
Volume 3
Issue 1 *A Celebration of Foster Care, Vol.3,*
2002

2002-01-01

Colour Blind

Tommy Turner

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/ijass>

Recommended Citation

Turner, Tommy (2002) "Colour Blind," *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies*: Vol. 3: Iss. 1, Article 17.

doi:10.21427/D7C15V

Available at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/ijass/vol3/iss1/17>

**The Stolen Generations:
Lessons Australia can reveal to the rest of the World**

Nicole Breeze*, Marge Campbell and Zeena Elton
***Edmund Rice Centre for Justice & Community Education.**
www.erc.org.au nicole@erc.org.au

Abstract:

In recent years groups of young people, educators, and leaders of peace and reconciliation processes internationally, have met to learn from each other's experiences of various reconciliation settings from across the world. *Let's Talk* is a project that facilitates cross-cultural and international exchange amongst people from diverse regions including Australia, Latin America, the European Union, Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

One of the key issues in the process of Reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in Australia relates to the widespread removal of Aboriginal children from their families as an instrument of assimilation; what has become internationally known as the 'Stolen Generations'. It has been five years since the largely critical findings of a National Inquiry into the policies and practices of Aboriginal child removal were tabled in the Australian Parliament. *Let's Talk* has provided a vehicle for Aboriginal women and men to tell their stories, stimulating new insights about the politics of identity, and better understandings of the complexities of families and communities, especially where children have been displaced. A recent visit of an Australian delegation to University College, Cork, focused on potential social and political implications of child removal in cross-cultural settings.¹ The story of Australia provides a cautionary note, as this paper reveals. The mistakes of our history show that 'good intentions' are not adequate reasons in explaining child removal and must entail critical reflection and analysis. Policies must be well thought out and developed with all stakeholders in mind, particularly concerning children from diverse cultural backgrounds. There are important lessons to be learnt from the traumatic impact of policies of child removal in Australia during the twentieth century.

¹ <http://www.ireland.com/newspaper/features/2000/1230/fea12.htm>

Introduction:

In 1997 in Australia, the National Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) conducted an extensive inquiry into the forced removal of Indigenous children from their families. The findings from this report continue to impact upon Australian society today. Since the European colonisation of Australia the process of dispossession has been systematic and devastating for Indigenous families. Successive Government policies were designed to breakdown Indigenous cultures and identities through practices of segregation and assimilation. Families and communities were particularly destabilised by the removal of children for the primary purpose of assimilating them into 'White' society.

Policies and practices of assimilation have left a legacy of continuing trauma in Aboriginal families and communities across Australia. The evidence indicates that not one Indigenous family has escaped the effects of such policies. The Report also found that such policies are in breach of international human rights agreements, particularly the International Genocide Convention that was adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 9, 1948 and ratified by Australia on July 8, 1949. Continuing ethnocentrism and lack of awareness within Australian society has produced widespread apathy and denial and the "stolen generations" continues to generate a variety of emotional responses within the community. Despite the recommendations from the Inquiry, there has been minimal recognition of what has occurred in Australia and there has been no reparation to Indigenous peoples to compensate for violations of their human rights.

The 'Stolen Generations':

By the mid 1990s it had become increasingly apparent within Australian society, that the removal of Indigenous children from their families and communities was not a series of isolated incidents but was clearly systematic and widespread. The Australian Government's official statistical organisation, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) indicates that in 1994, over 10% of Indigenous peoples aged 25 years and over reported having been taken from their natural family by a mission, the government or 'welfare'. A 1998 ABS report directly links the removal of Indigenous children to the Australian national goal of cultural assimilation.

