

Rabbit-Proof Fence: the Question of 'Intent' in History

Article

In 2002 the Australian film [*Rabbit-Proof Fence*](#) was released nationwide and won the Best Film category at the Australian Film Industry Awards. The film tells the story of three mixed descent girls from an Aboriginal settlement at Jigalong, in the far north of Western Australia. [Molly](#), Gracie and Daisy were taken from their family in 1931 by the police because they were deemed in the language of the day '[half-caste](#)' and transported 2,400 kilometers to the Moore River Native Settlement, north of Perth. There they were homesick and miserable. They took off, intent on going back to Jigalong. Police and trackers searched for them but failed to find them. The girls walked for nine weeks. They lived off bush tucker including emu chicks plucked and cooked, birds eggs, rabbits and lizards. Once, they dined on a big feral cat. They followed the rabbit-proof fence built to keep rabbits from gaining access west of the fence. The film is based on Daisy's recollections of the epic journey, her family's memories, official documents and newspaper reports. The story was first published in 1996 in a book written by Molly's daughter, [Doris Pilkington](#), who also goes by the name of Nugi Garimara. Her book is called [*Follow the Rabbit-Proof Fence*](#).

The film matters to historians because it deals with a controversial issue, sometimes called the issue of the 'Stolen Generations'. There are always hot topics in Australian history. This is a hot topic because it deals with the separation of children from their parents - an emotional business. It is also a hot topic because it has disturbed settled views on how things were in the past. The past is important to us - it is part of the way we see ourselves, part



This image is taken from the film *Rabbit-Proof Fence*
Image reproduced by courtesy of Jabal Films Pty Ltd

of our identity. When historians raise controversial issues like this one, people get hot under the collar. The heat is made even greater when some parts of the media sensationalize the topic.

First, let's outline the background. From late in the nineteenth century to the late 1960s, about 70 years, State governments removed mixed-descent Aboriginal children from their families, often by force. The children were often re-located in institutions, or, in some cases, sent to foster homes. Many of these children never saw their immediate family again. An Australian Bureau of Statistics 1994 survey suggests that one in ten Aboriginal children were removed. This number is 'as safe as any rough estimate can be'. That means the estimate is a cautious one; the real figure may well be higher because many people who saw themselves as Aborigines may not have been classified as such by agencies and governments.

Rabbit-Proof Fence sets out to portray the sadness and anxiety this policy inflicted on many Aboriginal communities. While one in ten children were removed or 'stolen' (the other term, now widely used), others lived with the fear of being taken away from their families and communities.

The big historical issue is why did this happen? What motivated the policy-makers?

The architect of the removal policy in Western Australia was the Chief Protector of Aborigines, A.O. Neville. He was Chief Protector in that state from 1915 to 1940. The film depicts his vision of a society without 'half-castes'. He called his scheme 'the breeding out of colour', a process called miscegenation. In an important scene in the film, Neville lectures an audience of middle-class ladies about his scheme. His policy encouraged the marriage of 'half-caste' (called mulatto in the West Indies) or 'quarter-caste (quadroon)' girls to European men. He wanted to turn 'blacks' into 'whites' over two or three generations. Mirroring contemporary views of the racial superiority of whites, Mr Neville thought it was better for a 'half-caste' to be made more

'white' than 'black'. The 'full bloods' would take care of themselves, he believed -- they were thought to be 'dying out' fast. Neville focussed his removal efforts on so-called 'mixed blood' children because their numbers were evidently growing. For instance, in 1903, the Western Australian Aborigines Department reported that 850 'half-castes' resided in the state. By 1935, this figure had risen to 4,245. They seemed to represent a big 'problem' for a nation that prided itself on being 'white'.

A Minor Newspaper Article of 1931

Missing Native Girls

The Chief Protector of Aborigines, Mr. A.O. Neville, is concerned about three native girls, ranging from eight to 15 years of age, who a week ago, ran away from the Moore River Native Settlement... They came in from the Nullagine district recently, Mr. Neville said yesterday, and, being very timid, were scared by their new quarters, apparently, and fled in the hope of getting back home. Some people saw them passing New Norcia, when they seemed to be heading north-east. The children would probably keep away from habitations and he would be grateful if any person who saw them would notify him promptly. "We have been searching high and low for the children for a week past," added Mr. Neville, "and all the trace we found of them was a dead rabbit which they had been trying to eat. We are very anxious that no harm may come to them in the bush." (Report in West Australian, 11 August 1931)

Things to Discuss and Consider

Assume that the reporter for the West Australian has not misquoted the Chief Protector of Aborigines, A.O. Neville. What did Neville believe about the attitudes and outlook of the runaway children? He says that he thinks that the runaway children 'would probably keep away from habitations'. What did he mean? What conclusions might you draw about Neville's outlook on Aboriginal policy? Is there any evidence in the report that Neville's views were unusual?

