Chapter Seventeen

Stolen Generations and Vanishing Indians

The Removal of Indigenous Children as a Weapon of War in the United States and Australia, 1870–1940

Victoria Haskins and Margaret D. Jacobs

In 1906, a girl named Helen "awoke to find [her] camp surrounded by troops." A government official, she later recalled, "called the men together, ordering the women and children to remain in their separate family groups." "The government," he said:

> had reached the limit of its patience and that the children would have to go to school. . . . All children of school age were lined up to be registered and taken away to school. Eighty-two children . . . were taken to the schoolhouse . . . with military escort.[1]

In about 1915, the police came for a girl named Margaret. "They said they wanted to take my children away," Margaret's mother Theresa remembered. "I said 'My children are well cared for.'" A policeman took Margaret, her sister, and her cousin from their local school, in the face of the weeping entreaties of her mother. Margaret wrote that the policeman patted a holster at his belt while telling her resistant mother that he would "have to use this if you do not let us take these children now." Thinking that the policeman would shoot their mother, Margaret and her young relatives screamed, "We'll go with him Mum, we'll go."[2]

The similarity of these two stories is remarkable. In each case, government authorities forcibly removed children from their families for the stated purposes of educating them or improving their lives. Yet the incidents took place in almost opposite corners of the world. Helen was Helen Sekaquaptewa, a Hopi girl who lived in northeastern Arizona in the United

States. Margaret was Margaret Tucker, or Lilardia, an Ulupna/Wiradjuri Aboriginal girl from the southeastern corner of the Australian continent.[3] Despite being poles apart, Helen and Margaret, as well as their communities, shared a common experience at the hands of white governmental authorities.

As a central component of the assimilation agenda in the United States and of absorption plans in Australia, child removal became a systematic government policy toward indigenous peoples in both countries in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Using the rhetoric of protecting and saving indigenous children, reformers and government officials touted child removal as a means to "uplift" and "civilize" indigenous children. Modern-day historians, until very recently, have characterized child removal in similar ways: as a well-intentioned, though ultimately misguided, alternative to warfare and violence against indigenous peoples.

If we turn our attention to the perspectives of the indigenous peoples who confronted this policy, a different view emerges. While outright violence against indigenous peoples in both the United States and Australia did virtually end in the late nineteenth century, efforts by colonizers to pacify and control indigenous populations and to confiscate their lands continued with the removal of indigenous children. Such a policy was hardly a departure from military methods of subjugation; rather, the systematic and forcible removal of their younger generations represented an ongoing assault upon indigenous communities.

The removal of Indian children as a systematic state policy began in earnest in the United States in the 1880s. The idea to assimilate Indians through removing Indian children originated in 1875 with an "experiment" conducted upon Kiowa, Comanche, and Cheyenne prisoners of war incarcerated at Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida, under the command of Captain Richard Henry Pratt. Pratt decided to "rehabilitate" the prisoners by cutting their hair, replacing their native dress with military uniforms, and introducing military discipline and education to them. In 1879, with new authority from the government, Pratt opened Carlisle Institute, in Carlisle, Pennsylvania on twenty-seven acres of land, complete with stables, officer's quarters, and commodious barracks buildings, all donated by the U.S. War Department. As at Fort Marion, Pratt ran the school along military lines. He issued military uniforms to Indian boys, and required both boys and girls to form in companies, march, and drill each day before they carried out their assigned "details." Pratt deemed dormitories "quarters" and implemented a strict military regime.[4]

Thus even from their inception, Indian boarding schools were intimately connected with the U.S. military. The U.S. government adopted Pratt's plan for assimilating and remolding American Indian children. By 1902, they had established 154 boarding schools (including 25 off-reservation schools) and 154 day schools for about 21,500 Native Americans. There were also still a number of mission schools operated by various religious organizations. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas Morgan claimed that through this new system:

> the Indians are not only becoming Americanized, but they are by this process of education gradually being absorbed, losing their identity as Indians, and becoming an indistinguishable part of the great body politic.[5]

While the federal government supposedly did not allow the removal of children without the consent of their parents, Indian agents resorted to force, withholding rations, or making bribes to fill boarding school quotas.[6] After World War II, the government revived assimilation policy under a new name—termination and relocation. Although many boarding schools remained in operation, Indian child removal now more often manifested itself in the form of social workers who removed Indian children from families they deemed unfit, to be raised in white foster homes.

