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PART III: ASSIMILATION
In 1979, Peter Read asked Leonie Simpson, a twenty-four year old Aboriginal woman from Cowra, 'What did you make of the Assimilation Policy?' Simpson replied:

I think it's a load of crap. If the Aboriginals want to live in their tribal ways, they should. I don't think they should be forced into the white community, and be forced to do something they don't want to do. If they want to move into town and still have their old ways, well good luck to them.¹

Assimilation was the stated objective of the federal government from 1951 to 1972 when it was replaced by a policy of self-determination.² It was, therefore, appropriate for Read to pose his question in the past tense; to ask what Simpson had thought of assimilation. For Simpson, however, assimilation was an ongoing concern. Born in 1955, Simpson grew up during the high-point of assimilationist thinking in Australia and, by the late 1970s, had witnessed no end to its influence over her people.

An inability to agree on basic questions such as when the assimilation policy began in Australia, when it ended and whether, in fact, it has ended, is emblematic of the contested nature of assimilation, and its study, today.³ Driving academic interest and debate are disputes over what assimilation means now, and had meant in the past. Under review is the issue of goals and anticipated futures. What was the assimilated Aboriginal supposed to look like, think like, act like? How was this to be achieved and at what cost to Aboriginal culture and identity? Who supported assimilation and why? Who opposed it and why? Did the assimilation policy have any positive outcomes or redeeming features? However, that such questions are even asked leaves many Aboriginal people incredulous. To them, assimilation is a word whose meaning is born on the bodies and worn in the hearts and minds of those who suffered, and continue to suffer, as a consequence of its implementation. Held responsible for generations of 'stolen children' and for the loss of Aboriginal culture and identity, assimilation meant, and continues to mean, extinction to

many Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and is sometimes referred to as a policy of genocide.\(^4\)

Derived from the Latin *assimilare* (to liken), the word assimilation has been in the English language since the early seventeenth century. Most commonly used to denote the action of making or becoming like, from the mid seventeenth century assimilation was also used to describe the physical conversion, usually by an animal or plant, of extraneous materials into fluids and materials identical with its own. In the mid nineteenth century assimilation came to be associated with learning and interpretation and was first used to denote racial and/or cultural integration in the early twentieth century.\(^5\) During the 1950s and 1960s in Australia, 'the term assimilation ... [had] many meanings'.\(^6\) Writing in the late 1960s, Charles Rowley described Australia's 'nebulous "assimilation" goal' as a 'vaguely defined' objective that sponsored multiple interpretations.\(^7\) In its most benign form assimilation promised 'no more than a general equality', according to Rowley, but at its most extreme it predicated 'the disappearance of the Aboriginal'; the extreme assimilationist position involved 'the complete loss of Aboriginal identity, with the consequent disappearance of the "problem" population'.\(^8\) In Rowley's view, much of the criticism of the assimilation policy was (and is) criticism of the extreme position, a position that Rowley saw as a legacy of the time in Australia's history when 'assimilation meant genetic absorption'.\(^9\) Now a contested and controversial concept, assimilation in the early twenty-first century eludes consensual definition.

This introduction seeks to contextualise Charles Duguid's support for Paul Hasluck's policy of assimilation. In explaining why Duguid supported assimilation, it serves as a prelude to chapters five and six which examine how Duguid's support for assimilation was realised during the 1950s and 1960s in Australia.

**Enter Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories**

To Charles Duguid, Paul Hasluck's advent to the role of Minister for the Territories in May 1951, and his subsequent espousal of assimilation as the aim of government policy in the Northern Territory, represented a chance for real improvement—a chance that we have

---

\(^4\) Ideas and impressions gleaned from conference 'Assimilation: Then and Now', a two day forum at the University of Sydney, 30 November and 1 December 2000. See also John Moriarty, *Saltwater Fella*, Viking, Ringwood (Vic), 2000, pp. 6-7. In Moriarty's view, 'the assimilation policy ... was an insidious, arrogant policy that amounted to cultural genocide. It was the stuff Hitler was made of, the things he espoused that are seen as abhorrent today'. Moriarty's view is discussed in chapter six.


never had before'.

Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, Duguid had worried over government's apparent indifference, even antipathy, towards Aborigines, regularly drawing attention to what he perceived as the federal government's disinclination to 'preserve the race'. In 1945, Duguid called for a 'revolution' in thinking 'so that all future legislation for natives [would] aim at leading them to full citizenship'. Repeating his call for 'drastic change' in 1949, Duguid described 'the present federal administration [as] ... unfitted for the task', it being 'out of sympathy with the Aborigines'. In 1950, in a statement prepared for the United Nations Association of Australia, Duguid argued that 'No Federal Government has ever yet carried out a policy for the welfare of the Aborigines with enthusiasm. A start is usually made with each new deal but as a rule little more happens'. Less than a year later, with Hasluck's appointment to the new Department of the Territories, Duguid believed that the 'revolution' he had been calling for had finally arrived.

Despite having been in federal politics less than two years at the time of his cabinet appointment, Hasluck had more than proved himself worthy in Duguid's eyes. In June 1950, just six months after his election as the Liberal member for the Perth electorate of Curtin, Hasluck delivered a speech in the House of Representatives which Duguid felt echoed his own words from a decade earlier (see chapter four). Interviewed by the Adelaide News the day after Hasluck's speech, Duguid said: 'It is a grand thing that at long last we have someone in Federal Parliament willing to point out the utter inconsistency between our national and international policy on human rights'. Even as a back-bencher, Hasluck had given Duguid and other like-minded campaigners hope. Here was someone in authority who seemed prepared to learn from the 'lessons of the past', acknowledge the failings of past administrations and speak the shocking truth about the conditions under which Aborigines lived. Speaking at the inaugural meeting of the Council for Aboriginal Rights (CAR) in Melbourne in June 1951, Duguid declared:

And Hasluck said this in the House just a year ago in June: 'When we enter into international discussions, and raise our voice as we should raise it in defence of human rights and the protection of human welfare, our very words

---


Duguid to editor, Advertiser, 18 February 1949, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 2, p. 147.

Duguid to general secretary, United Nations Association of Australia, 30 June 1950, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.

'The Nebulous "Assimilation" Goal'
are mocked by the thousands of degraded and depressed people who crouch
on rubbish heaps throughout the whole of this continent'.

In Duguid's opinion, this statement alone proved Hasluck's commitment to the Aboriginal
cause: 'Has any man', he asked, 'ever said anything more drastic in Australia?' Duguid
urged all who were interested in Aboriginal affairs 'to come in in strong support of that
man'—Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories.

Writing to congratulate Hasluck on his cabinet appointment in May 1951, Duguid
saw fit to 'congratulate too the Northern Territory on having [him] as Minister', for unlike
the legion of past Ministers responsible for Aboriginal welfare, Hasluck's interest in
Aboriginal affairs was not the result of his cabinet appointment, but the cause of it. Prior
to entering politics, Hasluck had investigated the living conditions of Aborigines in
Western Australia, and had published an historical study *Black Australians: A survey of
native policy in Western Australia 1829-1897* in 1942. After the war, Hasluck worked for
the Department of External Affairs. He assisted in formulating the Charter of United
Nations and planning the first meeting of the United Nations Assembly in Geneva, an
experience which alerted him to the vital importance of Australia's international
reputation.

Jeremy Long, a patrol officer in the Northern Territory during Hasluck's
time, has argued that:

None of [Hasluck's] predecessors in the forty years since the Commonwealth
assumed responsibility for the Northern Territory had come to the job as well
qualified to direct the Administration in its dealings with the Aboriginal
inhabitants of the Territory.

More than Hasluck's experience, however, it was his ideas (or more precisely, the apparent
similarity between Hasluck's 'fine words' and Duguid's own) that led Duguid to predict 'a
very great improvement in Aboriginal affairs in the [Northern] Territory' under Hasluck's
leadership. It would have given Duguid great pleasure to learn that Hasluck had 'of
course, been familiar for many years with [his] efforts on behalf of Aborigines and [had]
read [his] booklet *The Future of the Aborigines of Australia*.

---

16 Duguid, CAR Speech. See also Paul Hasluck, *Native Welfare in Australia*, Paterson Brokensha,
17 Duguid, CAR Speech.
18 Duguid to Hasluck, Minister for the Territories, 23 May 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
20 Jeremy Long, *The Go Betweens: Patrol Officers in Aboriginal Affairs Administration in the
Northern Territory 1936-74*, North Australian Research Unit, Australian National University,
Canberra, 1992, p. 95.
21 Duguid, CAR Speech; Duguid, 'comments on resolution that control of Aborigines be handed to
the Commonwealth', 20 April 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
22 Hasluck to Duguid, 12 June 1950, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
With the object of bringing about closer Commonwealth and state co-operation, Hasluck invited the various Ministers responsible for Aborigines to attend a Native Welfare Conference in Canberra at the beginning of September 1951. The Conference agreed that assimilation would henceforth be 'the objective of native welfare measures' throughout Australia. Assimilation meant, Hasluck explained, 'that, in the course of time, it is expected that all persons of Aboriginal blood or mixed blood in Australia will live like white Australians do'; it meant that the old idea of 'protection' had finally yielded to the new idea of 'advancement' and that Aborigines would 'eventually find a fitting place as members of the Australian community'.

Described by Hasluck as a 'distinctively Australian' policy which would give Aborigines a 'fair go' in the 'land of opportunity', most white Australians favoured assimilation, as did many Aborigines. It was an idealistic policy which promised all Australians 'the chance of a happy and useful life' in a society without 'minorities or special classes', but it was also a 'realistic' one which acknowledged 'the stark fact that large numbers' of Aborigines were not yet capable of entering the general community at an acceptable level or of maintaining themselves in it. Thus, while Hasluck 'declare[d] the same ideal for all'—namely a place for Aborigines in Australian society alongside whites—assimilation was to be a 'policy of opportunity' which recognised the 'claims of the Aboriginal as an individual'. Unlike segregation—the only alternative policy Hasluck considered and rejected on the grounds that 'it would result in the very situation in Australia which we [had] always sought to avoid, namely, the existence of a separate racial group living on its own'—assimilation gave to 'the Aboriginal and to the person of mixed blood a chance to shape his own life'. Whereas segregation opened 'the door into a peculiar and separate world for coloured people only', assimilation opened the door 'into the society in which, by force of history, [Aborigines were] bound to live', Australian society.

On 6 September 1951, just two days after the Native Welfare Conference had concluded, Hasluck forwarded the full text of the statements agreed to at the Conference to Duguid for comment. In reply, Duguid indicated that almost everything had 'been repeatedly advocated by [him]' for years. The Conference's statement on health was 'exactly what [he had] said' in 1941, Duguid observed, as were the statements on citizenship, social services, education and missions, the latter having been 'advocated by [him] since 1935'. In fact, Duguid found 'the decisions of the Conference [to be] so much in line with what [he had] said and written over the years' that he applauded Hasluck's 'leadership in the matter'. It was not just Hasluck's leadership that Duguid was applauding, however, it was also his own. Duguid believed that Hasluck's assimilation
policy was precisely what he had been fighting for since the mid 1930s: it was 'advancement', 'development' and 'uplift' under a different name. It signalled official recognition that Aborigines were capable of 'rising in the human scale', and meant that Aborigines would finally receive the assistance they required during their 'transition to our way of life'. Duguid was convinced that if Hasluck failed to 'clean up the mess in the Northern Territory' it would only be because cabinet and the people of Australia failed to support him.27

The basis of Duguid's support for Hasluck was two-fold. On the one hand there was Hasluck 'the man' or 'the politician' whose 'keen interest ... in the welfare of the natives' Duguid found both impressive and refreshing; on the other hand, there was Hasluck's assimilation policy, a policy that Duguid believed was identical to his own.28 Intricately intertwined in Duguid's mind, Hasluck and his assimilation policy became one.

To support Hasluck was to support assimilation; to find fault with assimilation was to find fault with Hasluck, and by implication, with himself.

'Assimilation is not absorption'

J.J. Barton, a shop-keeper in the Northern Territory and regular correspondent of Duguid's, was not convinced about assimilation. Shortly after the Native Welfare Conference in 1951, Barton asked Duguid what he thought of 'Hasluck's idea of assimilation'. Expressing his opinion that 'a better word' for assimilation 'would be extermination', Barton maintained that the solution to the 'Aboriginal problem' was 'simple': 'segregation of the tribal natives and co-operative production for the detribalised, without exploitation'.29 At the same time Duguid received a letter from Gordon Sweeny, a patrol

---

28 See Minutes of the Aborigines Advancement League of South Australia, 16 November 1951, Papers of the Aborigines Advancement League, State Library of South Australia, Mortlock Collection, SRG 250, Series 3/1.
29 J.J. Barton to Duguid, 21 November 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1. Barton's view mirrored that of Tom Wright, secretary of the Sheet Metal Workers Union, vice-president of the Labor Council of New South Wales and leading member of the Communist Party of Australia. In a powerfully worded letter to the newly formed Council for Aboriginal Rights (CAR) in Melbourne, Wright condemned the 'pseudo-progressive cloak' of assimilation for hiding the real intentions of government. Rather than a new policy, Wright argued that assimilation was 'the continuation of the policy of all previous administrations and [meant] the extermination of the Australian Native Race' through 'the destruction of tribal life, employment as wage earners, and "gradual" elevation of the individual Aborigines to "citizenship"'. To prevent extermination, Wright maintained that 'a policy must be advanced not of "assimilation" but of a future for the Aborigines as a race of people similar to that of national minorities in other countries'. As Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus have observed, however, 'Wright's strictures, like those of other critics of assimilation at this time, only applied to what were called 'tribal' or 'full-blood' Aborigines'. According to Attwood and Markus, 'practically everyone', including Wright, believed that the future of Aborigines of mixed-descent lay with social assimilation. Tom Wright to Henry Wardlaw, honorary secretary CAR, 20 September 1951, CAR Papers, State Library of Victoria, La Trobe Collection, MS 12913, Box 1, Series 1/1; Attwood and Markus, Research Essay in Aboriginal Studies, Museum of Victoria, Department of Indigenous Studies, Draft Copy, 1996, p. 51. See also Sue Taffe, 'The Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders. The politics of inter-racial coalition in Australia, 1958-1973', PhD Thesis, School of Historical Studies, Monash University, 2001, p. 35.
officer with the Northern Territory Department of Native Affairs, informing him that "Assimilation" [was] yet to be worked out. As Sweeny understood it, 'the policy envisaged [was] economic and social assimilation, not racial assimilation', but he warned Duguid that it would only work if the departments concerned, such as Health, Education and Housing, recognised that 'they [were] dealing with Aborigines and not whites'. In August 1952, Sweeny wrote again, this time informing Duguid that 'Assimilation [was] interpreted to be the bringing of the Aboriginal to [a] white level economically, socially and culturally as soon as possible and removing restraints and protection such as reserves etc.' Reflecting on the practical workings of assimilation in the Northern Territory, Sweeny argued that:

*It is overlooked that the only safe assimilation is that based on stable family and social life and the detribalised native at the mercy of a competitive economic society has little hope of survival, even with our idea of white 'education' we can expect to have a few isolated cases of advancement who will pass on with no follow up from their people.*

Although Duguid considered Barton a 'reliable man', he did not agree with his views on assimilation. Sweeny, on the other hand, had a point. At the top of Sweeny's second letter, Duguid wrote in bold script 'KEEP'.

Following Sweeny, what criticisms Duguid made of the assimilation policy were criticisms of the way it was being carried out, not of the ideal: that 'the Aborigines [were] to become one with us', Duguid had no doubt. Other campaigners, white and black, did have doubts however, and from the mid 1950s the policy of assimilation came under increasing attack. In Victoria, Anna Vroland led the charge, arguing in 1955 that it was 'terribly important that assimilation should not in fact mean destruction'. Influenced by the anthropologist Donald Thomson who, in the same year, pronounced assimilation an 'absolute failure', Vroland decried the 'cruelty and uselessness' of a scheme that was more intent on 'trying to scrub [the] black man white' than helping Aborigines to be independent in their own right. Having spent more than a decade trying to help Aborigines of mixed-

---

31 Sweeny to Duguid, 21 August 1952, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1 (emphasis added).
32 Of Barton, Duguid wrote: 'Barton I knew first in 1934 in Alice Springs and I have met him on several occasions since. As far as I know he is a reliable man. He frequently writes to me on Aborigines'. Duguid to Hasluck, 30 October 1952, National Archives of Australia, Series A452/1, Item 1957/2566.
34 Anna Vroland to Chairman, Victorian Council for Social Services, 24 November 1955, Anton Vroland Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 3991 (hereafter Vroland Papers), Box 3, Folder 21.
descent in Victoria attain a standard of living on par with white Australians, Vroland came to the conclusion that 'social acceptance by their own people still [meant] more to most [Aborigines] than [did] assimilation into the general community'. In 1957, the Western Australian campaigner, Mary Bennett joined the fray, arguing for 'integration' not 'assimilation' in her book *Human Rights for Australian Aborigines*. Following Bennett, the Aboriginal leader Douglas Nicholls argued that 'Aboriginals wanted integration, not assimilation'. 'We want to integrate, but we want to identify ourselves as a people', Nicholls declared; 'we are fighting to keep ourselves as a people'.

Hasluck had no time for such 'jargon'. In a paper presented to the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science in 1958, Hasluck criticised those who used the 'term "integration" as though it had some special value'. Having detected in it 'an idea of preserving something of the separate cultural identity of the two races', Hasluck questioned whether this was 'anything more than a romantic notion'. The likely reality, according to Hasluck, was that 'the Aboriginal people [would disappear] as a separate racial group'. They might 'carry a proud memory of their own ancient origin', but 'in the long run' Hasluck believed that the Aborigines would 'be biologically assimilated and become part of the general infusion that makes up the Australia of the future'. Indeed, he reflected, this 'would be integration in the exact and ancient meaning of the term—a making one'.

According to Sue Taffe, the newly formed Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA) was not prepared to accept the 'disappearance of the Aborigines as a separate cultural group', nor 'their physical absorption by the rest of the community', and so firmly rejected assimilation at its first conference held in Adelaide in 1958. By contrast, Bain Attwood has argued that the FCAA's 'criticism of assimilation was relatively muted'. Although it disavowed the 'more obviously racial dimension of assimilation', Attwood maintains that the Federal Council 'basically endorsed the programme of assimilation by adopting 'Equal citizenship rights with other Australian citizens for Aborigines' as its leading principle'. What the FCAA wanted, according to Attwood, was social (but not racial) assimilation. The Aboriginal leader and FCAA delegate Bert Groves, representing the Aboriginal-Australian Fellowship, made this clear when he asked: 'What

---

38 Hasluck, 'The Future of the Australian Aborigines', Paper read to Section F (Anthropology) of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 22 August 1958, WILPF Papers, Box 1747, Folder 5.
does assimilation imply? Certainly, citizenship and equal status—so far so good. The problem with assimilation, Groves told the conference, was that it also implied, in fact 'assumed that if the Aboriginals [were] going to lead the same kind of life as other Australians, then they must disappear as a culturally distinct group'. It was largely on the basis of Groves' statement that the FCAA rejected assimilation and proffered instead 'the word "integration" as a term that implied a "truer definition of [its] aims and objects". Therefore, although the FCAA's preference for integration did not amount to a rejection of assimilation per se, as far as the FCAA was concerned, integration—or equal citizenship rights—was not the same as the government's policy of assimilation which it saw as having absorptionist implications.

In recognition of Duguid's long service to the Aboriginal cause, and in the hope that he would bring respectability to the new group, Duguid was appointed president of the FCAA at its inaugural conference. Shirley Andrews, honorary secretary of the CAR and founding member of the FCAA, has recalled that 'everyone thought it was very important that [Duguid] was the ... key figure': 'he was the one person who was putting forward the ideas that left-wing people were putting forward who couldn't be accused of being that way'—being communist—'so [he] was a very important person to include', Andrews explained. However, not only did Duguid not share his fellow delegates' concerns about assimilation, he strongly defended Hasluck and assimilation against criticism such as theirs.

Since 1955 Duguid had been arguing that assimilation was not the same as absorption. Whereas absorption—'an old idea ... and not a very worthy one', according to Duguid—meant 'breeding the Aboriginal race white', assimilation—the 'only worthy policy'—meant that the Aborigines would be assisted to 'take their place on a basis of economic and social equality with white Australians'. Repeating this argument several years later, Duguid declared: 'Assimilation is not absorption'. Absorption aimed to rid Australia of its 'Aboriginal problem' by ridding Australia of its Aboriginal population, and 'such a state of affairs was never ... in the mind of the Minister for the Territories, the Hon Paul Hasluck, when he introduced the present policy of assimilation', Duguid opined, thereby showing his awareness of, and apparent disregard for, Hasluck's later statements on the likely biological outcome of social assimilation.

In defence of Hasluck and assimilation, Duguid published No Dying Race in 1963, a work which '[set] out the steps [he considered] necessary to bring [the Aborigines] into
equal enjoyment of Australian life'.\textsuperscript{47} Although Hasluck 'believe[d] it [would] do good', it was too late to quell the tide of criticism.\textsuperscript{48} By then even Professor A.P. Elkin, a long-time champion of assimilation and defender of government, had come out in opposition to Hasluck. In 1959, newspapers throughout the country reported on a public disagreement between Hasluck and Elkin in which the anthropologist stated that he 'took a view on assimilation diametrically opposed to Mr Hasluck's':

>'Assimilation is going, but it is just a trickle', [Elkin] said. 'The main bulk is adopting voluntary segregation or withdrawal. They do not want assimilation in the form of dispersal among the white community. They want to keep their own identity.'\textsuperscript{49}

Members of Duguid's own League, the South Australian Aborigines Advancement League (SA AAL), had also begun expressing doubts about assimilation in their quarterly newsletter. Following the publication of T.G.H. Strehlow's booklet \textit{Nomads in No-Man's Land} in 1960, which included 'practical suggestions' as to how Aborigines could 'take their place in our economy "without the complete loss of their racial and cultural identity"', League members began to argue that Aborigines should be 'integrated in groups', not as individuals.\textsuperscript{50} In June 1963, Iris Schultz, secretary of the SA AAL, argued that there was a 'very serious inequality of right wrapped up' in Hasluck's individualist approach to assimilation:

>...The right of a separate cultural group to retain its separate identity within the general community for as long as it desires is accepted by all other Australians for themselves, and this right they have to be prepared to offer to Aborigines for as long as they shall desire it.\textsuperscript{51}

The following edition of the League's newsletter carried the warning of another executive member, Jean Blackburn, that the policy of assimilation had 'irreversible consequences': 'No-one can call back into being an Aboriginal community which has ceased to exist by shattering', she observed.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Ibid.}, preface.  
\textsuperscript{48} Hasluck to Duguid, 20 March 1964, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.  
\textsuperscript{49} 'Minister, differ on Natives', \textit{Advertiser}, 29 August 1959, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 112; Attwood, \textit{Rights for Aborigines}, pp. 202-203.  
\textsuperscript{51} 'Strains of Assimilation', \textit{Aborigines Advancement League Newsletter}, No. 18, June 1963, pp. 3-4.  
\textsuperscript{52} 'Assimilation — A View', \textit{Aborigines Advancement League Newsletter}, No. 19, September 1963, p. 1.
Duguid had long been aware of the importance of group or community life among Aborigines. Interviewed on a local television news programme in 1959, he made it clear that 'one could not assimilate [Aborigines] as individuals'. However, rather than directly criticise government or Hasluck, Duguid presented his concerns as advice. In No Dying Race he explained that:

In our approach to the full-bloods we must remember that the family is the basis of their lives as it is of ours. Young children should never be separated from their parents and housed in dormitories or institutions. ... Attempts at assimilation by bringing very bright individual Aborigines into the community is cruel and wrong. ... And it certainly should not be demanded that those entering our way of life should give up all contact with their full-blood relatives.

Furthermore, Duguid observed:

If the policy of assimilation is to succeed, the purely paternal control of the past must cease, and a new approach be made through specially trained personnel who can appreciate the feelings of the Aborigines in their time of transfer from their way of life to ours. The aim must always be to enable the Aborigines to retain the self-respect and independence they had in tribal days.

Duguid reserved his strongest criticism for white Australians. Since '[s]uccessful assimilation [depended] above all on an enlightened attitude on race, and the complete elimination of colour prejudice', Duguid declared it an impossible goal unless, and 'until there [was] a radical alteration in the attitude of white people to our Aborigines'.

Despite Duguid's obvious misgivings over how the policy of assimilation was being implemented and received, Hasluck's ideal, and Hasluck himself, remained unblemished in his eyes. Hasluck was not to blame for the nation's prejudice. Quite the contrary, Duguid argued, for Hasluck had been 'vigorous in advocating [the Aborigines'] social acceptance'. It was not through want of effort on Hasluck's part, not to mention Duguid's own, that social acceptance was 'still a long way from complete realisation'.

During Hasluck's twelve years as Minister for Territories (1951-63), Duguid and Hasluck's relationship developed beyond that of advocate and politician, to a kind of

---

54 Duguid, No Dying Race, pp. 184-5.
55 Ibid., pp. 185-6.
56 Ibid., pp. 183-5.
friendship based on mutual admiration and respect. Particularly 'when there [was] so much criticism of government policy', Hasluck found Duguid's 'understand[ing] and support [of] the work that [was] being done ... very encouraging'. When Hasluck moved to the Department of Defence in 1964, he thanked Duguid for his continued support: 'During the years in which I was Minister for the Territories it was a great help to me personally to have had the advantage, from time to time, of hearing from you', Hasluck wrote. Later that year when Duguid declined to accept life-membership of the FCAA on the grounds that the Federal Council was too heavily dominated by communists, Hasluck told him that he 'deeply respect[ed] his stand: 'You richly deserve such an honour because of your life-long work for the Aboriginal people', Hasluck reflected, 'but I think you might have put yourself in a false position if you had accepted'. While it may simply have been a tactical decision on Hasluck's part to allow such a relationship to develop—perhaps with the hope of forestalling criticism from Duguid—Duguid believed otherwise. His trust in Hasluck and assimilation was complete.