"Large numbers of Indigenous children were removed from their families to advance the cause of assimilation. They were placed in institutions or foster homes, or adopted into non-Indigenous families - sometimes a progression of several of these. This practice declined in the 1970s following the establishment of legal representation for Indigenous children and their families in removal applications. However, it was not until the

1980s that the practice of removal and placement was finally reappraised.
(ABS, 1998)

The emergence of the 'Stolen Generations' issue into the public arena has increasingly led to a highly charged national debate in Australia. There has been debate about the actual numbers of children removed and disagreement relating to the semantics of Indigenous child separation. The term 'Stolen Generations' is now widely known throughout Australia to refer to the removal of Indigenous children. However, conservative historians and politicians including the Prime Minister, John Howard, have publicly contested the use of this term deeming it inadequate on two accounts. Firstly, there has been dispute about whether children were, in fact, actually 'stolen' from their families as opposed to merely being removed "for their own good". Secondly, the use of 'Generations' in this context has been challenged. The basis of this critique is that whole generations of people were not physically removed, therefore the term is seen by critics as misleading. However, what is clearly misleading is the government focus on semantics as opposed to the substance of the issue, effectively dismissing the continuing trauma experienced by Indigenous communities. Indeed, while every State and Territory government has issued formal apologies, John Howard on behalf of the Australian Federal Government has refused².

La Trobe University scholar Robert Manne, is highly critical of efforts made by government officials and right-wing commentators to divert the attention of the Australian people away from the substance of the issue. He charges the Prime Minister and journalists in the popular press with conducting "a long campaign to change the moral and political balance with regard to the issue of the stolen generations, and indeed with regard to the Aboriginal question as a whole." (Manne, 2001:4)

Manne argues that the term generation is used in the same way as we speak of the generation who lost their lives in World War I. Although we do not mean 50 per cent or 90 percent of young people we accept that "the use of the term generation is a kind of metaphor for a collective experience" (Manne quoted in ABC, 2001:2). Furthermore, "stolen generations" has touched the Aboriginal sensibility and is now a term that Aboriginal people use to describe their collective suffering and captures "in a metaphorical way, and a literal way for very large numbers, the suffering they went through" (Manne quoted in ABC, 2001:2).

² See proceedings of the National Reconciliation Convention, Melbourne: May 1997.

“Bringing them Home” – A National Inquiry:

Prior to the 1990’s, non-Indigenous Australians had little knowledge of the policy agendas concerning Indigenous people. Attitudes reflected the dominant belief that if Indigenous children were taken away from their families it was for their own good. Accordingly, there was very little understanding of the legacy of trauma left within Indigenous communities at the hands of successive governments, and there continues to be widespread disbelief. By the 1990’s Australia was forced to consider International human rights standards, which exposed a pressing need to address the treatment of Indigenous peoples. It had become clear that laws, policies and practices concerning Indigenous peoples required further examination and review.

There were a number of factors that contributed to the call for a National Inquiry into the Stolen Generations. During the 1980’s and 1990’s, Indigenous groups were raising many issues concerning the impact of government policies. Indigenous history encompassed diverse evidence of the forced removal of children from many families throughout the 20th century, and was now being told in schools. Many Indigenous communities were expressing their hurt and working towards generating a response from the government regarding the impact of successive government policies.

Academic research was also beginning to uncover and document the extent of the removal of Aboriginal children. In the early 1980’s Peter Read (University of Melbourne) drew attention to the extensive number of Indigenous children who were removed by force and compulsion from their families. In the 1980’s the removal of children was “scarcely talked about” and non-Aboriginal people said that it could not have happened (Read,1996:4). Read was the first to publicly use the term “Stolen Generations” to describe what he viewed as a significant impact upon successive generations of Indigenous people. According to Read, this was a shameful and hidden story of Australia’s recent past.