For historians, and the general public, it is important to know if the film's account of Neville's policy is accurate. Did the ideal of a 'White Australia' inspire child removal policy in Western Australia at this time? Is the historical interpretation in *Rabbit-Proof Fence* entirely true, or at least true in vital respects? Could it be true that at one time or another, in one state or another,

official policies existed to gradually eliminate Aboriginal people - policies that were put into practice?

Whatever the truth, some Aboriginal people, activists and historians have answered 'yes' to this last question. In recent years, the emotive word [genocide](#) has crept into the debate, along with its vivid and inescapable connotations - of 1933-45 when the Nazis rounded up Jewish people, Gypsies, and other victims all over occupied Europe (1933-41). The Nazis placed their victims into ghettos (1938-41), shot many of them (1939-42) and, eventually and horribly exterminated them in the 'Final Solution' (1942-45) by poisoning them in gas chambers and burning their bodies in crematoria. Genocide carries all this historical meaning - and more.

The writer and academic Robert Manne has argued that *Rabbit-Proof Fence* accurately depicts A.O. Neville's intentions. Manne believes that in the late 1930s Neville and other Chief Protectors - from the other States and the Northern Territory - were united in their desire to 'breed out the colour'. Manne thinks they wanted to gradually eliminate Aboriginal people.

In 1936, the West Australian parliament passed legislation that gave Neville the power to implement his 'breeding-out' policy. The new law made sexual relations between Europeans and Aborigines without permission an offence. People could be imprisoned if they broke this law. Aborigines had to seek permission to marry. With the idea of somehow protecting 'full bloods', these policy-makers tried to restrict interaction between 'half-castes' and 'full bloods'. Their policies overlooked the fact that many Aborigines shared the same culture, regardless of skin colour.



This image is taken from the film *Rabbit-Proof Fence*

Image reproduced by courtesy of Jabal Films Pty Ltd

In 1937, the top administrators in Aboriginal affairs came to Canberra from all over Australia to discuss Aboriginal welfare policies. Neville played a leading part in this conference. He told his audience that the 'half-caste' problem could be solved, principally by removing children from their Aboriginal families. He emphasized the importance of removing the children before they were six years of age. There was much discussion about the practical problems of child removal and how these problems (e.g., parental opposition) might be overcome; there was also discussion about the details of institutional life for the children and the control of their futures, notably control of whom they could marry.

Neville summed up his purpose by putting a rhetorical question to the gathering: 'Are we going to have a population of 1 million blacks in the Commonwealth, or are we going to merge them into our white community and eventually forget that there were any Aborigines in Australia?' The Commonwealth Census of 1933 estimated a total Aboriginal population of 66,000. The figure had probably not changed much by 1937.

The main outcome of the 1937 conference was the adoption of a policy of assimilation. Assimilation aimed to absorb mixed-descent Aboriginal people into mainstream Australian society. The report of the 1937 conference stated, 'the destiny of the natives of aboriginal origin, but not of the full blood, lies in their ultimate absorption by the people of the Commonwealth and it therefore recommends that all efforts be directed to that end.' Policy-makers expected that mixed-descent Aborigines would assimilate. They thought that the 'white blood' in mixed- descent Aborigines enabled them to be educated in European ways.

[Robert Manne](#) thinks that 'if there exists a more terrible moment than this in the history of the twentieth-century Australian state... [he] for one do not know where it is to be discovered.' Today we must all make our own judgment. Not everyone agrees. *Rabbit-Proof Fence* is controversial; it supports Manne's view of A.O. Neville as a bureaucrat committed to the elimination of the Aboriginal race, a man empowered to pursue that objective by laws passed by the West Australian state parliament.

After his retirement, A.O. Neville wrote a book called *Australia's Coloured Minority. Its Place in the Community*, Sydney Currawong Publishing Co., 1948. Here are two excerpts from Neville's book:

'I make no apologies for writing the book, because there are things which need to be said. So few of our own people as a whole are aware of the position [of the coloured people of Australia]. Yet we have had the coloured man amongst us for a hundred years or more. He has died in his hundreds, nay thousands, in pain, misery and squalor, and through avoidable ill-health. Innumerable little children have perished through neglect and ignorance. The position, in some vital respects, is not much better today than it was fifty years ago. Man is entitled to a measure of happiness in his life. Yet most of these people have never known real happiness. Some are never likely to know it. The causes of their condition are many. Mainly it is not their fault, it is ours, just as it lies with us to put the matter right.' (p. 21)

and,

'Thirty or forty years ago there existed a better type of half-caste. These were robust, meat-eating people - the women big like the men and as vigorous. The family heads were mostly first-cross [???] people. They traveled the country with their camel carts, horses, buggies and what not, in family groups, and they were good, hard workers. They were a people apart, and intermarriage was inevitable. The offspring were not equal to the parents; they ran to seed through intermarriage and became lethargic. But with the admixture of further white blood they recovered some of the original traits, acquiring part of the good qualities of both races; the physical improvement being notable. It is because the success of our plan of assimilation is so allied with the question of who shall marry whom, and because colour plays so great a part in the scheme of things, that we must encourage approach towards the white rather than the black, through marriage.' (p.68)

What do you make of these statements?