---

58 Hasluck to Duguid, 13 January 1959, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
59 Hasluck to Duguid, 20 March 1964, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
60 Hasluck to Duguid, 7 August 1964, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
Chapter 5

'END OF THE TRIBES'
Assimilation in the Northern Territory and Central Australia

This chapter and the next are about assimilation in the 1950s and 1960s in Australia. The first examines Dr Charles Duguid's views on the assimilation of Aborigines of full-descent in the Northern Territory and Central Australia, and the second looks at the same process at work among Aborigines of mixed-descent in Adelaide and the settled south. The decision to separate these chapters came from Duguid: 'The needs of the part-Aborigines in the cities and larger towns of Australia are quite different from the needs of the full-bloods', he argued in 1951; hence the 'needs of the full-bloods must be considered separately from those of the part-Aborigines'. Irrespective of their 'way of life' or 'stage of development', the 'full-bloods'—or, as Duguid put it 'in the parlance of [his] day, the first Australians'—came first in Duguid's thinking, their need for help far outweighing that of 'part-Aborigines' whose assimilation he believed 'present[ed] little difficulty'.

In statements prepared for the Australian Association for the United Nations (AAUN) in 1950 and 1951, Duguid argued that Aborigines of full-descent had two options; they could either 'retain their own religion, tradition and customs' or they could 'adopt the new civilisation where that [had] grown up around them'. Either way, Duguid was adamant that 'no force of any kind must be used to change their tribal customs. Any change must be of their own free will'. Assimilation, or adoption of the new civilisation, was thus envisaged by Duguid as a matter of choice for Aborigines of full-descent. But what choice did they really have? In the context of dispossession there was no choice, only its semblance, presented by Duguid as a concession to the 'dignity and rights of the full-bloods'; it was either choose to assimilate or choose to die out. 'We have no right to force them to change', Duguid explained in 1963, but having 'usurped their land and made their old life almost impossible', he described it as 'incumbent on us to provide the means by

---


2 Duguid, CAR Speech; Duguid, 'A policy for the Future of the Aborigines', 1951.

3 Duguid to general secretary, United Nations Association of Australia, 30 June 1950, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1; Duguid, 'Statement on Australian Aborigines for the Australian Association of the United Nations', 4 June 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 6. Duguid's statement had much in common with Anna Vroland's 'Charter of Rights' which was loosely based on Donald Thomson's 'Native Rights Agenda'. See Anna Vroland, 'Charter of Rights for Aborigines', [1951], Anton Vroland Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 3991, Box 4, Folder 27; Donald Thomson. 'Heads of Proposals for Agenda for a Conference on Native Rights', [May 1947], Donald Thomson Papers, Department of Indigenous Studies, Museum of Victoria.

which they [could] change to our ways if they wish[ed].\(^5\) If 'they' wished and if 'we' helped, Duguid was convinced that Paul Hasluck's policy of assimilation would enable 'the first Australians ... [to] become part of the population of Australia with all the benefits and responsibilities of citizenship'.\(^6\)

Duguid was unquestionably a supporter of assimilation. But was he a supporter of the same kind of assimilation that Hasluck's department administered? This chapter comprises three case-studies which test Duguid's belief that his version of assimilation was the same as Hasluck's. First, Duguid's concerns over the forced removal of 'half-caste' children and the impact this had on their 'full-blood' mothers, raised in chapter three, will be examined in more detail; second, the continuing saga of Sydney James Cook, his life in the Northern Territory and Duguid's role in it; and third, Duguid's concerns over the role of government settlements in the assimilation process. As will become apparent, in each case Duguid raised vital questions about assimilation which suggest fundamental differences between his understanding of the process and purpose of assimilation and Hasluck's version. It is worth stressing, however, that in illuminating the differences between Duguid's meaning of assimilation and the official one, my intention is not to portray Duguid as a critic of assimilation, but as a supporter of a different kind of assimilation; an assimilation which celebrated rather than suppressed Aboriginality.

I. 'Cruel policy on natives babies', Darwin 1951

In 1934, when Charles Duguid first ventured north to investigate the condition of Aborigines, he had been heading to Darwin. In 1951, he eventually made it. Armed with a letter of introduction from the new Minister for the Territories, Paul Hasluck, Duguid flew to Darwin at the beginning of July that year. Although conceived by Phyllis as a 'holiday', Duguid had no time for relaxation. His three weeks in Darwin and its environs were spent 'on the job', investigating the 'life of the northern Aborigines from every angle'. In addition to seeing 'everything in the Darwin area' pertinent to Aboriginal matters, Duguid 'sailed along the coast to Croker Island, flew on to Goulburn Island, then visited the Roper Valley, staying at the Roper River Mission', and from there 'flew to Borroloola, Tennant Creek and Alice Springs'.\(^7\)

Soon after his return to Adelaide, Duguid sent Hasluck a report of his findings. It was a draft report, the form of which would have to be altered, Duguid informed the Minister, adding that 'if there [was] anything [Hasluck] would prefer not to be made public, [he would] eliminate it'. While awaiting Hasluck's reply, Duguid turned reporters
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7 Duguid to Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories, 23 May 1951 and [August] 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1; Duguid, *The Aborigines of Darwin and the Tropic North*, p. 3.
away, deliberately withholding the details of his investigations until Hasluck had had an
opportunity to examine his report. Having faithfully recorded 'things as [he] saw them' and
included his 'considered opinion on some of the problems' in his report, Duguid felt
confident of Hasluck's approval. Demonstrating (once again) his disdain of modesty in
matters of such importance, Duguid attached a covering note which read in part:

You realise, I know, that my aim for the past 21 years has been to raise the
status of the Aborigines and to bring the white population of Australia to
recognise their worth. Consequently, I was heartened to find a definite
improvement in the attitude of the white people in Darwin to the natives, and I
was human enough to appreciate [patrol officer, Gordon] Sweeny's remark
the day before I left, that my persistent effort over the years was a major factor
in the change.  

Perhaps underestimating Duguid's capacity (or desire) to cause trouble for government,
Hasluck suggested no amendments. It was a mistake that would cost his department
dearly.

On 22 October 1951, at the annual meeting of the South Australia Aborigines
Advancement League (SA AAL)—at which meeting Duguid was elected president of the
League—Duguid criticised the federal government's 'policy of taking half-caste babies
away from [their] full-blood mothers at the age of three months'. It was, Duguid claimed,
'the most hated task of every patrol officer'. The following day, Duguid's statement
regarding government's 'cruel policy' hit the headlines, bringing public scrutiny and
criticism upon Hasluck and his department.  Having previously been a strong supporter
of such a policy (see chapter three), Duguid's altered view was the result of seeing 'babies
in their cots' in Darwin, and of lengthy discussions with Sweeny who told him that 'taking
away the babies ... [was his] hardest job'. After meeting with Sweeny in Darwin, Duguid
recorded the following notes in his travel diary:

They [the children] are taken away as early as 4 [months]. Breaks heart of the
mothers who ardently love their children. Mothers not to blame for having the
child.

\[8\] Duguid to Hasluck, [August] 1951 (original emphasis).
\[9\] Minutes of the Aborigines Advancement League of South Australia (hereafter SA AAL Minutes), 22 October 1951, Papers of the Aborigines Advancement League, State Library of South Australia, Mortlock Collection, SRG 250 (hereafter League Papers), Series 3/1.
\[10\] 'Cruel policy' on native babies', Herald (Melbourne), 23 October 1951.
\[11\] Duguid, The Aborigines of Darwin and Tropic North, p. 10; Duguid, Travel Diary, July 1951, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 2, p. 60.
\[12\] Duguid, Travel Diary, July 1951, p. 60.
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Back in Adelaide, Duguid maintained regular contact with Sweeny who was willing to provide Duguid with information, but did not want his name used in connection with such. 'My views are not necessarily' those of the department, Sweeny wrote, making it clear that any information he provided regarding 'policy ... [was] confidential'. This, according to Duguid, was Sweeny's 'one fault—he [quailed] before authority and [found] it difficult to take resolute action'. Nevertheless, being 'most grateful' to Sweeny, Duguid abided his request for discretion, using his information but not mentioning his name.

On the basis of Sweeny's information, Duguid re-stated his concerns regarding the forced removal of 'half-caste babies' in an address to the National Council of Women in August 1952. Speaking only 'of the offspring of a full-blood more or less tribal woman and a white man', Duguid explained that:

The policy of the Federal Government is to collect the half-caste children of the Northern Territory whenever they are reported—be it at 3-4 months or 3-5 years—bring them to Darwin and later segregate them either in Melville Island under the Roman Catholic Church or at Croker Island under the Methodist Church. At Darwin they are in the care of the undenominational Aborigines Inland Mission—last year I saw many of the tiny babies in their cots—but at about the age of five they are drafted out to the two Islands.

'Are you and I satisfied that the best possible is being done for mother and child?', Duguid asked. According to him, the wishes of the mothers were 'hardly considered, if at all, but it was admitted frankly that [they were] utterly broken-hearted at the loss of their children'. Duguid asked his audience of predominantly middle-class white women to consider whether 'it [was] right that the native woman whose responsibility for her plight [was] negligible should have this suffering forced upon her? While 'in no way [wishing] to embarrass the Minister responsible for the Aborigines'—namely Hasluck—Duguid made it clear that he did 'not think separation of the half-caste child from its mother [was] in the interests of either'.

By then it was too late to save Hasluck embarrassment: the damage had already been done. Duguid's initial criticism had been widely reported in the southern press, reaching as far afield as Tasmania where few, if any, Aborigines were then believed to exist. Requests for information on the 'factual basis' of Duguid's claims were received by
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14 Duguid to Hasluck, [August] 1951.
15 Duguid did eventually use Sweeny's name, but not until 1963. See Duguid, No Dying Race, p. 185.
16 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and their Half-Caste Children', address to the National Council of Women, 14 August 1952, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 6.
17 ibid; Duguid, untitled radio broadcast, 29 November 1952, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 6.
18 Hasluck to secretary, Department of the Territories, 19 November 1951, National Archives of Australia (hereafter NAA), Series A452, Item 1961/7809.
government from organisations such as the Women's Non-Party League in Hobart and the Tasmanian division of the AAUN. Although unconvinced by newspaper reports which tended to 'convey the impression that this procedure [was] common and the reasons for it flimsy', the AAUN informed Hasluck that it would 'protest most strongly against' the practice 'if indeed it [did] occur'; the taking of 'half-caste' children from their mothers 'at a very tender age' being contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The National Association for the Advancement of the Native Races (NAANR) in Melbourne also had doubts about the truth of Duguid's claims. Headed by A.O. Neville, former Chief Protector of Aborigines in Western Australia, the NAANR wanted 'detailed confutation' from the Minister in order to put the matter to rest.

Hasluck was happy to oblige, however, having only recently assumed the responsibilities of Minister for the Territories, he knew little about the policy of removing Aboriginal children. Hasluck's request for information elicited the following carefully worded response from the Administrator of the Northern Territory, F.J.S. Wise:

> Aboriginals are human beings with the same basic affections that we have and the Aboriginal mother has a real love for her children, especially those of a tender age. We cannot expect a normal Aboriginal mother to appreciate the reason why her part-Aboriginal child should be taken from her.

As to how such removals were effected, Hasluck was informed that certain 'methods were employed ... to ensure that the least upset [was] caused to the mother and child'. It was the task of patrol officers to 'negotiate' the removal of the child by impressing the mother 'with the advantages to be gained'. However:

---


20 Rockleft to Hasluck, 6 November 1951.


22 In order to answer Duguid's criticisms, Hasluck requested information covering the following points:

i. The exact nature of current practice in the Northern Territory [regarding the removal of half-caste children from their mothers]

ii. Who makes the decision and in what respect does the practice differ in regard to neglected white children.

iii. Under what power is the decision carried out.

iv. How many children have in fact been removed from the care of their mothers in the Northern Territory during the past two years.

v. What has in fact happened to the children so removed, and where are they at present.

vi. What was the age and condition of the children so removed at the time of removal.

vii. Have any objections been raised by the parents of the children, and if so, in what form.

See Hasluck to secretary, Department of the Territories, 19 November 1951, NAA: A452, 1961/7809.

If the Officer is unsuccessful on his first visit and the mother does not part with the child, another attempt is made later until such time as the child is willingly handed over to the custody of the Patrol Officer.\(^{24}\)

In other words, although 'normal' Aboriginal mothers were not expected to appreciate why their children were being removed, they were expected to 'willingly' hand their children over. That it was coercion, not negotiation, that achieved this result, mattered little it seems, for in 'most cases the mothers [were] quite willing that their children receive education and go to an institution for that purpose'. Those mothers who objected did so on the grounds that their children were 'not strong enough'. By this, it was explained, 'the native mother means ... that the baby is not old enough'; 'it would appear they prefer that the child be removed only from 5 years of age and upwards (i.e. they prefer to keep the younger children)'\(^{25}\)

In order to refute Duguid's allegations, Hasluck needed to know how many children had been removed in the past two years, and their ages. According to departmental records, a total of 42 children had been removed since 1949.\(^{26}\) Of these, thirteen were under five years old at the time, meaning that 'the majority were removed from their parents between the ages of 5 years and 13 years'.\(^{27}\) Moreover, of the thirteen children under five, 'only' four were aged less than one year at the time of their removal; a girl aged 1 month, born in the Darwin Hospital and 'removed with the mother's consent' in April 1950; a girl aged 9 months whose 'irresponsible' and 'disinterested' mother 'raised no objection to her child's removal' in January 1951; a boy aged 6 weeks who was removed from a 'native camp ... at the request of [his] mother' at the end of July 1951; and a boy aged 2 months who was 'removed with mother's consent' in August 1951.\(^{28}\) Given that Duguid's tour of Darwin lasted three weeks from the beginning of July 1951, it seems likely that the only 'babies' he saw in their cots were the two girls, both of whom would have been over a year old at the time.

These figures, once conveyed to the NAANR, were more than enough to convince Neville's association of the 'gravely misleading' nature of Duguid's allegations.\(^{29}\) Since Duguid's claims were not 'literally true', the NAANR found 'it somewhat puzzling to understand how [his] story that all such children were removed at three months old should ever have received such currency', thereby implying that Duguid had lied.\(^{30}\) Although not adverse to exaggeration, Duguid was no liar. That he saw 'babies in their cots' is, I believe, an unquestionable truth. Duguid may only have seen one or two infants, but it was not the

\(^{24}\) Ibid. (emphasis added).

\(^{25}\) Ibid.

\(^{26}\) Ibid.

\(^{27}\) Hasluck to Cuthbert, 23 November 1951, NAA: A452, 1961/7809.

\(^{28}\) C.R. Lambert, secretary Department of the Territories to Leeper, 8 February 1952, NAA: A452, 1961/7809.

\(^{29}\) Leeper to Hasluck, 20 December 1951, NAA: A452, 1961/7809.

\(^{30}\) Leeper to Hasluck, 12 February 1952, NAA: A452, 1961/7809.
numbers that mattered. It was the practice of taking 'half-caste babies ... from their full-blood mothers against their will at 3 to 4 months of age' that concerned him. 31 Contrary to NAANR's statement, Duguid never claimed that all children were taken at this age. Instead, having seen some who were, and having learned from Sweeny that his instructions were to take 'half-caste babies ... from their full blood mothers in the native camps as opportunity arises', Duguid argued that this practice 'require[d] re-thinking'. 32

In keeping with Duguid's version of events, Reginald K. McCaffery, a former police officer and acting Director of Native Affairs in the Northern Territory in 1949-50 and 1953-54, has recalled that 'the policy ... was you took the child from the breast of the mother and brought it in to Darwin'. 33 Interviewed in 1980, McCaffery maintained that he thought it was wrong to take 'the child from the breast—when the breast was finished—yes then', but not before. The following excerpt reveals a depth of feeling on the question of child removal common among former members of the Department of Native Affairs.

Interviewer: And this was a forcible removal?
McCaffery: Forcible, yes. There were great scenes of gins screaming their lungs out. Great scenes ... They were grabbing them off the breast and just sort of molesting them into these mission stations.
Interviewer: So this would have been from Hasluck's time on?
McCaffery: Yes.
Interviewer: In effect, this was the policy that Harry Giese was overseeing?
McCaffery: No, we oversaw that before Giese. It was still extant when Giese took over [in 1954], but it had softened down because I put the breaks on it. ... I didn't like it from the start—it sounded inhuman to me ... I think it was wrong. 34

Similar concerns were raised contemporaneously by other members of the department. In 1949, patrol officer Ted Evans expressed grave misgivings over the practice of removing Aboriginal children in an internal departmental report. Having just facilitated the removal of five children from Wave Hill, Evans described a tortuous scene of departure:
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31 Duguid, untitled radio broadcast, 29 November 1952.
34 Transcript of interview with Reginald Kevin McCaffery.
The removal of the children from Wave Hill by ... aircraft was accompanied by distressing scenes the like of which I wish never to experience again. The engines of the 'plane are not stopped at Wave Hill and the noise combined with the strangeness of an aircraft only accentuated the grief and fear of the children, resulting in near-hysteria in two of them.35

In addition to recommending that aircraft 'only be used in extreme cases', Evans suggested leaving the children 'with their mothers until they [were] at least six years of age' and that a female welfare officer be appointed 'to assist native mothers ... and to help in the gentler removal of part-Aboriginal children'.36

Jeremy Long has argued that Evans' report 'led to a critical review of the practice [of removing Aboriginal children] and radical changes in the way it was administered'.37 However, other than acknowledgment on the part of the government secretary that the practice seemed likely to attract 'criticism for violation of the present day conception of 'human rights' and 'to outrage the feelings of the average observer', the only substantive change appears to have been the casual recruitment of two female welfare workers, both of whom were wives of patrol officers.38 In the wake of Duguid's criticisms and the unwanted attention his claims drew upon government policy, procedures for removing children were revised, thereafter restricting removals 'to children who were neglected or in need of medical care or whose removal was expressly requested by the mother'. This meant that fewer children in the Northern Territory were removed after 1952; from eighteen in 1950 alone, to twenty-one between 1951 and 1953, and seven in the years 1954 to 1956.39

Duguid's criticisms did not stop the policy of removing Aboriginal children, but then he had no desire to stop it, just reform it. Duguid's concerns were with the 'present method' employed—i.e. 'taking young babies from their mothers'—not the practice itself.40 In Duguid's view, the obvious solution lay with the station owners; white men who paid 'no income tax, [were] provided with cheap labour, [made] adequate profits and [collected] Child Endowment for the Aboriginal children on their properties', but were not obliged to educate them.41 Duguid wanted government to 'insist on the stations
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35 Long, The Go-Betweens, pp. 82-3.
36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.; See also transcript of interview with Reginald Kevin McCaffery. According to McCaffery, he appointed these women, both of whom were nursing sisters and the wives of patrol officers.
40 Duguid, untitled radio broadcast, 29 November 1952.
41 On the issue of Child Endowment, Duguid wrote: 'The Department of Social Services recognises the right of every Aboriginal child under the age of 16 years employed or living on station properties to Child Endowment, but the payment is not made to the mother or father but to the managers of the stations. The endowment has to be "claimed" by the parent presumably by a finger print and the station manager has to submit to the Director a statement as to how the first payment was disbursed and periodical statements regarding later payments. Tribal parents cannot
supervising the education of the full-blood and half-caste children on their runs'.

The other alternative, according to Duguid, lay with the establishment of hostels such as St Mary's at Alice Springs. Having visited St Mary's on his way home from Darwin, Duguid was convinced that it provided the only humane answer to the separation of 'half-caste' children from their families. The children, brought in with parental consent at the age of five or six, all attended the Alice Springs state school and were visited during the year by their 'parent or parents, as the case may be'. In his travel diary Duguid described St Mary's as 'by far the finest home for part-Aborigines [he had] ever seen anywhere in Australia ... This place isn't an institution—it is a home'. Confident that 'full-blood mothers ... could easily be induced to bring their children to these centres knowing that they could visit them during the year and have them home at the end it', Duguid called for 'many hostels of the St Mary's type [to be established] throughout the Territory'.

Duguid's views had changed dramatically. Where once he would have agreed with Hasluck's assertion that the 'half-caste' child left with 'the bush tribe [would] grow up to have neither the full satisfaction in life which the tribal native has nor the opportunity to advance to any other status', by the early 1950s Duguid was adamant that 'it would be an advantage to have half-castes grow up with their full-blood relatives in their own country'. Whether educated on the stations or at state schools with the help of hostels like St Mary's, or both—for instance Duguid knew of one station where 'half-caste' children were receiving lessons by correspondence before being sent to St Mary's—it took 'little imagination to see how the educated children would help their mothers towards our civilisation', Duguid claimed. He looked forward to the day when educated 'half-castes' with 'some training in teaching could start the education of the full-blood children on the stations'.

Duguid's primary concern was for the welfare of 'full-blood' Aborigines, and while he believed that maintaining family relationships would be advantageous for all concerned, including government, it was 'full-blood' Aborigines who stood to gain the most. Since they were the ones who had the most to lose in terms of culture and identity, according to Duguid, he put their needs first. Therein lay one of the principle differences between Duguid and Hasluck's approach to Aboriginal welfare; their point of departure. In seeking to reform government's policy on the removal of 'half-caste' children, Duguid's first

42 Duguid, The Aborigines of Darwin and the Tropic North, Addendum, p. 27.
43 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and Their Half-Caste Children'.
44 Duguid, Travel Diary, July 1931, pp. 83-4.
45 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and Their Half-Caste Children'.
47 Duguid, The Aborigines of Darwin and the Tropic North, p. 11; Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and Their Half-Caste Children'.
48 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and Their Half-Caste Children'.
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concern lay with the suffering it caused their 'full-blood' mothers. Hasluck, in contrast, focused solely on serving the 'interests of the children'.

Further illustrating this difference, Hasluck was pleased to inform potential detractors that, 'where possible, the mother [was] permitted to accompany the child [to Darwin] to make the separation more gradual'. While Duguid may have appreciated the sentiment behind such action, this would not have satisfied him, as the following notes from his travel diary suggest: 'They now bring the mother into Darwin and take it [the child] there. Is D[arwin] a good place to bring the mother? Rather than decrease the mother's suffering as intended, Duguid felt that bringing her to Darwin would only increase it by exposing her to a new and alien way of life. To then send her back to her old life, minus her child, would permanently disrupt her known world. Aborigines of full-descent needed time to adjust to the new civilisation, according to Duguid. They needed assistance, understanding and respect, and their children—'full-blood' and 'half-caste'—needed education. But Duguid did not advocate the removal of 'full-blood' children. Only 'half-caste' children warranted such measures, according to him, and this was because 'very few white fathers' accepted responsibility for them. Therefore, you and I—in other words, the Government—must do something about it', Duguid explained: white society was to assume the role of the absent father, but no longer at the expense of the mother.

But was it just the absence of the white father that made government intervention into the lives of mixed-descent children essential? What of the children born of two mixed-descent parents, was government still responsible for them? Duguid's answer to the latter question was a resounding 'yes'. In No Dying Race he reflected that:

> Throughout the years there has been too little recognition of our responsibility for the existence of the mixed-blood people—too little concerted effort to provide western amenities of all kinds for the children for whom our race, and our race only, is responsible.

The absent white father could have been a grandfather, a great-grandfather or someone even further removed, for as Duguid acknowledged, 'the greatest increase in their numbers [was] the result of part-Aborigines naturally marrying among themselves'. However: 'When the white race came to Australia and spread across the continent, it was white men who sought out the native women—not the reverse. Thus were brought into being people
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49 Hasluck to Cuthbert, 23 November 1951.
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51 Duguid, Travel Diary, July 1951, p. 60.
52 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and Their Half-Caste Children'.
53 Duguid, No Dying Race, p. 180 (emphasis added).
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of mixed-blood', Duguid argued. In his view, this made white society 'especially responsible for [them]' irrespective of when the infusion of 'white blood' occurred.

Like Hasluck and others, Duguid continued to believe that the 'white blood' (and hence lighter skin colour) in 'half-castes' made them more amenable to social assimilation. However, whereas previously Duguid had acknowledged little, if any, connection between Aborigines of full and mixed-descent in terms of Aboriginal identity, during the 1950s this changed. Following his trip to Darwin, Duguid began to see Aborigines of mixed descent as being 'part-Aboriginal': a change in nomenclature which symbolised Duguid's growing awareness, and acceptance, that people of mixed-descent were not only 'part-white', they were also 'part-Aboriginal'. Terms like 'full-blood' and 'half-caste' were not just casual descriptors, as Duguid knew, but names loaded with meaning. In 1959, Professor J.B. Cleland, a friend and contemporary of Duguid's, proposed that 'part-white' be used instead of 'part-Aboriginal' because it would bring Aborigines of mixed-descent 'more closely into the white fraternity into which they must ultimately merge'. Duguid's use of the term 'part-Aboriginal' in preference to 'part-white' did much more, therefore, than reflect the changing parlance of the day; it also reflected his changing view of what it meant to be Aboriginal.