In Australia, child removal policies were brought in under the banner of "Protection." Beginning with an 1871 regulation to the Victorian Aborigines Act (1869), and followed by the colony of Queensland in 1897, by 1911 all the newly formed states of federated Australia had their own raft of special legislation for the forcible removal, institutionalization, and indenturing of indigenous children. Child removal was aimed ostensibly at making Aboriginal children into "decent and useful members of the community" and couched in the language of benevolent welfare policy.[7] Thus, the New South Wales (NSW) Aborigines Protection Board had the power to secure custody and control of any Aboriginal child "if it is satisfied that such a course is in the interest of the moral or physical welfare of such child."[8] Powers enabling state governments to forcibly remove Aboriginal children at their own discretion, without parental consent or court hearings, were acquired piecemeal and by the 1930s were extensive around Australia. Child removal practices included the routine segregation of children from about age four in dormitories on large, regulated missions and reserves; the removal of very young children (especially of mixed descent) to distant institutions; and the forcing of children from about the age of fourteen into "training homes" and indentures. As in the United States, after World War

II the policies were renamed (ironically, as "Assimilation") and while the institutions remained, social workers increasingly removed Aboriginal children under general child welfare laws, for fostering and adoption.

Despite the lofty "saving the children" rhetoric, it became clear that government officials saw a more practical dimension to child removal. Authorities in the United States often remarked on the inverse connection between child removal to boarding schools and wars with the Indians. Thomas Morgan asserted, "It is cheaper to educate a man and to raise him to self-support than to raise another generation of savages and fight them." White officials also perceived that child removal had positive effects by making Indian parents more docile. John Miles, the Quaker agent to the Cheyennes and Arapahoes in Indian territory, wrote to his friend Pratt:

> There are so many points gained in placing Indian children in school.... The child being in school the parents are much easier managed; are loyal to the Government, to the Agent, and take an interest in the affairs of the Agency, and never dare, or desire, to commit a serious wrong. I am yet to know of the first individual Indian on this reservation who has joined in a raid, that has had his child in school.

Government officials made such policies explicit, as when the Commissioner of Indian Affairs expressly ordered Pratt to obtain children from two particularly resistant reservations, "saying that the children, if brought east, would become hostages for tribal good behavior."[9]

In Australia, government authorities also turned to child removal to control indigenous communities. As the NSW Aborigines Protection Board pointed out, white authorities "really had no control over the reserves and the residents could set authority at defiance" until such legislation enabled them to make "radical changes in the methods of dealing with the aboriginal population, more especially in the direction of training the young."[10] However, the overriding aim of most Australian authorities in targeting the children was to ensure the disappearance of the race. Discussion of child removal policies in the frontier regions of Australia, where sporadic conflicts and massacres continued, reflected anxieties over the vulnerability and impermanence of the settler population. Child removal would ensure that "the black population is speedily absorbed in the white," warned the Northern Territory (NT) Aboriginal Protector, "[otherwise] the white population will be absorbed into the black."[11]

In settled Australia where Aborigines were a clear minority and violent clashes a distant memory, such racial demographic concerns were still para-

mount. "These black children must be rescued from danger to themselves, and from being a danger to the whole of the white population," stated a NSW politician and Board member.

