



PROJECT MUSE[®]

“Homes Are Sought for These Children”

*Locating Adoption within the Australian
Stolen Generations Narrative*

SHURLEE SWAIN

In 1838 a child known as Mathinna was removed from the settlement for the remnant of the Tasmanian Aboriginal people on Flinders Island and taken to Hobart to live in the house of the lieutenant governor. Sir John and Lady Franklin, the historical record recounts, were impressed by her intelligence and wanted to bring her up as a companion to their own daughter. However, when they were recalled to Britain five years later, Mathinna was left behind. Initially sent to the Orphan School, she was later returned to live amongst her people and reputedly died at a young age while under the influence of alcohol.¹ Mathinna has been memorialized in art, dance, literature, and children's books primarily as the tragic victim of a failed experiment in the contest between savagery and civilization, but hers is also a story of adoption that encompasses within it much of what would bedevil attempts to adopt Indigenous children in Australia over the next 150 years.²

When James Bonwick, one of the earliest historians of European Tasmania, set out to tell the Mathinna story, claiming as his source a colonial official responsible for managing the Indigenous people, he focused on what he saw as the core problem: How could a black body find a place in white society?

The age of early womanhood found her attractive in mind and body. But for whom were these charms to bud? On whom could she bestow her affections and preserve her virtue? Could she, who had been indulged in the drawing-room of the Governor, who had become used to the luxuries of civilization, be content to be the bride of ever so handsome a Black? Dare she hope to be the mate of an Englishman whose tastes and education were equal to her own?³

Although the abandoned Mathinna was but eight years old, her black body is retrospectively sexualized and positioned as a threat to the purity of the race. This core question has been repeated by generations of scholars who have studied the adoption of Indigenous children into non-Indigenous families: Where did the transplanted child belong?

The forced removal of Indigenous children, a practice common to many settler colonies, has attracted particular attention in Australia. Historians collaborated with Indigenous people to bring the subject to public attention in the latter years of the twentieth century. Their joint efforts resulted in an inquiry conducted by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, whose report, *Bringing Them Home*, brought the issue onto the public record and gave currency to the collective term “Stolen Generations.”⁴ Indigenous adoptees have been marginalized both in the story of the Stolen Generations and in the history of adoption in Australia. Minorities in both categories, they are the subject of much generalization but little detailed study. Their story is difficult to retrieve, but it is also more complex and contested than that of the children subject to cruelty and abuse in institutions and mission dormitories. In the Stolen Generations literature, adoptees are acknowledged but rarely represented amongst the stories used to characterize the experience.⁵

The secrecy surrounding legal adoption means that there is little agreement as to how many of the Stolen Generations were ever adopted. Anna Haebich, whose research focuses on the west of the country, concludes that “numbers remained fairly low over time.”⁶ Christine Cheater, who is more familiar with the experience in the more closely settled states of Victoria and New South Wales, estimated that the adoptees constituted a little less than 17 percent of the total number of removed children, most from the 1950s through the 1980s.⁷ Link-up, the Aboriginal organization established to facilitate reunions of Aboriginal families fragmented by child removal policies, is reluctant to validate such estimates, preferring instead to emphasize the 100,000 Australians unaware of their Indigeneity because they are the descendants of children removed and brought up in the non-Indigenous community.⁸

Even the highest of these estimates would be minuscule in proportion to the total number of non-Indigenous children separated from their birth families by adoption. Hence, in this context, too, their story tends to be ignored. In the one published history of adoption in Australia

lia, Indigenous adoption is confined to a single chapter drawn primarily from the *Bringing Them Home* inquiry.⁹ In the report of the recent Senate Committee investigating former forced adoption practices, the experiences of Indigenous adoptees are subsumed into the broader category of “adopted people [who] feel they do not fit in with their adoptive parents’ culture, but are not welcomed by people from their birth parents’ culture.”¹⁰ Their presence is more commonly acknowledged amongst adoption activists, some of whom, identifying as mothers of the “white stolen generation,” have appropriated the Aboriginal experience in order to assert their claim to apology and redress.¹¹ Such usage does little to bring Aboriginal adoptees within the wider adoption narrative because it diminishes the uniqueness of the experience that Stolen Generations activists took so long to have recognized.¹² The aim of this article is to move beyond such political contestations in order to locate Indigenous adoption within both the broader history of adoption in Australia and the history of the Stolen Generations.