The film, *The Rabbit-Proof Fence*, has its critics. [Neville's son](#) has spoken out, disputing the representation of his father. There has also been a [debate about the film](#) in the pages of *The Australian* that includes the critical views of a former Commonwealth Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Peter Howson.

The current controversy about child removal is not brand new. It has built up steam over about twenty years. A lot of research has been done on the 'Stolen Generations' in that time. Autobiographies, family histories and academic studies have been written. Poems and songs have been composed and performed, plus exhibition displays and documentaries on TV. And there has been a major government funded inquiry. Its findings were set out in a report called *Bringing Them Home*, published in 1997. That was a controversial report. It used the word 'genocide'. The appearance of that word in the Report is possibly the main reason why the debate about the 'Stolen Generations' is so heated. Some critics regard the suggestion of 'genocide' as

unfair and unwarranted. Others, such as Manne and Broome, believe that it is a reasonable claim. [For a discussion of this issue click here and read another <ozhistorybytes> article which explores the Genocide debate in Australia.](#)

Article II of the United Nations Convention of 1948 defines genocide as any of the following acts committed with the intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

The crucial words here are 'with the intent to destroy'. If we take the UN definition, noting in particular points (d) and (e), perhaps the 'breeding out of colour' policy was a form of genocide. Historian Richard Broome has called it 'benign genocide'.

Do you think there can be such a thing as benign genocide?

No one questions the fact that child removal happened. The outcome was certainly tragic for thousands of the families involved. Some of the pain this caused is on public record; reactions include outrage, anger and sadness. Some people want the Australian Government to apologise to the Aboriginal people affected by this policy. Others see an apology as unnecessary because they believe that there is no need for governments to apologise for the actions of people in the past.

What do you think?

Here are some further things to consider as you try to work out what you think, and as you consider what motivated the people in this drama. A great deal depends on how we weigh up intentions and outcomes. We need to

know what the architects of the child removal policy intended. An important part of doing history is the careful scrutiny of things people wanted or set out to do. As historians we must try to do justice to the people who are our subjects. Working out their intentions is not easy. Intentions can have outcomes that no one planned. They can have 'unintended consequences'.



**This image is taken from the film
*Rabbit-Proof Fence***

Image reproduced by courtesy of Jabal Films Pty Ltd

Policy-makers and people in the front line, like policemen, frequently believed that they were acting in the best interests of the child. Many policy-makers thought that they were rescuing the children from racial degeneration and squalor. They insisted that children removed from Aboriginal dwellings and sent to institutions were 'rescued' from tribal societies that they thought were rejecting them, or else they were taken from families, 'tribal' or not, because of parental cruelty or neglect. They thought the institutions they set up for the children were places of refuge. While some [Aboriginal children](#) were removed because they were neglected, many children were removed from loving families where no neglect existed.

The key issue is whether policies to remove Aboriginal children from their families really did have the best interests of the children at heart. Or were they a smokescreen to hide a policy of 'breeding out colour'? Or was it the case that welfare and racial motives were inseparable in the minds of administrators. Motives can be simple, singular and clear; they can also be mixed, complex, even contradictory.

One way of telling is by comparing removal policies for Aboriginal or white children. Robert van Krieken shows that removals of Aboriginal and white Australian working class children were handled differently. While white families were often supported to enable their children to come back home, this was generally not the case with Aboriginal children. Van Krieken concluded, 'Unlike white children who came into the state's control, far greater care was taken to ensure that they never saw their parents or family again. They were often given new names, and the greater distances involved in rural areas made it easier to prevent parents and children on separate missions from tracing each other.'

However, not all white children were reunited with their families. In particular [British children](#), who were sent to Australia as child migrants, experienced the same displacement and loss of family as their Aboriginal counterparts. Many of these children were transported from Britain without their parents' knowledge or permission. Often neither child nor parent found out what happened to the other. Like Australian welfare authorities, British authorities considered that by sending children to Australia they were 'rescuing' them from a life of neglect in Britain. Growing up in Australia was intended to provide these children with greater opportunities. Today we know that rather than being 'rescued', child migrants have suffered from similar emotional distress to that experienced by 'the Stolen Generation'.

