

Many customs compete with mainstream economic businesses, such as wild
rice (Canada), green muscles (New Zealand) and fish traps (Australia).
When this occurs there are no rights given to Indigenous peoples, as they do
not hold power in economic ventures or have the finances to take the matter
to court. True self-determination would help, if not stop, this from occurring.

It would also allow for educational, health and other Indigenous services to
be managed in ways that are truly independent and culturally sustainable.
These factors would in themselves promote Social and Emotional Wellbeing
and form part of the relationship between the government and Indigenous
peoples.
11.3. **Follow through**

Follow through is an important part of an apology. In an interpersonal apology this is where the wrongdoer, having apologised, offers to give back and rectify the wrong, or offers to do something in exchange.

This is redress. People expect some sort of redress when a wrong is committed against them. The criminal codes of all three countries are based on this principle. If you do something against the law (the people) you will be punished. This is a different issue to compensation, which is an offering of some sort, normally money, given to a person in recognition of damage caused, pain and suffering, and/or loss (Oxford Dictionaries, 2014b). Redress is about righting wrongs, about returning things back to the state in which they were in before the wrong was committed.

The following statements provide evidence that people were expecting more from the apology then just a statement of regret:

*The apology? I feel the apology started off well but it's unfinished business. What's required of an apology has never really eventuated. It's not just saying I'm sorry but it's also following up on - sorry, I've lost the words (Aboriginal woman, Canberra).*

*But since then yeah, nothing has really happened. We're still having problems with the government trying to fix up the wrong that they've done, yeah (Aboriginal man, Melbourne).*

While redress will not remove the pain, hurt and suffering from past events, it can help with current psychosocial issues and economic disadvantage that are the results of these events. This is why the Canadian Government offered a compensation package. But there are other steps that could form a redress package. As mentioned above, true Indigenous self-determination is one, but it is only one.

Redress is about resolving the issues, not turning away from them.
Governments need to really look at how Indigenous affairs in their respective countries are managed and develop an interface between Indigenous peoples’ needs and rights and those of non-indigenous peoples, as outlined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, of which all three countries are signatories. This would involve more than reconciliation; it is decolonisation (United Nations, 2012).

11.4. Apologies as political tools

The quote below is perhaps the most insightful in relation to why governments feel the need to apologise for historical wrongdoings, if forgiveness is not the intended outcome.

When I went to the apology in Ottawa and I was sitting in the gallery I didn’t have any reaction to the apology. Still don’t have too much faith in what it means. It wasn’t for us. It was for a different purpose. It wasn’t even for the people that abused us. It was for political (First Nations woman, Sault Ste Marie).

Verdeja (2010), Gibney (2008) and Bowman (2014) state that intergroup apologies are often used as a political tool to help society move forward, beyond a particular event, and to minimise claims for reparation and compensation. No matter the political reason for giving an apology, there are some real positive outcomes, which must be recognised. Apologies recognise the government’s role in the wrongdoing, even if there is no acceptance of guilt. The fact that the government is apologising infers responsibility. This statement by an Aboriginal woman in Sydney expresses the importance of apologies and educational tools:

Me and my family will never be close and to say sorry about that well you can’t give that back to me. You can’t give me back my childhood. But besides all of that I would see it as a positive thing in regards to Australia got to learn a bit more about aboriginal people but there’s still, in all the work that I do, there’s still so much more work to do. People seem to think well we said sorry, what more do you want (Aboriginal woman, Sydney).
As intergroup apologies often have long introductions surrounded by pomp and ceremony, they give a history lesson about facts that the general public may not be aware of. They therefore become an educational tool for Indigenous history. This leads to a common understanding of past events. It also means that the government can longer hide behind policy, current or historical.

Education and acknowledgement of the truth may not reconcile a relationship, especially one with a long history of mistrust and broken promises. However, they may be satellites to the issue, show a moral redress, and move beyond acknowledgment to allowing for a new beginning to form in the relationship (Verdeja, 2010). Further research this field would need to be conducted.

11.5. Apology and Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Social and Emotional Wellbeing was tested within the survey combined with the interview statements. This was followed by testing the mean in relation to the question: Has the apology helped me feel better about being removed? This proved to be inconclusive with a mean range of 3.25 – 4.03 on a 7-point sliding scale.
### Table 9: Social and Emotional Wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apology has helped me feel better about being removed</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation has moved forward since the apology</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 primarily belongs within the Social and Emotional Wellbeing data. However, this data does describe the way people view the apology. If people were more accepting of the apology, then there should be at least an improvement in reconciliation because the relationship between the people (victim) and the government (wrongdoer) would have improved. As stated earlier, all evidence collected in this study suggests that people removed from their family and culture do not accept the apology that was offered.
12. Discussion and reintegration

This chapter reiterates the main points within the study working through the study’s methodology, including the cultural situated researcher. I discuss the major findings, and make a number of recommendations and suggestions for future research aimed at improving Social and Emotional Wellbeing, and reconciliation models.

12.1. Context/cultural relativity

I have previously described, in chapter 2, the unique context of Indigenous social research and the challenges faced by the situated researcher. As a Wiradjuri man, with a history that is associated with forced removal within our family group, I cannot divorce myself from the subject matter. Instead I have sought advice from Elders and adopted and adapted some traditional methodologies.

Many organisations and people, who participated in the study, are partners, ensuring that nothing was taken; only borrowed. Making sure that the findings from this research study can be understood by all and used by the communities from which the data was borrowed has been a high priority for this study.

With community use in mind, this thesis is completed in the narrative, punctuated with extracts from participant’s stories adding qualitative authenticity and richness of the document. This style is used as it is the best fit in relation to Indigenous traditional methods of passing down knowledge.

12.1.1. The need

From the onset, it was evident that there was little research in the area of Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by forced removal policies and the impact of reconciliation activities that has not been completed by the government. There are a few other authors in peripherally related subject
areas, however, importantly when looking at the issue from an Indigenous perspective, there is very little work in this area (Hart, 2010; Marker, 2003; Australian Institute Health Welfare, 2009).

12.1.2. The importance of truth

Reconciliation is about bridging the divide between peoples. Governments are using apologies as a tool to achieve this. For an apology to be effective, it needs to contain certain elements, which opens the door for a new relationship to develop between the wrongdoer and the victim (Verdeja, 2010).

Truth is one of the key elements in an apology, not only as a foundation to build the relationship on, but also for the reconciliation process. All residents must know and understand the country’s past trauma. Governments don’t hide facts about war or other traumatic events. In fact they celebrate it in the form of memorial days. The same should be true of past forced removals. The truth about the policies and practices should be taught at schools in the same way as students are taught about World War I or II (Tylim, 2005). Our Indigenous history is our history.

12.1.3. Key questions

The driving questions for this research study have been: whether or not Indigenous people accepted the apology offered to them; and do intergroup apologies affect the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of this population. This was followed up with whether Indigenous people who were removed from their families and friends support reconciliation.

12.1.4. Purpose and relevance - why is this research study important?

Undertaking my research study has created new knowledge in the key areas of reconciliation, apologies, and Social and Emotional Wellbeing. I make recommendations that governments, policy makers and the general public
should adopt if they wish to understand Indigenous perspectives; develop common understandings; and strengthen positive outcomes, which would help establish new and equal partnerships.

This study contributes to an understanding of how reconciliation and apologies affect the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous people, and will help bring Indigenous people and non-Indigenous people together.

In addition, the study provides greater understanding of what is and is not working, and will allow for policy makers and governments to take new directions in their decision-making. It will also help with the current wave of children that are being removed by social services and the like, as it is predicted that many of the same issues presented here, will face them in the future.

Furthermore, Christian organisations should also take note of the research findings as, to date, churches have done little to support the victims of their abuse. The study clearly demonstrates that an apology is not enough to allow victims of abuse to move forward and heal, there needs to be more (as discussed further in the literature below).

12.1.5. **Review of forced removal policies**

As previously discussed many atrocities were committed against Indigenous people including: enslavement, massacres, murders and civil war. I use the term *civil war*, as in all three cases; the conflict was often about land owned by the Indigenous people; and brought about by non-Indigenous citizens within each country. For example: Māori had a legal right under the Treaty of Waitangi to hold traditional land, which the Crown wanted (Consedine and Consedine, 2012); the Canadian First Nations peoples had treaties, which involved land and other rights (Wasserman, 2005); and under English law (at the time), Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples should have been protected under treaties (Elder, 2002; Pascoe, 2014).
All countries studied believed that their Indigenous populations were a problem (Willow, 2012). This came from the belief that Indigenous people were inferior to Europeans. Each country used variations of the same tool to manage their problem. When it was realised that the method of dealing with the problem was not working another was tried. For example, education was the next tool to be used and the practice of assimilation of Indigenous children. This lead to the unfortunate phrase, to kill the Indian in the child (Canada, 2012).

Removal could not break the links to identity and culture, and in the late 20th Century, policies of forced removal based solely on race ceased. This is not to say that the practice did not continue for years after. Even today, many more Indigenous children compared to non-Indigenous children are still being removed from their families (Edwards, 2015; Ministry of Health, 2012; The Canadian Press, 2011).

12.2. Trauma

The treatment of Indigenous people by their respective countries, governments and non-Indigenous populations has led to poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing and a traumatised Indigenous population (Canada, 2012; HREOC, 1997; Love, 2002).

Many Indigenous people suffered trauma, which has led to a range of anxiety disorders, including PTSD (Kidron, 2003). To help with the symptoms many self-medicate with drugs and alcohol (Brown et al., 1999; Browne et al., 2010; Kessler et al., 1995).

12.3. Social and Emotional Wellbeing

Each country has their own set of Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors and views. Common to all is the notion that Social and Emotional Wellbeing needs to be in harmony, as it is a whole of life practice. There needs to be balance, in order for individuals and communities to reach their optimum
potential. Western psycho-medical perspectives have limits and drawbacks, in that they do not acknowledge these specific cultural issues of Indigenous wellbeing.

Social and Emotional Wellbeing is not a new concept for Indigenous peoples. It has been a method of surviving for millennia. It has, however, been thrust to the forefront as Indigenous leaders try and influence Western health models and funding promises. Throughout the thesis, I have argued that Social and Emotional Wellbeing needs to be distanced from the medical focus and into a holistic care model, which would encompass mainstream socio-economic factors and cover all aspects of the community and individual.

12.4. **Research data – results of quantitative survey**

Table 9, below, provides an overview of the Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors affected by forced removal cited by participants in the study, spanning land, family, language, culture/ancestry, mental health and spirituality/identity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay on or near traditional land</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept name</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnection with family</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept family together</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of parents</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected by family</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learnt traditional language</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconnected with traditional culture</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger and resentment</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with criminal justice</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame and guilt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grief and loss</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor self-esteem</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicidal thoughts</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejections by family</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame of Indigeneity</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table demonstrates that the Māori people were more likely to have kept their name (33%), retained knowledge of their parents (70%) and re-
connected with traditional culture (53%). Yet participants still reported a significant rate of rejection by family (26%); the highest levels of anger and resentment (60%); poor self-esteem (16%); contact with the criminal justice system (56%) and gang affiliation (30%); and perhaps reflecting the impact of removal on loss of and search for identity.

The survivors of the Stolen Generations were the most likely to have reconnected with family (60%), this may perhaps reflect Australia’s efforts in providing Link Up services. They reported the highest rates of rejection by family (34%); a low rate of reconnection with culture (19%); high anger and resentment (59%); contact with the criminal justice system (23%); the highest rates of grief and loss (19%), sadness (15%), suicidal thoughts (15%); and shame of indigeneity (16.6%), perhaps reflecting the importance of connectedness to culture, family and community in relation to these outcomes.

In Canada, the Residential Schools Survivors were the least likely to have reconnected with family (12%), but knowledge of parents was relatively high (56%) reflecting the fact that removals were at school age. Anger and resentment was still relatively high (34%) but notably grief and loss (6%), poor self-esteem (7%), suicidal thoughts (6%), sadness (3%) and shame of indigeneity (3%) were lower than Australia and New Zealand. This implies connection to, and knowledge of, family results in lower adverse mental health outcomes. It also implies that some cultural knowledge would be present. This forms the bases of Social and Emotional Wellbeing.

12.5. Reconciliation

The treatment of Indigenous people has led to a need to rebuild and form new relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people. This new relationship recognises that there are differences between cultures and that both are equal and need to coexist (Sinclair, n.d.; Tutu, 2000b).
While the premise of reconciliation allows for different models between regions, there are common elements and a common aim: to build strong relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and communities. For this to occur there must be truth, because without truth, there can be no common understanding of the past. This alone, means there is a divergence in the core of the population's belief system.

Table 11 quantifies data reported in interviews: support for reconciliation and waning support for reconciliation, as a result of unmet expectations, missing factors and other concerns.

| Table 11 Qualitative Reconciliation Data |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
|                               | Australia (n30)  | Canada (n33)    | New Zealand (n30) |
| Support for reconciliation    | 29%              | 91%             | 23%               |
| Support waning                | 29%              | 12%             | 23%               |

The support for reconciliation is good in Canada and it is postulated that this is due to the TRC being newly formed and its national events, which were being rolled out when the fieldwork was conducted. It is most likely that this has biased the data.

Furthermore, waning support for reconciliation was noticeably higher in Australia and New Zealand, likely as a result of a general feeling of unfinished business, given the time that has passed since the reconciliation models of each country were established.