Legal adoption was introduced to most of Australia in the 1920s. It was designed to provide certainty for parents who had adopted children under the informal arrangements that had applied until that time. In the unregulated market, Cheater suggests, Aboriginal adoption was rare because it transgressed the notions of protection that governed contemporary policies for managing the lives of Indigenous peoples. Protection was designed to maintain racial purity by controlling contact between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, a purpose that cross-racial adoption could not achieve.¹³ However, while adoption may have been rare, it was not unknown. Mathinna was not alone in being taken into a settler’s home. The practice began in 1788 at the first settlement at Sydney Cove, where the chaplain, Richard Johnson, took what he saw as abandoned children into his house to train them in the ways of “civilisation.” Over a century later, his great-niece was reported as having kept up the family tradition, removing an Aboriginal infant from a hospital in which it was receiving treatment for a spinal condition and taking it to New Zealand, where she registered the child as her own.¹⁴ Haebich has unearthed a parallel to the Mathinna story, another Tasmanian child who was adopted by a prominent settler, Dr. Temple Pearson, after he found her wounded during a raid on her family in 1825. Like Mathinna, she was rejected six years later, reportedly because she had become “exceedingly obstinate and perverse.”¹⁵ Absorption of enemy children via

adoption was a common feature of frontier conflict in other settler nations, a way of signifying the superiority of the conquering over the vanquished culture, and it would appear that Australia was no exception.¹⁶

In the unregulated market, children changed hands in a remarkably casual manner. The motivations of the adoptive parents were rarely interrogated. The language of the regular advertisements placed in daily papers offering or seeking children to adopt suggests a range of motivations but also establishes a clear hierarchy of demand. Indigenous children were at the base of the racial hierarchy, but they were not completely absent. In advertisements seeking children for adoption, requests for fair, blue-eyed children predominate. There are many notices seeking homes for children that identify a dark complexion but only one in which Aboriginality is specifically mentioned—a two-year-old Adelaide boy offered for adoption in 1887.¹⁷ However, evidence from other sources would suggest that Indigenous children were not immune from this irregular transfer and that, perhaps, their irregular transfer continued long after it had been substantially suppressed amongst the non-Indigenous population following legalization. A series of advertisements in the 1930s in a northern Tasmanian newspaper seeking or offering “dark” children for adoption suggests the development of a specialized market there at a time when oral evidence would suggest that the local Indigenous community was coming under increasing pressure to relinquish their children.¹⁸

A 1916 report gives some insight into the fate of children removed in this way. It told the story of a two-year-old boy adopted from the North Queensland by taxidermist Robert Grant, who claimed to have found the child, orphaned during a “tribal disturbance,” while on a collecting expedition. He took the boy south and brought him up as his own son. Trained as a draftsman, the boy had enlisted in the armed services and, the report claimed, qualified as a sergeant. The story lists Grant’s many “accomplishments”—“He writes a splendid hand, draws well, recites Shakespeare with histrionic ability, plays the Scottish bagpipes, and can earn a very good living at any time by following his profession”—as evidence of “what may be done with an aboriginal when taken early and trained.”¹⁹ Grant’s army record would suggest that this account was somewhat exaggerated. Although he may have passed the sergeant’s examinations, he was still a private on his discharge in 1919. What is clear is that Grant was stripped of his Aboriginality through adoption.

Asked whether he was a natural-born or naturalized British subject, he responded “natural,” to which a later annotation added the word “born.” His appearance is consistently recorded as “dark complexion,” but no mention is made of his Indigenous status.²⁰

A 1900 account tells of the disputed adoption of an Aboriginal child called Jennie with a focus on the contested motivations of the people involved. Brought to Townsville to train as a maid, Jennie was “as wild as possible,” but her employer, “having no child of her own,” decided to adopt her. However, when the potential adopter went away for a time, the child “became wayward.” The adopter’s husband handed Jennie over to a woman looking for a maid. The newspaper report deals with the subsequent court case, in which the adoptive mother sought to regain custody of the child. The magistrate, following the laws governing the employment of servants, ordered that Jennie remain with her employer, but the minister with responsibility for “native affairs” intervened, arguing Jennie should be dealt with as a neglected child. His justification was that a law “intended to prevent trafficking in pickaninnies” specified that “any child born of an aboriginal or half-caste mother is a neglected child.” The outcome for Jennie was grim. She was sent to a reformatory until her future could be decided.²¹

