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Preface to the 1975 Edition

This volume represents an attempt to reveal and explain the sources of racial interaction in an Australian colonial setting. Dealing, as it does, with European — and mostly British — reactions to the main racial “minority” groups in the one colony, and over the same time period, it affords a unique opportunity to examine an entire corpus of racial thought, expression and behaviour by whites towards non-whites within a single, coherent and intelligible framework: a framework, moreover, which demonstrates definite patterns of racial conflict and colonial conquest, as well as the realities of racial subjugation, oppression and discrimination. Our title is therefore uncompromisingly blunt — and purposely so. The picture we mean to present is one of a white-dominated, though racially heterogeneous society, moving painfully — and, ultimately, vainly — towards a desired goal of white homogeneity and “racial purity”.

The choice of nineteenth century Queensland as the scenario for such developments is not made in order to imply that this colony was singularly outstanding among the rest in relation to racist ideas and actions. Rather, Queensland — which, hitherto, has been somewhat overlooked in Australian historical writings — has been selected to illustrate and exemplify general Australian racial trends in this period: and it seems especially well equipped to do so — having experienced a most dramatic attempt at Aboriginal extermination concurrent with a widely feared Chinese influx and the much-debated indentured servitude of Melanesians upon Queensland plantations. Additionally, significant minorities of Indians, Malays, Javanese and, later, Japanese were present in the Colony to give substance and persuasiveness to European phobias about racial inter-mixing and the looming necessity for a general ‘struggle for survival’. Whether such factors do give to Queensland a particular excessiveness or extremism in the realm of racial issues, we are not, at present, able to say. Detailed studies similar to this one and concentrating upon the problems herein raised, need to be undertaken into the situation in other colonies before this can be confidently assessed.

Our aim, then, is to examine the origins of racism — both structural and ideological — in Queensland’s colonial history in order to provoke thought about the wider Australian experience of this phenomenon; and, in doing so, we hope to cast a freshly critical light upon the precise nature of Australian nationalism. In attempting this, we have tried to utilize the widest range of source material available and to adopt the most sophisticated methodology possible.
Our approach, therefore, is essentially thematic rather than chronological and episodic. We have incorporated into our argument, wherever they seem most fitting, techniques and concepts of the newly emergent writings in the sociology of race relations, and introduced, at all points conceivable, fresh and, we feel, thoroughly convincing primary material to substantiate this argument.

We are especially concerned to see “racism” or “racialism” handled as serious historical and social concepts rather than being simply dismissed as pejorative terms of contemporary abuse. Further, the contact situations revealed in this book must be seen as much more than static set-pieces, fixed in time. For they represent human confrontations, incorporating the reasons, the emotions, the endurance and suffering of men and women, either voluntarily involved or accidentally caught up in social happenings they could not fully understand. The easiest response for us today is to condemn the exploiters and pity the exploited — and, indeed, some condemnation and pity do not seem to be entirely out of place here. Yet it is hardest, though more important, that we endeavour, principally to understand these people — and it is to this end that our efforts have been largely directed.

In offering our sincerest thanks to the many people who have expressed interest and provided help in the preparation of this work, we would like to mention, especially, two notable Queensland historians, Roger Joyce and Duncan Waterson, who have been constantly encouraging and sympathetic towards our efforts. We would like, additionally, to give special mention to economic historian, Frank Stevens who originally suggested the possibility of this study to our publishers. Our research has carried us to numerous libraries and archives and we are indebted, in every case, to their patient and competent staffs, namely: the Fryer and Hayes Collections, University of Queensland; the Oxley and Parliamentary Libraries, Brisbane; the Mitchell Library and New South Wales State Archives, Sydney; and the Latrobe Library, Melbourne. Our warmest appreciation, however, must go to the friendly painstaking people at the Queensland State Archives. We are very grateful, in turn, to the various typists and proof-readers who have slaved over the manuscript — and we thank, most volubly, our families and friends for enduring our interminable conversations upon the issues which this book raises.

May 1974

Raymond Evans
Kay Saunders
Kathryn Cronin
Preface to the 1988 Edition

Given the profusion of studies available on Australian race relations today, it is hard to imagine a time when this field was largely unexplored. Tertiary students, after some cautious introduction into this former *terra incognita*, can now speak with almost casual authority in tutorial debate about the “British invasion” of this continent, “extermination processes” and “black resistance”. But for us, working in the early 1970s — only some fifteen years ago — there existed an immense void in perception of such matters, and a resounding silence. This book was a product of our confronting that void and crying out against the silence; both its achievements and limitations are intimately connected with our attempt to chart relatively unknown shores.

By 1973, it should be emphasized, these shores of race relations were not completely uninhabited. W. E. H. Stanner’s Boyer Lectures of 1968, *After the Dreaming*, had provided a cognitive map, and Charles Rowley’s massive *Aboriginal Policy and Practice*, produced in three volumes during 1970 and 1971, had furnished us with a wide-ranging reconnaissance of a beckoning, though forbidding, landscape.¹ Little had been accomplished overall on the history of Aboriginal/European relationships, however. Henry Reynolds was the only professional historian who had produced a book, *Aborigines and Settlers* (1972), and this was an edited collection of documents; Stanner and Rowley were essentially historically-minded anthropologists.² Far less had been written upon such esoteric subjects as Melanesian or Chinese migrants and their colonial struggles. A. T. Yarwood’s pioneering *Asian Migration to Australia* (1964), along with similar studies by Kenneth Rivett, A. C. Palfreeman and H. I. London, focused upon administrative mechanisms of racial exclusion rather than internal patterns of racial association.³ The only volume of note about Melanesians was Peter Corris’s Pacific-trade oriented *Passage, Port and Plantation* (1973); those more lurid productions, *Cannibal Cargoes* (1969) and *The Blackbirders* (1970), by the non-academic writers Hector Holthouse and Edward Docker, simply tended to mythologize and sensationalize the topic.⁴ Virtually nothing of value was available on the Chinese apart from Arthur Huck’s very general overview, *The Chinese in Australia* (1968).⁵ There was little in any of these works directly confronting the historical problem of white racism in Australia.

That is why, as researchers working upon white interactions with Aborigines, Melanesians and Chinese in Queensland, we were greatly stimulated by the seemingly iconoclastic appearance, in 1972, of a three volume set of studies, boldly titled *Racism: The Australian Experience*, edited by economic historian, Frank Stevens. These
books seemed to herald a long overdue penetration of the Anglo-
Australian psyche, in search of the hidden roots of “race prejudice”. As a reading experience, Racism was thus cathartic in terms of what it frankly raised for public disclosure rather than what it ultimately deciphered. It fired a scatter-gun of disturbing articles into a formerly quiet public place and, to our ears, it carried the report of a starter’s pistol.

Reading and researching were not the only spurs to writing about race relations. In fact, one coda of this turbulent era was the persistent plaint: “Who has time to read?”. In 1973, Humphrey McQueen published, in a book of historiographical essays, a photograph of himself, striding out jauntily between two plain-clothed policemen. The caption read: “A historian at work: Humphrey McQueen being arrested in Canberra for distributing anti-conscription leaflets.”

Our concerns as historians were formed as much by our social experiences and political commitments as by the documents we researched. At a distance, it is easier now to see this integration of our seemingly compartmentalized lives. It was not only those days spent diligently working at the Queensland State Archives or the Fryer Memorial Library which shaped our intellectual perceptions. There were also other, angrier days spent in protesting against military conscription, the Vietnam war and apartheid; as well as those measureless times of debate on human liberation, women’s rights or class oppression. And there was, beside all this, that period of watching a land rights consciousness painfully emerge into political articulation and national prominence. Another coda of that time, acted out rather than stated, was: “We think, therefore we do”. Between the lines and behind the phrases of this book, a sense of these involvements must always echo, and it would be timorous now to deny them.

Of all those political engagements, the Springbok Rugby Union tour of Australia, between June and August 1971, was the one which fired our enthusiasm to write this book. Although Australia’s Vietnam involvement had once more provoked anti-Asian sentiment in this country, social researchers were telling us, as the seventies opened, that attitudinal racism was on the wane. To paraphrase a line in a contemporary song, it looked like it was dying, when — in terms of critical awareness — it had hardly been born. The South African Rugby tour, however, exposed the naked face of racism once more, outside the respectable halls of academia. From the sporting stadiums, we heard its unmistakably raucous roar.

Kathryn Cronin, working at Monash University on the Victorian goldfields’ Chinese for her doctoral dissertation, rang us on Saturday evening, 3 July, distraught and infuriated, to tell of her experiences at the Olympic Park oval that afternoon, during what Stuart Harris,
in *Political Football* (1972), called “The Battle in Melbourne”. In Brisbane we were soon plunged into our own State of Emergency — the largest campus in Australia on strike, the Exhibition arena entangled in barbed wire, the police riot at the Tower Mill motel, and, worst of all, the Toowoomba bashings, where police allowed racist football supporters to attack anti-apartheid demonstrators. “[Our] society was as deeply divided as it was during the Spanish Civil War and the Strikes of 1890–3”, Manning Clark concluded in March 1972. Anti-racism, in confronting an unswerving and unthinking sports mania, had released the old dogs of racial conflict once more.

The book’s original title inverted that of this new edition. Like the bold-face of Frank Stevens’s trilogy, with its stark, Rorschach-blot covers, we placed first the words “Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination”, to shout an abrasive message. The title did not belie the book’s contents. The robust and often unrelenting tone was quite consciously conceived to carry the debate on Australian racism into the camp of “the enemy”: that rather vaguely conceived “enemy” including the articulators of racism and the deniers of its presence in this country — often, paradoxically, one and the same. As Gary Foley and Harold Thomas designed the Aboriginal flag in 1972, we began to design this book, less portentously no doubt, yet with a similar impetus of passionate intent.

The actual writing by the three of us — sometimes in bleary, all-night sessions — took place between late November 1973 and early May 1974 (with the Brisbane floods intervening in January). Politically, it seemed a time of hope, with lost battles turning miraculously into victorious wars. The Rugby tour was not stopped, but from December 1972 all sporting ties with South Africa had been cut. The Vietnam moratoria had not defeated Australian militarism, but from the end of 1972 the troops were coming home. The Aboriginal Tent Embassy on the Parliamentary lawns, despite spirited defence, had fallen in July 1972, but the Woodward Commission was moving towards its recognition of special Aboriginal title to land from December. In seemingly triumphant progression, the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee, the Aboriginal Land Rights Commission and the Aboriginal Land Fund Commission followed in 1973 and 1974. The stridency of style in this volume needs, therefore, to be related as much to a sense of optimism as to that of rage.

The contribution the book has made to historical understanding may be modestly summarized. To begin with, no book like this had ever been written about Queensland, nor has any since. More importantly, no book had appeared before this in the Australian historiographical tradition which attempted to relate Anglo-Australian racism comprehensively to a range of targeted minority groups. No
Australian book had dealt so extensively with the historical phenomenon of racism as an integrated attitudinal, ideological and structural system of privilege and oppression. An exploration of that complex dialectic which developed between the European intellectual tradition of racism as a scientific "law" and its social practice in a distant colonial setting was here consciously informed and underpinned by our critical reading of the theories of John Rex, Eugene Genovese, Michael Banton, Marvin Harris and Philip Mason. (Significantly, Michael Banton would later use this book to develop a "Queensland Model" of race relations to gauge and offset racial procedures in South Africa, the United States of America and Great Britain.)

And, finally, no book on Australian race relations had been so diligently — perhaps obsessively — researched from archival sources, contemporary newspapers and manuscript collections. Cronin's 716 footnotes to Part Three, for instance, must surely represent something of a record in empirical homage! It was not, as some reviewers claimed, that all this referencing arose from the "fact" that the book's parts were the sum of several academic theses (they were not). It was just that a degree of textual quotation, which one might now consider excessive, was then deemed essential in order to document and substantiate something which had been so stoutly denied for so long.

We produced this book ourselves, with little institutional help. Our expressed intentions to pursue the spectre of racism were mostly greeted with academic apathy and unease — at times outright hostility. The only academics who bolstered our confidence to complete the task were Frank Stevens, who originally sold the idea of the volume to our first publisher; Duncan Waterson, whose enthusiasm for the project was infectious, and the late Roger Joyce, who cast a paternal eye over our earnest efforts. Unlike Charles Rowley, who had to weather an attempt to prevent the publication of *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society* in 1970, we were merely damned by faint interest. Yet, so early in our academic careers, this was daunting. When the book at last appeared, some of Brisbane's leading bookstores refused to stock it and the city's main daily newspaper neglected to review it.

Few authors will claim that their books ever receive the reviews they deserve. Yet this one was most favourably acknowledged by Henry Reynolds, Peter Corris, Bob Reece, Nonie Sharp and David Dunstan. It was assessed with balance and helpful reserve by Marie De Lepervanche, Stuart Rosewarne and Peter Hempenstall; and was least happily greeted by Andrew Markus and R.A. Wild. More worrisome, however, was the fact that *Labour History* seemed to place so narrowly Eurocentric a conception on labour relations that our "Exclusion book" was ignored in its review pages.
What has happened to Australian race relations history since this book appeared in 1975? In the preface to the first edition, we wondered whether the virulence of nineteenth-century racism in Queensland would be discovered to be as intensely replicated in other Australian colonies and states. "Detailed studies similar to this one and concentrating upon the problems herein raised need to be undertaken into the situation . . . before this can be confidently assessed," we added hopefully. That question has not been properly answered, and indeed, we were probably naive to expect that other Australian academics would become as preoccupied with the character of the Queensland experience as we were. In A. T. Yarwood and M. J. Knowling’s *Race Relations in Australia* (1982), the one study which has attempted, like our own, to examine "an entire corpus of racial thought, expression and behaviour by whites towards non-whites" — and that, across the entire continent — the Queensland situation is described as unique. In support of this conclusion, the authors suggest that it was the congruence of an indentured labour system and a violent frontier which made Queensland special. From this interaction, attitudes and values emerged which "produced in their most concentrated form the views associated with nineteenth century Australians, especially on racial questions . . . the behaviour of the Bjelke-Petersen government towards aborigines and its reaction to outside opinion, suggests the continuing influence of the nineteenth century trauma."

Other suggestions may be proffered which enhance this explanatory framework. A correlation of geography, climate and timing of settlement all conspired to promote Queensland’s uniqueness. It was the only colony where pastoral, mining and plantation frontiers were being advanced simultaneously, and this occurred as western racist theories were peaking in their certitude, extremism and infiltration. Frontier violence was exacerbated by an advanced weapons technology and the honing of superior conquest strategies from lessons learnt in conflicts further south. Aborigines in this region had realized, too, from the tragic experiences of others before them, that these whites were no spiritual sojourners, but inordinate usurpers who must be strongly resisted. Their numbers, relatively unravaged by the southern smallpox epidemics and sustained by often bountiful environments, were formidable.

Queensland, as an area of tropical and sub-tropical settlement, dominated by whites, attracted the widest range of ethnic minorities, many of whom were inducted into bonded labour arrangements. Squatters, planters and miners, often migrating from failure elsewhere, were intent upon material success, pursued with a ruthless singlemindedness. "Booty capitalism", linked to this economic desperation, produced a peculiarly coldblooded approach to ethnic
exploitation and social pluralism. This economic power, when linked with political force, produced such harsh features as quasi-slave communities of non-white labour, the killing machine of the Native Mounted Police and the first state-regulated system of racial segregation in Australia. Race rioting, too, was particularly severe and patterns of white endogamy (coupled with black sexual exploitation) were strictly maintained. The perception of Queensland as the "invasion colony" (and later "invasion state") of Australia, in relation to both Chinese and Japanese military scares, magnified anti-Asian sentiment considerably.

All the Australian colonies no doubt possessed elements of difference, each from the others, but Queensland was more different than most. Apart from the ambitious, integrative attempts by Henry Reynolds to understand the Australian frontier holistically, subsequent work upon race relations tends to reflect this fragmentation. Colonies such as Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia and the Northern Territory have had their frontier relations discreetly studied by Lyndall Ryan, Michael Christie, Bob Reece, Peter Biskup and Ann McGrath respectively, without much reference to such relationships elsewhere, or to other patterns of ethnic association within their own confines.11 Regional studies, such as those of Noel Loos and Dawn May on North Queensland, Evans and Walker on Wide Bay, Geoffrey Blomfield on the Falls district of central New South Wales, Don Watson on the Gippsland area, Neville Green and Susan Hunt on south-western and north-western Australia respectively, have usually tended to be even more elemental and introverted in their concerns, although Hunt does make an interesting attempt to interweave the experiences of white, black and Japanese women in her recent *Spinifex and Hessian* (1986).12 Despite useful overviews, like Richard Broome's *Aboriginal Australians* (1982) and Margaret Franklin's *Black and White Australians* (1976), no successful integrative study has been made of all the nuances of conflict, conflict resolution, conciliation and adaptation which such local studies disclose.13

Black historians and biographers in the 1980s have added interpretive dimensions which were clearly unforeseen when *Race Relations in Colonial Queensland* first appeared. Their purview is usually not that of a colony or region, but rather the microcosm of a tribal society or a clan, within which the individual struggle for survival and dignity is cast. Black historians like James Miller, Hazel McKellar and Phillip Pepper;14 black autobiographers like Marnie Kennedy, Kath Walker, Robert Bropho, Charles Perkins, Ida West, Elsie Roughsey and Willie Thaiday;15 and black interviewers like Kevin Gilbert and Bill Rosser have generally paid less attention to white destructiveness than to black endurance, the retention of culture and
a general triumph of the human spirit among Koori and Murri people, in spite of all the horrors which a work such as this one underlines.\textsuperscript{16} We would like to think of our findings, therefore, as compassionate with theirs, although undoubtedly far more pessimistic.

Less concerted activity may be detected in the areas of Melanesian and Chinese studies in Australia. Clive Moore's excellent oral and regional historical work has built upon and refined frameworks first constructed by Corris and Saunders in the seventies and early eighties.\textsuperscript{17} Ralph Shlomowitz's plethora of econometric articles and Adrian Graves's more contentious transcultural application of proletarianization theory have added new dimensions of economic rationality to this field.\textsuperscript{18} Apart from Faith Bandler's \textit{Wacvie}, Melanesians have yet to produce their own Australian history.\textsuperscript{19} Several Chinese historians (such as Sing-wu Wang, C. H. Choi, C. Yong and J. Gittens) have advanced their own versions of the other side of the gold-rush.\textsuperscript{20} Of the European-written accounts, Cronin's work on the Victorian Chinese experience, \textit{Colonial Casualties} (1982), outshines both Charles Price's bureaucratic survey of the nineteenth century and Andrew Markus's overreaching cross-cultural comparison of California and Australia.\textsuperscript{21}

If this book were written today, instead of fifteen years ago, perhaps more emphasis would be devoted to the political economy of race relations and the way in which class and gender themes intersect with those of ethnicity. Non-white perspectives would doubtless be larger in the text and the interrelationships between Aborigines, Melanesians and Chinese themselves (minus the convenient European conduit) would be explored. More oral testimony might be garnered from, say, Cherbourg, Malaita or Kwangtung. But this study is reproduced here in its original form to stand as a durable artefact — as a conscientious product of its time. And clearly, as the Bicentennial year begins, with Aboriginal land rights still an unfulfilled agenda, with police brutality and black deaths in custody a commonplace occurrence, with racist thought and expression in resurgence and calls for Asian exclusion ever resounding, that time continues today.

August 1987

Raymond Evans
Kay Saunders

NOTES TO PREFACE


Preface to the 1993 Edition

The logo upon the cover of this third edition of *Race Relations in Colonial Queensland* was first drawn in 1883 by *Bulletin* cartoonist, Livingstone Hopkins (alias "Hop") to censure and lampoon Queensland premier, Sir Thomas McIlwraith's aborted imperial grab for territory in Papua/Nuigini that same year. Yet its depiction of a grasping white male colonist bestriding the Queensland landmass, his great boots firmly planted upon its territory and his uncoiling stockwhip labelled "SLAVERY" resolutely in hand, was also a pictorial representation of a long accumulated reputation which had marked the colony off as a particularly savage place in its general dealings with indigenes and non-European migrants. Although rather crudely summarized in the raw power of Hop's ungainly caricature, it was a reputation that was entirely deserved. Indeed, it was the kind of image which was intended by its maker to cut to the bone, incorporating as it did reverberations of a particularly brutal convict past at Moreton Bay and, in the wider colony, a record of frontier violence against Aborigines and intense labour discipline exerted over Melanesian and Asian contract workers which had assumed, at various embarrassing moments during the nineteenth century, the dimensions of an imperial scandal.

Yet the stockwhip, as a symbol of colonial power, was not necessarily regarded so pejoratively by leading Queensland journalists and political spokespersons themselves. As a popular motif of white domination, it could clearly by utilized to cut both ways. Just five years after the appearance of Hop's famous cartoon, the local *Queensland Figaro* ran another illustration, entitled "McIlwraith To The Rescue", which depicted Sir Thomas, astride a galloping horse, wielding a stockwhip over the heads of a group of Chinese goldminers, who scattered in panic before his advance. Such an image was published, however, not to censure the politician for the extremism of his anti-Asian position, but rather to boost his successful campaign for the premiership during the 1888 Queensland elections. The vehemence of this campaign would contribute, in Brisbane, to the worst racial rioting on the Eastern Australian seaboard during the massive anti-Chinese mobilizations of that year. Speaking seven years later at a grand London dinner, organized in honour of Queensland sugar planter and Melanesian recruiter, Charles Rawson, and attended by some of Queensland's most powerful men, the Chairman of Proceedings, Sir Edwyn Sandys Dawes, the British shipping magnate, recalled with affection yet another example of Sir Thomas McIlwraith's fabled dexterity. "Some few years ago when Sir Thomas was visiting me", he
informed the assembled diners, “the conversation at dinner turned up
upon the question of the Aborigines of Queensland, and he was asked
what sort of people they were. He replied, not at all in a
boasting way, that he would undertake to disperse an army of them
with a stockwhip [Laughter].”

McIlwraith had then gone on to tell Dawes about the Aborigines’
alleged cannibalism, caused by their apparent lack of intelligence.
Not having enough brains “to provide themselves with food in times
of great distress”, the Premier explained, “they had resorted to eating
one another and thus it became a custom”. Surely the kind of people
who needed to be kept vigilantly at a stockwhip’s length! But that was
all now in the past, Dawes assured his 1895 dinner guests:

...what is happening now? Queensland, peopled by a superior race, not only amply
provides itself with food but is sending vast supplies abroad...It was not with the
military genius of Colonel Feez, nor the naval tactics of Captain Heath that we
conquered Queensland, but with the stockwhip we have just heard of. Looking
around this table, I see many men who have carried the stockwhip, and are as proud
of their deeds with this weapon as their military forefathers were of the sword, and
point to their flocks of sheep and their huge herds of cattle as the results of their
labours.

Preparing this 1993 preface almost a century later, therefore, we
pertinently employ this stockwhip motif in order to flick open a
perceptual window upon such a seemingly different world as this. It
was a world where white men were normally unabashed about admit-
ting to how they held the whip-hand in most race relations situations;
and where they justified the apparent inevitability of that dominance
by a sweeping gesture towards technological advantage, material
progress, Divine will or natural law. A world, in short, which wore its
racism upon its sleeve as a measure of white worth — as a boast, as
an assertion of lived realities or as a scientific dictum. In this world,
racism was not “a dirty word”, much less a well-examined label to
typify a system of expropriation, marginalization and disprivilege. In
fact, it was not a word at all but rather “a way of life” — a way of being
and of seeing which validated colonial expropriation and its con-
comitants in the interests of the expropriators; and which adjusted
like a changing lens to the happenings of the past and the needs of
the present.

Colonial racism, therefore, was never enduringly monolithic. It
altered over time and was replete with internal inconsistencies, blind
spots and loop-holes. It was at no time without its local critics and
detractors, but these were few in number and culturally suspect in
their modes of interpretation. Their place in the prevailing discourse
about how the contemporary world worked was invariably an uneasy
or extruded one. Although they mounted at times what appears in
hindsight to have been a telling critique of European dispossession or exploitation, few paused to listen to it. For the resistance of the colonizer who will not behave like other colonizers, and yet cannot become one of the colonized, is a politically truncated form of protest, which has no effective basis in mass support. Those who were consistently racism's targets — displaced, marginalized, used and diminished by the demands of colonialism — also did not suffer their belittlement gladly and struggled to make the best of the circumscribed world that it forged for them. Yet predominating outcomes were more often determined for them than being matters of their own determination. In their normally deprived and disempowered state under colonial rule, they remained acutely aware that those who now called the shots had also once fired the shots — and could do so still.

This world of the past, it is conventionally noted, is another country, although it remains in certain key respects our own country too, as we continue to reap its harvests — whether bountiful or bitter. Yet, for historians, this other country has been — and will undoubtedly remain — a much contested territory. This was clearly the case when this book (along with other titles) was first written almost two decades ago to challenge the prevailing orthodoxy of peaceful white settlement and the seemingly unimpeachable credentials of western civilization's Antipodean advance. The volume represents one of the most uncompromising revelations of the nether side of this advance, employing along with the historical tools of analytical research and reconstruction, a sociological model of conflict relations in order to expose the scars of colonialism and to help explain how and why such wounds were inflicted. In the process, as Reynolds notes, it registers "the most meticulously researched" documentation of frontier violence available, accompanied by closely studied accounts of the forceful nature of Queensland's plantation and pastoral economies, as well as the fitful racial struggles waged around the extraction of precious mineral resources. Over all this, the gathering obsession of Anglo-Australian colonists for an assiduous "ethnic cleansing", which became more and more compelling as the century advanced, is seen to hang.*

Around the time that we were preparing a second edition of this volume in 1987, however, a new explanatory paradigm of Australian race relations was being constructed. Bolstered by such major works as Clive Moore's *Kanaka: A History of Melanesian Mackay* (1986) and Ann McGrath's "*Born in the Cattle": Aborigines in Cattle Country* (1987), this new paradigm challenged the earlier contestational model by emphasizing instead strategies of accommodation and
adaptation developed by Melanesians in the Pacific and Aborigines in the Northern Territory, both to cooperate with and even to extract advantage from imposed European economic enterprises. Such studies as these serve to remind us graphically that no system of encroachment and coercion, however exacting in its intentions, is ever entirely successful in its actual implementation of exploitative measures; and that the human capacity for survival, acculturative ingenuity and creative self-interest, though dimmed, is rarely entirely extinguished.¹

Yet it would seem to be quite misleading to suggest, as some writers have done, that this newer emphasis upon patterns of cooperation and consensus represents a paradigm of human agency as opposed to a “rather one-dimensional” Seventies’ paradigm of victimization. For the colonized inhabitants of this volume, like those in other studies from the so-called “dispossession-resistance” school of historiography, do not, as one writer charges, “seem to stand stock still...and allow things to happen to them”. Even a cursory perusal of this book’s index will reveal, under such headings as “Aborigines”, “Chinese” and “Melanesians”, substantial references to such categories as “resistance of”, “violence by”, “petitions of” and “strikes of”. We were at pains to give the colonized an historic presence and, where feasible in a large overview such as this, to provide them with individualized attention. Indeed, this was one of the first studies where the agency of the colonised’s resistance became an extensive feature of analysis, particularly in relation to indigenous responses.²

Subsequently, Aboriginal resistance patterns were to be more substantially charted by Evans and Walker (1977) — “the first attempt to write Aboriginal history ‘from the inside’ ” — Ryan (1981), Reynolds (1981, 1987) and Loos (1982), with the latter three authors adding considerable refinement, depth and sophistication to the overall resistance model. It should scarcely require mentioning, of course, that it is in the essence of skilled resistance fighting not to “stand stock still” but rather to wage highly mobile campaigns of attrition. Rather, all that does seem to be standing “stock still” here are the doomed straw figures constructed by one outspoken accommodationist in order simply to demolish them. Similarly, in relation to the historic actions of other oppressed ethnic groups, Saunders in Workers in Bondage and Cronin in Colonial Casualties, both published in 1982, would further develop their appreciation of Melanesian and Chinese “agency”, in order to chart strategies of resistance by these people against oppressive plantation labour regimes on the one hand and restrictive “protectorates” and discriminatory poll taxes on the other. The concept of “agency” is therefore scarcely the creation of
the consensualists, although the term itself may not have been so
modishly employed by earlier writers.7

And there is good reason for this. Agency, in the precise meaning
of the term, implies choice; and choice, in turn, is contingent upon
a voluntary decision to embrace one of several feasible, available
alternatives. Yet the concept of freedom of choice becomes a most
contentious and dubious one when considered within a milieu of
colonial land-seizure, slaughter and general subjugation. Even exer-
cising one's "agency" for resistance in the face of this offensive
bespeaks of a painful kind of voluntarism, extracted largely in retali-
ation to the force of an extraneous assault, rather than being "freely"
or "willingly" adopted. It becomes an even more problematical
construct when the agency of accommodation is considered. When
Reece writes that "accommodation with Europeans was something
for which Aborigines strove" in the Perth district, or when Fels argues
for "positive Aboriginal choice...[and their] moving with remark-
able ease across cultural boundaries" at Port Phillip, the onus is upon
such writers to demonstrate effectively how choice operates in situ-
ations of colonization, where patterns of European force and closure
tend to impose certain tightly demarcated parameters around the
ongoing behaviours of invaded peoples.8 How much room to ma-
noeuvre can really be said to exist in such circumstances of land-loss,
decimation, kin alienation and cultural trauma? Are such writers
depicting an accommodation which was voluntarily sought or ac-
cepted; or rather are they describing reactions of submission and/or
collaboration which have been orchestrated through an often mas-
Sive strategical application of European confiscation, power and
violence, or at least the demonstrable threat of the same? As Attwood
has perceptively commented upon the "accommodation-consensus"
paradigm:

...the Aboriginal men who engaged themselves as stockmen [in McGrath's ac-
count] and Fels' men who joined the native police are credited with a degree of
choice and prescience which individuals seldom have; their desires and intentions
are too often confused with actual outcomes, which were more likely to have been
determined by Europeans.9

One way around this difficulty has been for accommodationist
history to opt for an interpretation of Australian frontier relations
which delimits the impact of violent conflict, either in actual extent
or in its repercussions. Thus McGrath uses frontier force and struggle
simply as a backdrop for Aboriginal actions which she believes are
best explained by reference to other causes. The detailed mechanics
of how Warlpiri and Gurinji country became "cattle country" are
simply glossed. Frontiers similarly tend to fade into the background,
due to the time-frame adopted in Bain Attwood's *The Making of the
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Aborigines (1989). Marie Fels, in Good Men and True (1988) seriously reduces the number of Europeans killed by resisting Aborigines in Victoria as well as the number of blacks despatched by native troops (as suggested in the works of Christie, Gardner and Critchett), as though such kill ratios really are unproblematically and objectively quantifiable. Along with Gordon Reid’s A Picnic with the Natives (1990), Fels also denies that stock raidings by Aborigines represent clear examples of frontier resistance. Furthermore, she does not believe that frontier struggle can be legitimately termed as warfare. Reid takes this reductionism a step further. He argues that Aboriginal oral evidence of massacres cannot be accepted unless confirmed by other sources, and as a result that “no serious violence” occurred in the Territory between 1905 and 1928.10

Thus we have the instructive paradox of McGrath, on the one hand, largely endorsing the oral testimony of black informants as they invoke a nostalgic recollection of better times on pastoral properties; with Reid, on the other, denying the very efficacy of such testimony whenever it speaks of destruction and terror in roughly the same region and time-zone! As Moore’s work has demonstrated, oral testimony by the colonized and their descendants is by no means uniform and corroborative. Melanesian descendants in Queensland reiterate memories of kidnapping whilst those in the Pacific islands highlight active engagement in the sugar industry. Impelled by the logic of the recruitment programme, Moore opts for the latter interpretation, although he posits a concept of “cultural kidnapping”, which advantaged European outcomes over those of the Pacific Islanders themselves.11

Yet the main thrust of such accommodationist research has been to marginalize or deny the ubiquity of force, conflict and violence, which is invariably a concomitant of the global march of European imperialism and colonialism elsewhere. In the process, these writers not only circumscribe the very significance of the colonized’s own agency for resistance but they also subscribe to a particularly pervasive brand of Australian exceptionalism which has, in recent times, constructed images of convictism without undue severity, capitalism without serious class conflicts and inequalities, patriarchy with happy and egalitarian families, and colonialism without serious racial rioting or genocide. (“Oh Lucky Country”, indeed!)13

Part of this pattern of conservative revisionism and denial has been a tendency to accuse conflict histories, such as this one, not only of “distortions”, “anti-colonial polemic”, “moral indignation” and even of “conventional wisdom parading as history”; but also of an unbecoming “enthusiasm to document the bloodiness” of Australian race relations.14 “Histories of colonial blood and horror”, such as Race
Relations in Colonial Queensland, the reviewer Gillian Cowlishaw recently writes, seem to be bereft of serious social analysis and simply to revel in the power to provoke a visceral “shock” among uninitiated readers — somewhat like an intellectual equivalent of the “penny dreadful”. Such a preoccupation, in turn, is viewed by others as a once understandable, though now most questionable product of “the dogmatism and moral outrage” of the the early Seventies. We leave it to our readers to decide whether Cowlishaw’s criticisms of the level of analysis herein are fair and accurate ones; but we nevertheless feel that it is imperative to re-emphasize that the shock of the old which we hope this study might invoke will not be that shock of “disgusted horror” which Cowlishaw registers, but rather a widespread shock of recognition, and with it a more realistic re-evaluation of the colonial past. In short, we are seeking intellectual engagement not raw emotional recoil. And, with a coterie of present historians implying that such detailed conflict research is somehow no longer relevant to present needs, and that evidence of bloodshed is itself somehow intellectually sullied, simplistic and politically suspect, there would seem, dialectically, to be even more call for the administration of such “short, sharp shocks” today.

Since we first wrote this book, the demographic consensus upon the number of indigenes occupying the land-mass we now call Australia has increased that overall total as much as three-fold. The number of Aboriginal people surviving by Federation, however, remains roughly the same low figure that it was then. Although it is incumbent upon us to study the histories of these survivors and their descendants, giving due weight to their many strategies of endurance, surely it is at least equally compelling for us as historians never to shrink from understanding the procedures whereby more than ninety per cent of that original pre-invasion population had vanished by 1901. Those twin processes of disease and violence — the dual accompaniments of warfare and forceful population intrusion the world over — demand our resolute, ongoing investigation. Both as academics and seriously engaged citizens, it is our brief not simply to throw up our hands, exclaiming “the horror, the horror!” like Conrad’s Mr Kurtz, and then turning away; but rather to hold those patterns of turbulent interaction with a fixed, steely-eyed, deductive gaze. For, what really matters more in this process of reconstruction — the poor, potentially bruised consciences of white Australians or the fate of those myriads of poor, bruised bodies buried (and still being buried) beneath the crumbling sod of generations of suppression and neglect?

We must also try to perceive the survivors’ positions in the light of this overall colonial onslaught, not simply as individual achievers,
projecting themselves advantageously into a new and engaging social world. Accommodationist writings are replete with what colonized peoples had to gain by their own “initiative” and active “cooperation” with their colonizers, but invariably fall curiously silent upon all that was lost and suffered. The colonizers took so much, not only all of the land, the watercourses and sacred sites for their own material purposes, decimating the game and destroying the flora in the process; but also they took women and children wholesale; they “souvenired” weapons, implements and other handiwork; they razed Aboriginal habitations, defaced their artistic works and shot their hunting dogs. They took lives in incalculable numbers and even then, when corpses were not incinerated or buried en masse in unmarked graves, they took away the skulls and other bones of the dead in their many thousands, often from inviolable resting places, in order to establish “scientifically” the immutable worthlessness of the living. All these processes occurred in Queensland (and elsewhere) not atypically but almost as a matter of course. As late as 1919, a well known Queensland pastoralist in the Mitchell district wrote to the director of the Queensland museum:

In reply to yours of 2nd inst. I looked up the local Golgotha, a large hollow box tree, where 6 blacks were buried but some other body snatcher had been there and I could only procure two skulls and two lower jaws which I don’t think belong to heads. The smaller skull I think will interest you. I think the person who used it [sic] must have had relations at Talgai; it doesn’t seem to have the usual quarters but maybe was a freak. There are some whites living who knew these blacks when alive especially the Gins as they were all or nearly all buried since the white horror [sic] invaded Australia. There are no blacks here now — the so called aborigines protection Act has done its dreadful work. The poor natives have either been forced into slavery or sent to the Death settlements on Islands and other places; like the NZ fern you cannot transplant a native from his old toxmi — and a permanent billet with no walkabout to him is slavery...

I will ask all old hands for skulls for you. Mr Jack Marsh, Hillsborough, Mitchell should be a good mark for you to write to re. dead and living natives. Let me know any time what sort of specimens you want and I will only be too pleased to get them if I can and I am sure Mr Marsh will do so if you write him.

My brother Donald...daresay...has told you there are many natives buried in trees and ground near his place Boolarwill that if not removed should be easily got...

In the light of such accounts, it seems strange that accommodationist analyses should concentrate so much upon the prescient and rewarding adaptation of the colonized, but never examine such syndromes as the consequences of profound grief and depression, patterns of psychological trauma, similar to those experienced by disaster and torture sufferers, or that poignant set of reactions known...
as "survivors' guilt" — that irrational shame that they should be the ones to live on when their friends, parents, brothers and sisters died — such as experienced by the living victims of Soviet collectivization in the 1930s, the Nazi holocaust during World War Two or American Atomic bomb explosions in Japan in 1945."

If, as some accommodationist critics contend, the "blood and thunder" writing of race conflict historians was merely a reflex of its time, rather than a more substantive exercise in encapsulating predominant colonial trends, then we might equally suggest that the more recent "harmony and initiative" history — the "new Conservatism", as Peter Read has termed it — is similarly a production of the 1980s, that decade of consensus politics and Industrial Accord, of possessive individualism and entrepreneurial adulation, as well as of receding race, class and gender mobilizations and collective victories. It has not simply arisen from a closer and more "subtle" awareness of what the colonized have to say. For what certain Aboriginal informants have told researchers like Ann McGrath differs dramatically from what others have revealed to black interviewers like Kevin Gilbert, Bill Rosser, and Jackie Huggins, or even to a string of white investigators like Frank Stevens, Peter Read, Luise Hercus, Deborah Bird Rose, Myra Tonkinson, Bill Thorpe, Lyn Riddett, Thom Blake, Joanne Watson, Christine Halse and Therese Forde. In all such latter cases, it is the images of oppression and suffering, slaughter and theft — though valiantly contended — which are invariably reflected upon the most graphically."

Aboriginal history, in the fullest sense of that term (i.e. written by Aborigines as well as about them) is increasingly being produced, along with a more modestly expanding shelf of titles by Torres Strait Islanders, Melanesian and Chinese descendents as well as other non-Anglo migrants. These studies will increasingly probe the largely Anglo-Celtic academic works written by both conflict and consensus professional historians. Although still largely "narrator-centred" studies, emphasizing the accomplishment of survival in an Anglo-dominated society, such accounts must inevitably turn to uncovering more forbidding folk memories. As Murri historian, Jackie Huggins has recently explained such a trajectory:

"...many Aboriginal contemporary writers have not yet demonstrated that they have come to grips of their conflictful past. What of the gory details...? It is, in itself, a great psychological blockage for Aboriginal people when attempting to analyse violence both past and ever-present. What has happened here? Have these stories been lost, not passed down, discouraged or concealed by white officials, deemed as false recollections, exaggerations and distortions? Probably all these factors have contributed to the temporary amnesia of Aboriginal writers in regard to the massacres. It may also be too hurtful for Aboriginal people to recognize."
Perhaps older Aboriginal writers' works have an air of conservatism due to the "controls" under which Aboriginal people of their generation were placed; whether they had been forcibly moved to reserves, had children taken away, been subjected to assimilationist policies and so on... It remains to be seen if younger Aboriginal writers who have not experienced the rigours of such stringent controls will be able to piece together a more cogent appraisal of the violence directed at Aboriginal society, particularly the massacres... Such writing may... help in healing a deep and festering wound and help us come to terms with our grieving process.

It seems certain that, as such flood-gates of memory are at last opened, it will render what is written here — however "horrific" and "awful" it may still seem to some white readers — as a mere bagatelle. At the same time (and probably, as a product of the more sober and reflective Nineties!) a renewed spate of white written conflict histories are now appearing, such as Roger Milliss's mammoth effort on New South Wales, Cassandra Pybus's intimate Tasmanian account, Peter Gardner's and Jan Critchett's closely researched works on Victoria, Andrew Markus's and Lyn Riddett's challenging analyses of the Northern Territory, as well as a large clutch of exciting dissertations upon Queensland's frontiers, reserves and missions, a number of which are presently in the process of publication. Henry Reynolds, though remaining primarily a conflict historian, has recently acceded somewhat to an accommodationist paradigm, however, by arguing in With the White People (1990) that Aboriginal "pioneering" for the invader was just as important as resistance against them — that neither response predominated. Although both reactions of accommodation and confrontation undoubtedly occurred across the Australian mainland and Tasmania, we would like here to re-assert the primacy of race relations conflict, based upon ongoing Queensland research, and to add that conceptual tools like "accommodation" and "pioneering" might more accurately and fruitfully be replaced by ones of "uneven negotiation" and "contested subjection". We are, in short, sticking to our interpretive guns, much as those European settlers of colonial Queensland, upon the perilous borderlands of early racial interaction, so demonstrably stuck to theirs.

August 1992
Raymond Evans
Kay Saunders
Kathryn Cronin
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INTRODUCTION

“Keep White The Strain”

Race relations in a colonial setting

RAYMOND EVANS

... if ... [the natives] put in an appearance some of these days on the heights above Cooktown and we were all suddenly summoned to arms, ... the 'Courier' 'expects that every man will do his duty'.

_Cooktown Courier_, 4 July 1874

Should [the 'Kanakas'] take it into their heads to resort to violence, the certain consequences would be 'murder'. Black and inferior races cannot be allowed the same latitude as Europeans.

Charles Horrocks, Inspector of Pacific Islanders, Maryborough 1877

The Chinese are getting 500,000 rifles manufactured in Europe. Load up, Australians!

_Boomerang_, 5 September 1891

_Late in November 1887_, the _Carpentaria Times_ carried a small item concerning "a diabolical slaughter of ... blacks" by the Normanton Native Police. The newspaper calculated that:

... three of the aboriginals frequenting the ... telegraph station were found dead not far away in the bush. Three more are missing, and the remaining blacks say they are dead too.

Notwithstanding the paper’s choice of the adjective ‘diabolical’, such news was fairly routine and was featured among paragraphs concerning the formation of a Normanton Fire Brigade, the drowning of an unidentified man, and the price of harness leather. Yet there was something special about this case nevertheless, for the natives who had been shot down were not of the ‘wild’ variety usually subjected to such treatment, but were, instead, from among a group of pacified and broken-spirited hangers-on at the outskirts of white settlement. When a closed and inconclusive inquiry was held into this incident one week later on board the steamer _Vigilant_, anchored off Normanton, the
reason why these seemingly innocuous natives had been driven off and some shot down became apparent. The telegraph officer had complained strongly to the police that:

... he could not keep the blacks off his verandah or out of his house and as most of them were diseased it was most disgusting the sights that sometimes met [the] eyes of his family...

Constable Lorigan informed the enquiry that he had been told that, "... it was most disgraceful and dangerous to have naked blacks about ... that the great part of the blacks were affected and using the only water near the place". Thus, because they had posed a moral and sanitary threat to the Europeans at this pilot and telegraph station by their nudity and illness and their need for shelter and water, these "half-civilized niggers" had been hunted away and a number indiscriminately and uncere­moniously 'put out of their misery'.

A resort to expulsion and bullets where charity and medicine were really required seemed an extreme and brutal reaction, but the Normanton Herald had, sometime earlier, been preaching this former tactic. The editor, a man named Booth, had argued that it was "more of a mercy than a crime to wipe [vagabond natives] off the face of the earth". And in response to the question 'why?', Booth had provided all the answers:

Considering the terrible nuisance these semi-civilized savages are generally in Northern Communities, considering their faithlessness and treachery, and how often ... they have been known to raise knives, axes and revolvers to their masters and mistresses ... considering their propensity for brandy, considering that the niggers are propagat­ing with terrible rapidity the most dreaded form of the syphilitic virus and ruining hundreds of men's con­stitutions ... therefore such "wretches" had to go.

The revulsion exhibited towards these indigenes, extravagant as it was, was itself overshadowed in June 1888, however, by the remarkable activities of white townspeople of Normanton against the coloured alien population there. Since April 1888, the local press had been agitating over the threat posed by the presence of this growing number of, chiefly, Malays and Chinese in the settle­ment, who already composed one-sixth of the local population. When, in mid-June, during a festival among the Malay community, one of their number ran "amuck" and murdered three white men, this atrocity provided the necessary catalyst for a
full scale race-riot by the Europeans. As the Hon. A.H. Palmer later explained to the Queensland Legislative Assembly, "the outrage... only led up to what had been culminating for a long time." The whites of Normanton, exhibiting signs of both "great excitement" and "panic", met at the School of Arts on the 16th June and in a fiery meeting, during which all Chinese and other coloured men present "were seized and dragged out and thrown in the street", lynchings were advocated and the Government was called upon to remove every alien from the Colony. The townsmen dismissed all their coloured servants and at midnight 200 whites gathered on the Normanton Wharf. Armed with firesticks, this yelling mob proceeded to the alien quarter and began to put it to the torch. While the coloured inhabitants fled, eighteen houses were burnt to the ground. The rioting continued the following day with more firing of buildings, and although special constables were sworn in to aid the regular police, these were "worse than useless". The mob simply proved too strong for them. As the then Colonial Secretary, B.D. Morehead described the incident:

The white people of Normanton became panic stricken, and rose almost en masse, against the coloured people there; the police found that the only way in which they could protect the coloured people was to put them on board the hulk in the river. The number of police was not sufficient to deal with the almost near revolution which took place at Normanton.

As well as a large body of Malays sequestered in the hulk, a variety of other coloured men were placed on board. An American Negro who had just arrived in the town by steamer was seized. The Queenslander reported, "one coloured man who was carrying a swag was compelled by a party of horsemen to go at a jog-trot for fully three miles to the hulk" and even a Spanish carrier was incarcerated there. The white settlers then demanded that the whole bunch be forcibly deported and the terrified detainees were finally offered the choice of facing the hostile mob or being sent to Thursday Island. They wisely chose the latter alternative. In Parliament, A.H. Palmer stated boldly that he wished:

... to vindicate the name and fair fame of Normanton in this affair. The people there were driven to great straits, and I believe they acted in a self-contained and moderate manner, considering the circumstances in which they were placed. The material for the breaking out had existed there for months, and perhaps years past, as a very large number
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of those alien and very objectionable races were congre-
gated there and were a sore in the midst of the people.

... I do not know either if it was a very illegal act to deport
those men ... I do not think there is a town in Australia
where the people would suffer quietly what the Normanton
people suffered. So that there is very little, if any, blame
attached to them for taking the law into their own hands.

In answer to Palmer's justification of lynch law in the cause of
white supremacy, however, the Premier, Sir Thomas MacIlwraith
countered:

The people of Normanton were never in the slightest danger
from the coloured men who were expelled ... There never
was the slightest ... [chance] that the white people there
would not be able to protect themselves against the blacks.

Yet MacIlwraith recognized another danger which he also
interpreted in terms of the interests of Queensland's white
population. This danger was "that by some act on the part of the
people of Normanton, the fair fame of the colony might be
tarnished".11

In July 1888, the expelled party of eighty-four coloured men
"chiefly Malays, but including Spanish, French and American
coloured subjects"12 arrived at Thursday Island by steamer and
the police, anticipating trouble from these disgruntled passen-
gers, were again placed on the alert. Their reception by the small
number of white residents was once again hostile, for the existing
farrago of coloured races on the Island, which included Melane-
sians, Malays, Japanese, Cingalese, Chinese, Aborigines and
Torres Strait Islanders was considered "already too troublesome,
being largely in excess of the European residents".13

The responses demonstrated above to non-Caucasian races,
both indigenous and foreign, by the white people of Normanton
and — to a less dramatic extent — Thursday Island are startlingly
eloquent examples in microcosm, of a general colonial response
to coloured peoples which was prevalent at this time. The years
1887 to 1889, it should be remembered, marked the peak of
virulent anti-Chinese agitation in Queensland, with rioting in
centres as far apart as Brisbane, Clermont and Croydon. At this
same time, colonial liberals, representing both white middle and
working class opinions, were congratulating themselves over
their success at ensuring the expulsion of Melanesian labourers
from the colony — a deportation which was to take effect from 1
January 1891. The weekly "democratic" journal, the Boomerang
had, under the control of the radical William Lane and the liberal
J.G. Drake, been an outspoken advocate in both these causes. In January 1891, when it passed under the editorship of A.G. Stevens and Gresley Lukin, and boasted such notables on its staff as Henry Lawson and Archibald Meston, the Queensland Aboriginal expert, it promised, as part of its policy, "the same old drawing of the colour line".14

The paper found cold comfort in winning the battle against 'kanaka' labour, however, for, in the wake of the departing Islanders, some plantation-owners were planning to introduce Italian contract workers. The Boomerang wrote:

... and now with this point gained by white Queenslanders and lovers of the Anglo-Saxon race, surely we should not sacrifice ourselves and our country on the altars of Italian cheap labour with all its concomitant evils... the [Italian] cheap labour article must be acknowledged by every well-wisher of the higher civilized races to be non-conducive to the progress and higher development of the human species.

The Southern Italian worker was depicted as "vagrant... a fruitful source of danger" and "a menace to the decency of social life". He was seen as an even greater racial threat than the retiring Melanesian for, the paper argued:

The kanaka is comparatively harmless; he could not successfully struggle against us; he is freed of extinction. But the fiery Italian is as explosive as his native mountains and would overflow lava-like our regions and institutions.

Again, what were the "tribal quarrels of insular cannibals", which white Queenslanders had had to contend with, compared to:

... the contingency of a mafia or camorra being established in our midst; of labour disputes and family quarrels being settled by the knife and of the terror of organized assassination being substituted for the law-enforced quiet and safety of our towns... We want no blood-liquifying lazaroni from the Vesuvian capital to let daylight into us — no 'Sicilian cooks' to spoil our 'broth'.15

The objections, therefore, can be clearly seen to have gone far beyond a simple and reasonable economic concern. Introducing, as it did, concepts of moral and social pollution and appeals to 'lovers of the Anglo-Saxon race', the protest was couched in distinctly racist terms. It was the swarthier Southern Italians who
were dubbed "the Chinese of Europe" and execrated as "scum and refuse", while the lighter-skinned "thriving highly paid and long-headed Piedmontese... the Scotchmen of Italy" were distinctly preferred. The planter-parliamentarian, Hume Black, as a potential employer of the proposed 400 Italian labourers, admitted, "I have no particular hankering after Italians, if we could only induce some European farmers — men of our own colour — to accept these terms...", while the Hon. Mr. Salkeld, a decided opponent of the scheme, stated:

I have always been opposed to the introduction of alien races that cannot amalgamate and become part of our own community. I believe any community, if it is to be strong, should be made up of parts that can unite and form one homogeneous whole.

The racial preferences exhibited by colonial Britishers for exclusive fraternity with 'the higher civilized races' — those of 'our own color' — speak provocatively for themselves. They indicate also the unbounded self-esteem in which these colonists held themselves in comparison with the 'inferior' races, and the jealous regard they shared for the Imperial achievements of their own kind. They strove to preserve in Queensland a distant white bastion of an Empire whose strength and successes they tried to explain more in terms of racial superiority than those of simply technological and economic advantage. As the Australian journal, the Science of Man remarked in 1899:

It is curiously true that it is only the British people, and those from them, like the United States, Canada and Australia — people who are able to found successful colonies, self-supporting and well-governed, with all proper freedom; for the people of other types fail to do this, and from various causes, the colonies they found are stagnant and retrogressive.

This peculiar talent of the British was said to have arisen directly out of the racial admixture from which they were constituted and which had:

... made them the successful conquerors, colonisers, traders, navigators and all else that has given them so wide an area on the world's surface to occupy and use, and so many distinct races and mixed people to govern.

From the Gaulic, Cymric and Gaelic strains in their background, they were supposed to have inherited their "love of fight-
ing for their chiefs, the ambition for glory, the feelings of chivalry and homage to rulers and to women'. From the "Iberian race element" came their inventiveness and from the Lapp element "the power to explore and live in inhospitable lands". But the most important racial contribution was the "Canstadt" component which brought "... courage, fixity of purpose, determination, hardy constitution and the capacity for fighting against odds and the true colonising spirit".20 As the Australasian Anthropological Journal defined it in 1896:

If the race is "Canstadt" its chief feature is its love for the dangers and emoluments of an individual enterprise, to dash off into the wilds with its flocks, herds, or agricultural operations, its trading or commercial ventures, and in a few years having beaten all competition, to emerge successful and wealthy from its thrifty and economical procedures, or to attack all weaker races, and having conquered them, to guide and use them for its profit and advantage as the working hordes of its nation.21

The English-speaking people were therefore regarded as the supreme exponents of "the colonisation talent", interpreted as a gift arising out of "the varied races from which they had sprung".22 The popular Queensland journal Progress was even more outspoken about these qualities and their employment than the Australian scientific publications quoted above. The paper admitted with disarming frankness in 1900:

It is true that our colonists have been guilty of occasional barbarities, that the blood of the innocent has more than once stained the pages of English colonisation annals. We have never hesitated to use force when it is necessary. The first proceeding when dealing with people of an inferior race, was to put them under foot, then keep them down, and if they attempted to rise, so much the worse for them, for the first principle of British colonisation is the absolute supremacy of our authority.

In the wake of subjugation, there was some scope to display "an element of humanity" towards "an inferior people", but even this was done because the Englishman:

... regarded the natives as a part of his stock in trade and protected and cared for them on the same principle that induced him to feed and shelter his cattle, that he might have the greater returns for his investment.23
The Britisher who went colonizing was naturally held in higher esteem than the one who stayed at home and dreamed about it. Thus, in 1884, A.W. Stirling called Australian men "the best type of the Anglo-Saxon race". The young Australian male, it was said, had cast off "the veneer of artificial civility or servility" of his English counterpart. In the place of this, wrote W. Ramsey Smith, "he oozes admiration from every pore when he sees real grit and merit." The Australian experiment of forging a nation 'free, white and great' was seen, by hindsight, to be a particularly noble and outstanding achievement. Ramsey-Smith in 1913 quoted an unnamed American author who stated:

"Australia is peopled by an almost pure British stock . . . This homogeneity . . . has had some pleasant and desirable results. National energy is not absorbed in assimilating foreigners. Uniform standards of conduct and living are easily maintained. The community of sentiment among the people is strong. The consciousness of national kinship, the collective family spirit is greater . . ."^26

Anglo-Australian conformity was, therefore, a national preoccupation, while it was hoped that the white Australian model, adapted from the proven British proto-type would, by virtue of a healthier environment and greater equality of opportunity, aspire to become a decided improvement upon the original. As Flora Shaw wrote in the British Australasian in 1894:

"The future is an intense and vivid reality in Australia. There is no looking down; there are no half longing glances towards the past. Every face is set eagerly, hopefully, determinedly forward. Progress is the keynote of the whole . . . permanent failure is rejected from the creed."^27

In 1917, R. Hamlyn-Harris, as Director of the Queensland Institute of Tropical Medicine told the Royal Society of Queensland:

"I am inclined to proclaim belief in the formation of a type of human beings specially adapted to live in Tropical Queensland. The type would be based on British blood and be so sustained and nourished, and be British in sentiment, but would be amended by the sun and soil in appearance, physique, speech and temperament.

And, "in order to make Queensland the cradle of a new breed", Hamlyn-Harris suggested her people should foster a
"clannishness" among themselves which would amount to a careful preservation of racial exclusiveness. This approach should cultivate:

... in the rising generation year after year a vision of greatness and a dream of a great unifying force at work producing [in them] ... a single Evolutionary unit ... a new race, bred of the sun and soil ...

The self-images of the Imperial Britisher and of his colonial counterpart — the bronzed 'Herrenvolk' of Hamlyn-Harris's imaginings — had one major element profoundly in common. This was derived racially from their Caucasian nature — their "white-ness" — and carried with it definite ideas about what a white-man inherently possessed. The exclamation "My word, but he is a white man!"28 when applied to a colonist was taken to convey the highest praise. Those, like squatter William Forster, who could write such uncompromising verse as:

Tis thus, a fatal race where'er we go
Some phase of fitful tragedy appears.
We strew the earth with murder, crime and woe
... We pave our way with terror, blood and tears
... Thus with whatever good
Our conquest brings, or seems to bring,
Perpetual evil mingles or conspires.
Pale death and ruin around our footsteps spring
And desolation dogs our civilized desires50

and so incisively confront the negative and destructive side of Imperial conquest and subjugation — were few. Most would prefer to concentrate upon the 'civilizing mission' of Imperialism and the 'unquestionable benefits' of British rule. The Englishman and the white colonist were usually pictured in relation to the other races as possessing all the virtues. In the study, *The Human Race*, written by Louis Figuier and heavily revised by Robert Wilson, the English racial type was depicted as one able to join:

... subtlety to will; hence his practical power; being strong and able, he acquires a confidence in himself which easily degenerates into pride, and saves him from smallness of character. He is neither obsequious nor prone to flattery; ... he keeps his word, and considers that he would be dishonoured in breaking it; but he makes the best of his advantages. For him, life is a struggle for triumph, without regard
for those who are unable to contend, and who succumb in the attempt. He asks no pity, and gives but little; he cannot be called cruel, for cruelty is a form of weakness; but he does not hesitate to oppress an enemy, when to do so would be productive of material advantage.\(^3\)

Similarly, speaking of the projected character of the new Commonwealth in March 1901, a correspondent to the *Brisbane Courier* proposed:

I think the White Australia we as a community desire is white men in every sense of the word — men whose characters are unblemished, moral men, men of principle, purpose and integrity and who are in every way worthy of the name.\(^2\)

It is notable that the mental images concocted in all these descriptions concentrate almost exclusively upon positive characteristics, and invariably present these in terms of a masculine ideal. Physically proficient men, white and preferably British were regarded as the best colonizers whose forceful nature, competitiveness and even occasional resort to brutality against inferiors were regarded as virtues to be applauded. “Still we may claim we are an imperial race”, wrote Queensland clergyman Frederick Richmond, while we can yet “admire the cool courage, boyish spirit and push of our successful men”.\(^5\) In such assessments, where self-praise is rarely tempered by self-criticism and the group holds this flattering portrait of itself as a measure by which to judge others, we observe the workings of ethnocentric stereotyping. W.E. Vinacke defines stereotyping as:

the tendency to attribute generalized and simplified characteristics to groups of people in the form of verbal labels, and to act towards the members of those groups in terms of those labels.\(^4\)

These labels, when applied to the group who invent them are normally complimentary and tend to ignore weaknesses. When attached to a minority racial group and used as “a justificatory device”\(^5\) for containing or rejecting them, however, the publicized traits are usually derogatory. Thus, as Jean Cohen writes:

A stereotype is not necessarily something to be despised but on the other hand it can be the worst form of oppression ever invented. Woe betide the man who finds himself cast in a false image by those whose path he crosses. It is no use
fighting against it; such a stereotype is stronger than reality. If it endures at all, it eventually becomes true.\textsuperscript{36}

The device of stereotyping by the dominant group in any society therefore plays a decisive part in defining the character of minority groups and its inter-relationship with them, as well as determining for those groups fixed behavioural patterns and immutable roles in such social relationships. As A.H. Richmond comments:

Stereotypes play an important part in governing race and ethnic relations. They are relatively fixed ideas about the characteristics of other groups that are passed on from one generation to another through the socialization, education, songs, stories and through the media of mass communications.\textsuperscript{37}

The tendency to stereotype an out-group with pejorative traits has, of course, a long history in Western culture. Since the late fifteenth century, as English sailors, explorers, traders, and later colonists gradually came into contact with Eskimos, African Negroes and American Indians, they characteristically drew attention to their ugliness, their 'bestial' social and sexual behaviour and their heathenism. This ethnocentric reaction to these strange and different peoples might be termed 'folk racism', but its interpretation did not end with the mere observation of physical and cultural differences. Writers and thinkers strove to explain the 'inferior' condition of these new beings by mentally relating towards them within the framework of the dominant intellectual movement of their time — that of Western Christianity. Thus the West Africans, who were described as "a people of beastly living, without God, law, religion or commonwealth"\textsuperscript{38} were interpreted as such because they were the outcome of Noah's prophecy, "Your seed will be ugly and darkskinned", when he cursed his son Ham. Their Biblical condemnation to a position of perpetual servility was used to rationalize their enslavement by the Europeans.\textsuperscript{39} Similarly, the American Indians were called "tawny devils . . . [or] serpents" by the early colonists and proposals were made to exterminate them because they were "the accursed seed of Ham". Furthermore, the expropriation of territory by the whites was explained away in terms of "the followers of the True Jehovah" taking "by force the land of the Canaanites".\textsuperscript{40} In this way theological dogmatism formed an intellectual basis for racist attitudes and racistist behaviour.

Such religious justifications were still exerting a perceptible
influence in the early years of Australian colonization, but they were gradually ceding to other mental preoccupations. From the mid-eighteenth century, the concept of human progress as a continuing social conflict against nature and towards greater civilization had been established by French philosophers like Turgot and Condorcet. Although this theory received a temporary setback in the later years of this century by the writings of Rousseau and the literary concerns of the Romantics with *A Natural Eden* and *The Noble Savage*, unencumbered by civilized restrictions, these latter ideals were exhausted during the early decades of the nineteenth century. The theme of progress, which accorded perfectly with the forward thrusts of Western capitalism — industrialization and imperialism — was given a new impetus by a revived interest in the writing of English economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo about unfettered economic competition, and especially in the writings of Thomas Malthus concerning the "struggle for existence".

At the same time, advances made in the various natural sciences, especially Geology, Comparative Anatomy, and Animal and Human Biology were both whittling away at an unquestioning acceptance of biblical fundamentalism, and proposing some revolutionary ideas about the origins and nature of mankind. When Darwin’s *Origin of Species* appeared in the same year as Queensland became a separate colony (1859), the ingredients of this new interpretation had been stirring in men’s minds for some time. J.A. Barnes states:

> The mid-century intellectual ferment which led to the development of anthropology must, like Darwin’s own work, be seen against the background of ideas about evolution and progress, and even of the survival of the fittest, that had been circulating in Europe for a hundred years or more before 1858.

Scientific ideas about the separate races of man and their comparative standards of excellence had been mooted in Europe since the mid-eighteenth century, and as Barnes notes:

> It is often overlooked that several of Darwin’s ideas were advocated a couple of decades before *The Origin of Species* by James Cowles Pritchard, a physician of Bristol, who began in 1813 to publish his *Researches into the Physical History of Man.*

> It was in 1850 that Herbert Spencer, the leading English exponent of positivist sociology, developing upon the
Malthusian idea of "struggle for survival", coined the phrase "the survival of the fittest", a statement which was rapidly seized by white imperialists to provide "a perfect rationalization of the status quo of conquest". It would also, writes Marvin Harris, be employed "to relieve the white man of his sense of guilt for failing to shoulder enough of the weight of charity" towards the conquered peoples of the New World. As the geologist Charles Lyell wrote confidently in 1850:

... few future events are more certain than the speedy extermination of the Indians of North America or the savages of New Holland in the course of a few centuries, when these tribes will be remembered only in poetry and tradition.**

In 1853, the Frenchman, Count de Gobineau reproduced these ideas about the inability of 'inferior races' either to combat or absorb 'civilization' when he wrote:

The Savage races of today have always been savage, and we are right in concluding, by analogy, that they will continue to be so, until the day when they disappear. Their disappearance is inevitable as soon as two entirely unconnected races come into active contact . . .

The European cannot win the Asiatic to his mode of thinking; he cannot civilize the Australian or the Negro

While in 1855, on a small island near the coast of New Guinea, Alfred Wallace sat contemplating Malthus and, as he later recalled:

... it suddenly flashed upon me that this self-acting process would necessarily improve the race . . . the inferior would inevitably be killed off and the superior would remain — that is the fittest would survive . . .

Thus, as Marvin Harris so ably argues:

Competition, progress, perfection, expansion, struggle, conquest — these were the themes, dynamic and optimistic, which awaited a joining with the biological interpretation of history

and it was Charles Darwin's remarkable synthesis, The Origin of Species which achieved this fertile combination. Harris says:
Origin was much more than a scientific treatise; it was a great book precisely because of the diverse cultural themes it consolidated and expressed. It dramatized and legitimized what many people from scientists to politicians had obscurely felt to be true, without themselves being able to put it into words.

Though the grim implications in Darwin's work for the biblical interpretation of Creation brought bitter controversy and fierce denunciation of the book, particularly by religious bodies, in Australia no less than England, his work opened the way for the eventual popular acceptance of the evolutionary writings of biologists, ethnologists and anthropologists upon the condition and fate of the numerous races of man. As Marvin Harris remarks:

... the professionalization of anthropology as a discipline coincided, and was intimately connected with the rise of raciology. By the sixties, anthropology and racial determinism had become almost synonyms. Within anthropology, the only issue was whether the 'inferior' races could legitimately aspire to improvement.46

Writing specifically about such anthropological regard for the Australian Aborigine, D.J. Mulvaney claims:

There is no hint in the writings of the founding fathers of anthropology that they felt any humanitarian concern for the savage, particularly the primeval Australian ... The contempt for primitive culture implicit in ... [their writings] probably confirmed the Australian community in its existing antipathy or indifference towards the 'blackfellow' ...47

In 1867, Frederick Farrar used Aboriginal examples to show that "the real wild pagan savage" would always "disappear" before advancing Western civilization "as surely and as perceptibly as the snow retreats before the advancing line of sun-beams". Therefore, he concluded:

To the Aryan ... apparently belong the destinies of the future. The races whose institutions and inventions are despotism, fetishism and cannibalism — the races who rest content in ... placid sensuality and unprogressive decrepitude can hardly hope to contend permanently in the great struggle for existence with the noblest division of the human species ...48
When in 1870, Max Muller in the *Anthropological Review* classified racial groups into seven categories on an ascending scale, his readers would not have found it difficult to draw the right conclusions about losers and winners in the ‘struggle for existence’. The Aboriginal was placed on the bottom of the scale with the Papuan, Malayo-Polynesian and Negro on the three levels above; over these stood the American Indian and then the "Higher Asiatic". On the three upper rungs were the Mediterranean type, the Semitic, and, at the top of the scale, the "Indo-German" — the Caucasian or Aryan type supreme.49

Colonists would experience little trouble in relating such information to their experiences and attitudes regarding Aborigines, Melanesians and Chinese whom they either directly encountered or read of, second-hand, on an almost daily basis, while they were in Queensland. Here the popular press, in the form of the daily newspaper and weekly or monthly journal, as well as the pamphlet, the colonial travel-book or novel, and the political speech played a key interpretive role. Stuart Miller has vividly shown how in America, "the rise of the penny press, which was the newspaper sector of the mass media revolution of the 1840s" heightened racist antagonisms by providing relevant articles containing more "detailed description and analysis" of racial themes than the "brash and noisy dailies".50 Similarly, in Queensland, weekly papers filled with articles of substance and lively debate on provocative issues, like the *Queenslander*, *Northern Miner*, *Queensland Punch*, *Figaro*, *Boomerang*, *Bulletin*, *Worker* and *Judge*, to name only several, provided their readers with a wealth of illustrative material which both popularized scientific racist theories and provided plenty of local examples to bear these theories out. Granted that intellectual debate in the colonies was mainly derivative and that, as the *Daily Guardian* stated rather apologetically in 1863:

... [pioneering] families [are] too involved in struggles for prosperity in a material point of view to bestow much time or money on what may be supposed to have to do with the intellectual and moral51

— these families generally learned enough, even in catch-cries like "white superiority" and "survival of the fittest", to justify, to their own intellectual satisfaction, the stereotypes they applied in everyday life.

As leading race-relations sociologist, John Rex has demonstrated of the way in which deterministic racial theories affect the common man:
very few men ever proceed to any complete and systematic discussion of their beliefs on either scientific, theological, cultural or historical grounds...

while intellectuals may debate ultimate and systematic justifications, the man in the street has little recourse to theories other than those which are implicit in folk-wisdom, in proverbs, in jokes, or in popular newspapers or political ideologies.