> They are an increasing danger, because although there are only a few full-blooded aborigines left, there are 6,000 of the mixed blood growing up. It is a danger to us to have a people like that among us looking upon our institutions with eyes different from ours.[12]

Since Aborigines were not "dying out" as expected, but instead had established themselves on rural land bases that were coveted by surrounding white settlers, authorities resorted to child removal. This, it was argued, would put "things into train on the lines that would eventually lead to the camps being depleted of their population, and finally the closing of the reserves and camps altogether."[13] In Australia, there was no Act designed to break up the reserves such as was legislated in the United States in the General Allotment Act of 1887, but child removal in the settled areas peaked in tandem with the revocation of reserved lands.[14]

Unlike assimilation policy in the United States, Australian child removal made no pretense of removing children for the sake of their education, it being held they were incapable of higher learning. Instead the stated intention of their removal was to "absorb" them into the "industrial classes" of white Australian society.[15] Officials considered the homes as "training" institutions for menial labor and as holding bays for workers prior to their indenturing to farm labor or domestic service. Furthermore, until the postwar era, girls and young women bore the brunt of the removal policy, as the authorities made their concerns about preventing Aboriginal "breeding" explicit.[16]

Upon close examination, it becomes clear that despite its more noble claims, the North American system also aimed at placing indigenous children into low-skilled, low-paid occupations at the margins of American society. Many boarding schools promoted a program of work for local employers in the afternoon, and also sought to place Indian children with white families during summers and other school holidays, "there to learn to work and to acquire civilized ways." Pratt and other reformers touted this plan, known as the outing system, as a means to break down Native American "superstition and savagery" and to more deeply inculcate in Indian children the values of white American society.[17] In reality, boarding schools became virtual labor recruiters for nearby families who sought cheap laborers. Thus, even as Australian and American policies diverged in semantics, they converged in practice.

Indigenous people rarely perceived the removal of their children as a benign alternative to war or as a humanitarian endeavor. Helen Sekaquaptewa remembered that:

> when we were five or six years of age, we, with our parents . . . became involved with the school officials, assisted by the Navajo policemen, in a serious and rather desperate game of hide-and-seek. . . . When September came there was no peace for us.

Hopi families often tried to hide their children in cupboards or baskets or took them outside the village to hide in cornfields or nearby ravines.[18]

Iris Burgoyne, a Mirning-Kokatha woman of South Australia (SA) described how adults warned the older children of the arrival of white officials on the mission, and these children then hid the younger children in the bush. Nuns would "go from house to house. The Sister would bark at the mothers, 'Where are your children?'" When unsuccessful with mothers, "this sister went to the old folks in search of the children. The old people never lied. . . . [t]hose children were ripped from their families, shoved into that car and driven away." Another girl from Western Australia (WA) in the 1930s recalled:

> During the raids on the camps [to collect children] it was not unusual for people to be shot—shot in the arm or the leg. You can understand the terror we lived in, the fright—not knowing when someone will come unawares and do whatever they were doing—either disrupting our family life, camp life, or shooting at us.[19]

In both Australia and the United States, growing up in such an atmosphere was akin to living in a war zone.

Once taken from their parents and tribal communities, indigenous children suffered enormously. Both American and Australian institutions set out to physically and mentally transform their inmates. Daklugie, a Chiricahua Apache, remembered that when he and several other Apache children were taken to Carlisle, "we were thrust into a vicious and hostile world that we both hated and feared. . . we had no choice but to submit." Once at Carlisle, Daklugie recalled, "the torture began. . . . The first thing they did was cut our hair." After a bath, "we were ordered to put on trousers. We'd lost our hair and we'd lost our clothes; with the two we'd lost our identity as Indians." Later Carlisle authorities "imposed meaningless new names on us." Daklugie always hated his new name, Asa; "it was forced on me as though I had been an animal."[20]

Indigenous children were prohibited from speaking their languages and subject to physical and psychological abuse aimed at ensuring their submission to control. Daisy Ruddick, placed in Kahlin Compound at Darwin aged six, talked of how total silence was maintained:

> if any of us made a noise. . . . You had a wooden post, and we had to stand in the hot boiling sun with our hands behind our back because we woke [the matron] up from her sleep. That was our punishment. You wouldn't believe it, would you? It sort of reminds me of a concentration camp. You'd stand in that hot boiling sun for . . . I don't know what . . . it seemed like a lifetime.[21]