Table 12, below, provides reconciliation data combined across all three countries on the importance of reconciliation, positive attitudes and support, reconciliation as an important issue, necessity, and recognition of the contribution of Indigenous peoples to the national identity. A scale of 1 to 7
was used, with 1 being important and 7 being unimportant. Question 3 is reversed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12 – Quantitative Reconciliation Data across the 3 Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation is an important issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a positive attitude and support reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the process of reconciliation is unnecessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the reconciliation process and what it means is a good thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal people have contributed to the national identity and this should be recognised by all citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table demonstrates that reconciliation is supported by the researched population, with the mean being positive in all categories. Question 3 was reversed, therefore the higher the mean the more supportive the population.
12.6. Apology

Table 13 provides a comparison of responses across Australia, Canada and New Zealand on elements contained within the apology, such as acknowledgement that the removal was true, that it was healing, and on the other hand that nothing has changed, leading to non-acceptance/rejection.

| Table 13 – Elements of the Apology and Acceptance/Rejection |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | Australia (n30) | Canada (n33)    | New Zealand (n30) |
| Acknowledgement that removal was true | 11.5%           | 6%              |                  |
| Apology as healing                  | 11.5%           | 6%              |                  |
| Nothing has changed                 | 19%             | 6%              | 3%               |
| Apology not accepted                | 46%             | 51%             |                  |
| Rejected over time                  | 50%             | 39%             |                  |

The table shows that Indigenous Australians had a greater sense that the apology acknowledged that removal was true and that it was healing (11.5%), compared to Canadian First Nations (6%), which suggests that the Australian apology was more sincere or contained more of the necessary elements. Conversely, Australians were much more likely to feel that nothing has changed (19%, compared to 6%). This reflects action/redress, or lack thereof, after the apology.

Around half the respondents in both Canada and Australia did not accept the apology—and over time there was a higher rate of rejection in Australia (50%) compared to 39% in Canada. The rate of initial acceptance is much lower than what Dhami (2011) had found, which was that 90% of victims would accept an apology offered by a perpetrator. In contrast, Strang and Sherman (2003) found that only 60% of people would accept an apology for
an act of a social indiscretion by the wrongdoer. The table also demonstrates that time is an important factor. This research found that 50% of Australians and 39% of Canadians interviewed found time to be an integral factor in deciding that nothing had change, and then decided to reject that apology.

The Māori respondents did not report that there had been any apology, so consequently did not express views on elements or acceptance/rejection.

Table 14 provides scores against questions on the apology helping participants feel better about being removed, and that reconciliation has moved forward since the apology. A scale of 1 to 7 was used, with 1 being important and 7 being unimportant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14 – Effect of Apology on Social and Emotional Wellbeing and moving forward reconciliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canada</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apology has helped me feel better about being removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation has moved forward since the apology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Nations Canadians were more likely to report that the apology had helped them feel better about being removed (4.3 vs. 3.25 for Australia, and 3.29 for New Zealand), and that reconciliation has moved forward since the apology (3.45 vs. 3.37 for Australia and 2.5 for NZ).

The Māori people were the least likely to feel that reconciliation had moved forward since the apology, consistent with the finding above that many were unaware that there had been any apology. There are two main reasons for
this outcome: the unintentional prompting of participants by myself to answer the question, or that the population felt that the question was worth answering, even without knowledge of the apology.

12.7. Conclusions

The research set out to answer a number of over-arching questions.

*Have major Reconciliation Activities (Apologies) affected the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of people affected by past government policies and practices?*

The complexities of Social and Emotional Wellbeing can be hard to unwind, as they include a number of interconnected elements, which are not always tangible. This research found some evidence of positive Social and Emotional Wellbeing, such as knowledge of parents (particularly in Canada) and speaking Indigenous languages (particularly in New Zealand), were stronger than expected.

There is also some evidence that participants saw the apology as healing, particularly within Australia, with percentages of 15.5% Australians and 6% for Canadians. While any healing is important, these lower percentages indicate that apologies have little effect on healing within the victim group.

This healing was over shadowed by negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing factors. One of the most disturbing negative factors was *shame of indigeneity*. This refers to internalisation of racism, which is the acceptance by a marginalised individual that the negative beliefs placed on them by the broader society (Loxley, 2005) are warranted. Donnelly and Briscoe (2005) claim this to be the most damaging psychological injury of racism, so much so that the Internalised Racial Oppression Scale was developed (Liberman and Borland, 2009).
The evidence that the offering of an apology has improved the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of Indigenous people who were removed from their families is limited. There is evidence that when people rejected the apology the result was even more negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing, primarily expressed through anger and resentment.

If the victim group views the apology as inadequate, or if over time the apologiser does not honour the apology, the result is further negative Social and Emotional Wellbeing. Consequent anger and resentment can lead to a range of physical and emotional disorders, including drug and alcohol abuse, and contact with the criminal justice system.

Due to the limited area of study into the impact of apologies on the Social and Emotional Wellbeing, further research should be undertaken especially in the areas of redress and compensation, and what effect this may have on acceptance/rejection of apologies and reconciliation going forward.

*Do Indigenous people accept the apology offered to them? Have indigenous people moved past the hurt, trauma and racism of forced removal?*

For an apology to be effective, there are a number of elements that need to be present. These are sincerity; admission of guilt/wrongdoing (morality); remorse and a commitment to not reoffend; reparation/redress (justice); compensation; as well as appropriate timing; use of the word *sorry*; the authority/position of the apologiser, and the setting (Tylim, 2005; Verdeja, 2010).

Approximately 50% of people participating in this research study accepted the apology when offered. However, once it was given, many people moved away from acceptance and later rejected the apology as they felt that action had been lacking, leaving unfinished business. This suggests that the *follow through* is as important as the apology itself. If the promises are not forthcoming then support can wane, eroding any positive impact.
The timing of an apology is important. If an apology is offered too quickly, it can be considered rushed and insincere. If too long a delay occurs, then it appears that an understanding of the wrongdoing does not exist.

For an apology to be effective it requires: the verbalisation of the word sorry; an expression of guilt, regret and remorse; an understanding of the moral code that has been breached; and to have both elements of justice (Tylim, 2005). For intergroup apologies there are extra elements: the person giving the apology must have the authority to do so, and must be in a position to match the moral breach; the setting must be public and the ceremony around the apology must be appropriate. It must also reflect the moral wrong committed and match the apology’s standing. Without these, the apology maybe be considered lacking and not genuine (Verdeja, 2010).

Each country within the study lacked one or more of these elements. All countries’ apologies were offered decades after the wrongs were committed. This explains why the level of acceptance is low compared to the findings demonstrated by Strang and Sherman (2003), and Dhami (2011).

In relation to Australia’s apology, the elements of justice were not offered, nor was compensation (Hastie and Augoustinos, 2012). This limited the element of remorse and demonstrated a lack of moral understanding by limiting liability to institutions not individuals.

In Canada, the Government did not have to offer compensation as part of the apology because the Indian Residential Schools Survivors Association (IRSSA) had already done so (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2008a). As far as redress, the Harper government announced that just two days after the apology the Canadian Healing foundation would lose funding. The Canadian Healing foundation was set up to help residential school survivors work through the trauma associated with their residential school experiences (Aboriginal Research, 2012; CBC News, 2010). The Canadian apology showed no remorse and also sidestepped blame by placing it with institutions.
The New Zealand experience contained many of the elements needed in an apology except for the word sorry (The Crown, 1995). This apology had no real pomp and ceremony and was very low key, which in turn has led to a lack of knowledge about the event.

It is the absence of these elements that has led to a large percentage of Indigenous Australians and Canadians not accepting the apology when it was offered. Many are cynical about the reason the apology was given, citing there was no emotion (Canada), no compensation (Australia), and an unmet obligation (both).

Due to the lack of evidence, no comment can be made for the Māori participants, most of who didn’t realise an apology had been given. As mentioned above, I theorised that this is due to the lack of ceremony associated with the event. Another reason is perhaps that the majority of Māori that were removed had not re-engaged with their tribal unit. Without this engagement, people may not have heard of the apology.

Griswold and Meninger (2008) and Digeser (2001) argue that in relation to intergroup apologies forgiveness comes with time, as changes associated with the apology take time to be realised. While it may take time for people to accept the apology, it is also true that they may take time to reject it. This reinforces my previous statement that, over time many Australians (50%) and Canadians (39%) have rejected the apology and stated that there is no evidence of any changes being implemented.

Models of reconciliation vary between countries. This is evident within the study: New Zealand views reconciliation via the Waitangi Tribunal; Canada’s TRC has a sunset clause of 2015 and has the element of truth in its title; and Australia has Reconciliation Australia which is a by-product of the Council of Reconciliation (Government of Australia, 1991; Taonga, 2010b; TRC, 2015). What they all have in common is that they are open to politics, as the respective governments fund them. There has been no reconciliation ground swell from the general public that would force governments to act.
A review of the literature found that reconciliation is not talked about from a social or psychological viewpoint, instead focusing on the political. However, relationship building goes to the heart of how people view each other and their relationship with reconciliation. These factors are psychological not political.

*Do Indigenous people who were removed from their family and culture support reconciliation?*

The evidence shows that by offering an apology a promise of a new relationship was given. To date there is no proof that this has occurred. This has resulted in anger and resentment levels building within the population (see table 10), undoing any immediate relief or long term gain that the apology may have promised.

*Do Indigenous people who were removed from their family and culture support reconciliation?*

The answer is yes. What is open for debate is an agreed definition of what reconciliation is. Many interviewees commented on the need for inter-family and intercultural reconciliation before external reconciliation could occur. This is interesting and somewhat explains the percentage (see table 11) of people who were unhappy with the current model.

While reconciliation is supported by participants, it was evident that their support was waning due to little or no change to their circumstances. Reconciliation has been engaging people in Australia and New Zealand for over a decade now, yet racism is still high and the disparity in all health and social markers still exist (Australian Institute Health Welfare, 2009; Government of Canada, 2013; Statistics New Zealand, 2011). Even with the most well received model in the research study, that is the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 12% of Canadians interviewed were unhappy due to wanting a different model.
This research study did not set out to develop different models of reconciliation, so I offer no comment on model development, except to state that research in this area needs to occur. This should also include looking into reconciliation through a psychological lens.

Without a broad focus on the area of reconciliation from the entire population, can reconciliation occur?

This has only been partially answered; it is true that reconciliation is a two-sided affair, and to conduct a complete review on both sides of the debate would be a massive undertaking and outside of the scope of this thesis. From the research and discussion presented, it is evident that many Indigenous people would like to focus on reconciling with their family and culture before looking outwards to non-Indigenous people. This raises more questions, such as, is it enough to have reconciliation models that only look at the relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples? Should inter-family and inter-cultural reconciliation models be developed? More research into this area needs to occur.

My research study has for the first time highlighted how Indigenous Australians, Canadians and New Zealanders view reconciliation and the apologies. I found that most of the participants viewed reconciliation as the way forward to a united country. They have this view even through a haze of trauma, which at times creates internal conflict with their views on reconciliation and their non-Indigenous counterparts. They want to heal and move away from the anger and resentment they still carry.

The literature suggests that by 2012, many Indigenous peoples had turned their backs on the apology, either because they viewed it as being inadequate in the first instance or that over time nothing had changed.

By apologising, governments acknowledge to the country and the world that they have committed a wrong. This in turn validates the victim's experiences and educates the general public.
There was no evidence that the Social and Emotional Wellbeing of the population had improved due to the apology. However, the evidence for poor Social and Emotional Wellbeing is more strongly reflected in the anger and resentment felt after the apologies. There is minimal evidence that the apology allowed some people to move forward with healing.

Since the publication of the BTH Report there is a broad community understanding that removing children from their families and disconnecting them from their culture has caused deep trauma. This trauma was compounded by the way in which children were being treated while in the care of the state authorities and missionaries, where physical, emotional and sexual abuses were common. This has culminated in intergenerational trauma and continued suffering among Indigenous peoples.

These scars will take time to heal and will not do so without appropriate help. While apologies serve to educate the general population and the world about national policies of genocide, this is not a reason to offer them to victim groups. Apologies should be primarily given to address the wrong done and to give notice that there is a new beginning. This new beginning is one such line of help.

The new beginning is also a door for reconciliation. Indigenous peoples have shown great support for reconciliation. It is now time that governments do the same, not just in terms of rhetoric, but also by leading their nations and taking action through policy and funding initiatives.
13. Recommendations

1. National oral history studies need to be undertaken to collect the stories of Indigenous people who were removed from their families and culture. These can be used to gain a common understanding of the events, trauma and identity of the nation.

In Australia, this was partially achieved in 2009/10 through the National Library of Australia’s, BTH Oral History study that was successful in collecting over 100 interviews. However, most of these are not accessible to the public (National Library of Australia, 2015).

The Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission has also collected oral histories through their national events. The actual numbers is not yet published nor are there policies on how are they going to be accessed.

Both these works need to be expanded to collect as many orals histories as possible.

2. A new common history should be taught through the education systems and to all who immigrate into the respective countries. Education should include a warts and all approach to history on forced removal policies and practices, including overt and covert reasons.

This is similar to recommendation 8a of the BTH Report.

3. The establishment of commemoration days in the form of public holidays and memorials, such as those built to commemorate war should also occur. This would demonstrate government commitment to a united country, and over time would build relationships and a new common understanding of the nation’s history.
4. A review of current reconciliation bodies needs to be conducted. This review should pay close attention to the success of reconciliation activities and awareness, external influence and funding models.

5. The Apology is the start of a new relationship, not the end. Governments need to lead their nations through the process of reconciliation, and not be passive bystanders in the process. Indigenous peoples need to be treated as equals when addressing issues associated with past forced removals. This means that Indigenous peoples need to have a voice.