For a brief time the 'breeding out of colour' scheme prevailed in Western Australia. What of other times and other States? You can assess child removal policy in your state using the state by state data at <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/IndigLRes/stolen/> For the historian studying child removal policy, perhaps the main task is to unravel the racial and the welfare motives that drove the policy-makers. *Can you see these motives at work in the documents?*

Time and History

Although Nugi Garimara was grateful for her mother and aunt's ability to recall their childhood trek so vividly, she faced real problems in re-telling events in story form. In the passage below (pp. xiii-xiv), Nugi outlines some of these problems.

Read the passage and explain what you think the problems are under each of these headings: time lapse, memory, culture, and challenges of research.

"... I realise that consideration must be given to the time lapse since they were young at the time, and to allow for patches of dimmed memories and sketchy reflections. Another fact I completely overlooked until the interviews began was their illiteracy. Combined with their lack of numeracy skills, this made it impossible to establish measurements accurately. Numbers, dates, in fact mathematics of any kind, have little or no relevance in Aboriginal society. Nature was their social calendar, everything was measured by events and incidents affected by seasonal changes. For example, summer is pink-eye time when eye problems brought on by the heat, dust and flies flare up.... The winter or rainy season is yalta or galyu time. Similarly, the days in the week were named according to which domestic duties were carried out [in the cattle station or mission station] on: Monday was referred to as washing day, Tuesday was ironing day, Wednesday was mending day, and so on.... [Speakers telling history stories] of the people in Jigalong [Molly, Daisy and Gracie's home] and the Gibson desert regions... will remind the listeners that, 'It was galyu time. Galyu everywhere, all the roads were cut off'. Or, 'It was Ngulungga time when we had that big meeting.' The listeners know that this was the time when traditional rites and rituals were performed. When recounting the long walk home, Aunty Daisy mentioned how they chased emu chicks at the Nannine railway siding south of Meekatharra. By combining research and personal observation I was able to establish that the chicks must have been a certain age and so it would have been either late August or September. Seasonal time -- and not numbers -- are [more]... important in recounting this journey... [than] the western notions of time and

distance. I have though worked to synthesise [combine] these different forms of knowledge to give readers the fullest insights into this historic journey."

Nugi Garimara troubles to explain why the history of her family and her people differs. Explain why she thinks it is different.

Think about the reasons you've just listed; were there ever times in your own life when, if you were writing about them, you'd use different time scales: seasonal (sun, perhaps even lunar?), calendar, clock (hours, minutes, even seconds...)

Suggest what might be the best ways to measure and scale in time:

- occurrences in the history of life forms, like dinosaurs
- happenings in the life of illiterate peasants in the Middle Ages
- ebbs and flows of glaciers
- the life of a fly
- shifts in the earth's tectonic plates

ages of prehistoric stone tools

Nugi Garimara is a literate and numerate historian writing stories about people close to her who are neither literate nor numerate in a western sense (although they are literate and numerate in their own culture). In setting out to show us how they saw things, she writes that she had 'to synthesise ... different forms of knowledge' about time and place. How does she do this?

By Peter Cochrane, Adrian Jones and Corinne Manning

[BACK TO TOP](#)

References

Doris Pilkington/Nugi Garimara, *Follow the Rabbit-Proof Fence*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1996. (Film edition reprint, 2002)

Bringing Them Home. Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, Commonwealth of Australia, April 1977. The full report is available at <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/special/rsjproject/rsjlibrary/hreoc/stolen/> or at <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/other/IndigLRes/stolen/>

The invaluable Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission website http://www.hreoc.gov.au/social_justice/stolen_children/index.html has special sections devoted to 'Frequently Asked Questions', 'Who Spoke Out at the Time' on child removal, and stories of people who were removed.

Robert Manne, 'In Denial', *The Australian Quarterly Essay*, vol. 1 (2000)... A public affairs website maintained by the Baptist Church summarises Manne's article and the debate it aroused at

<http://www.canbap.org.au/reconc/review1.htm>

For a historian's criticism of the Bringing Them Home report, see Bain Atwood, 'A Tour of Duty in Australia's History Wars', *Australian Financial Review*, 1 June 2001, pp. 8-9.

For a historian's view of the politics of Aboriginal issues in the 1990s see Richard Broome, *Aboriginal Australians*, 3rd ed., 2001, chapter 13; For the controversy of the 'stolen generation', see pp. 272 - 79.