Such comments, of course, apply as much to the man or woman on the bush track as to the man in the street. Following Rex, one could suggest that popular colonial writings formed an intermediate intellectual stage and forum between imported European theories about race relations and the colonists' actual interaction with these 'lower' forms of man. A two-way process may be seen to exist between the popularization and consequently simplification of scientific theories by the journalist and politician, and the mental expectations and responses of the reading and listening audience who received such impressions. Possibly the most important outcome of this was that white colonists obtained vital support for their racial attitudes from the most respected thinkers of the nineteenth century, the natural and social scientists. Sophisticated theories supported rougher stereotypes with very little apparent contradiction. Therefore, John Rex suggests:

Once such theories exist, they 'take on a life of their own', they escalate racial conflict and, by the intellectual permissions they give, they enable racialists to act with greater confidence.

The 'world-view' of the early settler, whether parochial or universalized, could therefore hardly avoid consideration of the racial aspect of his existence. From his own subjective standpoint, he developed a fairly clear view both of himself as a white man, and of the minorities of indigenous or alien races around him. Here, the propagandizing of racist theories and the procedures of stereotyping helped him to reach this viewpoint as much as his actual experience of Aboriginal warriors or derelicts, of 'kanaka' field hands and of Chinese manual workers, merchants or gold-diggers.

Furthermore, other generally held social attitudes related most pertinently to the racial views outlined above. The colonizing impulse, which was the principal preoccupation of the newcomers, can be viewed as a practical demonstration of the
Spencerian struggle against nature and against natural man. In introducing 'civilization', therefore, the colonist rendered natural man, represented by the Aborigine, both peripheral and redundant. In this new order of things, land became property, and it was, in common parlance, taken up, rather than seen to be taken from its original inhabitants. "I don't admit it was their country, and want proof of it," wrote "Pioneer" to the Queenslander in 1880,55 while, in 1903, a certain G. Phillips pictured the "brave band of pioneers . . . settling, as if by magic, great tracts of hitherto unoccupied country".56

Secondly, the violence which proved necessary in the unremitting struggle for resources, whether by Europeans with Aborigines over land and water courses, or with the Chinese over precious metal was excused by such assertions as: "The life is so rough that the slip across the line into brutality is half-unconscious".57 As George Carrington wrote, with some accuracy, in 1871:

No very great value is set upon human life in a new colony. Every man is supposed to take care of himself and the weakest goes to the wall . . . The bush is a wide place, and men disappear in it mysteriously, and it is useless to enquire about them.58

This expectation of human expendability in the cause of "the outward flow of restless and progressive industry"59 made it easier, therefore, for colonists to accept and excuse the slaughter of Aborigines and the brutal handling of Chinamen or Melanesians. As Blackwoods Magazine commented in 1852 of the Aborigines who stood in the way of Western progress:

Extermination is then the word — wholesale massacres of men, women and children . . . These terrible razzias occurring in the remote back settlements and pastures, are for the most part ignored by the local authorities — crown land commissioners, police magistrates, and others, or else considered a justifiable negrocide.60

'Hostile Aborigines' were seen by pastoralists and their shepherds as just another physical obstacle to be dealt with, in the same way as they were forced to weather droughts, floods and bush-fires in the battle for economic success. Similarly, the often ruthless handling of competitive Chinese — the "horrible heathen Chinese", clustering in "mining encampments . . . of foul sights and foul smells" — was justified by the rallying-cry: "Shall Australia be Mongolian or Anglo-Saxon?"61 Thus, if
white life was regularly seen as expendable on the frontier, black and yellow lives were more frequently regarded as being merely extraneous. Where white males banded together against implacable odds under the convenient banner of 'mateship', the coloured man was rigorously excluded from such a fraternity.

The colonial white working pattern was one which stressed both the nobility and mobility of labour. As the Queensland journal, Progress proclaimed in 1900:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{The noblest men that live on earth} \\
\text{Are men whose hands are brown with toil . . .} \\
\text{. . . The real Empire builders are the men who work.}
\end{align*}
\]

Because physical toil was the most vital component in building a new society in the wilderness, it was consequently held in high esteem. Queensland was publicized as "a land where there is work for all" and, as Charles Eden wrote in 1872:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{In that country, no-one loses caste by performing bodily labour; indeed it is just the reverse and the more a man can do for himself, the better he will get on . . .}
\end{align*}
\]

A dedicatedly industrious approach to life was promoted as the key to success, both for the young colony and for its individual member. As Richard Daintree advised intending migrants in 1873, "by dint of hard work, perseverance and prudence, success is realized". In speaking of the working man, the Queensland Figaro commented in January 1883, "we abjure once and for all the epithet 'poor' " and two months later, a leading Queensland politician, Samuel Griffith went so far as to claim that Queensland was a country "where a poor man cannot be found". The following year, A.W. Stirling adamantly wrote:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{One thing I can say without fear of contradiction . . . and that is, that no man, no woman, no child even, need ever starve, if they have hands to work with . . . In Queensland . . . any man who has a trade, landed there without a single shilling, ought to be independent, and employing workmen on his own account and accumulating money rapidly, in less than five years from the time his foot first touches the shore . . .}
\end{align*}
\]

White labour was therefore publicly exalted, and a vision of capitalist success was constantly being conjured up to proclaim it as a certain way of achieving upward social mobility.

When it came to coloured labour, however, the position and the
attitudes were entirely reversed. White men disdained to do "nigger" work — that is, demeaning 'servile' labour for others which offered no prospect of rising in the social structure. Such contempt was directed most specifically at field labour on large estates, or, to a lesser degree, towards domestic servitude, normally reserved for coloured persons or for lower working class white women, who, as domestic servants, were dubbed with the epithet "slavey". That field-work was "only fit for a nigger" became an often-repeated phrase in Northern Queensland. Writing in reference to the employment of Melanesians as field-hands, one observer commented perceptively:

The reasons why whites do not at present work satisfactorily in the cane fields of Queensland are not climatical, but economic, moral and racial; they will not do "nigger's" work — not because they can't, but because their morale for work is destroyed before they ever enter the canefield, by the feeling that they are degrading themselves . . . The same sentiment made all unskilled manual work more or less disgraceful to a white man in some of the Slave States of America.

Instead, it was expected that white men would always occupy the positions of power in relation to such labour, to regulate, control and contain it. The Queensland Figaro stated in 1883:

If you clearly examine your sentiments, and place yourself in actual contact with niggers, you must, if you are an honest man, own up . . . that . . . your own creed . . . (right or wrong) is — That the white man was created to boss the coloured man, and can never look upon him as his equal in intelligence and manhood.

Hence, no matter how hard or resourcefully they laboured, coloured men and women, because of their ascribed inferiority and real powerlessness, were prevented from rising above their given servile station in life. In short, they were "... deemed in myth to be incapable of skills other than those which it suit[ed] their masters that they should have".

A Presbyterian Minister, the Reverend J.R.B. Love stated as late as 1915, "It would be foolish to argue that all men are equal. The blackfellow is inferior and must necessarily remain so". The same sentiments were repeated, more or less confidently, about Melanesians and Chinese, as well as Javanese, Indians, Cingalese, Japanese, Malays and other racial groups who came
into Queensland, but whose plight is not examined in any great detail in this present volume. The white man was destined to be master, and the other races were expected to accept their predestined fate in compliance with the logic of his superiority and might. They must either succumb or expire, for, as Figaro promised its eager readers in October 1883:

> It is predicted that some day the menial work of the universe will be all done by Chinamen and negroes, whilst the Caucasian race is to fill the high places of the earth, and the other races are to be squeezed out of existence altogether.\(^7\)
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7.
70 See, for example, "Royal Commission into Conditions in the Sugar Industry",
"Newspaper, unknown, 26 October 1901. Mitchell Library Cutting Book on Coloured Labour, Vol. LXXXII.

Queensland Figaro, 15 September 1883.


For instance, in 1891, a certain J. H. Love had written the following highly optimistic statement concerning the relative prowess of Queenslanders and Chinese:

> What I wish every Australian to understand is that if he loves his country, if he loves his race, he will give his life if need be to keep the Chinese out of Australia . . . Even in its present condition Australia — nay, I might almost say *Queensland alone* — is quite strong enough to go and take China so far as fighting is concerned . . .

*Boomerang*, 21 February 1891.

Queensland Figaro, 6 October 1883.
PART ONE

"The Nigger Shall Disappear . . ."

Aborigines and Europeans in colonial Queensland

RAYMOND EVANS

It is at this time of day, in the nineteenth century of progress and humanity, that Englishmen, upon their settlement amongst an inferior race, are to despise the slightest attempt to conciliate or improve it, but to begin at once to war upon it, and . . . to exterminate it?

Charles Heyden, 1874

We shall never possess the detailed history of this singular and gradual work of extermination — such a tale would be too horrible to read — but we have an opportunity of seeing a similar process in full work in the colony of Queensland, and when we have seen that, we shall understand the mystery of Tasmania, New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia.

George Carrington, 1871
CHAPTER ONE

The "Darkling Plain"

Impressions of early racial confrontation

When a border society exists, the main energies of the two peoples concerned is [sic] likely to be devoted to the frontier problem, and the frontier problem may in fact be the problem through the resolution of which a new inclusive society is being constituted.

John Rex

Early in October 1861, George Elphinstone Dalrymple, explorer, land commissioner and prime mover behind the newly formed European settlement at Port Denison stood upon the beach of nearby Shaw Island, and attempted to address the yelling, gesticulating natives upon the cliffs above. His message was simple and direct. Through the medium of a Fitzroy River Aborigine, one of the six native troopers accompanying him, Dalrymple informed the inhabitants that his party had come to return "blood for blood", his words being punctuated finally by the firing of "several volleys" up the slopes. Earlier the members of his expedition had found upon the same beach the corpses of two white men, Mr. Henry Irving, a squatter and Nicholas Millar, a seaman lying side by side, and joined in death by an unusual amity, for the seaman's arm lay around the squatter's shoulders. Dalrymple wrote:

The skulls of both men were beaten flat, the bones of the faces being also entirely destroyed — numerous boomerang marks and spear holes appeared about the neck and ears. The backs and legs of both were gashed in a fearful manner and other parts of their persons treated with dishonour.

Back at Port Denison, Dalrymple penned his report of the encounter to the Queensland Government and in a covering statement indicated that a final blow had been given to his original hope that somehow this "first offspring of Queensland colonising enterprise" might be settled peacefully. Colonisation
without conflict was impossible, he concluded, for the newcomers were not dealing with rational God-fearing men like themselves but rather with:

... savages who have proved by an overwhelming mass of evidence to be bloodthirsty treacherous and unworthy of trust ... a race of bloodthirsty miscreants who believe in no God nor in any spiritual power, who cannot even trust each other in their own domestic intercourse and who are enemies of all men until fear enforces submission.

The evidence for this sombre conclusion seemed irrefutable, Dalrymple added, for had he not previously:

... pointed to the blood which already dies [sic] the hands of the Aborigines on this coast. The slaughter of 18 men of the Sapphires boats when bartering for turtle at one blow. The seven attacks made upon my own party in this district in 1859/60; those upon Lt. Powell and party in the boats of the Reindeer of Captain Sinclair and party in the Santa Barbara. On the Party of HMS Fly and others — to the murders of Gilbert, Kennedy &c . . .

Dalrymple's outburst provides us with a pertinent impression of the hostile frontier he faced, especially as his letter was composed barely a week before the massacre of nineteen members of the Wills party at Cullin-la-Ringo, inland from Rockhampton, the largest single mass killing of Europeans by Aborigines in Australian History. Yet it is necessary to comment additionally here that his listing of violent incidents was a particularly partial interpretation of border clashes between indigenes and invaders. He failed to mention that boat crews habitually fired upon natives and abducted their women or that he and Lieutenant Powell of the Native Mounted Police had both recently harrassed the local 'savage' in punitive raids of unrecorded ferocity or discrimination. Violence emanating from, or conducted on behalf of white settlers was seen instead as an "almost necessity" and justified by a general assertion that, "if white people were to be allowed to occupy the country, this could not be done without a certain amount of bloodshed". The bias implicit in the line of reasoning that Aboriginal violence emanated purely from savagery, whilst European violence, when recognized at all, was simply a justifiable reaction to such savagery is best exemplified by W.H. Wiseman, Commissioner of Lands in the Leichhardt district, reporting upon the Aboriginal problem there in 1855. Whilst the whites were "by education
disposed to kindness and benevolence,” he reasoned, “on the contrary, the savages are by nature greedy and prone to steal, [and] feel no compunction on committing murder . . .’’10 Stern retributive measures from the normally benevolent were therefore required.

The reality of the frontier situation, however, can be best envisaged as a condition of severe and usually protracted struggle, where contending parties behaved towards each other in a manner analogous to the confrontation adopted in a situation of war. The struggle itself concentrated upon such vital issues as competition for control over the environment and the opposition of two or more almost completely antagonistic cultural patterns of existence. Within this context of violence, the newcomers mainly reacted to the natives in a manner that was neither particularly civilized nor God-fearing. They reacted, in short, as they saw the immediate situation demanded; for it was in this novel situation of existing upon a yet untamed periphery rather than in the learnt reactions of a settled British background that they perceived their survival, their livelihood and future. The wilderness and all the obstacles it contained must be overcome first. ‘Civilization’ and all that pertained to it must, of necessity, come afterwards. As Philip Mason observes of the colonial conflict:

The man on the spot has the immense advantage of being desperately in earnest; the issues affect his life . . . Britain’s ideological commitment to ‘freedom’ and a mild form of democracy in the nineteenth century was no help at all to the . . . Australian Aborigines.11

And as a Queensland colonist himself observed, more simply and more bluntly:

. . . scandals arising from fights between Australian blacks and white men show that the white man, with all his civilization, can be as great a savage as anyone.12

The existence of conflict bred into the condition of life on the frontier, a pervasive form of tension, which at key times could stretch one’s emotional reactions between intense suspicion or even panic about potential adversaries and a determination to establish henceforth a ruthless control over one’s surroundings. An interesting example of the strain and terror involved in contending with the unknown wilds is contained in a perceptive and self-effacing recollection made by George Carrington of his first night alone as a shepherd on the Clarke River, inland from Townsville in the late 1860s:
... suppose the blacks attacked me, I might shout for help, no one could hear me ... all the horrible stories I had ever heard thronged to my recollection of men attacked by savages and murdered, of ghastly corpses subjected to frightful mutilations, of dead men lying unregarded and found days after in lonely huts. Then I began to picture to myself the dreary bush outside, and the forms that might even then be creeping up in silence shortly to be broken by unearthly yells. I lay now broad awake, and the perspiration streamed from every pore. My hearing seemed unnaturally sharpened ... all around the hut I fancied I heard the crackling of dry sticks, and the rustling of grass ...

At the same period, J.B. Stevenson, working as a new hand at a station on the upper Burdekin and out wandering in the bush, suddenly came upon one female and two male Aborigines. His immediate reaction, as he later admitted, was to draw his revolver and fire three times in quick succession at them. Turning without pausing to notice the effect of his action, he ran wildly for two miles back to his humpy. "For a fortnight after this we did not move out of camp ..." he revealingly concluded.14

It was possible for the kind of alarm exhibited here to be experienced en masse by entire nascent settler communities. As the Lands Commissioner for the Wide Bay and Burnett district noted of the Maryborough inhabitants in November 1853:

It is almost impossible for me to describe the constant state of alarm in which the Townspeople are kept from a dread of the aggressions of the Blacks whose treachery and audacity are almost incredible ...

In a similar vein, W.H. Wiseman reported of the settlers in the Dawson River area in early 1856:

The panic now amongst the whites is greater than ever and will probably be insurmountable when the news of the late wholesale murder [at Young's station, Mt. Larcomb, near Gladstone] becomes known. Such state of hostility is undoubtedly the natural consequence of the occupation of the soil by the white race. Without trying to disparage the character of the Savage[s] ... intimidation is the only principle in dealing with them. Submission to authority is surely the first step in civilized life ... [T]hese savages ... respect the man who, rifle in hand, demands "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth ..."
With practically the same reflex action shown by Stevenson in firing his revolver blindly at the natives, Wiseman advocated "Strict retaliation in killing any number of the tribe . . ." as a solution to the Aboriginal presence and to assuage his "... feelings of horror and detestation as a civilized man at the wholesale and treacherous murder just committed by the Savages on some of my fellow countrymen". Similarly when the Government engineer at Rockhampton heard of the first mentioned murders on Shaw Island, he reacted with the wish that a reinforced Native Police contingent should be given boats "to rid the islands of this scourge". Thus, as one investigates the structure of frontier contact, whether it involves the serio-comic aspect of Stevenson in flight or the more dramatic consequence of Dalrymple's calling up the cliffs, certain common features become apparent: Firstly, that in the relatively 'lawless' condition of the borderlands, each individual was regarded as responsible for both his own survival and for the general well-being of his own kind. George Carrington typified this as "order in disorder", when he wrote:

... every man is his own police-man, the community his law-court, and their judgment his legal remedy. Every man goes with his own life in his hands, and carries in his belt and at his pillow the lives of others.

Secondly, that between these individual 'strangers' and the host society of Aborigines, collisions would occur over resources and encroachments, which would eventually lead to an acceptance of the inevitability of violence. And, thirdly, that out of this violence and the emotional responses of fear, hatred and incomprehension it engendered, would develop the fixed concept that the usually hostile members of the host society were both inferior savages and enemies of white civilization who must be either totally subordinated or eliminated. Writing upon nineteenth century colonialism, John Rex, a leading sociologist of race relations, comments that it would be hard to exaggerate:

... the effect of the frontier experience on relations between colonalisers and settlers on the one hand and 'natives' on the other, not only upon immediate definitions of the situation, but upon long term images which the people of the industrially advanced countries have of people in the territories which they have exploited.
In another article examining ‘The Concept of Race,’ he remarks in direct relevance to this:

... the encounter between the frontier groups is marked by tension and by the emergence of stereotypes and belief systems that govern the interaction of members of one group with those of another.20

It is to the question of “stereotypes and belief systems” as well as “long-term images” that this section will eventually be returning, but firstly it is important to examine in greater depth and detail the advancing frontier in Queensland, for it is from this basic colonial situation that the well-springs of racial discrimination and racial prejudice arguably arise. In doing so, it is to the key question of frontier violence that we should first turn our attention.
CHAPTER TWO

"The Blood-Dimmed Tide"

Frontier violence and Aboriginal resistance

... we cannot blame them, when, after we have usurped their lands, and driven kangaroo away ... they strive to turn us out by the only means in their power, physical force, administered in the only style of warfare with which they are acquainted.

Sarah Lee, 1851

Should we take firearms? Perhaps it would be as well...

A.W. Stirling, 1884

... even when armed, the people are not safe from being fatally attacked by blacks, seeing that these conceal themselves and [then] launch their murderous weapons...

Humble Petition from 256 residents of Nigger Creek, Herberton District, 3 April 1882

The whole contentious question of violence in Australian history has received scant attention from historians. The dubious idea that the degree of violence can somehow be computed from the small numbers of Europeans who have been killed in several historically recognized public demonstrations is telling evidence of the infancy of the debate. Australian social history itself has not yet been sufficiently studied to make any accurate assessment, for instance, of the degree of violence implicit in the convict system and its aftermath, in the inheritance of turmoil from frontier land and mineral rushes, in the urban and rural pattern of crime and punishment, in the institutional treatment of social deviants, in the general public support for war and external aggressions, in the glorification of the soldier, in the protracted struggle between capital and labour, in religious sectarianism, in the domestic situation and the treatment of women, in the xenophobic reaction towards certain migrant groups, and in the entire 'male ethos' to which the Australian 'national character' seems to be wedded.
It is small wonder, then, that the complex question of the considerable degree of violence embedded in Australian race relations has received only passing mention from mainstream historians. In relation to the Aborigines, for instance, A.G.L. Shaw in *The Story of Australia* writes chapters upon “Founding a Colony”, “Settlements and Tensions”, “Squatting” and “The Gold Rush and its Aftermath” without mentioning the indigenes, and thereby overlooks, the decisive question of the relationship between colonialism, conflict and racialism. In the tradition of W.K. Hancock's *Australia*, which sees Aborigines as only “pathetically helpless” G. Blainey in a discussion of the “Land Barrier” rapidly dismisses the question of Aboriginal resistance as a “relatively mild threat”. When the question of violent clash is indeed recognized, it is either covered in generalized and imprecise terms without any reference to specific happenings; or, instead, a few well-known examples are listed, without then being integrated into an overall pattern of contact: the ‘black war’ in Tasmania, for instance, is quickly mentioned without any reference to the possibility that such ‘wars’ may have been reproduced upon the mainland. In such descriptions developments like the “battle of Pinjarra” and the “Myall Creek massacre” tend to play the same historical role as do the Eureka Stockade and the Lambing Flat lynchings: they are treated simply as an aberrant explosion of violence upon an otherwise relatively peaceful plateau of activity. Indeed, it does not seem ungenerous to surmise that the liberal historian finds the whole problem of racial violence an uncomfortable one and moves away from it with relief, for it does not fit easily within his tacit assumptions that the story of Australia is one of ‘lucky’, hopeful and relatively uninterrupted progress, that human decisions there arise from motives that are predominantly rational, and that human activities are governed, in the main, by legality and consensus.

Russell Ward, still the most prominent historian to date to turn his full attention to the Australian frontier gives, in *The Australian Legend*, little discussion of racial bloodletting and in his references to orderly goldfields, “the virtual absence of a warlike aboriginal race,” and “the relative lack of race prejudice in early Australia,” he presents the reader with the impression of a particularly tranquil and tolerant pattern of settlement. Developing this theme in his *Australia*, Ward believes that:

One difficulty that Australian pioneers . . . did not have to contend with was a warlike native race . . . They were among the most primitive and peaceable peoples known to history . . . their reaction was so sporadic and ineffectual that men seldom had to go armed on the Australian frontier . . .
To bring the question around full circle, Ward surmises that "the nature of the Aborigines and the white settlers' relationship with them," which he also sees as basically non-violent, is one reason why, historically, Australians have been "remarkably slow to kill each other" and why there is "a relatively low level of violence in Australian life" today. Thus, in Ward's thesis, a placid frontier helps to promote a pacified society thereafter.*

It is encouraging to see, however, that in the interests of historical accuracy, such sanguine sentiments as those outlined above are presently giving rise to debate, wherein a large amount of evidence relevant to the study of race relations in Australia is being resurrected. The bulk of the contributors to F.S. Stevens' three volume investigation, Racism, the Australian Experience seem largely to agree that:

... no real allowance has been made for the extreme violence in the treatment of the Aboriginal for the facts are easily enough established that homicide, rape and cruelty have been common place over wide areas and long periods ...

A welter of material to support this statement is provided.31 The number of academic historians among this list of writers is, however, small. Similarly C. D. Rowley's massive triple-volumed study upon Aboriginal Policy and Practice reveals the reality of Aboriginal guerilla resistance especially on the Queensland frontier, and the often virulent nature of white retaliation.32 Significantly again, Rowley is professionally not a historian but an anthropologist, although he has made a better fist at an Aboriginal/European history of contact than any practising historian has so far done.

One academic historian, Henry Reynolds has, however, recently attacked head-on those who have written "the Aboriginals [sic] out of our history . . [and] also written out much of the violence", in a short, though illuminating article entitled "Violence, the Aboriginals [sic] and the Australian Historian".33 He has since supported this challenge with a thoughtfully chosen selection of documents,34 which, along with Rowley's chapter in The Destruction of Aboriginal Society, pays particular attention to race relations in Queensland for the first time. He is especially critical — and understandably so — of Ward's conception of a frontier without firearms and quotes examples from North Queensland to show that it was "never safe to go unarmed".35 The present writer has found that a similar situation existed upon the frontier as it moved over the whole of the colony of Queens-
land. Travelling from Sydney towards Moreton Bay in 1842, James Demarr wrote of the properties he passed: "a carbine could not be dispensed with . . . gunpowder also, no station was ever without . . ."; and that, for his own part, "I needed several things, and above all, firearms of some sort; without the last, it would have been madness to go further . . .". At the same time, upon the Darling Downs, James Campbell described how, at his Westbrook station, he needed "plenty of men and the station well-armed" to quell any "uneasiness" there. He warned his readers that, "... nothing is more dangerous in the presence of wild blacks than to fire a gun unless you are sure of killing . . .".

During the 1850s, while F. H. Grundy as Government Surveyor at Moreton Bay felt confident that "guns, revolvers etc." made his party "masters of the situation"," a more worried A. Halloran was reporting from Wide Bay, further to the north:

... it is considered unsafe to go about even in the vicinity of the township without firearms and no one ventures to travel from Maryborough to this station [Tinana] . . . a distance of four miles without being armed . . . my own Troopers will not venture to go to the garden or to the creek for a bucket of water neither of which are more than three or four hundred yards from my house or even into the paddock without their firearms . . . it is those who have been longest on the Station that exercise the greatest caution."

At Kin Kin Creek, near Ipswich, George Harris recalled that timbergetters, because of their ill-treatment of the blacks:

... went in fear of their lives. They were thus obliged to carry firearms at all times. They worked with revolvers fastened in their belts, and many of them had peep-holes cut in the slabs of their huts, through which they could shoot if the occasion arose.

Indeed "solidly built slab homesteads and huts with loopholes pierced in the thick walls for rifles" would seem to have been the frontier norm in South-East Queensland. Travelling clergyman Frederick Richmond remembered seeing at the station homesteads in the 1870s, "racks of old fashioned muskets, relics of our first militant occupation," whilst Holthouse claims that the Archer Brothers at Gracemere had a ship's swivel gun mounted in front of their station-house to warn off the blacks.

Leaving Gracemere in 1865, W. R. O. Hill travelled to Reedy Lake Station on the Upper Burdekin, where he worked as overseer. He wrote:
I had three shepherds in charge of 2000 sheep each. They had to be armed with a Terry Rifle and Colt’s revolver as the blacks were always on the aggressive. Even my hut was loop-holed to fire through and we found that very useful . . .”

Hill’s brother-in-law, Charles Eden, as a new chum in the Colony, later recalled the helpful advice he received from Arthur Knox, as he prepared to travel inland from Port Denison with his wife:

“Look out for blacks and don’t leave Lucy”. I had not yet had any experience about the blacks and did not know or think much about them, so asked him, “What shall I do if they do come?” “Shoot them, of course. Goodbye, old fellow.” and away he rode.

Advisedly, Eden procured a double-barrelled shotgun for the journey, and later, shepherding at the Knox brothers’ station near the Belyando River, found “. . . the blacks were abundant and therefore he should always keep his carbine or pistol loaded and handy”. All the shepherds were armed with Terry’s breech-loaders “which are most excellent weapons and have a great range”, but, when riding, Eden preferred to carry “Tranter’s double-trigger pistols . . . none of those abominable safety catches being required”. The ‘new chum’, it would seem, had gained his ‘colonial experience’.

In 1870, E. B. Kennedy offered advice similar to that given by Knox to Eden, for emigrants heading towards North Queensland:

... a breach-loading [sic] gun, strong enough to carry ball, and a large supply of cartridge cases, ready capped, will be found invaluable. Every sort of revolver can be purchased in Brisbane.46

George Carrington carried a Terry’s breech-loader while shepherding inland from Townsville. In his reminiscences, he candidly comments upon the efficacy of this weapon, in shooting an Aborigine creeping upon his camp:

He was not dead, but when he saw me he held up his hands and shrieked; he was evidently wounded to death; the bullet had passed through him just above the hips, so I shot him through the head.47

Thus it should be painfully clear, from this multitude of
examples, that the paraphernalia of European violence was ever-present while settlement proceeded in any area of the Colony. Readers should additionally note that, in the foregoing, we have not merely been discussing weaponry per se, but weaponry carried for specific use against Aborigines, understood by pioneers to be no pliable and placid hosts, but 'vicious savages, lurking and unpredictable' — or, as we might typify them today — active resisters with the barbed spear and the waddy against the European invasion of their tribal lands.

Indeed it is possible, in the Queensland context at least, to turn Ward's wishful statement on its head, and suggest that Aboriginal reaction was so alarmingly a factor of existence that no man who valued his life went unarmed on the frontier. The gun — especially the cruel snub-nosed Snider carbine of the Native Police — was as much a fact of border life and pastoral expansion as was the sheep, the cow or the cabbage-tree hat. As the Queensland Figaro commented, as late as 1885:

Out on the very borders of civilization, where absolutely new country is being opened up, and where blacks are brought into contact with whites for the first time, the use of the rifle is undoubtedly necessary. Where every white man has to fight for every inch of country he occupies, where there is constant border warfare on the verge line of settlement, the white man has an excuse for taking life in defence of his own . . .

The initial settlement of almost every district in Queensland was accompanied by a period of violence, sometimes short and decisive, sometimes extending over many years, but always more or less severe. Precisely which party was responsible for the first outbreak of hostility was a question of some contemporary debate. W. H. Wiseman wrote:

I . . . think the first murder in a new country is generally committed by the blacks nor can I recal [sic] to my mind in these Northern Districts one 'unprovoked' or wanton attack by a Squatter on the Aborigines.

Yet squatter James Archer believed that depredations committed by Aborigines were provoked "by the misconduct of the whites, who seem to imagine the blacks will allow themselves to be ill-used without attempting revenge". James Campbell was told by his Aboriginal companion, "Tomo" that natives on the Downs only killed cattle where the station owner "pho-pho (shoot) musket" at them, and himself commented, "... the
ancient stock-keepers and hut-keepers were far too ready to use their firearms rather than try to conciliate [the blacks].” Writing upon his observations north of Capricorn, George Carrington depicted the beginning of conflict — with its subsequent escalatory pattern and indiscriminate nature — in the following detailed way:

The first outrages committed by . . . [the natives] are almost invariably in retaliation: some party of men propose for amusement to go out after the blacks. Perhaps they can’t as yet reconcile themselves to the idea of shooting them in cold blood; but they find a camp; the blackfellows fly at their approach, leaving all their possessions, nets, spears, wooden water vessels &/c. in their hurry, behind them. Most probably the white men take away as many of these things as they can carry and wantonly destroy the rest. The damage to be repaired involves many months of ingenuity and hard work. These heroes return to the station or township, and the blacks meditate revenge. They find some poor shepherd or traveller, wandering alone or sitting under a tree. They creep upon him through the long grass and kill him. They smash in his face with their clubs, and, having cut open his body, they take out his kidney fat, and smear themselves with it, and leave him pinned to the ground by a spear. Thus perishes innocent man number one. As soon as the murder is discovered there is a great “hullabaloo” in the district and a party turns out to disperse (i.e. to shoot) the blacks . . . led by a black tracker and riding on swift horses, the party soon find the blackfellows, whom they proceed to “disperse,” by shooting them down — men, women and children, the object being to destroy as many as possible. The remnant of the tribe then go on to a neighbouring run, and kill another shepherd, or perhaps two, and they are “dispersed” again . . .

The initial incident which seemingly inspired a vicious response could vary greatly, but it was invariably one which was interpreted by the victimized group as a criminal assault upon their own mode of existence. For instance, perhaps the earliest recorded clash occurred in 1824 when prisoners woodchopping at Humpybong — now Redcliffe — had an axe stolen from them by a native. For this crime against property, the Aborigines were fired upon and one killed. In return, they speared two convicts. Similarly, at Brisbane in 1827, Aborigines, this time led by two renegade convicts raided the settlement’s maize crop and wounded the guard. Again, there were retaliative killings on both
An Artist's impression of Native Police atrocity and abduction of Aboriginal women (Queensland Figaro, January 1885).
sides. Violence exploded on the Darling Downs at Grantham in the early eighteen-forties after a settler named Rogers had appropriated 400 sheets of iron-bark, used for shelter by aboriginal families at Humpy Flat. This theft sparked off "... a system of reprisals and aggressions which culminated in the death of, I think, seventeen white men — most of them shepherds". In the far north, at Somerset in 1864, collisions, leading to a "serious loss of life" among the Aborigines, occurred after John Jardine, the Government Resident, caned a native boy for pilfering a tomahawk, then warned him and several other suspected thieves that if they returned to the settlement "they would be shot".

Yet, regardless of the incident which directly provoked commotion, surely some such outburst was already implicit in a situation where land was peremptorily seized, and indigenes found that their former territories, hunting grounds, burial and sacred sites had suddenly been endowed with the name of some 'station', a name that denoted an alien concept of 'private property' and implied, as they soon painfully discovered, that the original owners were henceforward banished because, for instance, even their 'smell' disturbed the cattle. Land, the entire focus and central tenet of Aboriginal culture was torn suddenly and forcefully from its axis and made, instead, the exclusive preserve of the grazing herd. As Campbell, wrote of the first station-owners on the Darling Downs:

The Messrs. Leslie were extremely modest, only claiming the whole heads of the Condamine from Toolburra upwards, some fourteen creeks I believe — enough to form a principality.

Further west, on the Maranoa at Mt Abundance, Allan Macpherson assumed immediate control over 400 thousand acres, whilst in 1883, the Queensland Figaro named four Europeans controlling 7,776 square miles of land in the Warrego Country, and three others holding another 8,261 square miles in North Gregory.

William Wiseman, for all his conviction about the 'savagery' of the original inhabitants, whose former lands he was responsible for surveying and subdividing among the incoming Europeans, still had the perception to realize:

... that no tribes will allow of the peaceable occupation of their country but, following the counsel of the boldest and strongest men amongst them, will endeavour to check the progress of the white men by spearing their sheep and murdering their shepherds ...
History tells of no people or tribe, however small or weak, submitting tamely to the insolent intrusion of strangers. Nor is the Savage of Australia, however despicable some may deem him, so utterly devoid of courage and pride as to yield without a struggle that country which he claims as his own, on which he is used to obtain his food and to which he is undoubtedly attached.⁶⁴

Writing to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1865, Governor George Bowen informed him that hostilities had broken out in Cape York not so much through Jardine’s birching of a native boy, but simply because “the inevitable trial of strength” had occurred. The natives had to learn “by experience the superiority of European arms and discipline”, he elaborated, for:

... any trespass whatsoever on any district, whether by black or white strangers is, according to the customs of the aborigines, invariably punished with death, unless, after a trial of strength, the newcomers are found to be the strongest...⁶⁵

Though the eventual outcome of this ‘trial’ between spears and rifles was undoubtedly a foregone conclusion, Aboriginal resistance was determined and powerful enough in many areas to drive white settlement back temporarily. Indeed, on all frontiers in Queensland, one finds evidence of labourers deserting their employment, of stations being abandoned, of sheep and cattle speared or driven off, not in ones and twos, but in hundreds, even thousands.⁶⁶ In the early 1840s, on the Darling Downs, a resistance campaign led by one Multugerah, with the stated intention of waging “... war ... in earnest ... to spear all the commandants, ... to fence up the roads and stop the drays from travelling and to starve out the jackaroos (strangers)”, led to the murder of shepherds and station-owners, plunderings upon stock and provisions and the desertion of properties. When it “became evident that [the natives] ... must be conquered, or there really would be no more rations go to Darling Downs” a party of twenty armed settlers accompanied by Lieutenant Johnson and ten rank and file troops of the 99th Regiment took reprisal action against the Aborigines over several weeks “persistently giving them no time to procure their food and pouncing upon them by night or by day in camp” until they submitted.⁶⁷

Further west, in the Warrego Country, settlement along the Condamine, Maranoa and Lower Macintyre was thwarted for three years by guerilla forays and “began to retreat”.⁶⁸ The threat
of the South-Western tribes were not successfully countered until Frederick Walker eventually led his newly formed Native Police against them. In May and June 1849, the rifles and bayonets of these troopers put to rout those tribal groupings known as the "Bubera Blacks", the "Severn Blacks," the "Fitzroy Downs Blacks" and the "Condamine and Dawson River Blacks" in four successive encounters resulting in pitched battles, unrecorded casualties and the retreat of the indigenes.69

Settlement of the Burnett district, begun in 1842, had to be abandoned the following year due to aboriginal raids.70 John Taylor writes here of: "... a rather lengthy period of conflict. Between 1841 and 1855, at least 45 Europeans were killed by Aborigines in Wide Bay and Burnett".71 In December 1853, the citizens of Maryborough called for greater police protection as:

The Blacks have openly threatened to kill the white people ... without these cannibals receive a check, neither life and [sic] property will be safe and they will drive us out.72

During the following February, after a native had been arrested for the murder of a Chinese man, the Land Commissioner wrote:

Fraser Island's Blacks ... have mustered in large numbers round the township with the expressed determination of rescuing the prisoner and destroying the Town. On Sunday last, they appeared in such formidable numbers well armed with spears and nulla-nullas that I was obliged to send in my own men to disperse them ... if they knew their own strength, the place would very soon be abandoned ... [They] have threatened to burn, not only my quarters, but the whole town and to murder all the inhabitants ...73

By December 1855, Halloran was still indicating a continuation of this state of seige, and reporting that advancement was "very considerably retarded" due to the fact that: "For the last three months hardly a day has passed without a house or dray being robbed". He listed twenty-six serious depredations in the past six weeks and added that, as a consequence, thirty persons had left the town in one day to return to Sydney. He surmised:

When it is considered that the blacks are fully 15 to 1 as regards the white population, it will not be thought surprising that they are beginning to feel their own strength ...74

W. H. Wiseman, writing on behalf of small agricultural
proprietors “very much exposed to the marauding excursions of the Ningli Ningli Blacks inhabiting the scrubby and swampy coasts from Bribie Island to Wide Bay” attributed such activity largely to the “determination of the natives to pillage and murder till they can drive out the white man”.

Aboriginal resistance in the Southern districts, although decidedly broken by 1861, was calculated in that year to have accounted for the killing of approximately 250 Europeans. Additionally, John Taylor has estimated, largely from newspapers reports; a further thirty-three cases of physical assault, seventy-six accounts of raids on stock and thirty-five other robberies undertaken by Aborigines. These latter figures, too, are most definitely a considerable under-estimate, when one takes into account that A. E. Halloran was reporting over a number of years, Aboriginal depredations of “almost daily occurrence”.

If space permitted, a similar pattern of difficult advance could be charted in detail for the rest of Queensland. Indeed, it could be accurately shown that the forward thrust of white settlement met with and contested human obstruction far more desperately, the further north and west it moved: for example, “sporadic war” in the Dawson River area from 1857 to 1870; the pitiless struggle for domination of the Mackay and Bowen districts during the 1860s, with the pessimistic estimation of Governor Bowen in late 1866 that by now 600 whites had been killed by Aborigines and the grim conclusion of the Port Denison Times in 1869 that “our own town at least had its foundations cemented in blood”. The Cardwell district, the Palmer River Gold-fields and the Atherton Tableland during the seventies and early eighties were the scenes of even gorier contests. One miner reported of the Palmer natives:

They seemed to be long lanky fellows, more of a copper color than the Southern blacks and having by far more pluck — as when we pointed our guns at them they stood still, as much as to say, “Fire Away”.

At Battle Camp in November 1873, ranks of such ‘lanky fellows’ charged the diggers’ makeshift barricades, only to fall victims by the score to the volleys of Snider rifles. The entire road from Cooktown to the Palmer was “almost milestoned by the corpses of white men,” wrote the Cooktown Courier: it was simply “a warpath on which every white man risks his life”. Early in 1873, Dalrymple reported from the “high, wild, broken, conglomerate tablelands and ranges” around Gilberton that after a series of ten murders:
... nearly the whole Chinese population which formed the valuable alluvial diggers of the field had left the district, leaving the valley of the Gilbert in undisputed possession of the Aborigines.99

At Gilberton township itself, the following year, it was the white population’s turn. They were driven from the town by the natives after four men had been speared, and all their property, abandoned in panic in the street, was put to the torch. Mr Hodgkinson MLA, after failing to obtain some compensation for these unfortunates, intoned in open rage before Parliament that:

The manner in which [his motion] ... had been received would show the people in the North — those people on whom the prosperity of the country so much depended — that they must shoot every blackfellow they found, in spite of the pseudo-philanthropists.90

Though armed Europeans throughout Cape York would labour to make his harsh words something far more substantial than a hollow threat, isolated groups of Aborigines were “still unsubdued in some corners of the Peninsula at the turn of the century”.91

At the same time, in the Gulf area, on the so-called ‘Plains of Promise’, “the white and the Myall . . . [were] ever at war”, a Burketown settler, A. Turnbull would later recall:

During this period of settlement a continual guerilla warfare was waged with the blacks . . . Many whites lost their lives, usually solitary shepherds or stockmen, while hundreds of aborigines fell whenever whites turned out to retaliate . . . 92

In late 1874, both the Police Magistrate and the Land Commissioner at Normanton gave eloquent testimony to the tension caused by the natives’ presence when the one reported that they had “robbed nearly every house in the town”;93 and the other after commenting that it was “positively unsafe to be out of doors after nightfall unless provided with firearms”, predicted that if an organized attack were made:

... this place would share the fate of the Gilbert Township. I feel much anxiety lest the blacks should attempt to fire the buildings as they have been known to do in several instances.94
The recognized condition of "perpetual war" in the Burke District was duplicated in the Mt Isa — Cloncurry region from the late 1870s. It was not brought to its abrupt and bloody close until late 1884, when, after a series of raids on stations, along with skirmishes and running battles with 'posses' of squatters and Native Police detachments, the so-called 'Kalkadoons' finally ceased their running, turned and charged instead, again and again, at the muzzles of the carbines, and fell like the 'long lanky fellows' at Battle Camp a decade earlier.
CHAPTER THREE

"Musketry and Terror"

The pattern of European conquest

We are placed in this predicament: we must either retire from the place and leave a smiling country in the hands of a few cannibals, or we must protect our lives in such a manner as to convince the savage that he is powerless to cope with the white men's arms, and teach him that his only hope of safety lies in submission...

"Rusticus", 1861

The foregoing account of Aboriginal resistance makes no claim to being either exhaustive or fully explained. Indeed it mentions only some of the more outstanding features of that struggle, for it is presented primarily as an impressionistic survey of a valiant though doomed opposition which gave to the white usurper a just reason, he believed, for seeing the 'wild' native collectively as an enemy, and the frontier as the frontline of a battleground. Here, John Rex comments that a key psychological reaction to the tensions implicit in this confrontation is that "thinking about the other group means thinking about a situation of war". As Western Wood phrased it to the Queensland Legislative Assembly in 1864:

... in the battle of life the original possessors of the soil have had to give way to the advance of the white man... conflicts with the natives... in very many cases cannot be avoided.

The European in this conflict, with his vast technological, military and economic superiority, waged a campaign of no quarter against a poorly equipped and ill-organized adversary. Activated by a mixture of motives, ranging from the excessively precautionary to the fervently retributive, the white settlers rode out in groups to drum a leaden lesson into the hides of this undifferentiated enemy, in what often may well have been a first example of their co-operative endeavour against the wilderness, a
militant expression of white 'mateship' which cut across class lines simply because it reinforced racial ones. In the Parliament of 1880, the Hon. Mr Feez would recall how:

... in 1858 he went out on foot to Gracemere ... and met Mr Archer ... with a large escort; and, on asking them where they were going, was told that they were going to punish the blacks for depredations they had committed.\textsuperscript{99}

In 1880, also, J. B. Stevenson wrote frankly of a raid in which he had participated near Cape River, mounted in reprisal for the killing of two shepherds:

Vengeance was now the cry, and, after having hurriedly buried the bodies, the whole party started in pursuit of the murderers ... towards the evening of the second day, a large mob of some fifty or sixty blacks was discovered camped round a deep water hole, at the foot of the Cape ranges. The party, numbering about twenty-five spread out, and under-cover, formed a complete circle round the devoted [sic] mob. At a given signal, they closed in at a gallop, with rifles and revolvers ready. The dismay among the mob was frightful. Whichever way they turned, they were met by mounted men, armed to the teeth. Some few who tried to run the gauntlet were at once shot down; the rest took to the water. Not one escaped to tell the tale ...\textsuperscript{100}

George Carrington, happening in his travels upon such scenes some time after the attack had ended, reported:

I have seen two large pits, covered with branches and brush, and secured by a few stones, and the pits themselves were full of dead blackfellows, of all ages and both sexes.

On another occasion, I was traveling on a road where, for more than a quarter of a mile, the air was tainted with the putrefaction of corpses, which lay all along the ridges, just as they had fallen. It is true that the offence here was the murder of five shepherds, on one station, in a week, but such wholesale and indiscriminate vengeance seems rather disproportionate, to say the least.\textsuperscript{101}

Frederick Richmond, in summarizing the dismal business of reprisal, had this to say:

The white man's revenge is pure terrorism ... [In] the war
of the races . . . there is much useless slaughter, much that is not only not chivalrous but is absolutely revolting. In the waterholes in some parts of the North may be seen the ghastly remains of the dead blacks, skulls, ribs and thigh bones strewn about.\textsuperscript{102}

The act of poisoning whole communities of Aborigines with arsenic or strychnine-laced milk or rations — the so-called 'death pudding' — may be regarded from one viewpoint as the most sinister and brutal of atrocities in the 'war of the races'. Thus, one can feel little more than contempt for the jovial way Harold Finch-Hatton reports upon how an unnamed squatter of his acquaintance gave "the niggers . . . something really startling to keep them quiet" in the shape of poisoned food:

The rations contained about as much strychnine as anything else and not one of the mob escaped. When they awoke in the morning they were all dead corpses. More than a hundred Blacks were stretched out by this ruse of the owner of Long Lagoon.\textsuperscript{103}

Yet such desperate behaviour must also be understood as an index of the psychological pressure weighing upon isolated settlers to rid themselves permanently of the continuous, nagging threat of attack from the surrounding bush. The frightened shepherds at Kilcoy Creek in 1842 were of this order when they fled their outstation, leaving behind poisoned flour which would cause some sixty natives to die in great agony. An old Aboriginal man described "how each poor poisoned wretch had jumped about before he died":\textsuperscript{104}

That blackfellow been eatim damper. Then plenty that been jump about all the same fish, when you catch im, big mob been die — him dead all about . . .\textsuperscript{105}

The Kilcoy incident, which helped harden Aboriginal resistance throughout South-Eastern Queensland was merely one of the better publicised examples of this quietly lethal process. James Demarr records the poisoning of an unspecified number near Laidley in the 1840s,\textsuperscript{106} while both Tom Petrie\textsuperscript{107} and Edgar Foreman give evidence of arsenic placed in food killing "fifty or sixty" at Whitesides Station on the Upper Pine River. Foreman recalled finding some of the ghastly remains of this feast: "I, as a little boy, rode through a small pocket of what was called Rush Creek and saw scores of bleached bones including a complete skeleton".\textsuperscript{108} There are also mentions of poisoning along the
Macintyre and in the Warrego District, of an attempted poisoning on the Maroochy River, of a successful one at Maryborough in 1854, and of another, large distribution of toxic food “at Christmas” in the Burnett District sometime afterwards. There are reports of other poisonings in the Dawson River region, at Apis Station near Marlborough, and in the Cardwell District. There are undoubtedly numerous poisoning cases which, through guilt and shame, were never reported at all.

In North Queensland, E. W. Docker claims, such poisonings were “almost a commonplace occurrence,” whilst as late as 1908, an alarmed Reverend Campion was told here:

> Why, if you give the blacks phosphorous in their flour it only makes their eyes water, but if you mix arsenic with the flour, that’ll stretch them out.

That a resort to arms and to destruction when encountering Aborigines was the usual and most commonplace response is clearly indicated by so many complacent statements directly from settlers themselves or in their colonial press. For example, we have J. K. Wilson’s frank admission that “… a resolution was come to among the settlers and they went out and shot five or six of the blacks whenever they met them”, and there is Donald Gunn’s laconic recollection that Aborigines were “in many cases … shot down because they were a nuisance”. F. M. Bell similarly recalled “hundreds of … blacks shot and left to rot like cattle where they fell or snigged away with a horse if too close to camp”; while W. Bucknell explained in 1899 that because the blacks were “treacherous” at Herbert Downs, Georgiana River, “the station hands fired on them whenever they met them”. Newspapers reported congenially upon dispersals of Aborigines, executed “in the usually approved manner”, whilst *The Colonist* in 1872 mentioned in a small item that at Cape River: “A storekeeper named Richardson has revoltered a blackfellow whom he caught inside his counter with presumably felonious purposes” with not even a mild rebuke. “Every white man [on the gold fields] carrying a rifle tries its range on every black fellow he sees”, reported the *Queenslander* bluntly in 1877, and in 1891, the *Boomerang* greeted the news of the shooting of an Aboriginal with mock impatience:

> Why bother us at such critical national time with everyday commonplaces like this? Has it come to this in Australia that the taking off of a solitary blackfellow is to be wired all over this island-continent? Have coloured persons ceased to be a national game?
In 1883, the *Queensland Figaro*, in admonishing the Brisbane *Courier* for its bland reportage of a massacre of Aborigines at Normanton, commented forcefully:

Could it be that this is a Christian country when such deeds of violence are either ignored or are stated in complacent narrative style without rebuke by the journals which arrogate to themselves leading positions in the Press?\(^{125}\)

The overall tally of Aboriginal deaths from overt violence by the gun, poison and even the employment of savage dogs\(^{126}\) which such casual admissions suggest to the researcher, is indeed at present impossible to gauge. Without yet taking into account the decimating activities of the Native Police however, the conclusion that a massive death-toll was the direct product of European colonization seems virtually inescapable. George Carrington claimed in 1871 that “for every white man killed, six blackfellows, on the average [sic], bite the dust”,\(^{127}\) whilst in 1880, the Hon. B. Morehead estimated that “if the Black attacked the white man he suffered ten-fold”.\(^{128}\) A reprisal ratio of ten, or even twenty to one in many areas of Northern and Western Queensland cannot be discounted. Indeed, in 1889, Archibald Meston claimed that in the North, as many as fifty Aborigines had been slaughtered to avenge the killing of each European.\(^{129}\)

There were times, however, when the vehemence of the European settlers’ aggression would put all the random snipings, and even such drastic kill-ratios as these, into the shade. Such times marked a climactic point in the warlike relationship between the races; a point at which all the barely suppressed fears and exasperations were channelled into an outburst of embittered and uncompromising fury. This flash-point for massive retaliation was not usually ignited simply by Aborigines killing a disparate number of white individuals, such as shepherds.\(^{130}\) Rather, it was induced after they had struck down members of that social unit which was virtually identified with the coming of civilization into the wilds: the European family unit. The themes invoked here of ravished femininity and outraged innocence acted upon other settlers as a goad for revenge which would be pursued with a passion that even transcended their passion for land. After the massacre at Hornet Bank near Taroom of nine members of the Frazer family, on October 27, 1857, small armies of settlers, as well as Native Police Detachments — “A Squatters’ Crusade”\(^{131}\) — waged throughout the Dawson and Burnett Districts, a campaign of some six months duration against any and all Aborigines in the region, a campaign which Mrs Campbell Praed labels “the
little war',¹³² but which could more accurately be described as a vendetta, a rout or an "orgy of slaughter".¹³³ Several hundred Aborigines in broken batches were rounded up over a wide area, and standing mutely, or roped and handcuffed together, or ordered to run, were shot down, while the press called for extermination of "the black fiends by whom we are surrounded" and "full and just revenge" upon the "butchering aborigines".¹³⁴ Even as far south as Redbank, just outside Brisbane, Donald Gunn records, "a vigilance party" tethered a group of natives together and then 'executed' them.

Three years later, the murder of nineteen of the Wills' party at Cullin-La-Ringo near Springsure on 17 October 1861 called forth, if possible, a proportionately greater response. Within weeks, seven different detachments of Native Police were scouring the Leichhardt District, exacting a heavy and indiscriminate toll upon the Aborigines.¹³⁵ These were supported by groups of squatters "prepared to attack anything aboriginal that might be seen". Moore Dillon wrote from Orion Downs:

... an uncontrollable desire for vengeance took possession of every heart, words of execration and pity fell alike heedlessly upon the ear — the blood of strong men and helpless women, of grey-haired men and unconscious infants, spilled wantonly on every side, spoke to every heart in a language words could not interpret ...

and Daniel Cameron, on Planet Downs added, more in sorrow than in anger, that "months of peace" were now shattered:

... bloodshed, terror and anarchy, retaliation and revenge will be quick and sharp. The advocates of treating them little better than inferior animals will exult in their extermination ... the innocent and guilty alike will disappear.¹³⁷

As Lack and Stafford state, "... the greatest punitive expedition in pioneering history gathered in force from points north, east, south and west. Hundreds of blacks were slaughtered."¹³⁸

A similar rampage had occurred in the Burnett district in June 1849 when fifty armed men avenged an attack upon the Pegg family with almost 100 Aboriginal lives.¹³⁹ At Sandgate in December 1853, a raid on the Dowse family was responsible for the advent of Native Police "dispersals" in the Moreton Bay area,¹⁴⁰ while at Rockhampton in November 1860, the rape of Fanny Briggs, wrongly blamed upon local Aborigines led to a campaign of mass hatred and more slaughter.¹⁴¹ In the Palmer
region in 1874, it was the murder of the Strau family at the Normanby River which induced a terrible revenge. W. H. Corfield, one of those who saw the dead and mutilated family and then participated in the reprisal raid, wrote:

If at any time I felt a compunction in using my rifle, I lost it when I thought of the murders of Strau, his wife and daughter, and the outrages committed upon them.

The *Cooktown Courier* commented:

Rifle and revolver practice during camping time has become quite an institution since the murder of poor Straw [sic], his wife and child. A carrier's camp at eventide is a regular 'school of musketry' and no man ventures to go in search of his cattle in the morning without having his rifle slung for use and his revolver by his side.

Similarly, after an old pioneering couple, the Conns were killed by natives at Cardwell in April 1875, a correspondent to the *Queenslander* commented cryptically:

... let the murder of the Conn family at Cardwell, and the subsequent penalty paid by the blacks, testify. At this moment, scores of skeletons lie bleaching in the noonday sun ... in the scrubby coast ranges adjoining the scene of that awful murder.

Thus, whether defiant or unresisting, Aborigines fell before the white advance singly, or in dozens and even scores at once, in response to the "effect of the civilized weapon" or chemical compound. James Demarr observed:

They could not stand against the forces brought against them. The settler's horses, dogs and guns — and poison — gained the day. No wonder the natives eventually lost heart.

Talk of the 'systematic killing' and 'wanton slaughter *en masse* of natives became common-place narratives and, as John Macrossan alleged in the Legislative Assembly in 1876, "the system of continual war ... was being carried on at the present time to utter extermination". Several years earlier, the Reverend E. Fuller, residing as a missionary among the Fraser Island Aborigines had written to a colleague:
People talk about the danger of living amongst the Blacks . . . I have been living nearly two years amongst them in a place where the thieves and vagabonds and the most wicked amongst them generally resort . . . and yet we dread the whites more . . .\textsuperscript{147}

Where some writers execrated those with "white skins" who thought themselves "heroes . . . for slaying men with sticks in their hands and defenceless women and children," others argued, "Perhaps it is necessary to keep the wild spirit of the savages in awe, by a severe example now and then".\textsuperscript{148} Reviewing the entire story of white conquest, the \textit{Boomerang} commented in 1891:

The term "treat like a blackfellow" has come to mean the acme of personal discomfort as applied to an intellectual and physical inferior, with an almost total absence of moral sense. [This] . . . included such drastic measures as shooting on sight, slaughter of black women and children, and poisoning of waterholes . . . This is the treatment we have rendered out to them in the past . . . We have written with brutal plainness, but it is the brutal truth.\textsuperscript{149}
CHAPTER FOUR

"A Policy Tending to Extermination"

The Queensland Native Mounted Police

Could it be maintained that because outrages were certain to be committed after a war was begun, therefore a just war was not to be fought?

The Hon. H. E. King, 1880

I have seen their tracks, and on their tracks I have seen the dead bodies of their victims . . .

"Outis", 1880

The manner in which aggression was most efficiently and relentlessly applied, and violence institutionalized on the frontier however, was through the agency of the Native Mounted Police. This force of armed Aborigines under the command of European officers, first introduced privately by squatters of Northern New South Wales in 1848, and under the direct control of the Police Commissioner of that Colony by mid-1855, was adopted by the Queensland Government from the outset in 1859 as a counter-insurgency force to ascertain the ultimate supremacy of white settlement. Although both its founder, Frederick 'Filibuster' Walker and Queensland's first Governor, George Bowen were to assert that "border warfare when absolutely unavoidable should be carried on under some control on the part of the Government" so as to ensure "far less loss of life, with actions far less sanguinary than when the white man is left to defend himself", their expectations were hardly in accord with the confrontation situation they were establishing. To begin with, the attraction of the force for settlers in threatened areas was that its black troopers could pursue their native adversaries into seemingly impenetrable country where white police and settlers could not follow. As Police Magistrate, Edward Quinn wrote of the vine-tangled scrub near Fassifern and Dugandin: "the Native Police are the only men who would be of any use there to repel the Blacks in a country like that". After white inhabitants scouring Fraser
Island failed to meet and combat the Aborigines there, A. H. Halloran concurred:

> It requires people of their own class who can make their way through dense scrubs and creeks and places where a white man encumbered with clothing cannot travel.\(^{154}\)

The Native Police therefore removed much of the local tribes' environmental advantage in the struggle for the land and prevented the terrain affording them any secure refuge: Aborigines more easily located were more easily dispensed with.

Secondly, the cultural factor of Aboriginal inter-tribal enmity, once grasped by the Europeans, was utilized both cynically and advantageously to motivate Aboriginal troopers in the destruction of their fellows. "I have never been out among niggers before . . . [we were] driving the niggers out", innocently answered a native trooper called "Sambo" to questioning at an inquiry into the shooting of harmless Aborigines at Kimberley, near Norman-ton, in 1887.\(^{155}\) A Danish migrant wrote of how:

> . . . the blacks themselves delight in being cruel to their own kind — often while I was on the Herbert I would see them coming past, like regular bloodhounds, quite naked, with their rifle in their hand and a belt around their waist containing ammunition and the large scrub knife. Their bodies would be smeared over with grease . . . They would then be out on an expedition. It no doubt requires all the authority their officer can command at such times to temper the wind to the shorn lamb.\(^{156}\)

They were "perfect devils for hunting down and killing the wild tribes", observed Harold Finch-Hatton, and Donald Gunn added, "All they thought about or talked about was the number of niggers they had shot".\(^{157}\)

Although the number of Native Police, exclusive of white personnel, was never above 250, in the later 1870s, and indeed as low as 106 for some time in 1880,\(^{158}\) this numerical disadvantage was more than outweighed by the use of horses and weaponry which gave to the force "a striking power out of all proportion to its numbers".\(^{159}\) A. J. Vogan in 1889 described the trooper clad in his uniform of red, white and blue, all gaitered and spurred, and carrying:

> . . . as he is in "marching order", a brass cartridge belt, containing Snider cartridges . . . around his body . . . [W]e
may add that a Snider carbine hangs in its "bucket" and strap from the "off" side of the "boy's" saddle . . .

It was this breech-loading Snider carbine, more than any other single item, which was responsible for tearing Aboriginal resistance into shreds: A short, bulky rifle with a calibre of 0.577" — something akin to an American buffalo gun — it discharged its large leaden ball with tremendous impact leaving a ragged opening in its victim "four times the diameter of the modern 0.303" bullet". Even if, as their apologists often claimed, the Native Police were 'discriminate' in their choice of victim when they stormed Aboriginal encampments, it is hard to see how, in the ensuing mêlée, their weaponry could have allowed for expert marksmanship. The Snider, never particularly accurate, would, at close quarters, simply tear apart anyone or anything it hit.

Native troopers were recruited — sometimes forcefully and sometimes by the allurements of military regalia, adventure or captured Aboriginal women — from distant tribal groupings and subjected to a rapid and, arguably, brutalizing course of drilling, rifle practice and 'discipline'. At times, recruiting difficulties could mean that Aborigines, imprisoned for crimes ranging from murder to larceny, were offered a remission of sentence if they enlisted in the corps. Once recruited, the black 'policemen' would find that 'discipline' largely involved an ultimate resort to the crude military procedure of flogging. In his popular exposé of the force, A. J. Vogan describes the kind of whips used, while W. R. O. Hill, in his panegyric to the same organization, candidly mentions floggings he administered when one of its officers.

During an inquiry into the deaths of two native troops due to such punishment in 1876, Constable John Thomas gave the following vivid testimony:

On the morning of the 26th December [1875], Sub-Inspector Carroll directed me to bring [trooper] Echo from the dray to which he was handcuffed to the parade ground; the boy was then handcuffed to a tree ... Mr Carroll ... brought out two stockwhips and gave me one of them and told me to "wire in". I struck the trooper twice on the back with the whip. Mr Carroll then flogged him ... until the boy fainted ... I do not know the exact number [of lashes] but it was over thirty ... his head was hanging back and his eyes set. I poured ... water down his throat — it seemed to run down ... without his attempting to swallow it ... he was then handcuffed to the limb of a tree standing on his feet, while he was in this fainting fit, Mr Carroll struck him three times
with the whip. I took the key . . . to release the boy when Mr Carroll told me to let him there for two or three hours it would do him good . . . about a quarter of an hour afterwards I missed the boy from the tree and never saw him [again] . . . I did not report this matter . . . [as I was told] that it was a general occurrence in every Native Police Camp and not to mention the subject anywhere as people would call us tyrants . . . I have seen troopers on a former occasion flogged quite as much by Mr Carroll with wire.164

In February 1877, a columnist for the Queenslander, writing in general support of the 'wild justice' of the Native Police, nevertheless admitted that "officers have behaved in a most atrociously cruel manner to their boys" and provided some striking examples of this.165 Desertions on account of illtreatment were a constant feature, as was summary execution for recaptured troopers.166 Yet, though open force may have kept the recruits sufficiently cowed when in camp and amenable when on regular patrol, it did not seem to temper their ferocity when in actual combat. Charles Eden wrote that when Native Policemen became moved by "great excitement" they were "beyond the control of the officer":

It is a rash thing to rob a lioness of her whelps or a tiger of his prey, but I doubt if either would be attended with more danger than interfering between the troopers and their foes when once their blood is up. Then is the only time the officer loses his control over them.167

— and this, one might surmise, would be 'the only time' when proper disciplining really mattered. In circumstances such as these it was indeed ironically true that "the want of discipline is the want of mercy" — and the resultant carnage by the troopers simply served to show "how utterly their work has degraded them".168

Additionally, the character of the rough 'disciplinarians' was often as dubious as the motives of the imperfectly 'disciplined'. In 1880, the Hon. Mr Hamilton claimed, using graphic examples, that "the black troopers were less culpable than the men under whom they acted." While there were "good officers", he argued, there were also:

... men in the force whose careers were long records of crime sanctioned by the Government . . . men [who] had committed murders which were unparalleled in the records of the Bulgarian atrocities . . . He knew of such men who
went patrolling through the country shooting the unfortunate blacks wherever they met them . . . \(^{169}\)

During this debate, other parliamentarians also spoke openly of the ruthless character of the force. The squatter member for Blackall, Archibald Archer referred to the officers who were "... a disgrace to the nation that produced them . . . some of them would shoot blacks simply because they were blackfellows". At one point, after he had mentioned that: "A great many police officers . . . had been perfect brutes and [that] the Colonial Secretary knew that also", the Colonial Secretary himself — the man to whom these officers were ultimately responsible — responded, surprisingly enough, with a "Hear, hear".\(^{170}\)

Native Police Officers, indeed, were badly trained, poorly paid for dirty and dangerous work and their activities were subject to virtually no inspection beyond the evidence of their own carefully worded reports. D. T. Seymour, as Police Magistrate in direct control of the troops, admitted in 1875:

... no depot exists for training officers to the \textit{special} duties of the force and as no more are employed than are absolutely required for active service, it becomes frequently a matter of very great difficulty to fill a vacancy; though there has never been any lack of candidates . . . \(^{171}\)

The kind of men appointed, added the Hon. Mr. O'Sullivan, had too often been:

... great scoundrels, wild young devils, sent out here to gain colonial experience, who perhaps could trace their families beyond the flood, and had carpet bags full of testimonials, and who were sent away in charge of these police . . .

And how, asked the Hon. Mr. Persse, could they find better, more responsible men, "men who could see fair play to the blacks on £125-a-year?".\(^{172}\)

If space permitted, these general condemnations could be illuminated by case after case of officers shooting prisoners,\(^{173}\) kidnapping aboriginal women and children\(^{174}\) and ordering what can be seen as nothing less than the indiscriminate butchering of unresisting natives.\(^{175}\) It is obviously true that, as C. D. Rowley notes, "the Native Police offered a perfect niche for the sadist";\(^{176}\) but perhaps it is even more appropriate to see a system, where, in seeking to maintain "the decided superiority . . . [of] military
skill over savage force", the Europeans involved became rapidly dehumanized by the taint of the massive blood-letting this required. Year by year, these men played the dangerous game of massacre, and then denial of massacre — calling it 'dispersal' — as they skirted the boundaries of the law and sought refuge in its ambiguities. Few escaped unscathed; the natives themselves accounted for several, while many more fell foul of scandal, dissipation or alcoholism.\(^{178}\)

The legal foundations of the Native Police were almost as questionable and obscure as its frontier activities. Governor Bowen, along with the entire Executive Council merely "... presumed that this force was first established by the direction or with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Colonies",\(^{179}\) though they apparently possessed no documentary evidence of this. The force was not legalized in the Colony of Queensland until 1 January 1864, when the *Police Act* (27 Vic. No. 11) came into operation.\(^{180}\) This Act merely mentioned in Clause 3 that a Commissioner should control the Police Force, "including the Native Police Force". Section 33 again indicated that this latter organization should "continue to be", and allowed for the making of regulations.\(^{181}\) By this vague legislative nod, therefore, its activities were henceforward to fall roughly within the sphere of legality. Yet there would be continuing confusion over whether the Native Police were actually 'included within' the regular Police, as the law indicated, or whether it existed as a distinct and separate entity. In 1884, the Police Commissioner supported the latter proposition when he stated:

> We have in Queensland a native police force *quite separate* from the ordinary police, and maintained solely for the "purpose of dealing with offences committed by the natives".\(^{182}\)

Clearly, such an accepted concept of distinctiveness gave to the workings of this body an unspecified extra-legal dimension, which the *Police Act* did not seem to encompass.

This equivocal position was again compounded by the rules under which the squad operated. While regulations "on the model of the Irish Constabulary"\(^{183}\) served the normal Police, the Native Police ostensibly functioned under an entirely different set of rules, not issued until 1866 — and "more vague and mysterious regulations it would be difficult to frame", commented an ex-officer in 1881.\(^{184}\) Instead of ensuring centralized control and direction, they emphasized instead wide local discretionary powers and rigid official secrecy, and seemed, overall, to be perpetuating a situation where "officers acted very much as each
thought fit, without any effective supervision". Instead of receiving precise procedural directions, white personnel were informed that:

... as from the nature of the service its duties must vary, consequently the mode of execution must vary with them, and be directed by the circumstances of each particular case.

Orders, from the Commissioner down, were issued verbally, and no record of them was kept. There were no written directions for the punishment of insubordination. Unauthorized persons were not to accompany the force upon its rounds (although white reprisal bands often did) and officers were warned to be "very particular in always avoiding indiscreet discussions". As Inspector Armit stated in 1880: "I am forbidden to publish any information which would give the public even the slightest glimpse of the doings of the Native Police". When reporting raids upon Aboriginal groups, the words "dispersal" or "dispersed blacks by force of arms" was the only description required. A. J. Vogan commented sarcastically:

A young "sub", new in the force ... used the word "killed" instead of the official "dispersed" in speaking of the unfortunate natives left hors de combat on the field. The report was returned to him for correction in company with a severe reprimand for his careless wording ... The "sub" being rather a wag ... corrected his report so that the faulty portion now read as follows, "We successfully surrounded the said party of aborigines and dispersed fifteen, the remainder, some half dozen, succeeded in escaping ...".

The Native Police officer was caught, therefore, in a bind between what was legally proscribed and what was, in reality, demanded of him. As James Demarr put it:

It may be asked: Did the Government sanction these acts? No. The law was that any white man murdering a black should be hanged. But the law was a dead letter. The Government ... let the two races fight out their differences, and the Government must have known what the result would be ... It was in the Parliament of 1880, however, that John Douglas identified the implicit contradictions most precisely. The corps, he argued,
was neither one thing nor another. They were acting under civil law, although quartered in an enemy's country, and what could be expected? The original intention was that the force . . . be maintained for the purpose of executing warrants and in virtue of [this] . . . they used to disperse tribes by firing amongst them. Under martial law that might be perfectly justifiable, but certainly it was not justifiable under civil law. It was an unfortunate thing that the force occupied such an anomalous position, because officers and men did things which had no sanction, either in civil or military law . . . A soldier in command of a body of men would treat an enemy in a different way to what a policeman did. The officers . . . were not justified under the civil law in acting as they did, and they did not exercise that discretion which military law demanded . . .