Governments need to fund national centres similar to the National Research Centre for Truth and Reconciliation, University of Manitoba. These centres would do more than conduct research; they would manage research grants; support national reconciliation programs; and help individuals trace, find and connect with family and community. While funded by government, they would have a board of people affected by past policies and practises.
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Plain English Statement

Plain English Research Statement


Who is involved in the research study?

This research study is being conducted by me, Stewart Sutherland. It is part of my studies for a Doctorate at the Australian National University (ANU) in Canberra.

I am a visiting indigenous research fellow at AIATSIS 2011/2012; AIATSIS is supporting the research. The research is also supported by the Australian National University. I can show you the letters of support if you want to see them.

[Insert name of organisation eg Link-up service] is helping with this research by supplying room to conduct the research interview in, and access to a counsellor if you wish to see one.

This research study has been approved by the ANU Human Research Ethics Committee and by the AIATSISResearch Ethics Committee.

What will the researcher do?

The aim of this research is to assess the attitudes of Indigenous peoples towards reconciliation, and what part reconciliation plays in improving the social and emotional wellbeing in Indigenous people affected by past governments’ forced removal policies and practices.

I will conduct the research by interviewing people who have been removed from their families due to forced removal policies. I will also ask these people to complete a survey on their opinions. I will interview people one by one about their removal story, taping what you say.

The research will happen between January 2012 and June 2013.

What will the researcher do with the information he collect?

I want to write about the research in papers such as a thesis and articles in academic journals.

I will hold copyright in the papers. I won’t include personal or culturally restricted information without your consent.

I won’t use any names to identify people who participate in this research. Your interview will be identified by a code number; only I will have the code.

I will keep the notes and recordings of the interview in my office in Canberra for up to five years, while I complete my PhD. After that, I will either destroy them, give them back to you or ask you whether you want me to give them to an Indigenous organisation.
How long will it take
Completing the surveys and telling your story will take approximately 1 ½ hours maybe a little more of your time.

What will I get
On the day of the interview light refreshments will be catered for.

Giving material to AIATSIS
If you agree, I propose to give all of the notes/tapes to AIATSIS for safekeeping.

How can I take part in the research?
If you want to take part in this research just let fill in the bottom part and hand this form into the front desk and someone will contact you soon.

Name of person wishing to participate in the research:

.................................................................

Address:....................................................................................

Contact number:........................................................................

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Lawson Crescent, Acton Peninsula, ACTON ACT 2601
GPO Box 553, CANBERRA ACT 2601
Tel: 61 2 624611 Fax: 61 2 6261 4285
www.aiatsis.gov.au
Publishing as Aboriginal Studies Press
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Questionnaire
Attitudes toward Reconciliation an Indigenous Perspective

Please provide the following information about yourself.

I am

- Male
- female

My age group is

- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- Over 74

I was born

- In Australia
- Identify as Aboriginal
- Identify as Torres Strait Islander
- Identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

The main language I speak at home is: English / Other ______________

My postcode is __________

Circle the area that best describes where you live

City  Coastal  Rural  Remote
I was removed (stolen) from my family: Yes/No

My sibling was removed (stolen) from my family: Yes/No

Here are some statements about reconciliation. Please use the following rating scale to indicate whether you agree or disagree with each statement:

1 = Strongly Agree  2 = Agree  3 = Neutral  4 = Disagree  5 = Strongly Disagree

1. Reconciliation is an important issue for all Australians. ______
2. I have a positive attitude and support reconciliation. ______
3. I think that the process of reconciliation is unnecessary. ______
4. All Australians should be taught the truth about forced removal policies of Aboriginal Australians have suffered in the past. ______
5. Aboriginal people have contribution to the Australian Identity this should be recognised by all Australians ______
6. I feel that the reconciliation process, and what it means, is a good thing. ______
7. Reconciliation has moved forward in Australia since the Governments Apology ______
8. The Apology has helped me feel better about being removed from my family ______
   Or
9. Reconciliation has helped me feel better about my sibling being removed from my family ______
10. Knowing that Australia is working on Reconciling between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous people makes me feel better and happier ______

Please use the following rating scale to indicate whether you think Australians would agree with the following statements.

1 = Strongly Disagree  7 = Strongly Agree

1. Australians feel regret for the past treatment of Indigenous people.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Strongly Disagree  Strongly Agree
2. Australians believe that the damage caused to indigenous people, by being removed from their families should be repaired by the Government.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

3. Australians feel guilty about the horrible outcomes received by indigenous people that were brought about by past government policies of forced removal.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

4. Non Indigenous Australians are working toward better cultural understanding

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

5. All Australians need to understand true Aboriginal history

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly Disagree Neutral Strongly Agree

The following questions are about how you feel about contact with Non-Indigenous Australians. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Please choose one of the following 5 response options: Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, disagree, Strongly disagree

1. When I come into contact with Non-Indigenous Australians, we almost always interact as equals.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree Agree Strongly Agree

2. When I come into contact with Non-Indigenous Australians contact is almost always friendly.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Disagree Disagree Neither Agree Agree Strongly Agree

3. When I come into contact with Non-Indigenous Australians, we generally cooperate well with each other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. When I come into contact with Non-Indigenous Australians I feel that the contact is close and intimate, like being with good friends and family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informed Consent

INFORMED CONSENT PROFORMA


Name of researcher: Mr Stewart Sutherland. I am a PHD student at the Australian National University and an Indigenous Visiting Research Fellow at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies

1. I understand what this study is about
I have read and understand the Plain English Research Statement which explains what this research study is about.

I have had a chance to ask questions about the study, and I am comfortable with any answers that I have been given. I know that I can ask more questions whenever I like.

2. I have volunteered to participate
I agree to participate in the research. I know that I do not have to participate in it. I made up my own mind to participate – nobody is making me do it or talking me into it.

I know that I don’t have to answer any questions I don’t like.

3. What will happen if I want to stop participating?
I know that I can pull out at any time before I have checked the copy of my story when it is sent to me. If I pull out, I know I won’t get into trouble with the researcher or anyone else.

4. How the research will happen
I agree that the researcher can interview me for the research, and write down or record what I say.

I agree to fill out the survey that the researcher will give me.

5. Getting paid for participating in the research
I know that I won’t get paid for participating in the research study.
6. **Risks and benefits of the research**
I understand that the research may have the following benefits:

- Through an understanding of the emotional trauma and how Indigenous people feel about reconciliation, governments and grass roots organisations will be better informed about how to direct funding, resources and policies to better serve you.

- Providing answers to the research questions will provide insight into helping improve the social and emotional wellbeing of people affected by past Governments’ forced removal policies, and may lead to a country that is better reconciled.

But I understand that the research is not guaranteed to achieve these benefits, it depends on what the researcher finds out.

7. **Who will be the authors of the research?**
I understand that the researcher wants to write about the research in papers such as a thesis and articles in academic journals.

AND:
I understand that the researcher will write these papers by themselves. I won’t write them, but my story might be in the papers.

8. **Will people find out personal things about me from the research?**
I know that my name, where I live, and other personal information won’t be mentioned in these papers.

9. **What about culturally restricted information or things?**
I understand that the researcher will not collect any culturally restricted material.

10. **Who will have access to the research results?**
I understand that anyone can read the papers that come out of this research, and that even people on the other side of the world might see it, maybe on the internet. That’s OK with me.

AND:
I agree that the researcher can present information from the research at conferences even if I’m not there, and I understand that the researcher can do this without asking me first.

11. **Intellectual property**
I understand that the researcher will hold copyright in the papers. This means that:

- The researcher will be able to copy the information that is in these papers in other places or for other purposes (eg on the internet) without asking for anyone else’s permission.

- The researcher will be able to let other people copy that information without asking for anyone else’s permission.

- If the papers make any money, the researcher will keep it.
The researcher can pass copyright onto people I don’t know (eg their own children), who also won’t have to ask anyone’s permission before they copy the information in the papers, let other people reproduce it or keep any money that these research products make.

13. Complaints
I know that, if I am worried about the research study, I can ring up the researcher Stewart Sutherland on 02 6246 1111 and talk to him about it. Or, I can talk to, the Australian National University Research Complaints, Professor Mandy Thomas Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Graduate Studies) T: +61 (0)2 6125 2631 E: Mandy Thomas

I know that I can also complain to:

- the AIATSIS Director of Research, phone 02 6246 1196, or
- I can also write to the Ethics Committee at AIATSIS, GPO Box 553, Canberra, ACT 2601.

If I think there has been a breach of my privacy I can write to the Privacy Commissioner.

I have read this Informed Consent Form and I agree with it.

Signed by the research participant..........................................................

Date....................................................

OR

I read this Informed Consent Form aloud to [name of research participant] and I believe that s/he understood and agreed to it:

Signed by a witness..........................................................

AND:

Signed by or on behalf of the researcher

..........................................................

Name

Date.......................................................
Facilitator: Okay and it's recording.

Interviewee: My names [redacted], I’m [redacted] and I'm living in Canberra at the moment, I came over for the apology in 2008. I'm from Western Australia, I was adopted out as a baby in 1960, I was told I was Aboriginal when I was seven, that was 1967, referendum year, to help make us Australian citizens. Being seven I didn't know what that meant, I didn't see myself any different than who I was at that moment. But being told that I was someone different and that I had another family somewhere in another place and in another time made a difference to me.

I think from that time, 1967, so I think that little statement hovered underneath in my psyche for a long time, and still does in a lot of ways. Because I don't think nothing much has changed in Australia, for me personally, I think a lot of us stolen generation people have kept on the periphery of community and families because we've been knocked about and moved away. We're in the worlds - in a world between white and black, and so we're the grey - I call myself the grey person, because I'm mixed up in a culture that's been mixed up and shimmied along, moved around,
disgruntled hurt, used by the system to create wealth for other people.

We're an industry, but it's taken me a long time to even feel okay to say that, because as a person we shouldn't be treated as an industry. Like we were talking about before it's trafficking, the British knew how to do that very well when they came over here, they had lots of practice throughout the world where they took over, and we were the last country to be invaded. So they had a lot of experience and they've still got a lot of experience in how to deal with us through the tentacles of government which we were talking about.

Because all things being right the apology would have given us more - well yes I will say it, more power to make our own decisions, more power to make communities better, to be more funded well. There's lots of - well us mob, aboriginal mob know there's lots of nations within this nation, but the wider community and other people don't because it hasn't been educated. I was 12 when I first did my first project, that's year seven over in West Australia, and Swanbourne Primary.

I learnt about being Aboriginal, I didn't know anything about it until five years later, 1967 to 1972, but in between that time lots of things had happened to me and were about to happen after being 12. So when I was doing this project, lots of things just came to me boomerangs, just even maybe souvenirs I don't know. I don't know how it call came, tablecloths, tea towels, information it just became what my first, I think for hunger and information about this subject, The subject, the protected race the subject, because this is what we have been.

It was quite amazing, and so after that yeah, I think I felt a little bit different in a better way, but still at a loss because lots of things had happened in my life before that, before
12 and like I said after that. I grew up on the Swan River on Mosman Park, 10 Hanlon Street, it was all bush, the sugar refinery was over the road from us and the trains were still going, the steam trains, I can remember the smell. I was thinking about it the other night actually the smell of the steam trains, how do you convey the smell of a steam train when they're not around anymore. Especially over bridges which I had to do to get to Freemantle, and they were long walks from Hanlon Street to yeah Leighton Beach I suppose it is now, Cottesloe Beach no, Leighton Beach and that was just a stone's throw to Freemantle. So we had to walk about a 40 minute walk just to get to somewhere. I actually went back there last year, this year and a lot of the ground - the sugar refinery was long gone, I think it was still standing, or talking about moving it or breaking it down. But on a couple of occasions I've gone back and first time I went back about five years ago, four years ago, there was still bushlands over the road from where I was. Because my road was the last road and then there was grass and bush and then there was the Swan River, we used to do prawning and fishing and all that sort of stuff with my family, my adopted family. The first time I went back I was driving with my friend, we were going one way, and there was another car going the other way and it was my brother and his wife. We were looking at the same house on that particular Sunday, it was awesome, like it was supposed to be, serendipity, spirits looking after, reconnecting. It was an amazing thing, and then this last year I went back and I think PC Presbyterian Ladies College in Claremont had brought up some land and they'd demolished some of the land and built over it, but they'd still - the grass trees there. Used to be called black boys grass trees, and they were
taller than me and I'm five eight and took a few photos, they'd be six or seven foot now and pretty wide and big, and it was just nice to - I took off my thongs and just stood around it.

I hope they were the same bush trees that were there when I was growing up, and you'd want to hope so, just something special and it was just one of those moments. Yeah the bush is slowly going, it's being eaten up by economics and the force of the world to have space and place. But if we don't save the bush how do we have our memories, you can't have - well you can have memories in buildings, but it goes a lot deeper than that, it's what's built, where it's come from and what's been spilt on the land and what's been given to the land, but most of all for the white mob, what's been taken away, which they take away.

So I was - got a few sort of big things in my life that happened. I was 10 when I was sexually assaulted by a guy in Swanbourne, and just this year I tried to get papers for it through the legal system, through the police stations. But they couldn't find anything, I've got a legal service to help us in Perth there. Yeah at the time they thought it was lying or that it didn't happen because they'd questioned the guy and asked around the place whether anything else had happened, and they couldn't find anything and who knows what they did, I don't know. So you can't go over their files or whatever they did or didn't do, but it did happen.