International awareness contributed to the domestic climate of concern and together these factors led the Australian Parliament to instigate a National Inquiry. Increasing community awareness meant it was necessary for the Federal Government to take action to address issues of social justice, and the violation of human rights. In 1995 the Attorney General of Australia directed the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC) to investigate the forced removal of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (Australian Indigenous) children from their families. The Attorney General requested that HREOC produce a report on these issues that would be presented to the Australian Parliament. HREOC was to consult widely throughout Australia,

especially with Indigenous communities and with federal and state authorities.¹

Those conducting the Inquiry heard evidence from a large number of individuals and organisations throughout Australia. The subsequent *Bringing Them Home* report was presented to the Australian Parliament in April 1997. *Bringing Them Home* contained first hand testimonies gathered from Indigenous people who had been personally affected by policies of removal. It also contained analyses of policies and practices instituted by governments, church, welfare and other organisations who were directly involved in the removal of children. The Inquiry generated in excess of one hundred recommendations. Perhaps one of the most significant findings of the Inquiry is that for the majority of those who gave evidence, "the effects have been multiple, continuing and profoundly disabling" (1997:18). It is clear from the evidence that it was not only those children who were removed that were affected, but also the families who were left behind to grieve, and the communities who faced the continuing trauma of loss and associated dysfunction. Removal of a child from one generation continued to impact upon generations to follow and the evidence suggests that not one Indigenous family has escaped the effects of removal. The Report concluded that Indigenous families and communities "have endured gross violations of their human rights" which continue to have a massive impact upon their daily lives (HREOC Summary,1997:33). Attempts have been made by the Federal government and right-wing critics to trivialise the Inquiry by attacking the rigour of the HREOC research, and by promoting widespread denial in Australian society. However, the Report cannot be ignored as it clearly states that these violations were an act of genocide aimed at "wiping out Indigenous families, communities and cultures..." according to the United Nations definition for genocide (HREOC Summary, 1997:33, see www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/treaty1gen.htm).

Attitudes Underlying Assimilation:

The fact that Indigenous children were removed in such large numbers seems difficult to fathom, however the removal of children and the breakdown of family units is a more recent component in the cumulative dispossession of the Indigenous peoples. The extent of dispossession and its causes can be clearly seen through dominant attitudes held by the colonisers from Europe.

White people have never been able to leave Aborigines alone. Children particularly have suffered. Missionaries, teachers, government officials, have believed that the best way to make black people behave like white was to get hold of the children who had not yet learned Aboriginal lifeways.

¹ For the Terms of Reference of the Inquiry, see HREOC, 1997.

They thought that children's minds were like a kind of blackboard on which the European secrets could be written.

(Read,1996:5)

The aggressive process of colonisation of the Australian continent by Europeans from the late 1700's has severely impacted upon the lives of Indigenous peoples. Since that time, Indigenous people have been dispossessed from their land and prior sovereign rights. Initial Indigenous resistance to the colonisers was met with widespread and brutal massacres, which left many language groups decimated. It is estimated that, at the time of European contact there were at least 500 distinct languages and many more regional dialects of which perhaps only 200 remain today. The dominant colonial view of Indigenous peoples was that they were barely human and not worthy of consideration for negotiation of their lands, nor was it believed that their societies could offer Europeans anything of value. One example of the demeaning attitude towards Indigenous people still evident throughout the 20th century is from Ernest Scott, Professor of History at the University of Melbourne and founder of the first Australian history course in 1927. Scott's major work, *A short History of Australia* (1916) was reprinted twenty two times over seven editions until 1964. He argued that Aboriginal people were "black and painted savages...who were too low down in the scale of civilization even for barter" with "no domestic arts or domestic animals..." (quoted in Broome, 1996:56). Scott also referred to the views of Dutch explorer, William Dampier, who described the Shark Bay people of Western Australia, who he encountered in 1699 as "...black, ugly, flyblown, blinking creatures, the most unpleasant human beings...ever encountered..." (quoted in Broome, 1996:56)