It seemed that the only way out of this dilemma, apart from an open declaration of war, was a complex pattern of evasion and denial. Declaring war would mean recognizing Aborigines as an invaded people rather than, as they were legally defined, 'British subjects', whose resistance against the British system of law became logically a 'Criminal Act' and the resisters, automatically, 'outlaws'. On the other hand, undeclared war, if pursued cautiously, was largely unpublicized war, and conflict could be effected without regard to war's conventions: the treatment of prisoners, the signing of treaties, the making of territorial settlements, indemnities and the like. Native Police sorties, therefore, proceeded without witnesses — for Aboriginal 'subjects' were not regarded as entirely competent until after 1884 — without bodycounts — the dead being incinerated rather than enumerated — and without the taking of prisoners or any complications over land rights. And without open declarations, there could, of course, be no recognized truces and no official armistice, only a repetitive pattern of "a little wholesome correction" and "well-merited chastisement" until the blacks were "pretty well shot down and got rid of" and the district was "quiet".

Meanwhile Government politicians and civil servants maintained a civilized face by continually denying that anything disreputable was occurring at the periphery of their control. The Queenslander argued that, "...if [an officer] . . . keeps the blacks quiet no questions will be asked, and the authorities will remain obstinately deaf to all reports of his proceedings."

Thus, whilst the liberal press kept up a persistent barrage about a "barbarous corps of exterminators", "a system of native
slaughter . . . merciless and complete" \(^{195}\), the "massacre of unresisting human beings, paralysed by terror" \(^{196}\) and "Our Trained Murderers . . . saturated with innocent blood" \(^{197}\). Government members simply answered that "no illegal acts" were occurring. \(^{198}\) When singular atrocities became apparent, the Government spoke of an "error of judgment" or "indiscretion" \(^{199}\). The Police Commissioner, D. T. Seymour became the staunchest defender of the force he officially controlled. In July 1874, he stated categorically of the "blacks" at Cardwell and Cooktown, "... no instances of the[ir] wholesale slaughter . . . has ever come under my notice privately or officially, during a residence of nearly fourteen years in the colony" \(^{200}\). In his estimation, reported cases "existed but in [the] imagination" of "well meaning but, so far as relates to this subject, totally ignorant persons" who made "vague, general charges" they could not substantiate \(^{201}\). In a similar vein, when Bishop Mathew Hale wrote to the Colonial Secretary, A. H. Palmer in 1879 concerning a recent massacre of twenty-eight Aboriginal males near Cape Bedford by Sub-Inspector O’Connor and his troopers, Palmer brusquely responded, "The Colonial Secretary is not in the habit of taking any notice of absurd paragraphs in newspapers and declines being catechised on them" \(^{202}\), while O’Connor and his band were promptly despatched to Victoria to help track the Kelly gang. Over the following months, however, stories of Native Police excesses were to appear in profusion, especially in the columns of the *Queenslander*, and led the Hon. Mr O’Sullivan to remark that: "He had heard more of the massacre of blacks during the last two years than he ever did in his life before" \(^{203}\). Palmer himself admitted to hearing of so "many horrors" that he was getting his facts confused \(^{204}\). Hence, in the Estimates debate of 1880, he adopted a new line of approach. In order to offset demands for a Royal Commission into the force, he argued:

There was no doubt that there had been a great many bad native police officers — perhaps worse men could not be found under the sun; but things were different now, and what in the world was the use of raking up old matters when the men connected with them had gone \(^{205}\).

What effect this admission had upon the defensive denials of his own Commissioner of Police throughout the 1870s was, conveniently, not dwelt upon. \(^{206}\)

Nor did such diversionary tactics end here, for something far more vital than the reputation of the Native Police was at stake in
making these rebuttals. The denial of race-murder was ultimately the denial of European guilt and incrimination in the destruction of Aboriginal life and culture. It was, consequently, a defense of the putative qualities of the white race and their Imperial self-image of benevolence, justice and moral superiority. The Queenslander, which tried desperately in 1880 to "tear away the veil", recognized this when it wrote that "a true record of . . . proceedings would shame us before . . . every part of the British Empire". Its editorials continued:

If we are told that the cruelties practised on our blacks are merely incidents of the struggle carried on with the Natives in all parts of the world, we yet plead for a reform. We are at least adding a fresh element of disgrace to the universal horror; for if all the world is practising violent wrongdoing in its dealing with inferior races, we alone have descended to . . . extermination.207

Other writers were not so forthright: In 1902, William Lees, touching upon the story of settlement, called it "a shameful record of disgraceful actions such as tingle the cheeks of any with a particle of whiteness in them",208 and then passed rapidly on. Edward Kennedy in 1870 had been even more circumspect: "It was not . . . desirable for obvious reasons to go far into the subject", he tersely concluded.209

The feelings of embarrassment and uneasiness evidenced here arose naturally from the seeming irreconcilability of professed 'civilized' ideals on the one hand, and the harsh actions considered necessary in the process of 'civilizing' on the other. W. H. Wiseman was uncomfortably aware of this dichotomy when he claimed, concerning the implacable hostility existing between the races, "... such behaviour is not in accordance with the habits of civilized life and is totally inconsistent with the policy of the white race". Yet, he rationalized the absence of European "kindness and conciliation" on the frontier with the observation that:

However painful the reflection to the philanthropic and Christian spirit which directs all the activities of our Government, the fact must be observed that Destiny proclaims the certainty of the future triumph of the white race and of the final extrepation [sic] of the Aborigines.210

This dramatic, though abstract appeal to 'Destiny' was given more substance in the work of Charles Eden who argued that while "a policy tending to extermination is of necessity frightfully revolting to the Christian Mind", nevertheless:
It was . . . a question of absolute necessity, a choice between the protection of the pastoral industry of the country, or the abandonment of that pursuit by the colonists; nay, further, it was a choice between the sons of Japhet and the sons of Cush, for they could not coexist.211

And to this trinity of predestination, biblical precedent and pragmatic economics, Edward Kennedy added a fourth consideration. Rather than dealing in questions of "absolute justice", he reflected, white colonists should simply ask themselves, "whether we have any right in Australia at all". Then, with their answer strongly in the affirmative, they should simply:

. . . consider not what ought to be, but what is. Right or wrong we are in Australia, and we may take it for granted that we mean to stop here. That being the case, it is to strain at a gnat [sic] and to swallow a camel to pretend to hesitate on conscientious scruples about taking such measures as are necessary to secure our safety in doing so . . .212

Yet, for the colonists involved, it was a moot point whether such amoral appeals to expediency provided sufficient justification for what was happening. It was surely implicit in human nature that writers and speakers would raise the bothersome questions of 'right and wrong', and would develop a conscience about such things as invasion and genocide. Were the above arguments of Eden and Kennedy sufficient, for example, to answer Donald MacDonald when he wrote:

We are indeed a civilizing race . . . when we came here, the aborigines covered these wide plains in thousands. Where are they today? We have 'civilized' them — they are dead.213

Or to counter George Carrington, as he viciously parodied the talk of 'Destiny' and 'Providence':

The argument seems to be, that God never intended them to live long in the land in which He had placed them. Therefore, says the white man, in his superiority of strength and knowledge, away with them, disperse them, shoot and poison them, until there be none remaining; we will utterly destroy them, their wives and their little ones and all that they have and we will go in and possess the land.214

The fact that supporters of such arguments felt neither
sufficiently comforted nor exonerated by them is surely implicit in their repeated attacks upon reformers as "dirt-throwing philanthropists" and "monomaniacs", or in the uneasy levity which was often employed to submerge the seriousness of the question. In an attack on the "Negrophiles" at Mackay, who had begun a reserve for local Aborigines, 'Nicodemus Johnson' facetiously asked, "Why don't those merciful Mackay people migrate as missionaries up here and start along the Palmer road . . . ?". But the tone of the *Cooktown Courier* in July 1874 was one of indignant anger and exasperation rather than merriment when it wrote, regarding the "spurious philanthropists down south who are continually speaking of the 'poor blacks'":

> It is very easy for people who are perfectly safe from . . . danger . . . to preach toleration and humanity, and christian [sic] charity, but were they exposed to lose their property or their lives by the spears of their "sable brethren," the christian charity would soon evaporate in the smoke of a rifle.

—an argument which implied that it was only they, the "pioneers of civilization in the Far North" who really understood by bitter experience the nature of the 'savage' and that, in dealing with such an 'enemy', the finer sentiments of British civilization did not apply. As the journal, the *Judge* commented, "The fact is that only Northern men who have so lived with their life in their hands can fully appreciate the lurking devilry of the 'poor black man'".


CHAPTER FIVE

"A King of Brutes"

Stereotyping the vanquished

Group conflict, particularly in situations of war and conquest, may have little in the way of intellectually argued theory to support it. Ultimately it is possible with little more in the way of verbal expression than a hostile grunt. But sustained relations of opposition, exploitation or oppression . . . require some measure of codification and rationalization.

John Rex

Men, more or less busily engaged in killing and taking possession, are not likely to make a very favorable report of those poor creatures into whose inheritance they have come; mere self-defence would tempt them to try to lessen the greatness of their crimes, by asserting the victims of these to be scarcely deserving of a better fate . . .

W. Pridden, 1843

A detailed and denigrating racial stereotype of the tribalized Aborigine arose out of the direct experience of the violent frontier. Backed by ingrained ethnocentric conceptions, traditional as well as scientific beliefs and emotive second-hand evidence, this stereotype emerged as the major raison d'etre for racially prejudiced attitudes and responses towards the libelled native. Both the negative stereotype and the aura of prejudice surrounding it were then utilized in turn as a 'bridging' explanation for the violence, exploitation and discriminatory behaviour to which the 'civilized' European was 'forced' to stoop in his dealings with 'savages'. When a crusading paper like the Queensland Figaro attacked the "pioneers" for viewing "the niggers . . . as so much black trash to be turned into manure at the first convenient opportunity", an immediate answer was that the character of these 'niggers' made such treatment necessary. In 1883, the Normanton Herald argued that even "half civilized niggers" were no more than "wretches whom it were more of a
mercy than a crime to wipe off the face of the earth", and supported this with reference to their "treachery", violence and "defloration of little girls". An appeal to the innate character of the 'savage' therefore became the lynch-pin for European rationalizations of conquest and colonization. In August 1874, for instance, Governor Normanby employed the image of 'wild' natives, "numerous, savage, treacherous, and very commonly cannibals . . . [who] will generally murder any unarmed white man" to deflect the Earl of Carnarvon's attention away from lurid accounts of settlers' 'dispersal' activity. In a similar vein, the Illustrated London News in 1888 favorably contrasted the European's introduction of luxury, art and science, "civilization and the city" into Australia with its previous aspect of:

... scattered tribes of wandering, restless, half-starved, lazy, dirty, naked savages, homeless and miserably degraded by superstitious terrors, distrust and fear.

The contrast between an original condition of native barbarism and the European achievement of "wrestling the land from uselessness and sterility" was consistently drawn to underline the vast superiority of the latter undertaking. If the question was put, "Is pioneering to halt because of the existence of a few hundred naked cannibals?", the answer seemed obvious:

It is surely better in the interests of humanity that there should be millions of prosperous white people living civilized lives in Australia than a few thousand nomadic savages eking out a wretched existence on such sustenance as the unreclaimed waste provides.

Emphasis upon the base inferiority of these "utter savages" was therefore an essential element in this ethnocentric line of argument. Edward Kennedy claimed that, "There is not a redeeming point in their whole character . . . it is a fact that there is no savage so thoroughly low and degraded as the Queensland Black"; and A. C. Bicknell categorically agreed that "they . . . were the most miserable specimens of humanity imaginable". In appearance, C. H. Allen wrote, "No race of savages can be imagined more hideously ugly than the Aborigines of Australia" and their physique was parodied as "a shock head of hair supported by an attenuated streak". Their speech was either likened to "grunts" or an irritating "jabbering in high-pitched voice" whilst their uncleanness excited general disgust. "In fact," wrote A. C. Norton;
they are a very dirty people, and . . . it is wiser and pleasanter to keep windward of them . . . they possess an odour of their own which cleanly people cannot relish.232

Their corroborees were seen as "the most grotesque of capers" or simply "childish and weak"233 and it was considered that " . . . the artistic faculty . . . is almost entirely gone. They do not even understand a drawing". Their marriage laws were interpreted as "communal sharing of women"234 or "a kind of marriage by capture", both practices being regarded as the moral obverse of Christian monogamy;235 whilst the various responses to the question "Is there anything in him which can be called religion?" 236 seemed to affirm that "fear of the unseen and unknown" would be a more apt description for their "child-like" superstitions.237 Indeed, contemporary observers condemned the Aborigines with such all-round conclusions as:

They are in the lowest state of social existence, all equally ignorant of the very humblest of the arts of civilization, without clothing, habitations or agriculture, and when pressed for hunger devour with eagerness, grubs, snakes, stinking whales and even vermin.238

Before mid-century, theological justifications for the natives' inferiority were still frequently employed. For instance, the Reverend Eipper, writing in 1841 about Moreton Bay, invoked " . . . the testimony of Scripture that 'The dark places of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty' " to explain the Aborigines' heathenism, "passions . . . [and] violence".239 As late as 1864, the Reverend Ridley, a former missionary in Western Queensland, explained Aboriginal 'degeneration' by their refusal to obey the law of Progress "imposed by Divine wisdom upon human nature" and by the fact that, after the Aborigines withdrew from contact with "more . . . energetic nations" — presumably after the collapse of the Tower of Babel — they " . . . chose not to retain the knowledge of God . . . and as a necessary consequence declined from generation to generation until even the use of houses and clothing was forgotten".240 Arguments concerning Providence and degeneration linked to the biblical time-scale would persist, although they came increasingly under skeptical attack.241 For instance in the same year as Ridley's lecture, the Reverend J. Campbell, speaking to a large Brisbane audience, mentioned Kingsley's Village Sermons, wherein the Aborigines, depicted as "brutes in human shape", were likened to "the Canaanites of old, to be swept off the face of the earth". But Kingsley was here referred to only in order to be debunked.242
After mid-century, it was increasingly to the writings of natural science that Europeans turned to find the most plausible and convincing support for their racist suppositions. Although Charles Darwin originally found the Australian Aborigines "far from being such utterly degraded beings as they have usually been presented", standing "some few degrees higher in the scale of civilization than the Fuegians", this proved to be cold comfort after a whole coterie of unilinear evolutionists had had their say. To F. W. Farrar, in 1867, Aborigines were entrenched "in the lowest mud of barbarism" whilst, in 1874, Lorimer Fison moved them "several strata below barbarism into savagism". Upon the theoretical evolutionary ladders and trees of mankind which were constructed, the Aborigine was inevitably placed upon the lowest rung or the most stunted branch. As one writer put it in 1901, they were "the zero, so to speak, of all anthropological analysis". Popular writers, journalists and politicians, in turn, echoed the scientists wholeheartedly in concluding that here was "a very low type of humanity" — in fact, that "No much lower race of human beings exists than the Australian Aboriginal". From this point of view, it was not taking a very large step to ask, as did one correspondent to the *Queenslander* in 1880, "... And being a useless race, what does it matter what they suffer ...?"

A scientifically recognized status of 'savagery' for the Aborigine gave added credence to settlers' accounts of his bloodthirsty ferocity. Concepts of the native as a 'noble savage' had all but disappeared from circularized accounts of the Aborigine by the time the twice-expelled convicts were painfully colonizing Moreton Bay, in the late 1820s. The popular refusal to recognize anything faintly 'noble' in the 'barren meanderings of primitives' was reflected by A. W. Sterling, when he wrote:

> Let anyone who pictures to himself the splendid savage, mourning over the ruin of his race, demanding of the white man that justice which even the meanest should ask ... proud, free, and unconquerable — such a savage as Cooper loved to draw ... — [let him] dismiss from his mind all and every such notion before he hears the truth about these sons of the south.

Instead the general impression of Aboriginal savagery was closely related to such forbidding aspects as treachery, rape and cannibalism. George Dalrymple commented scornfully, "So long as they think the White man is master, they are cringing and servile but watching the unguarded moment which shall give them an easy prey". William Wiseman elaborated:
... they seek peace only with the intention of gaining time to concoct some scheme for the destruction of the white man. They waive [sic] the branch or the wisp of grass in token of amity but to deceive...[and then] some fatal night they arise and murder as many as they can.251

It was not until 1910 that a more sympathetic interpretation was recorded when German ethnologist, Dr Klaatsche explained that what seemed underhand treachery was "... the blackfellow...[meeting] superior force with guile...if he has been once deceived or cruelly treated".252

The Aboriginal male as the black rapist of white females was another pronounced theme of white racial beliefs. It was, furthermore, a theme which was exaggerated out of all proportion to the number of such rape cases which actually occurred. Later it was the spectre of the Chinese seducer of white girls or the 'Kanaka' ravisher which invoked the fear, hatred and protective responses of the white male. But in the earlier period of settlement, before the coming of Chinese or Melanesians in appreciable numbers, it was the Aborigine who bore the brunt of this racial obsession. W. H. Wiseman in 1855 claimed that "... a savage has no horror in shedding blood...or committing the most dreadful atrocities on females even of the most tender age";253 and it was generally held that in the event of an Aboriginal raid upon a white party of both sexes, "... better a man should keep his last shot for [despatching an attached female]...than suffer one he loved to fall into the hands of these fiends".254 Governor Bowen, without quoting any statistics, claimed in 1865 that, "At almost every Assizes in Queensland, natives are indicted for murders of Englishmen or rapes committed on Englishwomen". Earlier, during December 1861, he had displayed great concern at the number of black rapists, though there had only been three such convictions in the preceding two years. He added, "It is to be feared, indeed, that the crime of rape is of more frequent occurrence in this colony than appears...the victims often concealing their sufferings from feelings of shame". He was commenting here in relation to the Wills massacre, where he found it "...a subject of melancholy satisfaction that the English women of Mr Wills' station do not appear to have been violated before their murder, as is the usual practice with blacks". In 1866, however, in his anxiety about "wives and daughters ravished by hostile savages" he contradicted himself by claiming that:

In several instances, as in that of the Fraser family in 1858, and of the Wills family in 1861, all the men have been
cruelly butchered and in cold blood, while the women have expired under horrible outrages.\textsuperscript{255}

Though Bowen held that Aboriginal rapists received "a perfectly fair trial", the undefended native was usually rushed uncomprehendingly through the necessary court proceedings on his way to the gallows. For instance, in the case of \textit{R. v. Georgie} in November 1861 concerning this Aboriginal's alleged rape of one Bridget Ryan near Ipswich, the accused neither spoke nor was represented throughout the entire proceedings. On the night of the offence, Mrs Ryan had told the Ipswich doctor, Henry Challinor that no rape had actually occurred, yet in the witness-box she abruptly changed her story, claiming that she had earlier been "ashamed for her husband". Dr Challinor had made no relevant medical examination of the woman on the night in question and therefore neither of her assertions could be proven. The Judge wrote:

I told [the jury] that if they were not quite satisfied on that point, they ought to acquit the prisoner of the higher charge, and find him guilty of the misdemeanour only. The jury, after an absence of two or three minutes, returned into court with a verdict of guilty of the capital charge.\textsuperscript{256}

European men were informed that it was their "bounden duty to turn . . . out with all the men . . . in the station and hunt the black down\textsuperscript{257}" in the case of rape, whilst "unprotected females" in North Queensland were urged to carry revolvers.\textsuperscript{258}

Cannibalism, in turn, was seen as "a custom unworthy of the human race".\textsuperscript{259} The degree to which Queensland Aborigines actually indulged in the practice is problematical, as is the explanation for it, whether it be attributed to ceremonial behaviour, revenge, starvation or general cultural breakdown — or some combination of all four motives.\textsuperscript{260} What is important here, however, is the colonists' reaction to such behaviour, whether real or imagined. Settlers were convinced that Aborigines were "addicted to cannibalism\textsuperscript{261}" — a conviction which grew stronger with the spread of settlement into the North. "A very savage cannibal lot they were" wrote W. R. O. Hill of the natives on the Palmer\textsuperscript{262} and stories were told of "buckets of human flesh in their camps" as well as "dead Chinese roasted and trussed ready for their feast".\textsuperscript{263} Lurid descriptions of cannibal orgies invariably spiced with a highly imaginative seasoning of details were utilized to "prove . . . beyond the reach of question" the "most revolting ferocity" and "bloodthirsty propensities" of
Europeans reacted with a thrill of horror, “revulsion and indignation” to this “repulsive” and “disgusting” activity and then employed those strong emotions to justify “an exterminating war carried on against them.” Hudson Fysh, for example, provides an excellent example of how the stereotype of the savage Aboriginal served to excuse white reprisal activity when he claims:

The blacks’ outrages were usually accompanied by the lowest treachery. Their extreme savagery and cannibalistic habits incensed the settlers and diggers and since it was impossible to secure safety and order without severe measure, extreme action had to be taken.

At first sight, it might appear that scientific discussion over whether Aboriginal society approximated to the state of existence of neolithic, palaeolithic or even neanderthal man is only marginally connected to the racist stereotype being outlined here. Yet the constant reiteration of the idea that Aborigines were “the true living representatives of the stone age man” only served to emphasize the developmental gap plainly drawn between them and ‘civilized’ beings. As A. W. Howitt wrote:

In the varied series of social communities existing in Australian tribes, we may safely mark the gradual development of early society, which, through savagery, had led up, through the status of barbarism to the present position of civilized man.

Whereas Western people, by virtue of progress, were seen to have climbed to a condition of civilized pre-eminence, the Aborigines were regarded as remaining statically “in the same state as they were in the stone ages”. “Centuries ago, nature ‘side-tracked’ a race in Australia”, was the way Dr Ramsey-Smith explained it to the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science in 1913, and, two years later, Baldwin Spencer claimed that because Aborigines had lacked “the impetus derived from competition”, they had been left “stranded . . . in a low condition of savagery”. Furthermore, scientific writers were by no means neutral when it came to showing what primitive man was really like. “All savage and uncivilized races are superstitious, sensual and cruel”, wrote G. C. Nash in the Science of Man in 1899; but, argued the Australasian Anthropological Journal, “. . . earliest . . . men . . . brutal . . . [and] of very low intelligence . . . were far worse in every way than even the lowest savages of the present age”. Yet, claimed E. M. Curr, “If we would realise
what the earliest Black savages were like, we must study the Aus­
tralian before he passes away". Similarly, the Science of Man
argued, "All crime is a reversion to the manners of savage
ancestors . . . [for] crimes against the person or property are only
the normal doings of savages" and, as W. Campbell Thomson
added, stone-age Aborigines "stand upon the same level as our
criminal class".

There was a further group of thinkers and writers, however,
who saw the Aborigine as not merely a stone-age man with
criminal propensities, but as an actual form of 'non-man'. Philo­
sophers like Voltaire and David Hume had earlier challenged
Christian orthodoxy by claiming that the various races of men
were so different in appearance, mentality and cultural achieve­
ments that they were actually the product of several separate
Creations. 'Polygenesist' thought, as it was therefore called, pro­
vided in essence "a rationale for treating some human groups like
animals of another species", though biblically-fundamental
American slave-holders usually avoided its arguments because of
the theological implications. Nevertheless, polygenesist theory
flourished throughout the nineteenth century due primarily to
the writings of men like James Hunt and Lord Kames in
England, Edward Long of the British West Indies, and, most
importantly, to the works of Samuel George Morton, Louis
Agassiz, George R. Gliddon and Josuah Clark Nott of the United
States of America. It has been argued that the Darwinian evolu­
tionary explanation which re-emphasized man's common
ancestry, dealt "a fatal blow" to the polygenesists' argument that
"contemporary races were actually different species" in a
descending order of excellence". Yet it would be more accurate
to suggest that Darwinism simply made the polygenesists shift
their ground: If the common ancestry was "some kind of
monkey", how far removed from this creature had the various
races since become? As Marvin Harris states, "The question still
remained as to how long the races have maintained a separate
phylogeny within the species".

In Samuel Laing's Human Origins of 1903, he argued that the
problem was still "an open one" because the "... great variety of
human races . . . [contained] fundamental types so dissimilar as
to constitute what in animal zoology would often be called
separate species". And what of the Aborigines, judged as one of
the lowest evolutionary types and the closest living approxi­
mation to earliest man — was he of a species separate from his
more 'civilized' counterparts? Just how much of the beast had he
retained? It was on this point that a lively debate was enjoined,
with the polygenesists continuing to find in Aboriginal anatomy
and crania fertile ground for their theories.
R. Brough Smyth in 1878 claimed that “Australians are really human beings, and not creatures of another species, as so many have represented them” — and in Parliament the Hon. J. M. Thompson supported this by arguing rather shakily that “They had not said that the savages of the back slums of London were of a different order of beings”, then why say so of the Aborigines “made in the same form as themselves?” The general weight of opinion, however, seemed to favour an opposite conclusion. A contributor to the *Science of Man* stated in 1900: “The Australians form a distinct ethnic group — even a race apart from the rest of mankind”, while other writers condemned them as “hideous scandals to humanity” and creatures of “scarce human lineaments”. In 1870, Daniel Wilson, an English writer compared the “Australian savage” unfavorably to a “novel anthropoid of high type” — Shakespear’s Caliban. In Australia, it was suggested that the Aborigine might be “the connecting link between the human and the brute creation”, or, more specifically, the link between ‘man and monkey tribe’. A. Oldfield, in 1865, while emphasizing the Aborigines’ “simian appearance” was uncertain “whether we have to do with intelligent monkeys or with very much degraded men”, and C. Lumholtz, observing the natives of North Queensland, wrote, “Their projecting jaws make them resemble the apes more than any other race, and their foreheads are as a rule very low and receding.” As time passed, scientists seemed to grow even more convinced of the animalism of their subject. In 1896, the *Australasian Anthropological Journal* drew a direct relationship between Aborigines, “the orang-otang and the other apes” and in 1903, Laing commented that the Australian, along with the African Bushmen, “approach most nearly to the simian type”. In 1907, W. Ramsey Smith told the *Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science* that “... aboriginals have furnished the largest number of ape-like characters. The more one investigates the truer does this statement prove to be”. This led a newspaper, reporting his speech, to place the natives firmly among “the anthropoid apes — the gorilla, orang, gibbon and chimpanzee”. Ramsey Smith claimed, in particular, that Aborigines’ teeth approximated to “the dentition of new world monkeys”, whilst Dr Klaatsch closely compared their feet to those of anthropoids. The skull, however, received most attention, for in the wake of the craze over the pseudo-science of phrenology, it was still accepted that an intimate connection existed between cranial capacity and intelligence. Measurement of specimens by various calculators had led to a finding that the “internal capacity of the skull” for an average European was a good 10.4 cubic inches greater than for the average Aborigine, and
conclusions about the latter's very low mental ability were quickly drawn. As early as the 1820s, Barron Field had used phrenology to convince himself of "the animality of aboriginal behaviour", and during the sixties and seventies, the information gained its widest acceptance. Whereas T. H. Huxley emphasized the "similarity between the Neanderthal crania and those of aborigines", Laing, in turn, suggested that:

... it will be seen at a glance that the Neanderthal skull, especially in the frontal part, which is the chief seat of intelligence, is nearer to the chimpanzee than to modern man.

It should also be easily seen that polygenesist theory, in denying even a leaven of basic humanity to the benighted Aborigine, must be classed as the most extreme manifestation of racially deterministic thought. With scientific investigators relating Aborigines to apes, encouragement was naturally given to colonists to compare Aborigines to animal species closer to home. In 1891, the Reverend Louis Schulze argued that "hunting and rambling about in the bush kills all mental activity and lowers man to the level of the beasts", while A. W. Stirling drew "a curious likeness between the ways of the Kangaroo and the habits of the blackfellow who inhabits the same country". He then went on to talk ominously of the destruction of the "hated marsupial". Mrs Campbell Praed explained Aboriginal cannibalism as "due to some longing of the carnivorous animal", whilst the severity of the native police was caused, wrote J. G. Wood, by "the singular antipathy which invariably exists between wild and tamed animals, whether human or otherwise". The Aboriginal mind was seen to work instinctually rather than intellectually, and, wrote Edward Kennedy contemptuously, "what Dingo or any other wild animal" does not track as well? As late as 1910, A. J. Vogan could still comment:

It is very curious how prevalent is still the idea, even amongst ourselves here in Australia — who should know something about the aborigines — that the 'blacks' are 'mere animals'.

The step between seeing Aborigines as a form of animal and treating them as such was a small and seemingly logical one to take. In answer to the Queenslander's charge that "... the aboriginal inhabitants are treated exactly in the same way as the wild beasts or birds", a correspondent defensively replied:
You say we treat them like wild animals: Well to a certain extent their attributes are the same, and must be met in the same manner . . . It would be almost as useless for whites to try and make animals moral as the Queensland Aborigines.  

George Carrington frankly admitted that due to the "continued private enmity" between the bushmen and the natives:

... the latter has come to be considered in the light of a troublesome wild animal, to be shot and hunted down, whenever seen in the open country ... They are then 'ferae naturâ', and a nuisance, and the more they are shot at, the sooner they will learn what gunpowder means.  

References to "black vermin" were common. A.C. Bicknell, stranded overnight in the bush near Herberton, wrote, "I had with me a five shooter and twenty rounds of ammunition . . . quite expecting to get a brace or two of black game before the morning . . .".  

It is pertinent to comment here that a strong correlation can be seen between racist thoughts and racialist practice. A definite inter-relationship can be drawn between the structure of a contact situation and the ideas and the theories which evolve from, and in turn, serve to strengthen that structure. The beliefs, in short, tend to rationalize the behaviour of those involved in any particular contact pattern. Thus, if Aborigines were so dehumanized by a section of the colonists as to be seen as no better than brutes, one should not be surprised to discern brutal responses forthcoming towards them. As a columnist in the Queensland Figaro stated bluntly in 1883, "The blackfellow is a 'brute' and must be put out of the way". In 1880, another paper, the Sydney Mail had taken this rationalization to its logical extreme. In reference to Queensland, it argued:

The blackfellow's title to this country was destroyed by his savagery . . . he was lord only over snakes and kangaroos — a king of brutes, but little more than a brute among brutes. Back of the brute there was, no doubt the germ of manhood, but a creature with only an undeveloped germ of manhood cannot live among men. The blackfellow shrank from men, preferring to dwell among marsupials. He did not understand, he did not [act] . . . like a man . . . He fought against
him as a wild brute would fight — treacherously, savagely ... His blood is therefore upon his own head.\textsuperscript{312}

Here, therefore, the dehumanization of the black man happily provided for the exoneration of the white man in the on-going process of extinction. Vice-Admiral Sir George Tryon commented in 1885 of Queenslanders:

Certain it is that a 'nigger' is by many scarcely regarded as a human being. The stories told, and the acts that have passed without reproof, tend to bring up a generation hardened against natives. There has been far too much shooting down in cold blood deliberately done ...\textsuperscript{313}

This conscienceless atmosphere tended to shield from due process of law or even effective rebuke the activities of an extreme minority of settlers who went on hunting raids after wild blacks — euphemistically calling it "snipe-shooting" — or who openly boasted of the number of 'niggers' they had despatched.\textsuperscript{314} Although many may have quietly deplored such actions, their feelings were never expressed in any mass outcry against the slaughter. In April 1883, the British High Commissioner, Arthur Hamilton Gordon wrote candidly and privately to his close friend, Prime Minister Gladstone:

The habit of regarding natives as vermin, to be cleared off the face of the earth, has given to the average Queenslander a tone of brutality and cruelty in dealing with 'blacks' which it is very difficult for anyone who does not know it, as I do, to realize. I have heard men of culture and refinement, of the greatest humanity and kindness to their fellow whites, and who when you meet them here at home you would pronounce to be incapable of such deeds, talk, not only of the wholesale butchery (for the iniquity of that may sometimes be disguised from themselves) but of the individual murder of natives, exactly as they would talk of a day's sport, or of having to kill some troublesome animal.\textsuperscript{315}

In 1874, another less distinguished settler had struck out angrily at the euphemisms which masked the realities of carnage. Charles Heydon, a one time resident of the Cardwell district wrote:

I heard white men talk openly of the share they had taken in slaughtering whole camps, not only of men, but of women and children. They would defend it thus: They said that the
In 1880, the Queenslander attempted to set the record straight in the following manner. It suggested:

One man treats them with kindness, another with brutality; each white does as seems good in his eyes to the wretched savages who have learnt in their terror to submit to anything that the conquering race may choose to do . . .

The paper, however, was careful to draw "... a clear distinction between the small section of settlers who act with barbarity, the majority who do nothing, and the other minority who actively protest". Yet it concluded, unwaveringly, "Our contention is that the second class is equally guilty with the first one. [They] . . . condone and share the crime". Similarly, a despairing minister of the Crown wrote to Catholic missionary, Duncan McNab in November of that year:

Nothing has been done for the Blacks since you were there, and nothing is likely to be done . . . Nineteen-twentieths of the population of the Colony care nothing about them, and the other twentieth regard them as a nuisance to be got rid of . . .
McNab himself wrote to the Earl of Kimberley, concerning “a banquet given by the Governor at Christmas time”, 1880:

... the discourse turned on the treatment of the Aborigines and the conclusion arrived at (as I learned from a member of the Legislative Council, who was present on the occasion) was, that there is nothing for the Aborigines but extermination.521

Although the occurrence of any such conversation over Christmas dinner was hotly denied by the Government, McNab’s statement does serve to introduce the point that a belief in either the future extermination or, at least, extinction of the Aborigines was almost universally accepted throughout colonial society. From Southern Queensland, a Laidley resident wrote in 1876:

Sir, I live in one of the many districts where the work of extermination is virtually an accomplished fact... They have been shot and poisoned wholesale... and now the same work is going on elsewhere, and there is no general outcry against it; there seems no general desire to stop it.522

In the North, too, Inspector Henry Fitzgerald wrote despairingly of the conciliatory approach that his subordinate, Sub-Inspector Marratt was attempting towards the natives in the Cooktown region: “It is utterly hopeless for him to expect the good feelings of the majority of his neighbours — humanity is unrecognized — their creed: extermination of the natives”.523

Although the Laidley settler quoted above pointed out, “It is not somebody else that is responsible... it is not the squatter nor the pioneer miner nor the Government, in an abstract sense; it is you and I — it is each one of us”, 524 this was by no means the most popular interpretation. Many preferred to follow Darwin in ascribing the success of white men in supplanting the coloured indigene to “their arts, which are the product of the intellect”525 rather than to superior force, and to relate the disappearance of the native to “some mysterious agency generally at work”.526 Governor Bowen in 1859, saw the Aborigines “fast disappearing before the progress of European settlement” although “very seldom treated with violence and cruelty”;527 while by 1890, James Barnard, Vice-President of the Royal Society of Tasmania was one among many who solved the puzzle by seeing the process as “an axiom... [of] the law of evolution and survival of the fittest”. There was no reason to “suppose that there had been any culpable neglect” on the part of the whites, he concluded.528 In
tones of mystical inevitability, writer after writer described the
native “fading away . . . like mist before the morning sun”, or
“vanishing into the infinite azure of the past” or even “falling
into the oblivion natural to all that is lifeless and disconnected”
— sombre poetical phrases which ignored the agonies of Abori­
ginal demise and placed the development beyond the respon­
sibility of any human agency. To J. S. Dunnet in the Empire
Review, the “blackfellow” was “gradually passing away . . . hand
in hand” with the indigenous fauna, while to Flora Shaw of the
Times:

The occasional black man of low type, with narrow fore­
head, thick lips and tufted hair [who is seen] . . . is dying too
with the virgin woods [of primeval Australia]

Those who adopted an earthier, more realistic approach and
recognized “sins of neglect, oppression, cruelty, of massacre,
hasty or deliberate . . . recorded against us” also tended to
regard this as merely the practical application of scientific law.
Aspects of Malthusian, Darwinian and especially Spencerian
dogma were popularly invoked to show that human progress
only happened through constant struggle; where “the rule of the
strongest” eventually prevailed, and “the weaker must go to the
wall”. As Charles Knipe wrote in defence of the pioneer:

From the most infinitesimal creation of animated nature up
to the “noblest work of God” we recognise one universal
law — species preying upon species, and the weakest going
to the wall.

In the same fashion it was deemed inevitable that “the Australian
aborigine . . . must go down before the white man” for what
else could be expected when the ‘lowest’ of the ‘inferior’ races
clash with the fittest of the fit? Oscar Peschel, an ethnologist
wrote in 1876 of “The struggle for Existence in Australia”:

It was inevitable that the last surviving and superceded
forms of past ages should succumb . . . and the kangaroo
hunter disappear with the kangaroo. This has ever been the
course of Nature . . . it acknowledges only the right of the
strongest.

In the same year, Social Darwinist, H. K. Rusden explained:

The survival of the fittest means that might — widely used
— is right. And thus we invoke and remorselessly fulfil the
inexorable law of natural selection when exterminating the inferior Australian . . . and we appropriate their patrimony . . . cooly . . . though [this is] in diametrical opposition to all our favourite theories of right and justice — thus proved to be unnatural and false.  

And journalist Vincent Lesina told Parliament in 1901:

... that the aboriginal population of this country must eventually disappear entirely . . . is a matter that a study of evolution, a study of biology, a study of ethnology, should convince . . . [us] is absolutely incontroversible . . . The law of evolution says that the nigger shall disappear in the onward progress of the white man. There is really no hope at all.  

Though, to some observers, it seemed "a great pity that their total extinction looms ahead", others found consolation in the "Doomed Race" theory. Where the Brisbane Courier, a little guiltily, expressed "relief in the thought that the blacks are dying out", the Judge quite bluntly admitted, "the sooner they depart to the happy hunting grounds the better".  

Far into the twentieth century, white Australia would nurse a death-wish towards the original inhabitants, as, without any reliable demographic evidence to support them, writers continued to predict, in total confidence:

The Stone Age cannot blend with the Steel Age — the stone must crumble before the metal. The black man's work is done; sooner or later he must drift across the border-line into the land of vanished people, and his place amongst the races of the earth will be — must be — vacant.  

With the passage of time, also, unpleasant memories of frontier 'depredations' and 'dispersals' were allowed to fade. For instance, the Capricornian, a newspaper serving East-Central Queensland, could write on 16 October 1916:

The Aboriginal natives from the first were a negligible element and we had not to struggle, as New Zealand did, with a numerous and warlike race for the possession of the land . . .  

although the very area where the paper circulated had been the scene, in the late eighteen-fifties and early sixties, of a very bitter
struggle indeed. If it was ever necessary to take the factor of violence into account, the activity of black troopers, interpreted mainly as 'savagery' turned back upon itself, seemed sufficient explanation. Instead 'civilization' *per se*, although so beneficial to its European members, was seen as the great destroyer of the native, principally because of his 'hereditary' inability to grasp its gifts and its finer points. In 1891, the *Boomerang* branded the Aborigine "a decided failure":

In the wave of European civilization he is completely overwhelmed and without a groan, he sinks unknelled into the depths . . . the nearest he can get to civilization is to the vice that haunts it and those [sic] he assimilates like a sponge absorbs water . . ."  

In the Legislative Assembly, Barrister Arthur Rutledge confided to members that the "secret" of Aboriginal demise:

. . . was that the Aboriginal races were intellectually and in other respects inferior. They were ever ready to imitate the vices of the European, and were thus carried off by diseases and other causes."  

The popular interpretation was that because Aborigines, on the one hand, "lacked the power of concentration" and, on the other, were indelibly tainted by their savage traditions, "as a sow to its wallowings in the mire or a drunkard to his nip — you may reclaim them for a time but back they go". In 1896, the *Australasian Anthropological Journal* supported this idea with the pseudo-scientific observation that after Aborigines passed beyond puberty "the sutures of the cranium begin to consolidate, and the forepart of the brain ceases to develop as it does in other races".  

Because of the natives' undisciplined mentality and sensuality, therefore, educating them in the ways of the European was often regarded as a questionable, if not a dangerous procedure. A. W. Stirling wrote in 1884:

The "blackfellow" . . . never learns to trade, he never grasps the use of money, he has no idea of doing anything, provided he has enough to eat at the time . . . he has not even the foresight to work . . . I never heard of more than one black man who had been civilized . . . with the melancholy result that he was hanged in Queensland for an offence which is not to be mentioned in polite society."
Harold Finch-Hatton concurred that only "rascality" could be the outcome:

In acquiring the rudiments of civilization such as drinking, lying, thieving, and twisting red handkerchiefs round their heads, the blacks show themselves to be very apt pupils. But in all the higher branches of social science they are very backward.

In 1905, J. Mildred Creed argued in The Nineteenth Century magazine that, because of the sexual factor involved in mixing with white society, "it is not a kindness, but really a cruelty to cultivate" the Aboriginal intellect in any way. Thus, as it was believed that Aborigines were only able to absorb immorality and degradation — the so-called 'vices of civilization' — and the crime, disease and deterioration which were thought always to accompany these evils, European settlers sincerely demanded, "... to what purpose would we preserve them? What good could accrue from maintaining a remnant of a race that it is impossible to civilize?" Yet what we must now consider is how closely these confused impressions approached the real plight of the Aboriginal remnant, left stranded and dismayed in the wake of the violent frontier.
CHAPTER SIX

"Half-Savage and Half-Starved"

The condition of the Aboriginal remnant

If our instincts are true we must loathe the aborigines as they are now, less estimable than the mongrels that prowl like them in the offal of a station. By the ashes of their fire . . . they are crouched with their knees up to their chin and a half idiotic and wholly cunning leer on their faces, their hair matted in filth and their bodies greased in fat . . .

The Reverend Frederick Richmond

In the aftermath of overt frontier violence, the Aborigines remaining gave the appearance of a people thoroughly broken by the initial impact of Western culture: confused, frightened, profoundly shocked — indeed traumatised by the experience of their conquest. In 1885, in South Western Queensland, G. D. Preston described the natives driven back into:

... the most broken, baren [sic] and secluded parts . . . wither they retire as the country is stocked to avoid encounters with the whites. Of their wretchedness it is superfluous to speak — the want of water and something eatable make it complete enough . . . where it is next to impossible for any other [sic] animal to exist.

Similarly, the Aborigines' pitiful condition in the Burke District was described to Chief Justice Charles Lilley by J. S. Swan, a mines manager in 1891:

They are driven back in the spinifex ranges and when I was up the Nicholson they were living on ants. They dare not come on to where there was game for fear of kidnapping parties. They were the poorest things I ever seen [sic] — perfect skeletons . . . nothing to eat and sleeping in holes in the ground . . .

Sent by the Queensland Government in 1896 to determine the
condition of the Aborigines in Cape York, Archibald Meston, journalist and ardent reformer for the Aboriginal cause, wrote from Moreton:

Their treatment in this peninsula is a shame to our common humanity and would be incredible were there not so many dismal and conclusive proofs ... They came in here like hunted wild beasts, having lived for years in a state of absolute terrorism. They have too good reason to doubt the white man even when he comes with gifts. Their manifest joy at assurances of safety and protection is pathetic beyond expression. God knows they were in need of it.354

In the same year, the new Police Commissioner, W. E. Parry-Okeden found the Aborigines at Mein “... a very wretched lot ... ill-conditioned, intensely suspicious and nervous and ... [with] distinctly a hunted look”;355 while, due mainly to Native Police forays at Cardwell, it was reported:

They are so terrorized by the fate of some of their companions who have disappeared ... that they will not go hunting ... but gather round the houses of the friendliest settlers to starve ...356

Police Inspectors, who were ordered to adopt a placatory approach of offering rations to these hungry, disorientated remnants, found the “greatest difficulty in removing suspicion ... owing to past shameful treatment”.357 Inspector Lamond wrote in 1897 that, at a bullock-killing for Aborigines at Musgrave, “They were mostly all very timid and did not trust us as was shown by the absence of their young gins and boys — neither did they like being put into line, fearing some trap ...”.358 Nor were their fears often based simply upon a memory of recent wrongs. The fact that they had now been reduced to a condition of total subjection and docility was frequently taken to be an encouragement for renewed oppression. The Queenslander depicted them in their “thoroughly cowed and ... greatly reduced” situation as:

... driven from place to place; though not daring to resent insult, outrage or even murder committed by the whites ... they are yet a trouble to the settlers through their broken-hearted ignorant helplessness.359

In July 1895, a Cooktown correspondent to this paper wrote of his observations at a native encampment, south of the Annan River:
Men We Mark. No. 5.

Archibald Meston takes the fate of the 'derelict' Aborigine in hand (May 1891).
There were two old men, one young man (of very strong build, but then very sick) seven old women, and four young gins, three or four little girls from about 6 years to 11 or 12 years of age, three or four little boys and one little child about 12 months old, and some of the women had their hair matted together with clay in mourning for two little children they had buried recently. They had hardly any food in the camp... The poor creatures had all got colds, water was running from their noses, and they complained very much of too little "ki-ki", [food] and "too much cold longa night". I asked them why they did not go into the bush and kill possums, &c., and dig yams. They replied, "White-fellow along a yarraman [horse] too much break him spear, burn yambo, [humpies] cut him old man with whip; white man too much kill him kangaroo... we like our own country; only white man no good". The young gins said, "I think altogether we die soon".350

Most writers, however, were not so sympathetic, preferring to see in the miserable and degraded condition of the vanquished natives and their surroundings further evidence of their utter and unalterable inferiority. "Of all beastly places on earth, commend me to a blackfellows' camp," wrote "Old Chum" in 1876;361 while in 1901, two MPs indulged in the following 'humorous' interchange before the Legislative Council:

The Secretary of Public Instruction [J. Murray]: You can always tell when you are near a black's camp.

Hon. A. C. Gregory: On the lee side of them you can, but not to windward.362

In 1903, the *Evening Telegraph* reached an approximately equal level of satire when it described the Aboriginal camp outside Charters Towers as follows:

... of about 30 inhabitants, about a dozen gunyahs of various kinds of architecture, mostly built of bags, 100 dogs and a troup [sic] of performing fleas without which no camp is complete. In fact the aboriginal is only awakened out of his inherent laziness by the liveliness of this little creature.363

Aborigines who were no longer regarded as a dangerous threat were usually spoken of as 'tame blacks' -- a further reference to
their basic 'animality'. George Carrington defined these 'tame blacks' as those who:

Hang about stations and public-houses, and the outskirts of towns, begging always, stealing when they get the chance... They learn to drink grog and smoke and become weak and lazy, content to live on the white man's scraps, rather than exert themselves to get their own living...

The stereotype of the derelict Aborigine which developed, therefore, was built upon such observations as these and was often presented in terms which emphasized either the 'repulsive' or the 'comic' aspects of the image — or an uneasy combination of both. Charles Eden saw them as "a lazy vagabond set, constantly drunk..." and "great thieves...[who] will never do a stroke of work", while Harold Finch-Hatton distastefully depicted them in "mobs, invariably accompanied by a vast army of most wretched-looking mange-stricken dogs". On the 'comical' side, however, the Boomerang in 1891 presented a picture of the vagrant Aboriginal with rolling "mud-coloured eyes", "rudely accosted" by "street urchins" and moaning lugubriously, "Baal this p'feller Christmas — no rum, no 'baccy". Similarly, in October 1884, the Queensland Figaro carried a small item which speaks for itself:

A new way of utilizing the poor blacks has been introduced in Townsville — that of making them land-sale advertisements. In the wise: The beautiful lithographic plan of the Eden Garden Estate was placed on an aboriginal's back, the darkey also bearing a large placard in front — "Don't look at me!"

The 'semi-civilized' Aboriginal female was presented in turn by C. H. Allen as:

... a tall lank black woman stalking in great pride through one of the towns of Queensland, with an enormous crinoline and a pink gown, or some other gaudy castaway dress of her white sisters hanging over it, and this she lifts up in a remarkable manner whenever she crosses a street or comes near a puddle. A short pipe in her mouth completes the eccentric costume...

The ambivalent nature of this stereotype, and the way laughter could so easily turn to disgust is aptly demonstrated by the reactions of the anonymous Danish hero of the book, Missing Friend: After providing "a whole troup [sic] of dirty, lazy blacks"
at Bowen with some castoff clothing and having them caper before him for his entertainment, he was instead overcome with "a kind of remorse" for his lost items of apparel when he "saw these filthy blacks, lie wallowing in them, amid a flock of yelping curs . . .". 369

Yet, whether the stereotype of the alienated Aborigine was calculated to provoke ridicule or animosity, it was presented, like all racist stereotypes, in a manner that was both undiscriminating and immutable. C. H. Allen, for instance, typified all Aborigines as:

... a most idle thriftless lot . . . [who] will never settle to work with any regularity . . . They can never be made of much use to the settler . . . [They are] neither industrious nor trustworthy and will never become reliable servants. 570

J. S. Dunnet in 1907, capably summarized the universality of the stereotype and the way it foredoomed the "few thousands of unattractive specimens" remaining, when he wrote:

Vice has every attraction for them; virtue not any . . . their inherent laziness . . . aided and abetted their debauchery and their decadence was complete . . . they possess no racial pride, no virtues of any kind worth mentioning, no capacity to rise beyond the role of a serf . . . The impotent aboriginal, dressed in ill-fitting ragged clothes, cast off by a white, miserably aping English customs and freely imbibing the vices of his superiors, reduced by necessity to the point of beggary and, without any racial ambition [is] going headlong towards extinction . . . 571

Such observations did, of course, contain a degree of visual accuracy but their racist character arises from the assumption that the destitution and hopelessness described were features inherent in Aboriginal nature, rather than explainable by the powerless and oppressed position into which Aborigines were thrust by European conquest. Thus, when one writer in the 1890s noted pertinently of Aborigines in an encampment, "They had no energy to run, nor did they skip about and laugh", this was related to their laziness and "very limited" capacities rather than to the fact that they were either genuinely starving or suffering severe malnutrition and illness. 572 At Thornborough in 1882, it was not until some 200 starving Aborigines presented themselves within the small township itself that responsible residents realized they had a state of things which was a "disgrace to civilization" on their hands, "... the white man having posses-
sion of the rivers, hence no fish, the Marsupial Board having possession of the forest country, hence no kangaroo”. Desultory rationing was arranged by a hastily formed Amelioration of the Aboriginals Committee of five, and the natives were put to work “carrying firewood and water, gardening and washing”.

When in 1897, Archibald Meston toured the Central West and confronted townspeople with the “sad and deplorable condition” and the “continued defective nutrition” of fringe dwelling Aborigines they “confessed that they had not previously realized the actual state of these unfortunate blacks though living so near them”. During the Western drought at the turn of the century, Meston’s son Harold gave a graphic account of Aboriginal starvation in the interior. Although on several stations like Windorah, Thunda and Currawilla, owners or managers had humanely accepted the responsibility of feeding all resident Aborigines, on many other properties natives who were useless as a labour source were entirely neglected in their camps. At Durham Downs, there were forty-eight without rations, and at Canterbury, Morney Plains and Farrar’s Creek a similar “pitiable condition” was seen. At Palparara, he found thirty with only roots to eat and an occasional fish. He wrote, “Every soul in the Camp had sore eyes and two old men were . . . blind . . . I do not know how many of them will survive the winter”. At Tarko Station, a score of blacks, “wasted and weak-looking” had only pig-weed to eat, and sixteen at Keeroongooloo, ten of whom were unable to walk, were “living entirely on caterpillars”.

Though these examples exhibit a startling extreme of Aboriginal hunger, it should be realized that even regularly rationed Aborigines were suffering a severe nutritional plight. The transition from a finely balanced traditional vegetable and protein diet to a primarily starch-based one played havoc with their health and vitality. Where meat was irregularly provided, it was “without the variety of the ‘whole animal’ economy practiced formerly”, the natives being given simply “the offal”, “the head, entrails and refuse” of the slaughtered bullock or sheep — and all the “scraps” unwanted by the European. A. J. Vogan wrote:

After the whites have done their meal, the black stockmen are handed their “rations” which consists of the broken viands from the table, and such pieces of “junk” as have become tainted. The whole amount does not seem very much for the eight “boys” after their hard day’s work in the saddle, and when they have further sub-divided it with their relations at the black camp close by, their earnings for the day must appear very small indeed.
Where Aborigines barely survived upon a diet which allowed adults to waste away lethargically and children to die in infancy, where their fixed camps bred insanitary conditions, not culturally comprehended as a serious health hazard by a formerly itinerant people, and where debilitated Aborigines, living statically in filth, and without immunity from common European illnesses, were sitting targets for all forms of infection, it was easy enough for Europeans to surmise that Aborigines were basically lazy, dirty and diseased.

To such a description the adjective 'drunken' was invariably added. As a Commission of Inquiry into the condition of Aborigines noted in 1874:

They are passionately fond of intoxicating liquors, which, notwithstanding the law to the contrary, they have no difficulty in procuring whenever they have the means of paying for the same.379

This 'love of grog' was regarded as "the great attraction" inducing Aborigines to congregate round townships where they became a "nuisance to the whites" continually, and, when intoxicated, "hideous", "very saucy" and "most dangerous" as well.380 It should appear immediately obvious that the Aborigines' need for alcoholic release was directly proportional to the new intolerability of their existence. It should also be noted, however, that the Aboriginal response to the availability of alcohol, in terms of excessive intake and uproariously drunken behaviour, with both physical and mental deterioration resulting, approximated closely to the observed European drinking pattern in Queensland in the nineteenth century. "It is a curious fact that the publican is always second only to the squatter in the march of occupation",381 wrote J. B. Stephenson in 1880, and writer after writer upon colonial Queensland recorded that alcohol was "the curse of the place".382 The white male drinking fashion of 'lambing down' or 'knocking down a cheque' meant that "men make a business of being drunk while they are at it, and allow no interval of sobriety to intervene until they have finished their money".383 Men who might be "continually and noisily drunk" for a week or more at a time would stand "in wretched hovel in front of a rough wooden bar, and when they can no longer stand, roll upon the dusty floor, often unplanked". James Demarr commented:

A bush public house would at such times be as disgusting a sight as could possibly be seen in any country in the world.
Some dead drunk, and those who still retained their senses, fighting, swearing and slanging one another.  

W. R. O. Hill, casting about to describe the moral condition of a mining town on the Cape River Goldfields, where he was Police Magistrate, asked his readers to "[P]icture in your imagination a mob of two hundred or three hundred half-drunk semi-madmen running amok with each other in the brutal fights which were a daily occurrence". From continually imbibing inferior spirits, usually cruelly adulterated, white drinkers who became alcoholics were regularly depicted as on a downward slide almost as rapid as that of the doomed Aborigine. Charles Eden warned:

Once taste the degrading debauch, and there is no remedy, the victim goes on and on knocking down his cheque half-yearly, sinking lower and lower, all that was ever good in him withering and drying up under the curse, and he dies at last unknown, unregretted and unmissed. This may seem a terrible picture, but reader, it is underdrawn.

With such images in mind, Aboriginal drinking habits begin to appear as little more than a faithful reflection of the observed white example. As the Queensland Figaro demanded; "Who taught them to swill grog? The noble, civilized whiteman . . . ". The cultural norm which Aborigines learned from white recreational drinking was one of excess. If their decline from eagerly swallowing such "vile drugged stuff" was often more dramatic than that of the besotted European, this was both because Aborigines did not have as much tolerance towards alcohol as Europeans "on the spree" and, secondly, because the alcohol they were given was usually even more 'vile' than the 'stuff' the Europeans drank. Edgar Foreman wrote, "In those days they sold two kinds of rum. One kind was called blackfellow's rum . . . it was for the nigger alone". In August 1886, R. B. Sheridan told Parliament that:

... the publicans have a tub upon their counters — I have had it pointed out to me — and into it they throw the drainings of bottles and glasses and from the tub they supply the aboriginals; the name of this liquor is "all sorts".

Here Sheridan was trying to demonstrate that "... there are a great many more aboriginals destroyed by bad grog . . . than . . . by opium smoking" in a debate where several other members attempted to show that it was Chinese opium, not European liquor which was the "curse of the colony". 
In formulating a reason for Aborigines "fast dying out", however, it was the latter interpretation which came to hold the greatest attraction as a plausible explanation for the Doomed Race theory. The presence of Chinese opium addicts would be used to bear the blame — which Europeans shrugged away — for the decline of the Aborigine, in the same way as the activity of barbarous black troopers served to 'explain' frontier violence against the tribalized native. In both cases, the explanation helped to assuage feelings of European guilt — and Sheridan saw this clearly when he stated:

I am amazed at the holy horror . . . expressed at the idea that the blacks should be destroyed by opium. How have they been treated since the foundation of this colony? Have they not been ruthlessly and remorselessly shot down and treated as if they were vermin? Were not some persons, who will now raise their hands and eyes, concerned in wiping those people off the face of the earth . . . I do not believe a word of it. It is pure invention. It is an excuse to drive . . . [Chinese] out of the colony.391

Yet Sheridan here protested too much. Opium addiction did kill Aborigines in substantial numbers mainly because, in the same way as they were given alcoholic dregs, natives were sold in small packets, opium dross — the ash which remained after the opium itself had been smoked. This 'charcoal opium' or 'unchee', as the natives called it, was mixed with water into a grey paste and eaten, thus collecting as a foul sediment inside the stomach of the addicted person, and building an agonized craving which only more opium ash could temporarily appease. Aborigines caught up in the pleasure/pain syndrome of a new 'Dreamtime' which this drug brought, therefore, paid dearly for their visions.

Consistent reports of opium-addicted natives only become apparent from the mid-eighties. In July 1884, the Queensland Figaro reported "station managers" trading opium to Aborigines in return for labour services as far south as the Dawson River; while in November of that year a certain Mr E. Smith wrote to the Hon. Mr Morehead about being "much shocked at witnessing the effects of opium on the niggers" in the Winton, Surat and Roma districts. In 1886, James Beardmore of Rockhampton reported that "[S]ome few years ago a Surveyor took a Gin to Cooktown and she there learnt the use of it and taught her countrymen when she came back" with the result that "... the Blacks are fast dying out ... from Mackay to Rockhampton from the use of this drug".392 By 1896, John Douglas as Government Resident for Torres Strait was reporting "several opium dens..."
kept... chiefly by Malays and Chinese" on Thursday Island with opium smoking "in most of the coast towns" and broadcast throughout western districts. Young European men had also "acquired a taste" for the drug, he added, with some alarm.393

Though opium addiction should most accurately be seen, along with alcoholism, as a further major irritant upon the health condition of sick and enfeebled Aborigines, the rapid spread of the habit throughout the colony, plus its oriental origins and bizarre effects, led observers to brand it overwhelmingly the main destroyer of the semi-civilized black. Dr Walter Roth, who became Northern Protector of Aborigines in 1898, saw it as "... a cancerous sore slowly but surely eating its way into the bosom of the community — a danger alike to black and to the white";394 while to the Southern Protector, Archibald Meston, "the glazed and listless look" he encountered on the faces of Aborigines was enough to convince him that opium had taken "complete possession". It meant "... paralysis of mental and physical faculties, total destruction of energy and willpower ... annihilation of all sense of manhood or woman-hood, self-respect, shame, virtue, honesty and veracity" as well as blacks "dying in scores all over the West".395

Although Meston tended to emphasize that Chinese were the main suppliers, he was careful enough to note that "The Chinese are not the only criminals in this business, but so far they have been the scapegoats to carry the more prominent sins of the degrading traffic".396 Other writers also reported that "almost all the selectors and the stations on the coast supply the drug with but little secrecy";397 while inland "Every white man one meets has a supply of it to retail to blacks, everyone up this way has it; Rabbit fencers, stockmen, scalpers, curriers, mailmen all deal in it".398 Yet, despite such evidence, the supply of opium to the Aborigines rapidly assumed the reputation of being almost exclusively a Chinese evil, consistent with the reputedly "bland" and "cunning" nature of that race.399 Walter Roth blamed the "unabated vigour" of the traffic upon the "ever-increasing smartness of the Asiatics";400 while Meston's son Harold, writing from Tambo, composed the most graphic condemnation of the Oriental supplier. He wrote of "human wrecks, walking skeletons, the result of opium" living in "opium shelters made of old kerosene tins and bags" and "starving to death in the midst of plenty". He concluded ominously:

It is a frightful sight in a camp where boys and girls, even as young as eight and nine years of age, are lying with glazed eyes and wasted limbs, trembling and death-like under the influence of opium. While there are Chinese gardeners and
cooks on Stations and Chinese storekeepers and gardeners about the towns in any quantity, so long will this state of things continue until in a very short period, the aborigines of Western Queensland will be a people of the past.\textsuperscript{401}

The press, in turn, took up this scapegoating cry. For example, the \textit{Brisbane Courier}, wrote of "John Chinaman" arriving on the scene "with his mysterious cabalistic little packets of opium",\textsuperscript{402} while an article on Queensland Aborigines in the \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} depicted the Chinese as:

\ldots the cruellest enemies to the poor blacks. They supply them with opium and rum and make a practice of buying the young lubras \ldots Round all the Chinese camps are found thin emaciated opium smoking blacks with pigtails \ldots In 90\% of the cases, the offenders are Chinese. The term 'white Australia' is a hollow mockery up North.\textsuperscript{403}

Constant reiteration upon the theme of Aborigines "saturated with the noxious drug" and degraded beyond all explanation \textsuperscript{[sic]} by the activities of "the Chinese harpy"\textsuperscript{404} would soothe whites' consciences regarding the unwanted indigene at the same time as it outraged their sensibilities further concerning the unwelcome alien. Furthermore, such sensational material attracted attention away from a huge Aboriginal deathrate due primarily to European disease.

The devastating impact of various infectious and contagious diseases upon Aborigines was little understood or studied. It was simply observed, from some distance, and dismissed as 'a decree of nature for which no one is responsible'. The reason for virulent consumption among Aborigines was "not quite clear" but was related more to their wearing of wet clothing than seen as a direct consequence of emaciation and squalor.\textsuperscript{405} When, in 1901, the recognized Queensland 'expert' on Aborigines, Archibald Meston was asked, "Have you known any cases where they have been attacked by measles?", he replied, "No \ldots I have never noticed it".\textsuperscript{406} Yet, as recently as 1899, there had been a reported measles outbreak among Aborigines at Cloncurry; while in 1893, a serious epidemic had spread through the west, from Normanton to Blackall.\textsuperscript{407} The manner in which sicknesses that were not usually fatal to Europeans — like measles or influenza — cut a swathe through native groups with a seeming ease and inevitability encouraged an indifference among whites to the point of callousness on the question of Aboriginal illness. Thus, the \textit{Queensland Figaro} in July 1883 carried this obituary:
Nelly Lowry, a well known Rockhampton aborigine turned up her toes to the daisies last Friday. She had caught cold and the complaint settled on her lungs. Nelly was . . . a very intelligent specimen of her race . . .408

and the Boomerang in 1891 reported in the same lighthearted vein — “Near Herberton, there is an old gin leg-roped to a tree. There must be something wrong with that aged black lady . . .”.409

Leaving racial considerations aside, one might expect to find that a people more prone to contract a circulating illness, and then more likely to be seriously afflicted by it would consequently be the subject of greater medical protection and treatment. Yet, with racial considerations uppermost, the opposite proved to be the case. For infected whites, hospitals and doctors were usually available, and treatment, however makeshift, could be arranged; yet Aborigines were rarely afforded similar medical care. When, for instance, in 1873, a mortally wounded Aboriginal woman was turned out of Maryborough Hospital and afterwards died, the Secretary explained:

It has been a rule of the Maryborough Hospital ever since it has been in existence . . . that aboriginals should not be admitted as patients — both from lack of separate accommodation for them and the absolute dislike — we might say almost refusal of the servants to attend upon them.410

Similarly, in 1881, the Police Magistrate at Townsville wrote:

A black gin in an advanced state of disease and starvation was lying under a tree, untended and unfed. I ordered her removal to an outbuilding of our Hospital but none of the Hospital staff would go near her.411

Case after case could be presented of refusals on racial grounds by Queensland institutions carrying medical services to treat sick and dying Aborigines,412 leading Dr Roth to comment cautiously in 1900 upon “A tendency for certain Hospital Committees to repudiate, or rather, to put obstacles in the way of the admission of black patients”.413 Never so polite, Archibald Meston in 1898 had railed at the “incredible . . . inhumanity” of two doctors who had sent an Aboriginal woman suffering puerperal fever untended on a train from Toowoomba to Brisbane. This woman subsequently died and Meston commented bitterly that too many doctors had “apparently no more compassion for a half-caste or aboriginal patient than for a sick kangaroo”.414
In dramatic contrast, however, white communities were quickly shaken from apathy upon this question by the threat of contagion which diseased natives in the vicinity posed towards themselves and their families. Here, fear of contamination proved to be a far stronger impulse than humanitarian compassion, and Aborigines were simply moved away, to weather in isolation diseases they did not comprehend and could only ascribe to sorcery — for which there was no remedy. For example, in March 1900, when influenza was discovered among natives at Urundangie, local Aboriginal protector Alex Gordon wrote:

[My] informants feared an Epidemic might break out among the white children in town and suggested that the blacks should be isolated . . . I ordered them to be removed to a waterhole one mile from the town . . . This is all can be done for them at present.

A month later, he was sorry to report a raging epidemic among the natives which had accounted for eleven deaths.415

The horror of leprosy called forth an even stronger reaction. In late 1885, it was reported that:

Some Cooktown blacks are said to have contracted leprosy, in consequence of their intercourse with Chinese lepers on the North Shore . . . The town has taken fright . . . and Sam Griffith has been wired and asked to shift the lepers to some island . . .416

Similarly, at Georgetown in 1888, rumors of “Chinese lepers . . . cohabiting with aboriginals” led to the calling of a “large enthusiastic public meeting” to press for immediate action, and plans to establish a local Aboriginal reserve were mooted.417 On the other hand, when Inspector Graham found at Normanton that Aborigines, instead of suffering leprosy as feared, were plagued by widespread “erysipelas . . . in many cases . . . in a bad state from neglect”, concern about them eased miraculously. Graham’s request for a medical officer was met with the reply that as the afflicted were only “delta blacks”, the case “hardly warrants the expense of sending . . . [one] out”418

Leprosy, seen as another terrible facet of the Chinese ‘scourge’, was once more publicised out of all proportion to its extent. Yet the disease least talked about, save in official reports, was the one which worked the worst havoc upon Aboriginal populations. This disease was syphilis. Because of its sexual connotations, ‘syphilis’ was a whispered word — the “unnameable” disease, “of all the subjects in the world . . . least fitted for popular dis-
A disease that could not be maturely discussed was hardly likely to receive serious examination or sufficient and proper treatment. To begin with, a smothering repression kept the terrible story of the ravages of syphilis upon Aboriginal communities from being generally known. In December 1906, the ethnologist Dr Klaatsch, attempting to spread word about this problem, had to provide his lecture "for men only" and could not even publicise its title. A newspaper commented, "We are so cursed with prudery that we think ignorance is innocence, and so we have very much evil among us, and there seems no help for it". Both whites and blacks suffered from the false modesty and purposeful oversight involved here, yet where white people refused treatment at a public hospital, could receive private medical attention, blacks, for the most part, had no such final resort.

In May 1887, Inspector Frederick Urquhart found venereal disease "a difficult subject to write about", but he persisted with his report simply because "the evil as it exists can hardly be exaggerated" and he felt something must be done. After examining natives in the Cloncurry region, he estimated:

... about half the adult males are infected with it. Among the females it is all but universal. Fully 90 percent of those who come under notice are in a more or less advanced stage of this dreadful disease and of those employed in the town of Cloncurry or camped in its vicinity, I do not believe there is one free from it. I have also seen many young children with it. The wild blacks in the ranges are nearly as bad as the quiet ones — especially the females — and many die yearly from this cause.