That sort of wrecked me for quite a while, it wasn't a bad assault but it was enough to - just tip a little 10 year old over the edge and lose yourself again. Why did it happen, how did it happen, why did he do that, why didn't I tell my parents, lots of things. So for about three or four months I was ringing the police stations all round Perth,
Freemantle, every station, I got the phone book and I just used to ring up and not say anything. I'd do it at all hours of the night, my parents didn't know they were fast asleep, and just ring up, say nothing and sometimes they'd hang up and they got really cross sometimes. I just let that go, I couldn't bring it out, so eventually I think the Cottesloe Police Station actually traced the call, in those times it was able to. This was about...yeah sorry. So they traced the call and wondered why I was calling, and so it came out. I'm just - why I stopped there I always thought 10 was my age when that happened, but we moved from Mosman Park because something happened there, I'm not sure about. Yeah so that all happened when I was about 12 the actual assault, or the grooming. Yeah so at that time I went back and took photos of my space back in Hanlon Street, went back to Swanbourne and that was the first time I'd ever thought about doing that. I hadn't gone back before and the place was changed and it was all different, but it still had that sort of feeling around the area, because Swanbourne's a pretty special area too, just had that really different feel about it. Yeah to 12, the only thing I've got in my photo kit album is me at 12 looking very sad, yeah very lost, very alone, and this guy was being asked whether this had happened and that happened, they sent me to a psychologist in West Perth and that place has gone now, so I can't go back, unless that person's alive, and I bring it out in public, would that person be able to remember me and what happened, or do they keep papers that far back from the '70s, those sort of things come up in my mind. It's just retracing my steps and times in my moments of life that I've - because I think it's important to go through whatever you have to go through to come out of it, go to the other side. Because if you don't face your fears and
everything it's just going to keep coming back at you. I think this is why it's important for us to be on the tail of the government all the time, just to keep reminding them, we are here, we're still here. We can't be forgotten again us mob, and it doesn't all come down to economy and jobs, it's about the spirit of humanity really.

We're talking about the boat people, they're still trafficking, the jail systems a trafficking system, because we haven't worked out why in our human psyche that we do things to each other, just to get on top of each other and have the wealth and have the resources that you keep other people down. I can't understand it and this has been I suppose my protest in life is trying to get equality back, having a listening ear for people, because there's not a lot of people that really do listen out there, on the deeper deeper emotional level. Who aren't going to phase you out like corrective services, community services. Because it's all coming from a white base not from our historical base of knowledge and of respect. Because if they did have respect and trying to reconcile whatever that word is, which we discussed we have to have respect to acknowledge that we are the first nations, and we are the first - the stolen generation of the first nation people, who have historically been murdered and massacred, raped and pillaged, removed from lands, put into other peoples lands and that's caused problems. We've been moved from the Kimberley's down to Freemantle and Rottnest where I worked for two years, I didn't know it was a jail, I've learned that history.

All of our people and men have been so disenfranchised and moved around, we're like jigsaw puzzles trying to fit ourselves back together again and we're doing it continually every day, every day. When I was staying at the embassy, some refuge women came, and they'd been
doing their job for 35 years, and they were still on the same pay basically, and they were still struggling to try and help our mob to get ourselves glued back together again, because of what the policies and what the closed ear of governments do, is still keep us down.

They shouldn't be so scared of us, because all we want to do is the right thing, but when economy we're always chasing our tails, the economy and the circle of life, like having a life, having a mortgage, this is for all people in Australia. I mean I suppose even the world because there's a lot of people that have to do the same thing, because of the way the systems have been instilled in the world. It's not just Australia that has to look at it, it's the whole world because we've all got the same problems.

Why haven't the jail system been fixed up, why aren't we a better nation for our people.

So going back to 12 again, I went back to being - I went yeah chaos, chaos theory for Jude, it was not good. We moved again, moved to another place, yeah so went to Innaloo, Lawrence Street and I thought that was pretty strange because that was my - one of my brother's middle name, no first name actually sorry. So it was all familiar, familiar, I don't know, yeah so stayed there, but it was pretty bad. They didn't know what to do with me, because chaos theory was just all around me happening in my head, I think the only thing that saved me was music. They ended up putting me into - I don't know who they talked with, because I've ran off, could have got myself pregnant, went away for a weekend and just KO'd myself basically at 12 - 13. Took off and just - yeah it was not good. So I had that sexual experience and went walking through city arcade, a couple of days later, yeah parents were frantic, everyone was looking for me. It was pretty bad, I didn't know what I was doing, I was just going off
the wall. But in a sort of careful way, but still let yourself
go and that was it not good.
So just remember my brother seeing me in city arcade
there and then the police were called oh I can't remember
whether I actually got locked up or put into Graylands, I
think it was Graylands, just for whatever time. I can't
remember too much of that sort of stuff, it's closed off, I
tried remembering it a while back, but it doesn't come
through. It sort of gets mixed up with Longmire which was
a jail being used in those days for juvenile kids.
So I've had my institutionalisation of that sort of stuff, I
really didn't know why it was all being done, it was never
really explained to me that I can think of, it was just all
happening to me. But after I got out of the detention
centre, I think I ended up - yeah they said what's the best
thing, girl's school. So I went to Methodist Ladies College
in Swanbourne or Claremont and that was just over the
road - well not really because I'd moved from Innaloo, that
was an hour's trip from Innaloo to Methodist Ladies
College, just going through.
I did boarding for a little bit but that didn't suit me, and
then did day school and after day school it was just too
long a trip, getting in on a special bus an hour away with
all these well off kids that were living out of Karrinyup.
Because all the wealthy people are all over that side and
my family was starting to get wealthy, because my father
was a concrete mixer truck driver, and that was his dream,
he was a petrol tank driver in the early days, my mum was
a - just a housewife. Not just a housewife, she was a
brilliant housemother. I had a good life with that, there's
nothing happening in my family there it was a good life.
But there was just something always missing and it was
about 12 years difference between me and my youngest
brother, four in the family.
So I was taken away from a family of girls, I was fifth in line from Geraldton West Australia, moved down a thousand k's from Geraldton to Mosman Park and that's where I started my life. I've got papers relating to my adoption and certain facts that I asked for. I asked for before the apology years and years back, but I don't really believe them, lots of things get falsified and they're even getting shredded up as we speak, which is not good. There should be some sort of injunction to all the departments, everywhere ASAP to not shred any evidence, because we do know that it's still happening. I've heard a few stories around the place. How do we sit with reconciliation if we're always getting this stuff happening to us all the time, where we can't correct the falsifying and we're always lying always not telling the truth. But things like you said finally census are happening, but it's just too late for a lot of people over 50, even our 40 years olds are very tired. I went to a reconciliation thing with Tim Costello is it, he's the main guy, well not the main guy, and there was Lina at a church happening in town here this year. How do we fight the reconciliation where it's still happening with us, it's crazy. This 46 year old lady, she was a teacher, she said she's just tired, tired and how is her health going to be in another 10 years' time if we're pushing it so hard now, what is she going to be like, and the 50 and 60 year women who are looking after - trying to look after the grandkids, the next generation, while all these drugs and stuff are happening around the communities. We're not making the stuff, and who are these people who can afford cocaine? That so much is coming in, Ice is been - oh it's just - and this is where I think - I've always had my theories on the ADHD stuff, Ritalin coming in. I always thought that was -
it wasn't meant for our kids, it was for the supply of drugs and for all these mixes to be made, through deals who knows, but this my theory. I don't know whether it's true, but how easy if you start to degenerise (sic) a generation and say okay of whoever kids they are, black white or whatever. It's because they're not getting the right fundamental care and so you drug them up, and what an easy way, okay Ritalin. It's one of those things that can be processed into other drugs.

So that was my theory on why all of a sudden in the 80s - 90s or the 90s all this Ritalin and speed was coming on because of generalisation of children, because they're not getting their fundamental rights of parents, who have been downtrodden, who've gone through court systems, prison systems, black and white, but mainly us. Because our numbers have always been more than the white percentage. But they still don't know how to look after their mob, and we're caught up in it. This is the industry for me, always been - I've got two children of my own, three children but two boys and we're fighting that, always fought it. Yeah that's another big story.

So I went to girls school, slowly, slowly went nuts again, didn't end up going to school, and finally ended up saying okay we'll send her to secretarial school, so I did a bit of secretarial work, a little bit of shorthand, typing. I learnt the plug in old system, you pull the cords and plug in, did that before it got phased out, and that was only in the 70s my goodness. So I learnt that, I had a job for one time, but I don't know it felt uncomfortable doing that sort of stuff, and especially in an adult system where a guy was a head of the company, so it just didn't help my insecurities. I ended up - I got the job for a little bit but it didn't work out, so I ended up calling the manager by his first name, and that wasn't protocol and after that gone.
But in between that 12 and that time that I was doing secretarial work, my family life was up and down. My parents didn't know what to do, how to cope with me, how to cope with everything and all their emotions, I never saw them getting upset, but I'm sure they would have. Because unfortunately my mum and some of her - my adoptive mums family of sisters they were sexually assaulted too, so it must have brought back memories for my mum.

But I tried to keep on the up. I was lucky enough to go to Singapore at one time, when I was maybe 13, and that's another story in itself. That sort of opened up the wider world to me at one time, but that's the only time I've ever been out of the country. Then 13 - 14 this is about the main part of my life, when I'm changing from a teenager to adulthood. My father had always driven trucks, cars, always been around cars, garages, and he taught me to drive from the time I was about nine. Had a Holden HQ, that was his pride and joy, about Innaloo, Swanbourne, I had it in Swanbourne, because things were looking up. Concrete was yeah a big business, because Perth was being built up and Kwinana was being built up, all the chimney stacks up there, I remember going there.

So he taught me to drive, so about every once a year twice a year had a drive, and then when I was about 11 - 12 a little bit more. We were driving up Wanneroo and around all the new real estate roads that were going to be built on, that had been marked out and streets you know so it was safe for me to have a practice and that. Yeah so always been around the male sphere of things, I could have been a good carpenter because the guys - all the boys, four brothers and built their own houses. Dad in Hanlon Street built up the house in Hanlon Street, all around that as I was growing up.
I could have become an architect, I remember building and drawing houses and stuff because I was able to walk through houses when they were being built around Mosman Park and I used to walk for hours around Claremont and Swanbourne, yeah from a beach not far. So yeah just really going to Swanbourne actually opened my eyes to another sphere of life and even Hanlon Street. Used to play opposite Rose Hancock's playground there up on top of the hill in Mosman Park, the house is not there but the playground is. So another little memory. So yeah been learning to drive for ever, so my father and mum decided to - my father's roots come from South Australia, they're British, they came over at some time, I don't know of their history properly. So 27th December decided to end up going over to South Australia, so left, packed up - had Christmas packed up and took off. We hadn't even gotten out of WA, we're going near Southern Cross, and we'd had lunch and dad said do you want to drive, and I said okay I'll drive. Mum was comfortable, my aunty was in the back of the car, my mum was in the back and my father was on the side, the passenger seat and I was driving. I don't remember much of the day but it was after lunch, started driving and don't know how far Southern Cross is out of Perth or where we started from. It was a nice day, driving along after lunch you feel tired, and I think just the lull of the car and the scenery and everything and me not being used to driving during those sort of moments and times on a long trip like that. Yeah I fell asleep at the wheel, the next thing I know I'm over on the other side of the right hand lane and going into the gravel and hit a bit of a ditch and the next thing we're turned over, three or four, seven who knows how many times. We end up flat
on the wheels on the other side of the road near Southern Cross not far from there. Life just turned upside down. Father died...and everyone else was okay, but memories not good. Yeah so that turned my life around again, I say again because every time in my life, from seven onwards, even from my birth I suppose, change of destiny you’re on the wrong track, you’re not on the right track. So I don't know if they fell asleep, my feeling is that they fell asleep too because of just the drive and the day it was, or maybe they didn’t realise, dad didn’t look at me and see that I was falling asleep or whatever, but it didn't happen, never made it, and we ended up in hospital. I don't know how long it took to get to hospital, but yeah seeing my father next to me dead, head injuries yeah not good, and everyone else had survived, just with a few bruises and a lot of emotional shit to tackle for the next couple of years of their life as well.

It was something that I had to work out and being 14 didn't help and everything prior to that, another big upheaval of life. So finally took - I don't know, had the funeral and dream world, the boys - because in 1972 - 1974 a lot of cars still went on the road, they were sort of - a lot of accidents weren’t happening, because there was still a lot of good drivers around, a lot more people were a bit more careful. So accidents weren’t a big thing in a lot of people's lives I don't think, you never used to hear it a lot. But we had to deal with all of that and the boys, they must have had their emotional stuff, but I was only 14 I couldn't comprehend it all, it was too much, and how everyone else was dealing with it.

So my mum was in terrible grief, grief, grief, grief, along with all of that stuff chaos was still happening in my life from what had happened. Trying to get to secretarial school and then this happened, so I saw my mum sitting.
one day and I was taking photos of her one day, sitting in a rocker chair that her and dad each had one of in the lounge room. I just couldn't handle it anymore, so I ended up taking off. Worked out to go to Rottnest Island and I didn't know what the hell Rottnest Island was, another Stradbroke, another Palm Island. My god I didn't know. So another part of my life came into being and I think it was for the best, because having me around kept mum going in her grief, and we just didn't know how to deal with it, and we weren't getting counselled, I don't think mum was getting counselled, not even myself really. I excommunicated myself from everyone, and the boys were all having their own lives and children. So I was saying before that my youngest brother was 12 years older than me, so they were all finding their girlfriends, travelling around and I was basically by myself, most of my life. I had my parent's families and brothers and a few of them were Catholics and had lots of children. So that was the mob in a different way, catholic mob, so that sort of suited me and it helped mum as well in the early days when I was growing up.