The ministerial intervention is evidence that authorities were aware that adoptions were taking place, but it is not clear whether the goal was to regulate or completely outlaw the practice. Evidence from South Australia thirteen years later is more precise, with the relevant department admitting that it had “‘stretched the law’ and allowed adoption of some children ‘found’ in camps for ‘philanthropic’ motives or in instances where the children’s white fathers wish to adopt them.”²² Files in the Queensland State Archives illustrate the confusion that arose when people who believed they had adopted Indigenous children were asked by the Protector of Aborigines to pay them wages.²³ Although the term “adoption” is often used in such records, rarely are such children given the status of children born to the “adoptive” parents, for whom sometimes they serve as companions or servants. When confronted by station owners, the Protector generally agreed that wages should be waived, but he concluded nevertheless that these children “will cause a lot of bother in the future.” In cases where the children tried to free themselves from such placements, often alleging that they had been subject to abuse, the Protector was quick to have them transferred to a reformatory.²⁴

In the Stolen Generations narrative, adoption is located most clearly within the discussion of assimilation, the policy that, from the early twentieth century, promoted the absorption of Aboriginal people into the Australian population. A recognition that the segregation implicit in the policy of protection had failed, assimilation focused on the products of that failure, children of mixed descent. However, within the history of adoption, the fit is not as neat, for the acceptability of adoption, particularly in its earliest years, relied on the degree to which the child could become “as your very own.” Principles of matching were built around the desire of adoption workers to give to adoptive parents the child they would have given birth to if they had been physically able.²⁵ Within this context, cross-racial adoption was the opposite of good practice and a more insidious threat to racial purity than the older informal practices had been. In 1934 an article in the influential *Australian Women’s Weekly* gave voice to the fears of women’s organizations at plans to bring “oc-toroon girls” to city institutions where they would be free to “mingle” without their racial origins being clear, creating the possibility several generations down of “a black child appear[ing] in a white family.” However, a representative of a Victorian Aboriginal support group defended the plan, arguing that the children deserved the “chance to grow up among other white children.” Adoption was only possible, however, if their racial identity was not divulged.²⁶

In the postwar era, the two histories moved closer together. With the dissipation of many of the eugenic fears that had underwritten resistance to adoption in its early years, infant adoption was becoming mainstream, making it possible for advocates of adoption as a key tool of assimilation to begin to consider Indigenous adoption as a possibility. However, significant barriers remained. The 1954 Australian film *Jedda* brought the notion of Indigenous adoption to a wider audience than ever before, but central to the plot was the tragedy that ensued when the child, adopted at birth and raised as white, was “drawn” to her own people. Repeating the sexualization that characterized the Mathinna story, the film argued that it was wrong to attempt to raise an Aboriginal child as white not because of any rights that the birth family may have had but rather because a conflict between “blood” and “training” would ensue when “a shapely teenager meets her first wild handsome black.”²⁷ A widely syndicated article highlighting the plight of babies classified as “unadoptable,” published in the same year, used an Aboriginal infant

as its first example. Although the baby's "smiling eyes, the report read, seemed to plead from her cot, 'Please take me' . . . the matron told the couple to prepare themselves for a 'bombshell.' Quietly and without dramatics she disclosed that the baby's mother was an aborigine." Although in this fictionalized case the couple are reported to have agreed to take the child, the way in which the article is constructed makes it clear that they were both benevolent and courageous in doing so.²⁸

Benevolence was the most common motivation attributed in the cases of irregular adoptions that persisted throughout the postwar period. Despite the official rhetoric, which argued that assimilation was a goal all Aboriginal families could achieve, Haebich argues that the publicity given to irregular adoptions continued to promote the idea that removal and adoption by white families promised a much more reliable route to success.²⁹ Increased contact between non-Indigenous adults and Indigenous children through either organized holiday schemes or less formal arrangements created a pressure to relinquish their children that few Indigenous mothers were equipped to resist.³⁰ With the potential adoptive parents constructed as offering a "chance" for Indigenous children, it would be seen as churlish to refuse. Pictured taking their thirteen-year-old adopted daughter, Joyce, to do the shopping in the family Mercedes, her "fairy godfather and mother" assured the reporter that Joyce's parents were "quite happy" about the adoption, adding, "the dark people are not as possessive of their children as we are."³¹