II. Sydney James Cook, a test case for assimilation

When Sydney James Cook arrived at Roper River mission in the Northern Territory in 1950 he felt like a 'foreigner in a foreign land': 'I was as black as any of them yet I couldn't understand a word they said', Cook told the journalist Douglas Lockwood in 1965. According to Lockwood, the 'Roper people made an Aboriginal of [Cook]'; soon he was 'able to undertake walkabouts of several hundred miles and live by his wits and his hunting skills'. Cook had been at Roper River for two years when he wrote the following letter, delighting in his new-found hunting prowess, to Charles Duguid:

Dear Dad,

How are you getting on, Also mum and Andrew, has Rosemary won any more tennis games. I hope she has. We killed a buffaloe with spears, Myself, John, Tex, Dexter, Don, Darvis, Mjangria, we were all killing fish in one billabong when Dexter told us to go down to one little creek, as soon as we came to the edge of the creek we found him having a bathe. So we all through our spears and John killed him right in the back and broke his spine so he
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55 Duguid to editor, Advertiser, 6 September 1955, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 58.
58 Douglas Lockwood, 'He grew up in a white world', Herald (Melbourne), 26 February 1965.
could not get up, but Mjangria ran to get Mr Hart to come and shoot it with his gun...

to mum
*I'm glad that I have kill
him, the big strong buffaloe
*I'm glad, I'm glad...
Your Loving son,
Sydney. 59

Despite sending Cook hundreds of kilometres away, and to a place so far removed from their own way of life that it might as well have been a 'foreign land', Charles and Phyllis Duguid wanted Cook to feel that their 'home circle [was] his'. In 1951, Charles visited Cook at Roper River, and in 1952 Cook spent seven weeks with the family in Adelaide. Beyond that all contact was by correspondence. 60

Rather than severing the Duguids' relationship with Cook, sending Cook to Roper River engendered a new kind of relationship between the Duguids, Cook and the authorities responsible for Cook's welfare: the superintendents at Roper River, C.D. Gilchrist and later P.E. Leske; a district welfare officer, J.R. Ryan, whose task it was to report to the administration on Cook's welfare and progress; the Director of Welfare, H.C. Giese and the Administrators of the Northern Territory, F.J.S. Wise and later J.C. Archer, all of whom kept the Duguids informed of Cook's progress; and Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories, who took 'a close personal interest in the lad ... because of the special circumstances surrounding [him]'. 61 Those 'special circumstances', namely the education Cook received in Adelaide and the Duguids' continuing interest in him, meant that Cook was closely monitored by the Northern Territory administration. 62 Cook was viewed as a test case for assimilation. Because '[it was] of course on the results of cases such as [Cook's] that the success or failure of our assimilation programme will be judged', reports, letters and telegrams flew back and forth between Roper River, Katherine, Darwin, Canberra and Adelaide creating a file on Cook whose size alone is testimony to the high degree of 'particular and personal attention', or surveillance, he endured. 63

Everyone had an opinion on what was best for Cook, including Cook himself. Towards the end of 1953, Cook, aged sixteen, wrote to Duguid asking for permission to leave Roper River:

59 Sydney James Cook to Duguid, 12 June 1952, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1. The spelling and punctuation in this letter has not been corrected or altered from the original. Cook's meaning is quite clear without the use of sic, which, I feel, would be patronising in this context.
60 Duguid to Hasluck, 21 October 1953, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566.
61 H.C. Giese, Director of Welfare to J.R. Ryan, District Welfare Officer, 12 June 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/98. In this letter, Giese advised Ryan that 'the Minister, because of the special circumstances surrounding Sydney Cook, takes a close personal interest in the lad'.
63 J.C. Archer, Administrator, to Hasluck, 5 June 1957, NAA, F1, 1955/820/96-95.
I am wondering if I can go away and work on one of the Stations near the mission called Nutwood Downs for a change please and earn some money because I am walking around this place just like a bachelor with broken clothes and no net and blanket. 64

Cook's request in this matter was important to Duguid for it removed 'any question of pushing him around'. 65 Despite receiving contrary advice from Gilchrist who felt that Cook had not yet 'reached the stage where he would settle down to such employment', Duguid felt that Cook's 'desire to earn ... [was] natural and right'. 66 For assistance in this matter, Duguid turned to Hasluck who initiated a series of enquiries that resulted in Cook's employment at Nutwood Downs in 1954. 67

Hasluck's intervention was significant for several reasons. Because of the great distance involved, Duguid relied on information from the Northern Territory administration and his connection to Hasluck ensured that such advice was forthcoming. Hasluck wanted 'what [was] best' for Cook, but he also wanted to make sure that Duguid had no cause for complaint. 68 He therefore requested that Duguid be kept informed of Cook's progress at Nutwood Downs; a request which established a 'system of reporting to private people' that was bitterly resented by members of Hasluck's department and, in the opinion of E.C. Evans, Chief Welfare Officer, was having a detrimental impact on Cook. 69 As Evans saw it, the department's 'constant inquiry'—prompted by 'Dr Duguid and his pen'—left Cook with no 'opportunity to settle down'. 70 Thus, while Hasluck's intervention went some way towards bridging the gap between Duguid and the administration, it also increased the gap by fostering resentment against what was seen as Duguid's interference.

After three years at Nutwood Downs, during which time Duguid received nothing but favourable reports regarding Cook's 'conduct and efficiency', Duguid sought Hasluck's
advice on the question of Cook's exemption from the Aboriginals Ordinance. Duguid took it for granted that Cook would 'be exempted sooner or later', and since Cook was now 19 years of age, Duguid presented Hasluck with a strong case for the earlier option. Cook had several years experience in cattle work and was 'now learning the engineering side of station work', he could read and speak English 'perfectly' and was 'fully knowledgable in our ways'. Given this, was 'he not a case who should be exempted?', Duguid asked. Rather than continue to receive the wage given to an Aboriginal of his age and experience—one pound per week plus board, lodging and tobacco—Duguid wanted Cook to receive a 'wage worthy of his hire'; 'the white mans wage'.

Hasluck agreed, but the decision was not his to make. Hasluck referred the matter to the Administrator, J.C. Archer who referred it to J.R. Ryan, the district welfare officer responsible for monitoring Cook's progress. Asked for his opinion as to Cook's 'ability to adequately manage his own affairs and conduct himself as a full citizen', Ryan stated that he 'could not, under any consideration, recommend that young Cook be exempted'. Quite apart from Cook's lacking 'the necessary sense of responsibility', Ryan maintained that Cook's 'manner of living and his general lack of knowledge of our life would not qualify him for an exemption'. Informing Hasluck of such, Archer recommended that 'it would not be in the lad's interest for him to be declared not to be an Aborigine'. Hasluck was not impressed. Although he 'only [knew] of [Cook's] circumstances at second-hand', Hasluck protested that it was 'not enough ... [to] declare him a ward. [Can't] we build upon undoubted advantages [Cook] had in his early training and make something out of him?', Hasluck asked.

No-one, it seems, thought to ask Cook how he felt about being exempted. On learning of Duguid's efforts, Cook made his feelings clear:

*I do wish you would not write to Native Affairs about being like white man's way, like have rights. Just forget about that please ... I have been pushed*

---

71 Duguid received three such reports. See Wise to Duguid, 2 December 1954, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1; Wise to Duguid, 25 July 1955, NAA: F1, 1955/820/43; Archer to Duguid, 8 August 1956, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1. In the final report, Duguid was told that Cook was 'quite happy at Nutwood Downs' and that the manager 'had no complaints whatsoever regarding his conduct and efficiency'.

72 Duguid to Hasluck, 20 November 1956, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566.

73 Ibid.; Having previously requested the comparative rates of pay for Aborigines and whites employed in the pastoral industry in the Northern Territory, Duguid was appalled to learn that Cook was receiving one-seventh the amount paid to white employees his age. In contrast to Cook's one pound per week plus board, lodging and tobacco, a white man his age received over seven pounds per week. See Archer to Duguid, 15 October 1956, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1. Hasluck to Duguid, 3 December 1956, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566; Evans to Giese, 14 February 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/67; Giese to Ryan 12 March 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/74.

74 Giese to Ryan, 12 March 1957; Ryan to Giese, 23 March 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/79.

75 Ryan to Giese, 23 March 1957.

76 Archer to secretary, Department of the Territories, 15 April 1957, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566 (emphasis added).

77 Hasluck to Archer, 16 May 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/87.

PART 3: ASSIMILATION
around to much I am getting sick of it I don't suppose this a good letter but
I'm just tell you how I feel about it like someone going to shoot himself.\textsuperscript{79}

Clearly, Cook wanted to be left alone. Whether he also wanted to continue to be 'an Aborigine' was less clear, however, particularly since the two were almost entirely incompatible.

In April 1957, the \textit{Welfare Ordinance, 1953} came into operation and Cook was declared a ward.\textsuperscript{80} Under the new Ordinance, wards were defined as people incapable of exercising the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and in need of 'special care and assistance'. In theory, anybody could be declared a ward, including white Australians. However, as Anna Haebich has explained, Hasluck's attempt to deal with people on the basis of need rather than race was undermined by a group of concerned parliamentarians who pushed through a clause which stated that 'anybody who was entitled to vote could not normally be declared a "ward"'.\textsuperscript{81} Thus, in reality, ward meant 'full-blood Aboriginal'; all Aborigines of mixed-descent in the Northern Territory having been exempted from the Aboriginals Ordinance and declared 'citizens of Australia' in 1953.\textsuperscript{82} Under the new Ordinance the Director of Welfare was the legal guardian of all wards—'as though they were children', Charles Rowley later observed.\textsuperscript{83} As Duguid understood it: 'Wards cannot vote and permission is required for marriage ... Wards cannot own property nor are they free to move from place to place without permission'.\textsuperscript{84} In other words, wards got 'pushed around' at the discretion of the Director, as Cook soon discovered.

In July 1957, after absenting himself from Nutwood Downs—where, unbeknown to Duguid, Cook had been accused of stealing and inappropriate sexual behaviour—Cook returned to Roper River in order to 'obtain a wife'.\textsuperscript{85} The superintendent at Roper River, P.E. Leske, strongly disapproved of the match. He informed Phyllis Duguid that the woman in question, Ruth Camfoo, although 'a decent Christian girl as far as native Christian women go', was quite unsuitable for Cook, being ten years his senior and already married with four children.\textsuperscript{86} From Hasluck, Charles Duguid learned that Ruth was 'only

\textsuperscript{79} Cook to Duguid, 27 October 1957, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
\textsuperscript{80} Teleprinter message, 29 April 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/85; Hasluck to Duguid, 10 May 1957, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
\textsuperscript{82} Duguid, \textit{The Aborigines—A Comparison of Restrictions}, \textit{The Link}, 1 May 1954, p. 155.
\textsuperscript{84} Duguid, handwriten notes on 'Citizenship', [1961], Duguid Papers: 1, Series 6.
\textsuperscript{85} Giese to Leske, 19 July 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/99. Duguid received edited versions of Ryan's reports. For example, he was not told that Cook had been causing 'trouble... with some of the girls in the camp' or that he had been 'showing signs of being "light fingered"'. See Ryan to Giese, 5 July 1956, NAA: F1, 1955/820/41.
\textsuperscript{86} Leske to Giese, 22 August 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/106-05; Leske to Phyllis Duguid, 22 August 1957, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566.
tribally married to Tex Camfoo who [was] soon to marry another full-blood'. Although assured by Hasluck that 'nothing ... against [Cook's] interests' would be sanctioned by the department, Duguid was so dismayed at the prospect of Cook entering 'a lifelong union with a woman so much older than himself' that he suggested moving Cook to 'Ernabella or [anywhere] less primitive than Roper River'. Fearing that unless Cook was encouraged 'to re-orientate himself and adjust his sense of values' he might never re-enter the white community as planned, Duguid also suggested another visit to Adelaide at the department's expense.

Rather than authorise Cook's visit to Adelaide, the Director of Welfare, H.C. Giese arranged for Cook to be taken to Darwin 'for a period of adjustment, discussion and possible employment'. While there, Giese and Evans had several 'long and frank discussions with [Cook] concerning his proposed marriage and his future'. The outcome of these discussions, according to Evans, was that Cook agreed to abide by their ruling that it was 'not in his best interests' to marry Ruth. On the strict 'understanding that he [would] not continue his association with Ruth', Cook was permitted to return to Roper River mission in October 1957. Less than two weeks later, Cook wrote to Duguid 'about this bissiness about this girl':

I still wish to marry this girl Ruth I have been up to Darwin to see Mr Geecie about it but Mr Evans told me to write to you to see what you say because they are alright about it ... Well I wish you would let me marry Ruth because I love her ... I am looking after her now and children and she wishes to get married to me.

Cook's letter left Duguid with the impression that the only person stopping the marriage was him. Since Cook was 'evidently living with Ruth', Duguid proposed that all objections to the marriage be withdrawn.

'Between two worlds' or within them?
In February 1960, Cook and Ruth were finally married. By then, only six 'full-blood' Aborigines—all men—had been granted citizenship in the Northern Territory. Cook was

---

88 Duguid to Hasluck, 27 August 1957 and 2 October 1957, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566.
91 Cook to Duguid, 27 October 1957 (original spelling).
92 Duguid to Hasluck, 5 November 1957, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566.
93 Marriage Certificate, 25 February 1960, NAA: F1, 1955/820/177. A suggestion that Cook was having an affair with Ruth's eldest daughter was made, but not followed up. By 1960, the Welfare Branch was so determined to see Cook and Ruth married that a sum of 8 pounds 12 shillings was advanced to Cook to cover the registrar's fee and the cost of the ring. See Giese to
not one of these. To have their name removed from the Register of Wards, Aborigines of full-descent needed to show that they could live an independent assimilated way of life. Or, as was the case with Albert Namatjira, gain the attention of activists and humanitarians in the south. In response to political pressure, and in recognition of his achievement as an artist, Namatjira was granted full citizenship in 1957. Namatjira’s conviction for supplying alcohol to wards in 1958 and his death the following year prompted many people to question the correctness of this decision.

Having met Namatjira at Hermannsburg mission in 1934, opened his first exhibition of water-colours in Adelaide in 1939, and made the artist welcome in his home on at least three separate occasions ‘for periods up to a week’, Duguid considered Namatjira a ‘personal friend’. After witnessing Namatjira’s ‘tragic decline’ as reported in the national press, Duguid informed Giese that he did ‘not regard an Aborigine as a failure because he [wished] to live with his people’. Here, Duguid was referring specifically to Cook’s frustrated desire to marry Ruth. Having earlier opposed the marriage on the grounds that it would prevent Cook from ‘re-entering the general community’, Duguid’s altered view owed much to his understanding of the difficulties Namatjira faced in the process of assimilation. Thus, while providing some insight into Duguid’s re-evaluation of Cook’s status, his sympathy for Namatjira’s dilemma also further illustrates the difference between his and Hasluck’s version of assimilation.

As Rachel Standfield has observed, ‘Namatjira the ‘perfect Aborigine’ did not translate easily into Namatjira the perfect citizen’. A public argument between Namatjira and his agent, John Brakenreg, conducted in the pages of the Sydney Morning Herald and the Sun Herald newspapers in July 1958, encapsulated for many the problems with granting citizenship to ‘full-blood’ Aborigines. According to Brakenreg, Namatjira lived in squalid conditions, held ‘wild beer and wine parties at [his] camp’ and ‘squandered much of the money he received for his paintings’ on relatives and other ‘hangers-on’. Brakenreg also claimed that Namatjira and his relatives ‘were being badly affected by the cheap liquor being illeg ally supplied to them’. Although Namatjira responded that he was, in fact,
legally entitled to drink given his status as a citizen—"if I want to have an occasional drink there is nothing to stop me"—the picture of irresponsibility and intemperance painted by Brakenreg left readers with the clear impression that Namatjira had failed to live up to the standards of citizenship.\(^{102}\)

The death of a young Aboriginal woman at Morris Soak, the settlement where Namatjira lived, in August 1958, reinforced this picture. Namatjira was charged on four counts of supplying alcohol to wards, convicted and sentenced to six months gaol with hard labour, later reduced to three months which he served at the Haast Bluff section of Papunya settlement, 200 miles west of Alice Springs.\(^{103}\) Namatjira's conviction provoked widespread public sympathy and support, with appeals for clemency coming from all sections of the Australian community on the grounds that Namatjira had been 'asked to do the impossible—to live as a white man in a black camp'.\(^{104}\) However, there were just as many who felt that the blame lay elsewhere.

In January 1959, thirteen prominent Alice Springs residents, each claiming to have 'had several years experience in the field of Aboriginal welfare, education and/or employment', blamed the granting of citizenship 'by enactment' for the 'tragic and growing social problem' of which Namatjira's 'addiction to liquor' was just a part.\(^{105}\) Published in the letters column of the Adelaide Advertiser, their view that the federal government's granting of citizenship to Aborigines such as Namatjira 'without proper preparation [was] tantamount to writing their death sentence', provoked the following outraged response from Duguid:

> The suggestion that Aborigines should be "candidates" for citizenship in their own land is a gross insult. "Addiction to alcohol and gambling" is cited as a cause of failure. It is, but what example is being shown them?\(^{106}\)

As far as Duguid was concerned, 'the greatest factor in the success of the enactment [of citizenship was] the attitude of white citizens of Australia'.\(^{107}\) He doubted whether any of the thirteen men had 'taken Aboriginal orphans into their homes on the same footing as their own children' (as he had done with Cook), and until they did—until they were 'prepared to welcome Aboriginal people into their homes'—Duguid argued that they had no right or recourse to 'blame the government'.\(^{108}\)

---

102 'Albert Namatjira Voices Protest—'Have a Right to Drink", *Sun Herald*, 20 July 1958.
103 Standfield, 'Not for lack of trying', p. 28; Duguid, *No Dying Race*, p. 137.
104 Laurie Thomas, 'Namatjira: Tragic Symbol of the Lost People', *Woman's Day*, 27 October 1958, pp. 4-5; Standfield, 'Not for lack of trying', pp. 27-29.
105 Reverend A.W. Grant et al. to editor, *Advertiser*, 9 January 1959, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 101. Among the thirteen citizens—all white men—were F.W. Albrecht, superintendent at Hermannsburg mission, and Rex Batterbee, the artist.
Reflecting on Namatjira’s fall from grace in *No Dying Race* (1963), Duguid attempted to explain the artist’s actions within a framework of ‘traditional’ Aboriginal culture. According to Duguid, Namatjira had been ‘reluctant to accept’ full citizenship status because he realised that it would be impossible for him to be loyal to conflicting laws, for he was *by birth and training a tribal full-blood* and as such had to share everything with his people. He was not only an artist; he was a fine character with high standards of loyalty to family and kin, and a greater sense of responsibility than those people in capital cities who introduced him to social sipping of alcohol. For in time he became fond of it and shared his new possession with his tribal kith and kin.109

Although Duguid did not approve of the drinking, let alone the sharing of alcohol by anyone, he believed that the ‘habit of sharing, which persist[ed] with the Aborigines’ was essentially ‘good’. At the second annual FCAA conference in 1959, Duguid observed that ‘[m]any Aborigines who have long been converts to Christianity still seem to feel strongly their obligation to share their goods with relatives and tribal relatives’. By contrast, ‘[a]mong us, it is felt that it is the duty of a good citizen to provide good living conditions first for himself and his immediate family, and to give only what is left over after this, if he wishes, to others in need’. It seemed to Duguid that the ‘difficulty of reconciling these two points of view’ was one of the greatest ‘obstacles in carrying out the assimilation policy’. ‘Namatjira himself’, Duguid confirmed, was testimony to the importance of appreciating the cultural significance of sharing among Aborigines.110

Rather than blame assimilation directly, Duguid blamed Namatjira’s downfall on ‘the cash art dealers’, ‘the people who [loaded] him with luxury presents’ and the people who introduced him to alcohol. Duguid’s obvious sympathy for the difficulties Namatjira faced in being ‘caught between two civilisations’ contrasted markedly with Hasluck’s perception.111 Since the ‘expiring influence of Aboriginal culture’ was such that Hasluck found it ‘difficult to trace’, he blamed the artist’s attachment to a false Aboriginality, or, to use Hasluck’s words, ‘the cult of the Aboriginal that [was] being fostered in Australia’.112 Hasluck suggested ‘that the Aboriginal, considered as an individual person, felt the drag of

---

three sets of influences when he was on the borders of acceptance into Australian society'. First, 'there was the influence of his present social and cultural condition'. Essentially, this meant that even Aborigines who 'appeared to have lost all touch with an Aboriginal life' were 'sometimes slow and unwilling to step into the [white] world' through fear of further change. The second set of influences related to 'race'—or 'breeding' as Hasluck put it—and were impediments only in so far as they existed in the mind of the coloured person and in the mind of the white person. Reluctantly describing the third set of influences as 'kinship', Hasluck explained that by the time the individual Aborigine was preparing to enter Australian society, the old tribal meanings of kinship and the obligations of kinship—whether in marriage, in sharing of food or the acts of an avenger—had faded but he still had relatives and he could not wholly escape from them.113

ImPLYING that the difficulties Namatjira encountered were directly attributable to 'displacement'—to his no longer belonging to the crumbling Aboriginal society from which he came—Hasluck argued that Namatjira's principal difficulty was 'the strain he felt ... between him and his own people'; the undifferentiated masses of Aboriginal people not ready to be assimilated, yet unable to let Namatjira go.114

Having lived in white society and been expelled from it, the nature of Cook's displacement was almost the complete reverse of Namatjira's. It was the considered view of Archer, Giese, Ryan and others, that Cook's problems stemmed directly from his being 'forced ... back into a native camp environment' by Duguid in 1950.115 According to Ryan, when Cook 'first arrived at Roper River mission from Adelaide the other natives considered him a prodigy with his superior education and his ability to attract attention with stories of life in the city'.116 As the novelty wore off, Cook's behaviour deteriorated in line with his efforts to regain this 'early prestige', resulting in a vast inventory of complaints against him. Cook's fiercest critic was P.E. Leske, superintendent at Roper River mission.117 According to Leske, Cook was 'a first class nuisance [who obeyed] only when inclined, [walked] off a job without notice, and even once led a stop-work among the young fellows' at the mission.118 Cook was so 'lazy' and so 'arrogant', Leske complained,

113 Ibid., pp. 132-33.
115 Archer to Hasluck, 5 June 1957.
117 Evans felt that Leske had a 'personal bias against' Cook. Rather than Cook being the sole cause of trouble, Evans suggested that a climate of 'mutual bitterness [had] developed between the missionaries and [Cook]': 'In the former's eyes [Cook] is capable of any evil, whilst [Cook] obviously thinks that the missionaries are out to frustrate him at every turn and blame him for everything', Evans explained. See handwritten notes by Evans on Leske to Giese, 20 June 1958 and Ryan to Giese, 20 November 1958.
that when he went 'walkabout' he stole horses to 'save his legs'. Unfortunately for Cook, it was not just other Aborigines who considered him something of a prodigy; Leske too 'had many hopes for the lad'. Lamenting the fact that 'with [Cook] it [was] more retrogression rather than progression', Leske let his disappointment show. More than Cook's poor behaviour, however, it was his disinclination to 'progress' in the direction that Leske and others thought appropriate given his 'privileged' upbringing and 'excellent' education that was the cause of their disappointment.

Unable to abide Cook's 'wilful persistence in continual dissidence', Leske had him expelled from the mission at the end of 1958. From there Cook and Ruth went to Beswick Creek Station, where all seemed well until April 1960 when Cook was sentenced to four months' gaol for seriously assaulting his wife. Had Cook 'used his fists or a piece of wood the offence would not have appeared so bad', according to Ryan, but since 'the weapon [Cook] used a four foot length of flat iron approximately 2 inches in width', Ryan was surprised that 'he did not have to answer a charge of manslaughter or murder'. Ryan attributed the bulk of Cook's problems, including his violent temperament, to the 'difficulties he ... had to contend with in being sent as a child to surroundings completely unfamiliar to him'. Although not disclosed to Duguid at the time, Ryan cited 'Dr Duguid's action in sending [Cook] from his home to a comparatively isolated mission' as one of the principal reasons for disallowing Cook's exemption. Such an action being contrary to the aims of assimilation, Archer had agreed. Assimilation moved Aborigines out of Aboriginal society and into white society, not the reverse. It was clear to Archer that Cook's 'progress' had been 'retarded' by 'circumstances outside his control', for instead of 'building on the experiences and adjustment which [Cook] had gained during his stay with Dr Duguid', Duguid had 'made [Cook] slip back in the forward move towards assimilation' by sending him to Roper River.

Duguid would have been horrified to learn that his actions were perceived in this way. As indicated in chapter four, Duguid believed that Cook had been displaced at birth. Unlike Namatjira who was 'by birth and training a tribal full-blood', Cook was only 'tribal in appearance', meaning of full-Aboriginal descent. By giving Cook 'a people' and 'a place' at Roper River, Duguid felt that he was replacing that which Cook had been denied; the companionship and support of his 'own people', other 'full-blood' Aborigines who were
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121 Leske to Giese, 20 June 1958; C.D. Gilchrist, acting superintendent Roper River mission to Giese, 31 October 1958, NAA: F1, 1955/820/147-46. The decision to expel Cook was made by Leske before he went on furlough that month.
122 Giese to Duguid, 26 April 1960, Duguid Paper: 1, Series 1; Giese to Duguid, 11 May 1960, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.
123 Ryan to Giese, 6 May 1960.
124 Ibid.
125 Ryan to Giese, 23 March 1957, NAA: F1, 1955/820/79. In this report, Ryan described Cook's movement from Duguid's home to Roper River as 'cruel'.
126 Archer to Hasluck, 5 June 1957.
travelling the same road. In *Doctor and the Aborigines* (1972), Duguid proclaimed himself right. Describing his visit to Roper River mission in 1951, Duguid wrote:

There were two corroborees while I stayed at Roper River, and [Cook] was at both of them. The turn-out of Aborigines was understandably small at the Sunday morning [Church] service, since the corroborees had been going on through the two previous nights, but [Cook] turned up somewhat late looking sleepy and tousled. *He was a good example of assimilation into two worlds, able to dance and sing at the traditional ceremonies of the Aborigines and follow them with worship at a Christian service.*

Assimilation worked, Duguid was saying: just look at Cook, an assimilated 'full-blood' Aborigine with a place in both worlds, Aboriginal and white. While this interpretation was consistent with Duguid's overall approach to assimilation, and bore some resemblance to comments he made at the time—for example, Duguid noted Cook's attendance at a corroboree in his travel diary, and remarked upon Cook's tardiness at Church the next day—it did not reflect the reality of Cook's place at Roper River in 1951 or later. Nor did it reflect the reality of Hasluck's assimilation. This being Duguid's last word on his 'adopted' Aboriginal son's life, it reflected instead Duguid's hope that Cook would one day find a place in both worlds, and be happy there.