Beatings administered with sticks and whips were also a feature of institutional life, while Aboriginal children in employment also commonly experienced physical violence (as well as psychological and sexual abuse).[22] Such tactics of enforcing submission also aimed at erasing indigenous identity. As Arrente man George Bray reflected on his experience, "We were taken away and brainwashed towards living the white society instead of living the old Aborigine way. We were brought in to forget that sort of thing."[23]

Many indigenous children found the whole experience of institutional life, particularly Christian proselytization, mystifying. After her first day at church, Kaibah, a Navajo (Diné) girl, asked Nancy, an older Navajo girl, "Who are God and Jesus? And why are they going to burn us all up?" Nancy concluded, "They are the white man's gods, who are coming very soon to burn people that don't live like they want them to live." For Jean Begg, Christian teachings at Bomaderry Children's Home gave her nightly terrors of the risen Christ inextricably intertwined with a fear of Aboriginal people, "knowing that they were evil, wicked and not understanding black, but only relating it to sin and drinking and cruelness."[24]

Such religious education taught indigenous children to deny, despise, and fear every aspect of their indigenous identity. The indigenous children of Australia and the United States were of a race and culture that had been singled out and targeted for control and, in the Australian case, eradication, and this purpose underlay all their experiences of removal and institutionalization.

As James Wilson points out, they "were thrown into a hostile universe in which everything that made them what they were was systematically ridiculed and condemned. Not surprisingly, many did not survive."[25] Indeed, the numbers of indigenous children who died after being removed to white institutions or homes is astounding and tragic. Aboriginal rights activist Roberta Sykes discovered a list made in 1938 of the names and

"ages of death" of children removed by the NSW Aborigines Protection Board:

> I felt faint as I read through and found I had in my hand perhaps the earliest list of black deaths in custody . . . Girl taken, aged 13, died three years later, aged 16; girl taken, aged 8, died four years later, aged 12; girl taken aged 13, died aged 14; taken 13, died 18; taken 13, died 17; taken aged 7, died aged 12 . . . and so on.[26]

Some children were undoubtedly murdered, such as the child at Cootamundra Home in NSW in the 1920s who was "tied to the old bell post and belted continuously. She died that night, still tied to the post, no girl ever knew what happened to the body or where she was buried."[27] Others tried to kill themselves, either in the institutions or, more commonly it seems, after they left to go into domestic service.[28] Other deaths resulted from widespread disease.

Much of the illness that indigenous children suffered can be attributed to the miserable conditions in the institutions, which Thom Blake has labeled "passive violence" by the state.[29] Overcrowding, poor sanitation, a constant regime of physical work, and inadequate and poor-quality food were not conducive to good health. At the Bungalow, children supplemented their diet from the town dump; at Cootamundra and Kinchela Homes in NSW children picked grubs and weevils out of their food; while children in Kahlin Compound lived on a diet of peanuts during the Depression.[30] "It was very hard living," recalled one inmate of Cootamundra Home.[31] Very young children were most vulnerable to death from bronchial-related disease and gastroenteritis, while researcher Inara Walden found that the major cause of death listed for girls taken away in NSW was tuberculosis. Walden speculated that the children's "extreme social dislocation" could have made them susceptible to the disease.[32] Tuberculosis was also a killer of removed Native American children. In an 1889 War Department report, Lieutenant Guy Howard documented that of the 112 Apache children of POWs who had been sent to Carlisle, 30 had died, and another 12 had been returned to their parents because of poor health. Most of these sick children soon died, mostly from tuberculosis. Henrietta Stockel attributes such high rates of death to "the impact of a strange language, the unfamiliar situations, homesickness, the lack of sufficiently diversified exercise, and unusual food." The children had all experienced these factors along with their POW parents at Fort Marion, Florida, but as Stockel puts it, "the risk factors increased dramatically when the children were forcibly removed from their

parents and families, . . . and put into yet another terrifying situation." Even a general in the U.S. military remarked that the children were more susceptible to disease because of separation from their parents. Pratt himself blamed the "deplorable and almost hopeless conditions surrounding them. . . . They have no home, no country, no future, and life has become hardly worth living." Yet Pratt failed to own up to his own role in the children's illnesses and deaths.[33]