Interestingly, however, in the most prominent of these stories, the prospective parents seem to have been reluctant to commit to the responsibilities that formal adoption involved. Wealthy Melbourne couple Mr. and Mrs. Deutsher were much praised for "rescuing" two young girls they had met while filming in the Northern Territory and offering them a new home in their luxury mansion. After "nine months of red tape," they had decided to bring the girls south without waiting for legal approval and claimed that in so doing they had "made the initial move for a nationwide assimilation of aborigines and half-bloods into the community."³² By 1968 the director of the Victorian Department of Aboriginal Affairs was arguing that articles such as this reinforced "the idea of taking away from Aboriginal women the responsibility of caring for their own children," a view that he believed had led to widespread "trafficking" in Aboriginal children. Pregnant women were being "approached in the street by white women seeking to adopt their babies and

some mothers complied because they had been conditioned to think that white people always know best.³³ Aboriginal activists in New South Wales were similarly concerned, arguing that irregular adoptions were “as common as the common cold.”³⁴

By this time, however, other branches of government were deeply implicated in schemes that sought to find adoptive parents for Indigenous children. Their motives were economic as well as assimilatory, but their appeal to prospective parents placed benevolence at the core. In 1951 the Department of Native Affairs in Western Australia established an adoption program that ran parallel to the program run by the Department of Child Welfare. Despite publicity that consistently contrasted the safety of the white adoptive home with the risks faced by infants left in Aboriginal communities, there continued to be resistance to the Child Welfare Department program because it allowed “coloured” children to slip into the white community.³⁵ Similar attitudes in Queensland ensured that the State Children’s Department refused a 1960 request to place “light skinned” children for adoption, leaving it to the Department of Native Affairs to establish its own scheme.³⁶ The Northern Territory followed in 1964, extending its recruitment to southern states presumably because it was unable to find sufficient suitable applicants within its own jurisdiction.³⁷ In Victoria, the Aborigines Welfare Board was one of the twenty-three agencies registered under the 1964 Adoption Act, and, Colin Tatz believes, it quickly became known that if you “couldn’t get a baby through a normal adoption agency, you went to the Aborigines Welfare Board.”³⁸ However, the legal requirements and the professional standards surrounding adoption were such that Aboriginal couples were effectively excluded from participating in this new method of making families.³⁹ The appeal of adoption to welfare authorities was the same as it had been for non-Indigenous children: it was cheap and permanent, it erased the child’s original identity, and it removed the likelihood that the child would be a long-term charge on government resources. A child who had been in care for some time could be released for adoption, the mother’s consent dispensed with on the basis of “inability to locate,” even in cases where parents had continued to have contact, as courts rarely interrogated this claim in cases where Indigenous mothers were involved.⁴⁰

The non-Indigenous couples who responded to such appeals were different from those who dominated the new baby adoption market.

Because the appeal was essentially philanthropic, the focus was less on a couple's childlessness and more about what they could do for a child. Shocked by the conditions children were exposed to in Aboriginal camps—which potential adoptive parents viewed either directly or more usually through media images—these parents set out to “rescue” the children. Adoptive father Keith McEwan recalled, “We had no intention of enlarging our family. . . . It was because of reading in the newspapers . . . that there were young Aboriginal babies and children who were not being adopted and would go into orphanages. . . . We just saw a child as a child and we saw a home we could offer, simple as it may be, better than an orphanage.”⁴¹ For others, however, rescue was mixed with what could become a more malign intent, the desire to recruit a child to a particular religious denomination or an attempt to obtain a child through pathways less rigid than those encountered by couples applying for newborns.⁴² There were also some whose motive was purely economic gain, a factor that the move to infant adoption had all but removed from non-Indigenous adoption practice by this time.⁴³ “Most applications,” Haebich concludes, “were heartfelt and well-meaning but deeply paternalistic and assimilationist in intent . . . imbued with racist myths and stereotypes.”⁴⁴ Adopted into just such a family, Pauline McLeod was constantly told: “We were the lucky ones, chosen to help our people. That’s why we had been given the opportunity to live with them.”⁴⁵ Once the adoption was finalized, neither the child nor the parents had access to ongoing support. Adoptive parents struggled on alone when problems emerged, and children were left to grow up isolated within a white world.⁴⁶