Although he called for an "effort ... to check the spread ... on an extensive scale", his report was merely "read" and filed "away". Further communications from North and West during the early nineties upon the appalling state of the natives were received with apparent disbelief, and cursorily treated. In March 1891, Edward Quest reported that the Diamantina Aborigines were:

... fairly rotten from the most loathsome diseases, some of them living skeletons and covered with erosion. When those unfortunates see a white man, their cry is not as of old 'grog or tobacco' but 'medison' (medicine) in such emploring [sic] tones as would move the heart of a stone. Yet his description was given the lie by Sub-Inspector Dillon at
Winton who wrote, “I have never seen a healthier class of Blacks than what I have seen in this district”. Soon after, however, Dillon himself was forced to telegram:

Government medical officer informs syphilis is very prevalent amongst blacks this district numerous Europeans also affected and disease is assuming alarming proportions.  

The disease, however, was not effectively checked and rapidly worsened in the West. In October 1898, W. C. Hume, after a tour which extended from Hughenden to Windorah, via Cloncurry, Urandangie and Birdsville, concluded that, “Venereal disease is horribly prevalent, not only among grown women but sometimes among children of 12 years of age”. From Windorah, the police reported a condition that was “... something pitiable. It is almost impossible to find one male or female, that is not suffering from VD in some form ... [it] keeps continually spreading until they become incurable — and die. They sorely need medical advice and treatment by some Doctor”. At Boulia, Constable Reside wrote:

The walkabout blacks ... are nearly all suffering from VD and are horrible to look at through being covered with sores; some are almost blind. This class of blacks is dying out very fast as there is no one to cure them or take any interest in them.

In North Queensland, too, it was the same terrible story. From Cooktown, Police reported in May 1897 that “nearly all half-civilized blacks suffer from this disease”, while Sergeant James Whiteford, after a tour of the Musgrave district in September saw 450 blacks with “more or less Venereal Disease amongst all”. To the North and South, at Coen and Mt Garnet, the natives were similarly “reeking with syphilis”. Summarizing the situation in the Cook district generally, Inspector James Lamond stated in November 1897:

Nearly all the blacks ... are more or less diseased and it seems almost useless curing isolated cases — What is really necessary is a Doctor to go round amongst the tribes — he would see how much they suffered ... It is a big undertaking but unless something is done they will become a festering reproach to us ... Dr Roth should be the very man.

It is very likely that the appointment of Dr Roth as Northern Protector in January 1898 had a great deal to do with this
consideration. Yet the process of removing infected blacks principally to rescue whites from contagion remained a favorite device. At Birdsville in December 1898, when it was revealed that "a large number of white men and mere boys" were suffering venereal disease, the remedy proposed was: "remove all blacks". The following month at Winton, the local doctor claimed that the twenty Aboriginal women there were "productive of much VD among a class of whites" and had the local camp moved two miles away. At Burketown, in October, Inspector Lamond himself sent the 200 local natives off "to their old hunting grounds" because their "infected camps . . . [were] a danger to the health of the town". To alleviate the "rotting" condition of the blacks themselves, however, all he gave were "50 rations" and "5 bottles of lotion".
CHAPTER SEVEN

Harlots and Helots

Exploitation of the Aboriginal remnant

Oh! don’t you remember Black Alice, Sam Holt — Black Alice so dusky and dark . . .?

“Ironbark”, 1881

Oh! it’s only a nigger, you know;
It’s only a nigger, you know;
A nigger to wallop, a nigger to slave,
To treat with a word and a blow.

It’s only a nigger you know;
A nigger, whose feelings are slow;
A nigger to chain up, a nigger to treat
To a kick, and a curse and a blow.

“Lantern”, 1889

The hesitant way in which the extent of the venereal problem was accepted and the tentative approach to treatment then adopted — while hundreds, perhaps thousands, died in agony — provides telling evidence of the shame and embarrassment attached to this question. For more than illicit sexual intercourse was implied here. Recognition of syphilis on an epidemic scale was equally a recognition that the colour line had been sexually broached in alarming proportions — and that promiscuity between white men and coloured women was rife. As Sergeant O’Connor frankly alleged in 1898:

The Gins are simply prostitutes. Wherever there is a camp, there is prostitution and, more or less, venereal disease . . .
To the Sergeant’s personal knowledge, prostitution is rampant in every Black’s camp from Hungerford on the NSW border to the head of the Diamantina River.
Many pastoral stations had no white women upon them, and on these, wrote Archibald Meston:

The aboriginal women are usually at the mercy of anybody, from the proprietor or manager to the stockman, cook, rouseabout and jackaroo . . . If they have aboriginal husbands who are likely to object, these . . . are either employed on distant parts of the run or are sent away altogether. Frequently the women do all the housework and are locked up at night to keep them from their own people . . .

Many Aboriginal women living on western properties were known as “stud gins”, wrote the constable at Boulia, “The men living around here talk freely about seducing ‘Gins’ and reckon they have done a clever act if they seduce a ‘Gin’ belonging to an adjoining station”. As the Queensland Figaro commented sardonically of a fashion item in 1883: “Says a Society paper, — ‘Black velvet is very fashionable’. That is no news to Queenslanders”.

In The Australian Legend, Russel Ward argues against any aspect of compulsion being involved in the sexual exploitation of native women by white settlers. He points to what he alleges are permissive features in Aboriginal sexual mores and declares that “As long as the women were paid for their services with food, tobacco, or liquor they and their husbands were usually content” — a contentment which nevertheless seems strange in the midst of the venereal disease and murder of “half caste babies” he recognises on the previous page. Additionally, for Ward, “A sufficient supply of gins” was the right ingredient to keep sodomy out of mateship, and he goes so far as to suggest that:

Many writers, either ignorant of the facts or prompted by sentimentality, have attempted the scarcely possible task of making the picture blacker by implying that the ‘Gins’ were usually unwilling victims of the white man’s lust . . .

Being about to attempt this very task, I would like readers to bear in mind Ward’s charges of ‘ignorance’ and ‘sentimentality’ as the following material is read. They should note, also, that Ward has furnished only one reference to support his argument of voluntary sexual surrender. This is a statement by John Henderson in 1851 that, “They will frequently offer to lend it, meaning the Gin to the convict-servants for tobacco &/c.” — a statement which in itself suggests that female voluntarism is an unimpor-
tant consideration, and that Ward, in using this illustration, believes that bartering 'it' in return for another commodity has nothing at all to do with an enforced transfer. The *Queenslander* in 1880 also recognized that Aboriginal men loaning women "to visitors whom they are anxious to please" was an established custom; yet, its editorial continued, "at no time did this custom prevent the *forcible abduction* of a woman being regarded as the most exasperating insult."

In the same way as land was simply expropriated from Aboriginal tribes for the European's economic benefit, so too were Aboriginal women seized to serve his sexual needs. Around the same time as Ward's John Henderson wrote of willing exchanges, Missionary John Ridley was observing from the West:

One poor fellow on the Moonie addressed me in a long and pathetic harangue . . . and urged me . . . to go round and tell the white men not to wrong the blacks, especially not to take away their gins.

In 1856, Charles Archer informed a select committee that, "... in the matter of kidnapping gins, you cannot control white men . . . and it is the cause of half the murders committed by the blacks upon them". In 1862, a native police officer reported from the Belyando River District that a certain station owner, Mr Chambers "... was in the habit of hunting the Gins of the Blacks with a Blackfellow that he keeps in his place for this purpose . . .". When this "blackfellow" deserted Chambers' service along with a second Aborigine, he rode out and "drove them back to the station. He then shot the one and stabbed the other with a dagger". Finally, after firing upon several other natives and stabbing two more, he called in the Native Police for protection, and while the force was present he "went up to the whole lot of troopers and promised to give two pounds reward if they should bring him a Gin". At a much later date, "three gins were stolen and taken away from the tribe at Isley Plains", Belyando River by the Native Police themselves. Arthur Brown of Banchery station wrote, "There is no doubt that such acts of the police tend to make the bush roads unsafe for travelling and really if [a murder were committed] . . . I could nor would not blame the blacks". The capture of defenceless native women for the sexual use of native police officers and troopers was a most commonplace occurrence.

The widespread practice of stealing and exploiting native women in this way was often described as a kind of slave trade by contemporary observers. In June 1874, the Missionary Edward
Fuller wrote from Frazer Island to the Reverend J. Buckle of the oystermen and other whites who stole young girls from his mission. In one instance:

A young girl rushed into my hut and begged me not to let the white man take her away — her pursuer known by the name of Jacky a woodcutter was close on her heels. I told him he must not molest her. He informed me he had bought the girl in Maryborough for a blanket and tobacco and asked me if I was going to encourage her in her attempts to elude his grasp and escape from his custody. I told him we did not believe in Slavery in Queensland. . . . He left, taking another of our scholars, a girl with him.443

Similarly, in October two years later, a Station Master, a Police Magistrate and two other members of the force concluded that over the whole area between Cloncurry and Normanton, "The stealing of gins and children from the blacks . . . the running down and forcible detention of [them] . . . is a matter of frequent occurrence and a recognized custom in this district". A list of twelve known abductions which had recently occurred was appended to the letter.444 From the Walsh River in North Queensland, Sub-Inspector Brooke reported in 1882:

It is a common practice for men to keep Gins up here and if I enquire into the matter I am told the gins belong to a blackboy so that I can do nothing to prevent it though I believe this is the cause of most of the depredations.445

For decades a marked feature of the bêche-de-mer and pearling trade, which recruited around the entire coastline and adjacent islands of Cape York peninsula, was the enslavement of groups of natives for both forced labour and sexual services. This recruitment, commonly referred to as "shanghai-ing" or a "press-gang system"446 was execrated by Protector Roth in 1898 as "one long record of brutal cruelty, bestiality [sic] and debauchery".447 In the main street of Cooktown in March 1882, two bêche-de-mer fishermen fought for possession of a young Aboriginal girl whom they had kidnapped from Hinchinbrook Island. The Police Magistrate, Howard St George who witnessed this "most disgraceful scene in the open street in broad daylight" was prompted to write:

In numerous instances, I have heard of natives being induced to come on board of vessels engaged in fishing on unfrequented parts of the coast and when on board being taken off to a distant reef or Island and being detained there
... I know of at least three (3) cases in which massacres have taken place [because of this].

In response, the Attorney General's Office threatened to use The Slave Act (5 Geo. Cap 113) against proven offenders, though this was never done. In 1891, the Cooktown Courier was reporting the Police Magistrate's allegations that "... every murder that occurred on the coast was due to the carrying off of gins in the boats. There was not the slightest doubt of this being the case".

Nor is there 'the slightest doubt' that the rape and subjugation of Aboriginal women was a key feature in European/Aboriginal sexual relations. Where whites conveniently believed that native women were merely subject to capture and brutal oppression by their own menfolk, they did not see very much wrong in behaving similarly. Sexual frustration overcame any final qualms. Of course, there were cases where the woman's sexual favors could work for a time to her material advantage; for instance, in allowing her to reside in the vicinity of a station homestead rather than at a dilapidated camp while she remained attractive and free from disease. This rather dubious gain, however, was more frequently outweighed by the treatment normally accorded a person degraded to the position of exploitable human flesh. Cases of women being bought and sold, raped and generally illtreated, and even killed appeared periodically in the press. The Queensland Figaro reported blandly in January 1883, "A white brute named Spargo, at the Burrum, has killed his gin in the approved Straffordshire style"; then somewhat more angrily in April, it told of:

... instances where white savages have raped young maidens and old gins — ay, and boasted of their deeds vain-gloriously. E. Camm is on trial in the North for the rape of an aboriginal girl of tender years. He will probably escape if she doesn't know the nature of an oath. Again, a man at Cairns has been arrested for ravishing a picaninny of five years with, so the local papers say, great brutality.

From the Burke District, I. S. Swan wrote in late 1891 of the "mustering" expeditions undertaken — "... organized partys [sic] going up the Nicholson River and along the Coast, Point Parker way ... also Gunpowder river" to capture 'gins'. He told of 'gin-trading' and 'gin-stealing', with fatal results, and white men who regarded the women as their disposable property. He maintained:
I seen them chain up a gin to a tree one leg on each side . . . then [a] pair of hancuffs on her ancles [sic] for being too long looking for horses. I went and looked at her — the ants were running all over her person . . . [one man] sent a gin away with the mailman to Burketown to be sent south to some of his friends as a slave . . . She went through Burketown while I was there . . . consigned to a publican . . . She knew nothing of where she was going . . .

Indeed, to illustrate the extent to which such practices were taken — and locally tolerated — we need go no further than a case which appeared in the *Worker*, of 21 July 1900. It was here alleged that at Ardock Station, owned by the Queensland National Bank, and managed by a man named Green, the latter had “eight or nine black gins fenced in with rabbit-proof netting adjoining the house”. This information, which at first sight appears wildly implausible, was corroborated by Southern Aboriginal Protector, Archibald Meston when he visited this property.

In Philip Mason’s study *Patterns of Dominance*, he points out that in racist societies like South Africa or the Southern United States, “the objection is not so much to sex as to equality of sex” in intimate inter-racial situations. Leaving racial considerations aside, however, it would be impossible to argue that anything like ‘equality of sex’ existed even between white men and white women. All sexual relations accorded with the social acceptance of white male supremacy and were graded racially in subordination to this factor. Where the most acceptable sexual image of a white male/white female liaison was marriage, the social interpretation of black male/white female relations was usually rape. With white male/black female relations, however, the situation was more complex. Here the most tolerated pattern was, as we have seen, prostitution — “the taking of ‘black velvet’” or “the casual use of a social inferior for sexual pleasure”. A less frequent and far less condoned arrangement, however, was concubinage, where the man and woman lived together for an extended period and perhaps raised children. These ‘keepers of aboriginal women’ were contemptuously known as “Combos” — those who openly consorted with “the uncultured Mary, with the reek of her race about her”. With marked outrage, Frederick Richmond commented:

A “gentleman” drover in the North had the audacity to ride into town and shew himself among refined true women of his own race and class, while the native that rode after him dressed in boy’s clothes was a black woman.
In April 1885, a journal reported:

At St George, Bill Smith said Bill Freeman was "no white man" because he lived with a black gin . . . A row ensued, in which the gin took part . . . Freeman combed Smith's hair back with a garden rake. 459

Yet the actual marriage of a European male to an Aboriginal female was regarded as a far worse disgrace. At St George in April 1898, Joe Simpson's plea before the Bench to allow him to marry the black woman who accompanied him was refused as a "ridiculous request". 460 At the same time at Camooweal, W. Prosser, a gold miner who had several children by an Aboriginal woman was told by a JP that: "... the Government were desirous of discouraging the marriage of white men to Black Gins . . . they considered such marriages degrading to the white female . . .". 461 The Police Commissioner, W. E. Parry-Okeden condemned the "impropriety and inexpediency [sic] of such unions", 492 while Archibald Meston, the principal official spokesman against miscegenation stated:

I hold in utter abhorrence these marriages between Chinese and Aborigines, or whites and Aborigines . . . Unions between whites and aboriginal women are unfair to the woman and degrading to the man, though in nearly all cases the man is of very low type . . . An alliance with a white man who cannot get a woman of his own race is a degradation to any decent aboriginal woman. 463

In addition to all-round 'degradation' resulting from these marriages, the nature of the offspring was seen as an even more alarming racial problem. Meston considered:

It means the breeding of half-castes . . . The absolute isolation of the aboriginal women from contacts with whites is the only effective method of stopping all further supplies of half-castes and their attendant quadroons and octoroos among whom the law of atavism will assert itself in after years with unpleasant results . . . 464

A half-caste population whose presence tended to sully both the moral reputation and racial purity of white Australia was a decidedly unwanted phenomenon. Half-castes, it was commonly asserted, "have the vices of both races and the virtues of neither". 465 A writer in 1896 labelled them:
... a spurious compound of white and black parasites of a poisonous nature arising from a momentary sensuous joy with a naturally uncivilized wanton. She brings forth the offspring of the union with the offscouring of Australia to smirk and wallow in merciless treachery ...”

'Scientific' writers again lent respectability to the promulgation of this unpleasant stereotype. In 1907, the *Science of Man* propounded that, “The hybrid and mongrel mixtures of mankind are as unsatisfactory as those of the lower animals and they usually degenerate and become extinct”. Dr W. Ramsey Smith also warned the *Australian Association for the Advancement of Science* that “race mixtures” invariably resulted in “physical and moral havoc”.

Thus, the closer inter-racial sexual relations approached to the desired European norm — marriage and the rearing of children — the more loudly were they condemned. Real and abiding emotional attachments between the sexes of each race were regarded as anathema. The white man (and, most unusually, the white woman) who broke this racial taboo and entered into a forbidden marriage with an Aboriginal, became ‘a social outcast’. In 1915, the Reverend Love commented:

> The position of a white stockman married to a black woman is pitiable. His wife is not admitted to the house. The white men who treat lightly, and indeed openly avow relations with black women, scoff at the white man who *marries* a black woman.

For white males, who found themselves physically desiring the female of a people they so thoroughly despised, struggled inwardly with a racial conundrum. As A. P. Elkins stated it in 1937: “The Aboriginal is at the same time called a mongrel, or merely an animal, and yet his labour is found indispensable and his women are desired and taken ...”. Such a dichotomy could only be resolved psychologically by a process of exploitation coupled with a constant denigration of the exploited one.

An almost identical pattern to this can be discerned when European/Aboriginal labour relations are considered. According to race-relations sociologist John Rex, the pattern of colonial enterprise in relation to indigenes generally develops in the following way:

> Colonial enterprise involves in the first place the capture of land and other physical resources ... however the possession of the land by itself is not enough. Those who have
been expelled from the land have to be compelled by one means or another to work for the new proprietor.

Compulsion "after some kind of military conquest" engenders a work situation which is correspondingly "unfree", but which tends instead towards "an ideal type of purely coercive compliance". Aborigines were usually put to work at tasks considered demeaning and arduous by whites — such as scrub-clearing or the traditional hewing of wood and drawing of water. They provided, as the *Queensland Figaro* commented in 1885, "a kind of labor which, though nasty, is cheap". On inland properties where white labour was both scarce and expensive, Aborigines could aspire to becoming stockmen, but could expect to rise no higher in the station hierarchy. In October 1910, the *Sydney Morning Herald* provided a description of Aboriginal labour services which emphasizes the menial and manual nature of the work required from them:

... cane-cutting, or working farms, or timber getting, or droving, or boundary-riding or fishing, or engaged on beche-de-mer and pearling luggers or cutting sandal wood or mining. A few thousand lubras are engaged as domestic servants ...

Simply because they were Aborigines, they were neither expected nor allowed to rise any higher in occupational status than this: the basic, though essential services they performed, for minimal returns, were never intended to bring them into economic competition with the white worker. As Home Secretary, Horace Tozer assured parliamentarians in 1897, Aborigines "... are not suitable for all kinds of employment, and we do not intend to bring them into conflict with the whites in that respect". In 1903, the Reverend G. H. Schwarz of Hope Vale Mission, Cape Bedford informed Protector Roth that:

... no ... useful results can possibly accrue by teaching our mainland blacks composition, fractions, decimals or any other subjects that will in any way enable them to come into competition with Europeans.

Roth wholeheartedly agreed, believing as he did that fundamental Aboriginal 'usefulness' should "in no possible way be construed as interfering with white labour". This condition, according to Rex, is in essence what constitutes racialism in the economic sphere:
The colonial worker is put to work after some kind of military conquest, so that he is never a wholly free worker exploited solely through the labour market . . . The mere existence of harsh power, authority and exploitation, however, is not by itself sufficient to constitute a race relations situation. Racial exploitation . . . may only be said to occur where there is exploitation of group by group, where group membership is easily detected by external signs and where there is a consequent closure of mobility.478

After all that has been written here, it should not be necessary to outline the entire pattern of ‘harsh power, authority and exploitation’ in close and intimate detail. We have, once more, a pronounced tendency to forcibly abduct aboriginal children for labour purposes, encouraged by the assumption that “to tame blacks, they must be caught when very young”.479 Yet, whether blacks were forcibly brought in or protectively ‘let in’, the operative pre-condition for their enlistment as menial laborers was their reduction to a position of thorough subjugation. As John Douglas told the Legislative Assembly in 1880:

If, instead of shooting the blacks down, they could make them industrious, and show them that they gained something by submitting to [the white man] . . . — if they applied such a system resolutely and determinedly — they could not fail to reap great benefit . . . .480

Often it was the process of frontier violence which itself induced this submission. Thus at Thornborough in 1882, after “a war of extermination had been carried on” against the natives for a certain period, they were “brought in” by the Byrne Brothers, and “partially tamed” through offers of food and clothing. After several weeks, when “they were no longer afraid of being shot down like dogs”, they were introduced to the township and there put “to work for their food . . . carrying firewood and water, gardening and washing . . .”.481 Similarly, at Barron River in 1884, Sub-Inspector Carr notified his superior that, in the wake of frontier violence with “the Walsh and Mitchell blacks”:

It will take time before the[y] . . . can be imbued with sufficient confidence in the whites to enable them to be of any service on stations and to be otherwise useful, but I am in great hopes of having them thoroughly under subjection in twelve or eighteen months from now.482
'Taming' or 'civilizing' formerly 'wild' or 'Myall' Aborigines was usually advocated in the context of rendering them 'useful' to Europeans and thereby converting a social liability into an economic asset. In doing this, a perpetual condition of subservience was envisaged for the natives, and, in order to keep them servile, the most direct and forceful methods were often used. Archibald Meston reported from the Far West in 1900 that:

Tradition and custom are likely to be pleaded in the West as an . . . extenuating influence to account for some of the treatment still prevalent over a wide area . . . We meet there with people, who still regard the aboriginal as no more value in the scale of being than a horse or a bullock, an inheritance from those who shot him like a kangaroo, abducted his women and sent his children away to distant friends with as much indifference as if they were pet squirrels or tame galahs. . . . Never before had I seen aboriginal men living under such extraordinary terrorism, many of them fine athletic fellows who could in case of a row have settled with their terrorisers in a very summary fashion. But many of them had been long treated as the dogs are treated and were scared into a belief that their employers wielded the power of life and death . . . 

In a "private and confidential" despatch from the Whitula district in 1902, Harold Meston added:

Some people out here make as light of knocking down a blackfellow with a sliprail or flogging him with a stock-whip as though it was having a drink . . . These are common incidents in the West.

As far as repayment for services was concerned, Archie Meston noted:

On each station, I was informed that the blacks received wages varying from 5/- to 20/- per week and in nearly every case it appears to have been balanced by the store account, as none of them seemed to have a shilling.

The natives received only the "roughest . . . and cheapest" food and clothing for work at which they were "competent as any white man", while to the great majority of their employers, "The chief virtue of Aboriginal labour . . . is its cheapness and servility".
This is not to deny, of course, that there were employers of natives who did not behave in an overtly harsh and oppressive fashion towards their black station hands, but who reacted instead with comparative fairness and benevolence. Meston wrote:

It is pleasant to know that unselfish kindness to the aborigines is frequently practised by individual colonists in all parts of Queensland. [There are] excellent men and women whose active humanity is made conspicuous by contrast with [the] too prevalent heartless indifference.466

Yet the benevolent station manager exacted compliance from his native charges within a framework of power which was as authoritarian as that maintained by the vicious overseer. Whether the European employer, who now controlled land and resources behaved pitilessly or paternally, he was still indisputably the white master. Take, for example, the case of Cressbrook Station in South-East Queensland. Mary MacLeod Banks, the daughter of David McConnel, the station owner, claimed in 1931: “It was not till years after my childhood that I learnt of cruelties to the blacks, and I refused at first to believe it possible”. Yet, obviously unaware of the patronizing tone of her own remarks, she tells her readers, “The coloured folk living about us were our friends. We spoke of them as ‘the blacks’”.487 These ‘coloured folk’ wrote Mary’s mother in 1905, “often came to the white people to give them names for their children”;488 and the Aboriginal ‘servants’ at Cressbrook were given names like “Piggie”, “Kitty”, “Polly”, “Topsy” and “John Bull” in a no doubt affectionate but nevertheless clearly condescending manner.489 Indeed, it is probably no coincidence that the chapter in M. M. Banks’ book following the one devoted to “The Blacks” is entitled “Pets”. Illustrating the lovable behaviour of the station blacks, Mrs David McConnel recalled of one, “Long Kitty”:

She would look proudly over the country and say, stretching out her arms, “All this ‘yarman’ (land) belonging to me.” It did seem hard to have it all taken from them, but it had to be. They cultivated nothing; they were no use on it . . .490

The native tribes around Cressbrook had had their lands expropriated in the “stern work” of the 1840s and 1850s when “McConnel and his neighbours had to join forces for protection; and also constituted themselves into a court of justice to administer punishment . . .”. The natives who remained to par-
take of the new order of things were those who "came to . . . realise the value of good conduct" and consequently submitted themselves to station regimen. The McConnel brothers were sympathetic but stern, and as convinced "disciplinarians . . . they agreed with Solomon as to the use of the rod". Of another station famed for kindly treatment to the Aborigines — Lammermoor in Central Queensland — M. M. Bennett similarly observes that Robert Christison achieved discipline by a process of "wallopings for the naughty, tobacco and rations for the faithful blacks". Robert Gray wrote in 1913, "Christison was a very powerful man and had great influence amongst the blacks".

Complementary to this image of the benevolent though firmly exacting white father-figure was the stereotype of the faithful and child-like native servant — the role of the good 'Jacky' whom it was hoped all Aboriginal workers would emulate. Dwelling on the "faithful and affectionate" nature of Aboriginal companions Mr Hamilton MLA, first referred other parliamentarians, in 1897, to the favorite saga of Edward Kennedy and Jacky-Jacky, and then related the instructive tale of another explorer, Christie Palmerston and his "servant . . . boy" Pompo:

... on one occasion when this boy and he were travelling through scrub, Pompo was in front cutting . . . and Palmerston, thinking he was rather lazy, attempted to strike him with the flat of his scrub knife. The knife, catching in a vine, he unfortunately cut the boy on the neck, severing a blood vessel. Palmerston expressed his sorrow, and tried to staunch the blood but could not do so. Both thought Pompo was going to die, and as the white men were coming up, Pompo said, "Never mind, Christie, me tell me do it myself . . ."  

As well as being 'faithful unto death', the ideal Aboriginal helper was supposed to demonstrate the simple trust of a child towards his master. E. B. Kennedy commented, "They are always called Black boys no matter what their age is" and, as another writer observed, "Our blacks have only reached the childhood state, and, like children, they need guarding and protection." Yet this view of Aborigines as "the child people of the human race" was by no means bestowed as an unmixed blessing upon them. They were represented curiously as being "childlike yet debauched" and having "no sense of responsibility and, except in rare cases, no initiative." In 1870, for instance, Charles Allen provided a detailed description of the negative side of this stereotype. He saw a close resemblance to children in:
... the natural disposition they evince to domineer over each other; their love of teasing, and very often inflicting pain; their perfect indifference to the suffering of others, their unrelenting persistence in little worrying, even cruel ways; their invariable disposition to look upon female companions as inferior beings ... In the un-tutored savage, you see the grown-up child, who has never had anyone to correct him when he felt inclined to follow the bent of his unbroken will. Often and often have I been reminded of this resemblance, not only when I have seen a group of naked men playing marbles like ... schoolboys, or a bevy of sable daughters of the forest in ecstasies of delight in the possession of a few tattered rags of finery but also, when in their more sullen moods, they meet each other sometimes in single combat ... much in the same way as little children will scratch and slap ... 

In order to discipline and control such wilful children, therefore, it was thought that "some harshness would no doubt be necessary". Positive inducements would not be as successful, for "gratitude is a word not to be found in their vocabulary". Aborigines, it was believed "look upon ... kindness as a certain fear of them" and became "more exactive in proportion to the amount of food lavished" upon them. Writing in the Science of Man in 1901, Charles Scallon of Queensland explained the natives' "contempt" for "kind and just reward" as "Aboriginee [sic] Hereditary Ingratitude":

It is a lamentable truth that kindness produces a diminishing respect for the white, and that strict and even harsh treatment will gain for the white man the best services of which they are capable ...

It was 'unfortunate', therefore, that rough discipline and "demonstrations of strength" were essential. Yet, in any case, it was held that Aborigines were better equipped to take hard knocks, for "... having a much less highly-developed nervous system, [they] feel pain to a much less extent than we do". Writing of the native engaged in buck-jumping, A. W. Stirling believed:

His skull is so thick that a dozen falls will not crack it and even if anything does happen — well, to put it mildly — from a colonial point of view, a black more or less is not of much vital consequence.
Furthermore, it was alleged, Aborigines needed white men "to steady and boss them", because they were both 'inherently lazy' and 'undependable' in a labour situation. As the Hon. W. H. Walsh told the Assembly in 1884, "He had seen the most mutual friendship spring up between a black and his employer, and at the same time seen the black slither and glide away at a most unexpected moment". Yet, at the same time as it was argued that low wages were given "in keeping with their smaller degree of reliability and efficiency", there was a vast amount of contradictory evidence from individual employers, attesting to the desirability and often indispensability of Aboriginal labour. In 1891, William Butler at Kilcoy Station complained:

It is not as in old times when there were always some black boys about to give a hand when wanted... I do not see how stock-owners can make a living with the price of labour in the West and the desire for green money.

Meston stated in 1900:

Kindness over these western stations is the least that may be expected for aborigines who are practically doing nearly all the work. The food and clothes they get cost very little... Those engaged as stockmen are quite as useful as white men, and some are superior by reason of their intimate knowledge of the country.

And yet, what he discovered was the antithesis of kindness: Women "handed round from one station to another" until discarded to rot away with venereal disease, and men "for running away from hard work and harsh treatment... brought back, handcuffed, tied up and flogged". It was the familiar pattern of a racial group being clearly exploited while being defined, at the same time, in terms of a degrading racist stereotype which 'explained' the necessity for such behaviour, whenever public confession of it seemed unavoidable. An accompanying tactic, once more, was the general denial of bad treatment — the picture of kind masters and happy servants — the customary denial of European guilt. Meston wrote angrily:

Much of those miseries and deaths must be known to men who have the effrontery and audacity to publicly declare the Aborigines are well and kindly treated; that they are kept as "pets", better off than the white men... and the most lies... come from those who have cohabited with the abori-
iginal women, and worked the men as slaves of no more value that the station horses and dogs. 509
CHAPTER EIGHT

Epilogue; The Last Round-Up

‘Solving’ the Aboriginal ‘problem’

Many persons are under the idea that some system of force was used in starting the reserve on Fraser Island. Nothing of the kind! . . . Repeated complaints were made to me that these blacks were a nuisance to the white residents in the towns . . .

Home Secretary, Horace Tozer,\textsuperscript{510}

15 November 1897

Nothing can save the aboriginal race, and the Government are killing them quicker, and acting cruelly by taking them away from their own country, for they are like animals, and would sooner go home and starve than live on the best in a strange country.

The Worker, quoting the Packman,\textsuperscript{511}

26 March 1904

A thorough examination of the 1897 Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act and the establishment of reserves which accompanied its formulation and passage is beyond the scope of this present investigation. Yet, as the general background of conditions, beliefs and treatment against which this legislation was enacted has been detailed here, some comments in closing seem to be warranted. At one point in his volume, Outcasts in White Society, C. D. Rowley states that “. . . the background of the Queensland legislation suggests that its basis was one of humanitarian concern, that it was a genuine effort at protection”.\textsuperscript{512} Yet this is only part of the story. It is true that humanitarian protectionists like Archibald Meston believed that “massive grades of misery, hunger, degradation and disease” would not be obliterated by “rosewater and sentiment”\textsuperscript{513} and that the only “prospect of any satisfactory or permanent good is the creation of suitable reserves . . . and absolute isolation from contact with whites”;\textsuperscript{514} but there were inherent contradictions in philanthropists’ statements concerning the role they expected reserves to play. Were these allotted to “wean [Aborigines] away from the habit of opium smoking” and from the influence of the
"rascally rum-sodden, crime-sodden white man" and thus rehabi-
itate them mentally and physically — or were reserves provided 'to smooth their way to the grave', and thus remove the distasteful enactment of the Doomed Race Theory to a distant and largely inaccessible stage? Or, perhaps, more hopefully, could the reserves function as a sheltered training centre where natives might be taught Western ways and — although it was said they could never aspire to full 'civilization' they might become "semi-civilized" in, say, twenty years? All these propositions were stated as reasons for the reserve system in the late nineties, yet it is important to note that, amidst all the debate on this issue, the basic irreconcilability of these ideas was never recognized. Given the prevailing and almost exclusively held fatalism which existed concerning the extinction of the Aborigines, it is hard to see how stated concepts involving rejuvenation and social education could have been much more than high-flown rhetoric. When one studies the early development of reserves like Bogimbah Creek on Fraser Island or Durundur, near Caboolture, evidence of effective medical treatment, hygienic care, balanced diet, education and training is notable by its absence. In providing inadequate food, primitive shelter and occasionally, some medicine for Aboriginal inmates, the Government seems to have been more concerned about effecting "strict economy" than anything else.

It must be borne in mind, also, that the story of white humani-
tarian concern for the Aborigine — always the product of a very small and alienated group — during the nineteenth century, was mainly a story of failure: the failure to halt native police activity, the failure to challenge, effectively, determined pessimism about Aboriginal demise, the failure to obtain land rights for the original inhabitants, or the failure of any mission to show even signs of survival until the eighteen-nineties. Where some small successes were achieved, other motives were always present which had little to do with a mere humanitarian concern. On Queen Victoria's birthday each year, assembled natives were given a blanket apiece — but was the purpose of this hand-out mainly to protect Aborigines from the weather, or to protect the moral sensibilities of white citizens from "the disgusting spectacles" of "absolutely nude and offensively dirty" black bodies — in the interests of "public decency"? When ration distribution centres were established in the late eighties, was this done out of a genuine desire to end Aboriginal starvation, or was it calculated as an alternative to the desperate spearing of settlers' cattle and because the Aborigine might be exploited "through his stomach" in the best interests of cheap labour requirements: "... for everyone knows the sort of work that will be squeezed out of a hungry blackfellow"?
Solutions are offered on the Aboriginal 'problem'. Bishop Hale holds the feeding-bottle of reserves; the Rev Duncan McNab suggests freehold land while Sergeant O'Connor of the Native Police cheerfully considers the bullet (Queensland Punch, April 1879).
When one turns to the question of reserves, one finds a precedent for those gazetted after 1897 in the reserve settlements established outside Mackay, Brisbane, Bowen, Townsville and Cooktown from the mid-seventies onwards. These were calculated to provide both a local cheap labour reservoir and a place where native remnants, who were an "eyesore for everyone" — begging and pilfering, semi-naked and debauched — could be kept. When philanthropists attempted to provide education, decent housing, agricultural and fishing facilities on these reserves, the Government abruptly ceased all financial aid. Yet, at towns all over the colony, white settlers continued to segregate and rigidly control Aborigines' movements in the vicinity of settlement. Aboriginal camps were removed by being razed to the ground, and the inhabitants then driven off by mounted men wielding stockwhips or firing carbines over their heads. Curfews were imposed after sunset, when Aboriginal labour services were no longer required. Yet, eventually, even these locally-adopted patterns of exclusion were not enough. Unchecked epidemics of syphilis and other diseases in the discreetly distant camps posed a serious health threat to the whites, and the presence of Aboriginal 'prostitutes' with 'half-caste' children provided an intolerable moral and racial affront. The new reserve system, therefore, removed the contaminating influence of diseased and immoral natives from the sphere of progressive white society, while leaving those Aborigines bound in service to whites untouched. The Queensland reserve system, therefore, did not segregate white from black so much as it separated the useless native from the useful one: The life-alternatives thereby created for the Aborigine were, quite literally, an exploited labour service or an excluded reservation sentence.

In establishing the sources of racist thought, racial attitudes and racistist behaviour of white Queenslanders towards Aborigines, we have covered a wide area of belief, situation and action; and to encapsulate this panorama succinctly into a few concluding sentences seems a task too delicate to succeed in any more than a crudely generalized fashion. But, in December 1917, the organizers of the Heroes Day War Procession at Maryborough made an interesting attempt to summarize what had happened, according to their own viewpoint — and, as the foregoing account has been concerned greatly with white prejudices and their consequences, perhaps we can make their Aboriginal tableau in this parade our closing impression. Among floats which depicted soldiers in bloodstained bandages defending the trenches and "Huns" in spiked helmets engaged in atrocities, there marched a small band of natives who had been brought in from Barambah reserve for the occasion. They carried "boomer-
angs and other native weapons” and were daubed “in war paint” to represent “... an interesting link with the days of Captain Cook ... [when] the wild untutored blacks doubtless danced their corroborees”. Ahead of them moved a lorry which, covered with eucalypt branches to transform it into “a piece of bush”, carried the main attraction in the display:

There were two significant placards bearing the words “Before” and “After”. In one was the crouching form of an autochthon, clad in the proverbial loin cloth ... In the other was the civilized native in khaki, standing with bayonet fixed . . .

This imaginary, beaming black warrior, representing the modern Aborigine — both loyal and suitably sacrificial — was hung with a further notice which pathetically read: “By cripes! I’ll fight for White Australia”.
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PART TWO

"The Black Scourge . . . "

Racial responses towards Melanesians in colonial Queensland

KAY SAUNDERS

The history of Queensland, if ever written in full will contain some pages — on which will be narrated the dealings of white men with natives — which will not be pleasant reading . . . There are many who have been concerned in the labour traffic who dare not tell what they have seen or done. Far too large a part of the population laugh at the idea of justice for the nigger.

Vice-Admiral Sir George Tryon, 1885

Queensland was not in any sense dependent on its drunken and murderous islander . . . The only special attraction the islander possesses is that he can die without attracting so much attention as a white man would.

The Bulletin, 9 February 1901
Introduction

CHAPTER ONE

The Kanakas are coming

... the law of Queensland, as it at present stands enables any capitalist to import and employ what labour he pleases.

24 August 1863.

On 15 August 1863, the shipping list in the Brisbane Courier mentioned that a 100 ton schooner, the Don Juan had embarked to Brisbane from Sydney after a voyage to the New Hebrides. Less than a week later, a fierce controversy erupted in the Queensland Legislative Assembly and the metropolitan press as a response to the seemingly innocuous and insignificant arrival of this vessel. The debate engendered, which concerned the morality of the introduction of sixty-seven indentured servants from the New Hebrides and Loyalty Islands, alluded to many of the issues which were to trouble the consciences of contemporary and later writers concerned with this vexing question. T.P. Pugh, MLA asked the Colonial Secretary, R.W.G. Herbert whether this "cargo of miserable wretches... had been kidnapped in the manner adopted by the Peruvian vessels?" The question was somewhat rhetorical, for he continued that:

... call it what you will, it simply resolves itself into a branch of the Peruvian slave trade under a milder name [indenture]. We perfectly remember that Mr Benjamin Boyd deluged the colony of New South Wales with South Sea Islanders to the disgust and horror of the colonists.

Herbert then assured the House that the servants had been engaged by Captain Robert Towns, a prominent entrepreneur and parliamentarian in the neighbouring colony, for one year only, to be returned home at the completion of their service. Yet Pugh felt that:
It is clear that the Government are winking at the disgraceful transaction; it behoves the representatives of the people, therefore, to be up and doing, to suppress this traffic in its infancy.\footnote{4}

Two days later in a rejoinder to the \textit{Courier}, W.H. Palmer claimed that the Islanders, as “fellow colonists” and “British subjects. . . are all free men brought here of their own free will, for a specific purpose, and under specific conditions which they perfectly understand”\footnote{5}.

Thus, the arrival of the \textit{Don Juan} was significant in several ways. It brought to Queensland the first contingent of indentured labourers from non-literate societies, who would, by current standards, be regarded as ‘savages’. This prompted humanitarians in Britain and Australia to question whether these people from small-scale communities fully comprehended what indenture entailed; and even more importantly, did they come of their own volition or were they kidnapped? Whilst the Civil War raged with bloody fury in the United States of America, it raised several crucial questions in the new colony of Queensland. Was Queensland trying to perpetuate a system already morally and economically moribund in ‘enlightened’ Western society? The bitter debate which devolved between the supporters and opponents of large numbers of alien, servile workers who could provide regulated, cheap and tractable labour, was intensified after 1863, and continued until 1901, when the newly-formed Commonwealth irrevocably cast for a free white Australia. The question of whether Melanesians were slaves, or if not, to what degree their condition resembled that of chattel bondage, has likewise been fiercely contended by both contemporary and later writers. Lastly, the Islanders off the \textit{Don Juan} were destined for \textit{Towrnsvale}, a 4,000 acre cotton plantation on the Logan River, owned by Robert Towns.\footnote{6} How were they to be accommodated within Queensland’s expanding plantation system? In the wake of the cessation of supplies to the Old World of raw materials, namely cotton and sugar, consequent upon the disruption of trade during the Civil War, Queensland was regarded potentially as a second Louisiana.\footnote{7} In 1850, H.J. Roman had tentatively begun a cotton farm in Moreton Bay,\footnote{8} whilst three years later, G. and J. Harris had shipped twenty-one bales of cotton to London.\footnote{9} The enterprising editor of the \textit{Moreton Bay Courier}, Ambrose Eldridge, had also planted five acres of that crop on the Brisbane River in 1853.\footnote{10} Yet the vision of Queensland’s agricultural future, dominated by independent yeomen farmers which was articulated so forcefully by the Rev. Dr J.D. Lang from the 1840’s onwards,\footnote{11} and glorified by Liberals such as W.H. Groom and S.W. Griffith, remained at best, an unfulfilled dream. For whilst
the small farmer might eke out a meagre and precarious livelihood, the exigencies of the colonial environment, with its immense distances from markets, its poor communications, the necessity for large initial capital investments and its chronic labour shortages, combined to defeat him. Queensland's commitment to an agricultural staple (namely sugar), ultimately determined the development of a plantation system, which could mobilize capital, labour and resources on a large scale. The colony was "a big man's frontier",¹² and this pattern was to be exemplified by all the early employers of Melanesians — Towns, George Raff, Louis Hope, Claudius Whish and Gordon Sandeman.
CHAPTER TWO

"Massa Palmer's Black Labourer"

The fear of social contamination

Queensland Liberals, secure in the southern townships, opposed the development of large-scale rural capitalism as the basic economic and social system of the immature colony. They particularly questioned the wisdom of introducing a non-European labour force upon a mass scale. Though the rural capitalists and their representatives in Parliament sought to assuage the Liberals' apprehensions by their insistence that conservative "policy would be so defined as to make the immigration of Melanesians a temporary aid to us and not to encourage their permanent settlement in the country", their Liberal opponents did not find this argument particularly convincing. Again, though the Conservatives realised that even this "may create among our countrymen in Great Britain [a disinclination] to emigrate"\(^\text{13}\), their racial scruples were allayed by the prospect of immediate profit. On the other hand, Liberals like Charles Lilley stressed the colonial need for free white persons "not men of an inferior race". By introducing "Chinamen, Coolies and Polynesians", he continued,

... we shall depart from the first principle of every Australian colony ... to raise up a great nation by means of immigration from Europe ... the British people are the possessors of this soil; we hold the land in trust for our countrymen alone, not for Polynesians or Chinamen.\(^\text{14}\)

Premier Lilley and his colleagues feared the creation of a society which consisted of only two castes — "wealthy capitalists and serfs instead of a large prosperous community".

During the election campaign of 1878, a group of white working class Liberal supporters in Brisbane had graphically reminded the public of the potential source of social infection to the body politic which coloured labour threatened. They made their protest by a parade through city streets, dressed as "nigger minstrels", their ring-leader "disguised as a Kanaka" and bearing a placard on which was inscribed, "Massa Palmer's black
labourer". The white gentleman here referred to, Arthur Hunter Palmer had led a conservative ministry four years previously and was a prominent employer of Melanesian servants. The Liberal government of John Douglas, whose fall from power had prompted this election, had already made an initial attempt to contain the Melanesians, as a possible preliminary step towards expelling them altogether. Legislation in 1877 restricted first-contract Melanesians to engaging exclusively in tropical agriculture. This *Polynesian Labourers Act Amendment Act* further stated that they could not be employed more than thirty miles inland from the coastline. This meant that the squatters who owned the huge outback sheep and cattle stations would be henceforth denied servants from this source. Douglas, in introducing the legislation, had acted upon a general alarm he had earlier expressed that the unrestricted employment of Pacific Islanders throughout the colony was "accompanied by serious ills to society" which were "not consistent with the principles of freedom and humanity". He and his Liberal colleagues had previously informed Queen Victoria that:

The existence of such a class [Melanesians] is calculated to have a deteriorating influence on all our institutions — civil, religious and political. . . . for this unintelligent labor of aliens or semi-civilised races is incapable of exercising the rights of citizenship.

By this initial move, therefore, the Liberals can be seen to have taken a large step in the progressive elimination of the main source of their objections — the Melanesians — from the colony. The next step in this plan was intimated in a memorandum issued by the Colonial Secretary's Office in March 1884, when Samuel Griffith wrote that "the unrestricted employment of these Islanders . . . is a danger to the social welfare of the colony". Though the Melanesians were now confined to the coastal estates, Griffith and his colleagues, seemingly, still feared the creation of a caste society in Queensland.

In 1884 the Liberals passed an amendment to the Conservatives' 1880 *Pacific Island Laborers Act* to restrict Melanesian employment to within the sugar industry. Henceforth, Islanders were permitted to perform only menial agricultural tasks such as clearing land, planting crops, tending the cane and weeding. First-contract servants were specifically prohibited from engaging in domestic service or in any skilled capacity in the refineries, which positions were to be occupied exclusively by Europeans. Furthermore, Melanesians were to be graded into three distinct legal status groups — first contract servants were confined within menial agricultural toil, while the "time
expired" Melanesians (a term which was applied to those who had completed their first contract of three years' service) could either return home or re-engage under a short contract. This latter group were also not permitted to perform skilled occupations. The third category was composed of Islanders who possessed an "exemption ticket" which could only be obtained if the individual had been continuously resident in the colony since 1 September 1879. This stipulation effectively ensured that few would be eligible to enjoy relative freedom (for ticket-holders were not to be placed under the restrictions of any 'protective' legislation). Even this last tiny category of Melanesians, which consisted of only 500 people, could never anticipate the full benefits of citizenship, however, for the Naturalization of Aliens Act, passed in 1861 and consolidated in 1867, allowed only Africans and Asians among non-European peoples, to become British subjects.19

The Liberals had initiated this complex set of discriminatory legislation in order, as we have seen, to counteract the formation of a caste society. Yet it should readily be observed that this very legislation, in effectively restricting the Melanesian in relation to locale and industry as well as to a particular form and level of occupation, was actually ensuring the perpetuation of the caste society which the Liberals claimed to loathe, for the duration of the Melanesians' employment in Queensland. One can suggest that if the Liberals' objections were directed only against the concept of caste, and unaffected by any racist considerations, this apparent illogicality could not have occurred. The obvious way, politically, to overcome the development of a caste society would be to legislate against such a prospect rather than towards its eventuation — and this approach would have been in accord with genuine liberal principles. As it was, the only sop offered to such principles was the exemption ticket — a device which would affect no more than 0.8 per cent of the Islanders who came to the Colony.

The effect of the Liberals' legislation of 1877 and 1884 was, therefore, essentially racialist in character. As John Rex has demonstrated, the closure of upward social mobility for any ethnic minority group, who are thereby confined within an almost unalterable system of role-allocation (in this case, gang-labour), is one of the classic features of racialism in any society. The Liberals' policy exemplified this particular pattern of repression, especially since the justification they used to defend such discrimination was stated, however politely, in terms of the reputed racial inferiority of coloured servants, which precluded them from ever attaining any sort of effective equality with members of the 'host' society. William Brookes, the member for
North Brisbane, told the Legislative Assembly in February 1884 that:

The evil of coloured labour was that it placed the servile labourer too much under the control of the white man. They might not call it slavery, but it was akin to it — cousin to it; and unless they were very careful . . . [indentured service] would soon degenerate into slavery.20

Yet he offered no suggestion as to how indentured service might be transformed into any kind of free labour. Premier Griffith agreed in essence with Brookes, for he, too, thought that “large estates managed by a few” on which toiled numbers of coloured servile workers would ultimately “lead to the destruction of our government [and society]”.21 Previously, Griffith had stated that:

... the fact that we had amongst us a special class of people necessitates special legislation. In 1868, it was necessary to pass an Act to protect Polynesians from ourselves; now we had to legislate to protect ourselves from them. The more we restricted this labour the better.22

It was his avowed intention that agricultural labour by whites in the colony should not “be seen as a degrading occupation as it was in the American South, British Guiana, Mauritius and the West Indies”.23 Yet the legislation that resulted from these debates, under which Melanesians were almost exclusively confined to menial agricultural positions on sugar estates, directly contradicted this.

This policy of progressive containment was ultimately directed towards the total removal of the Melanesians from Queensland. In 1885 the Liberals, prompted by pressure from the apprehensive white working class and by their own vision of a free colony inhabited by independent European yeoman farmers and artisans, passed an Act to prohibit Melanesian indenture after 31 December 1890. This was to ensure that a healthy expanding community of free white men and women could fully develop. One Liberal, James Dickson, the member for Enoggera, believed that since “Polynesians could [never] become an integral part of the population of a colony inhabited by Anglo-Saxons”, they should be expelled, for the Melanesian comprised merely “the thin edge of a wedge for the introduction of a servile class of labour into our midst; in fact, there was no limit to which the thing might go”.24

The planters were given six years to phase out their Melanesian servants and to replace them with some other form of more acceptable labour. In 1885, a Royal Commission which
investigated kidnapping and other illegal ‘recruiting’ methods of Melanesians from New Guinea and adjacent areas, had engendered widespread opposition to the planters’ régime. In the light of this public exposure of undeniable murder, brutality and kidnapping on a large scale, the planters were unusually acquiescent. They realized that now they had little alternative but to accept the Liberals’ proposals.

To ensure that the sugar industry did not collapse, Griffith’s Liberal Government established an ambitious scheme, whereby the estate system was to be gradually replaced by a co-operative one. Instead of an extensive plantation owned by one family or company producing and manufacturing sugar on the one property, larger numbers of small white-owned farms were to grow cane which would be refined at local communally-managed mills. The Government initially was to subsidise these ventures, on the single stipulation that the sugar was totally manufactured by white labour. Essentially, the Liberals were attempting to rid the colony of the two castes they so vehemently hated — the group of rich planters who were so often absentee landlords and their Melanesian servants, kept servile by legislation and social discrimination. Yet their victory was not to be accomplished fully until the inauguration of the White Australia Policy by the Commonwealth Government, sixteen years later. When the time came to expel the Melanesians from Queensland in 1891, an unforeseen set of economic circumstances foreshadowed the implementation of the 1885 regulations. The sugar industry, seriously retarded financially since the later 1880s, had plunged into a full-scale depression by 1891 and only drastic action could avert its total demise. Samuel Griffith, once more Premier, (but now in an uneasy coalition with his hated former antagonist, Sir Thomas McIlwraith), with much reluctance reintroduced Melanesian labour for a further ten years. In his ‘Manifesto to the People of Queensland’ in February 1892, Griffith stated that he was still “the most determined opponent of the introduction of servile or coloured labour” whose presence was “injurious to the interests of Queensland as a home for the British race”. This time it was he who assured white colonists that the reintroduction of ‘Pacific Islanders’ in this period of crisis was only “a temporary and transitional expedient”.
CHAPTER THREE

"Frolicsome Urchins?"

The ‘reliable’ servant

A naturally weak constitution. This is the [Kanakas'] great secret. From this source springs that quality which has endeared the Kanaka to the plantation-owner — his docility. When he doesn't die altogether, he remains half-dead and quite submissive. He is priceless to the planter, because preeminently kickable.  

Bulletin, 26 March 1892

The Liberals' fear that their society, based upon 'democratic' and progressive principles, would be destroyed by the presence of alien labourers from an "inferior race" was intensified by the avowed motives of the grand rural masters. The urban bourgeoisie and working classes in the Moreton Bay settlement had, in the 1840s and 1850s, opposed the continued assignment of convicts, "ticket-of-leave" holders and 'exiles'. These categories of cheap servile labour were seen to pose a moral and political threat to the advancement of a free society, bearing as they did the taint of criminality and convictism. When criminals no longer could be engaged, with the cessation of Transportation, rural masters desired some other form of cheap, reliable and tractable labour. During the 1860 Select Committee which investigated the new colony's imminent requirements for workers and immigrants, the pastoralists forcefully argued the necessity for 'dependable', preferably coloured labour, if rural industry was to expand. Dr William Hobbs, representing the urban viewpoint, countered that the presence of cheap coloured servants as suggested by the squatters would be prejudicial to the operation of a democratic community — for they exhibited a badge of inferiority even more apparent than ex-convicts, as this was believed to be implicit in the darkness of their skins. Undeterred by such criticism, the pastoralists, followed later by the sugarplanters were never hesitant in impressing upon the public their need for this form of servile labour:

... not because we have any love of black skins and high
favours, but simply because it is impossible to carry out certain industries at profit with whites.\(^{31}\)

William Canny, the wealthy proprietor of *Eaton Vale* plantation at Maryborough, testified that:

> From my own knowledge of the district, I believe there would not be a stick of cane growing if this description of coloured labour [Melanesians] was stopped and some other form of cheap labour was not substituted for it.\(^{32}\)

In 1885, an hysterically written pamphlet warned of the dangers which would befall young white men working in the tropics. It told alarmingly of “physical and moral degeneration” and “premature decay” aggravated by the need to “use stimulants to maintain energy”.\(^{33}\) A Mackay squatter, Harold Finch-Hatton observed in 1886:

> It has been conclusively proved . . . that white men cannot and will not do the work done by niggers in the field, and . . . that if white labour were available, it would only be at wages which the planters could never afford to pay. The sugar industry is entirely dependent upon coloured labour.\(^{34}\)

Despite the popularity of the idea that whites could not work in the tropics, which formed an almost axiomatic ‘bridging belief’ to reinforce the cultural elevation of Europeans, some colonists did state that this was not entirely true. In 1873 one resident attested that “my experience proves that [the idea that] the climate is such that a white man cannot be employed agriculturally is so much rubbish”.\(^{35}\) George Ironside, a small cane farmer at Mackay, testified in 1889 that, since 1870, he had performed strenuous manual labour outdoors throughout the year without ill-effect.\(^{39}\) Constant claims about the unsuitability of Europeans toiling in the heat were not so much statements based upon actual observation, as rationalizations to substantiate the existence of a particular social structure wherein Melanesians and other non-Europeans were kept in a permanent position of economic and cultural subservience.

Masters often explained the necessity for coloured servants in quite candid terms. Claudius Whish of *Oaklands* Estate at Caboolture, remarked: “the chief element of . . . [the Islanders’] value consists in your being sure of their residence with you for a certain time”.\(^{37}\) The *Mackay Mercury*, a mouth-piece for the sugar-producers, declared in 1876 that:
The chief advantage of Polynesian labour appears therefore to be, not cheapness, but the independent condition in which it places the employer in respect to sudden fluctuations of the white labour market, so common in the colonies.\textsuperscript{38}

White men were neither cheap, reliable nor amenable to discipline like a coloured servant, for: "you have him when you want him, and he never sticks you up by refusing to work. If you have a 'Kanaka' by agreement, he will do just as he is told".\textsuperscript{39} Henry King, MLA for Wide Bay, commented in 1871 that masters expected "a servile race introduced, over whom they have complete power",\textsuperscript{40} whilst another Liberal went so far as to assert that employers preferred "a docile and obedient slave to a workman who is their equal".\textsuperscript{41} Even the Conservative British Secretary of State for the Colonies, Baron de Worms, agreed in 1892 that the sugar planters wanted a cheap subservient work force which had few rights and little governmental protection.\textsuperscript{42} It was to this objective — to provide servants who possessed four vital characteristics, a dark skin, cheapness, reliability and servility — that the squatters and planters consistently applied themselves.

In 1880, for instance, when the supply of Melanesian recruits from the New Hebrides and the Solomons, had appeared to be diminishing rapidly, the sugar-producers immediately began to cast about for a new source of coloured servile labour. During 1882, in an act of pure desperation, Indian Coolie labourers were tried. This form of cheap labour had first been proposed in February 1861 for the infant cotton industry:

\ldots and in order to prevent the probability of such labour clashing with the interests of European labour, and to guard against the evils which are usually incidental to the admixture of different races, and which are painfully emphasised in the United States \ldots the use of the islands of Moreton Bay for plantations

was suggested.\textsuperscript{43} Robert Towns as well as other leading squatters such as Charles Nicholson, Alfred Sandeman, and Robert Tooth all petitioned the Government to allow them to introduce Indians into the colony on a large scale.\textsuperscript{44} Sir Frederick Rogers, the humanitarian Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies in Britain, dampened their enthusiasm for the scheme, however, when he wrote:
I have read with very great and painful interest the accounts of the Colonists' dealings with the Aborigines ... I am confident that the Indian Government will not permit those for whose welfare they hold themselves responsible ... to leave India with the intention of locating themselves in districts where they are exposed to casualties of this kind.\textsuperscript{45}

Cottnam McLean of \textit{Beauchamp} Estate at Caboolture in 1869 pointed to the advantages of the masters' engaging Indians — they were accustomed to hard manual labour; they were British subjects; and since interpreters were readily available, there could be none of the allegations of "slavery" which tarnished the enlistment of Melanesians.\textsuperscript{46} Despite these favourable features, few Indians arrived in the colony. The Hon. Louis Hope obtained only ten in 1870, though he had asked for a large contingent to be sent to \textit{Ormiston}\.\textsuperscript{47} George Thorn Jr informed the members of the Legislative Assembly in September 1880, that Cingalese, like those at Christisons' \textit{Lammermoor},\textsuperscript{48} "are a fine active and intelligent lot, and to an old Anglo-Indian appear far more preferable to the plodding celestial or the ponderous kanaka".\textsuperscript{49}

In early 1881, all the leading planters of Queensland organized concerted pressure upon the conservative government to allow them to introduce large numbers of Indians.\textsuperscript{50} John Ewen Davidson of Mackay, one of the chief exponents of the scheme, wrote that his fellow planters are exceedingly anxious to be placed on an

\[
\text{... equal footing with these countries [Fiji, Java, New Caledonia, Mauritius and Natal] as regards labour, and since we consider that the islands of the Pacific will not, after a short time be able to supply the demands made upon them (not only by Queensland but many other countries) for the labourers required for the growth and manufacture of tropical production.}\textsuperscript{51}
\]

In November 1882, the plan was first realized, when a contingent of Cingalese, "almost as dark skinned as Negroes but with fine features and wearing effeminate robes", were introduced into Bundaberg.\textsuperscript{52} They were engaged under the \textit{Master and Servants Act} for a period of five years at £20 per annum. Food, clothing, accommodation, medical attendance and a return passage home was also included.\textsuperscript{53} Yet these men who had the "intelligence to assert their rights", resolutely refused to work in "the jungle";\textsuperscript{54} for as Harold Finch-Hatton testified, they were all
"well-educated" and "unaccustomed to hard work".\textsuperscript{55} Their original employer, Henry Ford of Bundaberg had attempted to transfer them to another master Josiah Nott: The Cingalese then refused to "recognise that they can be transferred".\textsuperscript{56} Horace Burkitt, the Police Magistrate of Bundaberg, sentenced the ring-leaders to one month in gaol under the provisions of the Act.\textsuperscript{57} A public outcry ensued when articles reporting the whole incident in the Bundaberg Star were reprinted in the Times of London, along with a severe condemnation of the servants' treatment by the influential British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. It was alleged that the scene outside the Bundaberg Court House "more resembled the hiring place or slave-mart of a Southern State before the war of Abolition than a rising town in a British colony"; whilst Nott was portrayed with "whip in hand and wearing a cross belt à la militaire, attached to which is a haversack and in which, it is rumoured, a revolver is concealed".\textsuperscript{58}

After this scandal sugar-producers once more turned their attention to hitherto unexploited areas of Melanesia. They discounted the Western Solomons, for here, the people were exceptionally bellicose head-hunters. This left only the New Guinea mainland and adjacent archipelagoes. Yet the natives here had experienced only sporadic contact with itinerant Europeans. From 1883-1885 over 5,000 servants from these "low-contact" areas were illegally brought into Queensland. Many were kidnapped, forcibly abducted or lured on board with a promise of trade goods, only to find themselves in the holds with the hatches battened down on top of them. Others were promised a pleasure jaunt around the islands or a relaxing sojourn in "whiteman's country". Those few with some vague understanding of European culture were informed that they were to serve in Queensland for three "borimas" or three "yams" — both entirely meaningless concepts which attempted to convey to them the period of three years indenture. The Royal Commission in 1885 concluded that the procurement of Melanesians in these areas:

\textit{... is one long record of deceit, cruel treachery, deliberate kidnapping and cold-blooded murder. The number of human beings whose lives were sacrificed during the "recruiting" can never accurately be known.}\textsuperscript{59}

The amoral candour and energy, which plantation owners and recruiters applied to obtaining labourers of this sort, confirmed the apprehensions felt by Liberals and their supporters. The conservative politicians reminded colonists that they regarded the Melanesian merely as a "valuable auxiliary" who was never
“intended to supercede European labourers and immigrants”. In fact, they ventured to claim, the presence of the coloured servants benefited the white working class, whose members could be elevated from the position of unskilled labourers to that of mechanics or overseers. The possession of a white skin would automatically ensure upward social mobility and permanent relief from “unpleasant [tropical] manual labour”. The pastoralists and planters envisaged rural Queensland as a highly-stratified society, with themselves at the apex as the economic and political leaders. They would employ various categories of skilled white workers, whilst large numbers of indentured non-European labourers would perform all the arduous, menial and monotonous toil. A distinct colour line was drawn, so that the non-European labourer, regardless of talent, experience or capacity, was to be kept permanently and unalterably in a subservient position. The knowledge that society in the American ante-bellum South had operated precisely after these principles merely intensified the suspicion felt by the Liberals and white workers. The conservative parliamentarians and masters found it difficult to comprehend urban agitation and resentment, for they saw themselves as neatly containing the Melanesians and other alien servants most effectively within the structure of the sugar plantation or the pastoral station. It may be seen that the masters’ policy of social and occupational containment differed somewhat from the Liberals’ own. Essentially, the planters and squatters regarded it as a necessary and totally restrictive structure in which the Melanesians’ labour could be most efficiently exploited, whilst the Liberals’ emphasis fell upon containment per se, followed by eventual removal.

The masters stated their case openly, basing it upon several contingent beliefs. Firstly, they earnestly desired the public, especially those urban sections which were intensely critical of indentured service, to believe that the Melanesians were never simply exploited ‘beasts of burden’, but rather willing servants who benefited from their sojourn in the colony. In April 1865, the Colonial Attorney-General wrote to the Governor that Melanesians “gain some idea of the superior power derived from knowledge: they have acquired habits of regular industry and they have seen what can be achieved by intelligence and labour combined”. Ten years later, a Government Agent, Alexander MacDonald argued that the Pacific Islanders in Queensland “learned the value which accrues from systematic labour”. A settler at Ingham, St George Queely went so far as to depict the transformation which service engendered:

The Kanakas come here a lot of starved, miserable-looking
objects, dejected and sullen, with animal-like expressions about their faces. Later [they become] fine, fat and hearty boys, looking bright and cheerful, with the stamp of manhood and civilization on their countenances.\(^{65}\)

J. Lely, the President of the Halifax Planters' Club was little more exact when he said that the Melanesians could “give their labour in exchange for culture and the products of civilization”.\(^{66}\) What the planters neglected to mention was the profit which they made from exploiting their indentured servants quite ruthlessly.

Rural masters were loath to admit that they maintained a system of exploitation and oppression. They argued that they supported a régime of benevolent paternalism which catered to the particular characteristics of the Melanesians. Around this assumption, they built a complex series of beliefs and responses towards this category of servant. The Islander was the ‘uncivilised child’ who needed understanding and firm guidance. Essentially, a stereotype of this nature acted as a further mechanism of containment, for it implied that the infantile Islander could not maintain an existence outside that provided by the solicitious master. This concept was supported by contemporary intellectual thought on the characteristics possessed by each ‘race’. The eminent sociologist, Herbert Spencer in 1875 argued that “primitive” people “had all the limitations of children, except that their childhood of intellect was permanent”,\(^{67}\) whilst Stanley Hall, an American psychologist thought that all non-literate groups were in a state of perpetually-arrested infancy.\(^{68}\) On the Scala Natura, the Melanesians would always be on “the foot of the ladder” as their “intellect will always move in a narrow circle”.\(^{69}\)

These scientific opinions gave a respectability and credibility to the planters’ stereotype of the Melanesians. Like Sambo in the Ante-Bellum American South and Quashee in Jamaica,\(^7\) Mary and Tommy Tanna, the female and male apppellations of this racist stereotype in Queensland, were irresponsible child-like beings who needed guidance and discipline. Generally, Melanesians in Queensland were called ‘Kanakas’, a term that originally came from a Polynesian dialect and simply signified the general concept of “man”.\(^71\) However, its application in Queensland acquired quite different connotations, being closely related to the term ‘nigger’ and ‘boy’, as used in the American South. As late as 1966 J.P. Sheppard informed his readers that he would not employ the derogatory term ‘Kanaka’ in reference to the Islanders. He went on to conclude, however, that the epithet ‘boy’ was not insulting, for Melanesians were always ‘boys’, as they constituted
Tongk Yanka: "How's this, they call us de victims of slavery and oppression?"

Sanny Naswa: "You is a ignorant gentleman! You see, we is de slave of fashion, and dey is frightened at de impression we makes on de ladies; de white man got no chance wit us, so they want to stop us comin' to dis country."

*The Figaro* lampoons the 'semi-civilized Kanaka' (February 1885).
a primitive people mentally with the ignorance and curiosity of a child. In 1892, Harry Blake stated that, regardless of age, a male Melanesian was "always a boy", who "takes life as he finds it and does not prematurely age himself trying to solve the complex and varied problems of civilization". He continued that "the 'boys' are always a cheerful feature in the landscape", who resembled "frolicsome urchins, school a-released". Charles Rawson, a prominent planter at Mackay, described them as "happy, singing at work and jolly". Archibald Forbes enlarged upon the stereotype, when he stated that a "Kanaka" was

... by nature a cheerful sort of fellow ... when you look at him, he grins responsively; when you speak to him, he smiles all over his head. He is a likeable sort of fellow and has an instinctive politeness and cordiality. He will run of his own accord to open a gate for you, or to hold your horse.

Perhaps many Melanesians were forced to play the role of the obsequious panderer; however, their institutionalized servile position demanded this type of nervous fawning before any white person who seemed important. Like a grateful dog, an Islander was portrayed as:

... loyal in heart, affectionate of disposition ... He has implicit faith in the master who is kind to him, though his soul will rise in passionate revolt against ill-treatment or betrayal of confidence ... [This illustrates] the childlike confidence of the Kanaka. Praise and sympathy are warmth to him.

Robert Towns, as early as 1863, had felt that they were "a poor, timid, unoffending race who require all the kindness you can show them". Charles Eden, a pioneer planter as well as Police Magistrate at Cardwell in the early 1860s, described his Tannese servants as "docile, laborious light-hearted, good-tempered and most faithful and affectionate", while a fellow settler, James Hope agreed that his New Hebridiens were "merciful and very friendly". Forbes felt that the Melanesians were almost "feudal" in their attachment to a kind master. The Clerk of the Colonial Parliament in the late nineteenth century, Charles Bernays depicted them as "peaceable, law-abiding, kindly-disposed savages" who were "wonderfully responsive to benevolence".

The planters and their supporters frequently praised the Pacific Islanders for their docility, amenability to discipline and their dependability. Eden remarked that, unlike white workers,
Melanesians could be trusted to perform their duties without resort to supervision,82 whilst Mary Banks of Cressbrook Station at Esk described the indentured servants there as “gentle, happy-natured men who worked steadily and gave no trouble”.83 Gordon Sandeman, a wealthy pastoralist and member of the Legislative Council, told his colleagues in 1880 that “Kanakas” were “honest and industrious workmen”.84 Twelve years later, a group of planters wrote that “the boys were law-abiding, hard-working and more easily-managed” than white labourers.85

Such statements fired the indignation and hostility of the white working class who feared the presence of any indentured servants who could so easily submit themselves to humiliating servility. They were never entirely convinced that the “docile Kanaka” could be totally contained within the confines of the planters’ and pastoralists’ authority. Perhaps the Melanesian was not the simple-minded child the master so carefully advertised. They wondered whether the rural employers might ultimately replace white workers with foreign aliens. Liberal politicians disputed the issue in more ideological terms, by questioning the very morality upon which the whole argument of the masters relied. As William Salkeld said when he confronted his parliamentary opponents: “we recognize it is not fair to make a bargain with a child, and these kanakas are very much like children”.86 Yet whilst conservatives and Liberals might agree that Melanesians were a type of retarded child, their views on the whole question of their engagement in the colony radically differed. To the former, the Melanesian was a cheap, reliable and servile labourer who materially advanced his master’s economic stronghold in the rural industry; to the Liberal, he was a source of social and moral contamination, eating into the very fibre of a free and progressive community.
CHAPTER FOUR

The Servant Bound

The nature of Indentured Service

John Rex has demonstrated how systems of indentured labour in the nineteenth century enlisted for a prescribed period of years the services of young men who could be returned home at the completion of their bond. They would live in almost prison-like conditions, whilst their labour could be efficiently exploited by white masters who were thereby relieved of the unproductive units (the small children, pregnant and lactating women and the elderly) which blighted slavery. In Queensland from 1863-1906, the period in which Melanesians were indentured, almost seventy-five per cent of the 61,160 Islander servants were aged between sixteen and thirty years. Women constituted only about six per cent of recruits, whilst the remainder — some nineteen per cent — were under-age youths, often as young as nine to twelve years.