[BACK TO TOP](#)

Internal Hyperlinks

Molly

This is what Doris Pilkington tells us about Molly, her mother's life after the trek (*Follow the Rabbit-Proof Fence*, University of Queensland Press, 1996, 2001, pp. 131-32): "Molly was trained and employed as a domestic help on Balfour Downs Station where she married Toby Kelly, a stockman. She had two daughters Doris (the author) and Annabelle. On 18 November 1940, after Molly's discharge from Royal Perth Hospital where she had undergone surgery for appendicitis, she was transported once again under ministerial

[W.A. government] warrant to Moore River Native Settlement. Nine months later, Molly received a letter from home advising her of the deaths of members of her family at Jigalong. A niece had died of self-inflicted wounds to the head, a customary action of the distressed and anguished and a common expression of grief and despair.... Others died from whooping cough. Permission to return to Balfour Downs was refused. Unable to settle down, Molly absconded [fled] on 1 January 1941, taking 18-month-old Annabelle with her and leaving Doris behind at the settlement. She and her baby daughter arrived safely at Jigalong months later, following the same route she had taken nine years earlier. She moved back to Balfour Downs Station with her husband Toby and baby Annabelle. Three years later Annabelle was removed and sent south to Sister Kate's Children's Home in Queens Park. Molly has not seen her since. Molly and Toby worked on various stations in the Meekatharra and Newman districts until their retirement in 1972. Toby passed away in October 1973. Molly now lives quietly in Jigalong, although she is still actively involved in community affairs. Under traditional Aboriginal kinship Molly has 18 grandchildren, 29 great-grandchildren and 2 great-great-grandchildren."

In an interview in February 2002, in ABC Radio National's Indigenous Arts programme, Away!, Nugi Garimara offers more details about her mother's second flight and trek and the effect it had on her:

<http://www.abc.net.au/arts/books/stories/s424264.htm>

<http://www.odyssey.apana.org.au/~charlesp/rudall.htm> has a picture of the country around Balfour Downs Station, and

<http://www.uic.com.au/KintyreEnviroMgt.htm> offers views on a rehabilitated mining site and the Aboriginal communities nearby. Weather records for the station can be accessed at

<http://www.wrc.wa.gov.au/waterinf/wrdata/BoM/004003/004003.htm>

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

'Half-caste'

For many years Australian governments categorised Aboriginal people

according to the level of 'Aboriginal blood' they were considered to have. For example, if two Aboriginal people had a baby it was categorised as a 'full-blood'. If an Aboriginal woman and a European man had a baby, this child would have been referred to as 'half-caste'. These terms are old-fashioned and insulting to Aboriginal people. This is because they consider Aboriginality to be made up of a variety of factors, including cultural understandings and heritage, rather than mere biology. Some prefer to say you are either Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, degrees of mixture are irrelevant to them, others acknowledge the distinction of 'full' or 'mixed' descent.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

Doris Pilkington

This is what Doris Pilkington tells us about her life on the cover of her book: Nugi Garimara is Doris Pilkington's Aboriginal name. She was born on Balfour Downs station, approximately 60 kilometres northwest of Jigalong Community in the east Pilbara. At age 4, she and her mother were forcibly brought from Jigalong to Moore River Native Settlement. She left Roelands Mission at 18, the first from the mission to enrol for Royal Perth Hospital's nursing aide training. Her married life was spent in Geraldton with her husband and six children. She returned to Perth to complete her education at Curtin University where she later studied journalism."

<http://abc.net.au/arts/headspace/rn/awaye/pilkington/story.htm> records an interview with Nugi Garimarra on ABC Radio National's Indigenous Arts programme, *Awaye!*, 20 August 1999. Another interview on the same programme was conducted on 21 February 2002:

<http://www.abc.net.au/arts/books/stories/s424264.htm> Use these to find out more about Nugi Garimarra.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

***Follow the Rabbit-Proof Fence* - Imagination and Information**

Introducing her novel, [Follow the] *Rabbit-Proof Fence*, University of Queensland Press, 1996, 2001, Doris Pilkington / Nugi Garimara discussed how she researched her book. Her key sources were her mother, Molly, the

oldest of the three trekking sisters, and Daisy, by then aged in their 60s and 70s; Gracie, whose name could henceforth not be mentioned directly had died in 1983. This is how Nugi Garimara says she pieced together her mother and her aunties' story (pp. xi-xii): "The task of reconstructing the trek home from the settlement has been both an exhausting and an interesting experience. One needed to have a vivid imagination.... Molly, Daisy and Gracie were outside familiar territory, so I found it necessary to become a ten-year-old girl again in order to draw on my own childhood memories of the countryside surrounding the [Moore River] settlement. In my mind I walked the same paths and called on my skills as a writer to describe the scenery and how it looked through their eyes. By combining my imagination and the information from records of geographical and botanical explorations undertaken in the area in the early 1900s and later, I was able to build a clearer picture of the vegetation and landscape through which the girls trekked."