Despite the positive media coverage given to adoptive families, the practice was not without its critics. A 1957 letter in a popular women's magazine drew attention to the isolation in which the children lived. The writer had visited a couple who had adopted a twenty-month-old child and found “the poor little black speck, playing with her toes . . . alone—a helpless mite, farmed out to white guardians and isolated by her colour.” Concerned that it would not be long before the child's “wondering instincts” were awakened and “she will see she is different,” the author suggested that “in future when aboriginal children are farmed out in white homes they be sent in pairs. Single children should be sent only to the homes of educated aborigines.”⁴⁷ In 1960 a rival women's magazine published a selection of letters in response to a reader who had asked,

Would it be wise to adopt an Aboriginal child? Most were encouraging, but two warned that problems could arise when the child became an adult. There is the “odd person who frowns on a dark person,” one commented before insisting that this should not be the case. “I feel it would be unwise to adopt a dark girl,” wrote another. “As a teenager she would find it hard to mix and have boyfriends as other teenagers do. Later it would be hard for her to find a marriage partner, as inter-marriages are not really accepted, and also she would not be able to go back to her tribe and adapt herself to the life there.”⁴⁸

There was, however, a separate strand in adoption practice that related more closely to the experience of non-Indigenous mothers in this period, a separation driven by rising market demand for new baby adoptions. Drawn into this market by the potential of their expected child to “pass” as white, Indigenous mothers were subject to the same punitive attitudes that saw tens of thousands of non-Indigenous mothers separated from their infants by a system that did not recognize their rights to be mothers.⁴⁹ They were cajoled, pressured, and, at times, lied to in an attempt to gain their consent so that the adoption could proceed.⁵⁰ Young women who had themselves been subject to removal were almost powerless in the face of such pressure. Like many young women in the non-Indigenous community, they were swept along by a tide that assured them that if they loved their baby, they would let it go.⁵¹ Pregnant in 1962, Valerie Linow was drugged during the birth, told that her child had been stillborn, and then asked to sign what she believed were discharge papers. She remembered “the social welfare were asking me all kind of questions about the Father, but at that time I thought she was helping me.” She only discovered that her child had been adopted when he turned up on her doorstep twenty-nine years later.⁵²

As the ability to “pass” was central to children’s acceptability in this market, their Aboriginality was not always disclosed for fear that it would render them less desirable to adopting parents.⁵³ This fear was well-founded, as Patricia Wesche discovered when her adoptive parents, having been urged by relatives to have her DNA tested, declared that if they “had known they wouldn’t have adopted me. I would have been ‘better off with, you know, your own people.’”⁵⁴ It was in these situations that the child’s identity was at greatest risk, yet “passing” or being allocated another, less undesirable ethnic identity could not preserve the child from racist slurs and their adoptive parents’ “unconscious antipathy towards Aboriginality.”⁵⁵

Adults who had been adopted as children made up 35.5 percent of the witnesses who gave evidence before the *Bringing Them Home* inquiry, but 11.5 percent of these were returned to institutional care when the placement broke down.⁵⁶ The report conflates the experience of all forms of care to conclude that “few had been happy and secure,” although for some of those few the security was provided by a supportive adoptive family.⁵⁷ These statistics would suggest that adoption was amongst the more benign forms of care, but the testimonies of witnesses and the response of agencies involved in family reunion, which cite a 90 to 95 percent failure rate, demonstrate that reinstitutionalization is an inadequate measure of success and failure and that even the most supportive of families could not completely compensate for the issues around identity that Indigenous adoptees experienced.⁵⁸ As an adult, Laurie Clarke found herself caught between “this family that loves me, that’s not my real family but brought me up, seen me through thick and thin . . . [and] the other family who are my real family, my blood, but haven’t been there at all. . . . [T]hey’re the same colour skin as me and stuff like that . . . but I had nothing in common with them, nothing at all.”⁵⁹ Dawn Brown stayed with her adoptive parents, who had treated her like a daughter, until she was twenty-eight but then returned to her Aboriginal family because she needed to find out “who I was. . . . I’m black skinned. . . . I stood out and I wanted to know why.”⁶⁰ Louis Johnson’s black skin cost him his life. He was attacked by a gang on the streets of Perth and left to die because of the racist assumptions of passersby.⁶¹ Pauline McLeod struggled to gain acceptance in either society. Moving to work amongst Aboriginal peoples, she found herself condemned as “white establishment . . . raised by white people . . . [who] wouldn’t understand.”⁶²