But after seven - eight - nine - 10, I was basically by myself and with my parents, so didn't have many close friends when I was growing up. I think Swanbourne was the only place, Swanbourne Primary, that's now gone. I was made prefect in that year, I was a pretty good sports person, did a lot of netball, practiced heaps with netball and I played right up until I was late 30s in Bunbury. Tennis, had the opportunity to win a championship at the primary school there, so I was a real sporty person in those days.

But all these things kept happening to me and I'd get on a good phase of my life and then kapow, and it's not just little things, it's life changing things. It was not as if the cat
ran away or the dog got run over, well yeah, maybe different things with the dog when you actually see it. But with people and the emotions and the feelings that we are capable of, sometimes we don't talk about it enough, sometimes we talk about it too much maybe, and I hasten to say it, I don't believe that, maybe we don't talk about it enough. Because it's taken this long to get to apology, it doesn't matter what colour our skins are we've still got the same emotions and hurts, and a lot of the people coming into this country now have had their own emotions taken to the limits too.

It all affects the way that communities get on with each other, I feel. So I ended up going to Rottnest and I worked there for two years, I started off being a housemaid and worked into being assistant chef to the chef that was there, because I was strong, I was well built and be able to handle all the ovens and the lifting of roasts and things like that. So I did that for two years, learned a lot more about life and relationships and how everyone revolves around on Rottnest Island is a party place. The social drug taking that was happening at that time, all this part and parcel of being - because lots of things were happening in those days in the '70s and '75 a lot of revolutionary stuff was happening, as in the '60s were happening when I was born. Martin Luther in '68 so I was coming in, all of us were coming in at big times of change in the world too.

So this was all brought into us too, but it was brought into me because I was experiencing it as a white person and not as an Aboriginal person. I can't speak the other way because I wasn't brought in it and I don't know whether a lot of Aboriginal had televisions in those days, I'm not sure. I just didn't know the other side. So just in my own way.
So Rottnest Island worked out it was a prison and it was pretty scary there sometimes in winter time, it's 12 miles off the Freemantle harbour, two hour trip by a boat or 12 to 15 - 20 minute trip by a little Cessna. So during winter time I'd take the Cessna, because gage roads is pretty bad going on a boat for 200 people. Then I used to have quicker boats and yeah it was a good life. It changed and opened and just my eyes, just cleared all of that crap that had been happening to me, but things were still happening in my life and my head was still not right as well.

A few things happened over there, but that was okay, but I ended up getting locked up one time over there by this copper, it was my sixteenth birthday. I don't know what happened there, but I got locked up, so that was yeah just for the night, and I wasn't drunk, just don't know why that happened. Nothing happened there, so that was good. I think he was locking me up for my own safety I don't know, maybe it was just to boost his numbers for the night, who knows. But that's on my sixteenth birthday, I had a lot of birthdays by myself in the meantime.

So I found out what Rottnest Island was about and I was pretty disgusted by that, and by the time I was 17 I was thinking about moving on. I had a friend who became a close girlfriend, she had a boyfriend and he was a carpenter on the island, and she was my next assistant that used to help us in the kitchen. We planned to come over to the Eastern States because that's where the boyfriend was from. So she asked us whether I wanted to travel and I did, and we came over in a Holden and a caravan with a cat on board.

Washington was the cat's name, Washy, so he learned to have good life in that caravan and we shared the room, yeah the rooms, that was a fairly long caravan. So it had good space and yeah it was great, so the guy had
Chrissie he was a scuba diver so he had tanks, so he'd go diving on the way, different places, beaches, pick up a bit of a feed, always have some sort of seafood and us girls would always cook up tomato, onion and pumpkin because they all had nice flavours with seafood. So that's how we lived.

Got to the Eastern States after travelling all around the place, Mount Gambia, Blue Lake, the volcano there and the flame trees, I remember that, going along the streets Mount Gambia. Because this was a whole new world I hadn't seen before and I was only 17 still. Well just going back to - I'd been here before, this wasn't my first time in Canberra, because I'm just remembering it now, but I remember it before. I had a month's holiday from [unclear], so it was closed during June.

So I brought a Greyhound bus ticket for a month's worth of travel, and I went all the way up to Brisbane on the bus. Backpackers here and there, stayed at Potts Point backpackers, and the head of Pan Am, his daughter was staying at the backpackers, I can't remember her name, but I remember she had long long hair. I just caught up with her and stayed there for a couple of days, didn't know her just one of those backpacker experiences.

I ended up going all the way up to Brisbane and then all the way back ready to start work again in a month. So that was - and I came to Canberra, and actually I think I remember, I don't know when that national gallery got made, but I just remember the different styles of buildings, a bit different than Perth.

Facilitator: Vastly different than Perth.
Interviewee: Yeah and yeah so I actually came through Canberra and it was - I said to people it was like a canvas at that time, it was still - you could paint anything on it, you could do anything with it. So yeah '75 that might have been, '76, so
then yeah '77 took off to Melbourne, met their family. Then what happened? Oh they continued on I stayed in Melbourne, and I met my husband eventually, stayed there for a couple of years by myself and then met up with my husband after a couple of years. So yeah came back not liked by his family, he had a horrible life himself and his family, he was from a family of four boys, father unstable and schizophrenic, mum a housewife. So two dysfunctional people together what does that equal? Who knows, life. Oh dear so we hitched, yeah hitched or caught a bus over to Perth and introduced and had a passionate affair and loved each other more and worked each other out. I'd come back into my family home, so it was really not conducive, they ended up not liking him, which was fair enough. Yeah I hate saying class or status or judging people but they didn't like him, but he was still my first sort of love that I'd really had, and he was non indigenous, but that didn't matter, it was just a person. But I didn't know he was yeah, I hate to say it an addict, and going through his stuff, he'd just come out of an institution himself after doing some rehab and being hospitalised because he hurt his leg or some story. But he was an ex addict trying to get himself stable and he did well. I came into his life and we did good actually together and it was great.

In between all of this, going backwards and forwards between Melbourne and WA, we hitchhiked a couple of times, but we got stuck in the middle of the Nullarbor Station. The guy that gave us a lift had work to do so that's as far as we could go, and it just led into that story. We got picked up by the coppers, they said if you haven't - because the Ceduna Police and the [Ukala] Police they go vice versa between each station. So the Ceduna Police said okay we usually do the run to Ukala, if you haven't
got picked up by that time. Yeah asked us how much money we had, we only had about two or five bucks between us. We were doing it very light, very light, so vagrancy.

They came and went back from Ukala and we got picked up and we got locked up for a long weekend, we didn't know it was a bloody long weekend did we, not good. But the men were allowed to go out and have a bit of exercise but there was another sheila, she had a problem. But because she was in there with me they wouldn't let me out, so they thought she might take off. Because I think she used to travel in the tracks, backwards, forwards. Yeah so they didn't let her out, so just for exercise.

But on this - before I even got to jail, the coppers, there was bad weather coming, I have to say this because it involves coppers and police in my life and safety and stuff like that, involvement. Was they picked us up, we weren't handcuffed or anything, I mean where could you go in the middle of the Nullarbor. So they took us off road and they got out their guns, they had guns in the car, and we were doing some rough riding, they were taking us for a ride. They knew where they were going and what the roads were like, because they'd been doing it for yonks. They saw a wombat it was huge, started shooting at it, and that was my first yeah, scary thing with the coppers.

Bad weather was coming in at the same time, a big storm coming in, and that started to get really bad and they were waving their way through and all of this that and the other. I really didn't like the car and then all of a sudden this weather came over the top of us, it wasn't for too long, but there was a lot of thunder and lightning. They had a big aerial and they were talking on the bloody microphone, through the radio. There's this thunder and lightning going kapoosh, kapoosh. Now in Nullarbor, I don't know if
anyone knows, that truck was the highest thing in the
world there, and with a blood aerial, like the statue of
liberty hanging outside, out in the Nullarbor. It was
attracting the lightening to us, and I said turn the bloody
radio off before it - it was really close, we could have been
frizzled out there honest, that's how scary it was.
So that was an eye opener, I couldn't believe that they
didn't have the sense. Anyway then they took us to one of
the communities in South Australia, not far away from the
Nullarbor station there, and they said don't get out. I said
what for? We're going to get a cuppa we'll see you in a
little bit, I said why can't we get out? He said well they'll
bloody spear you won't they, I didn't answer, I'm only 17 at
that time, I didn't know anything of communities. Then
you take the police for face value. So the weather had
changed it got really hot again, and it was bloody really
hot in the car and they stayed away for a whole hour, left
us sitting in that car sweltering and wondering, shit if we
do get out of the car, are we going to get - we didn't know
what it was all about type thing.
We just knew it was an Aboriginal reserve and that was it,
and coming from non-Aboriginal family I didn't know. So
anyway that happened, so we ended up going - getting
out of court after the long weekend, they said you have to
go back to West Australia, so we headed back to West
Australia, didn't make it to Melbourne. We stayed over
there and got married, had three children, and we tried to
bring them up in a great good way, a fair way, a share
way. Just reflecting on it the other day how that we bring
our children up in the right ways that we think are fair and
right, share, care. But still be observant just so that you
don't get hurt, and then when you take your kids to school
it all changes around.
From that time on you're a different person than what your parents have brought you up to be, whether black or white, because I'm sure Aboriginal people, this is why we are so pissed off with things, because we know our history now. A lot more of us know it, even our stolen generation I didn't know anything, and now after five years of reading history, I've got - you came back to that flat there. Books, books I've been reading for five years of history and the way the white mob have done business, and it just disturbs me. That's why history hasn't changed, because it's not being educated, it's not being put in the Gonski Report or the Better Schools. It's not going further enough, and we're talking about the maturity of Australia, are we mature enough, do they have the will to make things better.

If we do claim our sort of indigenous rights what rights are they and are they going to upheaval white Australia? I don't think so because we want what's right and our rights are the same as your rights, so what worse can we do? Except for better and look after the place, it doesn't always run on money, it doesn't always run on buildings and concrete, it runs on blood sweat and tears and what you do to people. We're sick of it, we want to start healing the place, we want to start looking after people, not just our mob but other people too. Because what comes around goes around, and if we don't look after our mob well who's going to look after us? We're the last country to be invaded, we're the last country to be on edge and at war with our mental psyche against a white psyche that just won't let us in properly.

The tentacles of government, and I'm going to keep referring to that, because I think that's a good one, the tentacles of government will their way through right down to local government, and thank god we're not having a
local government referendum. Because if they can't do stolen generation or apology properly how can they do local government, because then you're just - if you're doing local government referendum then you're just doing the whole reclamation of Australia again without indigenous consultation. You're not doing it right, you've got to do it right ways, not new ways, you've got to do right ways. I'm saying new ways because that's the new political thing for Rudd. You've got to do it right ways, not new ways, because I think this was discussed at the embassy in Canberra this year and a couple of years ago. The old ways are still good ways, they can still be worked on but just rejigged, just the same as what the white governments doing, they're just rehashing but in different ways and getting more wealth out of it at the loss of our people again. How many years do all the Northern Territory people have to way for a bloody house or to feel comfortable in walking down their street.

I went there when James Anaya was there, I cried over on the plane, over Uluru, I'd just come back from Perth from death and custody, an elder had taken his own life in Bunbury Prison. I was friends with his sister, now why did this man die, he's an old man that was not old, but he was with it. Why did he die, 51, he was the next South West elder with all the knowledge. Not good, and so after that death and custody I went over to Barbara Shores house, I stayed with her for three weeks while James Anaya was there. I went to every meeting, heard what all the Northern Territory mob had to say. Government, and this was the time that the 40 year leases were being looked at, and Barbara Shore and her mob were fighting, the whole Northern Territory, everywhere was fighting for it. The intervention mob came to the high
court and we went inside it for god's sake. Us protesters, we got up to the top floor, because I know because I let some of them, flag up the top taking photos down and the police, it was craziness. But how far do you have to keep going to get justice?

All these people making money out of everyone, the lawyers, the courts, we've been to court so much, me with my children, my boys it must be worth 50 million, nah not that, must be worth 10. I've never seen a buck, we should all get paid to go to jail, forget monopoly, do not pass go, do not get paid out, we should get paid. Because if everyone else is getting paid on the backs of trafficking and the slave trade, because back in Bunbury they have to work over there and grow veggies and everything for the community. It's crazy.

Just so much money is being filtered around the Aboriginal industry, I just can't fathom why we haven't gotten further. I come over in 2008 to come over for the apology, I even shook hands with the man a week after the apology, he was on the doorsteps of old parliament house. I had my camera, I've got a camera I was always taking photos, I saw this white car come up and big boom microphone thing. All of a sudden rush of media, I take my photo put the zoom on and oh that's Rudd. So yeah well I'm just over the road at the embassy, so yeah go over and shook his hand, a week after the apology, I said come over and visit, he said where are you I said over there. He said what you're doing over there, because I want to. So how long are you going to be there, oh I don't know.

So I just asked him to come over and have a cuppa, but I ended up given him a photograph of one of my art photography pictures and never got a reply or anything back from him. Don't know whether he got it, I was so
overawed with the whole situation of shaking with the PM how'd just said the apology. I forgot to give him the actual picture, but I had it in my hand, I was about to walk away, I felt it in my hand and oh shit. So I ended up giving it to his secretary, but I would have thought a letter might have come, thank you for this photography and meeting you. Nothing.