Nugi Garimara writes that she drew on 'information from records [archives and books]' and on her 'vivid imagination' in writing what the cover of her book, *Rabbit-Proof Fence*, calls it a 'True Story'. Discuss why historians like Nugi Garimara need both imagination and information to write history well. But can a history story have too much information, or too much imagination? Why/why not? Suggest reasons why Nugi Garimara preferred to write her story in the form of a novel.

<http://abc.net.au/arts/headspace/rn/awaye/pilkington/story.htm> records an interview with Nugi Garimarra on ABC Radio National's Indigenous Arts programme, *Awaye!*, 20 August 1999. Use it to supplement this information.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

Whites

An article in issue 3 will explore ideas of what it meant to be 'white'. Whiteness was associated with a 'way of life', not just skin colour. Old advertising of Pelaco white business shirts, using an Aboriginal man, Mulga Fred, and his slogan, 'Mine tink it fit!' will be explored in that essay.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

'dying out'

Under influential ideas of Social Darwinism, with their idea of 'survival of the fittest', many people in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were convinced that Aborigines were destined to die out precisely because their way of life and culture was dismissed as 'primitive'.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

Robert Manne

Robert Manne's full views are at http://www.tim-richardson.net/misc/stolen_generation.html

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

Neville's son

John Neville, A.O. Neville's son, was outraged at the depiction of his father in the film *Rabbit-Proof Fence*. Journalist, Frank Walker, outlined John Neville's criticisms in the Sun-Herald on the 10 February 2002. He wrote:

The son of Australia's leading architect of the stolen generation policy is furious that a controversial new film depicts his father as "Mr Devil" ... John Neville, 89, rejected an invitation to a preview of the film, slamming it as a "gross distortion" of the truth. ... Mr [John] Neville said: "My father believed in assimilation. He saw it as inevitable that there would be marriages between blacks and whites and he took it for granted that they would tend towards the white side as being more civilised. He thought the Aboriginal race would be gradually assimilated and eventually disappear ... My father had the greatest respect for full-blood Aborigines. He wanted to help them become civilised. He was very interested in their mythology and stories."

John Neville argued that Aboriginal children "loved" the Moore River settlement. He believed that his father's policy gave them the opportunity to acquire a European-style education and to work in white communities. He stated, "They learnt to draw, paint and write ... It gave them a chance for a job." He added, "Doris, who was taken from her mother and trained at the mission, became an articulate, self-supporting woman who wrote a best-

selling book [*Rabbit-Proof Fence*]. Molly, who went back to the desert, is living in squalor.

Who would you rather be, Doris or Molly?"

On what basis does John Neville assess the quality of life of Doris and Molly?

Do you think Doris would have agreed with John Neville's assessments? How might she have assessed her own quality of life?

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

debate about the film

On 11 March 2002, the Australian, printed an article which refuted claims made in the film Rabbit Proof Fence. The article was written by Peter Howson, a former minister for Aboriginal affairs in 1971 and 1972 and Des Moore, a director of the Institute for Private Enterprise. They stated that claims of forcible child removal in Australia are often fabricated and unproven. They wrote, 'No testing of forcible removal claims has been made in West Australian courts and the story of the separation of the rabbit-proof fence girls rests only on a tale told 35 years later by one of the girls to her daughter. The daughter then wrote the book on which the producers of the film drew. But the film's removal scene bears no resemblance to even the book's account of a separation that apparently required no force.'

The authors also claimed that the film made 'grossly misleading assertions regarding Aboriginal policy'. They stated, 'the film's publicity conveys a completely erroneous [false] picture of the policy circumstances under which children were removed from parents, and the extent of such removals. Thus, we are told that "the official policy of the time decreed that all half-caste children should be taken from their kin and land in order to be made white" and that A.O. Neville was a racist who believed "the answer to the 'coloured problem' is to breed out the Aboriginal race" ... In reality, however, only a small proportion of half-caste children were being separated when the rabbit-proof fence girls were removed from their mother/aunt.'

Howson and Moore believe that the film's depiction of Neville as "a devil" in the eyes of Aborigines is the final insult. They argued, 'After he died, his mother received about 500 letters from Aborigines praising his efforts on their behalf. A true story would have shown his humane actions to protect them from exploitation by whites or their own kin.' The online Australian archives can be accessed, for a modest fee, at

<http://theaustralian.news.com.au/archives/>

The transcript of an interview conducted for the ABC's *7.30 Report*, between Mick O'Donnell, Howson and Pilkington, can be accessed at the following website: <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/s744408.htm>

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

Aboriginal children

These Aboriginal memoirs tell stories of child removal. Margaret Tucker's autobiography, *If Everyone Cared*, Ure Smith, 1977, and Mavis Thorpe Clark's biography, *Pastor Doug: The Story of Sir Douglas Nicholls, Aboriginal Leader*, Lansdowne Press, 1972.