These attitudes were reinforced as the colonisers took control of vast tracts of land and resources throughout the continent and justified their inhumane actions toward Indigenous people in the name of European civilization. Indigenous people were considered to be "uncivilised heathens" who needed to be Christianized at all costs. So began the subjugation and control of Indigenous groups everywhere who by the late 1800s were coerced or forced onto missions and reserves for the purpose of "Christianisation". By the 1890s, the eastern states of New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland had instituted policies of "protection" in which the Chief Protector watched over the "interests" of Aborigines, and Protection Boards increased their control over Aboriginal family life. In Western Australia in 1905 the Chief Protector was made the legal guardian of every Aboriginal and "half-caste" child under 16 and in South Australia this age was extended to the age of 21, displacing the rights of parents. (HREOC, 1997:28). By 1911 "protectionist legislation" had been introduced in every state (except Tasmania) and the Northern Territory giving the Chief Protector or

Protection Board extensive power to control the lives of Indigenous people (HREOC, 1997:28).

Every aspect of the lives of Indigenous people became subject to extensive control by the early 1900s. Increasingly regulations developed that governed entry to and exit from reserves, people's right to marry, their employment, and their everyday life on reserves and missions (HREOC, 1997:29). Children became the focus for conversion to Christianity with particular emphasis on distancing them from their Indigenous lifestyles, and housing them in dormitories away from their families (HREOC, 1997:29). Contact between children and their families was strictly limited and attention became focused on "merging" and "absorbing" children into "White society" (HREOC, 1997:29). The attitudes of the time are reflected in the views of those who removed children from under Aboriginal Acts in each state.

I would not hesitate for one moment to separate any half-caste from its aboriginal mother, no matter how frantic her momentary grief might be at the time. They soon forget their offspring.

(Travelling inspector, James Isdell, quoted in HREOC
Summary Report, 1997:11).

Impact on Aboriginal Australia:

Marge Campbell and Donella Brown are two Aboriginal women who have played key community education roles in developing first-hand understanding of the issues involved in Indigenous child removal in Australia. Donella Brown is the Principal of Clontarf Aboriginal College, in Perth, Western Australia. Marge Campbell works in Yalbalinga, the Aboriginal Support Unit at Australian Catholic University in Sydney, New South Wales. Both women have been an important part of *Let's Talk* in Ireland. Their willingness to share personal and often painful experiences from their lives has led to a greater international awareness of child removal policies in Australia. Their stories indicate that these policies have affected Aboriginal people across the Australian continent. Donella and Marge have approached this section in a story-telling sense, to communicate the personal impact of policies on their lives and on Aboriginal society.

Donella Brown

The effect of the stolen generation is still being felt Australia wide. As an Indigenous person there have been many things throughout my life that have puzzled me, particularly when my parents acted in ways or said things that were strange at the time.

I used to wonder about many things. Why I wasn't allowed to bring schoolmates from the mission⁴ home to play; why I had to have leprosy checks before going away to school, why my elders were not able to speak any languages, why older people that knew used the term "coloured people"; why people lived in separate parts of the town; and why the people from the mission were only allowed to sit right at the back in the picture theatre. These are only a few of the questions that went unanswered whilst I was in my years of schooling up until I left my hometown of Derby.

It was only when I left the confines of a small community in 1970 and went to Geraldton and later to Perth that I began to read and talk about what had happened and what was happening with Indigenous people. It was only when I left Derby that I began to experience prejudice and racism on a level that I had never experienced before.

There were many experiences during this time away that I discovered how lonely the road was in a mainstream education where there were very few Indigenous people and very few supporters of Indigenous rights. I think that people were reluctant to become involved because of the limited knowledge of the history of Indigenous people, the stigma of becoming involved, and people were scared to be associated with difference.

Up to 10 years ago I would have said that the forcible removal of children had very little effect on my own family. However in 2000 and 2001 I began to make contact with my Grandfather's people who now live mainly in Northern Queensland and the Torres Strait Islands. In continuing the talking I have come to the conclusion that the long term effects of the removal of my Grandfather and his two sisters has had a profound effect on my family.