Many leading planters, like Robert Towns, the Tyssen Amhursts, Alfred Hewitt, the Young Brothers and Edmund and Charles Rawson were prominent financiers in the vessels which enlisted Melanesians for Queensland. Robert Philp, later to become the conservative Premier (1899 to 1903; and 1907 to 1908), had owned, when in partnership with James Burns, the notorious kidnapping vessels, the Ceara and the Hopeful, both of which were investigated by the 1885 Royal Commission. Their firm, Burns Philp Ltd. also owned the Titus, the Moresby and the Induana which were used by the Commonwealth to deport Melanesians on a mass-scale in 1907 whilst Philp was Premier. Such masters were involved in the complete cycle of indenture — the process of enlistment of the servants, their exploitation in Queensland, and, (if they survived these), their return home. On a conservative estimation, between twenty-five and thirty per cent of Islanders who entered Queensland were procured by illegal or nefarious methods. In the early phases of enlistment, 'recruiters' would use many devices, such as luring native villagers onto their vessels on the pretence of bartering and then forcibly abducting them; posing as missionaries, or simply offering to take the
young men on a pleasure jaunt. Yet overall, less than a thousand were actually kidnapped in a manner reminiscent of the African slave-trade. The vast majority of those who were illegally procured, enlisted without fully understanding what indenture entailed. *The Polynesian Labourers Act* of 1868 explicitly stated that recruitment (as against procurement) occurred only when “labourers have voluntarily engaged themselves and entered into agreements with the full knowledge and understanding of nature and conditions.”

Missionaries like Rev. R.H. Codrington and the Presbyterians in the New Hebrides testified that tribal people who had little contact with Europeans could not be expected to understand what indenture in a foreign country entailed, especially when this institution had no parallels in their own culture. Yet, as Hugh Romilly, the Deputy Commissioner in the Western Pacific wrote in 1885, the planters in Queensland who were then desperate to obtain field-hands, knew full well that men from New Guinea and the adjacent areas had been kidnapped and sometimes even murdered during the previous two years. The Select Committees to enquire into the conditions of the ‘Polynesians’ (as the Melanesians were erroneously dubbed) in 1869 and 1876 similarly revealed that many had been illegally enlisted; yet once again expediency and the desire for profit overcame any moral doubts. In some respects, the humanitarians argued that the indentured servant was effectively worse off than the slave. In the West Indies under slavery:

The manager calculated how many years of labour, at high speed, could be got out of a man before he was ‘expended’. There, however, the market value of the ‘field-hand’ served as a check, which unfortunately does not exist in the case of the Kanaka hired for only three years.

The Russian naturalist, Baron Nicholas de Miklouho-Maclay argued in 1881, that the Melanesian was “a temporary slave for three years”, who suffered overwork and deprivation with little medical assistance, because a master “does not have the material interest to take care of them any longer than he has use for them”. Whilst Islanders in Queensland were never slaves (that is, the legal property of another person, to whose will they were totally subject and who could coerce their labour), they comprised a form of highly unfree labour, subject to stringent legal and social discrimination.

Before the Act of 1868, which placed all first-contract Melanesians in servitude for three years, many had been engaged under the *Master and Servants Act* of 1861, for periods ranging
from six months to two years. Under this latter Act, all servants regardless of sex, age or ethnic origin were given the same legal status. This legislation sought to preserve continuity in the workforce for the masters, by providing severe penalties (three month's gaol or forfeiture of wages) for offences committed by servants such as absconding, leaving hired service without permission or insubordination. It was additionally a misdemeanor for servants to attempt "to raise wages or otherwise improve conditions of labour". Severe inequalities were explicitly recognized between master and servant, for the former could only be fined, while the employee could be treated as a criminal for a trivial infringement of contract. A correspondent to the Moreton Bay Courier in 1852 revealed these discrepancies, when he wrote that:

By the Act, the supreme penalty for the employer is £5, whilst for the servant it is £20, and three months' imprisonment is the alternative. If a servant complains, witnesses must be examined, but if a master complains, the Justices of the Peace then and there assembled, are to adjudicate [sic] thereupon and no appeal can be made nor is anything said about witnesses, the unsupported word of a master is enough, but not of a servant.

The only protection afforded an employee was the right to sue for outstanding wages, but this might involve expensive legal costs far beyond the meagre resources of a worker. Even if the case did reach court, the Bench was not impartial:

The magistrates before whom these men are taken, also find it useless to deal with them according to the letter of the law, so that they try to smooth matters over as best they can without regard to the law, and getting to the "equities" in the best manner they can. The chief object is to get the men back to their places, and . . . [with] coaxing, promises and no amount of quiet "humbbugging", they succeed.

Many Melanesians, however, being unable to speak much English and ignorant of their common law rights, were powerless to take advantage of even the meagre protection afforded by the Master and Servants Act. Before 1876, an Islander had to have a competent European to act on his behalf, for his evidence was not allowed in court without substantiation. This was unlike the white servant who could proceed in court of his or her own volition. In May 1868, three men, Lawie, Waiwassie and Simonia, indentured under this Act to a pastoralist, Mr Scott of Bowen, were tried for "deserting their hired service" and consequently
losing seventy sheep in the bush. They had unlawfully terminated their engagements, as their wages of £6 per annum were long overdue. The Bowen Police Magistrate reported:

The boys positively refuse to return, alleging that they would rather forfeit all the money owing them by Mr Scott . . . The maltreatment [was] . . . insufficiency of rations, want of proper shelter and clothing etc. . . . [and] is alleged to have consisted of floggings more or less severe with stockwhips, blows from sticks, fists, boots etc.¹⁰⁷

Despite this abuse, the Bench ordered the three men back to their legal master, “a man of position and a JP”.¹⁰⁸ Whilst many gross inadequacies existed under the Master and Servants Act, many Melanesians introduced between 1863-68 were not even placed under any formal contract, and were thus subject to the almost unrestrained authority of their masters.

*The Polynesian Labourers Act* of 1868 incorporated many of the punitive features of the above legislation, as well as setting out very inadequate regulations for recruitment in the islands. For a first offence against the new regulations, a Melanesian could be fined £10 which increased to £20 or three month’s gaol for a subsequent infringement.¹⁰⁹ Since Melanesians could legally only earn £6 per annum, (at this time paid at the termination of their contract) paying fines was out of the question. Clause 5 allowed the Governor-in-Council to appoint special Protectors to safeguard the interests of the Melanesians under contract. The duties and the extent of the authority of these Protectors, however, were not mentioned, let alone defined. No Inspectors were appointed before 1875 and local Police Magistrates were expected to fill this role. This created certain legal anomalies; for as George Faircloth, the Magistrate at Maryborough pointed out in July 1869, a magistrate could not act as such and as a protector simultaneously in court, for the former office implied impartiality.¹¹⁰

The Colonial Secretary, Charles Lilley did not appear to be concerned about this discrepancy in roles, which an official was forced to perform. He commented that: “Mr Faircloth has a proper conception of his duties, but he should not allow them to interfere with his position on the Bench as Police Magistrate”.¹¹¹

If a Magistrate acted simply as defendant in cases involving Melanesians, this meant that the Bench would have to consist of unpaid officials and Justices of the Peace. This was hardly conducive to impartiality, for as Faircloth reminded the Colonial Secretary — “so many of the unpaid Magistrates [are] . . . interested, either as shareholders or directors of sugar companies, or even as employers of Polynesians”.
William Goodall, the conscientious Magistrate at Mackay, informed his superiors in January 1876 that it was difficult to secure cases involving Melanesians, even when the master was undeniably at fault, as members of the Bench "will not sentence each other".\textsuperscript{112} Ten months later, Goodall complained that he was no longer even able to prosecute cases, as those eligible to sit on the Bench declined for fear of confronting a guilty friend or colleague.\textsuperscript{113} On other occasions, the paid Magistrate was a close friend of some of the leading sugar-producers, as in a case on the Herbert River in the 1870s, the government official being associated with the Mackenzie Brothers of \textit{Macknade} Estate. Melanesians who suffered abuse were daunted from complaining, whilst those who did, were arrested for absconding as they came to register their injuries.\textsuperscript{114} In 1884 Samuel Grimes informed the members of the Legislative Assembly that:

\begin{quote}
Generally speaking, the Inspectors came and hobnobbed with the proprietor, the overseer or the manager. They sat around the table and drank toddy at night, and reported on the state of the Kanakas in the morning.\textsuperscript{115}
\end{quote}

As late as 1892, the Liberal Parliamentarian, J.G. Drake was still complaining of these practices.\textsuperscript{116}

As the Melanesians were a special category of \textit{unfree} workers, governmental protection and intervention was deemed necessary to prevent abuse. Yet the theoretical concept of 'protection' would usually fail when its actual implementation was necessary. When the conservative Premier, R.R. Mackenzie proposed the 1868 Act to establish the conditions under which Melanesians were to be indentured, he was simultaneously the silent partner in the firm of Fenwick and Company, one of the chief agents importing Islanders into the colony.\textsuperscript{117} Many squatters and planters until 1890, by virtue of their economic ascendancy, not only dominated the exceedingly conservative Legislative Council (an appointed body of land-holders and businessmen) but also the elected Assembly. As the major rural capitalists, they were the foremost employers of indentured servants. Sir Arthur Gordon, the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, writing to his friend, William Gladstone called the Queensland planters "an ignorant and selfish oligarchy".\textsuperscript{118} The radical Presbyterian missionaries in the New Hebrides agreed that the Queensland legislation was enacted by the representatives of the master class solely for their own benefit.\textsuperscript{119} As a former plantation worker remarked: "The planters believed they ran the State, and no-one had a right to interfere with them".\textsuperscript{120}
Planters and pastoralists might express sentiments that the Melanesians were a "child-like and inoffensive people," "decent, trustworthy and painstaking," yet the reality of their actions suggested otherwise. Partially, this dichotomy arose out of the planters' idea of themselves as gracious, benign patricians, carefully nurturing the limited capacities of their servants. J.F. Kelsey, a sugar-producer felt in 1869 that "the savage becomes a man", by learning the benefits accruing from regular work. The English novelist, Anthony Trollope, after a trip to Queensland, in the early 1870s heartily agreed. Tension arose, however, when the planter or pastoralist, attempting to act out the role of the benevolent father, was caught within the consequences of a social system involving coercion and potential racial conflict (to be discussed in detail in Chapter 5). Hugh Romilly, a liberal was forced to admit that the planters "are all English gentlemen and by far the most civilized, so to speak, in the colony." Yet these same gentlemen could order the flogging of 'Kanakas' and keep these men in conditions of extreme deprivation. As Eugene Genovese has demonstrated, the planters in the USA were troubled by the same conflict between ideals and realities. Not only was it difficult to sustain the image of a cultivated gentleman within the confines of a society only recently emerging from the violence of the frontier, but such an ideal was at variance with the working man's Arcadia which Queensland supposedly offered.

An official Government publication declared that:

The keynote to any discourse upon social ethics in Queensland must be that consciousness of equality, or potential equality . . . The chief evidence of this disrespect for the inequalities of life is found in the entire absence . . . of any attitude of servility between man and man . . . there is no bowing and scraping and bobbing and curtsying to the Squire.

Yet overall practice often suggested a different mode of action, particularly in reference to non-Europeans. Prime Minister Barton, expounding a common belief, bluntly stated that "I do not think that the doctrine of equality of man was really ever intended to include racial equality".

The plantation system operated along rigid class and colour lines, with all non-Europeans being relegated to an almost caste-like status. Lewis Gray defines a plantation as:

... a capitalistic type of agricultural organization in which
a considerable number of *unfree* labourers are employed under unified direction and control in the production of a staple crop.\textsuperscript{128}

Concomitantly, he notes three requirements necessary for its successful operation — the need for large-scale investment, the specialization in a single crop and commercialization. It was within this last category that Queensland producers were to find themselves beset by problems. On the one hand, the paternalistic ethos of gentility and benign guidance was essentially anti-bourgeois; social status, political hegemony and other aristocratic ideals were more highly-regarded than simply profit accumulation. To this end, many planters who later went bankrupt, preferred to retain inefficient and out-modeled methods such as employing vast numbers of unskilled field-hands worked in gangs "instead of improving cultivation methods" and using heavy machinery.\textsuperscript{129} The estate-owners jealously guarded their own social position, "resenting the thought that a labourer could ever own a farm".\textsuperscript{130} Their indifference towards improved techniques undermined the very foundations of the sugar industry, which declined with devastating rapidity in the late 1880s. It is within this context of conflict between aristocratic values and economic realities that a sustained mode of thought and behaviour towards indentured servants was to operate.

Ultimately, the Melanesians were regarded "as mere machines" and "treated like dumb animals".\textsuperscript{131} Even in the late 1890s, Bishop Cecil Wilson of Melanesia was horrified by the masters' calculated exploitation,\textsuperscript{132} while the English parliamentarian, Michael Davitt observed similar oppression.\textsuperscript{133} As early as 1870, the Rev. James Fussell argued that the Melanesians were worked like prison-gangs, feeling "the sting of the stockwhip" for lagging or loitering.\textsuperscript{134} The servant was called a "noxious animal".\textsuperscript{135} and a "useful being, nothing more, nothing less".\textsuperscript{136} Supporters of the rural régime would continue to deny these assertions. For instance, Malbon Thompson, the member for Ipswich, stated in March 1869, that:

> These islanders would not put up with what even ordinary labourers would submit to. They were, it was well known, very touchy; they could be led, but not driven; the only way they could be managed was with kindness.\textsuperscript{137}

Planters and pastoralists continually referred to the "tractable" nature of the Melanesians, in statements such as "[there is] no labour . . . that is so easily managed".\textsuperscript{138} William Canny testified that "they always behave themselves well, if fairly treated, and at
the same time firmly". However, J.W. Anderson was more forthright in his opinions:

> The great thing is to train your 'boys' so they will respect you. They must be treated with firmness; they do not expect much leniency and would take advantage of it. Above all, they must not be treated too well, according to our notions ... for their minds are so constituted that they do not appreciate such treatment.

This concept of the 'congenital ingratitude' of 'savages' who regarded all kindness as weakness, was closely allied to another stereotype of the Melanesian, which applied to them predominately in their island homes. The Rev. Dr R.H. Steel, although an outspoken humanitarian on other issues, admitted candidly that the New Hebrides was inhabited by a "lower type of man". The naturalist, Charles Woodford (later to become the Deputy Commissioner for the British Solomon Protectorate) declared they were "like wild beasts, always prowling about for prey". Racist ideology expressed in terms such as: "Kanakas, like other dark races, cannot understand much kindness and will be much more obedient if inspired by a sense of fear than if they are pampered" — would therefore support a system of institutionalized exploitation and oppression.

If Melanesians were installed within this highly authoritarian régime, they could be rendered docile and obedient within a short period. Likewise, it was necessary to maintain a policy of extreme firmness, if their former 'savagery' was not to re-appear. As A.S. Cowley, formerly the manager of a large estate, Gairloch, wrote:

> Whilst a Kanaka is under supervision and control of his employer, he is a good servant and conducts himself in an exemplary manner, but immediately he is free from restraint, he becomes a prey to evil-minded persons and influenced by them, degenerates into drunkenness and licentiousness.

Florence Young of Fairymead Plantation at Bundaberg clarified this dual concept of the Pacific Islander. She stated that they were "merry, warm-hearted and responsive" whilst under firm control, yet:

> ... there was another and darker side. For these were men, not children. Men with fierce passions, who came from lands where savage murders and cannibalism were freely practised.
Edgar Allan Poe, in his novel *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym* (1838), allegorically expressed this duality, when he portrayed the black inhabitants of an imaginary land, Tsalal, as apparently friendly, but who in the night murdered all the unsuspecting white travellers. It was within this uneasy duality of apparent trust and real tension that the plantation regime operated.
Melanesians were originally introduced to undertake the arduous task of clearing scrub, in order to establish rural capitalist enterprise. It was contended that:

The black skin and peculiar glandular system of the black races enable them to work with impunity in the unimpeded rays of the tropical sun, which could produce disease and death in men of the white race.147

This general racial statement was later particularized when it was asserted that "Polynesians are eminently adapted for the work required upon a plantation".148 As late as 1904, the Sydney Morning Herald claimed that "coloureds" were necessary "for the drudgery of tropical work".149 Melanesians could provide "cheap labour for purposes which do not require intelligence", maintained the Mackay Mercury;150 whilst in 1901 Robert Philp, the Premier of Queensland, confided to Prime Minister Barton that as the Islanders constituted an "inferior race", they were "better suited to unpleasant manual labour than white men".151 Furthermore, Alfred Brown, MLC, stated that Pacific Islanders "do not have much mechanical ability",152 so that he engaged them to clear scrub and prepare the land for crops — tasks which demanded the most exhausting effort but needed little initiative or intelligence.

Before 1877, Islanders were engaged to perform three separate types of work: domestic service and nursing children — mainly reserved for the women — shepherding, and routine agricultural toil. Being supposedly intellectually handicapped, they were believed to be "distinctly fond of children", so that the women made "good nurses".153 Frequently, "planters' children had 'black mammies' as in the 'Old South'".154 Men were engaged as house-servants or coachmen in the town-houses of the wealthy, both in the sugar towns and in Brisbane.155 The town of Maryborough in 1876 alone employed nearly 150 Melanesians as
domestics. After the 1884 Amendment Act was passed, these occupations were forbidden to them — the Liberals' gesture to calm the anxieties of the white working class. In December 1875, 500 men from the White Working Man's League protested against "unjust competition in nearly every department of industry by natives of barbarous countries". Such a compromise, however, could never be more than a gesture, for reports written to the Colonial Secretary, such as a petition from the Mulgrave Planters' Association at Bundaberg in September 1884 to supply 5,000 European indentured labourers, suggest that masters were chronically short of white workers. Three months later, the Maryborough Planters' and Farmers' Association complained that only ten of the 550 vacant positions available for Europeans had been filled.

Melanesians were engaged as shepherds on inland pastoral stations. Charles Rome, the former proprietor of Ravensbourne on the Barcoo River, remarked in 1876 that:

I think he is a rather inferior animal who is attracted by a shepherd's life at all. I do not think you need make it attractive to white men: of course, a first class shepherd is the best man a squatter can have; but, for a young white man, I do not think the life is fit for him.

However, if white workers found the life frightening because of a solitude which sent many "cranky", a euphemism for insane, Rome found:

... the average Kanaka servant was better than the average white shepherd of the present day ... I have found that, with careful treatment, the Kanakas make good shepherds, and to avoid the danger of being short of labour at shearing or at any other time, when it might be a serious matter, it is better to have them.

He totally disregarded the fact that Melanesians were forced to work under these conditions. The pastoralist, Robert Gray recalled that:

Owing to the difficulty of obtaining white labour, I had obtained a few South Sea Islanders ... During the time they were with me, they were very useful and fairly good at lambing and bush work.

The Hon. Louis Hope, the prominent planter who had previously been the part-owner of Albinia Downs, had been "very
pleased” with his Melanesian servants. John Ferrett put the Islanders to fencing, gardening, stock-keeping, domestic work and destroying wallabies. William Matson, an observant Government Agent, stated that “many Islanders who had been here before . . . distinctly objected to go far away from the coast”. Often they would be duped as to their destination. A group of twenty Islanders who were promised that they would be engaged to Colin Munro, a popular master at Moreton Bay were sent instead to Gordon Sandeman’s sheep station in the outback. The Immigration Agent admitted that Melanesians “like town life best” and that they frequently went insane or absconded if forced to serve with pastoralists. Rev. J.C. Kirby was alarmed to watch a group of Islanders passing through Dalby on their way inland. They were without shoes, whilst the overseers accompanying them were armed with pistols as they rode, mounted on horseback beside them. He described it as a “scene from Uncle Tom’s Cabin”, whilst William Brookes, MLA stated that: “the driver [would be] comfortably seated with a long stock-whip, on a horse, the Polynesians barefoot; day after day, plodding their weary way”. Richard Sheridan, the Inspector at Maryborough in 1876, verified these statements, adding that “some of them die . . . on the road from weariness”. The engagement of Melanesians on outback stations illustrates very clearly the compulsion used to force them into uncongenial occupations, and their powerlessness to protest effectively. Previously, convicts and ticket-of-leave men had been assigned to these jobs, and when this form of unfree labour was abandoned, Melanesians, who were equally without political liberty, were compelled to work there. Later, when Islanders were removed from these outback stations, the exploitation of Aboriginal labour was increasingly substituted. As early as November 1867, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, was afraid that serious abuse would occur if Islanders were indentured so far away from Government surveillance. On 12 April 1877, John Douglas, the Liberal Premier, passed regulations that first-contract Melanesians were to be confined within (sub) tropical agriculture, which was to be within thirty miles of the coast. The Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880, passed by McIlwraith’s conservatives, formalized these regulations. An examination of statistics from the 1871 and the 1881 census show a drastic decline in the numbers of Melanesians resident in the outback. This meant that very few time-expired Melanesians elected to work inland when they could choose where to reside.

In 1868, over half (651) of the 1147 Pacific Islanders in the colony were engaged in agriculture, whilst 488 were confined
within the pastoral industry and only eight were working in the towns. From the period when the sugar industry was in its ascendancy (the late 1860s), Melanesians were predominately consigned to the coastal estates, stretching from the Moreton district to Ingham. Though most of the masters engaged five or fewer Islanders, the overwhelming majority of Melanesians were in service on the large plantations. The demographic pattern for the Maryborough-Tiaro-Wide Bay district in 1879 illustrates this distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Melanesians</th>
<th>No. of Employers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>54 Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>8 Total: 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>1 Planter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>3 Total: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,350 Pacific Islanders were indentured in this district, with four estates — those of William Boughy, Brown and Richardson, Moreton and Canny and the Cran Brothers employing 695 of them. Melanesians therefore were predominately assigned to plantations (a property which employed more than twenty fieldhands). Some of these estates were extremely complex, involving hundreds of indentured servants of various nationalities and dozens of skilled Europeans as artisans, overseers, engineers and administrative staff. Goondi Plantation, two and a half miles from Geraldton (as Innisfail was then called), comprised 12,500 acres. 2,300 acres were under cultivation, producing 2,400 tons of sugar in 1889. The Colonial Sugar Refinery Company which owned this estate, along with Victoria on the Johnstone River and Homebush at Mackay, invested £250,000 in each. In 1888, the work force of Goondi comprised 175 Europeans, fifty Chinese, seventy Aborigines, 325 Melanesians and fifty others (Malays and Javanese amongst them).

The large estates, incorporating both the production and manufacture of sugar, were situated in six main areas — Bundaberg, Maryborough, Mackay, Ingham, Ayr and Innisfail. These plantations could operate as distinct and integrated social systems, the dominant power relationship being that of the master and the servant. The rigorous class and de facto caste systems operating here intensified the social and ethnic hierarchy.
which pertained in the wider community. In this respect, it provided a microcosm of the power relationships within colonial society, with Melanesians being placed near the bottom, followed only by the Aborigines. Their status within the economic framework of the plantation had wider implications; it reflected the position to which the Islanders were assigned on the cultural continuum of evolutionary writers which ranged from animistic savagery (the putative original state of the Melanesian indentured servants) up to refined civilization (the European masters). The innate racial characteristic supposedly possessed by people with black skins — intense physical prowess, endurance in the tropics, low intelligence, the inability to perform complex or technical tasks and the need to be carefully guided — which were promulgated by nineteenth century social scientists — were employed in order to rationalize the servile position of Melanesians and other non-Europeans in Queensland.

Yet nagging doubts and insecurity still troubled white workers, intent upon upward social mobility. Before 1884, Pacific Islanders were not legally prevented from entering any occupation (if they possessed the necessary qualifications) on termination of their first contract — although social pressures mitigated against this. Contrary to the stereotype which depicted them as plodding and dull-witted, the very small number of Melanesians who entered employment outside the estates when their contracts were completed, proved to be capable and enterprising. Many field-hands had come to the colony with skills in fishing, gardening and boat-building as well as artistic ability, which, though they could not be directly utilized, could form a basis for learning new occupations. A tiny minority became well-trained workers in the refineries or entered into small independent businesses, such as scrub-clearing, boarding-house keeping or tenant farming.

Whilst various forms of overt social discrimination, arising from prevalent racialism, contained the upward social mobility of almost all Melanesians, white workers still unreasonably feared their competition. The 1884 Amendment to the Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880 which demanded the procurement of an exemption ticket further restricted the chances of Melanesians becoming anything more than unskilled labourers whilst in Queensland. At the same time Islanders were being effectively confined by this legislation at the base of the plantation structure, this system was registering its highest death-rates for Melanesian field labourers. Charles Horrocks testified that in May 1884 alone, 250 had died (the equivalent of 3,000 per annum in a population of 10,000 Melanesians). Alexander Macdonald, the Inspector at Mackay warned that:
... every precaution has been adopted to guard [sic] against the spread of dysentery. In spite of all care, 25 deaths were reported during the current month [at Mackay], and immediate preparation is now being made at the Islander Hospital for the reception of thirty patients from . . . [Homebush] estate alone.  

Dr Charles Clarkson, the superintendent of this hospital, testified that these people — mainly New Guineans — were "of a weakly frame, not at all suited for the work they have been introduced to perform". An unprecedented scandal ensued which damaged the colony's reputation throughout Australia and in Great Britain. Allegations that Queensland maintained an internal system of slavery and had procured defenceless Melanesians by methods reminiscent of the West African slave trade were intensified. The preceding abduction of uncomprehending natives from New Guinea and adjacent islands since 1883, the brutality which accompanied this enterprise, and the appalling death rate subsequently on the plantations, all serve to highlight two significant repercussions attached to indentured service. Firstly, the planter's pretensions about being benign and solicitous patriarchs who cared deeply for every individual servant were exposed as a cruelly ironic facade. Hugh Romilly remarked in 1885 that: "in their hearts, they know the men have been kidnapped, but their hostility to the present [Liberal] government, prevents them from owning it". What was laid bare here, with undisputable clarity, was the employers' most prevalent attitude — that the servant was expendable, an instrument to be exploited in the most ruthless and efficient manner for the duration of his or her contract and maintained for the lowest possible expenditure. Secondly, the procurement of labourers who would have to be forced to perform their allotted duties, elucidates the pattern which Herbert Spencer termed "compulsory cooperation". Here the servant had to "obey in everything ordered under the penalty of inflicted suffering". The implications of these two interrelated social phenomena — expendability and compulsion — will now be examined in more detail.

Melanesians were required to work for long hours, usually at least ten per day at exhausting manual toil. At Townsvale in 1866, they were set to clearing scrub, preparing the fields for cultivation, and operating heavy steam-ploughs from dawn until dark with one hour off for lunch. When Drs Wray and Thomson investigated conditions in the Maryborough district in 1879 and 1880, they discovered that many Islanders were forced to labour from 6.00 am until 6.45 pm, with only a forty-five
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"The prospects of disease in some parts of the world last year were 1840; but 1893, the worst on record. If this air be pure and dry, it takes a lot of heat to kill an Englishman. The same applies, however, to most of the other races. Turkey, in a week, cannot be 100 per cent. His death rate last year was 1840; and now, we must not forget, a chance wholly on adult men. Individuals, every day, have been buried by a large proportion of the general death rate, yet we get the same number of burials: the same number in white and black." Quoted, Nov. 28, 1893.

"I am often asked to-night, leaving the death-rate of another race who have died already. How is it possible that I have been in the same position before we go to bed or a year ago." Five years, on hands below.

The Worker highlights the prospects of another 'dying' race (Brisbane, 2 December 1893).
minutes break. Before the 1884 legislation restricting occupational categories, Samuel Grimes revealed to his parliamentary colleagues that:

It was often necessary to work mills to eleven or twelve o'clock at night. Kanakas would work up to that time without grumbling, but I am sure Europeans would not, unless there were relays and they would be paid double wages.

Noel Deer in his History of Sugar explains that:

Since each plantation was a self-contained unit and a limited supply of floating labour was available, excessive hours during the grinding season, night and Sunday work, were an absolute necessity.

Both William Brookes and Premier Griffith claimed that "Islanders are worked to death, especially in the crushing season". Drs Wray and Thomson previously had concluded that the labour schedule was altogether:

... too long and... too little regard is given to the nature of the work... the Islanders have to perform. It must be patent to anyone that young recruits who have never worked and who, in many cases are as soft as females, cannot at once do heavy work in the cane fields or at the mills... new recruits are put to it with often fatal results.

Masters were frequently aware of these problems, so that the newly-recruited would start later in the morning and be assigned to less demanding chores. This pattern occurred, for instance, at all three of Colonial Sugar Refinery's estates. At the end of twelve months' "seasoning" or 'breaking-in', as it was called, servants would be obliged to perform the full quota of toil.

Drs Wray and Thomson recommended that all first-contract Melanesians only work for a maximum of eight hours in winter and nine hours in summer. Hon. C.S. Mein felt that it was the responsibility of the government to legislate an eight-hour day for this category of servant; whilst Hon. C.S.D. Melbourne argued that seven hours, as required at Demerara in the West Indies was sufficient. Despite medical evidence concerning the debilitating and often fatal effects of overwork, no legislation was ever forthcoming to regulate hours of toil. Masters could legally obtain excessive hours from their servants; while white workers too were often employed for long periods. Yet, although the "Eight Hour
Day" movement among white workers did not gain strength and momentum until the late 1880s, their situation was not altogether analogous to that of the Melanesian. Mary McConnel of Cressbrook Station at Esk remarked that her husband always gave their indentured coloured servants an extra 10s. for working at the busiest time of the year. This practice of supplementing the meagre £6 per annum which Melanesians earned was not common. On the other hand, white workers could go on strike, bargain for better wages and conditions, form trade unions or leave their place of employment. The bonded servant was legally precluded from attempting to improve his or her situation in these ways. The indentured labourer could not leave service or refuse to perform allotted duties, and strict penalties were provided for disobedience, insubordination or absconding.

In 1970, Edward W. Docker, reiterating the stereotype of the Pacific Islander as the 'happy-go lucky, a-singin' an' dancin' darkie', claims that:

The notion, so popularly held at the time, that the Kanaka was a mere unresisting object of exploitation was simply not true. When in the mood, they ran skylarking out into the fields to begin the day's work; raced one another to the end of a row and, at midday flung themselves down, laughing and exhausting, to gobble some food.

This highly distorted and romantic view hardly corresponds to observations of reliable contemporaries like Drs Wray and Thomson, who instead reported the men working "with a sullen doggedness". Michael Davitt in 1898 noticed that the Islanders "are not 'driven' in the task, as slaves would be, but they look, when at labour, more like prison gangs than free workers. They appear to work sullenly".

Combined with excessive toil, the general living conditions for Melanesians were often deplorable. Whilst these saved the master expense, a poor environment directly contributed to the excessive death rate amongst Pacific Islanders. The diet scale, as proscribed by legislation, consisted of a daily allowance of 1 lb of beef or mutton (or 2 lb fish), 1 lb flour or bread, 5 oz sugar or molasses and 2 lb vegetables (or 4 oz rice or 8 oz maize meal, though this menu was rarely observed.) Even if masters provided the freshest vegetables, well-baked bread and good meat (an almost non-existent situation), this scale did not provide sufficient calories and balanced nutrition for labourers engaged in heavy manual toil. The scale concentrated too heavily on cheap carbohydrates and did not allow for necessary protein foods such as eggs, milk and cheese. Secondly, there was no recognition officially of the
Melanesians' previous diet which had consisted of taro (rich in Vitamin A, protein and starch),^201 coconuts, some pork and fowl, as well as fish for the coast-dwellers. Richard Sheridan in 1876 warned that Pacific Islanders, being deprived of their accustomed vegetables, were seriously affected.202 Commodore James Wilson of the Australian Station went further to question the system whereby:

The rations in Queensland, though ample, are unsuited to the native, who is almost entirely a vegetarian; the sudden change from his natural diet to large quantities of animal food has a most pernicious effect and is one cause of the enormous death rate.203

Melanesians on the plantations, where meals were often prepared in bulk by contractors, were frequently given food that was unfit for human consumption. This practice was not simply confined to the extensive estates. Arthur Dixon, a farmer on the Albert River in 1869, frequently gave his bonded servants rancid meat;^204 Islanders at Magnolia Estate at Maryborough complained that they were served salted dugong.205 Melanesians were often served what was euphemistically referred to as 'Kanaka beef' — the offal, refuse and the tough, unpalatable quarters of a slaughtered beast. Charles Forster, the Assistant Inspector of Pacific Islanders at Mackay, noticed in 1886 that the men were apportioned helpings ranging from 2 to 9½ oz of "fibrene" (animal fibre) instead of their pound of meat. Though "an ordinary meal in the Queensland bush" consisted of "half a pound of corned meat, tea and dirty black sugar",206 the majority of Melanesians were situated on the coastal fringe, where fresh fruit and vegetables should have been available for them. Masters could also have given supplies of fish and dairy foods had they spent more money on the servants' maintenance. Employers usually preferred to serve cheap, poor quality food, thereby saving themselves expenditure.

In 1882, Horace Burkitt investigated the death of Semmon, a lad of fourteen who had died of scurvy. Dr Henry May testified at the Inquest that the boy was "very thin" with "his bones showing through, his lips and gums, swollen and bleeding". Dr May took this opportunity to warn of the dire effects upon Melanesians' health if they were not regularly supplied with fresh fruit and vegetables.207 Two years later, Dr C.H. Clarkson at Mackay despaired that scurvy was reaching epidemic proportions in that district, and advised masters to supply servants with yams, coconuts and fish.208 Scurvy, caused by the absence of ascorbic acid in the diet, was prevalent among Islanders through-
out much of Queensland. *Goondi* was alone in supplying lime juice to Melanesians to prevent the outbreak of the disease.\(^9\)

The plantations were invariably situated upon very unhealthy locations,\(^{210}\) often being constructed along the swampy alluvial river banks. At Mackay, for instance, the most well-endowed estates such as River, Pioneer, Alexandra, Te Kowai, Nebia, Meadowlands and Dumbleton were all located directly on the banks of the Pioneer River. The soil here was rich, supplies of water for irrigation were readily available and transportation costs could be reduced. Such advantages to the capitalist for increased sugar output at lower cost, however, operated to the detriment of the labour-force. Infestations of mosquitoes and other insects carried disease and brought discomfort, as the swampy flats proved to be ideal breeding-grounds for them. Drainage primarily served the irrigation system and was not constructed to promote salubrious living conditions. Drs Wray and Thomson condemned “the stagnant water holes fed by the drainage from the surrounding fields... the surface water is greasy and microscopic examination showed it to be teeming with varieties of [bacteria]... which are most prominent in polluted waste”.\(^{211}\) The Melanesians would work all day without any covering on their feet in these infested fields. At Yerra Yerra near Maryborough, the drinking water for the Islanders “was from a stagnant water-hole, twenty five yards long and varying in width from one to six yards. It was about three foot deep and was fed by surface drainage from cultivated land, some of which had been manured”.\(^{212}\) Islanders were not supplied with fresh water whilst working, so that they would, “even on the admission of one of the managers, drink from any hole or puddle”.\(^{213}\) Alpha Plantation at Maryborough maintained a constantly fresh supply of water, which was stored in clean wooden reservoirs: No epidemics of dysentery erupted here.\(^{214}\)

Masters were often slow to provide proper sanitary arrangements. Dr Thomas Bancroft was alarmed that “privy closets” were not constructed on the Johnstone River estates:

... the custom being for [the Islanders]... to go outside the house or among the sugar cane or bananas in the immediate vicinity. The fecal accumulation at the Queensland Companies’ estates was to such an extent that I feared it was causing mild typhoid, severe dysentery and diarrhoea amongst them and at my request, it was cleared away; it was so great that at some of the houses that stepping stones were placed about to prevent one going shoetops’ deep.\(^{215}\)

Dr Bancroft strongly condemned the small, ill-ventilated and
"filthy dirty" huts in which the Johnstone River Melanesians dwelt. He felt that their habit of sleeping all night in overcrowded, suffocating shacks with fires constantly burning, was not only a dangerous fire hazard but extremely unhealthy. Drs Wray and Thompson likewise had been critical of the "eminently unhealthy, dirty" huts where Islanders crowd[ed] indiscriminately.¹¹⁶ They remarked that "the grass hut becomes, after a time, saturated with impurities which alone are enough to breed disease". The prevalence of fleas aggravated these already appalling living conditions.²¹⁷

Some masters like William Boughy of Magnolia plantation did provide room, clean and relatively comfortable accommodation. He constructed two octagonal buildings, twenty-eight feet in diameter, with a ventilated roof, shaped like a cone which rose to a height of thirty-two feet. They were enclosed by a seven feet wide verandah, whilst all the floors were cemented to prevent dirt and fire. Forty bunks were arranged like the spokes of a wheel.²¹⁸ Michael Davitt noticed that even the best quality accommodation for Islanders in the late 1890s (when conditions had improved immeasurably), "resembled as a rule a fairly clean stable for a horse or donkey".²¹⁹ Yet when the masters did provide housing of which medical authorities might approve, the Melanesians themselves firmly rejected it. First-contract servants in particular wanted accommodation reminiscent of their former island dwellings. At Yengarie, the New Hebridians constructed twelve huts:

... built very irregularly in a small enclosure through which there was a very offensive drain. The huts were very small... containing three, four or five boys, not being five feet from the ground and they were in every possible state of decay.²²⁰

In 1883 all the huts in Kalamia Plantations on the Burdekin Delta were burnt down accidentally, as a consequence of sparks from the constant fires flying onto the dry grass walls.²²¹ Melanesians were fearful of sleeping in the large barracks, as men from other tribes might commit sorcery, injure or even kill them. They preferred small intimate huts where they could reside with their kin. These were normally abandoned when a resident died — a common occurrence indeed.²²² The issue of accommodation therefore demonstrates a salient example of the cultural clash between the masters and the Melanesians. Whilst employers were often negligent and parsimonious, those who did attempt to provide hygienic, though hardly comfortable housing found their
efforts thwarted by their servants who had quite different cultural values and preferences.

Mortality Rates per 1,000 among Melanesians in Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. per Thousand</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. per Thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>47.90</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>46.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>61.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>85.11*</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>42.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>52.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>43.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>85.87</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>35.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>55.78</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>36.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>62.89</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>64.74</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>75.74</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>31.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>147.74</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>37.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>98.84</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>38.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>58.20</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>35.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>26.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No figures available for 1872-4

Source: Parnaby 1964: 205

As medical authorities and government officials constantly warned, the swampy land, the inadequate diet, the absence of proper sanitation together with the relentless grind of field-work, all combined to contribute to the alarmingly high death rate amongst Melanesians. Whilst it was true that Queensland society in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a notably unhealthy one — with recorded epidemics of cholera, typhoid, dysentery, scurvy and even bubonic plague, the Melanesian com-
Comparison of Death Rates Between Europeans and Melanesians 1882-1884

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1882</th>
<th>1883</th>
<th>1884</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of deaths by TB for Europeans</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated European population</td>
<td>228,558</td>
<td>262,663</td>
<td>285,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death rate per 1,000 for TB</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Melanesian deaths from TB</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Melanesian population</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>12,204</td>
<td>11,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death rate per 1,000 (TB)</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of Melanesian deaths</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>1,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Melanesian death rate per 1,000</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>75.31</td>
<td>147.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total European death rate per 1,000</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>17.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QSA CRS/150

munities there were in a far more vulnerable position. Ophthalmia, tuberculosis, whooping cough, measles and influenza which were all prevalent in the colony could only be treated by very primitive methods. Yet if the white settlers were subject to the vicissitudes of disease and misfortune, the Melanesians’ position was worse for they lacked any immunity to these unfamiliar and virulent diseases. Many arrived in the colony already suffering severe pulmonary infections or dysentery, and subsequent conditions aggravated their ill-health. For instance, Dr David Salmond, the Health Officer of Rockhampton, wrote that 120 newly-indentured men, already debilitated by sickness, were shipped ashore from the labour vessel in a small steamer, whilst being fully exposed to the inclement weather.

Drs Wray and Thomson condemned the inspection system in the colonial ports which, they argued, “should be real instead of a sham”. The practice whereby lads could be enlisted if accompanied by a bona fide adult male relative, was “open to loopholes”. Since the “sole object” of the recruiters was to fill the vessels with labourers, regardless of their capacity to undertake the onerous duties of a bonded servant, “miserable-looking, weedy and small recruits were imported”, although Inspectors should have ensured that only strong, robust and healthy young people were passed. Thus, Islanders, already racked with fatigue and disease on arrival, were expected to perform unfamiliar and taxing duties.
Masters calmly accepted the inordinately high death rate as one of the more regrettable aspects of engaging cheap, "uncivilized" labourers. Any pangs of conscience they may have felt about exploiting and grossly neglecting their servants could be assuaged by a resort to Spencerian dogma. That Melanesians were not allowed into most hospitals because of their colour, and that plantation 'hospitals' operated as little more than a dumping ground for the useless was totally overlooked. The Melanesians' demise could be attributed to some, almost mystical, yet inevitable law of Nature, whereby the weak and the inferior fatally collapsed on contact with the strong and the superior. John Wisker, in an article in 1882 entitled "The Victim of Civilisation", calmly stated:

That the superior race should be unable to multiply and replenish the earth without directly or indirectly exterminating a more hapless set of human beings, is one of the most lamentable facts in the history of mankind.

He felt that the Pacific Islanders in Queensland died because "the stream of civilisation drives its scum before it". Blame could be firmly affixed onto the Melanesian here, rather than upon the dominant Europeans, as the former's "incapacity for improvement — his immobility" which constituted "his most general capacity" prevented the accumulation of those cultural factors which could ensure survival. The Islander added to this innate susceptibility to disease, "a fatal acquaintance with firearms and strong drink". In a rejoinder to Wisker, Dr Francis Harricks testified, on spurious medical evidence, that "the absolute lack of nervous force and strength of will to help them through when laid low" was the chief reason for their deaths. He concluded that their demise was "simply the law of the 'survival of the fittest'".

Yet the resort by masters and officials to a generalized scientific explanation was approached by some with a certain degree of trepidation, for the guilt arising from their all too apparent neglect and callous handling of these field-hands could never be entirely eradicated. The Inspector for the Maryborough district, H.R. Buttenshaw, maintained in 1879 that "the more the masters lose by the death of their servants, the more expense they will incur in keeping them in health". The Aborigines' Protection Society in London strongly castigated the Colonial Office for allowing Queensland masters to permit the alarming death rate amongst Melanesians to continue. Queensland's Immigration Agent, Robert Gray, defensive and terse, tried to salvage the Colony's reputation by insisting that the masters did not treat
their employees any worse than was common in similar institutions overseas. He added, "I do not think that it is very much in advance of the average death rate of coolie labour employed in other sugar-producing countries". He indignantly refuted the APS's allegations of maltreatment and abuse, for

Not even the bitterest opponent of the trade in the colony dare assert that these islanders are treated otherwise than in the kindest possible manner by their employers... I do not say that there are not individual cases of hardship, because there are, and where do not such cases occur?

The next section of this article, however, will show how Mr Gray erred on the side of excessive underestimation when he stated that few Melanesians were subjected to ill-treatment.

Only three years before, in 1876, another scandal had erupted when Richard Sheridan had publicized the conditions which Melanesians in the Maryborough district had to endure. They were overworked, "assaulted and otherwise ill-treated with impunity" and denied adequate medical attendance when ill. For while the planter or pastoralist might publicly say that he regarded the Melanesian as a trusting and affectionate child to whose welfare he was unsparingly committed, his actions pointed to an entirely different conclusion. Had the Islanders been treated simply like dependent children, they would not have been worked to death or been seen as expendable and replaceable. Sheridan illuminated this discrepancy between fanciful pronouncement and harsh reality, when he said that the masters "look upon Polynesians as mere machines". This was not an entirely apt analogy, however, for machines could be exploited with impunity and could not protest against abuse.
CHAPTER SIX

"Lords of the Lash"

Methods of correction, coercion and restraint

Rebellion cannot exist without the feeling that somewhere, in some way you are justified. He [the slave] affirms that there are limits and also suspects — and wishes to preserve the existence of certain things beyond these limits. He stubbornly insists that there are certain things which "are worthwhile . . . and which must be taken into consideration".

Albert Camus, The Rebel

However much it might be disregarded, the Melanesian was not a malleable, unprotesting machine — his very humanity was to ensure the second significant mode of action by which the master related to the servant. Alexander MacDonald, as we have already seen, despaired of the methods used to force illegally enlisted New Ireland and New Britain Islanders to work. Even the New Hebridi ans and Solomon Islanders in the decades of the sixties and seventies who voluntarily committed themselves to serve a term of indenture, often had to be coerced by various means into performing their allotted tasks, which were hardly pleasant and rewarding.

Writing in 1929, Harry Easterby, the former Director of the Sugar Experiment Bureau, claimed that "if they were late in turning out in the morning [the Melanesians] . . . would get a kick from an irate boss or overseer, but mostly they bore it smilingly". Easterby never pauses to explain why a kick should be returned by a smile — indeed he merely acknowledges the violence incidental to the interaction of ethnic groups, basically antagonistic to each other, without ever understanding its implications. Robert Shepherd, the manager of Ruby Anna Plantation at Bundaberg casually remarked in 1897, without any fear that he might be reprimanded in any way, that "it is my opinion that the best way to deal with the Kanaka is to use a certain amount of force with them [sic]". A colleague, Frederick Roebuck, the field-manager of Bingera Estate, disagreed, feeling that "it is not actually necessary to use force with the Kanakas now". He was
a man of wide experience on the plantations and no doubt remembered the harsher days of the early eighties.

The actual amount of violence that was deemed efficacious varied considerably, according to the individual case. Verifying Easterby's statement, Solomon Islanders, who had been servants in Queensland in the final phase of indenture, told Dr Peter Corris that the overseers shouted very rudely at them in the morning or tweaked the ears of the tardy.\(^{239}\) Having eventually marched the Melanesians to their places in the fields, the white staff kept their charges at toil all day. To ensure this, "you have the overseers riding backwards and forwards",\(^{240}\) armed with a leather crop to prod those who slackened. The effect of this continual coercion on the field-hands should be clearly understood. Melanesians came from a culture in which the individual co-operated with kin and affines and could directly reap the benefit of labour expended. The depersonalization and remote monetary recompense for meaningless labour which occurred when in service left them alienated and morose — 'sulky' or 'surly', as the masters termed it.

Employers did want, however, to establish a régime amongst their non-European labourers where servants would obey orders at all times without the resort to violence. This harmonious system, wherein the master was understanding of the needs and capacities of his workers who, in turn, were grateful and submissive, was at best a wishful dream. Coercion and brutality triumphed over moral persuasion and kindness — and this was tacitly recognized in the legal system. T.R. Sadlier, the Police Magistrate at Tambo stated in 1876 that a lawful master was entitled to "correct" his servants with corporal punishment.\(^{241}\) Undoubtedly, many of his confrères in the government service would have endorsed his opinion. Yet Sadlier failed to differentiate between lawful 'correction' and 'assault'. This fine point of law was not to trouble many masters, who, as it will be demonstrated, went far beyond the bounds of reprimand into the realm of unnecessary violence against recalcitrant servants.

Charles Forster, an observant Assistant Inspector at Mackay, pointed to the implications of even minor coercion — "an overseer handles the Islander roughly and endeavours in this way to compel the Islanders to do as he requires. [They] . . . resist and blows ensue".\(^{242}\) In early 1886 when he was conducting a tour of inspection at Cassandra Plantation, an overseer and a Melanesian began fighting over some trivial issue. They rolled into a tank of molasses and despite the discomfort, continued the affray. At Te Kowai, an overseer named Pascoe, whilst trying to force an Islander to work, was hit on the head with a stick of sugar-cane. This prompted a general fist-fight among black and white
In 1897, it was revealed that *Fairymead Plantation* at Bundaberg "bears a very bad name in the Islands on account of the overseers". It is ironical that one of the owners of this property, Florence Young, should have been the founder of the Queensland Kanaka Mission.

Peter Corris has written that "the temperament of the overseers was important in determining whether the Islander reacted favourably or unfavourably to plantation life". Unfortunately for many Melanesians, the type of man attracted to the position of ganger, field-supervisor or overseer was hardly gente or sympathetic. The work involved controlling often unwilling servants under arduous and filthy conditions; and many overseers were little more than ruffians. Yet before they resorted to outright physical attack, they possessed a number of other tactics to bring the rebellious to heel.

As early as 1863, W. Walker, the manager of *Townsvale* noted that the New Hebridian and Loyalty Islanders there:

> ... seem to have a great dislike to be separated from those with whom they have been in the habit of associating, but it is generally sufficient to *threaten* this; the threat is seldom carried out.

Charles Eden agreed that "the poor fellows are like love-birds, so gregarious that, if separated from their companions, they pine and die". A Melanesian, particularly one serving a first term of indenture, would have been mortally afraid of sorcery or injury from strange Islanders. Service alone would have entailed immense trauma and psychological stress while the individual adapted to an alien way of life on the farm, the station or the plantation. To remove or threaten to remove an individual from kin or friendly tribesmen who could provide emotional support, was an effective means of social control. Insubordinate islanders might find their few luxuries such as the meagre tobacco ration or recreation time curtailed. Charles Forster was critical of the actions of Walter Paget of *Nindaroo* who deprived a Melanesian of his Christmas vacation — the only prolonged period of rest (although even this was merely for four or five days). The Bench of Magistrates fined the unfortunate Islander £2 (the equivalent of four month's wages) for disobedience to his lawful master.

Some masters felt that these small deprivations were insufficient in strength and impression, and therefore resorted to more definite demonstrations of their authority. For instance, twelve men engaged on Lawson and Stewart's station, *Boondooma*, in 1868 were severely beaten and half-starved. One of the number was extremely ill, yet received no medical attendance.
When the Bench in Brisbane — (the men having, in desperation, walked from the western Darling Downs to the capital) — heard of their sufferings, it still ordered them to return to their employers. Three men in service at Beit's property, Westbrook, in 1872 had been deprived of the necessities of life. The Magistrate ordered a fine of £20 upon each of the Islanders or three months' hard labour for absconding. William Groom, then the Liberal member for Drayton and Toowoomba, protested that the Master and Servants Act made no provision for "hard labour". In another case, however, Carl Wagner, a farmer at Beenleigh was warned by the local Bench to ensure that his Melanesian servants, who had previously absconded, were given adequate provisions. This kind of direction by the court was most unusual, for invariably Pacific Islanders, who had lodged complaints of ill-usage or neglect, would themselves be prosecuted for leaving service or disobedience. For instance, twelve men employed by the notorious David Jack of Barrie Plantation at Mackay were each sentenced to three months in prison for leaving their lawful place of service without permission of their master. They had been walking into town to complain of abuses they had endured, when Jack overtook them. Reaching the office of the Inspector of Pacific Islanders first, Jack then filed a complaint that the men had absconded. In 1879, John Wallace, a substantial farmer at Bundaberg, was brought to court when one of his servants, Berrecane stated that he had been starved, whilst his foot had been severely burnt by his master. In another incident two years before at Maryborough, a man named Bicon, in service to a Maryborough tradesman, Cornwall, died as a result of exposure and starvation. It was admitted that Cornwall had treated the man "in a most cruel and heartless manner". The master was merely reprimanded, and like so many others, was never even tried for assault, let alone manslaughter or murder.

Hammangi, a San Christobal Islander, who had been employed at Mackay, died in September 1874 from exposure, starvation and a fractured skull. He had left his place of service, Branscombe Plantation with two compatriots. Later, he was found dead, still tied to a tree. His master was not even called to testify at the Inquest into this atrocity, as it was conducted by Alfred Hewitt, JP, the proprietor of another local estate Pleystowe. In a newspaper article entitled "Only a Blasted Nigger!", the death of a lad named Locy was exposed. This Melanesian who was engaged at Pandora Station near Rockhampton, was only a "half dingo-eaten corpse... whose hands were tied behind him with a rope" when he was discovered. John Murray, one of the Justices on the Bench at the subsequent inquest, blandly stated that there were "no traces of violence or anything to indicate the cause of
death". The whole case was closed when W.F. Thurston, the other presiding Justice of the Peace, felt satisfied that all the remaining servants at Pandora seemed "cheerful and contented". Few Magistrates were like Fred Myles at Ayr who actually castigated the overseers at Seaforth and Airdmillan, who had conspired to keep an absconding Islander in leg-irons without food or shelter for several days. The man in question, named Sallially was in the final stages of pulmonary disease, for which he had not received medical attention. Myles warned the Burdekin masters that the two overseers should consider themselves fortunate that they had not been charged with manslaughter, as legally they should have been.

Yet the white staff and proprietors knew they could act with virtual impunity — they might be reprimanded in a Magistrate's Court by some zealous official, or even be ostracized as a 'nigger-killer' by more discreet masters — but this is as far as it would go. The full force of the law would never be directed upon them. Any official, like Charles Forster at Mackay or Henry Caufield at Bundaberg who did act conscientiously and fairly, might themselves become the subject of enquiry and be censured by their superiors for interfering. The masters

... treated both the law and the regulations with utter contempt, and appear to assume such an air of superiority that you think sometimes that we can't be in a free country.

It was claimed, with a large degree of truth for the period before 1885, that:

Any person in the public service of the colony who dares to report any gross breach of the Pacific Island Labourers Act ... does so at the imminent risk of dismissal and disgrace ... Inspectors of Polynesians ... know ... their only chance of remaining in their situation is to keep things quiet and rub along as comfortably as they can with the employers of South Sea Islanders because they are really the masters, whatever may be alleged or pretended to the contrary.

Forster was removed from office after he had rebuked the manager of Victoria Estate for improper rationing. The Colonial Sugar Refinery Company pressured conservative Government members in 1888 until "they could find him some other job". Political patronage of this sort was still strong in the colony even at this late date.
Various examples of violence, resulting from the tension implicit in the coercive use of Melanesians, can be used to demonstrate the foundations upon which indenture rested. In 1876, a man called Jepson, an employee of *Te Kowai* had savagely assaulted an Islander named Collio to such a degree that he died. Previously, Jepson had been warned by the Bench against this persistent maltreatment of those under his control. Even after this tragic development, he was not charged with murder, as his manager, Hugh McCready, formerly a planter himself, shielded the culprit. All that the Bench would insist upon was Jepson's dismissal. Melanesians had told Richard Sheridan in 1876 that Hugh Monkton, the proprietor of *Nevada*, would "beaty boy, whip him boy", whilst the overseer at neighbouring *Magnolia* Estate was also "grossly ill-treating" field-hands. Lewis Hoey, the field-supervisor employed by the Drysdales of *Pioneer* at Ayr, was frequently vicious to the Melanesians: On one occasion, he had gouged out the eye of an Islander with his whip. On another occasion, he had nearly beaten Jimmy Santo to death. He subsequently set savage dogs onto Santo's compatriots to deter them from complaining to the local Inspector.

Planters and pastoralists felt so secure in their position and thought so little of violence and ill-treatment towards non-Europeans — which was summed up in folk-sayings like "if there is to be any nigger-driving knocking about, let us have our darkie brother to experiment on" — that they did not even bother to inform the Government when one of their servants died after severe "chastisement". In 1871, a white labourer at *Alexandra*, named John Riley, claimed that:

Five weeks ago, a nigger-driver named Smith . . . did cruelly ill-treat and beat one of the niggers by breaking three of his ribs and shoulders with a hoe in the cane-field.

The unfortunate Melanesian, Vacon died and was unceremoniously buried. The overseer did not report the death to the local Inspector. Disclosures were made only after Riley was dismissed from service. Three years later at *Branscombe*, a servant had been "so severely" assaulted by the white overseer that he too succumbed. The manager had the body buried immediately.

In September 1879, the Registrar-General queried the Immigration Agent on the notable absence of death certificates for Islanders in comparison with the alarming number of deaths. Until this time, few Melanesians' deaths were officially investigated; most inquests being held in the case of accidental death such as drowning or where a physician was consulted during the termination of an illness. Only particularly vigilant
inspectors like William Goodall at Mackay might try to examine all cases where death occurred by violence — either outright physical brutality or callous neglect. However, their actions were hampered in various ways. Firstly, the white plantation or station staff maintained a guilty conspiracy of silence, protecting even the most sadistic amongst them. This has already been demonstrated in the foregoing examples of extreme violence, where the Inspector would discover a case of statutory murder only indirectly. With considerable understatement, Forster in 1886 informed his superior officer, Alexander MacDonald (formerly a planter in the district in which he served) that “I do not imagine that all cases [of assault] come to the notice of this office”.272 Secondly, various mechanisms operated to minimize the Melanesians’ ability to lodge formal complaints. As the Rev. John Inglis pointed out in 1871:

One obvious reason why they make no complaint was, that they had no medium through which to make [it] ... they knew nobody’s language and nobody knew theirs.273

Richard Sheridan, though very sympathetic to the newly-recruited, found communication with them almost impossible. Even when the Melanesians had resided long enough in the colony to speak ‘Kanaka English’, they were intimidated by proprietors and overseers, by being made painfully aware of the repercussions to themselves and their kin if they disclosed any abuse. Charles Horrocks (who took over Sheridan’s position after his resignation — prompted by disgust at the manner in which Melanesians were maltreated) stated that he would question the assembled men “softly and quietly ... instead of roaring at them”. He found that simple courtesy achieved a degree of cooperation often unknown between the servant and the master, who regarded each other with mutual suspicion and hostility.274 Since European employers saw Melanesians as inferior savages who needed to be kept firmly within a stringent system of discipline, their methods of coercion, both verbal and physical, only produced resentment amongst the servants. This could ignite into counter-violence at the slightest incident.

In 1877 when Goodall was investigating cases of extreme ill-treatment at Inverness, the overseer refused to allow him to interview the Melanesians in private. The Inspector noticed how reticent and nervous they were in front of the overseer, the chief cause of their terror.275 When the Royal Commission of 1885 was sitting at Cardwell, the manager of Hamleigh, A.S. Cowley (who was later to be knighted, having become a prominent conservative politician) was ordered from the room, as he was inter-
ferring with the evidence of the coloured witnesses. \(^{276}\) These instances of outright intimidation continued until the early 1890s, \(^{277}\) when Melanesians became more conscious of their statutory rights.

Even when an Islander reported a serious case, as the law deemed was his right, he might find his allegations disregarded. In 1872, a missionary-educated man, Vee Vat, who was engaged on *Northampton Downs* near Tambo, reported that several co-workers were:

> . . . cruelly . . . flogged with a stock-whip, (one receiving 36 lashes on his bare back after he had been tied up by the two hands to a tree.) Three other South Sea Islanders underwent the same punishment for refus[ing] to work without rations. \(^{278}\)

The local Police Magistrate bluntly stated that "I do not think they have any reason to complain". \(^{279}\) It seemed to be implicitly understood that such inhumanity was an accepted mode of treatment towards a savage. In October 1885, R.S.G. MacDonald of *Bainagown* Station near Rockhampton assaulted one of his Melanesians with a stock-whip without any provocation or apparent reason. The local Bench of Magistrates admitted it "was clear an assault had been committed, but of so trivial a nature that they would dismiss the case". \(^{280}\) For whilst Magistrate Myles of Ayr might rebuke his fellow officials by reminding them that "Kanakas are under the same law as Englishmen", \(^{281}\) such legal technicalities were easily disregarded in the local atmosphere of extreme racialism.

In 1869, the *Queenslander* reported that "already the 'irons' and the stock-whip with wire knots were spoken of as in use and will [soon] be in general use". \(^{282}\) An influential Liberal newspaper in Britain, the *Leeds Mercury* that year exposed the mode employed in dealing with the 'malignerer' — "[the Islanders] often gammon to be ill, but we take a whip and tickle them a bit and they soon get well". \(^{283}\) Considering the excessive death rate, Melanesians hardly needed to pretend to be sick. Masters would often force critically ill coloured servants to work. One notable case occurred at *Home Creek* Station near Tambo in 1875 when Goo-be-yak was compelled to drive a large mob of sheep, without being given adequate supplies of food and water. His health, already broken, caused him to become insane and die. \(^{284}\)

Many contemporary and later writers have taken an opposite interpretation to the one argued here. The Colonial Immigration Agent in 1869 stated:
I have not learnt officially from any reliable source of cruelties of any kind being practised upon these people, and judging from my personal observation of some of the sugar plantations around Brisbane, they are so far well-treated.\footnote{285}

Since Melanesians were not at this time reliable or competent witnesses in the legal sense, this prime source of information was disregarded almost totally. Sir Ralph Gore, the subsequent Immigration Agent (who was later to be dismissed from office for his negligence in the 1885 kidnapping scandal)\footnote{286} blandly remarked in 1883 that “I am aware that they [the Islanders] are, as a rule, well-treated”. In 1917, B.H. Molesworth, in a dissertation reminiscent of the pro-slavery argument in the ante-bellum South, categorically denied that the Melanesians were treated otherwise than kindly, considering their savage propensities. In 1964, Dr Owen Parnaby commented that “there is no evidence that the few isolated cases of ill-treatment have anything to do with the high mortality”.\footnote{287} Parnaby’s statement does contain some truth, though it must be readily disputed that abuse was only an isolated phenomenon — for the very nature of indenture endorsed coercion and all its results. Thousands of Pacific Islanders in the colony were to succumb to disease and neglect, which often constituted other rather insidious forms of violence. The master or the overseer did not, in this case, beat or flog the servant — yet the effects of deprivation and sickness, which were accepted as inevitable consequences of employing inferior aliens, had a more pernicious impact than outright brutality. Most indentured coloured servants in the colony suffered to some degree from the sins of omission implicit in serious neglect. Professor Geoffrey Bolton in 1967 claimed that “the important point is that there was no deliberate cruelty, no floggings, or other harsh treatment such as the Negro slaves in America had undergone”.\footnote{288} Bolton’s contention that “North Queensland bred no Simon Legrees” must be seriously questioned.\footnote{289} While it is true that Melanesians were not subjected to the completely unhindered authority of the master, they nevertheless — as the accumulated evidence so clearly shows — suffered dehumanizing brutality which was but a modification of the pattern in the ante-bellum South.\footnote{290}

It is undeniable that coercion and cruelty towards Melanesians were very prevalent in the period before 1890; in the remaining phase until 1906, another form of social control was to help restrain the Islanders. In 1886, Florence Young, having enjoyed a modicum of success in her efforts to evangelize the Melanesian servants on her brothers’ estate, established the Queensland
Kanaka Mission. This organization firmly placed “salvation before education or civilization”. Previously, Pacific Islanders had conducted their own religious services especially in the period before 1875 when many had been enlisted from areas in the New Hebrides and the Loyalty Group where Protestant missionaries were active. The Rev. Dr J.D. Lang in 1868 noted that the eighteen Mare labourers at George Raff’s plantation at Caboolture, “read the scriptures in their own language”. A service conducted by the servants of Banchory Station near Rock-hampton in 1869 was held

... in the Court House on Sunday afternoon ... with marked decorum. They were provided with hymn books and portions of the Bible printed in their own language and sung with the proficiency of the average English congregation. One of the number preached a sermon, and apparently fulfilled that duty in an earnest, eloquent and effective manner.

The Rev. Frederick Richmond, a fervent opponent of coloured labour in the colony, admitted that the Pacific Islanders on the western stations, as well as on the coast,

... would meet daily for prayers and the singing of hymns, until the station hands, to whom devoutness was bad form, jeered them out of it. The zealous clergyman in Maryborough kept them well together, instructing them and baptising those that were still heathen.

Attempts to involve the conventional denominations in the spiritual welfare of the Melanesians proved unsuccessful. Indicative of a general attitude throughout the colony, a public meeting, held in 1877 at Maryborough for the purpose of “Christianizing the Polynesians” drew an “extremely limited attendance”. By the early 1880s, however, increasing interest was shown in the evangelization of the Melanesians — Mary Goodwin Robinson, the wife of a Mackay planter had begun Bible classes on their estate in 1884, whilst a local minister, W.A. Turner assisted her efforts. Yet many masters at this time still remained skeptical of the benefits to be derived from religious instruction. They argued:

It is the height of folly to try and teach Christianity to a savage before he has any idea of those fundamental laws
The doctrine that all people were equal in the sight of God was totally antagonistic to the operation of the hierarchical and authoritarian regime of the plantation, and:

No one will have anything to do with a "missionary-boy", if he can, by other means, get another one . . . Experience proves that it has nothing whatever to do with the Kanakas themselves; for until they are persuaded to become Christians, they are an orderly, contented and industrious race.299

Masters feared that the articulate and knowledgeable Melanesian who spoke good English would report any abuse or neglect to the local Inspectors of Pacific Islanders. The planters' fears of the effects of widespread evangelization, however, proved groundless. Christianity could also stress the duty of the servant to obey implicitly his or her temporal as well as spiritual master, and this is the way it was taught to the Islanders. Submission rather than equality was the dominating theme of the evangelical programme from the mid-1880s onwards. By 1889, Theo Pugh, the Police Magistrate at Bundaberg, observed that "the planters universally admit the advantages that have arisen from religious training and the police are in accord with the planters on this point".500 The QKM was extremely popular amongst the Melanesians, so that in 1895 in Mackay alone, fifteen "night-schools" instructed over 1,000 people.501 Ten years later, there were nineteen missionaries, and eighteen "teacher-boys", as the Melanesian assistants were derisively called, operating in eleven centres from Bundaberg to the Herbert River.502

Michael Davitt was dubious of the motives behind the planters' suddenly acquired enthusiasm for this religious activity, for he felt that "the pretence of 'Christianizing' the Kanakas is a piece of disgusting capitalist hypocrisy".503 The Rev. Dr J.G. Paton, formerly a Presbyterian missionary in the New Hebrides, questioned the morality of the "time-serving Churches" in Queensland whose actions and doctrines in this sphere were reminiscent of those in the slave South of the United States, which had legitimized the oppression of those in servitude.504 The Melanesians were to be converted to a strict puritanism, which stressed the benefits of thrift, obedience, self-discipline, continuous application to duty and hard work and the baneful consequence of sinful lapses. Once these characteristics were assimi-
lated by the indentured servants, they could perform their allotted tasks without the overseer's need to resort to overt coercion. Furthermore, as Pugh noted with satisfaction, the incidence of intoxication among Islanders had diminished, though potential access to illegal supplies of alcohol had increased — "this improvement is mainly owing to the praiseworthy and evangelistic efforts that have been made by the local Kanaka mission and their supporters". Both the Government and the planters agreed that religion was a far more efficient restraining force than those reactions inspired by the "fear of the magistrate and the lock-up", which had dominated the period before the late 1880s.

Bishop Cecil Wilson of the Melanesian Diocese in 1895 wrote, with some exaggeration, that "all Christian 'boys', from no matter which Island, all play together". A Solomon Islander told Evangelist Cumming that:

I am son belong chief, that is why it is very hard for me to come to Jesus. All my countrymen like me plenty to be fighting — man all same my father and when I come to Queensland, everyone say "You no go along school, suppose man ask you, you no go". But God make way for me, for I go straight along one plantation with a Christian man belong my country teach; so I listen talk belong him, and lead me little way to Jesus.