Done other things that we've got no replies to, government doesn't answer the activists or the protesters, he only or they only answer to - I hate to say it, to some of the people, well I don't know I shouldn't say hate to say it. Because a lot of people have done a lot of good work in the Aboriginal politics and trying to get through the upheaval of bloody life and the pages they have to turn just to get a bit of justice, even a little bit of funding. But starting to talk captains choices now, still is captain choices and maybe the election might bring a few different people on, but even in political parties, it still takes a lot of will and a lot of sweat and tears just to get a little bit of centimetre or millimetres of justice, or compromise. Because they hold on to that power really bloody well, might have a breath for a minute.

Facilitator: So what did you think of the apology and what do you think of it now?

Interviewee: It was good that they said it, good that they worked it out, a lot of work still needs to be done, it was pretty emotive, I wasn't inside of the building, I was on the outside, sitting outside the media tent actually. Yeah and everyone sort of just moved away so that I had a good view of the TV on the grass area there. Because it was a bit of irony even getting to Canberra, because I had to just go back even to just get to Canberra, because it's all relative in how you go and where you go and who you see. Because in 1995 and '96 I was lucky
enough to get some employment with Yirra Yaakin aboriginal theatre, West Australian theatre mob there, got a gig for two years. Didn't like the second year but the first year went to all the communities in one of the regions of Western Australia and then in the second year I did six weeks. So I saw my communities, my country touched it gripped it, it was amazing.

So I was lucky enough to do that and experience something that I haven't experienced before. So we're at Kalgoorlie, Menzies, Kalgoorlie going out to Menzies, Cosgo, Newbury, we go to one of these communities that was having a wedding. We ended up staying that weekend for a wedding or just for a rest anyway, there was a wedding on and a lot of the people were from Canberra. A Canberra guy was getting married to an Aboriginal lady, so there was a TAFE based kitchen type thing there. So we stayed there and hospitality type industry, and they were all geared up for a big celebration, so yeah listened, sort of kept away from it, but they did their stuff. At the end of it I went and contacted, had a talk with someone, and I said just in case I ever get to Canberra, can I have your name and your address and your phone number and boom boom.

So in my travel book yeah had her phone number, so 2008 - '98 - '96 to 2008 I found that book again.

Serendipity of all of it, just luck of it, yeah so rang that lady up and yeah. I didn't know anything about the embassy, knew nothing it wasn't in my head about what that was all about. The only thing I knew about the embassy was why are all these Aboriginal people fighting, Fitzroy Crossing and all that happening in the '70s. Because our land was getting taken away up that way.

Get me on track.

Facilitator: The apology.
Interviewee: The apology. Yeah so I contacted this lady, my daughter, somebody helped me get over to Canberra for the apology, didn't know anything about the embassy. So the lady that had - that came and picked me up from the airport, a different lady, said you know anything about the embassy, I said no, what's that all about. She told me a quick little thing, she said do you want to go past, and I said yeah. We go past and it was full of life, everything happening there, fire, oh smoke, yeah it was great. There was just on the up, it all just felt really light and it felt great. So the story of history just going along and parliament house and the embassy there, King Edward drive or whatever, King George, and she said oh do you want to stay there. She wasn't Aboriginal, I said well I don't know, I haven't got a tent or anything. So within about an hour we had a tent and I was yeah ensconced, I was there. This is all three days before the apology happened, so got the feel, got the drift of it, I ended up staying on the statue of King George side because there was the Northern Territory mob over that side and I wanted to hear language. So I stayed that way and I stayed for two years after that. It all had to do with the apology, just the life that I've led to get to that point of getting to the apology and driving all the cobwebs away and still feeling pissed off with everything, that's still happening with my kids in Canberra and the justice system and the correction system, the work that really doesn't get done but they're falsifying evidence.

This is from an enforced policy of protecting our people, our race, it's not good. How much of everything do you want, I was fighting in Bunbury Western Australia for my kids and I'm still fighting for my boys here, I'm fighting for my daughter because she's realising what it's all about a little bit, because she didn't want to know anything about
being Aboriginal. When we changed from country to Bunbury she got chased down the road by some Aboriginal kids, because we weren't family, but we were claiming Aboriginality. But it took time to get from Bunbury to where we were living to get the message, yeah okay that we were known and there was some family history. Even though we didn't know it and I personally didn't know it, and I didn't meet my family until I was 29 and this all goes into the apology question that you're asking. That's a whole other big story too, so might get on to that not sure. But with this lady that I met in Australia from Canberra, I ended up going to her place, having a rest because it was pretty hectic at the embassy, a lot of things to take in, a lot of talk was happening, a lot of information, a lot of happiness and music. Yeah it was great, it was fantastic and it was just one of those journeys that you just can't have anywhere else except for that point of time. I suppose it would just be like standing in America with Martin Luther King doing the same thing, all the space filled up with millions of people Well that place on apology day was filled up with people, there wasn't a space that you could get. You couldn't see grass, you could only just see people and I got this great picture of this guy, he's in a couple of my photos, and he's just got a sign, sorry. That's one of the most powerful emotive pictures I personally have got in my albums. It was just like that, it was awesome. But I ended up going to this - to get a break have a break from being there for a bit, went to this ladies house. Went out to have a cigarette while she was fixing tea outside and it was opposite the Woden cemetery. I looked over and there were three balloons, three colours, red black and yellow over at that cemetery. I can't remember if it was before or after apology but just thinking about it now it
just brings up tears, it brings up sadness. I got another
friend that I stayed at, yeah I had a few different people
that I could go to and have a break from the embassy
there which was nice.
I asked my friend Anne whether she could take us to the
cemetery, and so a week or two after, it can't have been
too long because the balloons were still up and they were
just slowly going down. Actually they were down, so I
actually had to look for the grave and look for the flat and
get - sort it out, suss it out. There was this grave and it
had beer bottles, it had little police cars, it had plastic hand
cuffs, it had mementos and it had a story of this young
person's life, he was 17.
I know the name but I won't say it, and it just brought a
whole lot of emotion of why I was over there, it wasn't just
for the words or - it was for my kids. I'm sorry that it
happened to you my boys and I'm sorry for that 17 year
old that's lying in that ground, he should be alive walking
around, breathing, doing what he should be doing, instead
of being in this chaotic world of bloody economies and
wealth and resources and take take take take. Having a
house, us fellas don't have houses, I've got to go back to
West Australia, but I've got no money, and how the hell
am I going to afford $450 or $250 - I don't want to go into
state housing. Let's pass the wealth around a little bit.
So I cried on that grave and I said I'm going to help stop it,
I'm going to be a part of it, because I'd never done that
sort of thing before, it just wasn't - I'd been processed as
an Aboriginal. With my children and yeah, so I cried over
his grave and I said I'm here for you boyo and I'm not
going to let it happen anymore, and that's why I'm still
here. Apart from a lot of other things that happened, I
want things to change, and it can't come quick enough for
me, and I suppose it can't come quick enough for you or
for anyone else. But we know what we want, some of us might not know what we want and sometimes we don't feel we're good enough to have what we want. There's a whole generation of 15 - 16 even 17 years olds out there, but some of them are in good health and been looked after that have got so much expertise. They need to be welcomed on to sites and places and be part of the economy as well, because they were left behind, they got taught to do domestic work in the '40s and '50s and '60s. As Australia was changing, where it's more in our history now not in past times.
The apology hasn't gone far enough, it's good to say it, but there was this movie called Love Story with Ryan O'Neill and another person. There's the sorry word, sorry means never having to say you're sorry, love, sorry, don't do it again. If we're going to say sorry or the apology and keep doing the same as we did yesterday, especially in white governments ways, and trying to keep us from our full potentials. There are men and women around who are so lost and so defeated in their minds, that even their children are getting pissed off with them that they're not fighting. I heard it from an 18 year old, saying mum you're not doing it right, you know what you should be doing. But we're not being encouraged and it's not being left to us to define ourselves and our destinies. Because it's been taken away from us, all being good I should be up in a country in Geraldton somewhere, or even is it Turkey Creek, Worman up that way, Kimberley's, where my family's history goes right the way through West Australia, and across, across the continent. I shouldn't be here, if all things being right and it shouldn't take five - eight years to work out reparations. It should just be something that should have been worked out at the same time as the apology.
If we have apology what do we do, we're sick of counselling, we're sick of - some of us might need healing, but a lot of us have worked it out and we're on track and we need to yes go ahead and be ourselves, we need the money to be able to access land and farms, because it gets taken up by other countries people for their own sustenance. We've already lost so much land, our foods have gone, they're being degenerated for mining, for pastoral leases for cows and beef and hay and everything. We need our sustenance, we need communities need their foods, so why can't they do their own foods on their own lands and maybe cross cultural do the foods, so that everyone has it.

Because every country has their own minerals and resources, and you need to look after that. Whereas incoming people they have their own different foods, and if we're all only going to eat the foods that are processed and not natural to us, we're half killing us because we don't have the right foods. But it's for us to eat the right foods that are in our presence at the moment, because it's been taken away, but it's still not the same. So we need access to lands, we need access like we're talking about, we need to have our own parliament as in conjunction with white governance.

It's all part of the apology and part of the apology I think is reconciling them, the white governance and the white mob to actually let go. Not just trying to be half full let it be all full or all empty, you can't just live on half empty or half full all the time. You've got to have one or the other, and I think if we get our own lands and be able to buy houses or you know. Have some sort of means for maintenance to look after those places, and have succession plans, whereas that's been taken away from us, descendants, lands, urban Aboriginal people have had our lands.
politically taken away from us, so there's no inheritance of land.

This is where the difference of communities and forced people who have been moved away, who don't know their families very well, we're stuck in the middle. We want our lands but how do we incorporate that in our families and what of my mother, she still hasn't told her story. It's a shame that she has to be - hate to say it have to have a tipple or two to let it come out, but that's painful in itself and she's going to be 80 next year, my birth mother. I don't know whether it's important for her to say it or not or whether she's happy for her to say what happened and my removal. I've heard a couple of different stories and I got one from family, whatever family courts, that do the chasing of papers. Even my sisters want to know what happened, because they don't know the story, and my mother had another - my birth mother had another three children after I was born.

So I'm one of eight or nine that I know of, on my father's side, possibly 12 in that family, so I've got a big family. How do you reparate that, how do you compensate for something like that, how do you follow up your history, right up to the Kimberley's' of reparations of what I've been taken away from. Because I've been back to Geraldton a couple of times and a lot of my sisters have got plywood, they're about what two foot wide, two and a half foot wide, by about five foot long, photos of everything that's happened. Family, friends, get togethers, births, funerals, everything, and I've missed every one of that, I've missed everyone of that, and how do you compensate for that?

Because I feel really pissed off that I didn't participate in that, why? You hear a lot of stories, women who never saw their kids or they signed away they were drugged up,
it should never have happened in the first place. If they were doing things the right ways and looking after people that wouldn't have happened. We've gone so far away from community, the wider sector have gone so far away from community and looking after your people to being individualistic, and this is why the economy runs as it is. Because - and this is what they don't like about aboriginal people, all having their money together in a sense. So the apology still needs a long way to go, we need our people, we need our parliaments, or our voices in there. We need lands back, we need justice and justice can mean a lot of things, but once sorry is said then things shouldn't be happening over and over and over again the same as yesterday. I know there's a lot of us mob there trying to get into the system and do stuff, but I think it's our next generation the new leaders coming on board that are really cross and angry, of why is it still going on. We don't want to be defeatist, but when you just can't take anymore, or when they've crushed you into the ground, that one too often time, some people do go down. But we're strong and we're survivors and I could have been dead about five or six times in my lifetime through my own self harm. Trying to get through things that have been enforced on me, things that have happened to me, how do you compensate for that. It was none of - at my wishes or my wants, and what can we do. If I had this one thing that I knew I could change that I could make the white government and us mob see that there's a way of going forward. Should I take it? If I saw this one particular space, or if you had this one particular thing that you knew that could open the door and unlock everything to our new destiny of where we can go and try and jigsaw the place back up again and us personally saw us all up and we all get back to families.
Or maybe we won't, maybe we choose not to because it's such a hard thing to do, and trying to get back to family. You can have all the counselling and have all the healing sessions and this that and the other, but it's like going to another world, another country all the time. I've been back about five or six times since I met my family, it's still very hard.

I've tried to put in my little bit of info and possibilities of things that could happen and I've got no space, no place, because I haven't been there in the line of discussion and family business. That's like a lock out to me, and I see it from a different perspective because I've been brought up in a different perspective and a different way of life. Sometimes that's not sometimes but a lot it's to my disadvantage, because I've grown up by myself without any support, without any mentors, just without and I've had to do it all by myself.

I feel really pissed off that I had to do that and I have to go back to family eventually, but I can't go back to family until this business here is fixed up with my children and myself in court. Yes it's still a long way to go and I've got this court case personally myself, my kids have had court case after court case since we've been here, the second year of us being here. I've had that shit in Western Australia, and you'd think from the capital of the territory of what once was the federal capital before being ACT, you know all that differentiation of things.