Issues around identity confront many adult adoptees. They lay behind the campaigns to remove the secrecy surrounding adoption by providing access to the information that could facilitate reunion with their birth families. Indigenous adoptees are located both within and apart from such campaigns. Since the 1970s Aboriginal communities have campaigned to regain control of their own children, asserting the right to be involved in placement decisions where removal was considered justified.⁶³ Attention was also focused on reclaiming the lost and restoring to those whose identities had been erased by the process of adoption a sense of belonging within the community. This campaign

has both positive and negative elements. It asserts Indigenous identity as a unique privilege that these adoptees have been denied, but it also argues that even the best adoptive parents could not prepare a child to live in a black body in a racist Australia. It is at this point that the experience of Indigenous adoptees diverges from both the more general history of adoption in Australia and the Stolen Generations narrative, for they fit in neither but rather sit somewhat uncomfortably between the two.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this article was funded by the Australian Research Council Discovery Grant, *The Search for Family: A History of Adoption in Australia*.

NOTES

1. Heather Felton, "Mathinna," http://www.utas.edu.au/library/companion_to_tasmanian_history/M/Mathinna.htm, accessed April 29, 2011.

2. These works include the 1842 Thomas Bock portrait, accessible at http://www.utas.edu.au/library/companion_to_tasmanian_history/M/Mathinna.htm, accessed April 29, 2011; a radio play by Margaret Murray that became the basis for a two-act ballet choreographed by Laurel Martyn in 1956; a contemporary dance piece choreographed by Stephen Page for the Bangarra Dance Theatre in 2008; a book for children by Nan Chauncy, *Mathinna's People* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967); and a novel by Richard Flanagan, *Wanting* (Sydney: Knopf, 2008).

3. James Bonwick, *The Last of the Tasmanians* (London: Low, 1870), 358.

4. For details of the story of the Stolen Generations, see Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families* (Sydney: HREOC, 1997).

5. See, for example, Aboriginal Legal Service of Western Australia, *Telling Our Story: A Report on the Removal of Aboriginal Children in Western Australia* (Aboriginal Legal Service of Western Australia, 1995).

6. Anna Haebich, *Broken Circles* (Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2000), 556.

7. Christine Cheater, "'My Brown Skin Baby They Take Him Away': A Reassessment of the Role of Adoption in the Forced Removal of Aboriginal Children from Their Families," in *Other People's Children: Adoption in Australia*, edited by

Ceridwen Spark and Denise Cuthbert (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, 2009), 178–79.

8. Coral Edwards and Peter Read, *The Lost Children: Thirteen Australians Taken from Their Aboriginal Families Tell of the Struggle to Find Their Natural Parents* (Moorebank NSW: Doubleday, 1989), ix.

9. Audrey Marshall and Margaret McDonald, *The Many-Sided Triangle: Adoption in Australia* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001), chap. 7.

10. Australia Senate Community Affairs References Committee, *Commonwealth Contribution to Former Forced Adoption Policies and Practices* (Canberra: Senate Printing Unit, Parliament House, 2012), 79–80.

11. Christine Cole, “The Hidden Tragedy of the White Stolen Generation and Its Consequences: Perspectives on Adoption in Australia from a Mother of the White Stolen Generation,” in Spark and Cuthbert, *Other People’s Children*, 110–26.

12. National Stolen Generations Alliance, Submission 227, *Commonwealth Contribution to Former Forced Adoption Policies and Practices*, 8, <http://senate.aph.gov.au/submissions/comitees/viewdocument.aspx?id=fab6b9c9-82do-4dff-9fbo-ad7a5c1d985c>, accessed March 16, 2012.

13. Cheater, “My Brown Skin Baby,” 180.

14. Kirstin Ross, Submission 132, *Commonwealth Contribution*, http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate_Committees?url=clac_ctte/comm_contrib_former_forced_adoption/submissions.htm, accessed March 16, 2012.

15. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 86–87.

16. Victoria Smith, *Captive Arizona, 1851–1900* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), xiv.

17. *South Australian Advertiser*, January 27, 1887, 8, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article37166590>, accessed March 16, 2012.

18. See *Launceston Examiner*, October 30, 1937, 1, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article52167322>; November 17, 1937, 1, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article52170107>; March 6, 1938, April 30, 1938, 2, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article52203669>; June 11, 1938, 2, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article52210619>; January 12, 1939, 2, March 15, 1939, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article52298277>, accessed March 16, 2012. Naomi Wolfe, a member of the Northern Tasmanian Aboriginal community, provided the oral evidence to support this claim.