---

128 Duguid, Travel Diary, July 1951, pp. 65-66, 68.
129 The Welfare Branch ceased its close monitoring of Cook following his imprisonment. In 1962, Duguid was informed that Cook had completed a Patrol Assistant's training course and was giving 'excellent service to the Branch'. It was felt that Cook was 'destined to become an important figure in Territory life'. In 1964, Cook played the role of the witch-doctor in Cecil Holmes' film *The Aboriginal*. In January 1965, Cook was appointed the 'first full-blood union organiser' with the North Australian Workers Union (NAWU). In July that year, Cook lost his NAWU position to Dexter Daniels, a childhood friend from Roper River. Cook died in 1983, aged 47. Anecdotal evidence suggests that his death was alcohol related. See A.H. Pitts, District Welfare Officer to Duguid, 19 December 1962, Duguid Papers: I, Series 1; 'Foundling Aboriginal Gains Union Post', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 January 1965; 'Foundling Aboriginal new NAWU Organiser', *News* (Darwin), 11 January 1965; Erica Mirfin to Margery Meades, 15 June 1965, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1; Sandra Holmes to A.P. Elkin, 23 March 1965, A.P. Elkin Papers, University of Sydney Archives, Series 1, Box 5, Folder 66; Sandra Le Brun Holmes, *Faces in the Sun: Outback Journeys*, Penguin, Ringwood (Vic), 1999; Personal communication with Nancy Sheppard, 17 January 2000.
III. Government Settlements versus Ernabella Mission

At a public meeting in Adelaide in July 1955, Duguid challenged two unnamed men who made the following statements:

1. That the Government and Missions in the Northern Territory were combining to detribalise the Aborigines and to make them available, whether they liked it or not, to the cattle stations.
2. That the Government had formed compounds throughout the Northern Territory in which to hold the Aborigines for a few weeks before sending them to work on cattle stations.
3. That Aborigines from many different tribes were being forced into these compounds far removed from their tribal country and that even aeroplanes were being used to collect the natives.  

Informing Hasluck of such, Duguid made it clear that while he doubted the veracity of these claims—"such conduct ... [being] at variance from [Hasluck's] published policy"—he nevertheless wanted 'definite information on the above points' so that he could positively refute the charges.  

In reply, Hasluck stated that 'there [was] most definitely no deliberate attempt on the part of either the Missions or the Government to hold Aborigines as a labour pool for pastoralists', and this was so even although the Government clearly recognises that large numbers of Aborigines must look to the pastoralists for employment if they are to become skilled and self-supporting units within the white Australia economy as envisaged in the governments assimilation policy.

Nor were 'any Aborigines forced into 'compounds", Hasluck maintained, despite the fact that:

"It is true that the Northern Territory welfare programme is based in part on a system of "settlements" ... [However, no] natives are forced to live on settlements and, of those who elect to live there, none are forced to leave."  

---

130 Duguid to Hasluck, 23 July 1955, Sir Paul Hasluck Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 5274 (hereafter Hasluck Papers), Box 32.
131 Ibid.
132 Hasluck to Duguid, [August 1955], Hasluck Papers, Box 32.
133 Ibid.
As for detribalisation, the answer was 'simply that this process [had] developed inevitably as a result of the general impact of the 20th Century on the Aborigines', Hasluck explained.134

Duguid had his own views on the causes of detribalisation (see chapter two). Although he wanted to accept the Minister's assurances, the idea that 'full-bloods [were] being taken into compounds and ... compulsorily put to work—often far removed from their own country' was 'very persistent', and could not be 'authoritatively refute[d]' on the basis of Hasluck's statement.135 More information, and less prevarication, was required.

Perhaps fearing Duguid's propensity to cause trouble, Hasluck wasted no time requesting further information from his department—'supported by statistics ... if possible'—to answer Duguid's concerns.136 Duly supplied, such figures 'clearly demonstrate[d]' that the department's 'preference [was] to keep natives in their home country', and to encourage Aborigines to seek employment 'on the pastoral stations and elsewhere rather than [have them] gathered into government settlements'. Moreover, Duguid could be 'assured that it [was] most definitely not the objective of [government] policy to gather natives on to settlements and missions'.137 Such places were 'regarded only as a means by which the needs of policy [were] served and not as an end in themselves'. Since the 'ultimate objective of [government] policy [was] that, generation by generation, more and more natives [would] be able to live as members of the general community', Hasluck explained that he

would regard it as a policy failure if the eventual outcome was that we had in the Northern Territory a series of flourishing native settlements in which the majority of the native peoples were living apart from the rest of the community.138

Admonishing Duguid to 'refute most emphatically any suggestion' that government was holding the Aborigines as a labour pool for pastoralists, Hasluck decried the absurdity of such an idea: 'The Aborigine is as free in principle to choose his employment as is the white Australian. Any suggestion to the contrary is quite absurd'.139 With this, Duguid let the matter rest, however, his '[refusal] to believe' that Hasluck would condone such practices was not the same as positively knowing that they did not occur.140

134 Ibid.
135 Duguid to Hasluck, 24 August 1955, Hasluck Papers, Box 32.
136 Hasluck to Duguid, 29 August 1955, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566. See additional note at foot of letter, Hasluck to secretary: 'Please send a copy of my letter to the Acting Administrator and ask him to arrange for Mr Giese to let me have a more carefully considered reply to Dr Duguid. If possible the reply should be supported by statistics.'
137 Hasluck to Duguid, 11 October, 1955, NAA: A452/1, 1957/2566 (original emphasis).
138 Ibid.
139 Ibid.
140 Duguid to Hasluck, 24 August 1955.
Following press reports in April 1964 that over forty ‘primitive’ Aborigines from the western desert region had been ‘taken at their own request’ to the Papunya native settlement 300 miles away in the Northern Territory, Duguid raised the matter again—only this time in public. In an address to an ABSCHOL meeting in July 1964, Duguid condemned what he saw as ‘relentless assimilation in West Australia and [the] Northern Territory’. Unwilling to accept the claim that these ‘primitive Aborigines ... want[ed] to abandon their sand and spinifex hunting grounds and move into the fringe of white civilisation’, Duguid asked why, if their general health was ‘good’ as reported, they had been ‘enticed and impressed to leave their own homeland for a crowded settlement and to a life utterly foreign to them?’ ‘Is it that [government has] become solicitous for the people in the desert? If so, there was no need to uproot them’, Duguid asserted. Ration depots could have been set up in ‘their own country’ and ‘visited by patrols from time to time’. Instead, the Northern Territory administration sent out patrols to bring the people in:

A truck is loaded with foodstuffs and second-hand dresses, trousers and shirts. The primitive Aborigines when found are first given food ... [then they] are told [that] food is in plenty at Papunya but that they cannot have it in their own country.\(^\text{142}\)

Duguid doubted ‘whether regard for the natives’ welfare was the factor at work’. In his view, it was about government ‘hurrying the last of a nomadic people into civilisation’; it was about the ‘End of the Tribes’.\(^\text{143}\)

By 1964 the Northern Territory had ceased to be Hasluck’s responsibility. That Hasluck’s move to the Department of Defence preceded Duguid’s public criticism of assimilation is no coincidence.\(^\text{144}\) Duguid, it seems, felt freer to air his misgivings about assimilation after Hasluck’s change of portfolio. This change also influenced Duguid’s later account of his visit to several native welfare settlements in the Northern Territory in 1960.

As with his earlier trip to Darwin in 1951, Duguid contacted Hasluck before venturing into the Northern Territory.\(^\text{145}\) Hoping for a letter of introduction and permission to visit the settlements west of Alice Springs, Duguid was gratified to learn that arrangements had been made for him to visit seven such settlements ‘in company with a


\(^{142}\) Duguid, ‘Relentless Assimilation’, pp. 15-16.


\(^{144}\) Hasluck moved to the Department of Defence in January 1964. In April that year, he moved to the Department of External Affairs. See Duguid to Hasluck, 13 January 1964 and 29 April 1964, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1.

senior officer of the Welfare Branch and with transport provided by the Administration'. 146 In May 1960, Duguid spent one week inspecting the settlements at Jay Creek, Amoonguna, Warrabri, Yuendumu, Papunya, Areyonga and Ilparpa. Immediately upon his return to Adelaide, Duguid congratulated the Commonwealth government 'on its handling of the Northern Territory Aboriginal assimilation problem': 'The Commonwealth government is undertaking an excellent programme to raise the full-blood tribal natives to our standard', he told the Adelaide Advertiser, adding that in his opinion, it was the 'most progressive effort ever made in this country'. 147

Duguid's 'willingness to publicise what the Commonwealth government [was] doing in the field of native welfare in the Northern Territory [was] greatly appreciated' by the Welfare Branch. 148 Giese told Duguid that his positive evaluation would enable the Welfare Branch to

counter some of the unwarranted and unjustified criticism which emanates from some Aborigines welfare organisations in the southern States who in some cases, of course, have not had an opportunity to talk to us about our problems here and to see what we are attempting to do. 149

Duguid guessed that the welfare organisations to which Giese referred were the 'two Victorian organisations'—the Victorian Aborigines Advancement League and the Council for Aboriginal Rights—'whose attitude to Mr Hasluck and his work in the Northern Territory' Duguid deplored. So much so, Duguid explained, that his organisation, the South Australian Aborigines Advancement League (SA AAL), was considering withdrawing from the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA), it being too heavily dominated, in his view, by the Victorian organisations. Like Giese, Duguid had no time for the criticisms of organisations without 'knowledge' or 'first-hand' experience of the 'practical issues'. 150 Anything Duguid could do to help sway public opinion in favour of the settlement programme would be gladly done.

With the aim of further helping government, Duguid compiled a detailed report of his visit to the settlements. As with his Darwin report, Duguid sent the first draft to be checked by government before releasing it to the press: 'I would like you, or someone

'Natives Project Praised', Advertiser, 4 June 1960; Duguid to Giese, 8 June 1960, NAA: Fl, 1960/398.
149 Giese to Duguid, 10 June 1960, NAA: Fl, 1960/398.
150 Duguid to Giese, 18 June 1960, NAA: Fl, 1960/398. The SA AAL's affiliation with the FCAA was 'frequently debated' from 1958 until 1966 when the decision to withdraw was finally made. See SA AAL Minutes, 2 November 1958 and 27 April 1959, League Papers, Series 3/2; SA AAL Minutes, 10 August 1964, League Papers, Series 3/3; SA AAL Minutes, 15 August 1966, League Papers, Series 3/4; Phyllis Duguid, 'The History of the League Part II', Aborigines Advancement League Newsletter, No. 27, September 1965, p. 4; Iris Schultz to editor, Aborigines Advancement League Newsletter, March 1966, p. 5. See also chapter six.
nominated by you, to read what I have written to correct any misconception', he told
Giese.\footnote{Duguid to Giese, 30 August 1960, NAA: F1, 1960/398.} Giese's representative, the Assistant Director of Welfare, E.P. Milliken
suggested several minor alterations to Duguid's text, none of which were substantive
changes. Duguid's report, as Milliken noted, was 'certainly very comprehensive'.\footnote{Milliken to Duguid, 18 November 1960.} It
described in detail the type of housing provided on the settlements—'prefabricated
aluminium houses, a single room 12 feet by 12 feet with a 6 foot verandah on three
sides'—and the type of facilities provided, such as at Amoonguna, a settlement near Alice
Springs, where there was a

school, two dormitories, and a pre-school centre, modern hospital, kitchen and
mess room unit for the provision of three cooked meals a day, ablution blocks
and toilets with septic tank drainage, a manual training centre for trades, and
an agricultural training area, and there is a large recreation hut with canteen at
one end.\footnote{Duguid, 'Welfare Work in the Northern Territory', unpublished report, 29 August 1960, Charles
Duguid Papers, Private Collection, Adelaide, since deposited at the National Library of Australia
(hereafter Duguid Papers: 3).}

According to Duguid, this 'new and positive approach'—wholly 'conceived by the Minister,
Mr Hasluck'—was designed 'to give the native people in the Northern Territory an
opportunity to understand the white man's way of life, in the hope that, in due course, they
will become part of it'.\footnote{Clearly, government was sparing no expense in 'furthering the development of the full-bloods'.
To those who would argue that the cost was too high, Duguid maintained that it was 'not a
thousandth part of what we [had] taken from them'. According to Jeremy Long, more than half of
the greatly increased expenditure on Aboriginal welfare in the post-war period was devoted to
these settlements. Duguid, 'Welfare Work in the Northern Territory'; Long, The Go-Betweens,
p. 123. See also Tim Rowse, White Flour, White Power: From Rations to Citizenship in
that as far as Aborigines under Federal Ordinance are concerned, we have entered an era of
hope', and he urged 'all who are interested in the future of our dark brethren to support the
settlement policy'.\footnote{Duguid, 'Welfare Work in the Northern Territory'.}

In an otherwise soporific report, leaden with detail about building materials and the
like, Duguid's 'thrill' at meeting Tjaruru at Papunya settlement, and at being remembered
by him, was self-evident. Duguid first met Tjaruru in 1936 when 'he was a boy of eleven,
and one the most brilliant youths of any race [Duguid had] known' (see chapter four).
Although twenty-four years had elapsed since last they met, they 'knew one another at
sight'.\footnote{Duguid to Administrator, 27 March 1960, NAA: F1, 1960/398; Duguid to Giese, 7 April 1960,
NAA: F1, 1960/398.} Before leaving for Alice Springs, Duguid had mentioned his desire to see Tjaruru
and Warungulla, a friend of Tjaruru's he had also met in 1936.\footnote{Duguid to Giese, 30 August 1960, NAA: F1, 1960/398.} Enquiries were made as
to their whereabouts, however, 'none of the white staff' knew them, Duguid explained in his report, because it was 'the policy of the Welfare Department to speak only in English'. Duguid found them by asking 'older natives' at Papunya where they were. As in 1936 when Tjaruru had 'amazed' him with his intelligence, Duguid delighted in reporting that nothing had changed: 'in the early morning who should be standing near the track as we left but Tjaruru, waving farewell. Don't try to tell me that young man belongs to an inferior race.' 158

Recounting this meeting with Tjaruru at Papunya in Doctor and the Aborigines (1972), Duguid told a very different story. Although twelve years had passed, more important than the lapse of time was the fact that Duguid no longer felt compelled to project a positive image of the settlement project. In Doctor and the Aborigines Duguid explained that no white person at Papunya had known who Tjaruru and Warungulla were because they were known as 'Johnny D and C-two'. 159 In Duguid's view, this lack of insight suggested a fundamental lack of respect on the part of the white staff, none of whom, he recalled, 'had any knowledge of the native tongues'. This in tum affected the teaching of children in the settlement schools where only English—'a completely foreign tongue with no relevance to their old way of life'—was being taught. 'In the Papunya dining hall', Duguid continued:

I saw the Aborigines file in three times a day, and sit on chairs at tables with knives, forks and spoons in front of them. The Commonwealth government was certainly feeding those who might otherwise go hungry, but it seemed hardly right to hustle them at such a speed into the western way of life. 160

Like the re-naming of Tjaruru and Warungulla and the teaching of English only, Duguid protested that the distribution of food at Papunya reflected an attitude of 'unimaginative benevolence' which was as 'damaging in its own way ... [as] downright malevolence'. 161

Rather than new views, or views revised over time, I suggest that Duguid's comments on Papunya in Doctor and the Aborigines accurately reflect how he felt in 1960. To have raised such concerns then would have fuelled Hasluck's critics' fire, thus Duguid kept his misgivings to himself. However, it is clear that Duguid had reservations about aspects of the settlement project prior to the publication of his autobiography. In July 1960, just two months after Duguid's Northern Territory tour, the South Australian government agreed to establish a cattle station in the Musgrave Ranges to 'train and employ tribal Aborigines' from Ernabella mission. Praising this initiative in a letter to the editor of the Adelaide Advertiser, Duguid explained that the aim was 'to settle the young
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158 Duguid, 'Welfare Work in the Northern Territory'.
159 Duguid, Doctor and the Aborigines, p. 200.
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men with their wives and families in their tribal country'. In 1962, in an address to the fifth annual FCAA conference, Duguid urged the states to follow the Northern Territory's lead, or better yet to 'improve on it' by sending 'well-trained people ... to the reserves to train [the Aborigines] for a satisfying life'. In 1963, while still maintaining his support for the settlement project, Duguid argued that there was, however, an 'inherent weakness in the scheme': 'The Aborigines, divorced from their tribal life and the discipline of their own culture, are forced to accept laws and sanctions they cannot readily understand'. With great care and more subtlety than he usually employed, Duguid proffered Ernabella mission as a better model, implying that rather than move 'tribal' Aborigines to the settlements, it was far better 'to train and settle the young men with their wives and families in their own country', as was being done at Ernabella, because 'loss of land [meant] the end of tribal life'.

Following the 'forced' relocation of Aborigines from the western desert to Papunya in 1964, Duguid was less circumspect in his promotion of Ernabella. It was, he declared, the one 'bright spot' in an otherwise sorry record of assimilation for 'tribal full-bloods'. In stark contrast to the 'drastic idea of immediate assimilation being countenanced' by the Commonwealth government, Ernabella offered 'quiet and gradual assimilation', Duguid claimed. For 27 years this alternative form of 'assimilation [had] been going on' at Ernabella and the results spoke for themselves: 'There [was] no inferiority at Ernabella, no apathy, no sad faces'. Instead, the people were 'happy'. Before the mission came, the people 'were dignified men and women living meaningful lives like nomadic Aborigines everywhere'; 'today [they] are responsible for almost all the work on the station—boring for water, erecting windmills and tanks, fencing, gardening, butchering, driving trucks and now, house building'.

According to Duguid, the key to this 'gradual and happy change', indeed the key to Ernabella's success, was 'intelligent compromise'—a policy which acknowledged that 'our civilisation [had] something to offer the Aborigines', but which recognised the importance of offering it 'to them on their own terms and in their own tribal land'. Duguid was 'completely convinced that no-one [had] any right to force another into a new way of life', yet he was 'equally convinced that true Christian living [was] a larger and a better way of life than that of the tribal native'. Thus, he advocated leaving 'it to the Aborigines to make
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the change if they [thought] our way [was] better than theirs.\textsuperscript{169} At Ernabella, this meant that there was 'respect for native customs [and] no compulsion in education or religion'. It meant that the children were taught to read and write in their own language before later being taught English, and that 'responsibility [was] passed to the Aborigines whenever they [were] willing and able to take it'. These 'basic factors' were the 'secret of the rapid yet quiet and solid development of the Aborigines at Ernabella'. In Duguid's view, they were what made Ernabella and the Commonwealth government's approach to assimilation 'as far apart as the poles'.\textsuperscript{170}

Duguid's finest (and favourite) exemplars of the 'rapid development' that was possible at a mission or settlement that met 'tribal natives' on their own terms were the Aborigines from Ernabella who travelled to Adelaide to see the Queen in 1954 (see Plate 12):

\begin{quote}
The extent to which they have travelled from the Stone Age in 16 years can be gauged when I tell you that 24 of them came down the thousand miles by truck to Adelaide to see the Queen. They paid their expenses and had enough money over to do a full day's shopping before returning home.\textsuperscript{171}
\end{quote}

This was what 'quiet' assimilation could achieve; 'actual tribal Aborigines who in sixteen years [had] developed to our standard of living from the native tribal state'.\textsuperscript{172} Without face paint, body paint, loincloth or spears, these were 'tribal' Aborigines who stood alongside whites to see the Queen, not as the attraction, but as interested observers. Hair neatly combed and coiffed in finery, 'their behaviour was a lesson in poise and dignity', Duguid claimed:

\begin{quote}
It was the first time the white citizens [of Adelaide] had seen tribal full-blood[s] in the city and they were duly impressed. Now they had to admit they were little different from ourselves except in colour, and that they were practising Christians.\textsuperscript{173}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{169} Duguid, 'The Aborigines: From Stone-Age to Twentieth Century in Sixteen Years', The Link, 1 October 1954, p. 58.

\textsuperscript{170} \textit{Ibid.}; Duguid, Relentless Assimilation in West Australia and Northern Territory', p. 16.

\textsuperscript{171} Duguid, 'Voices From Overseas', typescript of radio broadcast, recorded 18 May 1954, Duguid Papers: 3. See also Duguid, 'The Aborigines: From Stone-Age to Twentieth Century in Sixteen Years', p. 58; Duguid, White Doctor, Chapter 3: Aborigines who went to see the Queen', \textit{Evening News} (Scotland), 29 December 1954, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{172} Duguid to Playford, Premier South Australia, 31 July 1953, State Records of South Australia, GRG 24/140/22 (cited, recordSArchives, official newsletter of the State Records of South Australia, No. 20, March 2002, p. 3).

\textsuperscript{173} Duguid, \textit{No Dying Race}, p. 101; Duguid, White Doctor, Chapter 4: The Aborigines began to die out', \textit{Evening News} (Scotland), 30 December 1954, p. 6, Duguid Papers: 3.
Where Duguid stressed the uniqueness of this occasion for having brought 'tribal full-bloods' in contact with white Australians in the city, Hasluck would probably have questioned the designation 'tribal'. Certainly they were 'full-bloods', but if they had 'developed to our standard of living' as Duguid claimed, were they not detribalised? Was this not the point of assimilation?

Hasluck viewed detribalisation as a necessary precondition for assimilation, arguing in 1959 that 'if anyone of Aboriginal descent is to be accepted as a full member of our society, he must cease to be a primitive Aboriginal and change in outlook and habit'.174 The Aborigines from Emabella who went to see the Queen had changed in outlook and habit, and were no longer 'primitive'—if by 'primitive' was meant a 'way of life' ignorant of all things 'modern'—but they were still 'tribal' in Duguid's eyes, and always would be. They were civilised and Christianised 'tribal' Aborigines who had changed far more than Duguid believed necessary for full social acceptance—their right as human beings—to be accorded them.

Assimilation, if carried out correctly, did not stop 'full-blood' Aborigines being 'tribal', according to Duguid. Instead, it gave them the necessary skills to cope with white society, to interact with white people on equal terms, and to 'take their part in the economy of Australia'.175 As early as 1952, Duguid claimed that Emabella showed how 'quickly ... tribal people' could fit 'into our national life'. At that time, the men were 'responsible for the economy of 2000 square miles of country', and did the shepherding, shearing and wool classing of over 4000 sheep, while the women turned the waste-wool into rugs and mats and were 'responsible for the daily feeding of at least 250 people'.176 Thirteen years later, at a 'Wages and Employment Seminar' organised by the SA AAL, Duguid proudly declared that the Aborigines at Emabella were 'still tribal':

In 1935 when I first visited the Musgraves, every man, woman and child were naked nomads living off the land. They still do that. You must realise this when considering the whole situation. They are still tribal—still hold corroborees. The boys still go through their initiation rites. Marriage customs are still tribal. Tribal culture continues at their wish and ours.177

174 'Minister, Differ on Natives', Advertiser, 29 August 1959, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 112.
175 Duguid, 'Full-blood Mothers and their Half-caste Children'.
176 Duguid, 'What we are doing to help Aborigines fit into our national life', typescript of ABC broadcast, 28 January 1952, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 6. See also Peggy Brock, 'Pastoral Stations and Reserves in South and Central Australia', Aboriginal Workers: Labour History, No. 69, November 1995, pp. 102-114.
177 Duguid, untitled paper presented at 'Wages and Employment Seminar' organised by the SA AAL, 9 October 1965, Papers of Dr Charles Duguid, State Library of South Australia, Mortlock Collection, PRG 387, Series 5.

PART 3: ASSIMILATION
By 1965, the Aborigines at Ernabella were 'beginning to move out to other employment', however, Duguid was confident that they would return to Ernabella when their work was done, for 'it [was] home to the Pitjantjatjara people'.

Duguid's description of Ernabella as 'a happy, contented community in which the Aborigines [were] playing a great part, and [which would] soon [play] a major part in the development of the north-west corner of South Australia', would have caused Hasluck to look askance. In Hasluck's perception of assimilation, it was critical that missions and government settlements be regarded as transitory places where individuals would acquire the 'tools of assimilation' and then move off into white society. In 1961, Hasluck argued that the task of missions and settlements was to do 'themselves out of a job'. 'The natives cannot be kept in one place simply to keep a mission or settlement in continued existence', he asserted, adding that 'in the long run' assimilation meant that missions would 'cease to exist'. By the late 1970s Ernabella had ceased to exist as a mission, but the people had not moved on. In one of Duguid's last published articles, 'Tribal Nomadic People' (1978), he observed that: 'Today Ernabella is no longer a mission, but independent land administered by a democratically elected council of semi-tribal men and women who choose white "community advisers" to help them on their way.' With its own 'modern amenities'—grocery store, hospital, church and school—Ernabella had become what Duguid always hoped it would, and what Hasluck most feared—a self-managing Aboriginal community that was more or less separate from white society.

Duguid was a strong supporter of Hasluck and assimilation, and yet, as this chapter has shown, he was not supportive of all that was done in the name of assimilation. He did not support the forced removal of Aboriginal children, or the forced relocation of Aboriginal adults. Nor did he support the central tenet of Hasluck's ideal—individualism. Instead, Duguid believed that Aborigines needed the support of their own people in order to assimilate; that Aboriginal culture aided rather than impeded assimilation; and that 'tribal' Aborigines could make the 'transition to our way of life' without giving up their 'tribal' identity or their 'tribal' land. Duguid believed that 'true assimilation' meant saving Aborigines and their culture from extinction by encouraging them to 'bring their gifts to

---

**Notes:**

178 Duguid worked hard to make Ernabella a viable home in terms of employment and economic sustainability. As a consequence of the areas limited natural resources, this was no easy task. Visiting Ernabella in 1958, Duguid met many 'young men who had been educated at the school, but for whom work was not available'. In 1960, he described unemployment as the mission's 'chief failure'. By 1965, Duguid was resigned to the fact that such men would have to 'move out' to seek employment. See Duguid, handwritten notes on Ernabella's future, [1960], Duguid Papers: 1, Series 10, Sub-series 6; Duguid, No Dying race, p. 109; Duguid, untitled paper presented at 'Wages and Employment Seminar'.