It's bloody harder than West Australia, trying to get through the truthfulness and the lies, and the injustice that's still being done. I stayed at that embassy a lot of times by myself doing the fire, and seen the sad people that come to that place to get healed, to smell that fire to be on that sacred place, where a lot of our emotions and tears and our wishes and our blood have been let on such
a big place, such a - it's like military force. It's bridged itself up all the time, it's like a mending, the amendment of legislation or constitution, you have to build it up, build it up until unfortunately there's nowhere to go except for you take away peoples human rights totally. This is what the intervention was about, what the sobering up stuff is, my kids have been on breathalyser tests for ages, why, the apology hasn't changed that. Apology hasn't changed them being locked up, the apology hasn't changed the lies from the police and the charges, it hasn't changed anything, it's still the same. I believe that I've got a little latch key myself that I can do something with and especially my court case I have to do it. But if you had that opportunity to do what you had - you know it's such a scary thing to do because you're thinking about the white mob, and you're thinking about the black mob and the things that could do to the whole of the sphere of Australia, because it would change things and people would get frightened. They picked the wrong person. I thought that I was just going to be maybe some easy person to - who's not going to fight anymore. But I've always taught my children you fight for what's right, you acknowledge what you've done wrong, even if it hurts, be responsible. But don't put up with the shit, don't put up with the lies, don't put up with authority trying to keep you down. Because once we do that, well we've lost. So people from here didn't know who I was because I had no family real connections and stuff like that, and it just caused a lot of problems. It caused problems for all of us and all three of us had police charges, we've had confrontations with people at the embassy, and I lost a lot of friends at the embassy. For politics, for the fortieth anniversary, yeah and the land, there's always this consequences of people taking over,
taking over that I saw myself as not taking over, I was
waiting for people to come because there was lots of
floods in Queensland that were happening and summits
were put off and times rearranged, and I was just waiting
for people to come. This is all part of the apology because
we're all trying to work things out, from all over Australia.
So I've never had a court case in my life, I mean as in a
big charge, it started off with commonwealth charges,
because the embassy and around there, they sort of
reinforced their status. But yeah 2011 they dropped some
of the commonwealth charges, so now I've got two
charges and from what I've read in history, I reckon I've
got some sort of a leeway to be able to do something. But
once again I'm doing it by myself because no one wants to
help, I can't really explain it to people, to where they'd
understand it.
So I may go into court and doing all these actions and
listening to the justice systems of this capital territory, I
just can't believe that they get away with what they're
doing. No one's questioning them, no one's really
questioning anything, they're just letting it go. I mean you
have your court cases but it's yeah. We're all run dry a bit
I think, I'm a bit tired, we've gone to the Australian human
rights, my sons or one of them, has learned a lot of stuff
about human rights and the indigenous rights.
You can learn anything and everything that you want, but
if you're still being suppressed and oppressed by a system
that keeps you oppressed and suppressed, especially by
the higher officials of this nation, and the agencies that
filter through to the legislators, and the house of reps and
the senate. We're never going to get through anything,
because even [redacted] doesn't do it right, through my
sons papers, not right.
They have a justice circle or sentencing circle here I think, it might do for other people but it doesn't do it for me. We need to keep defining, re working out, we need to have I don't know, more proper representatives, I don't - that person doesn't know me, I don't know her. Been put down, my sons been put down by this person, how do you get justice, and this is coming from our own mob. It's been going for a little while, but it's not going right. For me it's not going right, it might be going right for them and they're getting paid for it. Wouldn't it be interesting to pay all the prisoners and all the mums, doing all this fighting for justice.

Facilitator: We might - it sounds like a good place to end actually.
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I am [Name], Māori wahine. My dad is [Name], my mother is Pakeha. I don’t have a connection with my father due to my parents broke up - well I’ve always known them to be broken up. So there was me and there are three siblings, three younger brothers. We’re all Māori but I have two biological brothers and one half brother. So I had another Māori stepfather when I was around about seven. But my main interactions as a child were with my mother and her parents which were very English. So I grew up with a lot of subtle messages about Māori. For example I remember being a little girl next to my grandmother and they’d always the news. Then there was something on the news that some education for Māoris was coming or some funding for Māoris, and I remember my grandmother - I still remember this today - she was going don’t educate them. Then she started laughing. I remember laughing with her. So that’s just an example of my childhood messages that I got which I realise now had a big impact on me later on. Yeah because I loved my grandparents and when you’re little that’s all you know.
So I don’t know, I suppose I’ve always felt like something was wrong really. Because I had white mother, white grandparents, so therefore white ways. But yet I look very Māori when people look at me so it has been strange growing up actually. I’ve never been connected to Māori culture and just from the example I gave you of my childhood messages - that was just one of them - you can imagine I ended up not liking being a Māori actually at all. So I adapted very English ways when I was young. I would not even identify as Māori. I suppose yeah, I was a rebellious child at school. I was made a state ward around the age of 13, 14.

So I was put into what we call Miramar Girls Home here in Wellington. Then because of my colourful ways I was promoted and put into Auckland Girls Home for a longer period of time. Those experiences were very unique. Yeah, yeah it was actually - I got sentenced to nine and a half months when I was 14 years of age. I got sentenced to that just because I ran away from another home. So they decided to sentence me to another home but with just more security. So that was strange now that I’ve said that out loud. So that was the answer to it. It was very punitive and punished. I remember no aroha and I actually don’t even remember anyone saying to me you know what’s happening at home or what’s going on for you girl?

It was just if you played up in the home, you were put down in what was called secure which were like cells. You were just basically left there. So the more you played up, the more you were chucked in the cells. That was kind of their answer to everything. I didn't like being put in the cells so I just kept absconding, kept running away, hence I ended up in Auckland. Auckland I did three weeks and I took off. I took off with four others and ended
up - that was the beginning of my - start of my life into a lot of alcohol and drugs and a life of gangs and a life of shit really to be honest. There was no encouragement in these homes to identify with any culture, whether it was Pakeha or Māori. It was just basically all about control. You be good and you do as you're told and yeah, I don't remember any cultural encouragements at all for anything. Mind you, they would have been pushing shit uphill with me anyway. I wasn't interested in identifying as Māori and I didn't want to know about my Māori culture at all. I actually didn't like being Māori. I actually thought being Māori was - because of my western influences, I judged success materially. I looked at success and getting ahead as in - as westerners do - by how many cars you had or what you were wearing or the bling on your fingers or the house you had. Māoris had nothing. I didn't want to be like that. It was really weird. I didn't want to not have anything. I didn't want to be broke. So yeah, that was the lens that I judged people through for a lot of years. Yeah, what you had was material. I've only now realised, in the last say five years, how that is a really western concept and how that's changed for me over time. It's interesting though because I have four children that are of different iwi - Māori - and I have two Columbian boys. So I'll go back. When I was in Auckland I escaped from the home. I hooked up with a gang. Ended up with a life of alcohol and drugs for a lot of years. I was on the streets at 15 so of course it was all about survival. There was nothing about - and I've got to be honest, I didn't know who I was at all. Yeah, I didn't know who I was. I suppose I found my whole childhood and everything confusing really with these messages I got. But I just [unclear]. So for me, I also remember around
that time when I took off from the home and hooked up with a gang. I would be in pubs and that and people would say things like to me kia ora kare. Kare means friend in Māori and I remember saying fuck off that's not my name. Don't talk to me like that. I can laugh about it now. But yeah, just all this - yeah, it was really weird for me really. Anyway my A and D escalated, as it does with anyone that picks it up at a young age and wants to use it daily, become dependent.

I come to the attention of courts quite regularly. I remember my A and D got to such a stage that I had to be - and my children were taken off me because of my A and D. So that's the effect of me not having an identity or having a whanau or support as well. I got put into a place called Hanmer Springs. As I said, I didn't like being a Māori and I didn't identify as being Māori but I look like Māori. So when I got into this rehab, of course I needed a Māori program and I would be fine. Well I tell you that did my fucking head in because my whole world was my Pakeha ways I'd been brought up. So all of a sudden they want me to dry out and I'm stuck in a fucking marae. I remember it so well. It was terrible. I lasted a week and a half and I got kicked out because I just couldn't handle it. Because I didn't know any of the concepts. They wanted me to do karakia, waiata. I can laugh about this now but at this time it was deadly serious for me because this is how disconnected I was. I remember they wanted me to do waiata which is singing songs and swinging a poi for an hour a day and I said to them look, stick me over on that Pakeha side, that's where I need to be. They're not swinging pois and singing songs. I don't need to do this shit and what has it got to do with my Valium addiction? So I was really in conflict with myself.
This happened to me for a lot of years actually - that because I looked Māori I needed Māori stuff. I was really, really resistant to it because I didn't know any of the ways. I'd never grown up with it. So it was like what are you doing to me? That was hard. The more Māori stuff that tended to get pushed on me, the more I didn't like it. I didn't want it. Yeah, so anyway my A and D went on for a hell of a long time. I only cleaned up in 2005. That's because my child was taken off me at birth due to my colourful ways. That kind of kicked me in the head really. I thought well I need to do something different. So due to that, I cleaned up.

I found myself on a New Options for Women course. I then went and did a degree in alcohol and drugs. I am now a registered A and D clinician and for the first time in my life - I am 46 - I have just finished a certificate in Te Arataki Manu Korero. So that is big where I'm at now. I'm enrolled for next year for Te Reo. I've got to be honest, I still - and this is the first time I've - in a Kaupapa Māori agency and I've been here for a week. But this is fucking huge stuff for me actually. Excuse my language but it's actually huge that I'm finally at a place where I'm not totally comfortable but I'm willing to learn and I'm wanting to learn about my culture.

I'm actually learning that the impact of the childhood messages had on me from my loving grandparents, became so ingrained that it was detrimental really to my - I didn't have a culture and I felt like what we referred to as an onion. I was brown on the outside but white on the inside. To be honest, today, I still don't totally - because I'm learning my language and my tikanga - my protocol and my ways - which I find very difficult at times. Actually, most of the time. So I don't feel like I totally fit in the Māori world and I don't fit totally in the Pakeha world because of
how I look. So yeah, that's me being honest and that's still today.

Now that I've been clean for seven, eight years, I'm now finding that I'm actually - the Māori way is more me. I love the - yeah, it feels warmer. I'm just getting attracted more to it. The ripple effect that this has had, none of my children - I have six children - none of them identify as Māori. I have two grandchildren in Australia and this is I think as me as a [unclear] and as grandmother, it's my responsibility to get. Hence this has also motivated me to get educated about my culture because I can clearly see that it is lost in my whanua. Due to no fault of our own. But yeah, I feel it's my responsibility to learn it. I tell you, it's not easy. It's not easy.

I kind of get a bit pissed because it should be. But it's not coming easy at all. I get frustrated with it. I can't pronounce the language. I think that's sad on its own actually because I am Māori. A lot of it feels really new and uncomfortable. But I'm up for the challenge because of my mokos. I don't want them to go through this. It's taken me a long time to - like this last year is the first time I've managed to do my pepeha. A pepeha is where Māori introduce themselves. This is the first year that I actually can introduce myself in Māori and it actually feels good. I'm finally feeling I want to learn the language and I'm also getting a pull that I need to go back to where I'm from to have a connection there as well.

I feel like this is a huge journey. I just want to take it slowly. I don't want to get overwhelmed with it because I'm learning a lot of new stuff and it can be overwhelming. I suppose I feel a little bit of shame too that the fact that I never wanted to identify as Māori as well. I think that would be natural. Yeah, I've now - the lens that I had of looking at success with it having to be bling or cars or a
The house has actually changed for me now. I actually realise how rich indigenous cultures are. This is only new for me too over the last couple of years. I actually realise how rich I am now because I have a mountain, I have a river, and I have a place where I come from. But our culture is so beautiful with the waiata and the weaving and the pounamu. Yeah so I'm seeing - I'm losing that western material lens that I measured as success. Because I now believe that Māori people are rich with their culture. It's beautiful. I'm really looking excited to the day that I can - I'm giving myself five years - that I can fluently have a conversation in Te Reo, in Māori, and I'm looking forward to that day. Yeah, it's going to be a good day.

Facilitator: That is a beautiful story.
Interviewee: Thank you.
Facilitator: We'll turn that off.
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Facilitator: And we’re off and running.
Interviewee: Okay, my name is [redacted] and I was born in [redacted], Ontario, [redacted]. I was brought up in Missinaibi which is where all of our people lived at that time. It was like a little village there with mostly all native people there at that time of the year - the century I should say or whatever - and that's where they took me back after I was born. I grew up there until I was five years old and I went to the little public school there that had a kindergarten at that time, or kind of a craft thing. I don't think it was called kindergarten but it was kind of a place where we went as little children and to learn colouring and all of you know, the million minute things that a child has to learn.
I was there until - I was about five years old I guess - and then we moved to [redacted] and we moved down the river in [redacted], it was about I'd say about three kilometres from the town. I had to walk, we had to walk in the early - no later spring - because in the early spring it would be too much water in the bush that we'd have to walk through so we'd have to wait until it dried up a little bit so. My brother
and I went to the school - the public school - in town and I went there maybe for about, oh I'd say about a few months in the summer until school was over yeah, you know, they closed the school for July to August and then I went back.
I stayed home and I lived - my grandmother and grandfather lived down the reserve. They had one house and I had - we had another and I was mostly over to my grandfather and grandmothers place all the time. My younger siblings were, were really younger than me and I had to help my mum with looking after them because my dad was in, in the world war. He was in World War 2 - I mean one and two - so he was a really army man and he was away from home quite a bit too until they got furlough or when they could come home. I was over to grandfathers and grandmothers all, mostly all the time when I wasn't taking care of my siblings.
They took me hunting with them, like in the fall. I used to go hunting with them and trapping, they used to have a cabin, a few down the track. Like we'd had a railroad to go on at that time - CPR Railroad and we would take - jump on the train and get off at their trapping grounds or hunting grounds, wherever you know. It was beautiful there and I remember - it still sticks in my mind that time we went - we went to trap. It was like, it was in - near Christmas time and we stayed there for Christ - we were there for Christmas but I remember going and they had the dog team. They put the dog team in the baggage car with the sleigh and all their possessions that they took when they went trapping.
So they set up the dog team and everything and when we went oh, it was just so beautiful. I just remember them going along the lake, along the shore you know, and you could hear the wolves in the background howling. It was
really - probably had just snowed maybe -because the moon was out full and I could see just the snow shining, you know like when the moon's shining on it and you could hear the crunch of the snow where the dogs were running you know. We were all tucked in the sleigh, all warm and everything [laughs], we were cosy. Because my grandmother made rabbit skin blankets and we all had a rabbit skin blanket so that was all tucked around us and we were pretty warm in there. My grandfather ran behind our sleigh and took care of that so, anyways we got to the cabin there and we were all tired so we just went to bed [laughs]. Then the next morning we - I went with my grandfather to look at the traps and he said I could have a little trap that I could have myself that if anything was caught in there I could have that, and it was a little weasel trap [laughs]. I must have had about - maybe after the season - I must have had about six little weasels that were mine ay, so he probably took them over to the - when he had his first take-in to the store and so - but that was one episode there that I went with my grandparents.