If we regard indigenous children's experiences as living in a state of warfare, within which they were both targets and victims, we might also consider them as combatants, engaged in a struggle to maintain their identity as indigenous people. For those children who were taken, physical survival was hard enough, but they also had to struggle against all odds to retain any positive identification with their race and culture. Many indigenous children learned to cope by finding ways to keep their native ways alive, sometimes in new and surprising ways. Daklugie remembered:

> The thing that pulled me through was the athletic training at Carlisle. I enjoyed the sports and, although the conditioning didn't measure up to my father's and Geronimo's training routine, it kept me active and fit.

After football games, "to celebrate the victory, we had a party in the gym. Some of us did our native dances."[34] Aboriginal children placed in service in rural areas were able to maintain their knowledge of bush food and indigenous practices such as leaving cobwebs for birds to feed their young, knowledge which they passed on to the white children they looked after.[35]

Children in mission dormitories located near their own communities sometimes obtained bush food and brought "some meat back to the camp for the older people." Wadjularbinna at Doomadgee mission in Queensland recalled that the children there were "very fortunate" because older girls, who had learned from their parents:

> kept the culture alive in the dormitory. They told us stories, they kept us in the kinship system; they kept that alive. . . . Our culture was intact, but we had to do it really sneaky, don't let the missionaries know.[36]

Many children never adjusted and sought to escape. Such resistance could result in humiliating punishments. At a boarding school for the Navajos in Toadlena, Arizona, authorities punished four girls who ran away by subjecting them to a public ritual headshaving. Authorities knew that "to have one's hair cut short was a drastic break in Navajo tradition, but to have it all cut off, was a great disgrace."[37]

Aboriginal children also ran away from the institutions, and met with public shaming rituals and punishment on their return. A greater proportion escaped from their places of employment; when recaptured, most were dispatched to another employer, while others were drawn into the juvenile justice system, placed in reformatories, convents, or even mental asylums.

Ultimately, resistance for children removed under these policies was manifested most clearly by the enthusiasm of many of those same children as adults to find their cultural identity, to actively work toward cultural revitalization, and to assert their indigenous identity with pride. As Ngarrindjeri poet Margaret Brusnahan writes:

> Reared your way didn't make me white
> If only once you'd had the insight
> To know the day you set me free
> I'd return to my own The Ngarrindjeri.[38]

In the meantime, the effect of child removal on families and tribal communities proved profoundly devastating. Poignant letters from Apache POW parents at Fort Marion to their children at Carlisle provide testimony to the tragedy that befell native peoples when their children were removed. One mother, Chenlozite, wrote (through an interpreter):

> My dear children,
> Are you happy? You must be happy my two boys. I see well yet and I talk kind. When you went away from me I cried every day. I feel better now. We live very well here. I think we shall see each other again. You must not think about me. I don't think about myself.

While visiting the imprisoned Apaches at Fort Marion, famed nineteenth-century author Harriet Beecher Stowe witnessed Indian after Indian rise to speak at a prayer meeting, professing their adherence to white ways if only they be allowed to reunite with their families.[39] In some cases, holding children hostage and separating family members from one another did seem to produce the desired effect of the government to pacify and control Native Americans, at least temporarily. Many families submitted to the government's wishes in hopes of being reunited with their children as soon as possible. When Native American families did resist the removal of their children, they did so individually or in small groups, rather than through collective organization.