At a reunion held this year the families from Western Australia travelled to Cairns in North Queensland for a reunion. We met with at least 200 people who we have never known and this is only a starting point.

What was most moving was the contact that I had with two sisters whose parents had fostered my grandfather and his sisters on Mapoon Mission. For the two sisters it was a very moving experience of being reconnected. For the descendants of my grandfather's sisters it was an experience of meeting people who bore resemblance to

⁴ Missions, stations and reserves were established in the 19th century by various ecumenical groups and taken over later by "Protection Boards" on behalf of state and territory governments.

their own mothers or grandmothers. For me it was sitting with aunts and cousins who looked like me or looked like my grandfather.

At the reunion we had the old and young people sing and dance the stories of the mission and the Torres Strait Culture. When the songs were being sung I looked around and realised that many of my family from Western Australia were reduced to tears. For me it was like a homecoming to the culture that I have been deprived of for 47 years, and a culture that my grandfather left at the age of twenty, and a culture that my father and aunts never knew. It is perhaps a very hard experience to describe and may even be more difficult for people to appreciate if you have never been in a similar situation.

My own conclusion from this one gathering has confirmed for me the thoughts that I have had for many years about the impact of the forcible removal of my grandfather and his sister in the early 1900's.

In summary and retrospect the long-term impact has meant the following for my family and many other Indigenous families that were fragmented by the forcible removal of children:

- *The development of an Indigenous class or labelling system, by the non Indigenous people, to divide a race of people;*
- *Development of a deep sense of mistrust by Indigenous people toward non Indigenous people;*
- *Loss of language;*
- *Loss of cultural links and ceremonies;*
- *Fragmentation of family members;*
- *The challenge of fitting into mainstream culture and operating in two worlds;*
- *A deep sense of loss and a constant search for links to the past;*
- *The final pain and joy of being reunited; and*
- *The task of rediscovering the past 100 years after my grandfather was removed.*

Marge Campbell

Growing up in western Sydney in the late 1960's and early 1970's I didn't realise that I was so different to others. I didn't realise that I was an 'Aborigine' until a teacher in my year 5 class pointed to me and asked:

"Marjorie, tell the rest of the class what sorts of utensils were used by Aborigines to hunt with?"

I naturally replied: "Spears and boomerangs, sir...", thinking that this was the only information he required. I felt good, because I was able to give him an answer.

He then proceeded to ask, 'But what kinds of boomerangs were there and for what specific reason are they used?'

I replied: 'I don't know, sir...'

His response, 'why not, as an Aborigine surely, you should know...'

But I didn't know, except for the details I'd read in books. I didn't know because I was taken from my family.

I then began to ask myself and my foster family questions about who I am and where I'm from and that's when all the deceit came into play. No one wanted to give me any details or to admit that things weren't right. There was a lot going on that I didn't seem to understand as a child. Before this time I'd never thought of myself of being from any other family except the one that I felt part of. I'd 'fully assimilated' into this family. I now hate that word, 'Assimilation.' Looking at the files the New South Wales Child Welfare Department had kept about me, that's the language used throughout.

I was forever asking about who I was. I thought that I had two sisters from the answers that were given to me and they were the people I kept asking to see, to whom I was denied contact. I was also told that both my parents had died. So there was all of this confusion about where I fit. I suppose I should mention about being placed with an English family. They had arrived in Australia only two years before and had no idea of the role they were playing in acting out assimilation policies. Now, talking with my foster brother I have learnt that the reason that they arranged to foster me was because the lady next door had fostered an Aboriginal child.

When I met my family, thinking that my parents had died, I had found out that my mother was alive and well, as was my dad. Looking back on that, I think about my mother as being someone who had been so down-trodden that she had become an alcoholic.