This quote aptly demonstrates the conflict felt by certain individual Melanesians, arising from the clash between the old and new cultural values. Yet despite the new familiarity with former strangers which enforced residence promoted, the old enmities did not abate immediately. William Canny testified that: "If there are ten or fifteen boys belonging to the same island, they like to engage together, and generally they do so. There may be seven or eight of that number new hands". Masters would accept a contingent from one island, "the weak ones as well" in order to promote harmony and stability amongst a party of Melanesians. At the same time, large estates might contain other groups of Islanders from antagonistic tribes of Melanesia. For instance, there might be a group of Tannese and another of Malaitans all resident on the one plantation. This practice of engaging totally incompatible parties would, at first glance, seem to be detrimental to the smooth operation of the estate. In fact, it tended to work to the benefit of the proprietor, for racial tension could be deflected away from the oppression of the socio-economic system, and thus be wholly contained within and between the Melanesian communities themselves. Islanders
might mutter their 'favourite threat' to kill'um b — y white man all same like 'um Tanna man kill Captain Ambrym', but organized and concerted protest, expressed in mass action, could not take place because of the dominating inter-tribal divisions.

On Saturday afternoon and Sunday, when the servants were released from their usual chores, all the Islanders formerly from one area of Melanesia would congregate on one designated estate to conduct what white settlers mockingly called 'sing-sings' or 'corroborees'. A reporter of the Brisbane Courier in 1881 described a dance performed by sixty Tannese labourers at Airdmillan, as "energetic but ugly" resembling "scrub turkeys at the Botanical Gardens". Vast quantities of alcohol, though prohibited by law to Islanders and Aborigines, would be consumed here. A widespread 'sly-grog' trade existed in the pubs of the townships and in shanties erected nearer to the plantations. Often the liquor was contaminated or overly potent, sometimes inducing death. Charles Adams of Goondi at Innisfail in 1888 was disgusted at the sight of intoxicated Melanesians on the public roads as well as on the estates every recreation period. When Melanesians were paid their wages twice a year (after 1877) they would hold a large banquet. Police Inspector Isley of Townsville informed his superiors that:

Every time the Kanakas on a plantation are paid they give a "spree" to there [sic] friends on the other plantations; the grog for this has been accumulating for some time previous and general drunk[enness] is the consequence.

At another estate near Innisfail, fifty Melanesians consumed 180 large bottles of spirits in one evening. James Knox at Goondi attempted to organize his fellow proprietors into a vigilante committee to disperse these banquets. His efforts were unsuccessful, as undoubtedly masters realized that their hard-working servants needed this total physical and emotional release occasionally, to relieve the tensions of their toil.

At these gatherings, however, serious inter-tribal fighting would erupt. In 1893 the police considered resurrecting the Sunday Observance Act of 1842 (5 Vic. No. 6) to prevent Melanesians congregating on the Sabbath, whilst it was proposed that:

These labourers should be confined to the plantations on which they are employed; or that, if they are permitted to leave them, they should do so, only when under the care of an officer capable of controlling them.
The Mulgrave Planters’ Association at Bundaberg wanted all time-expired Islanders, who had more freedom of movement than those under first contract, to wear conspicuous badges, proclaiming their status. In 1895, a conference of planters from all over the colony suggested that a Pacific Islander should “not be allowed to leave his place of employment without a pass from his employer”. Furthermore, “a strict watch should be kept on Kanakas and to ensure this”, the Mackay proprietors wanted them to be confined in their quarters after 10 pm at night. These repressive methods were all used in the ante-bellum South to control and restrict the slaves. They were suggested in Queensland when the estate system had begun to disintegrate and new mechanisms of social control were needed to replace those which had formerly been used.

Despite these suggested precautions — which were never legally enforced in Queensland though unofficially employed at times locally — tribal fights continued. Some were very stylized encounters, which operated according to the heroic tradition of Melanesian conflict. In April 1883, an affray between eighty Tannese and fifty Solomon Islanders all armed with bows and arrows, observed these conventions, for “they boldly yelled at each other for over an hour, inviting the foe to come over and be killed”. The fight was terminated when equal injuries were sustained on each side. Yet many did not follow these chivalric traditions to the same degree. At Pleystowe in 1885, a group of Tannese were conducting a feast. A serious skirmish developed when a number of Solomon Islanders assaulted a Tannese woman. A Florida Islander, named Dingee was killed by tomahawk and arrow wounds, whilst several others on each side were critically wounded. After fighting had erupted at Victoria Estate in 1883, the Colonial Sugar Refinery Company instructed its managers in the colony

... to make it a rule not to allow the boys to take their tools into the houses, but to have a small shed erected specially for the purpose and provided with lock and key.

At Pioneer on the Burdekin two years later, a group of Malaitans and Chinese who were brawling with mattocks, tomahawks, pick-handles, and bows and arrows, were dispersed by Lewis Hoey and a squad of Tannese. On the Herbert River from 1889 to 1892, there were four serious fights between antagonistic groups of Melanesians, the largest of which occurred at Macknade and involved 200 Islanders. In 1897, a disturbance
between Lacon Islanders and Malaitans at Pioneer near Ayr resulted in the death of one man and the critical injury of others.\textsuperscript{528} Two years later at Mourilyan, 200 Islanders, Malays and Japanese rioted, after a minor gambling dispute escalated into a major clash.\textsuperscript{529} Despite legal prohibitions against the Melanesian possession of firearms since 1877, the Islanders continued to be heavily armed. In October 1897, the police confiscated from a small proportion of the labourers at Goondi, two single and one double-barrelled shotguns, thirteen spears, thirty bows and one bundle of arrows, four tomahawks and eight war-clubs, while at Ayr, twenty-three firearms as well as vast quantities of ammunition were taken.\textsuperscript{530} This action caused considerable resentment amongst the Melanesians, as their primary incentive to enlist for service was the lure of firearms with which to wage deadly warfare when they returned home.\textsuperscript{531} Charles Horrocks, on his first tour of inspection of the Maryborough district in 1877, was alarmed at the large number of Snider rifles and knives amongst other weaponry which the Melanesians kept in their huts at all times. With some apprehension, he remarked:

The white employer or overseer is more or less at their mercy; should they take it into their heads to resort to violence, the certain consequence would be 'murder', Black and inferior races cannot be allowed the same latitude as Europeans.\textsuperscript{532}

Despite persistent humiliation and oppression, the Melanesians never conducted a revolt throughout the entire history of their indenture in Queensland. This is not to say that acts of violence by Islanders against Europeans did not occur — most certainly, they did. Yet they were mainly acts of retaliation by an individual. The enmities existing between different tribes of Melanesians in Queensland which remained unabated over relatively short periods of indenture prevented their combination for any sort of revolt like the Nat Turner Rebellion in Virginia during 1822 — here occurring only after more than two centuries of slavery. Most inter-tribal fighting happened after 1890 when the bellicose Malaitans were increasingly indentured. All other groups hated and feared these people who were frequently instrumental in provoking violence. To prevent an armed uprising against themselves, masters also allowed their servants sufficient palliatives in the form of alcohol, gambling, visits to prostitutes and relaxation time to maintain a semblance of order and docility. Such an appearance, however, would become all the harder to maintain as the plantation system disintegrated after 1888. Hence, another stereotype of the Melanesians was finally necessary to com-
plement the altered social structure and reinforce the containment of the bonded servant.
CHAPTER SEVEN

From Noble Savage to Degraded Savage

‘Tommy Tanna’ revealed

Niggers are hardly higher in the scale than animals, indeed I prefer dogs — very much.

reputed to Alfred, Lord Tennyson.93

Their visages at rest were winter clouds,
Fix’d gloom, whence sun nor shower could be foretold:
But, in high revelry, when full of prey,
Cannibal prey, tremendous was their laughter.

James Montgomery, Pelican Island.

A stereotype which depicted the Melanesian as a lascivious murdering savage became popular in the colony from the late 1880s onwards. It had played a very secondary role in Queensland throughout the previous twenty-five years, submerged by the economic necessity of portraying the servants as useful and indispensable. The planters and pastoralists, the principal exponents of the ‘uncivilized child’ stereotype could, by their ascendant political, social and financial position, ensure that such a concept would largely predominate. There was already a rich and varied literary and scientific tradition devoted wholly to a commentary upon the Melanesians and other Pacific Island dwellers. Bernard Smith, in his excellent study of European artistic conceptualization of the South Pacific, states that in 1768, the year of Cook’s first exploratory voyage, the Royal Academy in London promoted Neo-Classicism in art, whilst the Royal Society (which sponsored Cook) urged the scientific study of Nature. These two approaches were to exert a fundamental influence on the subsequent depiction of the Melanesian.934

Firstly, neo-classicism (a movement which attempted to show Nature in its perfected, rather than real form) regarded the people of the South Pacific as examples of men and women living in a state of natural perfection, in an Arcadia, reminiscent of the mythical Golden Age of Ancient Greece. H. Fairchild has ably described the concept of the Noble Savage, who was “any free and
wild being who draws directly from Nature, virtues which raise doubts as to the value of civilization". The neo-classical poet, John Dryden in his *Conquest of Granada* wrote:

I am as free as Nature's first man,  
Ere the base laws of servitude began  
When wild in woods, the noble savage ran.

Both Sir Joseph Banks and Captain James Cook, whilst exponents of a scientifically-oriented appraisal of natural phenomena in their professional undertakings, originally characterised the Pacific Islanders within this contemporary literary device, as amiable, if somewhat thievish, children. This conception gained far more adherence among the subsequent Romantics, like Wordsworth, Byron, Coleridge and Southey. They ascribed to the Pacific Islanders certain romantic values, such as love of personal freedom, temperaments which reacted fervently and immediately to experience, as well as courage, child-like warmth and generosity. As Lord Byron in his poem, *The Island or Christian and his Comrade* wrote, they were all "the naked knights of savage chivalry". The stereotype of the Noble Savage which was imposed upon the people of the South Pacific by fanciful, highly-refined writers therefore expressed a naive and unrealistic view of human society.

Behind the facade of innocence and spiritual superiority, there lurked the chimera of the *Ignoble Savage* (albeit as unrealistic as the Romantic view) which was expounded by contemporary explorers like La Perouse and Crozet. They saw the Melanesians as cunning, treacherous and ferocious, whilst Thomas Haweis, the founder of the London Missionary Society, was inspired to evangelical fervour against a section of the account of Cook's first voyage. In 1795 he preached that these savages would:

... [pass the day] in ease and affluence and the night in music and dancing. But in the midst their savage nature still feasts on the flesh of its prisoners — appeases its Gods with human sacrifice — whole societies of men and women live promiscuously and murder every infant born amongst them.

From here, it was but a step to regard the Melanesians and other Islanders as the incorporation of the *Barbarous Savage*. The main impulse behind missionary activity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was the ideal of salvaging any humanity these savages might possess. As the Rev Dr R. Steel, the tutor in Church History at St Andrew's College, Sydney,
explained in 1880: "a noble band of Christian missionaries have braved many dangers to teach cannibal people the love of God". He invoked the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans to describe the Melanesians, for "sin in all its horrid and debasing forms is there".

These conceptions of the Islanders relied heavily upon literary and theological foundations. By the time that Melanesians were first being introduced into Queensland in 1863, however, these views had become somewhat redundant, although they might still occasionally be invoked. In the wake of the new emphasis upon positivist science, particularly biology and anthropology, the nature of these people was described in seemingly 'rational' terms. The Melanesians, classified erroneously as Negroes or 'AEthiopians' were placed upon the Scala Natura with only the Australian Aborigines occupying a lower position. Melanesians were regarded by social and natural scientists as simple, handicapped children who could be vicious and treacherous as well as warm and responsive. Scientific dogma in the form of Spencerian theory was utilized to substantiate this conception. When the Islanders in Queensland died at an alarming rate, these theories could again be applied as a concrete example of the immutable law of the "survival of the fittest".

In the late 1880s, however, a stereotype which referred back to the eighteenth century explorers' vision of the treacherous cannibal, emerged as the dominant conception of the Melanesians in Queensland. This was publicized most vociferously by the newly-organized, strident white working class movement, whose members regarded the Pacific Islanders in their midst with fear and hostility. A number of contingent characteristics can be discerned which comprise the Barbarous Savage stereotype.

A poor selector on the Tully River, James Henry claimed in 1891 that "three boys in my employ" invited him to one of their feasts. He related his conversation with them as follows:

"Mas'r, we go, along booroon (corroboree) [sic]. Kiki [eat] Mary".
I said: "What for you kiki Mary?"
He replied: "O. very good, all the same bulloacy".

Henry stated that his brother had been offered the delicacy of a freshly-cooked new-born infant, whilst "the good and faithful" servant, Jimmy had also suffered the baby's fate. For beneath the appearance of a

... poor, deluded, frightened, ignorant South Sea Islander
who can't change the blank expression of his stolid
countenance even if you hit him with a brick.\textsuperscript{544}

there lurked a "treacherous, cowardly, sly, indolent savage."\textsuperscript{545} While it was generally agreed that Melanesians in their own
societies were demonaic cannibals whoslowly boiled or roasted
their frequent victims to death,\textsuperscript{546} the fear was expressed that they
would indulge in such pernicious behaviour in a civilized
country. These bestial tendencies, therefore, had to be kept firmly
under control.

Without any corroborative evidence, one northern journalist
claimed in 1901 that:

The gentle Tommy Tanna has just broken out again . . .
250 of him [sic] mobbed the police, freely using knives,
slingshots, boulders, broken bottles and revolvers and many
injuries resulted . . . the "mild and reliable niggers" are
putting up a ghastly record of crime, brutality, vice and
indecency.\textsuperscript{547}

Their ascribed innate tendency towards degradation and violence
was aggravated by their addiction to alcohol — for the Islanders,
it was said, like the Aborigines, could absorb only the "vices of
civilization".\textsuperscript{548} They were also attracted to the abuses of
gambling and opium, the recognized palliatives of the Chinese.\textsuperscript{549}
A clergyman warned also that "their very languages are steeped in
filthiness and replete with topics and illusions, most minutely
lecherous" which would prove "dangerous to the morals of
young [European] people".\textsuperscript{550}

The most commonly expressed fear was sexual in nature: that
the black man was "foaming at the mouth with malevolent desire
for white women"\textsuperscript{551} who were reduced to such a state of
hysterical anxiety that few dared venture out on the streets
unaccompanied by a white male 'protector'.\textsuperscript{552} Mrs F. Wheeler in
1901, writing in a most venomously racist style, claimed that:

Kanakas, like all other cheap articles are nasty . . . They
have not enough women to go around, and no white woman
is safe when alone in a Kanaka district, for these brutes can
never be trusted. They are kept in check by force — armed
force. They adopt all the white man's worst vices, especially
drink, and even if a thousand of them were boiled down, it
would be impossible to find in the sediment even a trace of a
white man's virtue.\textsuperscript{553}

Whilst expressed here in rather rabid terms, these sentiments were
The 'Kanaka' proposes and Woman disposes.
commonly-held assertions. Another author in 1901 suggested that:

No young girl dare go out after dark in many places — not even in the daylight in some — without an escort. What with the black scourge and the yellow curse, the State is fast becoming a hell on earth.\textsuperscript{554}

The \textit{Queenslander} ominously warned its readers that the Melanesians "are notoriously a race of men of the most brutal and unbridled passions and they are showing every indication of a tendency to indulge in them".\textsuperscript{555}

White working class girls were portrayed as the "victims of this dreadful sacrifice", if they married or cohabited with non-Europeans. The Melbourne newspaper the \textit{Herald} took this anxiety one step further when it wrote that:

The daughters of civilization, offspring of British fathers and mothers, the sweet school-girl of the years that have gone, afterwards, maybe the beloved of some honest British working man's heart, yields to the embrace of a coloured savage.\textsuperscript{556}

Such authors, who publicly wept maudlin tears over this, in almost the same breath advocated the benefits which would accrue if Islanders visited prostitutes. The common justification was that this practice protected the 'respectable' girl and woman, for "if there were no white prostitutes then none of our women would be safe".\textsuperscript{557} An even more desirable situation was the widespread use of Japanese or other coloured prostitutes in the northern centres, a policy which would "minimize the risk to all white women".\textsuperscript{558}

If sexual relations between white women and black men were reviled and feared, any resulting progeny was even more abhorred, for:

There is a very real danger of an Australian-born mongrel population growing up to make the decent white labourer, with a clean home and respectable white children, an impossibility.\textsuperscript{559}

This expected racial contamination demanded a drastic course of social sanitation; for the problem of "the festering human offal of a Piebald Australia" which permitted "mud and filth [to enter] the nation's pure life blood"\textsuperscript{560} could not be purified of its own accord. It would have to be vigorously isolated to prevent its
infecting the body general of White Australia." One writer, albeit more extreme even than his contemporaries, advocated legalized murder of all "half-castes" — "perhaps the most merciful way to deal with [them] . . . would be the bald, thorough-going method of Herod the Great" — while the Bulletin asked rhetorically, "do we want Australia to be a community of mongrels?" A firmly-held belief was that "the half-caste usually inherits the vices of both races and the virtues of neither". The person born of the union of parents from different ethnic origins was placed in an uneasy social limbo, for:

A horde of such a breed, so near white that to all appearances they could pass for Europeans . . . possessing the white man's cunning and the savage's savagery, will develop into a race most unwelcome amongst civilized people.

These views, which reached tragic proportions in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s as the ultimate outcome of the Ayran Race theory, expressed basic and deterministic racist beliefs. As de Gobineau had written, the various 'races' possessed immutable physical and psychological characteristics which were inherited biologically. Within this context, the "half-caste" was particularly dangerous to the "superior race", for beneath an outwardly respectable European appearance, there might lurk the barbarous passions, "the intensity of desire" of the savage. The white man in Queensland, sexually repressed by the mores of Victorian convention, deeply feared the supposedly superior virility of the black man. This anxiety manifested itself into almost pathological denunciations of the Melanesians' intentions to ravish innocent white women.

If the Islander contaminated the civilized whites through sexual encounters, they were also seen as the harbingers of another form of social contamination, the "deadly virus, the mouldering leper's scab" which carried in its path "the hideous breath of leprosy and filth". A prominent Liberal politician in Queensland, Charles Powers, who actively propagated the "contamination taint" theory asked, "Must we accept these loathsome diseases as a further penalty for our foolishness in making our workers compete with alien labour?" Another author in 1901 encapsulated a variety of characteristics which Melanesians reputedly possessed:

... broccoli-headed, chocolate-coloured droll-doll kiddies gaze over an eternal segment of the arc, fashioned by a semi-circle of perfect teeth, either from a huge watermelon, or,
better still, from a half-rotten pumpkin. The father comes along, greets you with a beaming smile . . . On the breast of the Kanaka, a large patch of skin has a peculiar whitey appearance of leprosy!\textsuperscript{371}

The leper was the ultimate social outcast, to be reviled and banished to desolate island prisons,\textsuperscript{372} in order to prevent the "black circle of death" from contaminating white society. Yet it was feared additionally that: "this horrible taint festers in the ghastliest quiet in the veins of many low-class whites, men, women and children"\textsuperscript{373} — that is, those who might have come into too intimate contact with the 'Kanaka' labourer, the Indian vendor or the Chinese vegetable hawker. Leprosy, unlike venereal disease or miscegenation, was not the direct product of 'perverse' sexual intercourse, but could be transmitted by social or residential contact with Melanesians or Chinese. The spectre of 'loathsome disease' and moral decay was therefore clearly evident, though:

Only those who have lived on outlying plantations where the lowest whites, the aborigines, the islanders of both sexes freely intermingle, can imagine the indescribable vileness that festers in the North.\textsuperscript{374}

Constantly embellished stories in newspapers such as the Worker, the Boomerang, and Progress which aimed at a largely white working-class audience, left their readers little to imagine, as these tirades against the moral and social dangers of coloured aliens portrayed them in gruesome, totally exaggerated detail. Yet if we examine two prevalent assertions — that the Melanesians continually raped white women and that they transmitted leprosy wholesale — we find that there is very little substantive evidence to support them. The Queensland Figaro in 1883 stated that it was common for twenty or thirty\textsuperscript{376} "buck-niggers"\textsuperscript{376} to rape one white woman. Not one case even remotely resembling these proportions can be verified for the entire period from 1865 to 1906. In 1874, a Melanesian, nicknamed Aleck, was executed for the rape of a white woman. Three years later, two Islanders were publicly hanged at Maryborough for the rape of a European female. Their conviction was obtained through a process of dubious legality; for, as the two men did not speak English and no competent interpreter could be located, evidence rested solely upon the unsubstantiated word of the plaintiff. Alfred Davidson, commenting on the case, remarked that:

These Polynesians do not reason by the same line of thought
as we do . . . South Sea’s women are frequently taken for immoral purposes by the ships, hardly by their own consent. They will reason thus: "white man take our women, but if south seaman take white woman, then he die, but they no hang white man . . . bye and bye, we kill one".377

To prevent any such reprisals from actually eventuating, in some coastal centres like Mackay, vigilante committees calling themselves The White League(s) were established to disarm the “antagonistic race”.378

In April 1877, a young girl at Maryborough, Miss R. Nolan was threatened by a group of Melanesians who raided her parents’ farm.379 A girl at Mackay in July 1885 was attacked by a mentally-ill islander who was later committed to Woogaroo Lunatic Asylum.380 Ten years later, Hallah of Rockhampton was sentenced to ten years imprisonment for “carnally abusing a child”.381 During the period 1895-1901, there was a sharp increase, in comparison to the previous thirty years, in the number of convicted cases of sexual offence which involved Melanesian males, with five cases of rape (all in 1899), one of carnal knowledge (in 1891) and one of attempted carnal knowledge (in 1886),382 though this was a small number, considering the thousands of unattached Melanesian men in Queensland at the time. No statistics were kept for the period before 1885, as this year was the first which specifically tabulated felonies committed by Melanesians alone. The cases recorded in the inward correspondence of the Colonial Secretary’s Office, however, do permit an accurate indication of their nature and extent in the period from 1863 to 1885 — and these have already been illustrated.

Some 59,000 male Melanesians were introduced into Queensland in the period 1863-1904. Most of this number were single, unattached young men, so that the incidence of sexual offences amongst them was extremely small. The most sensational cases involving rape or sexual assault were not against European but Melanesian women. These did not receive publicity in the press or censure by government officials. Most cases did not even reach the courts. A Melanesian man whose name was not recorded was held on suspicion of having raped a Tannese woman on Hamleigh Estate at Cardwell in 1882. When no competent interpreter was found, the case was simply dismissed.383 Charles Forster reported a “diabolical outrage” to the Mackay police in November 1885, which involved seven men (six Solomon Islanders and one New Hebridian) who pack-raped a Bugga Bugga Island woman. The woman’s husband was forci-
bly held down and made to watch. Though a local farmer, Mr Mannell heard the victim screaming for help, he “did not go near them to interfere, having my own house and family to look after”. This incident, like others, was dismissed for “want of an interpreter”, though “his Worship commented strongly on the inefficiency of the police”.

When a Melanesian woman (name not stated) was sexually attacked by a Tanna Islander at Ingham in July 1877, the local Justice of the Peace, William Warren, was solely concerned that “the ruffian . . . could have attacked the wife or daughter of some isolated selector”. Again, when “8 or 9 Pacific Islanders from Port Douglas” abducted “six Aboriginal gins” in 1889, the Government was totally apathetic. The public and the Colonial authorities, imbued as they were with a thoroughly racist outlook, never regarded these brutal assaults against non-European women and girls as noteworthy, although no white female was ever subjected to this severe type of humiliation or anguish. The outpourings of rage in the popular press against Melanesians ravishing European females, which bordered in the late period upon a kind of dementia, seem little more than the figments of highly-prejudiced and somewhat deranged minds.

Several reasons suggest themselves for the low incidence of sexual attack by Melanesians upon white females. Firstly and most significantly, Pacific Islanders could be under no mis-apprehension as to the serious consequences of any infringement of European mores, especially in such an emotion-laden area as inter-racial sex. They knew that if they were accused of having attacked or raped a white woman they would most certainly be hung. Secondly, many of the servants were barely pubescent lads whose sexual instincts had not fully matured. Thirdly, and most importantly, they originated from societies which were themselves highly sexually repressed and socially controlled by a type of stringent puritanism. Pre-marital chastity was enforced in most societies from which indentured labourers were enlisted. Young men did not possess the magical skills to counteract the ‘contaminating’ influence of women, which was revealed to them by older men on their marriage. When Islanders first arrived in Queensland, they would have retained these deeply-imbued values. However, on prolonged residence there, they adopted one of the practices of a section of the white male population and would visit cheap brothels. This was often their only recourse to heterosexual union, for as the Queensland Figaro facetiously commented in 1883:

Are the ten [Melanesian] women, who in “the hour of grace” of the ninety [Melanesian] men are “uncertain coy
and hard to please”, to become “ministering angels” when "pain and anguish wring the brow "of their ninety dark-skinned compatriots?588

In 1906, when over 5,000 Melanesian men were resident in the State, only 237 had a permanent union with a woman.589 Homosexuality in some areas of the New Hebrides (particularly Aoba, North Pentecost, Malekula and Maewo) from which many servants were enlisted, was socially recognized.590 Written records do not mention the incidence of homosexuality in Queensland (for either black, white or yellow), though this was probably due more to the intensely furtive nature of nineteenth century morality, than to an accurate indication of the practice amongst different ethnic groups.

In 1885, the Maryborough Chronicle denounced the practice whereby the local planters countenanced prostitutes soliciting near their estates.591 In this respect, the masters acknowledged that the servants were not the ‘children’ they would have the public believe. During the previous year the ladies of the township, as members of the Maryborough Purity Society, implored the “soiled doves” of the local brothel to forsake their fallen ways — but to no avail.592 The larger sugar centres all had their areas, dubbed ‘Chinatowns’ or ‘Yokahamas’ where brothels, gambling dens and ‘sly-grog’ shanties were located.593

On the issue of leprosy, the Worker in 1898 warned:

Think of it, fathers and mothers! A disease of such unspeakable loathsomeness is brought into our fair land with ‘suitable’ labour, brought here by cheap Asiatics and South Sea Islanders . . . scores of leprous coloureds . . . might roam the city and the country broadcasting the disease without the fear of detection. Our advice to the people of Australia is to take no risk with the filthy Asiatic and South Sea aliens who bring with them many disgusting vices and habits.594

Were these anxieties regarding the Melanesians realistic or were they, like the hysteria surrounding the blacks’ ‘desire to ravish white women’, wholly unjustified? In the years 1890 to 1899, there were approximately eighty diagnosed lepers in Queensland of whom sixteen were Europeans, nineteen were Chinese and thirty-two were Melanesians.595 Yet, as Raymond Evans has so ably demonstrated, the methods employed for the detection and diagnosis of the disease were so primitive as to prove inaccurate in many cases and doctors and Health Authorities invariably erred on the side of caution. Writing in 1950, E.A. Cook claimed that:
...the islanders were probably more frequently affected than available information would suggest, is indicated by the fact that, all coastal practitioners were familiar with a condition termed "Islanders Toe Disease", which in a great majority of instances must, from its description, have been a manifestation of neural leprosy.596

One can dispute Cook's assertions and declare that, in fact, some of the Melanesians incarcerated in the miserable lazarets were free of the ailment of leprosy. An experienced surgeon, who worked extensively in the Solomon Islands in the 1880s, H.B. Guppy stated that a particularly unpleasant form of ringworm, "Icthyosis" which was "most repulsive in appearance" was frequently mistaken by doctors for leprosy. This fungoid disease which left the skin discoloured in white streaky patches, was extremely prevalent throughout Melanesia. Treatment consisted of applications of sulphur ointment, tincture of iodine and a lotion of hydrosulphite of soda.597 'Icthyosis' was probably the "Islanders' Toe Disease" that Cook mentions. From this evidence, it would seem that Melanesians were not the harbingers of physical decay which the radical press so luridly portrayed.

In 1885, the Sydney Quarterly Magazine warned of the "sullen homicidal insanity which so often renders the South Sea Islander so dangerous".598 One of the most clearly definable characteristics of the 'barbarous savage' stereotype was the supposedly innate tendency of the Melanesian towards senseless violence. The sugar towns of the North from the late 1880s onward were depicted with Melanesians running amok, rioting and sadistically assaulting any innocent (usually female) white passerby. Events which actually did occur would often be misconstrued and distorted to paint the Islanders in an unfavourable light. The first significantly violent encounter which received considerable publicity was the 'Mackay Race-Course Riot' which erupted on Boxing Day, 1883. A number of New Hebradians attending the race-course meeting has been refused alcohol by a storekeeper on the track, who had formerly supplied them illegally. The men protested by hurling bottles at him. A group of planters, farmers and townsman on horseback, seeing the disturbance, rode into the protesting Melanesians, flaying them with whips and fence palings.599 In the mêlée which lasted for half an hour, one Islander was killed and several seriously wounded, though no major injuries were sustained by the white men. A townsman was given a sentence of one month imprisonment for 'assault'. The whole incident precipitated enormous resentment among Melanesians, both in the colony and in the Islands where
it was said “Port Mackay, very bad man, he kill blackfellow”. Europeans on the other hand interpreted these events as evidence of the violent, unpredictable treachery of the savage.

Frequently brawls would erupt in connection with the surreptitious supply of alcohol to Melanesians. At Richmond’s Hotel at Bundaberg in August 1883, a group of Melanesians were charged 3s above the retail price for a bottle of spirits. When they protested to the white man who had procured the alcohol illegally for them, an argument broke out which involved 100 Europeans and forty Islanders who brawled in the streets until the police intervened. In 1894, at North Street in Maryborough, a party of sixty drunken Melanesians who had congregated there as they usually did on a Saturday night, were asked “to go home quietly” by Constable A.W. Henderson. Before the men could move on, fifteen stalwart white men who were passing by immediately ran to the aid of the police officer, thereby provoking a general skirmish in the streets. The overly enthusiastic citizens chased the Pacific Islanders home to Fairymead Plantation, where to their utmost surprise the overseer, Louis Steinieg said to the accosted servants “Give it to ‘um, boys!”. Had the Melanesians been more belligerent, serious injuries could have been sustained on both sides, and an incident with far wider implications like the ‘Race-Course Riot’ could have ensued.

Melanesians were also the aggressors on some occasions. In January 1884, a group of twenty men “armed with rifles, axes, tomahawks kicked up a row in Anne Street, Maryborough and chased some white men”. No injuries were inflicted. The Queensland Figaro in 1885 castigated three Melanesians who attacked a white man in Adelaide Street, Maryborough. They “severely beat him around the face”. Another case in that year at Bundaberg involved “a dozen Kanakas, one armed with a gun, another with spears and tomahawks” who chased a European named Jackson. This man had made a “disgraceful bargain with the niggers” and when his female companion refused to oblige, the Melanesians pursued him.

Some newspaper reports on incidents of this type which were no more serious than the activities of white larrikins, were so grossly distorted as to render them unrecognizable. In 1901, he “joys of living in a Kanaka town” were luridly depicted:

On Christmas Eve, 1,000 Kanakas inspired by whiskey, gin and opium started to raise Cain in the town of Bundaberg. The police, aided by civilians, eventually put down the riot. Some of these days, some of the Kanaka towns of Queensland will be laid in ruins by the drunken orgies of their semi-cannibal population.
The item then concluded on the ominous note that these ‘savages’ “frighten women and children”. In the same year another equally inaccurate account stated that “some gentle and harmless Polynesian broke into the house of a white crippled man and hacked him to pieces”. This type of irresponsible reportage, calculated to stimulate the highly-prejudiced imagination of a mainly working-class audience, contributed largely to the adverse stereotype of the Melanesian from the later 1880s onwards.

A number of reasons suggest themselves to explain the different and more vicious stereotype which predominated in the last phase of indenture. Whilst urban Liberals had, until this time, stressed how the obsequious servile alien would undermine the fabric of their society which purported to support democracy and civil liberty, later working-class authors had changed the racial emphasis from that of a predominantly political and economic threat to a sexual and social one. The debates in the Commonwealth Parliament in 1901 on the ‘White Australia’ policy can be used to demonstrate the main arguments in vogue. Isaac Isaacs, when he stated that:

The maintenance of Kanaka labour is, I venture to say, indefensible . . . we are forced to the conclusion that we cannot temporize with this evil [system] any longer, was reiterating the arguments of Charles Lilley and John Douglas which had been prominent over thirty years previously. Yet though N.B. Nairn in 1956 argued confusingly that “the economic factor was of infinitely greater importance in the development of a White Australia Policy than either the racial or the political”, contemporary evidence does not support his contention. Though white workers feared the lower wages and poor living conditions — which coloured people had but little option except to endure — their major preoccupation was more akin to that of the member for Moreton, the Hon. Mr Wilkinson, MHR who stated that:

My desire is, at the earliest possible moment, to have a “White Australia”, and to keep from our shores all coloured labourers of a lower degree of civilization than our own.

The member for Coolgardie retorted that “never yet has a servile race existed alongside a superior race without sooner or later resulting in the downfall of civilization”. These gentlemen were far too circumspect in their speeches before the nation to refer specifically to the ascribed characteristics possessed by the
Melanesians which threatened the physical, social and moral fibre of their society. Anyone who had read a contemporary newspaper, however, knew exactly what they meant.

From the late 1880s, the white working class, now articulate through the medium of such newspapers as the *Worker*, the *Boomerang* and the *Bulletin*, no longer needed the urban bourgeoisie to expound on their behalf. It can be readily discerned that when the attitudes of the two classes were separately pronounced, they diverged considerably. The bourgeois spokesman, secure in remunerative employment and living in a spacious home run by domestic servants, could refer generally to the dangers which a servile and alien minority in the community posed to the body politic. Working class people who might interact with these coloured aliens in the work sphere, in the pubs or even residentially, had immediate, tangible and physical fears. Thus while the expression of liberal commentators remained relatively restrained, circulated white working class opinion became positively rabid.

Secondly, with the abrupt demise of the plantation system in 1888 and 1889, a new psychological response was needed to correspond with the altered social and economic structure. It was feared that without the control and continual discipline of the work routine on the larger estates, the Melanesians might revert to their 'natural' barbarity and become totally unmanageable. Yet, as has been demonstrated, these fears were almost totally groundless, as evangelical religion substituted for physical force as a means to impress upon the Melanesians their servile position in colonial society. Most frustrations which arose from their bondage were directed within the Melanesian communities themselves. Yet, Pacific Islanders were quite aware of the enmity with which they were regarded by all classes of white settlers in Queensland. The masters and their conservative supporters viewed them as a containable source of cheap labour to be exploited; the urban liberal described the Melanesians as posing a social threat to a democratic community and demanded their total exclusion from Queensland, while the white worker regarded the Islanders as a cause of racial pollution.

Each of these groups within the European community was to resort to racial stereotyping to validate their particular argument. Melanesians were sensitive to the whole process of ascribing generalized characteristics to their diverse tribal groupings resident in the colony, whether the stereotype was of the hapless child or the lascivious cannibal. A Malaitan, Joe Mayroon (who was one of the five Solomon Islanders convicted of murdering in 1895 a Bundaberg selector whom they mistook for a
rival Melanesian) pathetically requested the presiding Judge to ask:

... the Government to send all the coloured boys in Queensland back to their Islands, where they could do no more harm to the white man.*

Peter Arroo, an Aoban who had been resident in Queensland for twenty years, demanded that the 1906 Royal Commission enquire into the mass deportation of Melanesians the following year:

We are very sorry, and we have plenty of feeling. We know white man don’t like black man in this country and hate the sight of us; but, if you invite your friend to tea in the evening, would you like to hunt him back after tea? . . . These boys no come from their Islands by their own will. Ship come to their Islands and make fools of them, and fetch them to this country and now when they open their eyes, and know God and get civilized . . . [they are deported].

Arroo concluded his earnest plea by remarking that “I am ashamed to think you drive people like that. That is a thing I would never do”. Though the Royal Commissioners seemingly sympathised with this man and all his compatriots who were to be excluded from Australia, they were helpless to offer an alternative. The urban Liberals and workers, triumphant in the new Commonwealth Parliament, were ultimately successful in purging Queensland of the unwanted and expendable Melanesian.
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PART THREE

"The Yellow Agony"

Racial attitudes and responses towards the Chinese in colonial Queensland

KATHRYN CRONIN

Let us begin by candidly confessing that in our opposition to them there is something of sentiment and of prejudice too. We have not arrived at that sublime pitch of perfection, that total absence of partiality in which socially and industrially we can like a negro or a Mongolian as well as we do men of European blood.

_Brisbane Courier_, 23 November 1878

_The Yellow Agony_
Shoals of pigtails, almond-eyed,
Flooding all the country side,
Skimmed off as their country's scum,
Odorous of opium.
Yellow rascals, cunning, knavish,
Bowed in foul vice-bondage slavish,
They, with Eastern filth imbedded,
Form one monster hydra-headed, ...

_Queensland Figaro_, 19 May 1883, p. 318
CHAPTER ONE

From Plodding 'Paddy' to 'The Ching-Chong Chinaman'

The Chinese Rural Labourer

"The great object of the Queensland legislation has been from the beginning, how to get cheap labour in the colony; that is the grand legislative idea of prosperity, cheap labour at any price".

G. Carrington,
Colonial Adventures and Experiences by a University Man, London, 1871, p.15.

When in November 1848, fifty-six Chinese labourers disembarked from the steamer Nimrod at Brisbane, they received an unusually enthusiastic welcome from the colonists there.¹ Any dissenters who may have had reservations about the wisdom of introducing this alien, servile race, were, for the moment, silent: For the Chinese were here to save the pastoral industry.²

The pioneering communities established on the Darling Downs and beyond were at this time gravely threatened by labour shortages. After transportation ceased in 1839, a ready source of workmen was discontinued, and pastoralists afterwards found it increasingly difficult to obtain the 'ticket-of-leave' or 'time-expired' men upon whom they had formerly relied. Free immigrants were also in short supply and were too expensive, while the local Aborigines were commonly held to be too unreliable. By 1849 the situation had become desperate. The severe economic recession that marred the early years of that decade, was over, and pastoralists were now clamouring for station hands;³ but the cost of labour had risen greatly. The Moreton Bay Courier listed the current wage rates per annum for servants as "Nothing less than £50 for a man and his wife, or £30 a single man and £25 for a single woman".⁴ The pastoralists were again cast into gloom. Patrick Leslie, one of the first settlers in this area, voiced their hopes and frustrations when he wrote to his family: "All we want to be the most prosperous colony in the world is labour";⁵ and his brother George, reiterated in May of that year, "I do not at present see how we are to obtain labour and I do not care, so long
as we get it". In desperation, some of the colonists argued for the reintroduction of the convict system, while others began to look to countries nearby which were already supplying "cheap, coloured, reliable and servile" labourers to places like Guiana and Peru.

India, a British colony, was their first consideration. Groups of Indian coolies had been imported into New South Wales some years previously and the press at this time, gave enthusiastic accounts of their working qualities. Consequently, some of the northern pastoralists became quite keen to organize a labour trade from Madras, and they called meetings at Brisbane and Ipswich to arrange the matter. But their plans were thwarted, as the British Government had placed restrictions on the exportation of Indian coolies, and even though the colonists pleaded their case through the Colonial Secretary in Sydney, the ban was not lifted. So while certain pastoralists managed to bring in small groups of Indian domestic servants, the general schemes for large scale Indian immigration were shelved, and the employers decided to direct their recruiting efforts at the Chinese.

Coolie emigration was also prohibited in China. Dr Winchester, an assistant at the British Consulate in Amoy at this time, wrote:

> It is one of the pleasant fictions of the Chinese Government that no child of the great Emperor can withdraw himself from the paternal rule; and that to leave his dominions and settle elsewhere permanently is a crime.

But some of the coastal ports were so overcrowded that the local mandarins were actually quite "relieved" to see a number of the inhabitants being taken to other countries, and the Chinese coolie trade grew quite rapidly. By 1847 contracted labourers were being sent to Mauritius, the Bourbon Isle and Cuba. The trade had also become more of a capitalistic enterprise under the control of coolie brokers and was increasingly associated with scandalous oppressions. The Chinese termed the transactions, "buying men" as many of the labourers placed under contract, were actually kidnapped, tricked or misled by unscrupulous agents. A recent study by Sing-wu Wang on Chinese coolie migration to Australia, concluded:

> The most pitiful part of this system was that the majority of Chinese emigrants were cheated and brought to the receiving stations against their will. If there was any difference between the ways of procuring an African slave
and a Chinese labourer it could only be that the Chinese labourer had signed a contract.  

In 1848 the settlers in the Moreton Bay area began negotiating with coolie agents in Amoy, and arranged for Chinese to be contracted for five years, at a wage of £6 per year plus two suits of clothing.  

These Chinese were subsequently despatched on the Nimrod. The pastoralists, who were overjoyed at having obtained cheap and docile servants, eagerly put them to work. But some of the coolies were restless and discontented and several more absconded or tried to force their employers to adjust their wages to the current white rates.  

This behaviour was hardly surprising when it is considered that some of these labourers had been deceived by the coolie brokers as to their destination or the nature of their contracts.  

Nevertheless their defections proved a great disappointment to their white masters and became a source of much anti-Chinese feeling. Not all the coolies were dissatisfied however, and some did settle down to their new conditions and were described by their employers as “excellent shepherds and servants”.  

So as the labour shortages in the district persisted, the pastoralists continued to import Chinese.  

T.A. Coghlan estimated that there were 225 of them in the area by 1851, and 2,000 more by 1856, and while there is some dispute as to how accurate these figures were, there is no doubt that there was a significant group of Chinese in the area prior to its separation from New South Wales.

The Chinese were incorporated into the existing labour structure in the district. The Moreton Bay settlement had begun as a detention centre for recalcitrant convicts, and, although it had been closed down in 1839, the pattern of enforced and servile labour, implicit in the convict system, persisted far beyond these years. The Masters and Servants Act to which the Chinese and other contracted labourers were subject, reflected these authoritarian concepts. This legislation, as its title suggests, was concerned with the rights of employers and employees but it was enacted by a parliament dominated by pastoralists, and the bill was therefore designed, almost totally, to serve the interests of the employers. Servants could be punished for absconding from their jobs, or for refusing to obey a master’s “lawful command”. If workers wished to lay charges against their employers, they had to produce witnesses to corroborate their accusation while the statements of their employers were accepted without verification. Finally there was no provision in the Act for punishing employers who had acted unjustly to their workmen. In consequence, this legislation became one of the most important
means by which the status quo of the highly stratified levels of power and degree in the Colony was preserved.

Although the labouring population was referred to as a single unit under this Act, it was actually a highly differentiated group. The free British, German or Danish immigrants were quite distinct from the 'dispossessed' Aborigine or the Chinese and Indians who had been specially imported as cheap, bonded labourers. Coloured servants were paid lower wages and only allowed in specific occupations. The Chinese were immediately cast as shepherds, shearers, gardeners or domestic servants as their employers maintained that these were the only jobs "suitable" for them.29 George Sandeman, a pastoralist from Moreton Bay, stated that "the employment of shepherding is unsuited and irksome to the more active mind of the European; it is peculiarly adapted to the comparatively listless and passive disposition of the native of the East".30 Donald Gunn reiterated the same sort of sentiments:

[The Chinese] were very good shepherds, cooks, gardeners and some made good shearers but when it came to hut building, fencing and work that needed strength and brains, the white men were much superior.31

So, although the Chinese were initially suggested only as a temporary solution for the early labour shortages, they soon became essential workmen in jobs considered badly paid or too menial or boring for Europeans.

In 1861 the colonists again attempted to secure and regulate the large-scale importation of coolies,32 for landowners interested in branching into the cotton and sugar growing industries wanted inexpensive field workers. Thus, the argument that the "lightwork" of cotton growing was suited not to the "more active, energetic European" but to the 'enduring', 'plodding Asiatic' was once more repeated.33 The planters also pointed out that the tropical heat "was unhealthy for Europeans",34 that work in the cane fields "would mean death to the man from cold climates",35 whereas the Chinese were "a race habituated to work at field labour under a tropic sun".36 Therefore the planters maintained: "It would . . . be utterly impossible to continue the cultivation . . . of the Tropical production . . . suitable to the Northern portion of the colony . . . without coloured labour of some description".37

As a result Chinese coolies were brought into the Colony right throughout the ensuing decades, and were generally imported by shipping agencies acting for individual planters.38 For instance, A.J. Cowley, the manager of Gairloch on the Herbert River,
claimed in 1889 to have introduced 300 Chinese at a cost of £20 each. Yet, efforts were still made at various times to organize a regular Governmentally controlled coolie trade. In 1875 at the height of the anti-Chinese uproar on the northern goldfields, a memo was sent to the Under Colonial Secretary suggesting that:

... the class [of Chinese] at present arriving shall be discouraged, that a superior class from the Agricultural Districts of China should take their places and that their influx shall be in the Northern Districts of Queensland where the Sugar Planters have a demand for such description of Labour.

Again, in 1883, in the midst of a fierce anti-Chinese and anti-coolie movement, the planters tried to organize an officially sponsored importation of indentured Chinese. An election campaign, which was in progress at this time was dominated by 'The Chinese Question'. The planters' group maintained that the Chinese were essential, cheap, servile labourers who could be kept in fixed economic and social positions; while the anti-Chinese enthusiasts, obsessed with China's numerical strength were convinced that all restraining influences would fail before an overwhelming 'invasion' of the 'the yellow hordes'.

Before examining the debate that raged over the Chinese question it would be profitable to examine the theories which were invoked to justify the condemnation and/or exploitation of the Chinese. For it is significant that they arrived in the Colony at a time when ancient popular ideas of folk racism were elevated to the status of an indisputable scientific theory which declared them non-assimilable on biological grounds.

This scientific theory had its beginnings in the debate between monogenists and polygenists. As the monists saw all men as the children of Adam and Eve, and all racial differences as the product of environmental variation, most of them were usually quite confident that if the environment of a racial group was changed then the physical and cultural characteristics of the group would alter. Some even argued that skin colour differences were subject to change within a single life-time, given the proper conditions of climate and diet. The polygenists (or pluralists), in contrast, were not so confident that culture contact situations could be so easily resolved. As they saw it, the various races were distinct biological species, and would always remain separate. They claimed that the different species created their own distinct social, cultural and political institutions which could not be properly assimilated by people from another race. Yet it was
miscegenation — viewed by pluralists as the unnatural mating of different species — which provided for them the ultimate horror.

Although these theories were somewhat modified by the ideas of Charles Darwin, they still continued to influence public opinion. This was very noticeable in Queensland, when, after the northern gold discoveries, the media took up the Chinese question in earnest. The polygenists' horror of miscegenation and their ideas on cultural racism were enthusiastically endorsed by propagandists of the early labour movement, while some of the advocates of cheap coloured labour responded by repeating the monist idea that the coolies would be civilized by contact with a superior race. But regardless of their economic interests, colonists in both camps were influenced by the basic assumption underlying the ideas of monists, pluralists and Social Darwinists — that of European superiority. It appeared self evident to both scientists and laymen alike that the peoples of Africa, Asia, America and the Pacific were inferior, for they were not able to successfully retaliate against the advancement of European military, economic or political institutions. It was no idle boast for a nineteenth century Anglo-Saxon like James McHenley, the Chinese interpreter at Cooktown, to declare:

We are the only people of the earth that are capable of impressing our character on our neighbours, while our antecedents' institutions, our present position and acknowledged aspirations, proclaim aloud in every tongue that we are the ruling people of the world.

Western nations were therefore accepted as the model for all progress and civilization, and other cultures were arranged in order of merit according to how closely they approximated to this ideal. This arrangement was generally represented as a continuum of darkening pigments, at the top of which were the Caucasian and other lighter coloured races while Negroes and Australian Aborigines were placed near the bottom.

Nevertheless, although seemingly secure in their own immutable superiority, Europeans were forced to concede the rival claims of the ancient and highly developed civilizations of China and Japan. China's achievements were usually explained away by the allegation that "... they seem to have been always living in the same stage of advancement as in the present day". The argument continued — "The Chinese are constant in their adherence to old established customs and ideas", they have "no desire for progress" whereas "The genius of the Western nations is that of change and progress". In an article entitled "The
Mental Condition of the Chinaman”, Isaac Headland elaborated further on this theme:51

Tell a Westerner something new or show him some new invention that makes labor more easy or more effective, and at once he copies and improves it. No product of thought is too difficult for him to understand, too intricate for him to work out, . . . What about the Chinaman? He looks at it with open-mouthed wonder or self-satisfied indifference, but he is without either the ability or desire to appreciate, improve, understand or use it.

China’s civilization was therefore described as “arrested”,52 “left in an imperfect state”53 and “dwarfed by age”.54 Her place in the hierarchy of civilizations was then allocated accordingly. In the *Anthropological Review* of 1866, it was stated:

As the type of the Negro is foetal, that of the Mongol is infantile. And in strict accordance with this we find their government, literature and art are infantile also. They are beardless children, whose life is a task, and whose chief virtue consists in unquestioning obedience.55

Westerners also defined the behavioural traits they observed amongst Chinese as hereditary racial characteristics. Thus, they were inclined to regard such features as Chinese ‘inscrutability’ as indicating an inborn imperviousness to pain or suffering. G.E. Morrison, an Australian doctor who visited China in the 1890s, wrote that “the sensory nervous system of a Chinaman is either blunted or of arrested development”.56 He made this assertion after witnessing “. . . the calmness with which he can sleep amid the noise of gunfire and crackers, . . . and the indifference with which he contemplates the suffering of lower animals, and the infliction of tortures on higher”.57 The practice of attributing observable traits to racial characteristics was not simply confined to the lay observer. Scientific journals also described Chinese manners and customs in purely racial terms. In 1897, the *Australasian Anthropological Journal* described the Chinese in the following way:

When the yellow species of man is uncrossed . . . it has a broad flat face, prominent cheek bones, oblique, almondshaped and cut eyelids, black straight, coarse hair, yellow coloured skin — They are of enduring, patient, plodding, regular working habits, and disposition. They have a constitution with which upon poor food they
continue to work, day after day, in bad climates of many and varied kinds. — They are slow, methodical, patient, induring [sic] labourers, cultivators, and mechanics, exact copyists as artisans, but not capable of many new inventions. — They have moral ideas different from other people, which are peculiar to themselves.\textsuperscript{58}

The common stereotype reiterated in the colonial press and elsewhere, pictured the Chinese in the same fashion. They were described as “temperate, frugal, hardworking and law abiding”,\textsuperscript{59} and as “useful, practical and docile servants”.\textsuperscript{60} A Chinese labourer was usually characterized with the label of ‘Paddy’ and declared to have had his “servility bred into him”.\textsuperscript{61} It was claimed that “the untiring industry, the frugality and perseverance of the Chinaman are the inherited instincts of his race”.\textsuperscript{62} As the \textit{Brisbane Courier} reported:

The Chinese are a race of workers in whom uncounted generations of serf-like toil have developed a capacity for unremitting labor, while killing out every spark of that higher nature which makes men capable of being true citizens of a free state.\textsuperscript{63}

Similarly, J.K. Tucker, a clergyman, wrote:

[The Chinese] physiognomy indicates no beam of intelligence or play of fancy but rather stolid stoicism.\textsuperscript{64} . . . They have been described as ‘materialism put in action’ being sceptical and indifferent to everything that concerns the moral side of man and destitute of religious feelings and belief.\textsuperscript{65}

It was not a great step to proceed from these notions to the pluralist-orientated idea that ‘Paddy’ was “not a man at all”,\textsuperscript{66} but closer to a plodding animal or a mindless machine. The pro-coolie group argued that “. . . the introduction of Asiatic labour would be to Queensland what Machinery has been to England”,\textsuperscript{67} while Flora Shaw, the \textit{Times} correspondent in Queensland wrote that they were “employed as a sort of self-acting Machine”.\textsuperscript{68} The Chinese were variously described as “vermin”,\textsuperscript{69} “a flock of sheep”\textsuperscript{70} and “working animals of low grade but great vitality”.\textsuperscript{71} According to Henry Challinor, one of the early Liberal parliamentarians:

. . . if we were justified in passing a bill to prevent diseased cattle and sheep from coming over the border from New
South Wales, the Government in that colony would be justified in demurring to the passage of . . . [Chinese] . . . through Queensland across the border.72

In many of these statements the dehumanization of the Chinese was obviously done unconsciously. Nevertheless by distorting their image in this way, the whites made it easier for themselves to rationalize their prejudices against the treatment of the Asiatics.

Yet even though the Chinese were pictured as decidedly inferior to the European, they were still regarded as superior to other coloured groups in the Colony. In keeping with the idea of a racial hierarchy, workers were paid wages commensurate with their racial status. On the plantations the unskilled Chinese field worker was generally awarded about £30 per year, which was £22 less than that given to a European, but £18 more than a Melanesian received, while Aborigines were usually given only their rations.73 Labourers were likewise assigned to jobs which were regarded as suitable to their racial skills and status, rather than to their own individual physical or intellectual abilities.74 Manual field labour in the service of others was felt to be degrading for the whites, although the colonists took care to stress that "... white men are physically capable . . . to do . . . whatever coloured men can do".75 It was just that "... in North Queensland the climatic conditions are such as to render the cultivation of the soil a labour fit only for the coloured races".76 Amongst the non-white workers the Chinese were classed as "much more intelligent human beings than the Polynesians they were now importing, and probably they were more intelligent and skillful than the natives of British India".77 According to the manager of Goondi Plantation: "The Chinaman is stronger physically and more powerful than the Kanaka, and is able to fell scrub, clear it, make roads and make formations and excavations better than the Kanaka".78 The Malays, Melanesians and Aborigines were, on the other hand, described as progressively more apathetic and unintelligent, and more dependent on strict supervision and discipline from white overseers.

Because of their pre-eminent position among the other coloured groups, the Chinese were regarded by the white colonists as a greater racial threat. They were conscious of China's international importance, her vast population and her close proximity to the Colony. After 1852, when large numbers began to migrate from China of their own free will, to the goldfields of Victoria and New South Wales, Queenslanders consequently became even more conscious of a Chinese danger. As one parliamentarian pointed out, the population on the surrounding islands was "limited" and would never be sufficient to "swamp"
the Colony, but the Chinese could "come in direct competition with the white man", and "would come in overwhelming numbers if admitted". Then, as Queensland was sparsely populated, they "would entirely supplant European labour" and retard the progress of the Colony.

These arguments were utilized in the continuing debate on the Chinese problem. Propagandists urging either Chinese exclusion or exploitation seemed to adopt whatever racist theory was consistent with their own prejudices and to use pseudoscientific jargon gleaned from anthropologists to lend greater force and credibility to their position. The employers of coloured labour generally took the stand that the introduction of Chinese workers "... would not interfere with the fair claims — of the European emigrant". In fact, they declared it would "... elevate the European labourer to the rank of a Mechanic, and the Mechanic to that of an employer and contribu[e] in a marvellous degree to the well being of every class in society". The anti-Chinese group retaliated by asserting that the Chinese would "degrade" labour and lower the wages of white workers. This question therefore became inextricably linked with the issue of cheap labour and the plight of the European worker, and, as it was a highly emotional topic, it was used with effect by the press and political groups.

Although there had been some slight objections made when the Chinese were brought into the district, there was no strong anti-Chinese movement until 1851. In March of that year a party of drunken whites in Ipswich attacked a group of Chinese. Twelve of the Chinese were quite seriously wounded and the Europeans were subsequently arrested and given severe sentences ranging from twelve months to two years hard labour. After the trial, the sympathies of "nearly all" the working population in Ipswich, were strongly in favour of the Europeans, and, in the election campaign that followed the Chinese question became an important one. The Moreton Bay Courier, under the editorship of James Swan, mounted an enthusiastic denunciation of the 'treacherous' aliens, and for some weeks the news columns were interspersed with allusions to the "violent and revengeful dispositions" of the Chinese and to the "appalling vices" that were a conspicuous feature of their all male congregations. Swan also argued against the pastoralists who, he claimed, were spoiling the district for "honest and virtuous populations" just to satisfy their own greed for cheap servants. Still, though emotions ran high for a time, the crisis passed, and the small community settled down again without being in the least perturbed that they had reached no unanimity about whether the usefulness of the Chinese outweighed their vices.
In the years following, the whites came no closer to solving the Chinese issue and it was not until 1862 that the question was again resurrected for public debate. Most of the agitation at this time centred round the Indian Coolie Bill which had been introduced after pressure from some of the planters and pastoralists. This aroused the anger of urban workers who were convinced that the importation of Asiatics would force down their wages and paralyse the workings of the existing Immigration Act. But a minor crisis was precipitated when, in the midst of this storm, the Lord Lyndhurst arrived with 260 Chinese passengers. The Chinese then became the scapegoats for the resentful workers, and once again the Brisbane Courier organized the anti-Chinese forces led by politicians such as C.W. Blakeney and William Brookes. Blakeney introduced a resolution imposing a capitation tax on all Chinese arriving in the Colony without their wives, which was defeated in the colonial parliament by a large majority. The Courier countered by questioning whether the Government was truly representative of the townspeople and ended by bitterly attacking the all-powerful squatters who were "... voting to facilitate the introduction of Chinese... which they can use at a low price, and have more slavish command over than would be possible with European immigrants". William Brookes also fanned the animosity of Brisbane workers by graphically describing how:

The wealthy men would roll up in their carriages, supported by the ill-paid labour of a foreign race... and the relations and friends of the Europeans at present here when they came out, would be shut up in the towns being unable to earn a living in the bush, and would have to occupy a position truly contemptible.

Even after it was discovered that the Chinese were, in fact, all bound for the gold fields of the southern colonies, the resentment against them was not assuaged. In Brisbane an anti-Chinese meeting was held, where they were reviled as "aliens of the most immoral and contaminating description", while their immigration was wholeheartedly condemned as "dangerous" to the "political, religious, moral and social advancement" of the Colony. According to the Courier:

A large number of them as permanent residents, would turn the colony upside down; all our legislation would have to be gone over again and the change would necessarily be from legislation adapted to a free intelligent, and Christian
people, to a legislation brought down to the coarse and sensual capacities of pagan bondsmen.\textsuperscript{106}

Even though the conservative planters and squatters had been attacked as pro-Chinese, they too wanted the Colony’s “blood and traditions” to be derived “from the old country”.\textsuperscript{107} They saw cheap coloured labourers as essential for tropical agriculture,\textsuperscript{108} yet they still desired to keep them under proper restrictions\textsuperscript{109} and to limit the contacts between them and the other colonists.\textsuperscript{110} Thus, Governor Bowen, a staunch advocate of coolie labour hoped to organize the immigration of Christian Chinese families to avoid “. . . the moral and social evils which must ensue from the disproportion of the sexes”.\textsuperscript{111} In the following years, as the Chinese debate became more virulent, the anti-Chinese prejudices of employers of coolies became more marked. Sir Thomas McIlwraith, who consistently stood on a pro-coolie platform, stated that: “No man knew better than he the danger of a coolie population settling down and breeding among us”.\textsuperscript{112} Another pastoralist, J.D. Macanish, also admitted:

\begin{quote}
I have had a good deal of experience with Chinamen, having employed them as shepherds, labourers, gardeners and cooks and I will say that they are very good workers, . . . But there is another side to the question. I think it will be admitted on all hands that they are the most immoral and degraded people on the face of the earth.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Similarly, F.R. Murphy, the lessee of \textit{Northampton Downs} in Central Queensland,\textsuperscript{114} pointed out that he would only employ Chinese gardeners because of the health of his men, for “. . . he did not wish it to be thought that he was a friend of the Chinaman or encouraged him in any way. He hated them and would like to see them banished altogether”.\textsuperscript{115}

It was hardly surprising then that the Chinese were subject to a number of serious restrictions. A platform adopted by the Liberal group in 1884 gave this justification for their racialism:

\begin{quote}
It can scarcely be successfully maintained that any . . . alien, who has been introduced into the Dominions of a State for a special purpose only . . . and that purpose assented to by himself . . . can claim as of right to be entitled to all the rights of a subject . . .\textsuperscript{116}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Aliens Act}, passed in 1861\textsuperscript{117} prevented Asiatics from becoming naturalized, unless they had been residing in the
Colony for three years, and were living there with their wives. This clause was retained in the consolidating Act of 1867, and became the legitimization for future discriminatory anti-Chinese legislation. It was likewise an "essential principle" of Queensland law "to prevent aliens from holding any interest in land", so while Chinese could obtain leasehold tenures to land for twenty-one years, only those who had been naturalized could buy it under freehold title.

These labourers were likewise more handicapped than white workmen. All of the early Chinese immigrants were imported into the Colony under contract, but it is doubtful whether many of them had any clear understanding of the nature of their bond, or what was to be their working situation. In addition, as the Moreton Bay Courier pointed out, their lot was cast "... amongst a population but little disposed, in the mass, to sympathise with [their] fortunes or to appreciate [their] regrets". As soon as some of them understood that they were being paid less than other workers, they openly rebelled. Some of them absconded, others banded together and struck for higher wages. But in their ignorance and their general cultural isolation, they were particularly vulnerable to the workings of the Masters and Servants Act, and during 1851, over forty Chinese were convicted for breaches of this legislation. Their employers were unanimous in condemning their "independent" and "determined" characters and they acted quickly to suppress all signs of coolie rebellion.

Chinese absconding from service were almost always brought to court where they faced imprisonment or a forcible return to their previous employment. One such servant asked to be given another term in gaol rather than go back to the position he had fled. In another case an employer tried to prevent his servant Bar Teong from escaping by withholding the balance of his wage, and giving him only enough food to keep him alive. Yet when Bar Teong did abscond, these facts were ignored by the magistrate, and he was ordered back to his post. An even more sensational incident was narrated to the parliament by W.H. Walsh. He had been informed that a Chinese labourer in Burketown had gone to a large employer of labour, a magistrate of the territory, and demanded his wages. At the instigation of his employer, the Chinese was "... set upon by a number of persons, nearly torn to pieces, stamped upon, tied to a stake, [and] tortured". It was suspected that he had then been killed. Yet, in answer to this story, the Attorney General stated that although he had evidence that the Chinese had been maltreated, he would not proceed in the matter unless there was definite proof that a murder had been committed.
Chinese strikers were also summarily dealt with. Those employed at Canning Downs, in protest against their contracts, took up shear blade daggers and locked themselves in the station's wool store. Yet they were quickly routed by a local native trooper and armed Europeans wielding stockwhips, and were sent back to work.\textsuperscript{128} Similarly at Pikedale Station when the Chinese shepherds joined together and marched to the homestead to state their complaints, the manager Mr Fitz became so angry that he hit at their spokesman with a hurdle head and inadvertently killed him. Although Fitz gave himself up to the local magistrate, he was acquitted of all charges as there was no white witness and the magistrate regarded the evidence of Asiatics as insufficient proof.\textsuperscript{129}

The general community likewise acted to restrict the Chinese and there were many clashes between them and white rural workers,\textsuperscript{130} especially when “... the Chinaman competed with the European labourers for employment which they could both follow”.\textsuperscript{131} Therefore many employers found it easier to keep their Chinese apart from the other workers, and to give them jobs that were not attractive to Europeans.\textsuperscript{132} Those aliens who had completed their contracts, were also discouraged from selling their labour in the general market, and in the early years, because complaints were made that Chinese were “wandering about without any settled occupation”, some of these were then arrested as vagrants.\textsuperscript{133}

These cases of Chinese rebellion are not quoted to prove that all the Chinese in the Colony were ill-treated. In fact some of them settled down quite contentedly with employers who were both sympathetic and fair minded.\textsuperscript{134} Rather, these examples are significant because they illustrate the strong institutionalized sanctions that were utilized to keep the Chinese in an unalterable, dependent position. The general community's attitude was that the Chinese had been brought to the Colony in order to perform certain restricted economic functions, not to acquire independent social and economic status.\textsuperscript{135}

Even so, after the opening of the north Queensland gold fields, it became increasingly difficult to contain Chinese labourers. Free Cantonese immigrants poured in through the new port of Cooktown, so that these rural workers could now live in Chinese communities and obtain alternative employment in gold-mining, or working for their own countrymen. Because of the exigencies of the plantation system, European employers continued to import their own indentured Chinese servants,\textsuperscript{136} but many of these escaped soon afterwards and headed for the gold fields.\textsuperscript{137} Unsuccessful Chinese miners were also employed on some
plantations, but they too, were very independent, and were generally not prepared to work for low wages.

Therefore the planters once more sought to apply the *Masters and Servants Act* to stifle Chinese rebellion, and many of those who absconded were arrested and punished under this legislation. Other employers, such as William Langdon of the *Pyramid* Plantation, simply withheld the wages of their Chinese workers until they had completed their contracts. Yet these measures no longer seemed so successful in restricting the Chinese and some planters lost heavily when their servants absconded. Thus, at the sugar enquiry held in 1889, European landowners were all agreed that their experiments with Chinese coolies had been totally unsatisfactory.

The colonists were more effective, however, in preventing the Chinese from obtaining occupational advancement and, consequently, upward social mobility. White agricultural labourers continued to agitate against the “intrusion of coloured labour into other and more important areas”, and Chinese shearers were continually harassed by white co-workers. At *Terrick* Station in 1885 some Chinese were nearly lynched by a group of Europeans after a furious struggle with “sticks, tomahawks and knives”. The Shearers Union later adopted, as part of their programme, the measure that Chinese, Melanesians and Aborigines should not be employed in that industry. Similarly under the *Sugar Bounty Act* passed in 1905 the Chinese were effectively excluded from plantation work. The small group of Chinese landowners also came under the fire of whites, and when a group of them opened a sugar and cotton plantation outside Cairns the parliament received a strong protest from European farmers who wrote that: “Should the Chinese in large number once get hold of our coast lands, no measures that would be tolerated by the Imperial Government would be sufficient to get rid of them”. But they had no real worries, for the Chinese lost heavily in this venture and there were very few amongst them who had the naturalized status, or the capital and know-how which would allow them to repeat it.

Thus the Chinese were eventually contained fairly successfully within a type of tenant farmer arrangement. They were forced to lease land from their naturalized countrymen or from Europeans, and in the districts of Cairns, Atherton and Geraldton — (later Innisfail) — almost all of the farming was done by Chinese leaseholders who grew fruit, particularly bananas, vegetables, sugarcane, maize and some rice. Most of the white landowners in these areas were disinclined to have anything to do with their holdings until it had been cleared and made ready for cultivation, as land in the North was very rich scrub, and when it
had been felled or burnt, it often had to be cultivated with a hoe for six or seven years. After that time the stumps had generally rotted out and horse implements could then be employed. European landowners found that the best way of preparing properties for themselves, was firstly to lease the land to the Chinese. Under this arrangement, they had their farms cleared and cultivated, and stood to make a profit from the rent charged. The Chinese also managed to benefit from their leaseholds, and by the 1890's their fruit-growing industry had become a lucrative business.

But this situation was not to last. The Chinese often obtained the services of Melanesians or Aborigines to help them in clearing the land and, according to the Sub-Inspector of Police at Mackay:

... the Chinese farmers who employ Aborigines treat them very much better than most of the white people who employ them. The Chinese offer better wages and what is more pay the aboriginals [sic] their wages when due, they also house and feed them well.