179 Duguid, 'White Doctor, Chapter 4: The Aborigines began to die out'.
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**PART 3: ASSIMILATION**
the common pool of Australia's enrichment: it meant the creation of a 'new Australia' in which all Aborigines would be 'welcomed as full citizens'. Duguid thought this was what Hasluck meant by assimilation. Indeed, he thought this was what assimilation meant. Although his willingness to publicise his misgivings over the way assimilation was being implemented in the Northern Territory following Hasluck's change of portfolio suggests that Duguid came to believe otherwise, Duguid did not join the chorus of anti-assimilationists in the 1960s because he believed that his version of assimilation was worth fighting for.

Chapter 6

URBAN ABORIGINES
Assimilation in Adelaide

While at Emabella mission in November 1953, Charles Duguid learned that Lucy Turner, a 'part-Aboriginal girl who [was] almost white', was to be included in the party travelling to Adelaide to see the Queen. Duguid queried this decision, only to learn from Ronald Trudinger, superintendent of the mission, that Lucy was 'the keenest of all the girls to go' and that it would 'break her heart' if she was not allowed. Pleading Lucy's case, Trudinger argued that she could 'stand in the back with us whites', leaving the 'main phalanx ... compiled entirely of full-bloods'. Despite everyone at the mission being 'overwhelmingly' in favour of Lucy being allowed to go, Duguid prevailed. Since the 'party [was] being represented as tribal Aborigines', Duguid felt it unwise to include 'Lucy in full-blood contingent'. In his view, it was not appropriate to keep Lucy 'in the background when the Queen pass[ed]', not least because it would hurt her feelings, but because appearances mattered. Simply put, Lucy could not stand with her friends and relatives to see the Queen because she was not one of them; she was not a 'full-blood' and only 'full-bloods' could be 'tribal'.

Duguid found Trudinger's attitude towards Lucy deeply troubling. Whereas Trudinger believed that Lucy would 'eventually ... marry a full-blood native and ... be a great asset to Emabella', Duguid was appalled at the prospect of 'starting a run of part-Aborigines in a tribal area'. 'Keeping Lucy at Emabella has not been the best for her', he told Trudinger, for if 'she had gone to a half-caste training centre and school, she would now be a member of the white community'. Having planned an overseas trip during 1954, Duguid could not take Lucy into his own home as he wished, but if not for this he would have taken 'her for as long as necessary to introduce her to the white community'. Later, Lucy did go to live with the Duguids, but she did not stay in white society as Duguid hoped. After marrying Jim (now Yami) Lester from the Duguids' home, with Charles and Phyllis acting as father and mother of the bride, hosting the festivities and giving their 'foster daughter' away, Lucy returned to Central Australia and made her life there.
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1 Charles Duguid, 'Proposed Visit of Emabella Natives to Adelaide: Talk with Staff Council', typescript report, November 1953, Records of the Presbyterian Church, South Australian Assembly, State Library of South Australia, Mortlock Collection (hereafter Presbyterian Papers), SRG 123/300.
2 Ibid.; Ronald Trudinger to Duguid, 6 February 1954 and Duguid to Trudinger, 9 February 1954, Presbyterian Papers, SRG 123/300.
3 Duguid, 'Proposed Visit of Emabella Natives to Adelaide'.
5 Duguid to Trudinger, 28 March 1954, Presbyterian Papers, SRG 123/300.
6 Nancy Barnes, Munyi's daughter: A spirited Brumby, Seaview Press, Henley Beach, 2000, p. 68.
Aboriginal Women in Focus Forum in 1985, Lucy (now Waniwa Lester) spoke of her life 'between two worlds':

I grew up at Ernabella. I lived with my people and went out hunting with them and learned their ways. It gives me great honour to be between two worlds. I choose to be in the middle. I choose not to leave my people, to live my life as [a] two-way person.  

Lucy chose a different life from the one Duguid thought 'best for her'. But was it really best for her, or best for the 'full-blood' community at Ernabella that she be brought to white society? Clearly the welfare of the 'full-blood' community was dominant in Duguid's thinking. It did not occur to him that Lucy could be as 'Aboriginal', or as 'tribal', as her 'full-blood' relatives. Blinded by Lucy's 'almost white' appearance, and the threat she posed to the Aboriginality of the others at the mission, Duguid could not see that her attachment to her people, her place and her land was as strong and as important to her as it was to 'tribal' Aborigines.

As determined as Duguid was to help 'tribal' Aborigines maintain their culture and identity, his dealings with Aborigines of mixed-descent were informed by the view that their 'white blood' somehow precluded their access to Aboriginality. If even Lucy—someone who had lived her entire life among 'tribal' Aborigines—was not Aboriginal enough to remain at Ernabella, then what of Aborigines of mixed-descent who had grown up in white society? How did Duguid view such people? How did they view themselves?

To understand Duguid's efforts on behalf of urban Aborigines, it is essential to know something about the people he was fighting for; whether his goals matched theirs; whether he listened to them; whether he learned from them. The sparsity of documentary evidence makes such questions difficult, but not impossible, to answer. Using oral testimony, autobiographies and sources from the time, it is possible to gain some insight into what Aborigines in the settled parts of South Australia wanted in the 1950s and 1960s. Representing Duguid's views on Aborigines of mixed-descent poses a similar challenge. Very few of Duguid's published writings dealt specifically, or even mostly, with Aborigines of mixed-descent. Scattered references in Duguid's correspondence, unpublished articles and speeches, and other material including the records of the South Australian Aborigines Advancement League (SA AAL) provide much needed insight, however, in comparison to the vast volumes Duguid produced on 'tribal' Aborigines, they
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also attest to his preference of 'leaving the question of the ['part-Aborigines'] to other[s]'\(^8\). During the 1950s and 1960s, the 'others' Duguid deferred to became 'part-Aborigines' themselves. Beginning with an account of Duguid's connection to Colebrook, the United Aborigines Mission (UAM) facility for Aboriginal children at Quorn in South Australia, this chapter examines Duguid's views on the relative ease with which Aborigines of mixed-descent could assimilate. It documents the SA AAL's campaigns on behalf of urban Aborigines and explores the changing scene of Aboriginal politics in the mid 1960s—the rise of 'all Aboriginal' organisations (or 'black power') and Duguid's response to it.

I. 'Part-Aborigines present little difficulty'

Not all Aborigines of mixed-descent were 'urban'. Although the majority of Aborigines who lived in the settled parts of South Australia were of mixed-descent, many also lived in remote parts of the state. Fay Gale, a doctoral student in the Department of Geography at the University of Adelaide undertook an extensive program of fieldwork among Aborigines of mixed-descent in South Australia in the late 1950s. Her thesis, 'A Study of Assimilation: Part-Aborigines in South Australia', begins with the question:

how best can a relatively small population of mixed bloods, no longer able to participate in the life of their indigenous forebears, find a place within the general community, which will give both satisfaction to themselves and be beneficial and acceptable to the larger community?\(^9\)

Covering the whole state, from the densely populated white-dominated south, to the thinly populated Aboriginal-dominated north, Gale concluded that:

No one answer can possibly suit both the three-quarter caste living in a semi-tribalised manner in the northern part of the State, and the quarter-caste in standard housing and employment—almost completely accepted by his neighbours in suburban Adelaide.\(^10\)

Another researcher in South Australia working on the question of Aborigines of mixed-descent at this time was Judy Inglis. Like Gale, she found it difficult to 'give a simple account of the way of life of our part-Aborigines' because:

\(^8\) Duguid, Speech delivered at the Melbourne Town Hall under the auspice of the Council for Aboriginal Rights (hereafter CAR Speech), 19 June 1951, Duguid Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 5068 (hereafter Duguid Papers: 1), Series 6.


They live on government reserves or stations, in shanty towns, and in ordinary houses in country towns and cities ... Their appearance varies from quite dark to fair, their living conditions vary from very bad to very good and their attitudes cover a wide range from feckless dependence on government assistance to aggressive independence ... In some cases they retain social habits and customs which seem to derive from their tribal past while in others their way of life differs little from that of European Australians.¹¹

Duguid was not blind to this diversity. He realised that 'the majority of half-castes [had] poor living conditions', and that in some parts of the state 'their lot was sheer tragedy'. However, rather than address such differences, he tended to focus on those Aborigines of mixed-descent who lived 'in our community' as proof that they all could.¹²

In 1958 Duguid claimed to know 'of about 100 young part-Aborigines who were born in the back country and who grew up under the sympathetic guidance of white people further south', and who were now 'so much [a] part of our community that few people [knew] they [were] in our midst'.¹³ Inglis' astute observation 'that what we do, or try to do, will be influenced by the end result we are seeking' found clear affirmation in Duguid's promotion of these people—separated from their parents, raised in institutions and educated in state schools—as proof that 'part-Aborigines who [had] opportunity and respect from birth [were] as capable of taking their place in our civilisation as we [were]'.¹⁴

While Duguid understood that not all Aborigines of mixed-descent were as 'favoured', he believed that the 'less favoured majority' could also take their place in white society if given 'respect and opportunity'. By respect Duguid meant that white Australians 'must look on the Aborigines with whom [they came] in contact as [they did their] own relatives—no better, no worse'. Full opportunity, he explained, meant ensuring 'that the Aborigines you

¹¹ Judy Inglis, research notes entitled 'Australia's Racial Minority', [1960], Judy Inglis Papers, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, MS 2907 (hereafter Inglis Papers), Box 1, Series 2, Item 6.
¹⁴ Inglis, 'Detribalised Reserves', draft copy of paper prepared for FCAA conference, 1962, p. 11, Inglis Papers, Box 1, Series 2, Item 9; Duguid, 'The Aborigines of Australia', Outlook, November, 1958.
[were] interested in [received] the same education and training for jobs you [got], with in addition a dash of encouragement thrown in'.

By making white Australians responsible for these 'two essentials for their future'—respect and opportunity—Duguid sought to involve white Australians in Aboriginal advancement by giving them familial responsibilities akin to parenthood. In his home, his work-place and through the voluntary association he headed, the SA AAL, this was what Duguid himself tried to do. In 1950, Myra Taylor, originally from Hermannsburg mission and latterly of Colebrook, went to live with the Duguids as Phyllis' 'standby'. Another former Colebrook resident, Nancy Barnes (nee Brumby), was also living with the Duguids at that time and working as Charles' secretary. In no time, according to Barnes, she and Myra 'came to be "adopted" as ... daughter[s]'. Myra was the first of the Duguids' 'foster daughters' to be married from their home in 1954. With nearly 100 invited guests—over 70 being Aborigines—Myra's marriage to Fred Ah Chee, also of Aboriginal descent, was news. The Adelaide Advertiser reported that:

Crowds jammed the Magill Baptist Church for an Aboriginal wedding ... Many of the guests were Aborigines from Victoria, the Northern Territory and the South Australian outback. Eighty attended a reception in Dr Charles Duguid's home afterwards. Tables were laden with cutlery, crystal, china, linen and other presents.

The reception was Phyllis' doing, Duguid told Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories: 'I gave [Myra] away'. Duguid's jubilant description of the 'dressing of the Aborigines of both sexes'—it was 'in perfect taste', he told Hasluck—suggests that for Duguid, Myra's wedding was more than a 'very happy occasion': it was proof that Aborigines 'could progress to the white man's level'—it was proof of assimilation. Nancy Barnes' adept handling of Duguid's correspondence, his accounts and appointment books was also proof of assimilation's success. At the bottom of a carefully typed and formatted letter to
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17 Barnes, Muniyi's daughter, pp. 124-25.
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19 'Big crowd attends Aboriginal wedding', Advertiser, 13 February 1954, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 27.
20 Duguid to Paul Hasluck, Minister for the Territories, 21 February 1954, Papers of Sir Paul Hasluck, National Library of Australia, MS 5274 (hereafter Hasluck Papers), Box 32. See also 'Expert makes plea for Aborigines', Herald (Melbourne), 6 February 1957, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 68.
Hasluck, Duguid wrote: 'P.S. This letter was typed by my secretary who is a 50/50 part-Aborigine'.

There is no denying that Duguid's approach to Aboriginal advancement was, at times, both patronising and paternalistic. Duguid's support for assimilation was founded on an assumption of cultural superiority. He did not hide his view that white society offered Aborigines a 'better way of life'. Duguid's policy for Aborigines of mixed-descent reflected his view that assisting them to 'live their lives as normal Australian citizens' was a relatively simple task. It did not matter to him whether they were 'of the first generation', meaning 'half-caste', or whether they were of 'three-quarter' or lesser caste; it did not matter whether they lived in Adelaide or Coober Pedy—as a consequence of his association with Colebrook, Duguid believed that assimilation for 'part-Aborigines [presented] little difficulty'.

Duguid's association with Colebrook owed much to the fact that many of the children there were of Pitjantjatjara descent. He knew their country, some of their Aboriginal mothers and most of their white fathers. He was even responsible for 'placing' some of them in the home (see chapter three). For Duguid, helping the Colebrook children achieve equality with white people was an extension of his self-imposed duty to their 'tribal' relatives at Emabella. In the summer of 1935-36, Duguid invited the Colebrook children—all thirty-four of them—to camp in his Adelaide house and garden (see Plate 13). Then aged eight, Nancy Barnes has recalled a summer of 'firsts':

This was the first time that Adelaide had seen a group of Aboriginal children ... We did all the things we would never have had a chance to do—going to the zoo, radio stations ... swimming, big ice-creams to lick, bigger than ourselves, our first train trip down from Quorn and arriving at Adelaide station, our first sight of the sea—endless water and sand; people, cars, tram cars, the Botanic Gardens—you name it—all these things ... Doctor [Duguid] even took us proudly visiting the patients.

Among the children who camped in Duguid's garden that summer were Ray Lester, Steve O'Donoghue and George Tongerie who went on to win service honours with the RAAF.
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22 Duguid to Hasluck, 21 October 1953, National Archives of Australia (hereafter NAA), Series A452/1, Item1957/2566.
23 Duguid, 'The Aborigines: From Stone Age to Twentieth Century in Sixteen years', The Link, 1 October 1954, p. 58.
26 Peter Read, Interview with Lois O'Donoghue, 28 July 1988, Peter Read Collection, National Library of Australia, Oral History Collection (hereafter Read Collection), TRC 2303/18.
27 Cited in Mattingley, Survival In Our Land, p. 215.
and Geoff O'Donoghue and Stephen Dodd who won AIF honours. The first primary school teacher of Aboriginal descent, Amy Levai (nee O'Donoghue), also spent that summer at the Duguids, as did her sister, Lois (now Lowitja) O'Donoghue, who became one of the first trainee nurses of Aboriginal descent in Adelaide, and whose list of civil honours and services to her people has made her one of the highest profile Aboriginal women in the country.\textsuperscript{28} Barnes, whose own significant accomplishments include becoming the first kindergarten director of Aboriginal descent, and the first woman of Aboriginal descent appointed to the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Board, has described the successes of these and many other former residents as proof of Colebrook's 'tremendous achievement'.\textsuperscript{29}

Colebrook was not like other institutions for Aboriginal children. It would be difficult to imagine former residents of the now infamous Cootamundra Girls Home, or Kinchela Boys Home in New South Wales, banding together to buy back these properties, yet this is precisely what a group of former Colebrook residents—or 'Colebrookites' as they sometimes refer to themselves—did in the late 1970s.\textsuperscript{30} With assistance from the Aboriginal Development Committee, Nancy Barnes, Lois O'Donoghue, Faith Thomas (nee Coulthard) and others bought their childhood home on behalf of their 'Colebrook family'. With several permanent residences and a caravan park for campers, the property in Quorn is now a holiday home for Colebrook 'family members'.\textsuperscript{31}

In 1988, Peter Read asked O'Donoghue what she thought the difference between Cootamundra and Colebrook was:

Cootamundra was a government run institution, Colebrook was a church run mission, it had continuity, they still punished the inmates etc, but it wasn't as bad. The matrons had a commitment to doing the best they could. The two matrons were always there.\textsuperscript{32}

From 1927, when Colebrook was established, to 1952, the same two female missionaries, Sisters R. Hyde and D. Rutter, ran the Colebrook home. This consistency in staffing distinguished Colebrook from other homes and institutions where superintendents changed regularly, and helped create a 'family' atmosphere.\textsuperscript{33} As Thomas put it:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{28} Barnes, \textit{Munyi's daughter}, p. 82; Mattingley, \textit{Survival In Our Land}, p. 216.
\item\textsuperscript{29} Barnes, \textit{Munyi's daughter}, p. 123; Mattingley, \textit{Survival In Our Land}, p. 216. When Duguid looked upon Colebrook's success, he saw proof that Aborigines of mixed-descent 'differ[ed] from white people only in tint of skin'. Duguid, \textit{Voices From Overseas}.
\item\textsuperscript{30} For accounts of the notorious Cootamundra and Kinchela institutions, see Margaret Tucker, \textit{If Everyone Cared}, Grosvenor Books, South Melbourne, 1986 (first published 1977), pp. 81, 95, 99-107; Peter Read, \textit{A Rape of the Soul so Profound. The Return of the Stolen Generations}, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, 1999, pp. 33-36.
\item\textsuperscript{31} Barnes, \textit{Munyi's daughter}, p. 135; See also Read, Interview with Lois O'Donoghue.
\item\textsuperscript{32} Read, Interview with Lois O'Donoghue.
\item\textsuperscript{33} Jane M. Jacobs, Caroline Laurence and Faith Thomas, 'Pearls from the Deep. Re-evaluating the Early History of Colebrook Home for Aboriginal Children', in Tony Swain and Deborah Bird
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'Colebrook started with Sister Hyde and Sister Rutter. They were Colebrook ... [We had] constant love and attention from the two ladies ... [they] pulled us into a family.'

Barnes felt the same. With Hyde and Rutter, the place was a 'home with two people who were always there: two parent figures, absolutely committed to the Christian faith'. 'We didn't miss out on anything', Barnes explained: 'Except perhaps our mothers'. But even this loss was partially overcome by the family atmosphere of the home; 'the older girls cared for us, and we were still knit together in a tribal network'. All the children were like 'brothers and sisters in one big family, normal children leading a normal life', according to Barnes; 'We were warm, fed, housed, cared for and loved for ourselves. We were a family.'

After Hyde and Rutter left, the atmosphere at Colebrook changed dramatically. Characterised by frequent changes in staff, superintendents who cared little about their charges, and sexual and physical abuse and neglect, Colebrook became like most other institutions for Aboriginal children: 'hell on earth'.

Lest the impression be formed that Colebrook under Hyde and Rutter was a paradise of sorts, it should be realised that while Colebrook may have been less brutal than other homes, the philosophy behind its establishment was the same. Founded on the idea that 'half-caste' children, once 'rescued' from the 'undesirable' influences of their Aboriginal relatives, could be turned into 'civilised Christians' and assimilated into white society, little thought or imagination went into the training of the children. As in other institutions, the girls were trained in domestic service and the boys in farm work.

The number of former Colebrook residents who took up professional positions within white society far exceeded everyone's expectations, including Duguid's.

Following their summer holiday at his home, Duguid described the Colebrook girls as 'expert maids, trained to fill any situation', and the boys as having a 'natural love for gardening'. In keeping with his belief that they were 'practically as intelligent as white children', Duguid's hopes for their future in 1936 did not extend beyond such menial occupations. Over the next few years, however, and in line with their performance at school, Duguid amended his estimation of their intelligence. 'Half-caste children from Colebrook ... have frequently topped the state school classes and several have graduated to high school', Duguid exclaimed in 1941, thus 'proving that in intelligence, they differ in no way from the white child'. That their 'brains [had] proved in no way inferior to the white child' was as much a revelation to Duguid as it was to his readers. When it became clear
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that the Colebrook children wanted more out of life than domestic service and farm work, and that they were capable of more, Duguid was among the first to help them.

A 'scandal howling for redress'

Until 1962 when the law governing Aborigines in South Australia was finally changed, 'everyone with any Aboriginal blood, no matter how advanced in culture or training' was legally subject to the control of the *Aborigines Act 1939.* Under this Act—described by Duguid in 1955 as a 'scandal howling for redress'—the only way for Aborigines to obtain 'full citizenship', or the 'status of a white person', was to apply for exemption from the Act. Although provision for the granting of 'immediate and irrevocable' exemptions existed, the Aborigines Protection Board compelled most applicants to accept the conditional terms of the Act, which meant undergoing 'a period of three years trial of character and conduct'. If, at the end of this period, full citizenship was granted, exempted Aborigines were required to carry a card—or 'dog tag'—to prove their legal status. According to Duguid, many Aborigines considered this process 'an indignity and the vast majority ... [refused] to apply believing that citizenship in their own country [was] their birthright and not a matter for declaration by the white race'. Former Colebrook residents figured prominently among the number who were 'working and living in the white community as full citizens without exemption'; as 'citizens in everything but law'. Rather than force them to endure the 'humiliation' of exemption, Duguid wanted the Aborigines Act 'altered so that Aborigines born in our midst, educated in our schools, trained in our callings, [earning] their living amongst us and paying income tax, [would] be citizens by right of birth'. Perhaps more importantly, he believed that this was what Aborigines themselves wanted.

In 1954 Duguid told the annual meeting of the Anti-Slavery Society in London that he knew 'the majority of [Aboriginals in South Australia] well'. Not that he knew the majority of Aborigines in Adelaide or at Ernabella well, but that he knew the majority of all Aborigines in South Australia. Based on the 1954 Census, police reports and reports of
the Aborigines Protection Board, Gale has estimated that at least 5635 Aborigines lived in South Australia at that time. Of these, just under 2000 were Aborigines of full-descent and well over 3500 were Aborigines of mixed-descent. Gale, 'A Study of Assimilation', pp. 36-37.

Clearly, Duguid was exaggerating when he said he knew the majority of these people well. Leaving Aborigines of full-descent aside, it is possible that Duguid knew many of the 240 Aborigines of mixed-descent who were believed to live in Adelaide, and at least some of the 800 or more who lived at the government settlements at Point Pearce and Point McLeay, but to say he knew the majority of them well was plainly absurd.

More than exaggeration, more than mere arrogance, Duguid's claims to 'know' Aborigines can be read as a reflection of his desire to know them. Unlike many other white (and black) campaigners who presumed to know, or did not care what Aborigines wanted, Duguid made it his business to find out. He was well known for keeping an 'open house' and for encouraging Aborigines to call on him for help. ‘No problem was too insignificant to be heard and receive his personal attention', Nancy Barnes has recalled; 'his door was always open for Aborigines'.

Likewise, Gladys Elphick, who grew up at Point Pearce, always felt welcome in Duguid's home. 'We can just walk into his home and there we are', she stated; 'there's no discrimination in his home'. Most of the Aborigines who turned to Duguid for help wanted the same thing—an end to discriminatory laws, attitudes and ideas, and equality with white people—leading Duguid to believe that he knew the majority well.

The reality, however, is that Duguid did not, and could not, know Aborigines any better than they knew themselves. Not all Aborigines wanted the same things, and even those who did were not always in agreement over how to achieve them. To expect otherwise is to expect Aborigines in Adelaide to have behaved differently from any other social or political group. White people disagreed over what was best for Aborigines, and so too did the people they fought over. Some Aborigines of mixed-descent preferred not to identify as Aborigines, some wanted help to assimilate, while others wanted nothing to do with white people. Some were angry and resentful towards white society, others were not. Some Aborigines of mixed-descent applied for and were granted exemptions from the Aborigines Act, while others found the system of exemptions insulting and refused to apply. Of those who refused to apply, some agreed with Duguid that citizenship should be
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their birthright, while others, such as Mrs M.E. Williams from Point Pearce, felt that becoming exempted meant losing her 'birthright, of which [she was] proud'.

Duguid tended to respond best to Aborigines (and whites) whose views accorded with his own; very few Aborigines challenged him during the 1950s. George Abdulla, 'a part Aboriginal man belonging to Western Australia', was one who did. At the beginning of 1953, Duguid gave Abdulla a few days work in his garden because he claimed to have no money. Subsequently, Duguid found Abdulla 'making misstatements'. In February 1953, for example, Abdulla was reported in the Advertiser as saying that 'he had seen more degradation among his people living in Adelaide than anywhere else in Australia'. 'Knowing the plight' of Aborigines in Abdulla's home state, Duguid declared himself 'surprised at this utterance'. The Aborigines in Adelaide are far better off than almost anywhere', Duguid tersely responded:

they vote, they attend primary and secondary schools, they can marry who they like, they can work where they will and many are members of trade unions. They can own property and they are not restricted in movement.

Abdulla's efforts to form a Native Welfare Council later that year met with strong opposition from Duguid who argued that the SA AAL was already 'doing all the things for Aborigines' that Abdulla claimed for his Council. Duguid warned Abdulla that the SA AAL would suffer if representatives from the Churches and other organisations joined his Council, yet 'none of these things interested him'. Incensed, Duguid wrote to Hasluck, describing Abdulla as 'a shrewd fellow' who had spent time 'with the communists' in Sydney, and possibly in Melbourne. Duguid did not need to label his adversary a communist for Hasluck to get the point, his blunt musings on the source of Abdulla's income did the job: 'I cannot help but wonder where he is getting the money for his activities. He is well dressed and well spoken and very connected'.

Duguid's overt dislike and mistrust of communists will be examined later in the chapter. This notwithstanding, his reaction to Abdulla, as well as his method of dealing
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with him, supports a former member of the SA AAL, Jean Blackburn's contention that Duguid 'wouldn't really allow another voice but his own to be heard about anything'.