19. “An Aboriginal Soldier,” *West Australian*, May 23, 1916, 5, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article26980190>, accessed March 16, 2012. This periodical was published in Perth from 1879 to 1954.

20. Private Grant’s service record is available online at <http://naa12.naa.gov.au/scripts/Imagine.asp?B=4663657>, accessed May 15, 2011. Grant was awarded a war pension in 1921 and died in Sydney in 1957.

21. "The Home Secretary's Statement," September 29, 1900, 708, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article21248995>, accessed March 16, 2012.
22. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 175. For an example of one such philanthropic adoption, see Margaret Jacobs, *White Mothers to a Dark Race* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009), chap. 5.
23. For details about Aboriginal wages, see Queensland Stolen Wages Fact Sheet, <http://www.reconciliation.qut.edu.au/issues/recweek/StolenWagesFactSheet.pdf>, accessed March 13, 2012.
24. These cases are reported in A/58749, miscellaneous subject batches, 1886–1920, half-castes, neglected children, and unprotected women; and A/58749, half-castes, neglected children, and unprotected women, 1904, Queensland State Archives 337181.
25. Ellen Herman, *Kinship by Design: A History of Adoption in the Modern United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), 84.
26. "Octoroon Girls Not Wanted in Melbourne," *Australian Women's Weekly*, September 8, 1934, 16, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article47478100>, accessed March 16, 2012.
27. "Jedda—Australian Drama," *Australian Women's Weekly*, December 8, 1954, 16, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article46946488>, accessed March 16, 2012. For details and clips from the film, see <http://aso.gov.au/titles/features/jedda/>, accessed March 14, 2012.
28. "Babies for the Brave," *Argus*, November 6, 1954, 1, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article23448221>, accessed March 16, 2012.
29. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 440.
30. Cheater, "My Brown Skin Baby," 183–84; Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 479; HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 9.
31. Isabel Carter, "The Aboriginal Cinderella," *Woman's Day with Woman*, September 8, 1958, n.d.
32. "Mission to Mansion," *Australian Women's Weekly*, June 12, 1957, 5, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article47119935>, accessed March 16, 2012.
33. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 576–77.
34. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 579.
35. Anna Haebich, *Spinning the Dream: Assimilation in Australia 1950–1970* (Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2008), 251. The Department of Community Welfare assumed responsibility for all adoptions in 1972 (252).
36. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 69.
37. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 44–45.
38. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 15.
39. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 45.
40. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 6.
41. Doreen Mellor and Anna Haebich, eds., *Many Voices: Reflections on Ex-*

periences of Indigenous Child Separation (Canberra: National Library of Australia, 2002), 129.

42. Cheater, "My Brown Skin Baby," 186.
43. Quentin Beresford and Paul Omaji, *Our State of Mind: Racial Planning and the Stolen Generations* (Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 1998), 112–13.
44. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 552–53.
45. Edwards and Read, *The Lost Children*, 15.
46. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 554–55.
47. Submission 227, *Commonwealth Contribution*.
48. "Should She Adopt an Aboriginal?," *Australian Women's Weekly*, November 16, 1960, 42, <http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-article46939323>, accessed March 16, 2012.
49. Shurlee Swain and Renate Howe, *Single Mothers and Their Children: Disposal, Punishment and Survival in Australia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 139–49.
50. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 549.
51. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 550; HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 41.
52. Valerie Linow, Submission 15, *Inquiry into Commonwealth Contribution*, http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate_Committees?url=clac_ctte/comm_contrib_former_forced_adoption/submissions.htm, accessed March 16, 2012.
53. Cheater, "My Brown Skin Baby," 183–84.
54. Patricia Wesche, "There Had to Be a Better Way [the Forced Removal of Aboriginal Children from Their Families]," *Meanjin* 57, no. 2 (1998): 379.
55. Peter Read, *A Rape of the Soul So Profound: The Return of the Stolen Generations* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1999), 37–38; Mellor and Haebich, *Many Voices*, 93.
56. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 163.
57. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 154.
58. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 411–12; Cheater, "My Brown Skin Baby," 192.
59. Mellor and Haebich, *Many Voices*, 65.
60. National Library of Australia, "Bringing Them Home Oral History Project," <http://nla.gov.au/nla.on-vn2046335>, accessed May 18, 2011.
61. Haebich, *Broken Circles*, 57.
62. Edwards and Read, *The Lost Children*, 20–21.
63. HREOC, *Bringing Them Home*, 29.