Yet just as the U.S. government found a new means to conquer and control Native Americans, so too did native people find new ways to resist ab-

solute control over their lives. Ironically, boarding schools, by teaching Indians English and inadvertently cultivating a pan-Indian identity, furnished Indian students with tools to build a strong legal resistance to white control. The first major pan-Indian organization, the Society of American Indians, founded in 1911, included mostly Native Americans who had themselves been removed as children. The group was divided on the issue of boarding-school education and never took a stand against the practice of child removal. However, they began to agitate for greater American Indian sovereignty, a goal that future American Indian organizations would carry further through battles in court.[40]

For many Aboriginal Australians, maintaining their religious ceremonies and practices was made difficult if not untenable by the full-scale removal of children. In some areas, such as the south coast of NSW, carrying out important ceremonies such as initiations may have actually "been to offer cause for taking children away from their families."[41] Child removal ravaged whole communities and families. "I have nothing to work for, [my wife] is dead," wrote a North Queensland father in 1901.

> She died broken-hearted, killed on that unlucky day when [our daughter] was dragged by animal force from her family and home, and forced from the arms of her mother on a false charge of being neglected.

While numerous parents protested by anguished letters to the authorities, others took direct action; in WA, a number of men, on learning that their children had been removed while they had been away fighting in World War II, marched into the office of the Aboriginal authorities and, at gunpoint, demanded their children's return.[42]

Aboriginal people organized forcefully and collectively against the removal of their children. In 1927 Fred Maynard, president of the Australian Aborigines Progressive Association (AAPA), accused the authorities of removing Aboriginal girls "to exterminate the Noble and Ancient Race of sunny Australia." He wrote to the NSW premier demanding that children be left with their parents—the "family life of Aboriginal people shall be held sacred and free from invasion."[43] Four years earlier in SA, three Nunga men presented a memorial to the SA governor that likened the new South Australian Aborigines (Training of Children) Act to a state of warfare between the government and "mother's love." The Nunga men told the press that they did not "mind the Government taking [the children] and training them. We want them to get on and be useful. But we want to feel we have full rights over them and that they are our own children." The memorial

itself, written by a Ngarrindjeri person, described the passing of the child removal legislation as an "ultimatum of one nation to another," and the refusal of the Aboriginal people to "comply with the demands" of this ultimatum, an "acceptance of a condition of warfare."[44]

Certainly, Aboriginal people experienced the removal of children as an act of warlike aggression, designed to intimidate them, to control them, and to ultimately destroy their communities. When we examine Aboriginal and American Indian perspectives on the removal of their children, rather than blindly accepting the national myths that have been constructed and reproduced over generations, it becomes clear that the hidden but real aims of the removal of children were not so different from the aims of violence and warfare against indigenous peoples. Warfare aimed at conquest and dispossession, at quelling indigenous resistance, and at transforming indigenous peoples from self-sufficient collective owners of their own land to impoverished and marginal members of society, who, in order to survive, had to work at menial labor for their conquerors. By the end of the nineteenth century, overt acts of violence against indigenous people may have become politically inexpedient, financially impracticable, or simply ineffective. Australian and American authorities continued to face the "problem" of a persistent indigenous population. Thus, officials turned to a new means of warfare, disguised as a humanitarian alternative. Child removal sought to accomplish the original aims of warfare against indigenous peoples, by the severance of tribal and land connections, the fragmentation of indigenous communities, and the training of indigenous children to serve their colonizers. The conquerors of Australian and North American indigenous peoples may have stopped the use of violence and outright warfare, but warfare against native peoples continued in a new but no less benign and damaging form.

NOTES

1. Helen Sekaquaptewa, *Me and Mine: The Life Story of Helen Sekaquaptewa*, as told to Louise Udall (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1969), 91–92.

2. Theresa Clements, *From Old Maloga: The Memoirs of an Aboriginal Woman*, pamphlet, n.d. (Prahan: privately printed, 1948), in Anton Vroland papers, MS 3991, Series 5, Box 6, Manuscript Section, National Library of Australia, Canberra; Margaret Tucker, *If Everyone Cared* (London: Grosvenor Books, 1983), 93.