Walter Roth, the Northern Protector of Aborigines reiterated: "The Chinese allow their aboriginal employee full use of their humpty even to smoking the same pipe and drinking out of the same billy". They also paid higher wages to their Melanesian workers and occasionally gave them a share in the profits from their farms. But this aroused the jealousy of white farmers who found it difficult to obtain and keep the services of the other coloured groups and the Ayr Farmers Association wrote to complain against the "cut throat" practices of the Chinese who enticed the 'Kanakas' away by "offering them higher wages". The Barron Valley Progress Association likewise objected to their utilizing cheap labour, and reported that they were "holding all the Aborigines in thrall" by giving them opium and thus "preventing them from legitimate employment with Europeans". The Association continued to decry Chinese vice despite the fact that one of their own members, E.C. Putt boasted that: "He had shot thirteen or fourteen niggers in this district and this is all the Government has done for me. I can't get a nigger when I want one. They all go to Chinamen". They finally achieved their objective of having the blacks "... taken away from the Chinese and compelled to work for any European who might require their services", for, under the implementation of the Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act, enacted in January 1898, the Chinese were prevented from employing any coloured labour. According to Charlie Wai Lee, a leading storekeeper, the Chinese now would not be able to make
their selections pay, "... if the law insists on their dispensing with black employees, they will have to think seriously about giving up their leases".\textsuperscript{164} The Asiatics were also handicapped by their own ignorance of advanced agricultural techniques, and by European disinterest in their projects. When the rice industry at Mossman failed because of their primitive methods, the \textit{Northern Mining Register} reported that "... since only Cairns Chinese were involved, there was no investigation into this disappointing show".\textsuperscript{165} Similarly, white colonists took little interest in the banana exporting industry. The marketing of the fruit was entirely controlled by Chinese merchants,\textsuperscript{166} but the shipments were carried by the Australian Steamship Navigation Company, which had a monopoly on the coastal trade. This company saw no reason to adapt their ships for the carriage of perishable cargo, and large consignments of fruit often arrived in Melbourne completely unfit for consumption.\textsuperscript{167} Again, it seems: "There was a tendency to feel that too much trouble need not be taken over the Chinaman's produce".\textsuperscript{168} The most obvious fact about the situation of the Chinese leaseholder was that his claim to the land was tenuous. Many of them were content to work for a few years to make money and then return to China. Others were able to cultivate their land for a time, only to have it reclaimed by the European owners. In 1896 much of the Chinese banana land in the Johnstone area was taken back by whites anxious to begin sugar growing there, and the Chinese farmers had to re-establish themselves in the Cairns and Tully districts.\textsuperscript{169} Finally in 1920, when the Returned Soldiers Association petitioned to have Asiatics excluded from the banana industry altogether and their farms turned over for soldier settlement schemes, the Chinese agricultural industry was totally destroyed.\textsuperscript{170} The white exclusionists had triumphed and plodding Paddy's fragile link with the land he had opened was broken. What remained was the 'ching-chong' chinaman, the comic coolie vegetable hawker, the butt of local larrikins and that "fearsome" figure\textsuperscript{171} concerned mothers warned their children against. He had come a long hard way from that day on the wharf when he was enthusiastically greeted as the saviour of the Colony.
CHAPTER TWO

On a Fast Boat to Queensland

The Chinese influx onto Queensland's goldfields

They're right enough while they are in the minority
Plodding and quiet and out of the way
But when they come here with a teeming majority
What they will do it's not easy to say. . .

Though we annoy them as much as we dare
Fair play or foul, they are more than a match for us. . .

They'll be our bosses and we'll grow their cabbages
If they go on the way they've begun.

"The Chinese Must Go"
Queensland Punch, 1 December, 1880.

The Chinese were first reported on the goldfields of Queensland as early as 1858. In that year, they were among the vanguard at the abortive Canoona rush outside Rockhampton. They also joined the pioneers at some of the fields opened in the 1860s, — at the Cape River, Crocodile Creek, Gympie and the Gilbert River. In fact, by 1870, it was calculated that over 2,000 Chinese miners were scattered throughout the Colony, most of whom had come overland from the older alluvial fields of New South Wales and Victoria.

Eventually though, reports of the latest gold discoveries reached back to China, and more prospective gold-diggers were encouraged to journey forth to try their luck. Yet it was not until after the Palmer River goldfield was opened in 1873 that the Chinese rush to Queensland really got under way. This field was proclaimed the 'new Bendigo', and was extravagantly described as a vast terrain where nuggets were lying around just waiting to be picked up. More and more Chinese were then tempted to travel to the Colony, and steamers bearing crowds of these excited and hopeful immigrants began to berth regularly at Cooktown. At times it seemed as if the stream of Chinese was
never ending. Within just three weeks, in April 1875, a full 3,272 disembarked at Cooktown: And still, as one newspaper commented, "... the hordes of gully-raking, rice-devouring, pig-tailed Chinkies keep arriving". By the middle of 1877, at the peak of their immigration, it was variously estimated that there were 18,000 Chinese on the Palmer field alone.

Their influx was so great that it began to appear as if North Queensland would not remain a white settlement for much longer. One miner wrote that the 'invading' Asians would "blot" the Colony "out of the world's future history", while the Cooktown Courier described how: "Within a very short time the great wall of China will encircle the Palmer, and the 'outer barbarian', the unfortunate digger will have to look for fresh fields". The press and some of the politicians elaborated further on this never ending threat from an overcrowded China, "whose geographical position makes the danger more imminent." W. H. Yaldwyn claimed:

We were near neighbours to a teeming mass of Chinese; — nearly 400,000,000 of them were separated from us by a narrow stretch of placid ocean. It was a stern struggle for existence in that closely packed country, and the advantages possessed by a rich and sparsely inhabited colony like Queensland must be only too apparent to them.

In 1876, when South Australia made a contract with the Netherlands India Steam Navigation Company to include Darwin in the Australian route of the Chinese trading ships, fears of invasion were intensified. Europeans in Queensland were convinced that this move would facilitate China's colonization of the whole of the north of Australia. As one newspaper claimed, it effectively provided "a way of escape" for the "pent up seething mass" of Chinese who were "burning to break beyond the barriers confining [them]".

In this general atmosphere of insecurity, the whites began to have doubts about the inviolability of their vaunted superiority. John Douglas, then Secretary of Public Lands, maintained that the Chinese "... really were as intelligent as themselves, and if once they acquired the power of combining and applying that power [sic], the result might seriously affect the social and political conditions of the country". Another of his colleagues, J. M. Thompson stated:

[Chinese] civilization was older than that of the English race, and because they had stood still in it for a long time, it
did not follow that ultimately they would not progress as much as the English or any other nation. 

Most of the colonists were convinced that China had learnt skills from the ‘higher’ European races that would enable her to throw off her former apathy and become a formidable power. The popular press stressed that China had ‘awakened’ and was undergoing a type of ‘renaissance’. Thus the Mackay Free Press and Pioneer Advocate stated, “In extreme age its Government exhibits all the vigour of youth”. And while other, more realistic writers were aware that “the Manchu dynasty was enfeebled,” they noted that China had suffered from dynastic changes several times, and had always gained “fresh strength” from it. This new China therefore assumed an increasingly menacing character for the white colonists, and they began to perceive the vast Oriental influx as part of a military design to conquer the North. Reports were circulated that “China had constructed a very large fleet which was commanded by officers who had been in the British and other European service, and who were very competent for their position”. In one petition submitted to parliament it was written that:

The foreign policy of... [China] is becoming daily more aggressive, and the increase of surplus population so excessive, that at any time hordes of thousands or even millions of Chinese may be expected to be flung forth on... the North Coast.

The press maximized these fears and Queeslanders were warned that “. . . the present is only the precursor of a greater and more formidable influx”. The Northern Miner asked, “Is our civilization to go down under the hoofs of those barbarians, or shall we stand up and beat them back?”. Without seeming to expect a reply, it continued, “The struggle is now before us, and we must face it like men.”

This impending confrontation was described in Spencerian terms as a ‘struggle for survival’ in which the ‘fittest’ would be triumphant. The Darling Downs Gazette maintained that:

Either... [the Chinese]... have to be utterly destroyed after a struggle and a slaughter such as the world has never yet witnessed, or they have to be blended with ourselves. Either the coming man will be of a mixed type, or he will be the actor, or the descendant of actors in the most stupendous struggle for supremacy and existence since the globe was
created. Either there must be a fusion or a survival of the fittest!\textsuperscript{204}

But this was a very popularized version of Social Darwinism and it would become increasingly obvious that many of the colonists had absorbed little beyond the catch-phrases associated with this theory. Thus the \textit{Cooktown Courier}, when reporting the death of two Chinese at Laura, commented, "After all it's only a continuation of the war of extinction of races".\textsuperscript{205} In fact it would seem more accurate to assume that these notions of racial conflict were derived more from the whites' immediate experiences in the frontier situation of the North than from any close grasp of intellectual doctrine.

Upon the northern frontier, the fight to establish a claim to the rich mineral resources there was particularly fierce. Both the Chinese and the whites were determined to make their fortune as quickly as possible and return with it to their homes or to more civilized parts.\textsuperscript{206} This project was made more urgent by their strong awareness that the supply of gold was necessarily limited, and that the more gold one group got, the less there would be for the other. Their competitiveness was not lessened in any way by their mutual concern to deal with the local Aborigines who violently opposed encroachments upon their lands. There were occasions when Chinese and Europeans travelled or worked together, for mutual protection against native raids,\textsuperscript{207} but these instances were rare and did not lessen mutual antagonisms. In fact the \textit{Cooktown Courier}\textsuperscript{208} even went so far as to express support for the Aborigines as they were doing such a good job in killing and supposedly eating hundreds of Chinese.\textsuperscript{209} The Orientals, for their part, "circulated reports at Swatow that Australians secretly wished them to come to Queensland to become vicariously food for the cannibalistic blacks".\textsuperscript{210} Thus the contest for the resources of the North became a clear racial struggle between the "white, yellow and black men".\textsuperscript{211}

This 'battle' was by no means one sided, though the whites with their Sniders were able to intimidate and drive back the Chinese and Aborigines. Nevertheless, in the early days of the Palmer, 'terrorist' activities of the blacks likewise retarded explorations and subsequent settlement of the miners.\textsuperscript{212} The Asiatics were particularly vulnerable to Aboriginal attacks as they usually travelled in single file and were often unarmed.\textsuperscript{213} Thus, the journey from Cooktown to the Palmer became something of a nightmare for them. Observers reported that "at every fresh turn" along the narrow tracks, there was "a new horror, either a dead horse or a dead Chinaman", many of whom had been ambushed and speared by natives.\textsuperscript{214} The Chinese soon became so terrified of
the blacks that they rarely moved outside their established
camps. In 1873, after ten miners, working near the Gilbert, had
been speared, "... [nearly] the whole Chinese population — left
the district, leaving the valley of the Gilbert in the undisputed
possession of the Aborigines".

Yet the Chinese did not always yield to attacking Europeans or
blacks. In the early period of the gold discoveries, they were very
conscious of their numerical inferiority, their general
unpopularity and their powerlessness in the community. But by
1876 their situation had changed markedly. On the Palmer, large,
well organized settlements of Chinese grew up, and in most places
they outnumbered the whites by at least two or three to one.
The European miners were then left with "no kindred
communities of diggers to espouse their cause and turn the
balance of physical force in their favour", and so they had no
choice but to capitulate to the aliens and allow them to work
unmolested. In this, the European colonist was also prompted by
the knowledge that most of the Asiatics were now armed and were
quite prepared to defend themselves against the depredations of
blacks or whites. They were even more wary after it was
publicized that there were professional Chinese criminals and
pirates on the field, who earned their living by terrorizing
unprotected miners and carriers. Highway robberies became
increasingly common; some isolated European storekeepers were
murdered and their stores burnt down; and the less powerful
Chinese clan and district groups were intimidated and forced to
pay protection money. According to all reports the 'Celestials'
had "gathered strength of purpose from their overwhelming
numbers, and fierceness from the pangs of hunger", and life
and property were no longer considered safe. So, after the
discovery of the rich Hodgkinson field in 1876, most of the whites
left, and the Chinese gained possession of the Palmer.

Although the Asiatics won control over this field, it was in
many ways a hollow victory. The alluvial yields began to
diminish after 1875 and according to the Europeans it was
"only fit for Chinamen anyhow". The colonists also had the
last word, for they were able to use their political influence to
contain the Chinese to this area and to similar diggings which
they had already worked over. Their new catchcry became
"Trinity Bay and the Hodgkinson for the white man".
The contact experiences of these years were to influence greatly
the kind of stereotypes popularly applied to the Chinese and the
northern Aborigines by European miners. The natives were
described as treacherous, savage and cannibalistic beasts, who
were bent on obstructing those who were "... the true
progressive agents; the explorer, ... digger, and settler rolled
The white miner, on the other hand, was characterized in a positive way as "tough, resourceful and full of grit", and yet still human enough to be "fond of whisky, games, fair women and fair deals." The third protagonist, 'John' Chinaman, was seen to be "mean and sneaky in [his] ways", as he "... always persistently [sic] dogged the steps of the European prospector, and takes advantage of his discoveries, waiting with all the cunning of [his] race until a field was opened for [him] into which [he] could slip easily". Like his rural counterpart, 'Paddy', 'John' was portrayed as "enduring and frugal" and capable of living "where a European would starve". Still, there was a basic difference between the two: 'Paddy' was a servile labourer, whereas 'John' was self-interested, self-sufficient and competitive. The early coolie labourers were thrust into an alien culture and employed in small isolated groups which had little contact with each other, whereas the Chinese miner was part of a vast well-organized community that "... was as independent of outside assistance as a Prussian army".

It was this ethnocentrism, — or what one writer termed, "the dull, unconquerable, unmitigated distaste of Asiatics for white men" — that was an outstanding quality of John Chinaman and one that provided an appropriate counterpoise to the whites' rejection of the Asiatic. It was galling for the colonists to realize that the Chinese regarded them as 'foreign barbarians', and it was the subject of bitter complaint that the aliens made no attempt to assimilate, did not acknowledge Queensland law and took British gold back to their country where no Britisher was allowed to mine. As Sir Arthur Macalister told the assembled members of the Royal Colonial Institute in London:

They came to Queensland for none of the ordinary pursuits of life; their object is simple enough — to take possession of the gold fields, to extract from the earth its auriferous deposits, and to this extent to impoverish the country and having done this, to return to China to spend their days.

Yet the arrogance of the Chinese, and the obvious education of some of his merchants, forced many colonists to acknowledge grudgingly that they were dealing with a group that had some dangerous claims to equality with themselves. The Queenslander wrote that in such as "... the art of organizing [and] superintending... the Mongolian is... superior to the Englishman", while others spoke of Chinese ingenuity and their shrewdness in dealing with Europeans. According to A. H. Palmer, "if the colonies were polled for intelligence and
ability, if 'John' did not beat the other colonists he would run them very close indeed'.241

The whites derived many of their attitudes concerning the Chinese from actual contact with them, for they were often camped cheek by jowl on the goldfields.242 Yet they were also influenced significantly by reports of the anti-Chinese experiences of southern colonists and, more particularly, of the settlers of California. Throughout this period there were strong parallels between the racist attitudes and responses of White Queenslanders and North Americans.243 Most of the colonists here approved of the treatment of Asian migrants in the United States and they very consciously tried to emulate her example.244 Consequently, they derived a measure of feverish satisfaction out of comparing their own anti-Chinese fears with those of the Californians. For, as the Queenslander reported:

... in California there is a white population of about 500,000 in a territory less than one third of the area of Queensland and that this population is supported by nearly forty million in the inland and Atlantic states. If the Chinese invasion is formidable, even to this vast power, what must it be to us with a population of less than 160,000 whites, backed up only by the small numbers in other Australian colonies.245

The power of America was nevertheless a source of comfort to the colonists who were fond of reiterating that:

The Pacific is theirs as well as ours, they know the yellow horde as we know it; Australia can never be isolated or beaten down while the strongest nation under the sun is her near and natural ally.246

Local newspapers at this time also included numerous references to Californian anti-Chinese stereotypes, many of which sprang from the polygenesist debate currently raging in the United States. These American theorists argued for the biological and cultural segregation of different races which they virtually regarded as separate species of mankind. They insisted that certain of such 'species' had aptitudes or immunities to particular diseases, and the contact between white and coloured races would infect the Europeans with the "darker" maladies of cholera, typhoid, smallpox and leprosy.247

These ideas had a very strong influence upon Queenslanders and were utilized not only by radical newspapers such as the Northern Miner,248 but also by the more conservative Brisbane
Thus in one prominent editorial of the *Miner* it was stated:

Kanakas and Chinese are distinct types of the genus Homo — some would go so far as to deny that they belong to the human family at all. There is no affinity between them and men of the Caucasian race, and miscegenation of races so physically antagonistic must inevitably degrade the higher race.250

The *Courier* was similarly concerned that there should be no mixture of the “different streams of blood” belonging to the white men and the Asiatic. for:

Such assimilation wherever it is attempted, whether with Teuton, Celt, or Saxon, always involves more or less a deterioration and degradation to the European races, without compensation to the other. They pull us down, while we fail to lift them up.251

This argument was extended to include the cultural distinctness of the Chinese who were described, politically and economically as “a race of slaves”, incapable of maintaining or defending a democratic society.252

Yet it was the American concern with the racial nature of disease which struck the most responsive chord in the colonist’s anti-Chinese sentiments. Even as early as 1874, the inhabitants of Townsville protested loudly when some sick Chinese were temporarily housed in an empty store near the wharves, for they were worried that somehow an epidemic would start.253 Their fears were echoed a few years later by the *Hodgkinson Mining News* which stated:

So infectious are the habits of the Mongolian horde that proximity to the dwellings of the white man should never have been allowed254

The whites were never very clear over how the “loathsome diseases” of the Asiatic were to be communicated, but the *Brisbane Courier* spoke of cholera as “a fine pestilence, spreading as the wind blows”,255 while the *Queensland Punch* warned that the suspensory pole for the baskets of the Chinese vegetable hawker could well be a conductor of smallpox.256

The ‘moral diseases’ of the Chinese “... their gambling and debauchery”,257 their homosexuality, their “filthy habits, immoral propensities, murder, rapine, bestiality and violence”258
— were all regarded as being equally contagious. Clergymen, journalists and politicians all proclaimed that it was the virtuous white woman who was most vulnerable to the degrading influences of 'the yellow man', and in 1876 the *Queensland Evangelical Standard* wrote:

The Asiatics were not children but savages, with irrepressible savage natures of a kind most dangerous to the safety of unprotected females. . . We are cherishing in our bosom an instrument of corruption and debasement which if it is tolerated much longer will injuriously affect the character of the people. . . What happiness can any poor foolish country woman of ours expect from uniting in marriage with a soft, pulpy, childish but passionate kanaka or the lithe, yellow-skinned mummy of the Celestial Empire?239

Accordingly, the anti-Chinese enthusiasts preached that there was "only one safe and efficacious remedy" against the contaminating influence of the Asiatic — to "wall them out".260 One miner, J. Conway, after thoroughly denouncing "the leprous heathens", addressed himself to his fellow-citizens, thus:

If you would not have your fair daughters contaminated by those immoral ruffians; if you would not see the youths of this fair land brought up in the polluted atmosphere of Chinese opium smoking, fantan and gambling hells, awake!261

During the seventies the Chinese question was debated within a highly charged emotional atmosphere. Once again, pastoralists and businessmen who wanted to employ cheap Chinese labourers, stressed that they could be contained,262 that they could not obtain freehold land and so "could not do much harm in the Colony".263 Boyd Morehead, who was interested in procuring coolies to work on the planned Transcontinental Railway, asserted that "... it was their duty, as a Christian community, to educate and Christianize these people; but it was a sign of utter weakness to keep them out of the colony".264 On the other hand, European labourers continued to argue against the morality of the capitalist who wanted to hire aliens "in the face of a superabundance of white labour".265 But it was the northern miners and merchants who were more particularly concerned with the Chinese question in this period, and Cooktown soon became the logical centre for most of the debate about the Orientals. Cooktown's future as a port depended to a large extent on the
success or failure of the Palmer field and the miners who worked there. It was likewise an important trading post, a town with a predominantly Chinese population, and one which relied heavily on the increased business and revenue that the Asiatic influx had brought. Thus the townspeople were divided into those who supported the white miners and wished to see the aliens excluded and those who had vested interests in a continuation of the China trade. Yet again, when the attitudes of both groups are examined, it will be seen that there were very few differences in the way they actually felt towards the Chinese race.

The Cooktown Herald, famed as the settlement’s pro-Chinese newspaper, stated that the Orientals were “... peacable... excellent citizens... kind hearted and charitable... and... law-abiding” — but, in the same article it objected to “their cast of countenance and elongated eyes”. Similarly, when a petition was sent from Rockhampton in 1875 asking for increased taxes on the aliens, the paper exclaimed that they had many more Chinese here than in the southern towns, yet they “... would not think of excluding them from the soil, and would... only ask that they be kept from mining till a certain period had gone”. In the same way their policy for Cooktown was to keep “every Celestial... in his proper sphere”, and to ensure that “the centre of their population... be confined to a given locality of the town, so as not to interfere with the European community except to trade etc”, so that “... many difficulties may be avoided, and the integrity of European morality predominate”.

At times the attitudes of merchant and miner came even closer. Towards the end of 1876, when the depressed state of the Palmer began to affect the trading returns of Cooktown, the so-called pro-Chinese party split in two. One group, led by John Walsh, a large importer of Asiatic food and merchandise, continued the policy of protecting the whites and ‘containing’ the Chinese. They argued against persecuting the aliens with unjust taxation, especially if “... its rigid enforcement may cause the Chinese to leave the field and cause serious loss to storekeepers who have laid in heavy stocks of goods”, but they approved of special business fees for Chinamen as “a wholesome handicap on their Asiatic rivals in trade”. The other group, led by the Cooktown Herald — now under new editorial management — pointed out how little benefit the aliens were to the white tradesmen, and in words surprisingly similar to the radical mining press, it recited how:

Any day an army of famishing wretches numbering thousands, more or less desperate and armed may march on Cooktown, and in what position are we to repel it.
The Herald's new, official, stated policy was to publicize anti-Chinese sentiments although the editor stressed that they "... didn't expect to revolutionize the country or cause the abrogation of the 'treaty of amity and commerce' with China."\(^{281}\)

As the Herald had formerly taken the public role of "apologist and protector" of the aliens, its change in attitude had a strong effect on southern Queensland newspapers. By 1877, there was virtually no favourable publicity given to the Chinese at all. Even the Brisbane Courier which had declared in March 1875:

Viewed from the highest standpoint all men are brethren, and the duty of race to race is in no wise different from the duty of man to man. . .\(^{282}\)

now, in 1877, proclaimed:

Australia cannot be both Chinese and British, it must be one or the other. . .\(^{283}\)

Furthermore in some newspapers the information circularised was actually a glaring exaggeration of the Chinese invasion,\(^{284}\) their poverty, vice\(^{285}\) and mining successes. At the same time as the official Mines Department report recorded the average gross annual earnings of the Chinese miners as £46 17s, which allowed them, at the current rate of living, a net profit close to £10 per annum;\(^{286}\) the Warwick Argus sensationaly disclosed that each Chinese returning home during the last two years took with him about £200 worth of gold.\(^{287}\) As a result of this excessive and unreliable publicity, the "theories and rationalizations" which the sociologist John Rex claims are "entertained guiltily and secretly" by the average person, were articulated and "came out into the open",\(^{288}\) and the 'Chinese Question' became one of the most pervasive issues in the Colony.

Colonial politicians were particularly susceptible to these prevailing and constantly reiterated prejudices. By 1877 they were subject to pressure even from such particularist journals as the German paper, the Nord Australischche Zeitung which exhorted its readers in the following manner:

The Chinese immigrants are the enemies of Queenslanders and we must fight them. . . We can only hope that all our countrymen will bring their influence to bear on the representatives of their districts, in order that this threatening danger may be firmly met.\(^{289}\)
In order "to keep themselves in office" parliamentarians generally complied with electoral demands and enacted racialist legislation. In 1875, when all vessels coming from Asia were placed under quarantine restrictions, the liberal Governor of Queensland, Sir William Cairns, wrote that it was:

... a mere pretext for the purpose of meeting a clamour on the part of the working and voting classes for the exclusion of the more thrifty sober and industrious Chinese immigrants.

The situation was potentially explosive, for, as miners and others saw that they could influence the politicians into meeting their demands, they continued to agitate for further prohibitions against the aliens. At the same time some politicians who were eager to further their careers and popularity were not slow in utilizing the anti-Chinese cause to this end.

During one parliamentary debate in 1889 John Murtagh Macrossan, then Minister for Mines, and Samuel Griffith, several times the Chief Secretary of the Colony, tried to score political points from each other by arguing about which of them had done more for the anti-Chinese movement. Both these men had often been accused of "protesting for political purposes" their disapproval of Asiatics, and were always careful to interpret and not to overreach their electors' demands in this area. In 1882, when newspaper comments on the aliens were fairly mild, John Macrossan stated that:

... it would be going too far to prevent Chinamen from mining on goldfields seeing that they were in the colony and came into it for that purpose.

Yet in 1889 in the aftermath of a virulent anti-Chinese campaign, he tried to do just that. He had maintained in a statement to the Queenslander that he was in favour of total exclusion of Asiatics but had to compromise his ideals, for some people were "apathetic" in the matter of the aliens, while others would look upon suffering Chinese "from a human point of view and would... oppose it."

Similarly Samuel Griffith argued that:

Any scheme... adopted for dealing with [Chinese]... must be reasonable and they would have to be assured it would commend itself to the minds of the public.

Despite Griffith's statement, the Liberals' first official attempts to "drive the Chinese miners away" came under a great deal of
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criticism. From the time of their arrival on the goldfields the Chinese paid huge amounts into the revenue through customs duties levied on their opium and foodstuffs. Yet the whites complained that the Colony received no benefit from their presence and that the large sums of money they sent back to China were not in exchange for merchandise as they claimed, but were the earnings they had won from land wrested from Britshers. To counter these accusations the Liberals decreed that the Asiatics must be "made to contribute something for the gold they took away" and in 1876 a tax of £9 6s 8d was exacted for each ton of imported rice, their mining fees were increased from ten shillings to £3 and their business licences from £4 to £10. The Chinese immediately organized to protest the taxes and submitted a petition to Parliament, which — as it is one of the few documents to bear out their attitudes towards the whites — is worth quoting almost in its entirety:

The Duty of £9 6s 8d on rice will make the price of that article to consumers about four times the cost price of rice in China, and is an oppressive and unjustify measure of taxation, deliberately calculated to fall heavily on the poorer classes of Chinese in the colony, and is in the worst form of class legislation. That the commerce of China is already heavily taxed in this colony, and the Chinese consumers are heavily burdened by the Customs import duties on tea, opium, tobacco, and other articles of their consumption, and in spite of the few wants of the labouring Chinese and their unwearied industry, a large proportion of them in this colony are at present in a state of absolute distress.

That the Chinese are prohibited by the operation of the Alien Act from having any voice in the expenditure of that revenue, contrary to the fundamental mansion [sic] of the English Constitution, that there shall be no taxation without representation, yet the Chinese as a body are as well educated and as good colonists as any other foreigners in the Colony, and, have been accustomed to have the laws in their own country framed and administered by men whose only recognized claim to the office is their honesty, and their abilities are clearly shown by their conduct and their success in the Imperial schools.

That if the Government of the colony determine to impose more taxation on the Chinese, your Petitioners would prefer a poll tax to be levied on the immigrating Chinese, which would not be open to the objection of its being an insidious
measure. . . would fall upon those able to pay, and be a more just and statesmanlike measure than one which has been deliberately calculated to starve out the Chinese already in this colony. . . 503

This complaint failed to elicit any official policy change; indeed it was rejected by the legislature after an angry outburst at the insulting allusions it contained. 504 The Chinese then organized amongst themselves an extremely successful campaign of non-co-operation and their countrymen were encouraged to 'no savvy' whenever a licence collector called. 505 Thus, although the Government expected to make almost £30,000 from the new licence fees, their returns were actually lower than ever. 506

On top of all this, the British Government almost precipitated a constitutional crisis when they refused at first to ratify the Colony's discriminatory legislation. 507 Finally the Queensland Government came under fire from some of the colonists themselves. 508 The press at this time was full of horrific tales of Chinese destitution and death and there was expressed indignation that this Act was to "... tax the poorest man on the gold field and tax him for his very existence". 509 One parliamentarian maintained that these duties were:

. . . intended to starve them. . . [and] make the prosecution of their industry so hard that they could not carry it on with profit to themselves. 510

Another report estimated that on their principal food, rice, the impoverished aliens "... were paying to the Government a duty of nearly cost price, and to the merchant a profit of over seventy per cent". 511 Finally, in a burst of alliterative oratory, W. H. Walsh condemned these laws as "... the most pandering, petty, personal, partial and he believed unconstitutional legislation any Government descended into". 512 So in 1878, under the weight of this moral outrage, and with the clear realization that their revenue was actually suffering, the Government reduced Chinese mining fees back to their previous level.

Legislators then turned their attention to the ones they saw as the real villains in the drama — the British steamship companies and the wealthy Chinese merchants who were encouraging and financing the Asian emigration trade. In 1877 the Chinese Immigrants Regulation Act was passed, which restricted the numbers of Asiatic immigrants to one for every ten tons of the ship's capacity, and demanded an entrance fee of £10 from each arrival. The passage expenses of most of the migrants were paid by Chinese trading firms to whom the miner was then bonded,
and so this tax really fell on the merchants.\textsuperscript{513} But the basic responsibility for observing the Act rested on the ships' captains who could be fined or made to forfeit their vessels if there were any infringements of these charges. This type of legislation proved to be so successful in stemming the rush of incoming Chinese that it was re-enacted in 1883; the poll-tax was increased to £20 and the number of passengers limited further to one for every fifty tons. Again in 1888, although the poll-tax was abolished, the number of Chinese was reduced to one for every 500 tons.

The various governments also continued the legislative traditions begun in the earlier period, whereby certain aliens were denied all the rights of British subjects. It was generally claimed that the Chinese had no racial aptitudes for participating in a democracy and so they were excluded from all real forms of political power. Still, if a Chinese had the necessary freehold qualifications, he could vote at municipal elections, and up until 1882 was allowed to register preferences in divisional ballots. In 1888, however, John Macrossan introduced a Bill to disenfranchise Asians altogether.\textsuperscript{514} In addition to this, the \textit{Aliens Act}, passed in 1876, precluded even naturalized Chinese from accepting a candidature for either house of parliament.

In the same way, the Chinese were persistently denied rights to land. In 1886, John Macrossan initiated a movement to prohibit them from holding homestead leases or mortgages within the area of a goldfield. In a speech that won the day, he urged:

\begin{quote}
.. let us deprive them of that right as we have deprived them of other rights in other Bills passed by this House.\textsuperscript{515}
\end{quote}

By 1891 no Asiatic or African alien was able to lease land in any type of mining district even if they had obtained a licence to mine in that area.\textsuperscript{516}

As a natural corollary to this principle, the colonists also sought to circumscribe the sphere of operations of the Asiatic miner and to "restrict him to the less profitable occupations''.\textsuperscript{517} For, according to C. S. Mein, then the Government's Representative in the Legislative Council:

\begin{quote}
The right to mine the goldfields of this colony was an inherent right of British subjects — inherent in those who had succeeded through the power and the expenditure of money and force of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{518}
\end{quote}

Consequently the Chinese were allowed only fossicking rights, and were kept from ".. treading too closely on the heels of
Europeans and coming into competition with them". Samuel Griffith stated:

So far as Europeans are concerned alluvial fields are usually worked out in three years, and it was thought not unfair to exclude the Chinese from new goldfields for three years so as to allow the alluvial deposits to be worked out. ... and they could come in and fossick afterwards.

This was to become the central theme of discriminatory mining statutes, but it was some time before it was enacted. John Macrossan suggested this idea initially in 1874 and he continued to press for it until 1878 when the Gold Fields Act Amendment Act was finally ratified. The precedent of ordering Chinese from fields not worked over by whites, was utilized in later years to exclude them almost indefinitely from some areas. The Russell River Goldfield was mined by Chinese and Europeans from the time of its discovery in 1884, yet in July 1887, after some disturbances there, it was declared a 'new' field and the Chinese, thereupon, were segregated into a small area of the site. Then in 1890, when this proclamation was due to expire, W. H. Wilson asked to have the no-entry period extended for another term for:

It appears that in consequence of the difficult nature of the workings on the Russell Gold Field, the three years proclamation. ... does not afford sufficient time to the miners who are now on the field to enable them to work out the alluvial deposits. ... Wilson then went on to discuss the problems encountered by the whites on the Palmer field who were “supplanted by Chinese” and he concluded that although there were only twenty Asiatics at present working on the Russell:

When they know this proclamation has expired they will cross over the border and there is not the slightest doubt from past experience that there will be a disturbance.

A. J. Thynne, however, completely contradicted these predictions and declared that:

... this is an action that will bring the Government of this colony into supreme contempt from even the Chinese nation. We are actually passing an Act of Parliament in all haste for the sake of dealing with twenty Chinese.
Nevertheless his appeal went unattended, and this field was closed to the aliens then, and again in 1894.525

Similarly in 1882 after the Chinese had been driven off the Northern tinfields, and subjected to “a series of brutal and murderous assaults by Europeans”,526 the legislators again acted to restrict them further. The Mineral Lands Act was hurriedly passed to ensure that no mining or business licence or mining lease could be granted to Asiatics to work on any fields other than gold diggings.

By 1898 the Chinese were severely hampered in all their mining activities. They could not be employed on any of the newer fields,527 and they could not own or lease land in the vicinity of their workings. In 1889 John Macrossan even tried to prohibit them from mining altogether: and, although under the Gold Fields Act of 1898 they were still able to obtain a miners right, it was only for the questionable privilege of fossicking in areas where no Europeans could make a living.528

The effect of all these laws to obstruct the assimilation of Chinamen was, ironically, to add weight to the general assertion that they were not capable of adjusting. As J. M. Thompson pointed out to the assembled parliamentarians:

... whilst it was proposed to take away from the Chinamen the rights of citizens, it was at the same time made a subject of complaint that they did not stay in the country.529

Yet most of the colonists did not seem aware that these aliens had been effectively prohibited from assimilating even if they had wanted to, and they continued to berate Orientals as “repugnant aliens” who were “like indigestable particles taken into the human constitution”.530

This pattern of legislation was both reflected and intensified by the racialist practices of governmental administrators and by the white population generally. In 1877, W. G. Bailey in a very revealing statement, pointed out to the Colonial Parliament that:

... we have inflicted on the Chinese in Queensland special taxation, special restrictions and special hardships to prevent them from coming here or to punish them when they are here. The policy of the House is... being carried out by the wardens only they are carrying it a little further. ...531

Thus on the goldfields, the aliens were confined, quite
illegally, to alluvial mining and were allowed to take out only certain types of claims. Extended claims on poor and abandoned ground were regularly granted to the whites (so as to keep the Chinese out) but as the Queenslander reported in 1876, "the Chinese were being restricted to ordinary claims". Similarly Warden Sellheim narrated how:

A couple of Chinese have spoken to me about applying for a reef but I am glad to say they have acted on my advice and desisted. I have explained to them their perfect right of application but also considered it prudent to point out the probable consequence of the action.\textsuperscript{533}

Sellheim's response was typical of almost all the local administrators, who, in this way, capitalized upon threats of violence on the part of whites. In 1878, the Northern Miner contained a series of articles complaining about Chinese working garden areas near the creeks in Charters Towers.\textsuperscript{534} The warden was immediately ordered to "... collect stringently miner's rights for every quarter acre of land" possessed by the aliens, or else to dispossess them.\textsuperscript{535} Again, at Herberton, when in 1882, the miners threatened a 'roll-up' if any garden areas were issued to Asiatics, the Under Secretary for Lands wrote to the Mineral Lands Officer there that:

Licences for garden areas are not to be issued to the Chinese — and all existing licences are not to be renewed. By Order.\textsuperscript{536}

In other towns where no legal technicality could be utilized to expel the Chinese, the police usually followed up anti-Chinese speeches by raiding their gambling houses or 'sly grog' shops.\textsuperscript{537} In Blackall, the feelings of the public were soothed when the local Bench refused, in 1879, to renew the publican's licence of Sam Wah. The town's Police Magistrate wrote to the Colonial Secretary that he:

... believe[d] the action of the Bench to be correct especially bearing in mind the large increase of Chinese here at a time when our own people here cannot get employment. \textsuperscript{538}

Although he admitted that Sam Wah's house was, in fact, well conducted, he rationalised the action of the Bench by referring to a common anti-Chinese stereotype, and concluded:
Every Chinese Public House that the Bench have had an opportunity of inspecting from the Comet to Blackall is a bawdy house of the worst kind.359

Similarly, two Chinese crewmen, shipwrecked from the Ceres, who were landed in the Colony in the midst of the anti-coolie campaign of 1883, found themselves arrested soon after for non-payment of the poll tax.340

Officials were equally sensitive to the current fears of infectious Asiatic diseases. On a number of occasions, Sellheim ordered all Chinese who were not holders of business licences into a separate camp in order "to avert a plague".341 Hospitals likewise responded to "the marked antipathy entertained by white[s] against these Asiatics"342 by building segregated quarters for coloured patients.343 In 1877 when the Rockhampton Hospital refused to admit a Chinese leper, the President wrote:

Even if the disease was not contagious the presence of the Leper would have an injurious effect on the other patients.344

Other hospitals made no attempt to rationalize their purely racial objections to non-white patients. The Ingham Hospital excluded from their admittance lists:

1 An African Negro because he is black;
2 A Malay because he is Asiatic;
3 A Native of New Caledonia because he is a South Sea Islander.345

An extreme example of this tendency to segregate non-European deviants, occurred in 1880 when Dr Smith at Woogaroo Lunatic Asylum arranged with the Government to have a group of Chinese mental patients shipped back to their homes — at the expense of their own countrymen.346 It would appear that this decision stemmed partially from the Doctor's inability to understand the Chinese in his care, for a few months previously he had written in his annual report:

An Asylum life forms a sort of earthly paradise to the celestials who when once in are very hard to turn out. It is no easy task to determine the sanity or otherwise of a Chinaman, but the readiness with which they have resort to weapons even when sane make me very careful of sending out a Chinaman whose sanity may be doubtful.347
On some occasions government officials were guilty not merely of over-reacting to the Chinese, but of openly intimidating or persecuting them. This was most obvious amongst some of the officers responsible for collecting their licence fees. Part of the problem here was inherent in the legislation itself which made no provision for enforcing the payment of the new licences, and, as mentioned above, the Chinese were quite prepared to avoid taking them out altogether. One police magistrate on the Palmer, W.R.O. Hill, wrote in his memoirs:

The wily Chinkie tried every dodge to evade payment and would have you if possible with spurious gold. I had on several occasions to round up and arrest mobs of them from 100 to 250 and escort them to my camp and then draft them out like sheep, retaining their swags until they found the ten shillings.

Warden Sellheim reported too, that they had “...to be careful when among the outside mobs, as they not infrequently draw knives to himself and his subordinates.” At the same time, the wardens were subject to conflicting sorts of pressure from the Government who officially condemned all cruelty to the aliens, but who deplored the Chinese evasion of taxation laws. This dual attitude was very clearly borne out by A. H. Palmer who in October, 1877 berated “the sub-officers of the Government” for their “inhuman” treatment of the Chinese and then a few months later, in 1878, argued that ‘John’ had been allowed “to slope” and that steps should be taken to prevent the drain on the Colony’s revenue. He maintained:

The only warden who ever attempted to do his duty, Mr Coward, was accused of cruelty to Chinamen...and then, on mere hearsay evidence...he was forced to resign...That was the way in which the Government encouraged their wardens to collect licences from Chinamen, and after such a sample of justice, it was not likely the other wardens would attempt to enforce the collection of these fees.

Yet the Warden Coward case, here referred to, was seen by most other contemporaries, as one of the worst incidents of official persecution of Chinese. Even the European miners and storekeepers at Byerstown were moved to protest that Coward’s conduct was “unmanly, tyrannical and derogatory to the position he holds”. W. C. Little, a butcher there, went on to relate how in his presence, Coward had beaten and handcuffed a Chinese, Ah
Loy. He then took the 'Celestial's' money and licence and when next day some of the local whites accompanied Ah Loy to the Warden's office to reclaim his possessions, Coward refused to return them unless he paid £10 and further threatened to rescind the licences of the Europeans or to put them in chains, if he found them sympathising with Asians again. Another 'boss' Chinese, Louis, reported that when he was renewing the licences of his companions he had warned Coward not to forget that they had taken them out, and was then abused, punched and beaten with a whip handle for his insubordination. He was later arrested and the Warden fined him £1 which he did not have, so he was handcuffed to a tree, whipped again and only released when he guaranteed to forward £10. Other witnesses came forward to testify that Coward “beats and kicks” 'new chum' Chinese, that he cuts off their pigtails and forces them to take out new licences even if the others have not expired. White storekeepers of Pine-tree Creek near Maytown, claimed that almost all the Asians had left after some of them had been “severely beaten”. The Chinese themselves tried to avenge these crimes and Coward's office was robbed and threats made upon his life, but, eventually, when the scandal could no longer be ignored, the Government was forced into action. A committee of enquiry was held and Coward volunteered his resignation.

This case received a great deal of publicity, while observers of the time described numerous other scenes of official anti-Chinese oppression. One common sight was the supposedly “comic” spectacle of a group of Chinese, all with their pig-tails tied together, being marched to the police camp to take out their licences. The Colonist told a similar tale of how Warden Mowbray at the Mulgrave goldfield would “descend like some avenging deity on Chinese diggers and burn their huts and tents with all their property”. According to W.R.O. Hill, the native troopers employed to help gold wardens “took infinite delight” in licence hunts and Chinese gambling raids and there were numerous references to their “illtreatment” of the aliens. Hill told of an incident involving H. M. Chester, the Commissioner at Charleville, who employed a Chinese cook. One night when he and his clerk had visitors, the cook sent in a meal that was badly spoilt. Chester and his assistant proceeded to put the Chinese into the hot ashes of his own fire as punishment but a scuffle followed where the cook stabbed at the clerk and was subsequently arrested. According to Hill, when the official recovered, their prisoner was released and it was “...deemed advisable to let the subject drop”.

In May 1887, the Colonist newspaper mentioned in one item that:}
When a Chinaman walks out he knows that the law protects him as little as it can, and, that he is at the mercy and whim of every body of larrikins he meets.\textsuperscript{569}

And throughout this period the protection of Chinese by British law in the Courts often seemed as sparingly afforded as it was on the streets.\textsuperscript{570} It was inevitable that many policemen, justices and juries would be influenced by current stereotypes of Chinese cunning and deceitfulness.\textsuperscript{571} These prejudices were given greater force, in turn, by the discovery that some Chinese interpreters were actually distorting evidence or bribing witnesses to protect members of their own clan or district groups.\textsuperscript{572} These cases were accorded a great deal of publicity and the vice came to be ascribed indiscriminately to all Asiatics. Thus, on one or two occasions, white prisoners were actually able to plead for a remission of their sentences on the grounds that they had been convicted by Chinese evidence.\textsuperscript{573} In Clermont, when the visiting district court judge dismissed a case in favour of a Chinese, Young Kin, who was being sued for money he was supposed to owe to a white man, the local press and progress association greeted the decision with a storm of protest.\textsuperscript{574} A petition was sent to the Colonial Secretary and a long editorial article declared:

Until this memorable decision it was not known that a Chinaman's oath was of more value in law, than the oaths of two white men. . . If the law be such that a Chinaman can out swear two white men, and virtually get a verdict, all security in commercial affairs is at an end.\textsuperscript{575}

In other legal cases, the discrimination shown against Asiatics was more a reflection of their unpopularity or their powerlessness in the general society than the decision above.\textsuperscript{576} Howard St George, the Police Magistrate at Cooktown, related how difficult it was to obtain justice for the Chinese in the early days on the Palmer, and told of one case in which a European was tried in Cooktown for killing a Chinaman. According to St George:

. . . he was acquitted by a jury in the face of what to all unprejudiced persons appeared the clearest evidence, and ever since has been conspicuous even amongst this community for his unreasoning animosity against the Chinese.\textsuperscript{577}

Another notable incident occurred when Christie Palmerston, a well known North Queensland explorer was sued by two Chinese,
Lee Cook and Ah Due for unlawful assault. In the story that was subsequently revealed it appeared that Palmerston, the discoverer of the Russell River gold field, wishing to promote his find, accordingly made an agreement with some Chinese merchants, whereby, for a guaranteed yield of three to four drams weight each per day, he would escort thirty of their countrymen to the site and protect them from Aborigines for a further fee of £1 per person. After two unprofitable weeks, however, almost all the men returned. Then, for no apparent reason, this venture was succeeded by a rush of almost 200 Chinese to the area. Palmerston, quickly turned this situation to his advantage. He surrounded the rather inaccessible field with his own group of armed Aborigines and then set up his own butcher’s shop there, charging “exhorbitant prices” for all supplies. The blacks were instructed to prevent the departure of any Chinese who did not have a special pass from Palmerston costing £1, and to prevent the arrival of any of their carriers with supplies. According to the Police Magistrate at Geraldton:

The great majority of those who attempted to escape were men who were destitute of means and of food.

Yet, Palmerston kept most of the miners “imprisoned” for eight weeks until some of those who had escaped succeeded in bringing complaints against him for assault.

The explorer immediately entered a counter suit against Lee Cook, and accused him of the totally unsubstantiated charge of having stolen forty ounces of gold. Although the magistrate had more than enough evidence to convict Christie Palmerston, he dismissed all the cases and only demanded that Palmerston take out a surety to keep the peace for three months. In a speech which was fraught with contradictions, and which aptly illustrated the relative importance of Palmerston and the Chinese, the magistrate declared that these events:

. . . would then be seen to have been very serious events indeed in the history of crime and very distinctly marked with the character of an accomplished criminal.

Yet he concluded:

I did not seek to punish or disgrace the accused. . . . I sought rather to preserve him from that formal transference to the criminal class to suppress the offences complained of up on the Lower Russel and to reform the offender.
Although it appears that official leniency would have little effect on the explorer and he continued his personal vendetta against the Asiatics.\textsuperscript{381} Just two months later he sent a telegram to the Parliament claiming that Warden Mowbray who had been subsequently sent up to segregate the two races on the field, was in fact "... surrendering [the] largest portion of [the] goldfield to Chinamen against European miners' wishes".\textsuperscript{382} In consequence, the Asiatics were confined to a small portion of these diggings and restricted within these limits until 1897.\textsuperscript{383}

For all its seeming improbability, the Christie Palmerston case was, in fact, quite similar to other examples of violence and exploitation on the frontier diggings. Peter McLean, a gold miner turned parliamentarian explained how, on some of the newer fields "... the Chinamen had to go about in mobs to protect them from Europeans"\textsuperscript{384} who were quick to react to any apparent threat to their interests or territory. Asiatics caught thieving from whites were treated with scant ceremony. A.C. Bicknell, another goldminer of this time, narrated how one Chinese caught stealing gold was placed on a bucket beside a tree, his pig-tail cut off, his ears nailed to the trunk and the bucket kicked away. He concluded, "We thought the Chinaman got off too easily".\textsuperscript{385} Writing in 1871, George Carrington gave a vivid description of a more typical case. One Sunday, after a Chinese thief had been "summarily thrashed", "... some few half-drunk heroes, proposed a raid on the Chinese quarter":

The news and excitement spread, contradictory and ridiculous version of the affair got abroad, no man knew the rights of the affair, but all were agreed that the Chinaman had committed some act, (the report varying from shovel-stealing to cannibalism,) which had at last brought matters to a crisis, and deserved condign punishment. All kinds of weapons were in requisition — shovels, guns, crow-bars, revolvers, picks, carbines and cudgels. The luckless Chinamen were taken unawares, their tents and huts levelled and burnt, their gardens laid waste, and themselves stoned and knocked down, and thrashed, and trampled on, and shot. To do the diggers justice, I think that they did not intend actually to take any lives, and nearly all the guns that were used were fired quite at random; still five or six Chinamen were killed, and the rest were forced to disperse all over the country.\textsuperscript{386}

In areas where no official law and order establishment was maintained, the Chinese were "fleeced" by white miners who
posed as officials and issued them with false licences; or who, like the stock and station agent in Cooktown, levied their own landing tax on all disembarking Asiatics. When policemen and wardens began to move into these areas, the aliens gained some measure of security and generally stayed close to their camps. In reality, however, their situation was not significantly changed, for officials were not often strong enough in either numbers or inclination to deal with any large-scale race riot. In 1877 when the Chinese of the Cape River field reported to the police that their tents had been pulled down by armed Europeans who threatened to shoot them if they did not leave, they were merely told that nothing could be done as there was no local magistrate. The fact was, as John Macrossan pointed out, on most fields, it was "the white miner" who was "his own constable", who administered his own type of justice and who effectively decided where and if the Chinese were to be allowed to stay.

The anti-Chinese experiences of miners in New South Wales and Victoria loomed large when the Queensland digger first challenged the aliens at the Canoona rush in 1858. One constable reported that: "There was some fighting for ground and the Chinese were pushed out"; while the Moreton Bay Courier proudly announced that the miners would not allow "these yellow faced idolators to fill their pockets with Australian gold, when British enterprise has led the way". Again, some years later, when the Crocodile Creek field was opened, the Gold Commissioner wrote:

Since the arrival of the Chinese in numbers on the Diggings there has been, by a certain class of Diggers, a continual expression of feeling against them.

He explained that the Chinamen had suffered "much small annoyance without retaliation" for many months. Then in January 1867, when one of them did strike a white man who tried to "jump" his claim, a general riot ensued. The "greater part of their dwelling places were burnt down", their stores were "broken into and looted" and according to the Commissioner:

The Chinese were treated with small ceremony by the white population and on that day I had some difficulty in restraining the Diggers and obtaining moderate justice for the Chinese.

This riot, like almost all anti-Chinese demonstrations, sprang from a deeply imbedded racial antipathy, most precisely reflecting, in these instances, an inability to deal rationally with Chinese competition and an obsessive jealousy concerning their
purported mining 'successes'. The official report on this riot stated:

The originators of and actors in these disturbances are confined to a comparatively small portion of the Diggers and consist chiefly of new hands who have had no experience on Goldfields, and to whom the hard work required is especially distasteful. These vagabonds will watch a Chinese party sink a shaft, and if a "good" prospect is obtained endeavour to get possession of it on some pretext or by force.\(^3\)

Yet, even though all the miners did not take part, only one person actually tried to stop the riot, and afterwards there was "... a positive disinclination... to give any assistance in bringing the offenders to justice".\(^3\) The Government too seemed little concerned for the aliens. The arrested rioters were given only minor sentences and the Chinese claims for compensation for their losses were all refused.\(^3\)

In the years following, this same pattern persisted, and the vocal anti-Chinese element successfully thwarted the advances of the aliens. In Gympie, when Chinese miners took over ground abandoned by the whites and then appeared to be doing well out of it, the Europeans staged a 'roll up' and forcibly repossessed their claims.\(^4\) When these new owners subsequently found the workings were too wet and difficult after all, the aliens were allowed to return.\(^4\) In April 1869, the press reported that the Chinese mining at the Norman had been robbed of their earnings and driven off the field.\(^5\) Two months later they were expelled from the workings at the Gilbert Range,\(^5\) and again in November were forced to leave the Cape River.\(^5\) These incidents all occurred at times when mining was slow and liquor was abundant\(^5\) and were more often emotional outbursts similar to the type described by George Carrington. The coloured aliens were seized upon as a convenient scapegoat for the diggers' frustrations, boredom or failure. Generally when mining conditions improved and the whites were once more productively employed, the Chinese were tolerated in the areas the Europeans had abandoned.\(^6\)

In consequence, matters were fairly quiet on most fields, until the 1870's when new and more lucrative discoveries of gold were made and the same sorts of hopes and frustrations exhibited upon the earlier fields were rekindled and intensified in the minds of white diggers. In December 1871 when thirty-five Chinese from Normanton set up camp in Cloncurry they were challenged on that same day by fifty mounted Europeans who "... charged at their camp and tore it down".\(^7\) They fought back energetically
with revolvers and long pointed sticks until the whites were forced to retire to recruit more men. At this point, the local police intervened and tried to remonstrate with the whites but were informed in terms reminiscent of another 'Wild West' that:

The Chinamen or us will be stretched dead on this ground before tomorrow's sun sets if they attempt to remain.\textsuperscript{408}

The police then persuaded the Chinese to leave, and that night escorted them out of the town. The whites were not contented until, the next day, they had followed up the tracks of the 'intruders' for almost thirty miles. The local mailman who sent a report of the incident to the Brisbane press, estimated that six Asiatics and two of the European colonists had been shot and referred to it as "the severest battle we've had in Northern Queensland".\textsuperscript{409}

Concurrent with the eruption of this disturbance, Howard St George, the Commissioner at Georgetown was writing to the Minister for Mines:

I am sorry to say that a great deal of ill-feeling continues to exist between the Europeans and the Chinese sects of the population and the latter are still prevented from following mining pursuits upon the Etheridge River and Talbot Creeks. They are however tolerated in these places as Gardeners, Cooks and Tradesmen.\textsuperscript{410}

Again, not long afterwards, the Police Magistrate at Ravenswood declared in a similar report:

I expect a roll up may take place should the Chinese attempt to come in and persist in working the alluvial at the 70 mile, 75 mile and nine mile [creeks].\textsuperscript{411}

Nevertheless, this pattern of challenging and then confining the Chinamen underwent a slight change after the Palmer field was opened in 1873. The area of this field was so vast and appeared so rich that it seemed initially as if there would be enough for both races. As the \textit{Queenslander} explained:

There was enough and to spare for white man and Chinaman and although some snarling occurred between the races they were as a rule too fully and profitably employed to be able to spare the time necessary for a settlement of their animosity of race and colour. Collisions are averted because the auriferous grounds are as extensive as they are rich. If the field should show a restricted area of
The other important difference on the Palmer field was its majority population of Chinese who came in ever increasing numbers from 1875 onwards. Any agitation against them was therefore confined to the few regions where whites were in numbers sizeable enough to mount and sustain an assault. At Oakey, Stony, Finegold, Limestone and Sandy Creeks notices were posted warning Chinese trespassers that "... they would be seized and hanged till death". On one occasion the "fiery cross" was sent around at Sandy and Oakey creeks, and the authorities were warned to expect a large "roll up". When this did occur a few months later, however, the whites seemed to have become acutely aware of the new strength of the aliens and afterwards collected all the tools and food abandoned by the routed Chinamen and returned it to them on the condition they continue to stay away from the area. Throughout the field, fighting almost invariably broke out if any Chinese tried to advance into deep mining — a form of work regarded as a white preserve; also, if Chinese took over mines abandoned only temporarily by Europeans, who had been diverted by the prospect of another rush, trouble usually resulted. When in 1876 most of the whites left for the new rich find at the Hodgkinson, one European miner who remained was able to state with great satisfaction that:

The Chinese on the Palmer were never less objectionable or located in a district so capable of affording them a support for many years without seriously interfering with European interests.

The usual sort of frontier lawlessness was now evidenced at the Hodgkinson and its new seaport, Cairns. Here, the *Queenslander* reported, "There is dangerous material for riot and bloodshed... a number of idle men, much 'fighting rum' and firearms far too plentiful amongst such a crowd". These men were provided with a welcome diversion when in November 1876, a group of Chinese tried to land in Cairns. A large mob of whites gathered on the landing, and shots were fired at the aliens, forcing them to leave. For two weeks the whites staged demonstrations and made inflammatory speeches. Eventually, however, the local constabulary were able to announce that five Asiatics had successfully disembarked in Cairns, presumably under their protection. When these men reached the Hodgkinson, they were again threatened and all the storekeepers there refused to issue
them with rations. Fully alerted by this reception, they “cleared out”. The anti-Chinese movement on this field was particularly fierce and meetings and petitions were organized to denounce the “uncleanliness and immorality” of the intruders, and to protest against their being allowed to dig for gold or live within the proclaimed limits of a whiteman’s field. As more and more Chinese began to move into the area an organized party was formed to drive them away.

At Island Point, outside Cairns, the Chinese gardeners were removed from the town and their countrymen who fished outside the port were ordered to execute any business with white purchasers outside the town limits. Nevertheless, just as on the other fields, the Hodgkinson diggers soon discovered the usefulness of Chinamen in proscribed areas and they were tolerated as gardeners and butchers. Even the Hodgkinson Mining News which had been one of their most virulent opponents now maintained — “They are here now, so let us benefit by their labour if we can without injuring others”. Some months later when Chinese moved into a portion of ground near MacLeod’s Creek and some whites decided to drive them away, only eight Europeans answered the call.

The racial struggle of the Hodgkinson miners marked a turning point in the anti-Chinese movement. The Government acceded to the protests of the miners and effectively contained the aliens by legislating to exclude them from all new fields for three years. Yet this popular movement continued and, rather than simply outliving its usefulness, it actually grew in intensity and power, for it now became more thoroughly organized and engineered by mining unions and the colonial press. In earlier frontier situations, the agitation against the Chinese was part of the general fight for resources, and the miners made almost no attempt to articulate their grievances against the ‘yellow men’ in any detailed fashion. But, in June 1877, the newspapers serving the Hodgkinson and Charters Towers areas sought to build up this crude racialism by announcing that there were to be monster-sized meetings in all centres in order to form an aggressive anti-Chinese association. This organization was to agitate “... to prevent the election of any man to Parliament who doesn’t give anti-Chinese Legislation his first Priority”; and to secure “... the discharge of all Chinese in employment by boycotting those who continue employing them”. Thadeus O’Kane, the editor of the Charters Towers’ paper the Northern Miner, wanted this group to incorporate some of the characteristics of a vigilante committee and to include a Voluntary Rifle Brigade, a Troop of Horse and the local brass band. After intense campaigning from both centres, about 1000 people offered themselves as
Sir Thomas McIlwraith defends fair Queensland from the Chinese.
members. According to one report, although no opposition was voiced against the scheme, there was "not much enthusiasm" expressed either.

Organized anti-Chinese groups were rarely able to maintain their commitment and numerical content over long periods, but their ideas were adopted by most of the local mining unions, progress associations and groups such as the Irish National Land Leagues. In times of crisis, any of these societies could be quickly converted into specifically anti-Chinese bodies. In July 1886, when a Miners' Union was organized at Charters Towers Thadeus O'Kane seized upon the occasion to press for its conversion into "a union of all classes against the common enemy John Chinaman." He campaigned energetically for several weeks to effect this transformation and lent weight to all his assertions by pointing to California where "in spite of greedy landlords and capitalists eager for cheap labour. . . the people have declared that Ah Sin must go". According to the Colonist, O'Kane succeeded in working the miners into "a pitch of frenzy" but once again the Chinese refused to be intimidated, and "the storm blew over".

Yet these press campaigns were influential in changing the aims and tactics of anti-Chinese enthusiasts. The organization created during the eighties was pledged to pressure not merely for the complete cessation of immigration from China, but also for an extension of the earlier policy of containment, so that the aliens would not be employed by whites, could not trade with them, live in their towns or work in occupations where the two races would be competing. This plan won support from several mining associations, and their organizers argued continually for reapplication of the exclusion principle inherent in the Gold Fields Act Amendment Act of 1878. Those who took a more moderate line denounced the extremism apparent in having the law "stretched and broken" whenever an old goldfield was to be declared a new one. The Chinese themselves argued that it was "very hard to be banished. . . from the holdings some of us possess, and. . . in which we laboured hard and perseveringly for years to bring to their present state of perfection". Nevertheless, in 1887 and 1888 the aliens were twice driven out of Croydon and Clermont and further restricted on the Russell River and Etheridge fields.

In October 1886, the respectable citizens of Croydon were declared by the Police Magistrate to be "in a state of terror" after a series of drunken fights by some of the town's larrikins. One of their number, a man named James Enright, tried to blackmail a naturalized Chinaman, George Ah Hoy, into giving him £10 for the privilege of being left alone. When Ah Hoy refused, Enright gathered a troop of almost 200 men who set out to destroy the
gardens and buildings of all Asiatics and whites employing them. Yet when the local police arrested the ringleaders of the riot, there was a great outcry. The newly formed anti-Chinese League at Townsville argued that the labouring classes had been moved “by an increased feeling of anger towards the non-tax paying alien with whom they are brought into unfair competition” and they concluded that:

Their offence was not instigated by paltry viciousness but rather by a feeling that they were doing a public good.

In response to this pressure Samuel Griffith ordered that a portion of the convicted rioters’ sentences be remitted and he allowed them the privilege of rationing themselves whilst in goal rather than existing upon prison fare. Similarly, the local officials at Croydon ordered all the Chinese to leave the field, except for three gardeners, whom the miners needed for the supply of fresh vegetables.

So long as this situation continued, the local racists were silent, but when in April 1888 Chinese waiters, cooks, milkmen and egg-sellers began to move into the town again, they were received by hostile whites. A catalyst was provided when a Chinese, diagnosed as a leper, escaped from Tabletop and sought refuge in the town. The runaway himself, and the Croydon Chinese generally, all declared that he only suffered a relatively mild type of skin irritation. After an examination by three medical officers, however, he was again certified as a leper and ordered to be quarantined. The Amalgamated Miners Association seized upon this excuse to demand that all the alien arrivals be sent away “as speedily as possible.”

The Government waited at first for the agitation to subside — Griffith writing that he could not evict the Asiatics without legislating to declare the area a new field. He ended his message by expressing the rather vain hope “... that in any action the people may take they will not do anything to affect the reputation of Queenslanders as a law abiding people”. Yet the Miners Association and the recently formed anti-Chinese League were not to be dissuaded by this timorous comment, and at a huge open-air meeting they threatened that “disorder and most probably bloodshed” would result if the “reptiles” were not thrown out. The local warden capitulated and ordered that all Chinese not in authorised holdings were to leave, or face charges of illegal occupation of Crown lands. Samuel Griffith then attempted a compromise solution. When the luckless George Ah Hoy, the butt of the 1886 disturbance, protested against their latest eviction, Griffith wrote:
It is not contemplated to disturb such men. They are peaceful and law abiding and being in possession of house and property it would be manifestly unjust to ask them to remove.

Nevertheless he ended by stating,

But the renewing of their title is with me quite another matter altogether.456

Thus it occasioned no official outcry when a few days later, W.O. Hodgkinson, the Minister for Mines — in what the Queenslander described as “a political move” to gain popularity457 — ordered the total expulsion of Asiatics from the field.458 Ironically, just two weeks later, on the 19th May, the press reported that the citizens of Croydon had begun to regret the Government’s decision, for the Chinese had registered their protest by destroying all their gardens before they left, and the town was now threatened with an outbreak of scurvy.459 But no publicity was given to the rather innocent-looking telegram which was sent from Dr Korteum of the Cooktown Hospital to the Colonial Secretary in June of that year, and which contained the news that the ‘leper’ from Croydon had been wrongly diagnosed as such.460

At almost the same time as miners’ associations and anti-Chinese leagues at Clermont and Etheridge were most vociferously and successfully advocating the removal of these hated aliens, the saga of the Chinese miner was itself drawing to a close. The official Mines Department report of 1889 illustrated just how far Chinese miners had been ‘contained’. Their numbers had dropped off considerably on all fields, and, accordingly, it was stated:

There has been no trouble with the Chinese during the year, they have gradually thinned out as water dried up on those portions of the field they were permitted to occupy; that is where Europeans could not make a living. . . .461

But the plight of the Asiatic goldminer was to have further repercussions within the Colony, for the success of the white digger in defeating his coloured rival gave inspiration to other Europeans in other occupations to agitate for the virtual exclusion of all Chinese competitors. The radical urban press now became preoccupied in posing the question first raised in 1878 by the Parliamentarian, W.H. Walsh, who argued:

If the presence of Chinese was inimical to [men]. . . on gold
fields, were not the Chinese in their towns and districts equally objects of dislike to their carpenters, farmers and gardeners? Why should they make miners their pet subjects? Why not protect their farmers and the hewers of wood and the drawers of water who were put in competition with Chinese... If it was unfair to goldminers, it was unfair to many other classes of Englishmen who had to compete equally as much with the Chinese.462
CHAPTER THREE

"Orientals, leprous-fitted/Blood diseased and small-pox pitted"

The urban anti-Chinese movement

"So," I thought, "this is the flower of Eastern civilization — a rich Chinaman. This greasy, yellow-white Sybarite, with his harem of beautiful white girls, slaves to himself and opium, this is the representative of the industrious, ant-like race, who are looking towards Australia as an earthly paradise. You screwy-eyed exponent of twenty-five centuries of dull rust, sensuality and cunning, Australia is no place for you."

"A Professional Secret". Worker, 14 December 1895

Within the two general labour fields where the majority of Chinese immigrants were concentrated — as agricultural workers and gold miners — they were usually limited at first to fairly remote and isolated areas, and during that time they came into contact with only a very small percentage of the European population. The sporadic fighting which erupted between them and the white pastoralists, shepherds and miners was likewise confined initially to this immediate frontier situation and racial competition and hostility in this context had "... little in the way of intellectually argued theory to support it". But it was not long before attitudes and verbalisations of enmity began to be circulated within and beyond the actual areas of Chinese-White contact, and these stereotypes came to govern all interaction between the two races. For instance, in 1851, when a mob of drunken Europeans near Ipswich attacked a Chinese work party, the Moreton Bay Courier utilized stories that the Chinese were "violent", "revengeful" and armed, in order to justify the whites' action, and, further, to condemn those who continued to import and employ them to the detriment of the honest British worker. Again, in 1862, when 260 Chinese disembarked in Brisbane on their way to the New South Wales goldfields, the Brisbane Courier and some of the local politicians repeated similar stories, and were able to make political capital from the incident by dramatising the Chinese arrival as the advance guard of a huge
'invasion' force that would create havoc among them and change the character of their institutions. As previously explained, these two campaigns gave rise to fierce and popular anti-Chinese agitation which was directed as much against the pastoralists and planters, and their political representatives as it was at the hapless foreigners.

When in the mid-1870s, it appeared that Queensland was again to be faced with an ingress of 'the yellow horde' — this time an estimated 20,000 of them — the popular press once more carried highly exaggerated and one-sided accounts of the 'invasion' and the character of the immigrants. But now these articles were being distributed to all classes in most parts of the Colony, and were to attract so much attention that the anti-Chinese movement began to assume the form of a widespread social and political crusade, or, as the radical paper, the Boomerang rousingly exclaimed, "It is more than a social or national movement that is upheaving itself around us... it is a true racial struggle". Once again, the agitation was taken up by publicists, amongst whom were such outstanding and widely celebrated personalities as the incisive mining politician John Murtagh Macrossan and the colourful and talented northern journalist Thadeus O'Kane. In the 1880's they were joined by William Lane, who was at one time joint-editor with J.G. Drake of the Boomerang and later sole editor of the union owned paper, the Worker, and who is credited by most historians of the early labour movement as having attained a "...position of leadership that has rarely been equalled in the history of Australian radicalism". The ideas of these men were in turn buttressed by the programmes of many other radical papers like the Gympie Miner which under the editorship of A.G. Stephens committed itself to:

The exclusion from Australia of Chinese and other servile races, and the preservation of the entire continent as a home for white men.

Others, like the Queensland Figaro adopted a more sensational approach and introduced a weekly feature entitled "The Yellow Agony Column" which purported to expose the true character of the 'Heathen Chinese', his vice, disease and criminal leanings and his attempts to oust "the man in moleskin pants". In the late 1890s, the ginger liberal paper the Progress re-introduced this theme under a more inclusive title "In Darkest Queensland" and thus divided its attentions equally among all the coloured groups.

In considering the racial publicists, it is impossible to ignore the role of the numerous anti-Chinese associations which sprang up in all the major centres. These groups adopted and extended the policies of radical journalists and worked within the general
community urging all people to boycott Chinese businessmen and to refuse to lease them land, houses or shops. Initially, these groups were very disorganized and rarely lasted beyond the periods of great racial excitation. But late in September 1886 the Townsville and Charters Towers' leagues decided to accelerate their campaigning and large demonstrations with accompanying brass bands and flags were organized. One of the speakers on this occasion, John Potts, tried to convince the committee members that "A sacrifice of brain and bodily exhaustion, time and money had to be made or the Anti-Chinese Movement would die out and never be effectually settled". Accordingly, with some small encouragement he became a travelling protester bent on "extending" the racist cause. As he argued in his book of reminiscences entitled, *One Year of Anti-Chinese Work in Queensland:*

> People were anxious that the Chinese should go; but they failed to realize the importance of a movement upon a broad basis and that it was necessary for a moving spirit to go forth for the purpose of arousing an agitation.

During his journeys "on the Chinkie war path", Potts visited twenty-nine centres of population throughout Queensland and in some of the southern colonies. He organized over eighty anti-Chinese demonstrations where his highly racist orations — described by the *Cooktown Courier* as "... a hashed-up medley of ill-digested facts, illogically strung together, and tortured into meaning to suit the speaker's own view" — nevertheless attracted him notoriety and some measure of public support. The popular enthusiasm which these groups and the radical press aroused, enabled them to exert some influence on politics. They directed a considerable amount of invective against aspiring or entrenched politicians who would not guarantee to increase the poll tax on each Chinese arrival from £30 to £100, their residence tax to £10 and to undertake to make it impossible for any Asiatic to obtain naturalization papers.