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

British children

For histories on British child migrants see; Alan Gill, *Orphans of the Empire*, Alexandria, NSW, Millennium Books, 1997; Geoffrey Herington & Chris Jeffery, *Fairbridge: Empire and Child Migration*, Nedlands, University of Western Australia Press, 1998. See also the television series, *The Leaving of Liverpool*, 1992; The British Government has information on its former child migration scheme at <http://www.doh.gov.uk/childinf.htm>

[BACK TO TEXT](#)

[BACK TO TOP](#)

Key Learning Areas

ACT

High School Band

TCC Knowledge and understanding of people, events and issues that have contributed to the Australian identity and to its changes.

TCC Change and continuity in political, social and economic organisation.

C Identity: individual experience of environments; family and community structures across time and place.

C Social cohesion and cultural diversity: diversity within Australian cultural groups; mainstream cultural values in Australia and elsewhere.

C Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander societies: the effects of occupation and dispossession of land; impact on cultural traditions of invasion, colonialism, dispossession, missions and oppressive laws; effects of racism and prejudice, and ways to counter it; human rights, their violation, and movements for social justice in a range of countries; values of various groups concerning an issue in the media.

Natural and social systems: Social systems: role of the public in making political choices; basic legal rights, responsibilities and presumptions and the values and beliefs on which they are based; ways in which organised groups may attempt to create change on behalf of individuals and their effectiveness in achieving their objectives; power relationships between individuals and groups of people within social systems in the public and private domain.

Senior Syllabus

Individual Case Studies.

NSW

Level 4

Focus Issue 4. What has been the nature of colonisation and contact between indigenous and non-indigenous people in Australia?

Level 5

Focus Issue 4: What has been the changing nature of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal relations in Australia?

Focus Issue: How have the rights and freedoms of various gender, cultural, social and economic groups changed?

Topic 3. Australia between the wars: Stolen generations.

Topic 5. Post-war Australia: Citizenship and Migrant debates.

NT

Level 4

Soc 4.1 Compare and contrast key features in the heritage of Australia and other nations including colonisation and the impact on Indigenous groups.

Soc 4.2 Research and present the impact of colonisation on Indigenous peoples in Australia.

Soc 4.3 Explain the concepts of prejudice, racism and discrimination and identify the common values inherent in the Declaration of Human Rights.

Soc 4.4 Identify, interpret and explain ways people express their values through their interactions based on age, culture, gender and class, including multiple perceptions of the same historical events. Judge how differences in culture, gender, race and religion have affected individuals' life chances, e.g. stereotyping, prejudice.

Level 5

Soc 5.1 Evaluate the impact of colonisation on today's society, eg slave trade, dispossession, land rights.

Soc 5.2 Critically analyse information for accuracy, relevance, reliability, bias, racism and paternalism.

Soc 5.4 Examine a range of political ideologies and religious belief systems and their impact on individual societies.

Level 5+

Soc 5+.3 Examine how legal and political philosophies can segregate or disempower individuals and groups. Investigate specific examples of prejudice, racism and discrimination in order to critically evaluate the circumstances that led to them. Examine and evaluate the philanthropic activities of individuals and organisations.

QLD

Level 4

TCC Evidence over time: distinctions between primary and secondary sources of evidence.

TCC Causes and effects: critiques of evidence (stereotypes, silent voices, completeness, representativeness).

CI Cultural perceptions: perceptions of particular aspects of cultural groups (traditional behaviours, multi-group membership, codes of practice, ethical behaviours).

CI Cultural change: changes resulting from cross-cultural contact on Australian and non-Australian indigenous cultures

Level 5

TCC Evidence over time: appropriate use of primary and secondary sources (reliability, representativeness and relevance).

PS Human-environment relationships: human perspectives concerning patterns that constitute a region (population, political and geographic patterns).

CI Cultural diversity: aspects of diverse cultural groups including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander groups.

CI Cultural perceptions: impacts of particular perceptions of cultural groups held by a community.

CI Belonging: cultural aspects that construct personal and group identity.

Level 6

TCC Evidence over time: cultural constructions of evidence (indigenous views of Australian events).

TCC Heritage: ethical behaviour of people in the past.

CI Cultural diversity: ways various societies inhibit or promote cultural diversity.

CI Cultural perceptions: perceptions of cultures associated with a current issue.