3. Where possible in this essay, we use the particular tribal or community affiliation that indigenous peoples prefer. Although there is much debate within in-

digenous and scholarly communities regarding proper terms for indigenous peoples in both countries, there is no consensus. Therefore, when we refer to indigenous peoples in the United States as a group, we use the words American Indians, Indians, and Native Americans interchangeably. In Australia, there are also a number of names by which Aboriginal people call themselves generically, such as Koori (southeastern Australia) and Nunga (South Australia), which we use where the name denoting the specific group affiliation is not known. When we refer to the indigenous peoples of Australia collectively, we use the terms Australian Aborigines, Aborigines, and Aboriginal people, these being currently acceptable terms.

4. Richard Henry Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867–1904* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964), 163, 233, and more generally, 104–166, 213–267; *The Redman* 1 (February 1909): back cover; Jason Betzinez with Wilbur Sturtevant Nye, *I Fought with Geronimo* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1959), 150, 153.

5. Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 57, 58; T. J. Morgan, "Our Red Neighbors," *Baptist Home Mission Monthly* 16 (June 1894), 190.

6. For examples of how agents obtained Indian children, see *The Indian's Friend* 3, no. 10 (June 1891): 2; Mann, *Cheyenne-Arapaho Education*, 50, 59, 80, 89; Ball, *Indeh*, 219.

7. Individual colonies were responsible for their administration of Aboriginal affairs and after Federation, in 1901, this situation continued, the federal government being prevented by the constitution from legislating on Aboriginal matters until 1967. The federal government, however, administered Aboriginal affairs in the Northern Territory after 1911—prior to that the territory was administered by South Australia. Tasmania alone did not have special provisions for removing Aboriginal children—Aboriginal children were removed there under general child welfare laws.

8. *NSW Aborigines Protection Board Annual Report for 1910* (Sydney: Government Printer, 1911); Sec. 13(A), *Aborigines Protection (Amending) Act*, (NSW) Act No. 2, 1915.

9. Morgan quoted in *The Indian's Friend* 4 (Jan. 1892); Miles quoted in Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom*, 242; Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom*, 202.

10. *NSW Aborigines Protection Board Report for 1909* (Sydney: Government Printer, 1910).

11. Dr. Cecil Cook, Chief Protector of the Aborigines in the Northern Territory, in Commonwealth of Australia, *Aboriginal Welfare—Initial Conference of Commonwealth and State Aboriginal Authorities, held at Canberra, 21st to 23rd April, 1937* (Canberra: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1937), 13–14.

12. Second reading in NSW Legislative Assembly, Aborigines Protection Amending Bill, 27/1/15, *NSW Parliamentary Debates* Vol. 56 (Sydney: Government Printer, 1915), 1965.

13. F. Flowers, citing Donaldson's speech during the 1912 deputation, second reading in NSW Legislative Council, Aborigines Protection Amending Bill, 24 November 1914, *NSW Parliamentary Debates* Vol. 56 (Sydney: Government Printer, 1915), 1353.

14. Based on figures for child removal in *NSW Aborigines Protection Board Register of Wards* and unpublished research on reservation revocation NSW in John Maynard, "Fred Maynard and the Awakening of Aboriginal Political Consciousness and Activism in Twentieth Century Australia" (Ph.D. dissertation, Newcastle University, NSW, in progress).

15. See comment by E. Harkness in Commonwealth of Australia, *Aboriginal Welfare*, 21; Board official (unidentified) in a speech to the Australasian Catholic Congress, 1909, quoted in Coral Edwards and Peter Read, *The Lost Children* (Sydney: Doubleday, 1989), xiii–xiv.

16. It was not until "assimilation" replaced "protection" as official policy, and fostering superseded indenturing, that proportions of girls and boys removed became equal. See Heather Goodall, "Saving the Children," *Aboriginal Law Bulletin* 2 (June 1990): 9.

17. Quoted in *The Indian's Friend* 2 (November 1889): 1.

18. Sekaquaptewa, *Me and Mine*, 8–9, 31.

19. Iris Yumadoo Kochallalya Burgoyne, *The Mirning We Are the Whales* (Broome: Magabala Books, 2000), 65–66; confidential evidence 681, *Western Australia, Bringing Them Home Report*, Chapter 2, p.1.