I'd like to point out here that Senator Herron⁵ had suggested that only 10% of Aboriginal people had been affected by the removal policies. In my family, 45% of

⁵ Federal Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs 1996-2000

people were removed. That's 5 out of 11 children were taken from my parents. In actual fact, I found out that I didn't have just two sisters, but I had 4 living brothers and 5 sisters who I have contact with today but was denied the chance to grow up with.

My mother could speak her own language – Gumbayngirr (Gum-bang-ghee), I didn't have the chance to learn it. My father's artefacts are now in the Australian Museum because I have since found out that he is a well-known Aboriginal artist. He and his brother were also involved in the first land rights movements in Sydney in the 1930s and 40s. All of these political and cultural things, I've been denied. The day I saw these artefacts in the museum left me overwhelmed. I found out that my mum speaks her language because I saw her speaking quietly with a little baby, whispering in his ear. She noticed that I was watching her and stopped. I asked her why she stopped and I told her I didn't know she could speak this language. All she said was, 'it's a secret.' Our people were not allowed to speak in their own language, they were punished if they did.

I got excited when I started reading stuff from the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS). In an article about my grandmother I learnt that she belonged to the Mosely family, a well-known family with strong cultural connections in the area. Her and her sons stood on the verandah shooting at police to defend their land. Here's this woman - a black woman –standing up for what she believed in at a time when Aboriginal people were jailed for standing up for their rights. She stood her ground, the strength that she bestowed upon her family protected what she believed in despite the attitudes of whites at the time. All of this was happening in Kempsey – Pauline Hanson territory⁶. I've missed out on all this history of my family.

When the separation happened, there were 5 children taken, 2 boys and 3 girls. The boys were placed at Kinchela Boys Home on the North Coast. The girls were placed at Bombaderry Children's home on the South Coast.⁷ The distance meant that we were so far removed from one another and from our family. There's no way you could connect with your family, the physical distance made it impossible. The three of us girls were dispersed again from Bombaderry. My younger sister and I were placed

⁶ Kempsey is a rural coastal town in New South Wales who has a large number of non-Aboriginal supporters of the Politician Pauline Hanson. The right-wing policies of her 'One Nation' Party have provoked division and discord throughout the nation and she continues to target Aboriginal people naming them recipients of extra benefits, more so than other Australians.

⁷ Aboriginal children's homes were established for the specific purpose of training boys and girls for domestic service and rural labouring work. Kinchela and Bombaderry are located more than 800 kilometres apart and visitation by families to these institutions was actively discouraged.

with different foster families and my other sister was placed in another Girls Home and then she was placed with a foster family.

One thing that I remember about being in a children's home in Edgecliff initially, was playing hide and seek with my sister. I remember squeezing through a wall and I when mentioned it to my sister, and said "do you remember", she said "don't you remember, that wasn't a game. We were hiding from the nuns so they wouldn't hit us.

I was angry for years and I was bitter about my life and toward others who didn't understand what I was trying to say. The attitude always seemed to be 'so what, get over it'. I was always searching for my place. I didn't know who I was supposed to be or where I fit in.

The healing process for me is being given the opportunity to tell my story. It's helped me come to terms with what has happened to me and my family. The healing process is part of feeling able to tell people what I need to tell them. That I won't be judged as 'this Aborigine' who is less than others. My other healing thing was going back to my country and meeting my extended family and feeling a sense of coming home and that I fit. It's still a journey of re-educating myself about my culture and my people.

Children need to know who they are and where they come from. Without that, they are going to be stuck and won't be able to move forward and grow. They need to know where they are from, they need to have resources available where kids aren't going to lose that cultural connection – be it language, or art, and family and kinship – because the loss is so great.

I'm now 40, I was taken when I was 4. 36 years later I'm in the process of learning my language. It's my final connection with my people. I feel that I belong somewhere. This also includes an understanding of the language boundaries of the land; the connection to the land, my land, my country, my place.