'Duguid was a marvellous man', Blackburn told Peter Read in 1988, but his word 'was also the end'. According to Blackburn, there were two main groups of Aborigines in Adelaide in the 1950s and 1960s; those 'who supported and followed the Duguids' and were patronised by them ... and the ones who resented that and wanted to take affairs into their own hands'. Describing the former group as 'Uncle Toms', a derogatory term meaning black people who were openly servile to whites, Blackburn's sympathy for the latter group was obvious. The Duguids and the SA AAL, she recalled, 'never had the notion that it was a good thing to encourage Aboriginal solidarity in the city, they were assimilationists in a big way'. Having 'invested their lives in helping Aborigines', Blackburn believed that Charles and Phyllis Duguid and other members of the SA AAL were 'sustained by the appreciation and gratitude' they received from the Aborigines who supported them. This shaped their 'own view about themselves', she argued, and led them to regard 'with some hostility' moves by Aborigines to act on their own behalf: 'no matter what they might have thought in their head about its desirability, [they] didn't like Aborigines organising on their own behalf'.

What Charles Duguid disliked was Aborigines like Abdulla who were 'queer[ing] the pitch'; that is, whose public 'rantings' had the potential to interfere with, or spoil, his own sanctioned efforts on behalf of Aborigines. The issue is not whether Duguid opposed Aborigines organising on their own behalf, for in fact he strongly encouraged it, but to which Aborigines, and to which of their causes, he gave his support. The simple answer is that Duguid supported Aborigines who supported assimilation. Yet, as Blackburn's denunciation of such Aborigines attests, there was nothing simple about this arrangement. To Blackburn's 'Uncle Tom' label could be added several others from Aboriginal people themselves; 'stool-pigeons', 'white lovers', 'tame blacks'. Aborigines accused of forgetting, or forgoing, their Aboriginal identity in favour of assimilation were, and still are, called 'coconuts' by other Aborigines, meaning 'dark outside, white inside'. To have supported assimilation in the 1950s and 1960s is not something that most Aborigines would now admit to, or be proud of. Yet many did, and it was these Aborigines that Duguid tried to help through the SA AAL.
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II. The South Australian Aborigines Advancement League

In May 1946, the Aborigines Protection League (APL), of which Charles Duguid was president, disbanded and donated its funds to the League for the Protection and Advancement of Aboriginal and Half-Caste Women.\(^64\) Founded in 1925 on a platform of support for a Model Aboriginal State, the APL had long since ceased to be an effective lobby group. By 1939, its members 'were rapidly dropping away—death, sickness and old age being the chief causes'.\(^65\) The possibility of amalgamation with the League for Women was discussed in 1940 but, fearing that they would 'lose [their] individuality' as a group of women, the League for Women rejected the idea.\(^66\) The APL's decision to disband removed the question of amalgamation, yet in practice this is what occurred.

In July 1946, the League for the Protection and Advancement of Aboriginal and Half-Caste Women shed its cumbersome title in favour of a new name; the Aborigines Advancement League. It also passed a resolution stating that 'membership should henceforth be open to men and women and [that] efforts should be made to gain Aboriginal members'.\(^67\) Out of the APL's disbandment then, a new League with a new name and new purpose was formed. No longer restricted to helping Aboriginal women, the SA AAL's aim was 'to secure for Aborigines and part-Aborigines an honourable status within the Australian nation by ensuring the economic security and development of the race'.\(^68\) Towards this end, the SA AAL claimed to 'investigate' every report—pertaining to the welfare of the Aborigine—that [was] received'.\(^69\) During its first few years of operation, most of the League's activities were directed towards raising funds for a 'Native Hostel' in Adelaide.

At the end of 1946, three 'educated part-Aborigines' took their concerns 'about what the future held for young Aboriginal people' to Charles Duguid. According to Jeff Barnes, one of the three, Duguid advised them to 'find out what [their] people needed most and then come back to him'. With Alex Taylor, a former Colebrook resident, Barnes surveyed Aborigines in the country areas of South Australia, while the third member of their party, Ivy Mitchell, surveyed Aborigines living in Adelaide. The end result was that 'the majority of the people' wanted a hostel in the city—'a place of their own where they could meet'.\(^70\) Barnes, Taylor and Mitchell presented their findings to Duguid who suggested that they approach the SA AAL for help. In March 1947, the SA AAL agreed to
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back their plan. However, other than creating a 'Hostel Fund' and steadily raising money for it, the SA AAL made little progress towards the establishment of such a facility until Charles Duguid took over as president in October 1951.

In March 1951, M.E. Eaton (the WCTU representative that Phyllis travelled to Alice Springs with in 1938), complained that 'the work of the League [was] too slow'.\(^71\) Rather than a pressure group with a clearly defined objective, League meetings resembled those of a charity organisation, with talk of jumble sales, garden fetes, and afternoon teas dominating each session.\(^72\) Following Eaton's criticism, it was minuted that 'the urgency for some definite plan' for the Native Hostel was being felt, yet no moves towards formulating a plan were made.\(^73\) Perhaps the clearest indication of the SA AAL's tenor at the time Duguid took over lies in its testimonial to the out-going president, Mrs Burnard, who had held the position for six years. Recording the League's 'pleasure' at having been 'associated with such a grand lady', the secretary described Burnard as:

well beloved for her kindly understanding of the native people. She is patient and treats them like children—never losing her confidence that they are really worthwhile.\(^74\)

That such attributes were considered admirable in the president of a League devoted to Aboriginal advancement belies the League's superior attitude towards the people it was supposed to help.

Under Burnard's presidency the SA AAL was white-dominated, patronising and painfully slow; the League had tried to 'make friendly contact with the natives' but 'without much success'.\(^75\) When coupled with Eaton's further complaint 'that some people alive now [would] not live to see the results of [the League's] efforts', it seems that Blackburn may have been right in her criticism of the SA AAL, if not of Duguid.\(^76\) Eaton wanted the League's work to quicken as much for her own benefit as for Aborigines; she wanted to see change happen and reap the rewards of her benevolence. Neither was Duguid selfless in his endeavours. Asked in 1971 what he considered his proudest achievement, Duguid replied: 'that I have lived to see white attitudes come much closer to my viewpoint'.\(^77\) However, it does not necessarily follow that this precluded Duguid's support for Aborigines organising on their own behalf. Following his election as president of the SA
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AAL, Mitchell and another Aboriginal member, Mrs Weetra, 'expressed gratitude to Dr Duguid for the help he had given their people'. Duguid received such compliments because he helped Aborigines, it was not why he helped them. More importantly, he received such compliments because he helped Aborigines 'to help themselves'.

Duguid's reaction to hearing Barnes, Taylor and Mitchell's initial proposal for an Aboriginal hostel in 1947 was to describe their endeavours as 'the most heartening sign of development in South Australia' to date. That they had, 'of their own accord ... formulated a policy without any assistance' from white people, left him 'convinced that the time [was] at hand when people of Aboriginal blood in South Australia [would] state the case for their people'. As far as Duguid was concerned, that time '[could] not come too soon'. Under his presidency, the SA AAL became a platform for Aborigines to have their voices heard.

The Town Hall Meeting
Lois O'Donoghue has recalled how she and many other former Colebrook residents joined the SA AAL in the early 1950s to fight 'a case for the girls to get into professions, like nursing and teaching and so on, and the fellas to get into apprenticeships':

O'Donoghue began training as a nurse at a country hospital in Victor Harbour in 1950. When she tried to transfer to the Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH) to complete her training in 1953, she 'realised how hard it was going to be'. The RAH 'wouldn't accept me', O'Donoghue explained, 'the matron wouldn't accept me. She never once even invited me into her office just to talk'.

Nancy Barnes, then working as Duguid's secretary in his North Terrace surgery, remembers the day in June 1953 when Grace Lester, Muriel Brumbie, and Faith Coulthard, all former Colebrook residents, arrived 'in some agitation, asking to see the...
Doctor'. Like O'Donoghue, they too had been denied permission to train at the RAH. Despite having the necessary pre-requisite education, the matron had told them 'that it would be much better if they went to Alice Springs and nursed their own people'. Barnes 'shared their indignation and their hurt' with Duguid who flew into a 'wild rage' and immediately set about changing the situation. The timing could not have been better. Since becoming president of the SA AAL, Duguid had twice invited Aboriginal speakers to address League meetings on the problems they faced in the white community, and had been so impressed with the 'excellent' standard of their speeches that he had booked the Adelaide Town Hall for a public meeting to be addressed solely by Aborigines. The nursing issue, along with the need for an Aboriginal hostel, was placed high on the agenda.

'So far as anyone knew', Duguid later explained, 'it was the first time that a Town Hall audience [had been] addressed by Aborigines'. Indeed, the 'idea was so novel that press and radio combined to publicise the meeting', with the result that over 1000 people turned up on the coldest and wettest night of the year, 31 August 1953, to hear what Aborigines had to say. The programme included 'singing, and the playing of instruments by Aborigines of different ages [and] ... a film of the Ernabella Mission', but it was the 'speeches by five part-Aborigines [that] proved the hit of the evening', Duguid claimed; 'not one grammatical error and the content, sequence and English could not have been improved'. The first three speakers, George Rankin, Mona Paul and Peter Tilmouth spoke on the topic 'Our Place in the Community', leaving Ivy Mitchell and Jeff Barnes to address the need for an Aboriginal hostel in Adelaide (see Plate 14).

Originally from Point Pearce, Rankin spoke about his experience of coming to Adelaide fifty years earlier, while Tilmouth told how he had come, at the age of ten, from Alice Springs to the St Francis home for Aboriginal boys in Sephamore. A former Colebrook resident, Paul used her speech to appeal to Aboriginal parents to send their children to school beyond the leaving age, for 'it was only by being better educated that Aborigines could fill their proper place in the community'. On the question of an Aboriginal hostel, Barnes and Mitchell told the audience: 'We want to feel we have your support for this project. But most of all, we want your best wishes and when we come to live with you, your neighbourliness'.

---
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'What a contrast to the rantings of [George] Abdulla', Duguid wryly observed in a letter to Hasluck detailing the meeting's success. Unlike Abdulla, all five participants had spoken 'quietly and with restraint'. In Duguid's view, it was their lack of 'bitterness', their lack of 'resentment' and their 'dignity' that 'captivated the audience' as they told of the 'social disabilities they suffered' as a consequence 'of having been born as Aborigines in Australia'. For Duguid, the 'most memorable of these disabilities' was related by Tilmouth who told how 'he and his part-Aboriginal friends had been refused the right to sit down with white people in the dining car of the north-south railway train'. Certainly this was shocking, but in the opinion of an Adelaide News reporter, it was Tilmouth's declaration that he was proud of both sides of his ancestry that most upset 'the complacency of the white members of the audience'. 'I am proud of my blood—both black and white', Tilmouth announced: 'Through each I have inherited a certain intelligence and I am going to use it'. Paul's disclosure that 'part-Aboriginal girls' were refused permission to train as nurses at the RAH 'because of their colour' also caused a stir, with the result that a few days after the Town Hall meeting, O'Donoghue and the others were invited to start their training.

The Town Hall meeting was a huge success. In addition to remedying the nursing problem, the meeting resulted in 'much heart-searching, many subscriptions for the Hostel Fund, and a very great increase in membership of the [SA] AAL'. More importantly, according to Duguid, the meeting proved that 'part-Aboriginal people needed only the encouragement of those who were interested in them to help them to speak and act for themselves'. At the end of 1953, the League's annual report stressed the importance of its 'native members':

It will be seen from this outline of the years work that our native members have taken a full part in all the activities of the League. We look forward to the time when the administration will be entirely in their hands.

Were these just words, as Blackburn implied, or did the white members of the SA AAL really look forward to making themselves redundant?
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Carried by the momentum of the previous year, the League began making plans for the Native Hostel in 1954 while Duguid was overseas. Upon learning that these plans centred on establishing a hostel for Aboriginal girls, Duguid objected that this was not what the initiators of the scheme, Barnes, Taylor and Mitchell, had wanted. Taylor 'said that in the beginning he and Mr Barnes had thought mainly of a social centre', while Mitchell said that she 'had thought of accommodation for transients and young people working'. Since no-one had thought of a hostel for girls, the SA AAL resolved 'that when the Hostel was established, those groups of native people whose need seemed greatest should be accommodated, and that a clubroom or recreation centre should be associated with it'. In the end, the group whose need seemed greatest was Aboriginal girls.97

Duguid's unsuccessful appeal to the South Australian government for help with funding in 1955 reveals that he, at least, was listening to what the initiators of the hostel scheme said they wanted:

They wish to be a real part of the community with a social centre of their own to which they can invite their white friends as well as their own people. They hope too, if possible, to have a few rooms for young [Aborigines] from the country attending technical and high schools, for young apprentices and for young people working in Adelaide.98

With no help forthcoming from government, it was another year before the SA AAL was in a position to purchase a suitable home for the hostel. At the beginning of 1956, the League bought 'a large private house' in the Adelaide suburb of Millswood which could accommodate up to ten girls. In November that year, the hostel was finally opened.99

Named 'Wiltja', a Pitjantjatjara word for 'home', the hostel was the culmination of nearly ten years work of which the 'outstanding feature', according to Phyllis Duguid, 'was the steady work of the Aboriginal people themselves'.100 From the initial idea, through to fund raising and campaigning, from furnishing and decorating the home through to working there—the first matron, Millie Glen, was a young 'part-Aboriginal' woman, and Aboriginal committee members were integrally involved in the daily running of the hostel—'Aborigines [had] been whole-hearted in their efforts since 1947 to achieve this result', Duguid proudly exclaimed.101 Neither he, nor anyone else, raised any objections to the hostel being for Aboriginal girls. Regardless of its form, Duguid was just thankful that
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the hostel 'was an established fact' so that the SA AAL could 'return to [considering] wider aspects of Aboriginal welfare'.

'Need not race'

Explaining why it is that collaboration such as this between black and white campaigners has been largely ignored by historians, Alison Holland has pointed to the evolution of Aboriginal History as a separate discipline within the academy as a possible cause. Following Bain Attwood, she has argued that this effectively silenced the "dialectical process" involved in relations between Aborigines and non-Aborigines within Australian history. Citing the preference of historians such as Peter Read to write about the 'the more fashionable and acceptable period of the 1960s' when there were 'changing perceptions by blacks and whites of who was to lead the advance', Holland's thesis is that '[a]nalysis of the Aboriginal advancement movement of the 1950s ... has been marginalised because it is seen to be white dominated', and because '[a]dvancement objectives are understood to have been one and the same as assimilation'.

Assuming a contrary position, Holland has argued that the SA AAL's efforts to establish an Aboriginal hostel were, in fact, 'quite at odds with the assimilationist rhetoric of post-war Aboriginal administrations'. For rather than severing community ties—an essential 'precondition' of assimilation, according to Holland—hostels 'would facilitate Aboriginal integration, without destroying Aboriginal community ties. They would provide a means by which Aboriginal people could move into and share in the benefits and privileges of white society, while staying grounded within their own'. However, whereas Holland sees this 'clash' between the advancement aims of the humanitarians and the assimilationist perspective of the governments' as indicative of the gulf that existed between them, I argue that there was no 'clash' because there was no acknowledgment of their different agendas. In the case of the SA AAL and government, it is only in hindsight that such differences emerge.

Duguid and the SA AAL—its Aboriginal members included—believed that their hostel would facilitate assimilation by helping Aboriginal 'girls to become independent members of the community'. So too, it seems, did Hasluck and the Northern Territory administration. Prior to the hostel's official opening, Duguid wrote to Hasluck advising him that the SA AAL would be pleased to accept girls from the Northern Territory, provided that the administration was prepared to pay for them. In reply, Hasluck confirmed that the Commonwealth government would contribute 'up to a maximum of 300
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pounds a year towards the board, accommodation, clothing and education' of 'part-coloured children from the Northern Territory selected for training ... [in] the Southern States'. Hasluck assured Duguid that he would ask the Administrator to 'consider whether the hostel of the [SA AAL] might come within this scheme'. 107 Although few records remain, it seems that the outcome was favourable. The SA AAL's newsletter for March 1967 states that of the 71 girls who had been through the hostel, 'a number [had] come from the N.T.', and furthermore, that their boarding fees had been paid 'by the N.T. Administration'. 108

In 1958, the newly formed Victorian Aborigines Advancement League (VAAL) opened a hostel for Aboriginal girls in the inner Melbourne suburb of Northcote. Two years later, the VAAL contacted Hasluck offering 'use of the hostel to accommodate 2 or 3 girls from the Northern Territory'. 109 According to Diane Barwick, the 'administration refused this offer because, since all the residents and the matron were Aborigines, such placements would "not be consistent with the policy of assimilation"'. 110 The VAAL understood this to mean that 'the Government policy of assimilation required such hostels to have white residents as well'. 111 However, since the SA AAL's hostel, replete with Aboriginal residents and an Aboriginal matron, was acceptable, the difference was altogether more subtle, and more political, than the VAAL appreciated. 112

Duguid's willingness to have his positive appraisal of the Northern Territory's settlement program used by the administration to 'counter some of the unwarranted criticism' of the VAAL, as mentioned in the previous chapter, provides some insight into tension that existed between the Adelaide and Melbourne based organisations. Both were constituent members of the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement (FCAA), however their disagreement over fundamental matters of policy was the cause of a major
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rift. The FCAA's first campaign following its formation in February 1958 was to mount an appeal against the conviction and sentencing of the Aboriginal artist Albert Namatjira. According to Bain Attwood and Andrew Markus, this campaign 'fell to the VAAL when the new organisation proved unequal to the task'. However, Sue Taffe has argued that it was because the 'politicisation of the Namatjira case was not endorsed by all FCAA affiliates'—namely the SA AAL—that the VAAL 'took responsibility' for it.113

In October 1958, the Melbourne based executive of the FCAA warned affiliates to be ready for an appeal for financial support. Legal advice had already been sought and it had been announced over the radio that there was to be a nation wide appeal for funds for Namatjira's defence. As president of the FCAA, Duguid was outraged. Having been neither consulted nor 'informed beforehand that the Council intended to make these moves', Duguid called an emergency meeting of the SA AAL's executive to consider Namatjira's appeal. After much discussion, the secretary of the SA AAL was instructed to write to the Federal Council expressing the League's opposition to a public appeal for funds.114 According to Taffe, the SA AAL refused to endorse the Federal Council's action 'on the grounds that the Victorians were planning to use the case to point out the weaknesses of the Northern Territory's Welfare Ordinance'.115 Given Duguid's strong support for Hasluck and the Northern Territory administration, this seems possible, even likely, yet this was not the reason the SA AAL gave for opposing the appeal. Believing that Namatjira 'could pay his [own] expenses, either immediately or by raising a loan', the SA AAL declared: 'We must not pauperise [him]—he is receiving a regular royalty' for his paintings.116

The SA AAL may have been more 'conservative' than the VAAL, as Taffe has argued, but it was not afraid to protest against government when it believed that such protest was warranted. In the case of Namatjira, the League believed it was not. The emphasis Taffe has placed on the SA AAL's apparent 'unpreparedness ... to challenge government on this issue' misses the point that in refusing to finance Namatjira's appeal, the League was upholding the classic liberal—and assimilationist—philosophy that any such assistance 'should be based on need, and not on race'.117 In the SA AAL's opinion, Namatjira did not 'need' financial help. Nor did Rupert Max Stuart, an Aboriginal man...
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found guilty of the rape and murder of a nine year old white girl in the following year.\footnote{118} Though 'troubled' by Stuart's conviction, Duguid and the majority of the SA AAL felt that 'the issue at stake was not the defence of an Aboriginal, but of a man'. Hence, the 'only action taken by [the] League as a League was the sending of telegrams' on the eve of Stuart's execution asking for his sentence to be commuted.\footnote{119}

In Duguid's view, Aborigines had to have 'the same rights and responsibilities as the rest of us—why else [was] assimilation preached?' 'Instead of imposing racial restrictions on Aborigines, the law of the land should operate for all', he argued in 1961. This was as true for citizenship as it was for the 'right to take, or to refuse, alcohol'.\footnote{120} Although Duguid personally deplored the drinking of alcohol by 'any human beings no matter what the colour of their skins', and sought to 'disassociate entirely' the conception of citizenship with the right to drink, he argued that what was 'legally right for white people ... should not be legally wrong for Aborigines'.\footnote{121} Following the success of the 1967 referendum which 'empowered the Commonwealth to enact 'special laws' for members of 'the Aboriginal race' and provided for Aboriginal people to be counted in the national census', the SA AAL sounded the following warning about the 'dangers inherent in [enacting] special legislation for a minority ethnic group'.\footnote{122}

Our League has always maintained that special provision for any group of people should be made on the basis of need, and not on the basis of 'race, colour, or creed'. The very attempt to define "Aborigines" for the purpose of social legislation is full of difficulty and danger. Our League would hope that any legislation enacted exclusively for "Aborigines" would be a temporary measure, designed, like the League itself, only for a period of adjustment.\footnote{123}

With this unambiguously assimilationist philosophy at its core, and Duguid and its helm, it is hardly surprising that the Northern Territory administration chose to send Aboriginal girls to the SA AAL's hostel, and not to the VAAL's. 'Our League', Duguid reminded Hasluck in 1959, 'is an old and solid one. Members are all Church people including
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Salvation Army, and a high proportion are University graduates'. The SA AAL was not to be mistakenly classed with the troublesome new-comers.

Proud of colour

Although the SA AAL had many Aboriginal members, and although, as Duguid proudly declared in 1953, 'half the executive and its treasurer [were] part-Aborigines', most of its members were white. Moreover, most of its members— Aboriginal and white—understood its advancement objectives as being one and the same as assimilation. In seeking retrospectively to demonstrate the difference between advancement and assimilation, Holland's work 'denies the historic specificity of the 1950s' in much the same way, and for much the same reason, as those works she criticises for overlooking this period in Australia's history. The problem lies with assimilation, or more precisely, with the negative image of assimilation currently held by most historians. A reluctance on the part of historians to acknowledge that many Aborigines supported assimilation lies at heart of this problem, for if Aborigines supported assimilation and assimilation meant extinction, then Aborigines were complicit in their own devastation. However, if Aborigines supported advancement and advancement was different to assimilation, then no such problem, fraught with political recriminations, exists.

Holland's position—that advancement objectives were different to assimilation—is equally as unsatisfactory as Read's. According to Read, Charles Perkins, a former St Francis resident and perhaps the best known and most outspoken advocate for his people, was 'an assimilationist', however he only supported assimilation because 'he knew no other policy and ... had been driven to it by years of enforced education'. Read's attempt to excuse Perkins' support for assimilation not only denies the historical specificity of Aboriginal support for assimilation in general, and Perkins' in particular, it suggests that Aborigines who supported assimilation did not know what they were doing. Subscribing to the view that 'assimilation ultimately [meant] absorption and that [meant] extinction', Read has argued that the implication 'that Aboriginal culture would be an unavoidable casualty of the process' of assimilation went 'unobserved or ignored' in the rush to 'enjoy the good life enjoyed by the Whites'. However, if Aborigines (and others) who supported assimilation did not know, or did not believe, that assimilation meant extinction, why the need to excuse their support? Surely, it is more valuable to ask what they meant by assimilation than dismiss their support as misguided or ill-informed.

Not everyone subscribed to the view that assimilation meant absorption and extinction. Duguid certainly did not, but then nor did he believe that Aborigines of mixed-
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descent had any Aboriginal culture to lose. In this belief he was not alone. Of 'part-Aborigines' living in Adelaide in the 1940s, the anthropologists Ronald and Catherine Berndt found that:

Most of them, except for newcomers from outlying regions, have little if any knowledge of Aboriginal life and culture, and retain only a few unrelated fragments which have no serious significance except that they represent some association with the past.\(^{129}\)

According to the Berndts, the 'main trend of their behaviour [was] towards assimilation into white society', not through compulsion, but because Aborigines of mixed-descent considered 'that their main hope for the future [lay] in their identification with the white community'. This, the Berndts claimed, was 'one reason for the desire of many women to have children from white fathers'; light-skinned progeny 'enhance[d] their social prestige and hasten[ed] their assimilation'.\(^{130}\) Writing of the same region more than a decade later, Gale concurred: 'None of the mixed-bloods ... has any tribal affiliation, nor does any remember the culture of his Aboriginal forebears ... Nothing remains of their Aboriginal traditions'. There being no hope of 'integration' or 'acculturation' for 'these remnant people', Gale argued that 'eventual absorption [seemed] the only likely future' for them. 'It is merely a matter of time', she observed, '[a]lready many have been completely absorbed and are no longer recognised as being of Aboriginal admixture'.\(^{131}\)

The main difference between the Berndts and Gale on the one hand and Duguid on the other, was that Duguid did not conflate absorption with assimilation. Against the Berndts' claim 'that many Aboriginal women prefer white babies, and that the absorption policy [was] favoured by spokesmen for the Aborigines themselves', Duguid argued that his 'experience on these points [was] the reverse'. Having learned from Tilmouth that 'the overwhelming majority of the Aborigines, if not all of them, [were] proud of their native blood', Duguid argued that it was 'time white people recognised that ... they much prefer to marry to their own people'.\(^{132}\) Duguid was not opposed to inter-marriage. Quite the contrary. He saw the 'idea of marriage between Aborigines and non-Aboriginal Australians ... [as the] final test of true social acceptance'. Duguid's point was that 'inter-marriage [was] not an indispensable condition of assimilation'.\(^{133}\) Promoting the virtues of assimilation as opposed to absorption, Duguid declared:
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When to official Government recognition is added complete social acceptance by the community there will be no need for whiter skins; the Aborigines as they are will play their part in the economy of Australia. Many of them are doing that now.\textsuperscript{134}

To meet whites on equal terms, Duguid believed that Aborigines of mixed-descent needed to feel 'proud of [their] colour'.\textsuperscript{135} The alternative, borne through decades of contempt on the part of white Australians, was shame. Since shame was not conducive to social equality, let alone 'self-respect', Duguid encouraged Aborigines of mixed-descent to look upon their darker skin with pride. Being 'proud of [one's] colour', or one's 'native blood', was not the same as being Aboriginal in a 'tribal' or 'traditional' sense, however. In Duguid's view, it was like having pride in one's cultural and familial heritage; one's past. Whether Aborigines of mixed-descent had any Aboriginal culture left was not something Duguid spoke about; their colour was a link to their ancestors and a constant reminder, both to themselves and white Australians, that they came from 'Aboriginal stock'.