And I used to go fishing with them in the fall. Like we used to have to fish in the - when it was getting really cold, like cold days in the fall so we'd have to put our fish up in ah, in big wooden barrels. We'd salt them up and that was for winter and that would eventually freeze in there and that was some of our food for winter besides having rabbits. This was a - this is just a very vague [unclear] of I went through when I was with my grandparents and how I knew about my culture before I went to the school, because when I went to school we didn't have anything like that you know.

Facilitator: Yeah.
Interviewee: We couldn't even think about you know, couldn't talk about anything like that to or other, because in school here - all I can say here but in [redacted] where I went to school for six years, here I went to school for four and my last grade here was Grade 8. Kind of sad that one our teachers - my last grade here - was 86 years old and that, that just goes to show what kind of teachers we had, what kind of quality. Because she used to fall asleep on us [laughs] in the class and that was our classroom. I think it's down over there on that side or the one, two, two storeys there - that was our classroom - that was my Grade 8 girl's classroom. Yep.

So anyways, this is really like my friend Claudette, she got me - I'm the elder for here for the - I've been working with the archives there for maybe two years now. But I was the Elder in Residence here at the university maybe about six years before that. I used to have come here and teach some of the culture to the students, there was a few of them there. There was just a few of them here then and we had a trailer way back in the back [laughs] it was way in the back and it was just like cold in there in the winter. And I had - then it was winter time when I had to come here from [redacted] - I was living in [redacted] and I never missed one - it was every second week I had to come and I never missed one you know. I came anyway and it was storming sometimes and I just, I had a truck [laughs] which is good, which is really - I was really thankful for that truck and I just said I would - and I was by myself and I just set out on the highway to come here to the [zoo] and do my job that I had. I really liked my job that I had then, and now because right now I'm the elder there for the, for the archives and Shingwauk School - Residential School Services.
I don't know how many - I didn't keep a record of how many groups of people I have talked to since I've been here but it was quite a few and like I said - like I tell everyone that I don't write anything down because it's all in here [gestures] it all comes out here you know [gestures] from here. What we went through here was, was terrible. I myself went through a very bad time here yep. I nearly died here in this school. And it still - and I was - I was 15 years old, I was still a child as they would say in - by the government rules and regulations and everything you know, and I had very bad appendicitis and they never got a doctor for me, and they never took me to a doctor.

They gave me - they thought I was constipated so they gave me laxatives, which is very bad. I know now that it was very bad what they gave me and they shouldn't have you know. Because our supervisor, Head Matron of the School, she was supposed to be an RN - a registered nurse - and she used to be all dressed in white, all white; her uniform, her stockings, her shoes, her hat and everything but in the end she gave me that laxative for appendicitis. And [redacted] her brother was here about - when [redacted] was a young girl - he was on that side and he had the same thing and they never did nothing for him and he died. Yep.

So it just, it just goes to show you what kind of people we had here. I mean I can't say all of them were like that but most of them were, in these schools. There is 147 schools in here, in Canada, maybe not counting the little schools or offside, like you know, off the side of a reserve or something like that. But the majority of the big schools, 147 of them yeah. It wasn't very good quality supervision but some people were - some supervisors were genuine and some weren't - some were very bad and what we - we
had to go through hunger and mentality, emotional, oh what do you call it? Abuse, well I'll - you know, I'll say that abuse.

Facilitator: Yeah.

Interviewee: We had to go through mental, emotional, physical and physical hunger - that was the worst - being hungry. You know after children play outside like - like today we'd have to get on our clothes and go for a work to a park - to Bellevue Park up here

Facilitator: Oh, yep.

Interviewee: Yeah, and walk two by two on the road, even though the road was all full of snow of everything, we had to go. But one thing I was [laughs] that I was really thankful for that I knew that the supervisor had to come with us and she had to go through that too you know.

[Laughter]

Interviewee: And the things we - I remember having mitts which the WA Women's Leagues - at that time had they had a WA Women's League - and they used to knit, knit socks and knit mitts for school - the residential schools. They used to bring a big box every winter and we used to go pick our mitts if we want and I picked these mitts you know - they're nice and long and everything. They last for a while but after a while they got wet and then you had to bring them inside and dry them you know, beside the radiator. Put them there, all the mitts in a line beside the radiators and eventually the mitts was down like that [gestures] and half of your hand was [laughs] half of your hand was suffering the cold and it would get - oh I would remember mine all chapped and bleeding all here. Eventually our mitts wouldn't even be keeping our hands warm. They didn't last very long so for the rest of the winter we were all without mitts you know, because you only got one pair of mitts for the whole season. They have
a picture of me in the archives there, I was - we had to do - we had to work half a day and then half a day at school. We worked in the dairy, in the bakery, in the kitchen, in the dining room, in the sewing room, did I say dairy? Yeah dairy yeah, and we had to work - help with the putting the kids to bed - the bigger girls.

Anyway, so we had chores to do you know that would - and because we never got that quality of education because we had to work in these places. In the laundry and ironing and mending and that's where they have a picture of me mending a good big tub of socks you know. And that's not only the things we had to mend, we had to mend overalls, underwear, shirts, aprons, dresses, the whole works. And we had to - in Chapleau we had to - we had umpteen lines across a great big veranda thing - like up on the second storey - and that's lines, we had to put lines and lines of clothes out, even in the winter. Oh that was terrible but that's what we had to do.

And it was - yeah we lived by the bell. We lived by the bell and everything was by the bell. You got up in the morning by the bell, you went to breakfast by the bell, and then went to service like in our auditorium here and the chapel.

We had to - after breakfast we had to go up and have a hymn and a scripture read and then a prayer, and then we left for the day. That was every day, every day, Sunday and on Sunday we had to go to Sunday school and then we had to go to morning service and then evening service. So it was a lot of - a lot of church you know, things.

But we were - we worked pretty hard - even the little kids had to do sweeping and mopping floors which is very, very bad in a way I think, for a child to be that way but I can honestly say that my childhood ended when I was six and a half years when they brought me here, here to the - in Chapleau to the school. I spent six years there at
Chapleau and that was really bad. But what - what other part we had to look forward to was in July and August we could go home if we had a home to go to, because a lot of children didn't have a home and so they had to stay in the school all year.

Some of them never went home until 16 or until they were - you couldn't say in the school after you were 16 - so you had to go home somewhere you know. One person I know of had went home - had never gone home - and when he had gone home his mother came to the door and they knocked on the door and she come to the door and she says - she didn't know them. Who are you? And that was something for these two people; you know my mother didn't even know me. Oh, that must have been really, I don't know - I don't know what I would have done.

Facilitator: It's tough isn't it, that one?
Interviewee: Huh?
Facilitator: That one's tough isn't it?
Interviewee: Yeah, yeah. I know I never used to see my mother sometimes, all year. Like when I was in Chapleau she used to come maybe once every two months because she had to come from down the river and then walk from the tracks up to the school which was quite away away. We used to be all happy because on the girls side there was my sister and me and Alice and Shirley, there was three of us on the girl's side. On the boys side was - and we would only see our brothers about once a month for maybe a half an hour, even though we were in the same school we couldn't have no family relations. Or I mean family get togethers or anything like - I think the only time where we had a really - concert or something like that at Christmas time but we still couldn't sit with our brothers. They had to - like all the boys had to sit on that
side and the girls have to sit on that side there. They were distinctly kept apart.

Facilitator: Hmm.
Interviewee: And the boys had to work in the undergrounds like, then we had - they had farm, they had cows and they had pigs and they had chickens and they planted. We have that little portfolio book there, you can see the - where this place was here and then all in the back there was a garden. All in the back over here where all those buildings are, there was just bush and that’s where we had gardens. We had potatoes back there and everything and all the kids in the - in the fall went out to pick that, to pick those - produce up from the garden.

There was potatoes, carrots, cabbage and then we all put them in the crocus bags - you know the big brown bags [laughs] - we all put them and stacked them up and then the weighers would come and take them back to the barn or wherever they put them over there, in the cellars. But that's what the boys did and they had to go and wood - go and get wood - and they had to go and get wood and the principal or whatever, he sold the wood. He sold the wood to people like in town and the same thing in Chapleau you know, all those young boys would have to go and cut wood, take turns going to cut wood and they used to sell it to the people in town.

They’d have to cut wood for the school too because they had - because down here was - down there in the big hallway down there and that door down there, that was the furnace room and that’s where the boys used to get punished. That was really bad.

Facilitator: Yep.
Interviewee: Because that furnace used to make a lot of noise you know, and they couldn't really call out for help or anything. Yep. When I talked to adult groups I say everything.
Interviewee: But when I talk to the little ones, which I talk to - I talk to a lot of them, little children from four to - from Grade 4 to 5, 6 and then from 6 to 8, 9 or - and they've come here, they've come here to the auditorium and I've gone up there with Michael and Claudette and tell them what the schools were about. A lot of people didn't know that the school was here and what was inside, and I remember seeing people going by but I wouldn't see very much stopping and coming in here. But once in a while they used to take us - take us out.

One time we went to see the Ice Capades, every year or once a year when the Ice Capades came to town and we always walked in the line you know, two by two. But you'd see everybody walking and everybody looking, you know wondering, wondering why and some were scornful looks, some were - were just looking for curiosity I guess, curiosity's sake, you know. But when I went out to work I looked after my siblings for a while at my aunt's farm out here on the Fourth Line. I looked after them and helped her with her housework and all that because she was an older woman and we were staying there.

Like me and Alice and Shirley and my younger brother - youngest in the family - there was four of us. So I had to cook for them and make sure their clothes were clean and took care of them while they were at school there. I couldn't leave home until I was 21, I tried but [laughs] I was called back and if you don't go back home, back to Aunt Alice's then you're going to, you know, you're going into [unclear] send you away to detention. [Laughs] So, I was - well, I never answered my mother back - you didn't dare, didn't dare. So I was thinking well, I'm in detention already; I was in detention anyway.
Anyways I left, when I was 21 I left, went out to the world - I was very confused but I knew I had to go sometime and look for a job you know. Went to the restaurants and got a job finally in this little rest - this Italian little restaurant downtown. I didn't stay there very long because I was really - I didn't have no confidence in myself - all my confidence probably didn't exist but I knew that if I don't get a job where am I going to stay, what am I going to do? I hunted around and hunted around and some places I wouldn't take no for an answer [laughs].

Oh I can do this, I can do that and I never thought about me going to school here and learning all these trades you know. Like I could have told them I know how to work in a dairy, I know how to bake, I know how to sew, I know how to clean and I really clean, you want to test me [laughs]? So anyway I really went out into the world and I knew that I had to work because I wanted to eat and I wanted to have a place where I could stay, you know even if it was a little room and where I could cook for myself.

I worked at - in quite a few - I worked in quite a few hospitals and nursing homes and I found that you really have to stick up for yourself because there's nobody out there that's going to come along and say to you well Fran, don't worry about, I'll go and see what I can do you know. You have to do for yourself and it took really resilience and oh I don't know, it was bear ah - what do you call it? Bear knowhow or - strength you know - the strength to go on, the strength to survive. I guess that's what clicked [laughs] clicked in in me you know, the thing to survive you know; so yeah.

And I'm proud to call myself Shingwauk resident - I mean the Indian Residential School Survivor and as far as Stephen Harper's apology, I do not think it was his apology. No. Somebody else wrote that. We wanted
something from somebody in his position to apologise. We don't want nothing that's been thought about and thought about and oh no, you take that word out and put this word in and - no, uh-uh you know, you speak from here [gestures]. He would have been better to just not read anything off the paper and say well, here it is you know. Because that's what I believe in; you face somebody and when I talk to anybody I like to face them, I like to talk to them you know, instead of on the phone or on the thing you know.

But that's the way I feel about things like being apologised, and being apologised and being apologetic, you have to follow up with good deeds, good deeds. Like if I hurt somebody and I apologise I have to go and up - not just apologise to them that day, but follow up and say anything I can do for you? Or here, here's a loaf of bread, here's some cookies or would you like to come shopping with me, I'll take you shopping you know. Its little things like that that have to be followed up on an apology.

Facilitator: Yep.
Interviewee: It's just not - say okay I'm sorry and that's it and forget about it.
Facilitator: Yes.
Interviewee: That's what I thought was wrong with his apology. Yeah, and I won't accept it until somebody comes up with something. To me he hasn't apologised.
Facilitator: Hmm.
Interviewee: So that's my - I couldn't say in a lump sum but that's as far as I could say today.
Facilitator: Okay, well thank you for that.
Interviewee: Yeah.
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<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

394
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P11</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>