Healing and the Future:

The testimonies of Marge and Donella are two of the many thousands of stories that reveal significant pain, loss and trauma in Aboriginal communities today. The reunification of families is an integral part of the future healing for Aboriginal people. As people return home they are finding ways to reconnect with their families, their land, their language and their culture. For many, healing involves the telling of stories and attempts to find their true place. The loss in communities has been profound and for many Aboriginal Australians the healing will be a lifelong process. Organisations such

as "Link-Up" have taken a pro-active role in bringing families together across Australia.

Many Indigenous people want acknowledgment of the injustices of the past. One of the principle recommendations of the National Inquiry was that all Australian Parliaments formally acknowledge responsibility of past governments for the laws, policies and practices of the forcible removal Indigenous children, and that they extend official and public apologies to those who have suffered (HREOC, 1997:284). The refusal of the current Prime Minister, John Howard to officially apologise has fostered denial of what has occurred throughout the Australian community, and fueled further antagonism towards Indigenous people.

An essential stipulation of the Inquiry was that reparation be made to Indigenous peoples consisting of:

- Acknowledgment and apology;
- Guarantees against repetition;
- Measures of restitution;
- Measures of rehabilitation, and
- Monetary compensation

(HREOC, 1997:282)

Future governments will need to carefully consider moving the agenda forward by establishing a compensation tribunal. A Compensation Tribunal, established with widespread consultation with Indigenous people would act to offer a no-fault, capped and limited reparation package that would adequately address the HREOC stipulations. Consultation with Indigenous people would determine the nature of the compensation and may in fact indicate a wide variety of needs in addition to monetary compensation. A reparations package could include, for example, counselling for individuals, families, and communities⁸ and national funding to increase the capacity of organisations working to reunite families.

⁸ It is significant that in the 1990 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody nearly half of the deaths investigated were of people who had been removed from their families. Aboriginal deaths in custody continue to be an expression of the trauma associated with communities in crisis. Funding for widespread counseling to deal with the effects of separation has been called for from Indigenous communities for sometime

Conclusions:

“Many Australians believe that the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from families and communities is past history. Link-Up states categorically, that this is not the case. Some children are to this day being separated from Aboriginal families and communities, and being sent to non-Aboriginal families or institutions. Everyone involved in separation deals today and everyday for the rest of their lives with the effects of separation trauma.”

(Link-Up, 27)

There is in Australia today great division and debate concerning the reality of the Stolen Generations, and the impact that this has had on Indigenous lives. The stories of Marge and Donella are not unlike many that were documented by the National Inquiry and many more being told by Indigenous people everywhere, everyday. While sectors of the Australian community deny such policies and practices ever existed, the evidence speaks for itself. There are important lessons that Australia can reveal to the rest of the world.

References:

Australian Broadcasting Commission (2001) *Academics debate contents of Stolen Generations Report*. Transcript of 7:30 report. www.abc.net.au

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (1998) *Australian social Trends – Family: Family formation – adoptions*. Commonwealth of Australia, ACT www.abs.gov.au

Broome, R. (1996) “Historians, Aborigines and Australia.: Writing the National Past.” In B.Atwood *In the Age of Mabo: History, Aborigines and Australia.* Allen & Unwin: Sydney.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC), (1997) *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families*. Commonwealth of Australia, ACT.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC), (1997) *Bringing Them Home: A guide to the findings and recommendations of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from their Families*. Commonwealth of Australia, ACT.

Manne, R (2001) “In Denial: The Stolen Generations and the Right.” *The Australian Quarterly Essay* Issue 1, Schwartz Publishing: Melbourne.

Link Up (NSW) Aboriginal Corporation and Wilson, TJ. (1997) *In the Best Interest of the Child? Stolen children: Aboriginal pain / White shame*. Canberra, Aboriginal History Incorporated.

Read, P (1998) *The Stolen Generations: The removal of Aboriginal children in New South Wales 1883-1969*. New South Wales Department of Aboriginal Affairs, Sydney.