\textbf{Ephraim Trip and the Consorting Clause}

Duguid and the SA AAL—its Aboriginal members included—did not challenge assimilation. Instead, they challenged discriminatory laws and ideas which threatened to upset the smooth operation of assimilation. In February 1957, Ephraim Trip, a 'part-Aboriginal' man from Victor Harbour, presented Duguid with a definite example of this. According to Trip, he and a white friend, Andrew Tuckwell, had been stopped by a police constable who asked whether Trip was an 'exempted native'. When Trip answered 'no', the constable motioned Tuckwell aside and told him that being in Trip's company 'laid him open to a charge of consorting with a native'. Under section 14 of the Police Offences Act 1953, it was an offence for any white person to 'habitually consort' with 'an Aboriginal native of Australia ... without reasonable excuse'. The penalty was 50 pounds or three months imprisonment. Trip, who drove to work with a white man every day and worked with white men on the Nairne railway, asked whether they were all liable to conviction. The constable answered 'yes'. When the constable learned that Trip could read and write English and that he lived in trust house only two doors down from Tuckwell (rather than in a tent or a 'wurlie'), Trip was told to go home and to forget about the incident. But Trip 'was most unhappy' and brought the matter to Duguid the very next day.\textsuperscript{136} In a subsequent letter to Duguid, Trip wrote:
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I hope you will help me to get better treatment for my people who are trying to abide by white laws. We have heard much about the Government policy of assimilation of Aborigines, but to expect this policy to succeed while full citizenship rights are withheld from us is pure nonsense. Who will invite us to their homes while the consorting clause of the Police Act threatens them?\textsuperscript{137}

This from a man who was asked whether he could read and write English!	extsuperscript{138} The consorting clause was humiliating, contradictory to assimilation and needed to be changed.

How could Aborigines assimilate—learn to live like whites and with whites—if they were barred from social mixing? Duguid 'habitually consort[ed]' with unexempted Aborigines—was he guilty of an offence? According to government, the clause was there to prevent 'undesirable characters' preying on Aborigines; it was there to protect Aborigines, not to impede 'free and friendly social relationships on a genuine basis'.\textsuperscript{139}

Any white person who 'habitually consort[ed] with an Aboriginal native of Australia with honest intentions and with a reasonable reputation could not be prosecuted under this Section', Duguid was told. However, such reassurances were meaningless when, as Trip's encounter had shown, it was 'evident that others [had] a different interpretation'.\textsuperscript{140} Duguid brought this flagrant act of 'unwarranted interference with the freedom of a white man and an Aborigine' to the attention of the SA AAL. In July 1957, the SA AAL agreed to sponsor a petition to have this 'unnecessary' clause removed. Drawn up by Donald Dunstan, then Labor shadow attorney-general and a member of the SA AAL, the League's petition stressed the incongruity between the 'declared assimilation policy of the Aborigines Protection Board' and the consorting clause which 'prevent[ed] the achievement' of that aim. By June 1958, over 7000 signatures had been collected. In October that year, the consorting clause was repealed.\textsuperscript{141}

Recalling this win for assimilation, Dunstan implied that it was actually the beginning of the end of the assimilation policy in South Australia. Rather than Trip's encounter being the catalyst for this campaign, Dunstan claimed that he had been approached by a group of Aboriginal men led by Charles Perkins who were 'keen ... to end discriminatory legislation against Aborigines'. In his autobiography, Felicia (1981) Dunstan explained: 'I suggested that the first target be the consorting provision in the Police Offences Act and they enthusiastically agreed'. Once this 'obnoxious provision [was] repealed ... we evolved a general policy about Aborigines which we would pursue:
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the assimilation policy must be scrapped and the Aborigines' rights to maintain and enhance as much of their culture as they could must be recognised and supported'.

It seems that Aborigines (and historians on their behalf), are not the only ones reluctant to be remembered as supporters of assimilation. Dunstan too would prefer to be remembered otherwise. Perkins, who left Australia towards the end of 1957 and did not return until June 1959, probably did not approach Dunstan until 1960. Nor did the reforms worked on by Dunstan and Perkins, along with several other former St Francis residents including John Moriarty and Gordon Briscoe, pose any challenge to assimilation. Quite the contrary. By calling for an end to discriminatory legislation, the implication of their efforts was assimilation. Together they worked to 'abolish the worst excesses' of the South Australian Aborigines Act, such as the much resented system of exemptions, and to collect signatures for a petition which called for legislation to be passed removing all 'legal restrictions specially applicable to Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal descent'.

In June 1961, Perkins organised a meeting at the Croatian Hall in Brompton in support of Dunstan's plan to introduce a private members Bill, which, had it been passed, would have given Aborigines 'full citizenship rights'. Approximately 50 people attended this meeting, at least 16 of whom were Aborigines; Moriarty and Briscoe were there, so was Ray Lister from Colebrook and Millie Glen, the matron of the SA AAL's hostel, along with four Wiltja residents. The Adelaide Advertiser's report of this meeting described Perkins as 'the vice-president' of the SA AAL, a 'misstatement' Duguid duly pointed out and had corrected. Perkins had joined the League in April that year, but he did not hold any office. Nor was Perkins' meeting 'sponsored in any way' by the SA AAL. Casting a different light on Jean Blackburn's later denunciation of Duguid and the SA AAL, it was she who stressed that Perkins 'had acted and spoken very unwisely' in representing himself as vice-president of the League, and it was she who moved that the SA AAL endorse the executive's action of sending letters to the editor of the Advertiser and the News correcting Perkins' misstatements.
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III. 'Out of his depth'?

In 1988, Peter Read conducted a series of interviews with former members of the SA AAL for his biography of Charles Perkins. Among those interviewed, Laurie Bryan, a white member of the League, was the most scathing in his criticism of Duguid. As Bryan 'saw it, [Aborigines] respected Dr Duguid, but they were conscious of his lack of appreciation of living under urban conditions'. The 'other thing ... that was very very wrong', according to Bryan, was the 'assimilation programme'. Later in the interview, Read suggested that:

A number of white people who work with traditional people, like Dr Duguid, find it difficult to work in an urban environment ... Urban people find them a bit patronising. I don't know if that was the case here, the Aboriginal people might have found he talked down to them a bit too much?

Bryan: I'm sure that was the case.148

In response to Blackburn's claim that Duguid was one of the main protagonists against Aborigines organising on their own behalf, Read suggested that:

Perhaps [Duguid] was a bit out of his depth with urban Aborigines?

Blackburn: Yes, I think that's right ... [Duguid] was very respectful of [Aboriginal] culture and wanting to preserve it ... but of course there was not really a proper differentiation made between the needs of Aboriginal groups living in traditional ways and those in the city.149

Read's explicit positioning of Duguid as someone who may have been 'out of his depth' among urban Aborigines, and Bryan and Blackburn's ready agreement, is symptomatic of contemporary anti-assimilationist feelings. Brought to its simplest form, this teleological view holds that because assimilation was 'very wrong', and Duguid supported assimilation, then Duguid was wrong.

The reality was far more complex. As this chapter has shown, most of the Aborigines who came to Duguid for help wanted to assimilate: to become the social, economic, legal and political equals of whites. Were they wrong too? Or, as Blackburn put it, had they lost their 'self-consciousness' as Aborigines as a consequence of being 'really oppressed and very patronised by do-gooding whites' like Duguid?150 Nancy Barnes lived
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with the Duguid family for over five years, worked as Duguid's receptionist, and credits Duguid with having 'raised [her] people from despair—even extinction—restoring their faith, hope, dignity, pride and the will to live'. She would strongly disagree on both counts; Gladys Elphick might not.151 In the late 1980s, Elphick told Faith Bandler that the FCAA (later the Federal Council for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders) had helped her people 'to wake up to the do-gooders and help [themselves]'.152 Elphick had 'nothing against [Duguid] personally', he was just too old, she believed, to 'change his ways' in line with the changing scene of Aboriginal politics in the 1960s.153

Duguid thought so too, but this did not stop him finding fault with the changes he saw. In October 1961, after ten years as president of the SA AAL, Duguid announced that 'the time had come for a younger man to take his place'. In taking this step, and making his resignation effective immediately, Duguid explained that he was heeding the advice of his physician who had warned him to 'resign from [all] positions that entailed tension and strain'.154 Having no reason to disbelieve their former leader whose 'devotion to the cause of Aboriginal advancement [was] so deep and sincere', the SA AAL honoured Duguid with life membership of the League.155 Duguid told C.J. Millar, acting secretary of the APB, a different story which Millar, a public servant, dutifully passed on the Australian Security Intelligence Office (ASIO). According to Millar, Duguid cited communist infiltration of the SA AAL as the main reason for his resignation as president.156 By the middle of the following year, Duguid had become so 'perturbed at the communistic tendencies displayed by several members' of the League that he gave Millar a list of names to watch. Foremost among these were Jean Blackburn and Judy Inglis, both of whom had been appointed to the executive committee of the SA AAL at the end of 1960. Blackburn, who claimed to have resigned from the Communist Party in 1956, 'still expressed communist views and exhibited similar tactics', according to Duguid, while Inglis 'expressed opinions in line with those of communist supporters'. In May 1962, Duguid informed Millar that he 'expected to see the control of the League taken over by the Communist groups' at the next annual meeting scheduled for October.157

There was no 'communist coup'. Inglis' tragic death in July that year may have had something to do with this, however, it seems more likely that Duguid had exaggerated the situation. Duguid had 'an absolute hatred for [communists]', according to Bryan, so much that he once asked a member of the League to leave 'because she was of a communist
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persuasion'.\textsuperscript{158} In the context of Cold War paranoia and ASIO surveillance of suspected communists, Duguid's comments about the SA AAL had serious repercussions for the League. In July 1963, the South Australian Minister for Aboriginal Affairs stated in the House of Assembly that he had received private and confidential letters from people associated with the SA AAL who were concerned about 'communist influence' in the League. Hasluck responded with a nation-wide 'warning against the activities of people who were attempting to worsen race relations in Australia for political purposes'. Although the SA AAL denied these 'unsubstantiated accusations', and claimed not to know 'who the subversive elements' in their midst were, let alone who had made the 'cowardly' and 'unjust' accusations in the first place, indelible suspicion was cast on the League.\textsuperscript{159}

Duguid's determination that 'justice to the Aborigines should not be left to the communists', and his fear that it would be, was intolerable to Bryan who joined the SA AAL towards the end of 1963 and left soon after.\textsuperscript{160} 'I couldn't work with it', Bryan told Read—Duguid was 'impossible'. The attitude of SA AAL members towards the people they were supposed to help also worried him. According to Bryan, the SA AAL 'didn't see the need for Aboriginal participation at their meetings'.\textsuperscript{161} With Malcolm Cooper, an Aboriginal member of the SA AAL and former St Francis resident, and John Moriarty, Bryan helped to form an 'all Aboriginal' 'breakaway group'—the Aborigines Progress Association (APA)—in 1964. Although few details about this organisation remain, a doctoral student from the Department of Anthropology at Washington University, James Pierson, interviewed most of its members in the late 1960s, and included a full account of the APA's formation and operation in his thesis 'Aboriginality in Adelaide: Urban Resources and Adaptations'.

According to Pierson, most of the Aboriginal members of the SA AAL shifted to the APA soon after its formation. While some were dissatisfied with the SA AAL's approach, in particular with its close relationship to government, 'most Aborigines left it with few ill-feelings', Pierson claimed; the 'time had simply come to try an additional approach'.\textsuperscript{162} O'Donoghue told Read a similar story:
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I guess we were wanting by this time to be more involved with a more Aboriginal organisation, whereas before we needed the help of an established organisation like the [SA AAL], and they were really committed to helping us, but when the Progress started up, we aligned ourselves with them—rather than with the [SA AAL]. For my part, there was never any bitterness about the [SA AAL].

Unlike the SA AAL, the APA was highly critical of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs, of conditions on government settlements and reserves, of the police, and of the public in general. Indeed, they were so critical that some of Pierson's Aboriginal informants believed that white people stopped paying attention when 'particular APA members [made] public criticisms because "they [did] too much of that"'.

Given Bryan’s role as co-founder, there was some dispute among Aborigines as to whether the APA was an 'all-Aboriginal' organisation, or simply a vehicle for Bryan to have his opinions voiced by Aborigines. Although membership and voting was restricted to persons of Aboriginal descent, 'meetings were generally open to whites and their ideas', and most of Pierson's Aboriginal informants believed that this was to enable Bryan's continued participation. While few denied that Bryan intended to be helpful, most believed that he was 'too active' in their organisation. Among Aborigines, according to Pierson, Bryan 'achieved the reputation of being a white who [told] Aborigines what they [wanted]'.

Casting a different light on Bryan's later criticism of the SA AAL, Pierson believed that Bryan's 'patience [was] ... too short to allow Aborigines to make or institute decisions'; that he was 'immune to criticism from either Aborigines or whites'; and that he was 'often insensitive to the feelings of the people he [was] trying to help'. Not surprisingly, Bryan's close association with the APA caused 'some Aborigines to be suspicious and critical of any action the organisation [took]'.

Bryan's 'way didn't suit' Gladys Elphick who recalled a particularly heated incident between Bryan and herself during a conversation with Kevin Gilbert in the late 1970s:
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[Bryan] wanted to send a letter to Dr Duguid protesting against Dr Duguid over some triflin' little things and I said, "Listen here Laurie ... You leave Dr Duguid out of this." I said, "He's been a good man," I said, "I got all the respect in the world for him and Mrs Duguid, more so because he's travelled amongst our people when they needed help and they were sick many years ago." I said, "He's getting on, now, and I don't think he should be drawn into anything like this." I said, "After all, you're not here to pick people that tried in the years past to help Aboriginals. You here to try to help the Aboriginals of today, what you're mixing with." 

Particularly since discrediting Duguid seems to have been part of Bryan's agenda, his later comments should be read with caution. Elphick, who considered herself 'a bit of a stirrer', was asked to leave the APA soon after this incident. In 1966, she and several other Aboriginal women combined to form their own 'all Aboriginal' organisation, the Council of Aboriginal Women of South Australia (CAWSA). Described by Elphick as an organisation formed 'by rejects and a breakaway group of Aboriginal women from another group run mainly by white people', the CAWSA's antagonism towards the APA, and Bryan in particular, was far greater, it seems, than either organisation's antipathy towards the SA AAL. 

As suggested by its name, the CAWSA restricted its membership to Aboriginal women. Most of its work, according to Pierson, was of a 'community service', rather than political nature. The CAWSA provided advice to individual Aboriginal families about their entitlements, and provided clothing, household items and small cash subsidies for food to Aboriginal families in need. They held weekly sewing, reading and art classes, and organised dances and other social events for Aboriginals. The CAWSA also tried 'to educate the white people' and 'improve the image of the Aboriginal in the eyes of the white community' by showing 'them what Aborigines could do'. Unlike the APA, the CAWSA worked closely with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and received substantial funding and support. The CAWSA had a permanent office, supplied by the Department, and a paid staff of three; an Aboriginal field-officer, a white social worker and a white receptionist. That the CAWSA not only employed white people, but took advice from them about Aborigines, was the cause of much critical concern among APA members. According to Pierson, the APA's president, Malcolm Cooper, 'repeatedly [criticised the] CAWSA for not merely encouraging, but paying a white to "do things for Aborigines". However, since the CAWSA believed that Cooper was 'strongly influenced
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by whites in most of his statements and actions, the women tended to regard such criticisms with amusement. 'Of course [the white social worker] tells us what to do', a CAWSA member told Pierson, 'that's what we pay him for'.

Personality and other conflicts aside, the CAWSA, the APA and the SA AAL were all working towards the same basic goal; equality with white people for Aborigines. In a paper entitled 'The Situation As I See It', delivered at a conference on the future prospects of Aborigines in South Australia in 1969, Moriarty, then vice-president and treasurer of the APA, said:

> do not get us wrong, we want to be part of your society, we want a share of the affluence that is all around us, we want big houses and we want motor cars ... We would like to mix with the general community ... We feel we can contribute a lot socially and culturally, and given half a chance can add to the gross national product ... We want to enjoy your affluence with you and, of course, contribute to it.

The problem, as Moriarty saw it, was that Aborigines had not been given a chance to 'integrate' into white society. Aborigines needed better housing, better employment prospects and, most of all, a completely new education system that was geared to the needs of Aboriginal people. '[W]e must ... start working from the Aborigine's point of view and present level', Moriarty argued. 'Concessions must be made on the way to the top, with the ultimate aim of reaching the same level as the Europeans'. To have 'top men in the same proportions as Europeans: professors, lawyers, doctors' was Moriarty's goal. To this end, policies of 'separate or segregated development ... always [had] been ... and always [would] be bad', according to him, for they 'produced only second rate citizens'. Aborigines wanted to be 'a part of Australia', Moriarty assured his audience, but rather than 'White Australia', it was 'Brown Australia' they longed for.

Many of the Aborigines Pierson spoke to disliked Moriarty's 'outspoken nature'. They resented that fact that Moriarty, who grew up at St Francis and completed a trade apprenticeship before attending university, was better educated and had had more opportunities than most Aborigines. CAWSA members disliked what they saw as Moriarty's 'better than us' attitude, and the way 'he flaunt[ed] his education in [their] faces'. That several of Pierson's Aboriginal informants also accused Moriarty of 'acting white' begs the question—was Moriarty 'out of his depth' too? Or was he, as Read has suggested of Peter Tilmouth, Lois O'Donoghue, Charles Perkins and other former
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'inmates' of St Francis and Colebrook, 'still groping towards a secure identity' as an Aboriginal?\textsuperscript{178} Moriarty has recently stated that he 'always felt strongly Aboriginal, right from when [he] was a kid'. In his autobiography, Saltwater Fella (2000), Moriarty explained that for him, Aboriginality 'is that inner fabric you build on to do all other things'.\textsuperscript{179} Now head of his own highly acclaimed company, Balarinji designs, Moriarty still rejects separate development and believes that Aborigines need to be 'integrated' into the 'wider society'. He also believes that Aborigines, Torres Strait Islanders and white Australians 'need to come to the negotiating table in a genuine spirit of co-operation ... [and] mutual respect' if reconciliation is to be achieved.\textsuperscript{180}

Having found his 'peace in both camps—the indigenous community and the wider Australian community', Moriarty's call for reconciliation mirrors his own and Duguid's aspirations from several decades prior; they mirror what Duguid called assimilation, yet Moriarty's hatred of the policy that stole him from his mother, his people and his culture is clear. In Saltwater Fella, Moriarty vehemently denounced assimilation. It was, he declared, 'an insidious, arrogant policy that amounted to cultural genocide. It was the stuff Hitler was made of, the things he espoused that are seen as abhorrent today'.\textsuperscript{181}

Rather than assimilation, it was integration that Moriarty fought for and still supports today. But how different was integration from assimilation? In 1960, Fay Gale described integration as being 'almost synonymous with social assimilation'. Unlike 'genetic assimilation' which meant 'intermarriage' and the 'eventual disappearance' of Aborigines, 'social assimilation' implied that Aborigines could 'live alongside, or within the general community, and enjoy all the benefits of housing, education etc., while still remaining a distinct people'. In other words, Gale believed that integration was to 'social assimilation' what absorption was to 'genetic assimilation'—they were two very different branches of the same (assimilation) tree.\textsuperscript{182} Judy Inglis' notes on the policy of assimilation are equally revealing: 'What is it? How can it be worked? What does it mean in practical terms?' she asked herself in the early 1960s. Does assimilation mean 'miscegenation and ultimate disappearance of [Aborigines]'?\textsuperscript{183} Inglis wondered. What about 'integration'—a policy which is aimed at incorporating dark groups, as groups, into white society'—could it be pursued simultaneously with assimilation, and if so, was it really that different to assimilation?\textsuperscript{184} Following Inglis' death in 1962, Diane Barwick, then a doctoral student in the Department of Anthropology at the Australian National University, described Inglis' work on assimilation as 'the least opinionated' she had seen 'for a long time'. By contrast, a session at the ANZAAS conference that year called 'Should the Aborigines be Assimilated'
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was 'lousy', Barwick contended, with little or no attempt made to analyse assimilation as a 'concept'.

Barwick submitted her doctoral thesis, 'A Little More Than Kin: Regional Affiliations and Group Identity Among Aboriginal Migrants in Melbourne' in 1963. In it she stated that 'Assimilation has many meanings'. In the same year, the National Missionary Council (NMC) released a detailed statement clarifying its meaning of assimilation. Although committed to a policy of assimilation, the NMC was concerned that 'the word [was] used loosely with varying meanings', and that 'some Government statements, like that of the Native Welfare Conference of 1961, [had] emphasised the temporary nature of measures for Aboriginal development, as though assimilation meant absorption in relatively short time'. Before revealing the meaning it 'desire[d] to give to the word', the NMC thought it 'important to note' Charles Rowley's observation that,

when the term 'assimilation' was adopted in 1939 to indicate the new policy on Aborigines, it was used by those best informed as a counter to the set of ideas for which the current term was 'absorption', involving the disappearance of the problem through the disappearance of Aboriginal physical and cultural characteristics.

Rejecting the term integration on the grounds that it too had 'several meanings and usages in Australia', the NMC defined assimilation as 'policy founded on mutual respect and the mutual recognition of common rights and responsibilities in a land that is shared by two races'. Furthermore, the Council stressed that assimilation had to be 'a two-way process' with the greater initiative resting with white Australians, and that it had to be a 'voluntary process' requiring 'assent' and the 'provision of alternatives to participation in the mainstream of Australian life'.

In our haste to condemn assimilation, and to distinguish it from the policy that followed, this period of discussion and debate about assimilation's multiple meanings and possibilities has been largely ignored by historians. If social commentators, missionary bodies, academics and other interested observers in the 1960s did not know what assimilation meant, or were concerned enough about its multiple meanings to clarify what they meant by it, why do we presume to know now that assimilation meant extinction? The constant claim of this thesis has been that assimilation, including its various guises of 'uplift', 'progress' and 'advancement', meant different things to different people at different times. Likewise, integration had more than one meaning. In Pierson's view, it made 'little
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difference' which term was used: 'Arguments about the use of the term "integration" as opposed to the official "assimilation" simply enabled the absence of action to be obscured by rhetoric'. Duguid tended to agree. Rather than debate the multiple meanings of these terms, in 1971 Duguid told an interviewer: 'Let's not talk about integration or assimilation. Those are just words. Let us work simply and go together as citizens of the same country'.

'Black Power is madness'
Was Duguid 'out of his depth with urban Aborigines'? In Adelaide, as in other parts of Australia, Aboriginal politics changed dramatically during the 1960s. White people were no longer wanted, and Aborigines of mixed-descent, previously considered a people without culture, were now proclaiming and celebrating their Aboriginal identity. The development of 'all Aboriginal' organisations in Adelaide (and elsewhere) both reflected and accentuated this change, for while the APA and the CAWSA played an important role in the 'increase of pride in Aboriginality' among urban Aborigines, as Pierson has argued, they also grew out of this change. If Duguid was 'out of his depth', then it was here, in his inability or unwillingness to see what 'being Aboriginal' meant to the people he was trying to help, that he was most at sea. More than 'colour', more than 'blood', more than a tenuous connection to a 'traditional' culture long since forgotten, 'Aboriginality' was a living, breathing and changing identity forged through shared experiences of discrimination and rejection by white society, and a desire to 'be Aboriginal'. Duguid had spent so long trying to prove that Aborigines of mixed-descent were the same as white people, only darker, that he could not understand their desire to 'be Aboriginal'; to be different. Nor could he understand their rejection of him and his help.

Aborigines were 'tired of white people making all their decisions', the CAWSA's first newsletter declared; Aborigines 'wanted the freedom and the opportunity to plan their own futures'. Throughout the 1950s, Duguid encouraged Aborigines to do just that, to state their claims in public, to make their voices heard, and to fight for their own rights. At the same time, Duguid encouraged white people to help Aborigines in this endeavour, to believe in them, and to co-operate with them. Duguid was not opposed to Aborigines organising on their behalf, but he was opposed to the 'isolationism' inherent in the idea of
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'all Aboriginal' organisations. 'It is imperative', Duguid argued in *Doctor and the Aborigines*, 'that we all move forward together':

The Aboriginal race has increased considerably since 1939, but the increasing numbers, greater mobility, and better education of the Aborigines have brought their own problems. In the past, the white new-comers refused to co-operate with the Aborigines; today, a clamant minority of part-Aborigines refuses to co-operate with the white people or with the rest of their own race. There is increasing talk of "Black Power", and propaganda couched in the language used by some Negroes of the United States. Such isolationism will benefit neither the Aborigines as a race nor Australia as a nation.194

Still believing that 'a change of heart' on the part of white Australians was the key to Aboriginal advancement, Duguid rejected 'black power' and all the anger and divisiveness that went along with it.195 The 'dominant, dictatorial, half-baked part-[Aborigines]' who were making all the noise and causing all the trouble—who were ostracising white Australians and 'hitting below the belt'—would only end up doing themselves, their people and their cause a disservice, Duguid argued; 'Black power is madness. Neither black nor white should dictate to each other'.196

In Duguid's view, Nancy Barnes and other Aborigines of mixed-descent who, like her, were quietly making a place for themselves and their people in the white community epitomised the way forward. After leaving Duguid's home and his employ in 1955, Barnes became a 'pioneer for her people', entering a one year intensive training course at the Kindergarten Training College in Adelaide.197 Following her graduation, Barnes was appointed director of the Salisbury Kindergarten in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. Interviewed in 1958 by the Adelaide *Advertiser*, Barnes explained her 'move towards independence and social status' in the following terms:

Most of my people are afraid to make the effort to come into the community and professional activities ... Their fear is not based on a feeling of inferiority, but on one of futility. I felt that the move had to be made by the individual.198

After two years at Salisbury, Barnes took up a position as director of the new Ida Standley preschool in Alice Springs. In 1963 she travelled overseas and worked briefly at the

---

195 Ibid., p. 218.
197 'Teacher is Pioneer for her People', *Advertiser*, 8 July 1958, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3, Clipping Book 3, p. 89. See also 'Representations by Dr Duguid, Charles re financial assistance for Brumbie, Miss Nancy to further her Kindergarten Training', NAA: A452/1, 1962/6747.
198 Ibid.
Barnardo Home in Kent, England, before being appointed a Regional Director with the Kindergarten Union of South Australia in 1965. In the same year, Barnes was appointed to the South Australian Government's Aboriginal Affairs Board. Jeff Barnes, one of the initiators of the SA AAL's hostel scheme, was the first person of Aboriginal descent appointed to this Board in 1963; Nancy was the first Aboriginal woman. For Nancy, being on the Board was 'critical' in terms of her 'goal of helping Aboriginal people and creating bridges'. For Jeff, a trained electrician, it meant being able to help other Aborigines to be like him—a good useful member of this community'. In 1968, Jeff and Nancy were married, with a proud Charles Duguid by their side acting as the 'father' of the bride (see Plate 15).