20. Quoted in Ball, *Indeh*, 141, 142, 144.

21. Daisy Ruddick, "'Talking About Cruel Things': Girls' Life in the Kahlin Compound," as told to Kathy Mills and Tony Austin, *Hecate*, 15 (1989): 18.

22. See Polly Smith, quoted in Stuart Rintoul, *The Wailing* (Port Melbourne: William Heinemann Australia, 1993), 24–25; "Millicent," *Bringing Them Home Report*, Chapter 7, 12; Victoria Haskins, "My One Bright Spot: A personal insight into relationships between white women and Aboriginal women under the NSW Aborigines Protection Board Apprenticeship Policy 1920–1942" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sydney, 1998).

23. Quoted in Rowena MacDonald, *Between Two Worlds* (Alice Springs: IAD Press, 1995), 32.

24. Kay Bennett, *Kaibah: Recollection of a Navajo Girlhood* (Los Angeles: Westernlore Press, 1964), 220; Begg quoted in James Miller, *Koori: A Will to Win* (London: Angus & Robertson, 1985), 159, 162.

25. James Wilson, *The Earth Shall Weep: A History of Native America* (London: Picador, 1999), 313.

26. Sykes quoted in Inara Walden, "'To Send Her to Service,'" *Aboriginal Law Bulletin* 3 (October 1995): 14.

27. "Jennifer," in *Bringing Them Home Report*, Chapter 3, p. 11.

28. See Carla Hankins, "The Missing Links: Cultural Genocide through the Abduction of Female Aboriginal Children, 1883–1969" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of New South Wales, 1982)," 4.5.8–4.5.11; Tucker, *If Everyone Cared*, 124–125.

29. Thom Blake, "A Dumping Ground: Barambah Aboriginal Settlement 1900–1940" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Queensland, 1991), 210; cited in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 403.

30. MacDonald, *Between Two Worlds*, 29; Link-Up and Wilson, *In the Best Interest of the Child?*, 111; Ruddick, "'Talking About Cruel Things,'" 16. See also Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 387–393.

31. Anonymous interviewee, quoted in Hankins, 4.3.10–4.3.12.

32. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 403; Walden, "'To Send Her to Service,'" 14.

33. Woodward B. Skinner, *The Apache Rock Crumbles* (Skinner Publications, 1987), 268–269; Stockel, *Survival of the Spirit*, xxi, 124–136; quote from Stockel, *Survival of the Spirit*, 124; quote from Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom*, 125.

34. Quoted in Ball, *Indeh*, 146, 147.

35. Recollections, Narrelle Kingsley-Strack (unpublished conversation with Victoria Haskins, Woolgoolga, NSW), May 20, 1993; Rona Mackay (correspondence with author), August 28, 1994, November 7, 1994, January 10, 1995.

36. Jack Davis quoted in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 393; Wadjularbinna quoted in Rintoul, *The Wailing*, 140–141.

37. Bennett, *Kaibah*, 227, 228; Haskins, "'My One Bright Spot,'" 147; Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 413–4; Walden, "'To send her to service,'" 13.

38. Quoted in Christobel Mattingley and Ken Hampton, eds., *Survival in Our Own Land: "Aboriginal" Experiences in "South Australia" since 1836* (Kew: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 1998), 164.

39. Chenlozite quoted in Stockel, *Survival of the Spirit*, 130–131; Stowe in Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom*, 159–160.

40. Hazel Hertzberg, *The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1971).

41. Deborah Bird Rose, *Gulaga: A Report on the Cultural Significance of Mt Dromadery to Aboriginal People* (Sydney: Forestry Commission of NSW and NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, 1990), 45.

42. Father quoted in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 290; Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 288.

43. F. Maynard, Letter to K—— B——, 14 October 1927, NSW Aborigines Protection Board Archives; letter to premier quoted in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 317.

44. Nunga men quoted in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 317; memorial quoted in Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 318–319.