Senior Syllabus: Modern History

Theme 1: Studies of Conflict

Through historical studies in this theme students will understand that important conflicts of the twentieth century have occurred on local, national and international stages and that they can have military, political, social and cultural causes, effects and repercussions.

Theme 2: Studies in Hope

Through historical studies in this theme students will understand that through progressive movements and other agencies of social, cultural and political change, people have been inspired by hope for change to respond to challenges in ways that promote human and/or ecological well-being, with varying degrees of success.

Theme 3: The history of ideas and beliefs

Through historical studies in this theme students will understand how ideas and beliefs have [impacted] on history, in local, national and global contexts.

Theme 7: Studies of diversity

Through historical studies in this theme students will understand the historical origins of the diversity of political, racial, ethnic, social or religious groups in a society, nation or region, and the ongoing historical significance of the relationships amongst groups.

SA

Levels 4 & 5

TCC Students research and compare concepts of identity and the lives of diversity of men, women and children in different Australian environments, including local areas, over time.

SC Students develop research and social skills that promote recognition and appreciation of the heritage of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and other groups. They develop the capacities to identify and counter prejudice and contribute to Reconciliation.

SC Students analyse situations and act responsibly to enhance the democratic and human rights of individuals and groups, and to counter prejudice, racism, harassment or oppression.

SS Students recognise connection between roles, structures, functions and limits of various political, legal and economic systems over time.

Senior Syllabus

Australian History: Topic 1, Contact and Resistance: Indigenous Australians and the Colonial Experience, 1788 to the Present.

TAS

Aboriginal History 9/10 AB004 S

Aboriginal History is designed to introduce both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal students to key ideas, concepts and events related to Australian history and culture.

Introduction to History 9/10 HS004 S:

Australian History 1850's to World War 2

Between the Wars - Australian History 10 HS007 S

History 11/12 HS730 B

Section 10 Racism in the Modern World.

VIC

Level 4

Focus: The way in which lifestyles of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have changed and adapted as a result of European occupation.

Learning Outcomes:

4.1 Demonstrate knowledge about how the organization and lifestyle of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities have changed over time.

Level 6

Focus: European occupation of Australia. Examines the impact of European occupation of Australia including the perspective of occupation as invasion.

Learning Outcomes:

6.1 Evaluate the impact of colonisation on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

6.3 Identify which civil and political rights were denied the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

VCE Koorie History Unit 1: Sections 1, 2, & 3. Land, Kinship and Culture.

The impact of the invasion on Koorie relationships with the land, kinship structures and identity, and on culture.

VCE Australian History Unit 4: Section 1, Everyday life in the twentieth century: 1901-1945 Section 2, Towards a changing society: 1945 - present.

WA

Level 6

C. 6.1 The student understands that contemporary cultures reflect change and continuity in beliefs and traditions. Students explain the consequences of the impact of European settlement on Aboriginal family and kinship systems.

C.6.3 The student understands that core values of a society influence personal, group and cultural identity. Students analyse the beliefs and attitudes of individuals towards groups which are different from the ones to which they belong.

TCC 6.1 The student understands that present-day communities and societies have been shaped by the changing and lasting aspects of significant events, people and ideas from the past. Students describe and explain changes in the rights and freedoms of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the 20th century.

Level 7

C. 7.3 The student understands that access to human rights impacts on personal, group and cultural identities. Students examine how the United Nations has influenced human rights issues.

TCC 7.3 The student understands that people's perspectives and actions on issues are based on their version of history. Students identify dominant influences that have contributed to the development of core values in Australia.

Level 8

C 8.2 The student understands that cultures adjust the ways in which they maintain cohesion and allow diversity in order to improve the quality of life and retain a sense of community. Students analyse the impact of successive government policies on Aboriginal people, e.g. civilising and Christianising, segregation, assimilation, self-determination, reconciliation.

TCC. 8.3 The student understands that different individuals, groups and societies constantly interpret and reinterpret history in different ways. Students explain why and how interpretations of issues, events, ideologies can change over time (release of archival material, new scientific methods in archaeology, changes in contexts, changes in social attitudes).

Year 11 History D 306

Unit 1, Investigating Change: Western Australia

Section 1.2 Social, economic and political forces bring about change.

Students investigate social structures and interactions within society and cultural features of society.

Section 1.5 Change can be understood in different contexts of time, place and culture. Students investigate today's perception and representation of the era and the social memory of individuals and groups in society.

Year 12 History, E 306

Unit 1, Australia in the Twentieth Century: Shaping a Nation, 1900-1945

Section 1.1 The nature of Australian Society reflects its identity - how Australians perceived themselves.

Section 1.5 Australia has been influenced by the social and cultural experiences of its people - Students investigate at least one group, movement or experience.