Having 'bridged the gap between two or more worlds' during her life, Nancy Barnes attributes her success to '[her] birth and [her] heritage, both Aboriginal and white', to Colebrook—but for Colebrook, we would not be here like this and have what we have today—and to 'the man who had a lasting influence on [her] life', Charles Duguid. Born to an Aboriginal mother and a white father in 1927, Barnes was three years old at the time of her 'placement' at Colebrook. Not 'stolen', but 'placed' Barnes firmly stated on the first page of her autobiography, for it was 'only with the permission of their parents ... that children were admitted to Colebrook'. Permission may have been given, but it was not always given willingly, as Duguid's account of the 'rescue' and subsequent 'placement' at Colebrook of three girls who were probably Barnes' sisters in 1937 has shown (see chapter three). The extent to which Barnes' self-image, her image of Colebrook and of Duguid rely on the pretext of 'placement' can be seen in the opening lines of her autobiography: 'We are referred to as the 'The Stolen Generation'. I consider myself 'Saved'. A sufferer of infantile poliomyelitis, Barnes' removal to Colebrook quite possibly prolonged her life, yet this is not what she meant by 'Saved'. Her testimony in Christobel Mattingley's Survival In Our Own Land: 'Aboriginal' experiences in 'South Australia' since 1836, provides a partial answer:

This generation of children, the children of 1920s and 1930s, are still known as 'the lost children'. These children had been sacrificed, yet saved for a purpose—for the sake of the two races, the combination of the two races. Surely there is something significant in that.

199 Barnes, Munyi's Daughter, pp. 106-116, 123.
200 Ibid., pp. 2, 174, 178.
201 Duguid did not name the girls—'aged eight, five and under two'—but he did say that they were the sisters of a girl 'rescued some time ago'. According to Barnes, her sisters—aged seven, five and two—joined her at Colebrook in 1937. See Duguid to Reverend H.C. Matthew, 23 February 1937 (enclosed 'a short note regarding recent rescues'), Duguid Papers: 1, Series 1; Barnes, Munyi's Daughter, p. 38.
202 Barnes, Munyi's Daughter, pp. 1, 6. According to Barnes, she 'survived' poliomyelitis when she lived in the camp with her family; her own 'strong body' made its own cure.
203 Mattingley, Survival In Our Own Land, p. 215. Believing that she was 'placed' at Colebrook, Barnes placed the burden of her removal on her mother, for if it was her mother who gave her to
Not 'stolen' but 'lost', not 'sacrificed' but 'saved', Barnes' deliberate inversion of the highly emotive terms we have come to associate with Aboriginal child removal suggests that for her, these terms are not just a matter of semantics. They enable her positive self-image, while also projecting a positive image of Colebrook, and people like Duguid who helped her achieve the purpose for which she was 'saved'.

The recent controversy (February/March 2001) surrounding Lois O'Donoghue's acknowledgment that she was 'removed rather than stolen' has revealed how dangerous such alternative narratives can be. Misquoted and misrepresented, O'Donoghue's words were used by the Prime Minister, John Howard, to justify his government's refusal to apologise to the 'stolen generations', as if her experience 'somehow weakened the historical argument about and of the stolen generations', Peter Read has argued. Read maintains that 'no one should have been surprised' by O'Donoghue's story, for all that it revealed 'was the diversity of Aboriginal experience'. Personally speaking, I was not surprised, but then I had already read Nancy Barnes' autobiography. Barnes' story did surprise me, and force me to re-evaluate all that I thought I knew about assimilation.

Assimilation was not just about Aboriginal child-removal, it was not just about destroying Aboriginal culture, it was not just about forcibly moving Aboriginal people from place to place until they forgot who they were. For some Aborigines it was about all these things. However, for others like Nancy and Jeff Barnes, it was a regime that offered egalitarian rewards. Nancy and Jeff Barnes are 'thoroughly assimilated' Aborigines; they are both thankful for their 'early Christian education' and the opportunities life has presented them. That they supported assimilation in the 1950s and 1960s and still support it today gives lie to 'the cliche that [all] Aborigines rejected assimilation'. Nancy Barnes' story is her own, her views are not necessarily the views of other Aborigines, nor can her experiences be generalised as the experiences of others. But her story does

the mission—who 'sacrificed' her for the sake of the future—then it was to her mother and her mother's people that she was 'lost'.

Bob McMullan, then Labor Aboriginal affairs spokesman, described the difference between 'stolen' and 'removed' as 'semantic'. See 'O'Donoghue Tears of Regret', Weekend Australian, 24-25 February 2001.

'O'Donoghue Tears of Regret', 'O'Donoghue's shock admission', 'Ugly attempt to bash the victim', 'Mission child becomes tireless rights advocate', 'Writer targeted 'a foul slur on Australia's good name', 'Sad semantics betray the stolen children', Weekend Australian, 24-25 February 2001; 'Blacks vent 'stolen' thunder', 'One word cannot negate a remarkable life born of tragedy', 'An inventor fumbles to maintain the fable', Sydney Morning Herald, 24 February 2001; 'Stolen, taken or removed, we suffered all the same', 'Burnt by a Bolt out for a blue', Australian, 15 March 2001. See also Bain Attwood, 'A Matter for History', The Australian Financial Review, 15 December 2000.


Personal communication with Andrew Duguid, 1 February 2000; Barnes, Munyi's daughter, p. 83.


PART 3: ASSIMILATION
indicate the need for further research into the diversity of Aboriginal experiences of assimilation, not least because of its potential to broaden our understanding of white support for assimilation as well. It was from Nancy Barnes and other 'Colebrookites' that Duguid learned what some Aborigines of mixed-descent could do, and it was from them that he learned what some Aborigines of mixed-descent wanted. Although Duguid, the respectable doctor and self-proclaimed father figure, probably influenced them more than they influenced him, it would go against everything Nancy Barnes has achieved, and everything she stands for, to suggest that she only supported assimilation because Duguid did.
PLATE 12. A group of tribal young folk from Ernabella to see the Queen in Adelaide.
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"Our place in the Community"
and
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Honorary Secretary: MISS FAITH HOLLIDGE, 24 Westall Street, Hyde Park

Source: Sir Paul Hasluck Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 5274, Box 32.
PLATE 15a. Charles Duguid as father of the bride.

PLATE 15b. Charles Duguid and Nancy Barnes (nee Brumbie) on her wedding day, Adelaide, 1968.
IN THE VERY BEGINNING ... THERE WAS DUGUID

Epilogue

IN THE VERY BEGINNING ... THERE WAS DUGUID

On behalf of the Pitjantjatjara people of the Musgrave Ranges, and on behalf of 'all Aboriginal people throughout Australia', Nancy Barnes sought to have a knighthood conferred on Charles Duguid in 1972. She collected memories of Duguid from Aborigines and whites in support of her claim, including the following from Nganyintja on the origins of Ernabella mission:

Dr Duguid came in the very beginning and saw the people and reported back to the authorities and they sent missionaries, and Dr Duguid himself continued to care about us, and was one of us. Dr Duguid saw motherless children, and half-caste children disowned by their white fathers and he constantly spoke on their behalf, and helped them ... He suggested making work available for the Aborigines and because of him, we are where we are today. From Dr Duguid new life came into us in a way that has not happened from any other white person. And he is still helping us, even at his great age he thinks of us and we love him.

There was no knighthood—in Barnes' opinion, Duguid 'had offended too many government and parliamentary figures by his fierce championship of us [Aborigines'] to receive one'. Barnes' efforts were not without effect however, for in the same year another Ernabella resident, Peter Nyaningu, wrote:

But listen—I, and the men and women came together to discuss this. We have decided that Dr Duguid's body should lie here at Ernabella so that Aborigines will always remember that he was one of us and that he faithfully helped us. Listen, we really do wish this. You know we have buried Aborigines here, and we should also keep Dr Duguid here at Ernabella.

---

1. Nancy Barnes, 'To whom it may concern', [1972], Charles Duguid Papers, Private Collection, Adelaide, since deposited at the National Library of Australia (hereafter Duguid Papers: 3).
2. Nganyintja, 'To whom it may concern', 10 July 1972, Nancy Barnes Private Collection, Adelaide. This statement can also be found in Christobel Mattingley (ed.), Survival in Our Own Land: 'Aboriginal' experiences in 'South Australia' since 1836, Hodder and Stoughton, Rydalmere, 1992, p. 255. See also Nancy Barnes, Munyi's daughter: A spirited Brumby, Seaview Press, Henley Beach, 2000, p. 79.
3. Barnes, Munyi's daughter, p. 80.
4. Peter Nyaningu to Nancy Sheppard, 18 July 1972, Nancy Barnes Private Collection, Adelaide. See also Barnes, Munyi's daughter, p. 80; Stewart Cockburn, 'Power of a selfless love', Advertiser, 2 December 1981.
This request, coming from the people of Emabella themselves, was Duguid's 'greatest honour'. Twenty-five years later, following his death in 1986, aged 102, Duguid's remains were buried at the Emabella cemetery.

In June 2001, I visited Duguid's grave at Emabella: a broken slab of concrete encased by spinifex, four lilting poles in place of a fence, and a solitary plastic rose faded white by the sun mark the spot (see Plate 16). A bronze plaque at the head of the grave reads:

CHARLES DUGUID
BORN SCOTLAND 1884
ARRIVED AUSTRALIA 1912
DIED ADELAIDE 1986
IN 1936 HE FOUNDED ERNABELLA FOR THE
PITJANTJATJARA PEOPLE

Pafurufanya altingu kala palumparingu.
Munla ngapartji palunya ngalya - altingu pilunpa ngarintjaku nganampa ngurangka.

He called us and we became his. So we called him here to lie in peace in our land.

The grave, which is also where Phyllis Duguid's ashes were scattered, is located at least ten metres away from the rest of the graves in the Emabella cemetery. It stands completely alone; a stark reminder of Duguid's singularity. At first its neglected appearance and solitary location saddened me. However, as I stood at the foot of Duguid’s grave and looked towards the graves of the Aborigines buried there, I realised that its location mirrored the original situation of Aborigines and whites at Emabella mission; a lasting and potent reminder of Duguid’s policy of minimal interference with 'tribal life'.

It was Duguid's plan that the missionaries at Emabella should live apart from the Aborigines, in a separate compound at least half-a-mile from the Aboriginal camp on the other side of the creek. Mary Bennett (nee Baird), a former teacher and craft coordinator at Emabella, felt that this policy left the missionaries 'free to be white people' and the Aborigines 'free to live their tribal life'. Together with Emabella's other operating principles—'no compulsion in religion or education, the use of the tribal tongue by all white staff, and the teaching of children' in Pitjantjatjara—the policy of minimal interference resulted, according to Duguid, 'in the maintenance of Pitjantjatjara culture, together with understanding of our life and ways'.

In February 1980, more than one hundred Aborigines from Emabella and surrounding communities travelled to Adelaide for a land rights demonstration. They

---

5 Cockburn, 'Power of a selfless love'; Phyllis Duguid, notes on 'The Emabella burial', [1987], Duguid Papers: 3.
6 Duguid died in December 1986. His burial at Emabella was in January 1987.
7 Bob Innes interview with Mary Bennett (nee Baird), 25 August 1995, Ara Iritijja Archive, Item s1507.
8 Duguid to editor, Advertiser, 24 March 1980.
campaigned at Victoria Park racecourse and Duguid, aged 95, joined them there (see Plate 17). Asked whether he agreed with their quest for land rights, Duguid declared: 'I have been of this opinion for 50 bloody years ... I know these people and I know why they need land rights.'

Duguid was extremely 'proud' of the way his 'friends' handled themselves at the demonstration. He was equally 'proud to think that [his] efforts so many years ago [had] given them the chance now to stand up and speak for themselves'.

The final draft of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill was passed in the South Australian parliament in March 1981. Initiated by Donald Dunstan's Labor government in the late 1970s, the Pitjantjatjara Lands Rights Act gave the Pitjantjatjara and Yankuntjara people inalienable freehold title to 102,360 square kilometres of land, their land. In November 1981, 1,500 people gathered at Itjipiri Creek, nine kilometres north of Ernabella, to witness the handing over of the title. Too old and frail to attend the ceremony himself, Duguid sent a message of congratulation:

> When I first visited the Pitjantjatjara lands, nearly fifty years ago, I felt a warm regard for your people and this has grown over the years as I have enjoyed many happy visits to you. I greatly admire the dignified persistence with which the [Pitjantjatjara] Council has maintained its struggle for land rights and I am very content that at last you have won legal recognition of those rights.

Duguid was 'grateful to have lived to see' this 'tremendous thing' come to pass. To him, it represented the final realisation of a long crusade that began with his first trip to the Musgrave Ranges in 1935.

**Pukatja, 2001-04**

Ernabella ceased to be a mission in 1974. Until recently it has been run by an elected council of community members, the Pitjantjatjara Council, and now it is run by the Anangu

---

9 'Old friends keep up the struggle', *Advertiser*, 4-5 February 1980. Duguid crossed out the word 'bloody' on his copy of the article, Charles Duguid Papers, National Library of Australia, MS 5068 (hereafter Duguid Papers: 1), Series 3.

10 Ibid.

11 Bill Edwards, 'Aboriginal Land Rights' in Mattingley (ed.), *Survival in Our Own Land*, p. 82.


13 Duguid to Alec Minujukur and Robert Stevens, Chairman and Secretary, Pitjantjatjara Council, 28 October 1981, Duguid Papers: 3.


Pitjantjatjara (AP) Executive Board. Today, Ernabella is known as Pukatja. With a population of about 400 people, it is the largest community on the AP Lands. It has a general store, medical clinic, pre-school, primary and secondary school, adult education and community centre, arts centre, service station and water treatment plant. Pukatja is not an easy place to visit: 1000 kilometres from Adelaide (including 200 kilometres of unsealed roads which become virtually impassable in the wet) and you need a permit to enter the Lands. When I first broached the idea of visiting Pukatja, several people who knew the place and who knew Duguid cautioned me against going. "There's nowhere to stay', 'the people won't talk to you and, even if they do, you won't learn much', I was told: 'They speak a different language—you'll need an interpreter'. I was also told that Pukatja was vastly different from the Ernabella that Duguid knew: social problems, health problems, violence and substance abuse were mentioned as reasons against my going.

All my research to that point had been about the past. I hadn't thought very much about what Ernabella/Pukatja was like in the present. I decided that I needed to make the journey—if only to see the place that Duguid helped to establish and the place where he was buried. I talked to as many people as I could about life on remote Aboriginal communities, about Pukatja and what I might find there. I thought that I was prepared; I was wrong. I travelled to Pukatja with a white woman employed by the Anangu Tertiary Education Program (AnTEP). Her job was to train Aboriginal women as teachers' assistants; mine was to look after her two children during the day. We stayed in a house on the edge of town which had steel bars over unshatterable plastic windows and security doors. Seeing the house made me feel less, rather than more, secure: it made me wonder about what, or whom, I was being protected against. I spent three weeks at Pukatja: not long enough to 'know' the place, but long enough to gain some impressions. The children I was minding attended school in the mornings, leaving me free to explore the community for a few hours each day. Seeing teenagers holding tins of petrol to their faces made me wonder what Duguid would make of Pukatja today. Duguid's last visit to Ernabella was in 1969. In Doctor and the Aborigines, he recorded his 'disappointment' at the state of the Aborigines' camp site: 'There was litter everywhere, too many dogs, and something new—many second-hand motor cars, a few of them broken down hulks'. Like Duguid, I saw packs of dogs scavenging for food in piles of rubbish and abandoned vehicles in various states of disrepair, but in comparison to Pukatja's other problems, Duguid's complaints seemed trivial; they belonged to a different time and place.

A few months after my visit to Pukatja, the journalist Paul Toohey visited the community—although 'community' was the wrong word, according to him, 'because there

---

16 Anangu is the Pitjantjatjara word for people.
17 These lands are sometimes referred to as Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankuntjara (APY) Lands.
18 Personal communication with Ron Lester and John Dallwitz, 25 January 2000.
19 Personal communication with Bill Edwards, 6 January 2000.
is no sense of community' there.\textsuperscript{21} Toohey's article 'Highly inflammable: Petrol Heads' was printed in the \textit{Weekend Australian Magazine} in November 2001. Toohey described Pukatja as 'a shabby desert town of filthy tin houses and office buildings that look more like jail blocks'; a town 'under siege by petrol sniffers; a town in 'deep crisis'. According to Toohey, Pukatja's petrol sniffing problem was 'the most blatant ... ever seen on Aboriginal land anywhere in Australia'. 'Petrol sniffers are in everybody's face, all the time'—they 'control the town and everyone is frightened'. Toohey estimated that there were 60 petrol sniffers at Pukatja. As for the rest of the Aboriginal population,

the majority of who are neither sniffers nor drunks, they have nowhere to hide. They are almost entirely welfare-dependent and find it hard to pack up and leave because their options are not appealing—perhaps another similarly ruined community further along the track, or to live with relatives in overcrowded camps in bigger towns. They have mostly given up hope and sit surrounded by the chaos, half-hoping for someone to airlift in an answer, but doubting it will arrive.\textsuperscript{22}

Searching for solutions, Toohey spoke to Peter Nyaningu (the Aboriginal man who requested that Duguid be buried at Ernabella). Now a Pukatja elder and church minister, Nyaningu said: "We want the work to come back ... Horses, cattle, fencing, gardens, welding. We used to be busy". Nyaningu felt that unless something was done to save the community, Pukatja would cease to exist within 10 to 15 years. "There will be nothing here", Nyaningu lamented. 'Nothing', Toohey added, 'except perhaps a petrol bowser for those passing though the empty Lands, standing there in mocking triumph'.\textsuperscript{23}

While most respondents felt that Toohey's article was 'balanced' and 'truthful', Makinti Rosalind Minutjukar pointed out that petrol sniffing was 'the end of a great big problem'.\textsuperscript{24} A Pukatja resident and community leader, Minutjukur explained that

the start of the problem is no food, no work, no money, no good houses, no clothes, no education, no \textit{waru} (warmth, fire, family hearth, home and happiness)—and because young people can't get any of those things properly, and because their parents can't help them to get those things, then the young people are sad and angry and they sniff.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
In the very beginning ... there was Duguid

In Minutjukur’s view, land rights was not enough: ‘we have our land, [but] we have nothing else. We can’t live on it the way we used to do because now we have to live like white people’, she explained. Minutjukur wanted the rest of Australia to know that parents at Pukatja were ‘trying to look after their children ... but inside they have given up hope. Because they can’t do everything by themselves [and] because the problem is so big’.25

In 2002, the South Australian coroner, Wayne Chivell, delivered a damning report on the living conditions on the AP Lands following his inquiry into the deaths of three ‘chronic petrol sniffers’ aged in their twenties. Chivell described petrol sniffing as ‘endemic on the Lands’, and called the situation a ‘disgrace and shame to us all’. Since petrol sniffing could not be divorced from the ‘environment of poverty, hunger, illness, poor education, almost total unemployment, boredom and hopelessness’ that characterised life on the AP Lands, Chivell criticised state and federal governments for taking ‘far too long to act’. As well as recommending the immediate establishment of secure detention, detoxification and rehabilitation facilities, Chivell called for a permanent police presence on the AP Lands—what was needed, he insisted, was ‘prompt, forthright, properly planned, properly funded action’.26

This year, 2004, has witnessed a great increase of political and media interest in the AP Lands, and Pukatja in particular. In March, the South Australian Legislative Council passed a motion of censure against the state government. It condemned its ‘failure to provide a timely and adequate response’ to Chivell’s recommendations; its ‘refusal to accept responsibility for the delays in providing effective health, welfare, police and other services for the people on the Lands’; and its ‘attempts to transfer blame to the AP Executive for the failures of the government to address issues on the AP Lands’.27 This followed a statement by the South Australian Deputy Premier, Kevin Foley, that self-governance on the AP Lands had failed, and his appointment of a white administrator to run the Lands.28 In April 2004, the South Australian Premier, Mike Rann, visited Pukatja and several other communities on the AP Lands accompanied by a large media contingent. Minutjukur and other community leaders expected Rann to meet with them and ‘to talk about their problems and hopes for a way forward’, but the meeting never happened. Instead, Rann walked around the town, spoke to the media, and then left.29 In August, Rann announced the appointment of Lowitja O’Donoghue and the Reverend Tim Costello as ‘special advisers’ on the AP Lands.30 It remains to be seen what effect these high profile

29 ‘Staring at the bottom of the bottle’, Age, 24 April 2004.
30 Robert Lawson, ‘The Tragedy of the Pitjantjatjara Lands’.
advisers—one born on the Lands, one the brother of the current federal treasurer—will have.

There is another side of life at Pukatja: a thriving arts centre and industry, Ernabella Arts Incorporated. Established by the Western Australian campaigner Mary M. Bennett in 1948, the arts centre at Pukatja is thought to be the longest continually running Aboriginal arts centre in Australia. Since the early 1970s, the artists, most of whom are women, have been producing highly acclaimed batiks, screen-prints, baskets, rugs, wood-carvings and paintings (see Plate 18). According to David Kaus of the National Museum of Australia, Ernabella artists have 'created for themselves a well-deserved worldwide reputation for their high quality work'. Ernabella Arts Incorporated is a cultural, social, artistic and economic organisation—a vital community facility that provides essential employment as well as fostering meaningful cross-cultural exchanges. As well as the arts centre, there is a strong women's council on the AP Lands and programs such as the Ara Irititja Archival Project working with the community to preserve important historical records, and AnTEP working with the community to provide employment for the future.

Pukatja is a place of extreme contrasts: a place where talented artists produce internationally acclaimed works and where adolescents sniff petrol to dull the pain of boredom and depression. Regarding the petrol sniffing problem, Terry Plane of the *Adelaide Review* recently suggested that:

> Perhaps what it needs is what the tjilpis [wise men, or elders] have been advocating for years: a bush camp, where the young men are forced to stay and learn traditional lore and law. With no petrol, no grog, no dope. Just food and the collective wisdom of people who care for their future.

A much loved and admired 'tjilpi' himself, Charles Duguid would probably have agreed. On his last visit to Ernabella in 1969, Duguid found 'the revolt of the nyinkas [uninitiated males] even more 'shocking' than the litter, dogs and cars. Whereas in the past, fathers and uncles had trained the boys in their teens before sending them out to fend for themselves ... [in] 1969 the nyinkas had not "gone bush"; they were living in a camp half-a-mile from the main camp'. Duguid 'saw a lad ride to the edge of the main camp and speak at length to a girl of his own age. That was a serious breach of nyinka discipline', he exclaimed. While Duguid understood that 'change of life at the mission was inevitable', he worried what a future devoid of tribal traditions and nyinka discipline would hold.

---

32 Kaus, 'Ernabella'.
34 Duguid was called 'tjilpi' meaning 'old man-father' and 'tjaumu' meaning grandfather. See They remembered 'Tjil[p]i', *Advertiser*, 8 April 1974, Duguid Papers: 1, Series 3.
It is impossible to know what Duguid would think of Pukatja today—it is probably unfair to even surmise. And yet the question 'what would Duguid think of this place' was foremost in my mind during my three weeks there. What I really wanted to know was what would Duguid do about Ernabella/Pukatja if he were alive today? As I sat on the hill behind the arts centre, marvelling at the majestic beauty of the landscape—and hoping to remain unnoticed by the petrol sniffers below—my thoughts turned to the epigraph introducing Duguid's *No Dying Race*:

*I saw an injustice done and tried to remedy it. I heard a falsehood taught and was compelled to deny it. Nothing else was possible to me. I knew not how little or how much might come of this business, or whether I was fit for it; but here was the lie, full set in front of me, and there was no way round it but only over it.*

These words, written over one-hundred-and-fifty years ago by John Ruskin, artist, scientist, poet and philosopher, inspired Duguid to fight, and to keep fighting for justice for Aborigines for more than forty years. As Ann Curthoys has shown, their publicisation by Duguid in the 1960s also inspired others to become involved in the Aboriginal cause. In today's increasingly uncertain world, words like 'injustice', 'falsehood' and 'lie' have less power to move us than in Duguid's day. We wonder what right we have to judge—from whose perspective is something unjust, false or wrong? Who is to say what is 'right'? Unburdened by such ethical questions, Charles Duguid would fight to save the people and the place he loved. Whether his help (interference) would be appreciated (allowed) today, I'm less certain, but I am positive that he would try.

---

36 This passage appears at the very beginning of Duguid, *No Dying Race*, Rigby, Adelaide, 1963. Duguid dedicated the book 'To my wife—Always at one with me in my efforts for recognition of the Aborigines, she many years ago gave me these words of Ruskin'. John Ruskin wrote them in 1842 in response to criticism of J.M.W. Turner, a painter he greatly admired. See Quentin Bell, *Ruskin*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1963, p. 6.


Source: Sitarani Kerin, personal collection.

Source: 'Old friends keep up the struggle', Advertiser, 15 February 1980.
PLATE 18a. Detail of hand drawn batik
Artist: Atipalku Intjalki

PLATE 18b. Ernabella Arts Incorporated.
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