It is very difficult to estimate the overall effect and influence of the various anti-Chinese publicists. Obviously, many of the 'respectable' and 'mainstream' politicians and other establishment groups were not prepared to countenance their extreme and often highly exaggerated racist statements. But, at the same time, the available evidence suggests that these groups were not entirely unmoved by the sheer reiteration and force of their radical arguments. Just as when, in earlier periods, the attitudes of white squatters and workers as well as merchants and miners reflected the same xenophobic assumptions, so now the racist ideas of the 'influentials', the conservative press and the
popular anti-Chinese enthusiasts again contained a basic similarity. Any variation between the approaches of these social groups lay not in the concepts they employed but in the differing treatment and language they used concerning a universally perceived problem. In fact, the consensus of opinion on the race issue was so marked throughout this entire period, it would appear that "...the characteristics of racism were in some way implicit in the whole structure of the society's thought".480

As one of the speakers of an anti-Chinese meeting at Mackay pointed out, rather apologetically, "It is a very difficult thing to say anything new on the Chinese".481 Consequently, articles concerning these aliens, and the contact experiences of white citizens with an increasing number of Chinese artisans, tradesmen and merchants were all interpreted within the framework of existing images, stereotypes and expectations which had originated earlier in the agricultural and mining situations. So, although there was no newly significant debate on the race question, the popular press greatly amplified and extended the earlier stereotypes. They were also able to exploit the new medium of the political and satirical cartoon to create clear pictures of their articulated concepts. When John Potts described a visiting Chinese diplomat in 1887 as having "a cunning in the eyes, [and] sensuality in the jaw and lips"482 or when he referred to the "bilious faces" or the "calm, serene and oily expression"483 of the Chinese, his words could be immediately associated with a cartoon effigy showing a monkey-faced creature "smiling, or rather grinning"484 malevolently up from the page.485 Other sketches pictured Chinese as a plague of evil-looking locusts, as a vicious looking octopus whose tentacles reached out to white women, gambling dens and the impoverished white worker,486 or as the Yellow Rogue — a renegade elephant running out of control.487 The spectre of leprosy was depicted by such threatening sights as a grotesque Chinaman with skeleton-like hands hovering overhead while underneath him stood a "childlike, bland but cunning"488 Chinese fruit vendor holding out the symbol of both temptation and infection — the apple.489 These caricatures contrasted starkly with the picture of the Australian worker, represented as honest, virile and hard-working, trying always to provide for his equally hard-working wife and family. John Potts gave a vivid description of such racial differences when he told of his visit to the home of a white labourer, where the children "were clad in clean and tasty costumes," and the furnishings and carpets were produced "by the looms and deft fingers of factory girls in old England".490 But then in the town's Chinese quarter:

In one small kennel was a slumbering son from the
flowering land, steeped in opium fumes, lying unconsciously among streaks of oily fat bacon, dried fish, and half-rotten fruit".  

He ended his narrative by stating — almost unnecessarily, one might think — "I leave it for the reader to draw his own conclusion as to which are the best Colonists".  

These mental images all succeeded in identifying "the enemy", and all that then remained was for 'Ah Sin's' particular and unsavoury characteristics to be typified and enumerated. One of the most influential anti-Chinese journalists was William Lane whose ideas and writings, according to one of his biographers — "unconsciously haunted the minds" of Queenslanders long after they had even forgotten his name.  

Like other public figures in the Colony, Lane was tremendously impressed by current radical writers of the United States. His socialistic beliefs were largely derived from the Americans, Edward Bellamy and Laurence Gronlund, while his racist assumptions depended heavily upon America's more extreme writers — the racial pluralists. As with all polygenists, Lane repeatedly described the white race as a separate and distinct "species" which must preserve its "colour strength" against pollution from the "baser strains" of non-whites. As he saw it, the most important task for Queensland was to "be white first", for only pure white children could "take the lamp of progress from us", and, more importantly, "keep it burning for all the generations to come". Accordingly he argued that all examples of Chinese assimilation must be ignored, for even if the Asiatic was to become a Christian, and wore "... shoddy pants and leather. . . shoes and had his hair clipped to the most approved Puritan cut", he was still a "Mongol" — "the representative of a rival civilization, the standard bearer of an arch-antagonistic race", and as such incapable — by pluralist standards — of preserving a white man's cultural, social and political heritage.  

At the core of such beliefs lurked Lane's emotional and intellectual loathing for inbreeding which could only "adulterate and weaken our civilization". As he emphatically stated in the Worker of 1892:

The prejudice against marriages with skins of other colours is a prejudice founded on instinct, an instinct which seeks to save us from an act fatal to us as a species.

Yet although he tried to glorify this "race instinct" he did not appear to place great reliance upon it. In fact the argument he used to keep the races apart was, significantly enough, a sexist one. In his novel, The Workingman's Paradise, he wrote "My
THE CHINESE PLAGUE.

White invasion fears dramatised.
women should be such that their children would hold them sacred and esteem all women for their sakes". Her physical charms were to be admired, but her sexuality was never to be openly expressed, for it might lead her to succumb to "the most depraved and sensuous race on earth" — 'the yellows'. And just as the virtuous white woman had to be protected from this insidious race, so too had the young, unsullied colony of Queensland, "lying" defenceless "among the coloured continents" to be saved "from the attack of those whose eyes are already gloating on her beauties". The conclusion here was inescapable: It was up to the white male to fight for his women and his country — a notion given symbolic expression in his serialized novel, White or Yellow? A Story of the Race War of A.D. 1908.

This described how the unscrupulous, power hungry Premier Stibbins decides to found a new dynasty — dedicated to the degradation of whites and the suppression of free institutions — in co-operation with a Chinese Australian millionaire and speculator, Sir Wong Hung Foo. To cement this alliance, Stibbins offers his daughter Stella in marriage to Sir Wong. But, happily for the readers, Stella is saved from this "fate worse than death" by the arrival of the dashing young leader of the anti-Chinese league — appropriately named John Saxby — who exposes Sir Wong as the murderer of his childhood sweetheart. Faced with the undeniable truth of this disclosure and made increasingly aware of the physical and spiritual contrast between her new husband and the young, honest and virile Saxby, Stella turns from the 'yellow man' she had once regarded as her 'lover and [her] king' and vows to cease working against her race and to "... act as well as be white".

Lane's development of a racial war theme in this serial was in part derived from Herbert Spencer's notions of a racial struggle, but additionally, it exemplified his own personal philosophy. Lane's race-war was sustained by protective sexual instincts and was directed not only against Chinese, but also upper class whites who had betrayed their race by consorting with "the yellows". Thus the socialist struggle could be here combined with the race struggle.

Just as Herbert Spencer had argued in his Principles of Sociology that we:

... must regard as relatively good that which furthers survival of the society, great as may be the suffering inflicted on its members

— so Lane too maintained that individual, "caste", business and family loyalties must all give way before the higher loyalty of
The Hon. Samuel Griffith declares that he prefers Chinese to any other colored labor because it is "more easily controlled."

*The Figaro* of 1883 imagines what it might be like (July).
race. In the Race War, Stella's mother finally shoots and kills Sir Wong rather than see her daughter enslaved by him. Again, under the pseudonym of "Lucinda Sharpe" — the 'authoress' of the Worker's ladies' column, Lane made the now famous — or perhaps infamous comment:

I would not do a black man harm or a yellow man or a green man for that matter but I'd sooner see a daughter of mine dead in her coffin than kissing one of them on the mouth or nursing a little coffee-coloured brat that she was mother to. . .

Similarly there was to be no mercy shown for the "white Chinamen" — those whites who "conspire[d] against our race" by employing or trading with Asiatics. Lane urged that they too should not "go unpunished" and in the Boomerang of 1888, he wrote:

Words cannot express our contempt and hatred for those whites who are fighting against their own kith and kin in this racial struggle. They deserve no consideration. The Chinese must go, and their friends, those white traitors had better be flung out with them.

He demanded that all whites should "stand together" and the "bland round face[d]" Chinese who were "watching them all slowly going down lower and lower, [and] were waiting to leap upon them in their last helplessness and enslave them all. . ." should be "driven out like cattle". As he stirringly proclaimed in an article entitled "Australia for Australians":

While we plough our fields and measure our calicos and swing our hammers, History is being made and we ourselves are taking part in a stirring drama. . . Here we face the hordes of the East as our kinsmen faced them in the dim distant centuries, and here we must beat them back if we would keep intact all that can make our lives worth living. It does not matter that today it is an insidious invasion of peaceful aliens instead of a warlike downpour of weaponed men. This is the industrial age. Our wars are industrial wars. These clannish and unchangeable coolies and Chinamen, will surely clean the white man from the far South — if we let them.

In William Lane's writings, we have one of the most consistent expositions of racial theories, and this combined with his
"fevered rhetoric" perhaps accounts for his great appeal. Still, one cannot ignore the fact that he was reflecting and reinforcing attitudes already strongly entrenched in the general community. His plea for a white Queensland was thoroughly endorsed, not only by other anti-Chinese agitators but by conservative politicians as well. In 1888, J.T. Annear, the owner of a mercantile company and the Member for Maryborough, stated in terms very reminiscent of Lane's that:

Queensland was for white man and should be kept for white men; and by proper government would always remain a white man's country.

Similarly Lane's personal and pluralist horror of miscegenation was repeated by other journals and individuals. In one petition to the Government it was described as a “malignant and infectious moral disease” while even as late as 1915, a resident of Maytown, Mr A. Low wrote to the Colonial Secretary to complain of the “... ghouls in the shape of human beings who are so debased and mentally degenerated to allow their vicious passions to overcome them and breed a half caste pestilence”. In the final analysis, “all Chinese sexual activity became debauch[ery] and all white women associating with them were classed as “the most debased type of courtesan[s]” who “became in turn sources of unspeakable moral contamination”. With no real evidence to support them, newspapers and parliamentarians circulated horrifying tales of girls being tempted to “opium and damnation”. The Progress described one woman who was “. . . in a pitiful state bordering on delirium and evidently very weak with sickness and possessed of a great terror”. They assumed her to have been doped and beaten by fiendish Chinese, but at the end of the item were forced to admit they were actually unsure of the real cause of her condition. Again, the Queensland Figaro after alluding to an incident of pack rape by white larrikins in Sydney, went on to describe it as though it were a Chinese crime:

... these scenes are committed half a dozen times a week in Chinatown [Brisbane]. Are our bland and sleepy-looking Chinese a whit more virtuous, a whit more restrained than those of Sydney? Have not white girls been decoyed by dozens to the opium fiend? Have not white baby-girls been stolen by Chinese and grown for vile purposes. I have heard many stories, of the kind, but not until it was too late for me to trace the children and authenticate the horrible narrations.
The dominant Chinese stereotype which emerged from similar dubious accounts reiterated in the press, pictured them “... herding together like pups in a kennel, and knowing no luxuries beyond opium, fantan, gambling”, and a community of “white girls and women they debauch”.

Consequently one finds clergymen and other respectable bodies setting out to “recover” white women living near the Chinese quarters, for like many others they seemed unable to credit that any European woman could want to associate or marry a Chinese of her own volition. As Charles Eden pointed out in his travel book, *My Wife and I in Queensland*:

> An alliance of this sort is very much depreciated in the bush, a Chinaman being looked upon as inferior even to a black fellow, and on this occasion it was more particularly objectionable, as the woman could have got a white husband at any time she liked.

It is indeed ironical that the only major attempt to redress this balance of accusations was made by Francis Adams, a well known British poet, essayist and critic, who became a close associate of William Lane and one of the colony’s celebrated anti-Chinese writers. Adams deplored the extremities to which Lane’s pluralist position led him, for he argued “that for sins and shame and filth... and in the matter of brutal cruelty and crime” the white man was “the worst of the two”. According to Adams the cries of “orthodox indignation against Chinese vice and filth” were those of “rogues and hypocrites”.

Another relic of the polygenesist debate which stressed that Chinese were incapable of assimilating democratic principles, also received widescale support. The Liberal politician Samuel Griffith, and groups such as the Queensland Employers Association argued that “inferior” beings needed special laws and must occupy the position of a “governed race” — one “repugnant to our whole system of government”. A.G. Stephens, the articulate editor of the *Gympie Miner* and, later, the *Bulletin*, developed this idea further and claimed that the inclusion of Chinese, Melanesians and Aborigines into an “ideal” democracy “would be a degradation” for “We are the heirs of European civilization, and we cannot merge our nationality to a barbarism to which European civilization is incomprehensible”. Any evidence contrary to this, showing the Chinese as loyal to the Government or as accepting democratic ideals was either conveniently ignored or actually turned against
the aliens. In 1900 after they had taken part in a patriotic procession at Bundaberg, the *Progress* argued:

... was the procession not rather marred by those Chinamen. For Heaven's sake don't let us take every snivelling alien to our breasts in the name of loyalty! ... their presence was... an outrage on British susceptibility.\(^{542}\)

Much has been made by certain historians of the fact that "the early anti-Chinese movement arose out of the economic interests and aspirations of the working class", rather than from specific racial antagonisms.\(^{543}\) Their error lies in disregarding the essential point that the so-called 'economic' threat posed by Chinese was closely tied to the racist acceptance of them as irrevocably servile. William Lane argued that just as Chinese would degrade white women, so too would they "demoralize and degrade" white labour\(^{544}\) — the sort of labour that led to individual self-advancement. Thus he demanded:

Are we to be a free state... in which industry will be held honorable and labour holy, or are we to be a slave-worked nation, in which nigger-driving land-holders will turn up their noses when they pass honest workers?\(^{545}\)

The union movement and the anti-Chinese leagues condemned the "slavish toil, [the] miserly habits and uneven competition of hordes of Chinese".\(^{546}\) As the labour movement saw it, the Chinese were threatening the whole basis of unionism for as cheap labourers they were seen as perpetuating the capitalist class — the "white Chinamen" who employed them.\(^{547}\) Like all newly migrated communities, the Chinese in Queensland were more "occupied in making a living in new lands" than in pursuing "opportunities for self-improvement".\(^{548}\) Still, in 1877, J.D. Crawford, the British Consular Agent from Shanghai, indicated in his perceptive report upon Queensland's Chinese that they had become very independent here because of "the influence of Australian institutions and the attractions of high wages" — that even when they were working for one of their own countrymen they "persistently harrass[ed] him with fresh demands on his purse".\(^{549}\) As already pointed out, the indentured Chinese coolies rebelled against their lower wages by calling the first strikes on the Darling Downs,\(^{550}\) by violence and, in the last resort, by absconding. Their European employers were unanimous in arguing that they were a far cry from the docile servants they had
expected. Similarly, there is very little evidence to support the continually reiterated claim that the Chinese artisan class — who were moving quickly into the industrial vacuum existing in the Colony — were actually working for significantly longer hours or less money than white cabinet makers or craftsmen. The Chinese themselves argued that they had "... always demanded the highest possible wages", but were handicapped somewhat by their "inability to speak English and the prejudice against them".551

But in the speeches of labour publicists it was not just the servility of the Chinese that was exaggerated, but the issue of the "white Chinaman" as well. Actually white employers and pastoralists accused of apostasy against their race were also to denounce, on several occasions, the slavishness of Asians,552 to urge all white workmen to cease buying the cheaper fish and vegetables of the Chinese hawker553 and to force the alien from industries like fishing, market gardening and domestic service where they enjoyed a virtual monopoly.554 But the labour enthusiasts were not to be deflected from their hard and fast ideas. Thus they continued to berate Chinese for not advancing the cause of the worker, while excluding them from union membership and chance to amalgamate with white labourers: The Queensland Shearer's Union, going one better than this, even prohibited from membership any white man:

who worked for anyone who employed Chinese, who had commercial dealings with Chinese, or who patronized any merchant or storekeeper who dealt with or employed Chinese.555

In the same way they continued to subsume a wider question of capitalist oppression within an obsessive preoccupation with the Chinese issue. As Humphrey McQueen has observed, laborites were racist before they were socialist.556 As will be made clearer later in this section, 'influentials' in the community also had a vested interest in keeping the anti-Chinese struggle alive, for this race question could be utilized to over-ride other tensions in the society and maintain the status quo. Thus, in assessing reasons for the failure of socialism in Queensland, racist preoccupations ought not to be overlooked.

Of all the pluralist assumptions popularized in Queensland the one which prompted the greatest emotional response was the fear that:

In spite of our ceaseless watchfulness the Chinaman will eventually import, along with his sour greasy carcase, some
one of the fearful plagues which have scourged the impure races of the East for so many centuries.\(^{557}\)

It was commonly held that the diseases of coloured men were always the most "loathsome", \(^{558}\) "revolting" \(^{559}\) and "gruesome" \(^{560}\) of scourges. According to one doctor, they conjured up "... visions of unutterable misery and woe, with all the horrors of the Inferno".\(^{561}\) Of these "germs", the most horrendous was leprosy, \(^{562}\) and in Queensland this disease, seemingly, could still invoke remnants of an almost Medieval terror. The press could find only the most emotive and highly pejorative terms to describe it. Thus, a poem entitled "The Chinese Leper" in the Clermont Truth characterized "the yellow, gaunt and grim" leper, Ah Ling, living "Up a dark and foetid alley/In a hovel reeking pestilence and noisome as the grave".\(^{563}\) In 1898, the Worker included a narrative concerning "A Visit to the Queensland White Leper Station"\(^{564}\) where they found one young white boy whose "... flesh had been eaten away from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet".

The article continued:

We were looking on a breathing skeleton. The whole body was the colour of a piece of raw meat turning black with decay. The features had disappeared—nothing being left but the bones covered with large repulsive scales.

It was hardly to be wondered at, therefore, that the whites lived in dread of contracting this infection, especially since the radical press spread the idea that "all Asiatics and Polynesians" were "simply saturated with leprosy germs".\(^{565}\) According to newspapers like the Boomerang and the Worker, the disease did not always manifest itself openly upon these aliens, and "... scores of leprous Asiatics might roam the city and country broadcasting the disease without fear of detection".\(^{566}\) One article from the Worker, entitled "Leprous Suppositions" told of a "kanaka" servant who:

\[\ldots\] infected his master when he handed him the reins of the carriage, the master in turn infected the Police Inspector, who infected the Judge, and eventually the ranks of the diseased included the Speaker of the House, the Ministry, and even His Excellency the Governor.\(^{567}\)

Certain items claimed that leprosy "poisons the air" and spreads the germs around".\(^{568}\) while others believed it was transmitted by flies or other insects.\(^{569}\) Yet, while these sentiments may appear far fetched, they rapidly captured the public
imagination. This was compounded by the fact that a great deal of uncertainty existed even among qualified medical practitioners concerning the mode of infection. The findings of the London College of Physicians — published in the *Queenslander* as early as 1867 — stated that there was "... no foundation whatever that this disease is under any circumstances contagious or infectious", for it was not transferable between husband and wife and attendants in leper hospitals were free from it. Yet the most common belief among Queensland doctors was that expressed by Dr J. Bancroft, an Honorary Surgeon at the Brisbane Hospital, who wrote in a report to the Intercolonial Medical Congress of Australia, that leprosy had been brought into Australia by Chinese and was then "... distributed by mosquitoes carrying the diseased blood to water tanks and elsewhere". He concluded that unless "Asiatic and Polynesian lepers" were removed "... to a considerable distance from the residences of the colonists, the disease will spread amongst ourselves". Other doctors seemed to be completely ignorant of the cause or appearance of leprosy and several cases of ringworm were wrongly diagnosed as such. In 1903, a medical officer at Croydon reported that his patient Ah Gin was "... suffering from either leprosy or syphilis, but which of the two it is I cannot say".

The anti-Chinese propagandists were able to profit from this atmosphere of uncertainty, and leprosy campaigns became a cornerstone of much of their agitation. According to William Lane, if "the influx of inferior races" continued for the next fifty years then "Australia will be the most leprous country in the world". By a judicious choice of words they were able to foster the impression that leprosy was synonymous with the Chinese presence. Thadeus O'Kane called them "leprosy faced hounds"; The *Eagle* "unwashed leprous brutes", while according to a modern writer on this theme, the use of phrases like "disease — discoloured devils" tends to suggest "... that people believed that the yellow skin of the Chinese was a symptom of the disease". At the same time the radical press suggested that the colonists were being duped by the conservative press, doctors, capitalists and the government, who were deliberately minimizing the threat of leprosy so that they could continue to exploit cheap coloured labour.

Public reaction to these frightening diatribes was predictably extreme. Whites were wary of living near the Chinese quarter or eating Chinese-grown vegetables for fear of infection. Others wrote to newspapers to complain that in steamers trading along the coast Whites and Chinese were expected to use the same "blankets, sheets and pillows", and asked that:
Racial contamination and white suffering.
Some distinction should be made in the colour of bedding supplied to Chinkies and to Europeans, in which case the latter could avoid using those of celestial hues... rather than to camp in sheets in which leprosy may have revelled on the previous trip.\textsuperscript{584}

To the frightened colonists, even dead Chinese could be a possible source of infection, so that when the cruiser, \textit{Leichhardt} was commissioned to carry a Chinese coffin to Mackay, the crewmen became so uneasy that they threw it overboard.\textsuperscript{585} Innumerable other incidents testified to Queenslander's fears of contagion, although until 1890, they were responding to the threat of infection, rather than to proof that they could actually contract the disease. But during the nineties, there were sixteen reputed European cases of leprosy.\textsuperscript{586} The greatest outcry occurred when, in 1895, it was reported that a young white boy attending the Brisbane Normal School had been certified as a leper. According to the radical press the undeniable presence of this "awful" Asiatic malady could no longer be ignored or tolerated.\textsuperscript{587}

In assessing the reasons for this communal response, it is not enough to attribute it simply to press propaganda, for the fears were also endorsed by official sources. In 1877 two lepers were discovered in the Chinese quarter at Cooktown, and panic immediately erupted. Although the local health officer told the police magistrate, Howard St George, that it was "neither infectious nor contagious"\textsuperscript{588} St George preferred to respond to the "strong general idea prevailing among the European and Chinese population" demanding "these men... be sent away and isolated".\textsuperscript{589} Consequently, they were banished to Great Lizard Island; the public furore died down; and the two lepers were not mentioned again. Only one month after the Cooktown incident, a Chinese prisoner in Rockhampton was declared leprous and was ordered to be segregated in a small wooden hut near the jail.\textsuperscript{590} An official visitor there, Mr Pugh wrote to the Colonial Secretary:

\begin{quote}
Although there is no positive danger of contagion it would not do to turn him loose on society... I see nothing for it but to arrest him as a vagrant as soon as he comes out, and put him back again until he can otherwise be dealt with.\textsuperscript{591}
\end{quote}

So, for the next three years, the Rockhampton leper became, in the words of R.L. Evans, "the colony's most stationary vagrant."\textsuperscript{592} When he died in March 1881, his cell, with his body
still inside was put to the torch and his ashes blanketed in quick-
lime. By responding to these patients as if their disease was
highly contagious, government officials lent a great deal of
legitimization to prevailing fears.

Parliamentarians and officials were also to initiate an
administrative policy towards lepers that was almost unparalleled
in its inhumanity. When in 1881 two lepers were ordered to be
segregated on the North Shore of Cooktown, the Police
Magistrate there noted that the hands of one of them were so
badly decomposed that he would be unable to cook, light fires or
collect wood. In actual fact, the man never left his tent until he
died. Similarly those men confined on Fitzroy Island in 1882,
were later reported to be “almost dead from neglect” because the
persons previously supplying them with food rations were now
too frightened to go to their compound. The Government's
only reaction was to stress that they had no intention of incurring
expenses in this respect. The first lazaret in Queensland,
Dayman Island, likewise had a history that “was neither a proud
nor a long one”. Like all the islands commandeered for leper
patients it was largely uninhabitable; and according to one of the
more outspoken critics of the Government’s leper policy, Dr W.F.
Taylor:

... lepers were sent to Dayman Island with the idea that the
sooner they were got rid of the better. They could not poison
them, or shoot them, or hang them, so they sent them to an
island in the Pacific and let them die there.

His contention was certainly borne out by the statistics, for, of the
sixteen lepers confined here, fifteen had died — thirteen of them
from bronchial infections resulting from their lack of shelter, and
two from suicides. Another doctor, A.E. Salter, the Medical
Officer at Thursday Island offered the meagre defence that
although these victims were lepers and Chinese “... notwithstanding
these two qualities ... they are also human
beings” and so should be given some consideration. Yet his
advice was disregarded and in the years following, although
white lepers were kept comparatively close to civilization at
Dunwich, coloured patients continued to find themselves on
inaccessible and uninviting islands.

In 1893, Horace Tozer, the Colonial Secretary, declared that his
Government would initiate a leprosy bill to “... remove the
scares which [have] affected not only private individuals but
government departments”. The resulting Act to Provide for the
Treatment and the Detention and Isolation of Lepers was dubbed
by Dr Taylor: "... drastic legislation... which would frighten... the life out of people", for persons not reporting leprosy cases could be fined up to £100, while an escaped suspect could be returned to custody "... with such necessary force as the case may require". When in 1897 this Act was reinforced by regulations which demanded the strict segregation and the disinfecting and burning of the leper’s clothes, dressing and excrement the public became totally convinced that this must be "the most loathsome and incurable disease that afflicts the human species" and began indulging in what Horace Tozer termed, "a new industry" — "Leper Hunting". Just a few months after the leprosy bill was enacted, telegrams began arriving from Townsville, Boulia, Maytown, Cooktown, Cunnamulla and Cairns all reporting "suspected leprosy" cases. In July, a Chinese gardener at Herberton with "swelled feet and legs" was arrested but later cleared. In March when a Courier reporter entered a Chinese boarding house in Brisbane:

He soon noticed a Chinaman in a sort of shed... whose movement struck him as somewhat strange. 'A suspected leper, I declare!' he ejaculated.

Despite protests from Tozer, 'the hunt' continued, and still in 1895 a Brisbane storekeeper recommended that Chinese be prevented from disposing clothing in licenced pawnshops for "some Chinese leper" no doubt had "slept" in them.

The powerful articulation and reinforcement of such anti-Chinese stereotypes by propagandists and establishment bodies alike resulted in the aliens being identified not simply as a pariah group, but, more significantly, as a scapegoat. It had become no longer sufficient merely to continue depriving, or containing the Chinese, but rather, as John Rex has shown, they —

... must be brought before the courts for offences not merely against the law, but against what is thought of as common morality, they must be found guilty and given exemplary sentences. And it will be important not merely that the courts act in this way, but that all "influentials" in the ruling group press home the lesson through their sermons, their newspaper articles and any other means of persuasion available.

Thus the Chinese were to be singled out as accountable for "failures of the system" — a social mechanism emphasizing
maintenance of the "host societies structure and value system". The most obvious Chinese offence against the articulated norms was of course their well publicized disease and immorality. For instance, the press, the Government, various humanitarians and members of the general public all concurred in relating the demise of the Aboriginal remnant to the opium and disease obtained from Orientals. Although early in the 1880s there were isolated reports of Chinese supplying drugs to Aborigines, there was no real concerted campaign to link examples of Asiatic degradation with the Doomed Race Theory until later in that decade. So, when it was claimed in 1885 that Aborigines on the North Shore near Cooktown had contracted leprosy from the Chinese, the local townspeople were only concerned with problems of contagion and segregation. But when a similar discovery was made on the Etheridge field in 1888, the Chinese had become identified as the scapegoat, and on this occasion the energies of the press and townspeople were directed at condemning the "insidious Chinkie" who had made "this fair land his home" and had been "... the means of conveying to the aboriginal of the soil, the horrible disease". The local Police Officer wrote to the Queenslander that leprosy would "cause greater havoc than did even the evil effects of rum or opium". Nevertheless, while the spectre of leprosy was to loom threateningly over the issue of Chinese-Aboriginal relations, the dominant stereotype proclaimed that the main cause of Aboriginal extinction was "the accursed opium habit". In Queensland — and indeed Australia — the smoking and marketing of opium was "indulged in so ostentatiously" by the Chinese that the impression created was that there was a "... larger consumption than the actual quantity of the drug imported would seem to warrant". Similarly, from the time it was first reported that Aborigines were taking opium, the idea developed that they were "... saturated with the noxious drug, and degraded beyond all explanation [sic]". The mere appearance of one of them with a "dull, opium, sickly appearance" was all the proof required by the public or local police officers. It is impossible then to gauge accurately the prevalence of opium smoking amongst Chinese and Aborigines, particularly as the latter were known to use a traditional narcotic plant, pitcheri, the apparent effects of which were similar to opium. Yet what is indisputable is that both poorer Chinese and Aborigines consumed either the adulterated drug or opium charcoal which had a stronger and more deleterious effect. One writer to the Commissioner of Police in 1910 told how the Aborigines would mix this ash with water and swallow it, and afterwards their abdomen would "... inflate... rendering them
Another more exaggerated report described how one addict "... lost his flesh, and his skin had become yellow and sickly. ... He was a mere skeleton and presumably on the brink of the grave". Archibald Meston, the Aboriginal protector contributed further by narrating how: "Opium apparently takes complete possession of the aboriginal, to the paralysis of mental and physical faculties. ...". He was further convinced that it had been responsible for the deaths of thousands of Aborigines within only ten years. The Northern Protector, Walter Roth supported his statement, when he wrote to the Home Secretary that: "This drug is exerting a far more baneful influence on the aboriginal than even liquor and venereal disease".

Roth's statement is interesting for it illustrates the progression of the scapegoating process, as by an effective transference system, the whites were able to divest themselves of their guilt concerning the ravages of venereal disease and alcohol on the Aborigines and attribute the greater responsibility to 'the yellow man's' vice. As a certain H. Archibald maintained, the blacks "... simply died off through the agency of the Chinese". In 1896 Meston had pointed out in his report:

The Chinese are not the only criminals in this business but so far they have been the scapegoats to carry the more prominent sins of the degrading traffic.

But by 1909 the more acceptable viewpoint was that enunciated by the parliamentarian, J. Deane who argued:

The Chinese were the greatest offenders with regard to the supply of opium. ... they gave it as a perquisite to the gins, who gave what they had to spare to the men.

Official records, however, indicate a similar involvement of whites both in smoking opium themselves, and in retailing it to the blacks. According to Meston, again, it was "... kept on many. ... stations and given to the blacks who are engaged as stockmen, in some cases as whole or part of their wages". These employers argued that unless they provided this enticement, they could not keep their Aboriginal workers. Thus a highly organized opium traffic flourished throughout the West. Meston told the Legislative Council in 1901 that he had known it to be sent to properties "in every conceivable form", even in "... the barrels of a double-barrelled muzzle loading gun". Other writers stated that it was not just the station-owners but "... nearly every carrier, banker, many of the swagmen and some of the mailmen" who were selling it. As Meston summarized the
whole situation: "... in the West opium is as common as sugar".637

By the late eighties, with the opium traffic becoming a well publicized scandal, parliamentarians attempted unsuccessfully to control the trade.638 Finally in 1891 they enacted the *Sale and Use of Poisons Act* which declared that "no certificate of fitness" would be awarded to an Asiatic to sell 'poisons' — a label they interpreted as including opium. This legislation had little effect but to increase drug smuggling and it was made largely inoperative when John Douglas reported from Thursday Island that a charge of opium possession against a European, John Lewis, had been dismissed on the grounds that opium was not a poison.639 So in 1897 a new bill was introduced, and as its title, *The Aborigines Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act* intimated, eleven of the thirty-two clauses dealt with the supply of this drug to Aborigines, and heavy fines were devised as a preventative. In contrast, the clauses dealing with the 'white' vice of alcohol provision to natives were softened considerably in the debate and the penalties weakened rather than strengthened. It was not thought that "... anyone would prosecute a person for giving an aborigine a little liquor for work done, or by way of a gift" for "... the fine was altogether out of proportion to the offence".640

Although this legislation did not specifically mention the Chinese, it is not surprising to find that most of the hardships stemming from its clauses fell most heavily upon Chinese scapegoats.641 For instance, the Act provided for half the fine levied on any person convicted of opium charges to be awarded to an "informant" who had brought on the case. Inadvertently, this provided a heaven-sent opportunity to many petty criminals or corrupt policemen who began to use Aboriginal decoys and to extort protection money from the more defenceless Chinese.642 In administering the Act, fines were imposed selectively, and often according to definite racial considerations. At *Meteor Downs*, opium for the local Aborigines was circulated by the station cook and gardener — both Chinese. But they were merely the go-betweens for the real suppliers, the white book-keepers. Yet, although these facts were reported, only the Chinese were prosecuted.643 Similarly, when Archibald Meston was shown a detailed report of opium trading upon white-owned cattle stations around Maryborough, his only comment was "contents noted", and it was filed away.644 According to an Acting Sergeant of Police writing from Blackwater, the police could not deal with station owners trading in opium in the same way they did 'ordinary business people or Chinamen'.645 Thus when opium case lists are examined, it is revealed that almost every arrest made
under this Act was of a Chinese, most of whom were given heavy fines; the Europeans convicted were 'punished' to the tune of five shillings, one shilling, or one hour's jail.***

The sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal has shown that the very process of scapegoating leads to "increased hostility and discrimination and hence to increased demands for punishment".**' Hence it was not sufficient merely to penalize and discriminate against Chinese in this way; the persecution had to be extended even further. Chinese were continually singled out for debauching and infecting Aboriginal "girls" with loathsome diseases*** and were regularly censured for "harbouring blacks" for "immoral purposes".**' Following the 1897 Act both Meston and Roth decreed that they would award no Aboriginal employment permits to Asiatics.*** Although Roth could state that, "Reputable Chinamen are amongst the best employers of aboriginals [sic] — they do pay them their wages",*" his actions generally belied his words. When in 1898, European members of the Ayr Farmer's and Barron Valley Progress Associations found themselves unable to obtain sufficient native workmen, they turned upon the local Chinese community with accusations of enticing the blacks away through opium.*'* Roth found no substantiation for their "alleged. . . protest", but his recommendation was, illogically enough, that "as a matter of expediency" and "in pursuance of my views in general", the Chinese should not employ Aborigines.**' Meston's motives for separating the races was largely related to a personal abhorrence of miscegenation. As he stated to the Legislative Council in 1901:

I have a strong aversion to the intermixture of black and white races; and without express instructions from the Home Secretary, I would never sanction a marriage of that kind.***

His repugnance of Chinese-Aboriginal liaisons was even more extreme. He wrote:

Our marriage has no meaning to a Chinaman. The Chinese have killed many hundreds of aborigines with opium, and it is asking too much that the unfortunate race thus cruelly wronged be asked to supply women for their deadliest enemies.***

When Charles Lee Loy applied for permission to marry a half-caste girl he had been living with for four years Meston not only refused this but had the two forcibly separated.*** He then tried
unsuccessfully to enforce her marriage to a native tracker who was revealed as her half brother. Under a subsequent Protector, J.W. Bleakley, a similar policy persisted. In 1916 Hom Yuen, a merchant to Thursday Island, armed with character references from the Mayor, the Town Clerk, a Justice of the Peace and six other Europeans, applied for permission to marry a half-caste girl. After two years of appeals the Protector remained adamant that such marriages could not be countenanced. The girl was sent off to a mission reserve and when Hom Yuen pursued her there he was simply fined £50 for visiting a reserve without permission. Such restrictions, constantly applied by local officials, constituted, in the end result, a pattern of intolerable harassment. In 1910 after the Chinese had been in the Tully district for eight years, the Sergeant of Police was able to report that owing to their “vigilance” in patrolling the Chinese camp and watching them for any contact with the blacks, these had finally given up, and the area was almost entirely deserted of the aliens.

The Chinese scapegoat was also used to inveigle the public in the field of colonial politics. In November 1878, European seamen working for the Australasian Steam Navigation Company struck work in protest against the firm’s employment of Chinese sailors on the Pacific and North Queensland ‘runs’. Following so closely upon the much feared ‘invasion’ of Chinese miners, this incident provoked widespread public reaction against ‘John Chinaman’ s monopolizing of another branch of white industry. Union organizations in Victoria, Queensland and South Australia gave monetary aid to the strikers and the Trades and Labour Councils in Sydney, and Brisbane provided moral support. A special anti-Chinese committee was formed in Brisbane to campaign for their cause and secure further relief funds. The seamen likewise won the approval of the traditional ‘enemies’ of the working man: the conservative press, as well as many businessmen and traders. In Brisbane, Cooktown and Mackay, these people held meetings which pledged a total boycott upon the A. & N. Company’s steamers until they ceased employing Chinese workers. In Rockhampton, the public outcry reached such proportions that when one of the Company’s ships docked there, a crowd gathered, and a Chinese sailor was seized and pulled from the gangway onto the wharf. When he refused to pay the landing tax demanded by the mob he was imprisoned, and only released when the Colonial Secretary called for an enquiry into the matter. Finally the Government itself acceded to the pressure of public opinion and threatened to cancel the very lucrative mail subsidy contract held by the Company, stating that in future this was to be awarded only to those
shipping firms which did not employ Asiatics or Polynesians. Faced with this eventuality, the Company managers had little choice but to capitulate, and their Chinese crewmen were progressively displaced: 210 of them returned immediately to Hong Kong with a settlement of one month's wages each.

The overwhelming support received by the striking seamen not only gave tremendous impetus to the union movement in Queensland, but effectively demonstrated to all the political importance of the anti-Chinese issue. In subsequent years, this question was constantly utilized as a "political red herring" and became part of the creed of the various labour organizations. The Trades and Labour Council, the Labour Federations, the various Queensland branches of the Australian Republican Association and most of the union groups, especially the Maritime Federation, the Furniture Manufacturers' Association and the Cooks and Shearers' Unions all adopted resolutions against the Chinese as part of their general platforms. Even so, the labour press continued to agitate for further union commitment to this cause. In Mackay, the Mercury attempted to unite the embryonic workingman's movement there by campaigning on the Chinese issue while in 1888, the Boomerang and the Northern Miner pressed farmers to form associations which would help combat Chinese gardeners. In the same way, articles dealing with the question of the Woman's Movement focussed on the Asiatics as sexual exploiters, and urged housewives to become politicized and boycott Chinese vegetable vendors.

Within the parliamentary sphere the Asiatic question was similarly "used as a political tool", and in 1886, even the strongly anti-Chinese newspaper, The Queensland Figaro reported, that because of this "we are getting too much of him". The paper continued:

If a member of Parliament... betrays the interests of his constituents, he defends his action by an anti-Chinese oration, which is received with applause, although the Chinkie had nothing to do with the subject of discussion, and was dragged in merely to divert attention from the point at issue.

The Chinese debate became a constant feature of election campaigns. For instance, in 1883, the electoral battle was fought almost entirely on the conflicting racial attitudes of the two contenders for government leadership, Samuel Griffith and Sir...
Thomas McIlwraith. Originally these two had widely diverging attitudes to coloured labour, for McIlwraith had committed himself to introduce Indian coolies and Griffith had shown himself during the invasion scare of the seventies, to favour strong restrictions against a Chinese influx. Early in 1883, however, Griffith argued that the Chinese were no longer a danger to Queensland for the legislative battle against them had been fought and won. The radical press interpreted this softening policy as an even greater danger than the potential arrival of Indian workmen. The *Queensland Figaro* mounted a particularly fierce campaign against him, and kept his statement constantly before the public by repeatedly referring to the Chinese as “Sam’s pets” and Griffith himself as “Ah Sam”. They also initiated the popular column, “Memorandums (Mems.) for Sam” — later “The Yellow Agony Column” — to show that there was a real danger from “Sam’s loathsome Yellow Agony”. As their campaign escalated towards the approaching election, Griffith was forced to adopt a stronger anti-Chinese line, or, as the versifier of the *Figaro* wrote:

The stumbling Samuel cried aloud
In one unbroken wail:
Place me in power with all my crowd
I’ll cut this vile pigtail

After this volte-face, the election resolved itself into a debate upon the general issue of importing coolie labour, and Griffith’s strong stand against this would appear to be at least partially responsible for ensuring his subsequent victory.

Once again in 1888, events conspired to force the Chinese question into public prominence as an important electoral issue. In May the previous year, an official commission arrived in Australia from China on a general tour, inspecting the condition of overseas Chinese communities in various Spanish, Dutch and British colonies. In Queensland, the anti-Chinese groups offered a very hostile reception, and argued that the commissioners were “simply slave inspectors”, here to “... see if there was room for a much larger introduction of ‘the yellow agony’”. Anti-Chinese leagues, workers’ unions and employer’s associations all denounced “the pigtailed animals” and demanded these aliens be restricted even further. Nor did the excitement abate with the commissioner’s departure. It was soon disclosed that the Chinese representative in London had formally protested to the British Government against the discriminatory poll tax levied upon his countrymen in the Australian Colonies. For many whites, China’s “secret plans” became even clearer after one southern
newspaper announced that "a powerful syndicate of Hong Kong and Canton merchants" had begun forcing hundreds of Chinese through the one port they could enter tax-free — Darwin.690 The old ‘invasion’ stories were resurrected once more, innumerable references being newly directed at an “awakened” China, which had made such “progress”, particularly “in the arts of modern warfare”.691 The public responded predictably: Government departments and the press were swamped with letters and petitions692 In Brisbane, public demonstrations were held in March and April of 1888, and the anti-Chinese league officiating decided that their goals would best be implemented if they kept the question before the people in the coming electoral campaign.693

Only those candidates who guaranteed to legislate against the aliens would be supported. After the Boomerang began to include virulent cartoons and stories on several candidates like John Stevenson who had refused to speak at an anti-Chinese rally,694 there was a general rush among political aspirants to pledge themselves to find “all the constitutional means and others if necessary to keep Chinese out of Queensland”.695 One challenger put forward his claim to the Drayton and Toowoomba constituency by stating that he had “never eaten a mouthful of vegetables grown by a Chinaman.”696 McIlwraith and Griffith, again battling for leadership, were now united in their opposition to Chinese,697 but the Conservatives tried to resurrect the 1883 issue by “securing a cab bearing the Griffith-ites instructions to voters, filling it with Chinamen and sending it through the streets of the city”.698

Acts of larrikinism against coloured aliens increased sharply699 and on the 11th May a full scale riot occurred in the centre of Brisbane. A crowd estimated at 1,000 rampaged through the Chinese quarters smashing the windows of their shops and terrorizing individual aliens they caught in the streets.700 In the police summary on the incident, Inspector Lewis maintained, “. . . that it was a few larrikins who threw the stones”, but he added a rider:

I noticed that every time a stone crashed through the glass, a loud and hearty cheer was given by the crowd showing plainly they were in full sympathy with the ruffians who made this dastardly attack and whom they shielded by their presence and support.701

In the years afterwards the Chinese question declined in importance as an electoral issue, but it was never to die out entirely. In 1895, W.H. Browne had “. . . the black flag, the
yellow flag and the brown flag waved in the faces of electors", and in 1899 with the prospect of Federation, candidates in some areas revived the question of "a white or piebald Queensland".

The racial debate also became entangled in the broader question of the unification of the Colonies, for their common problems with Chinese immigrants had drawn them closer together. Similarly, Queensland's imperial links with Britain were questioned on the basis of English alliances with China. As the Boomerang exclaimed angrily in 1888:

If she [Britain] thinks that in order to prevent her foreign arrangements getting tangled, we're going to put up with the yellow agony and run the risk of losing our children's land she's much mistaken.

Even after unified and severely restrictive policies had been instituted in 1888 for all the Australian colonies and the immigration of Chinese had almost entirely ceased, newspapers such as the Worker continued to level abuse at the aliens and demand proof from the Government "... that the colour fight is over". Thus, continual legislation to restrict and contain the remaining Chinese was offered. As a result of pressure from the Furniture Manufacturers Union, The Factories and Workshop Act of 1888, ruled that all furniture made by Asiatic labour was to be stamped accordingly. This Act also defined a 'factory' as "any place in which one Chinese is employed". This small item was effectively to preclude craftsmen from moving easily into the industrial workforce, for many employers were not prepared to place their workshops under the heading of 'factory' as this would force them to comply with the strict factory legislation. Similarly the Railways Construction (Land Subsidy) Act of 1892, prohibited any railway construction company from employing "Asiatics or Africans not of European descent". A penalty of £1 per employee per day proved an effective deterrent upon contractors and businessmen. In 1898, Horace Tozer issued an inter-departmental memo which amply illustrated how completely the demands of the anti-Chinese agitators had been met. He ordered that certificates of naturalization were only to be issued to those Chinese who were married and who had arrived in Queensland before 1878 — the three years residence imposed by the Aliens Act had grown to twenty. Hence, through a detailed process of verbal harangue and press harrassment as well as overt physical violence and institutionalized discrimination, 'the yellow agony' of the white colonists had been relieved. In areas like agriculture, land holding, mining, manufacturing, politics, unionized labour
and naturalization, the Chinese had gradually been restricted, contained and finally excluded. 

In 1895, the parliamentarian W.H. Browne commented:

I think the people of the colony will be glad to have a sum of money placed on the Estimates for the purpose of paying the passages of these coloured people back to their own country.

Regardless of how the majority of whites felt concerning such a proposed appropriation of public funds, his plan apparently had the approval of the remaining Chinese. A decade or so earlier, those Chinese living near Mackay had included a similar request in a petition to the Queensland Parliament when they stated:

[We]. . . feel certain that the antipathy now held by Europeans against . . . [us]. . . will become still greater as public meetings continue to be called. . . for the purpose of exciting the populace to rise with one voice and say “we will not have Chinamen in our midst”. . . [We]. . . are of opinion that if the Government of this Colony have acted unwisely in making terms on which. . . [we]. . . could come and reside in this Colony. . . [we]. . . are not accountable for said action and consequently should not suffer unjust oppression at the hands of the European public. . . [We]. . . state that the labouring class of. . . [Chinese]. . . ask only what is just when, rather than work or live under oppression they solicit at the hands of your Honourable Government a free passage back to their own country and a refund of the price paid by them for admission into this Colony.

And, as an anti-Chinese correspondent to The Bulletin agreed in 1901, in words approaching something less than this expression of Chinese good manners:

. . . the benevolent Federal Government had better set aside a sum of money, and charter a few steamers to carry back to the greasy-golden, pagoda-decked East the Undesirable [Chow] already here.

For, as The Bulletin continued to preach both tenaciously and rather hysterically in the light of the avowed Chinese intention to withdraw in any case:
The coloured labourer in Australia, like the moon, presents through varying phases one single face. In different languages and with many tones he asks the white Australian one question only: "Is this country to belong to me or to you?" There is no third category; for unrestricted influx of coloured races is not compatible with maintenance of the white breed and the white civilization. Either White or Coloured must be Eclipsed; — for in the strife of races Piebald is nowhere.716

NOTES TO PART THREE

1 Moreton Bay Courier, 2 December, 1848.
2 Brisbane Courier, 13 June 1862.
4 Moreton Bay Courier, 25 March 1848.
6 G. Leslie, to his Parents, 10 May 1847, Leslie Letters, O.M.I., in D. Denholm, op.cit., p.75.
7 A.V. Goleby, op.cit., p.18.
8 M.R. Coolidge, Chinese Immigration, Ch'eng-Wen, Taipei, 1968, p.44.
9 In 1837 two shiploads of Dhangars were imported into the Colony. I.M. Cumpston, Indians Overseas in British Territories 1834-1854, Oxford, London 1953, p.27.
10 Moreton Bay Courier, 17 December 1846.
11 ibid., 30 October 1847.
12 ibid., 4 March 1848.
14 In 1861 the colonists attempted once again to introduce legislation to regulate the coolie trade from India to Queensland. This time although the Act was passed, it proved too expensive to set up Queensland government agents in India who were to supervise recruiting and the transportation of the labourers.
15 Note by Dr Winchester, Enclosure 3 in Dr Bowring to Earl Malmesbury, 25 September 1852, Correspondence with the Superintendent of British Trade in China on the Subject of Emigration from that country. British Parliamentary Papers (B.P.P.), I.XVIII, 1852-3 p.353.
16 Dr Bowring to Earl Malmesbury, 3 August 1852, op.cit., p. 348.
17 P.C. Campbell, Chinese Coolie Emigration to Countries within the British Empire, P.S. King, London, 1923, Chapter III.
19 ibid.
21 Moreton Bay Courier, 2 December 1848.
After the Nimrod left Amoy, complaints were submitted from the parents of two of the coolies who protested that their sons had been enticed away. See — T.H. Layton to J.G. Bonham, 17 July 1848, op.cit.


In January 1850 a shipment of Chinese arrived on the Cadet. (Moreton Bay Courier, 5 Jan 1850). In May 1850, 108 more arrived on the Favourite, (ibid., 11 May 1850), and in June of that year a shipload of 190 were expected from the Amoy (ibid., 22 June 1850).


Moreton Bay Courier, 6 December 1851. It was stated here that there were 588 "Mahomedans and Pagans" in the Colony "not including those of recent importation".

The Masters and Servants Act was enacted by the legislature of New South Wales in 1850. This operated in the Moreton Bay area, until the new parliament of Queensland reintroduced it there in 1861.

D. Archer, to W. Archer, 12 November 1848, A Collection of Letters Mainly from Australia. Written between the years 1833 and 1855, for the most part to W. and Julia Archer of Tolderodden, Larbing, Norway by those sons in New South Wales, Thatchers Memorial Library (T.M.L.).

George Sandeman, Evidence to The Report from the Select Committee on Asiatic Labour, op.cit., p.9.


Governor Bowen, to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 6 January 1860 and 18 December 1860 and Geo. Raff. and Co., Brisbane to Under Secretary, Executive Council, 16 May 1862, Q.S.A. Col/A29, in letter 1443 of 1862.

Memorial from Mr Louis Hope and Others to the Duke of Newcastle, V & P., Qld., 1861, p.649.

ibid.


Petition of Land Stockholders, Merchants and Other Inhabitants of the District of Maryborough, V & P., Qld., 1861.

Governor Normanby, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 7 August 1874, V & P., Qld., 1875, p.560.

In 1862, George Raff and Co. tried to bring in large consignments of coolies from Amoy. G. Raff and Co., to Under Secretary Executive Council, 16 May 1862, Q.S.A., Col/A29 in letter 1443 of 1862. In 1874 Mr H. Eckhouse, the representative of the shipping firm, Bright Bros. and Co. was involved in the coolie trade, V & P., Qld., 1875, p.555. The mercantile firm, Messrs. Butterfield and Swire also attempted to organize the shipment of Chinese labourers. V & P., Qld., 1883-4, p.1421.


Memo to the Principal under Colonial Secretary, 27 April 1875, Enclosure to Q.S.A., Col/A208, in letter 1171 of 1875.

Correspondence Respecting Contract Emigration of Chinese from Hong Kong to Queensland, V & P., Qld., 1883-4, pp.1421-2.

See particularly — Queensland Figaro, May 1883.


This theory has been called the 'germ theory' of culture. See S.C. Miller, The Unwelcome Immigrant, Uni. of California Press, Berkeley, 1969, p.157.

M. Harris, op.cit., p.93.

James McHenley, "The Chinaman Abroad", Cooktown Herald, 29 July 1876.


ibid.

A. Macalister, *op.cit.*, p.52.

"On the Mongolian Race of Eastern Asia", *Anthropological Review*, IV, 1866, p.120. This view of the Chinese was given scientific proof by J. Langdon H. Down, who in 1866 published a paper in the *London Hospital Reports*, entitled, "Observations on an Ethnic Classification of Idiots". He noticed that "A very large number of congenital idiots are typical Mongols", and concluded that they were in fact, examples of racial reversion. See M. Mead, T. Dobzhansky, E. Tobach, and R.E. Light, *Science and the Concept of Race*, Columbia Uni. Press, New York, 1968, pp.38-39.


ibid.


Queensland Punch, 1 December 1878.


Brisbane Courier, 26 November 1878.


ibid., p.43.

Boomerang, 14 December 1889.

Despatch Governor Bowen to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 6 January 1860, *V & P.*, Qld., I, 1861.


Colonist, 30 July 1887.


Thus B. Gulliver, the proprietor of a nursery garden at Townsville stated, "Primarily I employ Chinese labour for cultivating new land with vegetables — and as I improve the land I employ more intelligent labour". *ibid.*, p.256.

R. Jeffray to the Colonial Secretary, 4 October 1884, *V & P*, Qld, 1884, See also *Queenslander*, 15 September 1877, p.25.

Cairns Post, 4 May 1887.

NOTES

79 Q.P.D., LVII, 6 June 1889, p. 172.
80 Q.P.D., LVII, 6 June 1889, p. 156.
81 S.W. Griffith to Lord Carnarvon, V & P., Qld., II, 1877, p.1205.
82 ibid.
83 Petition of Land Stockholders Merchants and Other Inhabitants of the District of Maryborough, V & P., Qld., 24 July 1861.
84 Governor G. Bowen, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 6 January 1860. V & P., Qld., 1, 1861.
85 William Brookes, Brisbane Courier, 10 June 1862. See also Moreton Bay Courier, 11 October 1851.
86 "An Englishman", to the editor, Moreton Bay Courier, 23 October 1847.
87 ibid., 22 March 1851.
88 ibid., 22 May 1851.
89 ibid., 22 November 1851.
90 ibid., 2 August 1851.
91 A.V. Goleby, op.cit., p.12.
92 Moreton Bay Courier, 20 September 1851.
93 A.V. Goleby, op.cit., p.12.
94 Moreton Bay Courier, 11 October 1851.
95 Brisbane Courier, 8 June 1862.
96 ibid., 9 June 1862.
97 At this time, C.W. Blakeney was the representative for Brisbane. See D.B. Waterson, A Biographical Register of the Queensland Parliament 1860-1929. A.N.U. Press, 1972, p. 16.
98 From 1858-1866 W. Brookes was an alderman in the Brisbane City Council, ibid., p.21.
99 Brisbane Courier, 12 July 1862.
100 V & P., Qld., 2nd Session, 25 June 1862.
101 It is interesting that the resolution was defeated by eighteen votes to four. The four assenting votes came from members in the urban electorates of Brisbane and Ipswich, ibid.
102 Brisbane Courier, 26 June 1862.
103 ibid., 10 June 1862.
104 ibid., 13 June 1862.
105 ibid., 10 June 1862.
106 ibid., 13 June 1862.
107 Q.P.D., IX, 12 May 1869, p.129.
108 Mr Taylor, Brisbane Courier, 13 June 1862.
109 George Raff, one of the largest importers of Chinese coolies, claimed that the best way to prevent Chinese Immigration was to allow coolies to come here under proper restrictions. Ibid. See also, T.L. Murray-Prior Q.P.D., LIV, 30 October 1858 p.112.
111 Sir G.F. Bowen, Governor of Queensland, to the Duke of Newcastle, 10 January 1862, Despatch No.4.
112 Queenslander, 24 March 1888.
113 J.D. Macanish, Q.P.D., XLVIII, 30 October 1886, p.135.
114 D.B. Waterson, op.cit., p.133.
115 F.R. Murphy, Q.P.D., XLIX, 8 September 1886, p.722.
116 Memo from Colonial Secretary’s Office, 18 March 1884, Q.S.A., Col/A395, in letter 5191 of 1884.
118 S.W. Griffith, to Secretary Government House, South Australia, 5 October
1876, V & P. S.A., No 91 and A. Macalister, The Queensland Agent General to the Earl Carnarvon, Secretary of State for the Colonies, 12 July 1877, V & P, Qld., 1878.

119 Q.P.D., 6 September 1877, p.621.

120 Moreton Bay Courier, 22 February 1851.

121 ibid. 20 September 1851; 1 May 1852; 20 November 1852; 27 November 1852; Moreton Bay Free Press, 21 December 1852.

122 Moreton Bay Courier, 11 October 1851.

123 ibid., 20 September 1851. A.E. Campbell, the commission agent in Ipswich and a firm supporter of the squatters, wanted a tread-mill clause included in the Masters and Servants Act for the express purpose of disciplining intractable Chinese labourers, ibid., 3 April 1852.

124 ibid., 6 March 1852.

125 ibid., 25 September 1852.

126 W.H. Walsh, Q.P.D., IX, 25 August 1869, p.783.

127 C. Lilley, ibid. and J. Garry, Burketown to Colonial Secretary, 22 April 1867, Q.S.A., Col/A92, in letter 1527 of 1867.


130 See Moreton Bay Courier, 22 February 1851; T.A. Coghlan, op.cit., p.774 and L.R. Marchant, op.cit..

131 A.M. Frances, Evidence to the Committee of Enquiry into Polynesian Labour, V & P, Qld., XI, 11, 1869, p.64.

132 D. Gunn, op.cit., p.4.

133 See Moreton Bay Courier, October and November 1851.


135 D. Gunn, op.cit. He wrote that the Chinese like the convicts did a lot of very valuable work for Australia in the early days, but that Parliament was wise in restricting them for "so far we have kept as much as we are able for the European Races".


137 ibid and Queenslander, 15 January 1876, p.1.

138 W.R.O. Hill to Colonial Secretary, 2 November 1883, Q.S.A. Col/A372, in letter 3704 of 1883 and Queenslander, 8 September 1893.

139 H.M. Nelson, Q.P.D., LXXIII, 30 August 1895, p.776 and Cairns Post, 3 July 1887.

140 Number of Chinese convicted under The Masters and Servants Act,

1883-70 1888-2
1884-25 1889-6
1885- 1890-2
1886- 1891-1
1887-61 1892-2


143 ibid.

144 T.A. Coghlan, Labour and Industry in Australia, III, op.cit., p. 1510; and Queenslander, 26 August 1876, p.22; 24 February 1877, p.18.

145 Queensland Figaro, 14 April 1888; Queensland, 25 February 1888;
Supplement to *The Australian Republican*, 27 December 1891, Q.S.A., Col/A651, in letter 02294 of 1891.

146 *Queensland Figaro*, 29 August 1885.


148 This legislation provided a bounty payment to planters employing European labourers, and thus made it too expensive for them to take on coloured workers.


150 Of the estimated 20,000 Chinese who arrived in the Colony only 0.8 per cent succeeded in complying with the required qualifications and obtaining their naturalization papers. See K. Cronin, "The Chinese Community in Queensland in the Nineteenth Century — A Study of Racial Interaction", B.A. Honours thesis, Uni of Qld., 1970 Appendix IV.

151 Evidence to Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry 1889, *op.cit.*, p.84. and W. Roth, to Under Secretary, Home Secretary’s Department, 1 January 1901, Q.S.A. Col/42, in letter 4884 of 1901. In the Atherton district the Chinese were renting land from seventy out of every seventy-six white land owners.

152 *Queenslander*, 17 February 1877, p.7, and Evidence to Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry, 1889, *op.cit.*, p.84. In the district of Cairns the whole of agriculture outside sugar farming was carried on by Chinese. There were 1200-1500 of them in this district.


157 Report Sub Inspector Martin, Mackay in Report W. Roth to Under Secretary Home Secretary’s Department, 1 January 1901, Q.S.A., Col/142, in letter 4884 of 1901.


160 *Progress*, 15 April 1899.


162 Report W. Roth, 20 October 1898, Q.S.A. Col/139.

163 *ibid.*.

164 Statement Charlie Wai Lee in Report W. Roth, Atherton, *ibid.*.

165 Northern Mining Register, 8 June 1892.

166 C.F. Yong, *op.cit.*.


169 *ibid.*, p. 226.

170 C.F. Yong, *op.cit.*, p.32.


172 Moreton Bay Courier, 25 September 1858.


174 *Queenslander*, 6 November 1869.

175 J. Jardine, Gold Commissioner, Crocodile Creek, to the Minister for Lands, 14 January 1867, Q.S.A., Lan/A4, in letter No. 148 of 1867.
Gympie Times, 11 July 1868.


See Census 1871, Table VI, V & P. Qld., 1871-72.

G.C. Bolton, op.cit., p.54.

Numbers of Chinese arriving in Queensland from China:
1874 — 637  1877 — 7513
1875 — 7680  1878 — 2493
1876 — 6650

J.D. Crawford, Notes on Chinese Immigration in the Australian Colonies, II, p.21, in A. Davenport, Acting Consul, Shanghai, to Lord Tenterden, 15 September 1877, Great Britain Foreign Office Archives, 1879-81, Confidential Print No. 5742.

Commission Police, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 24 February 1874, Q.S.A., Col/A192, in letter 399 of 1874.

Queenslander, 12 April 1875 and 3 May 1875.

Cooktown Courier, 3 October 1874.

Warden Sellheim, Report on the Palmer Goldfield for 1877, Queenslander, 2 February 1878.

W.G. Bailey, Q.P.D., XXIII, 13 June 1877, p.235.

John Shepherd, to the Editor, Northern Miner, 4 July 1877.

Cooktown Courier, 3 October 1874.

H. Parker, Chairman of the 1881 Colonial Conference, to Earl Kimberley, 22 February 1881, Q.S.A., Col/A308, in letter 805 of 1881.


Queenslander, 30 December 1876, p.22; J. Stevenson, Q.P.D., 9 August 1876, p.454; Petition Citizens of Rockhampton to Colonial Secretary, 13 April 1875, Q.S.A., Col/A208, in letter 1172 of 1875.

Northern Miner, 6 June 1877.

J. Douglas, Q.P.D., XX, 3 August 1876, p.381; also C.R. Haly, ibid., 9 August 1876, p. 456.

J.M. Thompson, ibid., p.373.


Mackay Free Press and Pioneer Advocate, 27 November 1880.


H.G. Simpson, Q.P.D, 7 September 1876, p.634.

Petition of 1574 people in the sugar industry of North East Queensland, V & P Qld., 1884.

Northern Miner, 6 June 1877.

ibid., 19 December 1878.

ibid.

ibid.

Darling Downs Gazette, 4 June 1877, quoted in Northern Miner, 6 June 1877.

Cooktown Courier, 1 September 1875.

This criticism was often justifiably levelled at the Chinese — See Secretary Meeting Thornborough to John Douglas, 7 May 1877, Q.S.A., Lan/A355, in letter 5478 of 1877. But it could be said with equal validity of the European miners. See Cooktown Herald, 21 February 1877.


Queenslander, 9 October 1875, p.24; and Petition from European and Chinese on the Goldfields for increased police protection, 2 June 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A240, in letter 3358 of 1877; and Q.S.A. Col/A453 in letter 0046 of 1886.


There is much controversy about whether or not the Aborigines actually were
There seems to be some evidence that it may have occurred even if only in isolated incidents. Certainly the myth has survived that the Aborigines preferred to eat Chinese because of their sweeter taste. See E.G. Heap, "Some Notes on Cannibalism Among Queensland Aborigines 1824-1900", *Queensland Heritage*, 1, November 1967; H.M. Fitzgerald, Inspector Police, Cooktown, to Commissioner Police Brisbane, 27 May 1892, Q.S.A., Col/A704, in letter 08566 of 1892; and Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Under Colonial Secretary, 28 October 1881, Q.S.A., Col/A324, in letter 4709 of 1881.

110 J.D. Crawford, "Notes on Chinese Immigration in the Australian Colonies", *op. cit.*.


112 Petition, Miners Palmer field, to Colonial Secretary, Q.S.A., Col/A453 in letter 0046 of 1886; and telegram H. St George, Maytown, to Colonial Secretary, 17 April 1885, Q.S.A., Col/A422, in letter 2595 of 1885.

113 *Queenslander*, 18 December 1875, p.26 and 22 September 1877, p.23.

114 J.D. Crawford, *op. cit.*, p.23.

115 *Queenslander*, 9 October 1875, p.24; and *Cooktown Courier*, 28 October 1875 and *Cooktown Herald*, 13 September 1876.

116 Police Officer, Gibbston to Colonial Secretary, 24 January 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A189, in letter 833 of 1873.

117 *Queenslander*, 10 June 1877, p.24 gave the following breakdown of population figures on the Palmer and outside. The report stressed that these numbers kept changing, as more Chinese arrived and new rushes occurred.

European | Chinese
---|---
The Palmer | 1400 | 17,000
Hodgkinson | 4500 | 300
Maytown | 900 | 300
Palmerville | 12 | 600
Jessop's Creek | 6 | 1,000
Stony Creek | 16 | 600
Byerstown | 16 | 800
Uhrstown | 10 | 600

218 *Queenslander*, 15 July 1876, p.27.

219 Warden Sellheim, Maytown, to Colonial Secretary, 26 May 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A238, in letter 2749 of 1877; and *Queenslander*, 23 June 1877, p.24.

220 Police Magistrate, Maytown, to Colonial Secretary, 7 May 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A238, in letter 2886 of 1877; and *Queenslander*, 26 May 1877, p.1; 9 June, 1877, p.24.

221 Petition, Chinese Merchants, Storekeepers, Packers and Miners, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 13 October 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A239, in letter 4924 of 1877; and Police Magistrate, Maytown, to Colonial Secretary, 22 February 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A254, in letter 939 of 1878.

222 *Hodgkinson Mining News*, 23 June 1877.


224 *Cooktown Courier*, 20 June 1874; 22 August 1874.

225 *Queenslander*, 28 October 1876, p.6.

226 Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Under Colonial Secretary, 28 October 1881, Q.S.A., Col/A324, in letter 4709 of 1881.

227 *Cooktown Courier*, 23 May 1874.


230 *Cooktown Courier*, 20 June 1874.
212 Q.P.D., XXIII, 13 June 1877, p.235.
215 Queenslander, 14 April 1877, p.16; See also F.T. Brentnall, Q.P.D., LIV, 30 October 1888, p.115.
216 Queenslander, 7 April 1877, p.25.
217 Sir A. Macalister, op.cit., p.52.
218 Q.P.D., XX, 5 August 1876, p.381; Anti-Chinese League to Colonial Secretary, 25 July, 1887, Col/A512.
222 Mr Kelsey, Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute, IX, 1877-78, 63. He argued: “But the wearied digger finds that when he comes to his humble home that Chinamen are squatting all around his camp”. This contrasted strongly with the situation in towns where generally there was a separate Chinese quarter.
224 Even as early as 1862 William Brookes used the occasion of an anti-Chinese rally to express the idea that “his highest aspiration for Queensland would be realized if in the next fifty years this colony was one patch on the United States of America”. (Brisbane Courier, 10 June 1862.) Queenslanders in the years afterwards were kept continually aware of the American anti-Chinese struggle. See Queenslander 3 March 1877; 25 June 1877; Cooktown Courier 6 June 1874; Northern Miner, 5 August 1886. Thus in 1877 the Hodgkinson Mining News (30 June 1877), when outlining their attempts to boycott and exclude Chinese residents ended with the statement: “If all else fails there is always the example of America”.
225 Supplement to Queenslander, 19 May 1877, p.4; 3 June 1876, p.16.
226 Boomerang, 26 May 1888.
228 Northern Miner, 4 July 1877.
229 Brisbane Courier, 17 March 1875; 31 March 1877.
230 Northern Miner, 26 May 1877.
231 Brisbane Courier, 25 November 1878.
232 Northern Miner, 10 December 1878.
233 Justice Peace, Cleveland Bay to Immigration Agent, Brisbane 20 July 1874, Q.S.A., in letter 2681 of 1874.
234 Hodgkinson Mining News, 7 April 1877.
235 Brisbane Courier, 20 June 1877.
236 Queensland Punch, 1 July 1881, p. 153.
237 A. Macalister, op.cit., p.54.
238 Hodgkinson Mining News, 7 April 1877.
239 Queensland Evangelical Standard, 8 April 1876, p.204.
240 Northern Miner, 10 December 1878.
241 ibid., 13 June 1877.
243 C.H. Buzacott, ibid., 9 August 1874, p.469.
244 B.D. Morehead, ibid., 3 July 1877, p.419.
NOTES

265 Senior Sergeant, Stanthorpe, to Commissioner Police, 23 December 1873, Q.S.A., Col/A189, in letter of 1873; and Croydon Mining News, 21 June 1889.
266 F.H. Hart, Q.P.D., 7 September 1876, p. 635. There were 12,000 people in Cooktown of whom 7,000 were Chinese.
267 Cooktown Herald, 27 March 1875; 28 April 1875; Queenslander, 25 September 1875; 8 January 1876; 6 October 1877.
268 Cooktown Herald, 10 April 1875.
269 ibid.
270 ibid., 5 May 1875.
271 ibid., 25 June 1875; See also 28 April 1875; 25 October 1876.
272 ibid., 23 August 1876, “Southern Cross” to Editor; See also Queenslander, 10 March 1877; 21 July 1877.
273 John Walsh was a tea dealer and a direct importer of Indian and Chinese merchandise and also the agent for the E. and A. Shipping firm whose steamers were employed in the passenger trade between Queensland and China. Cooktown Herald, 12 July 1876.
274 Queenslander, 19 August 1876, p.6.
275 John Walsh, to Colonial Secretary, 9 August 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A264, in letter 3100 of 1878.
276 Petition, to Minister Mines, in Queenslander, 23 February 1878.
277 ibid., 30 March 1878, p.22.
278 Cooktown Herald, 12 April 1875.
279 Cooktown Herald, quoted in Queenslander, 3 March 1877 p.6.
280 ibid., 26 May 1877, p.25.
281 Cooktown Herald, 3 February 1877.
282 Brisbane Courier, 17 March 1875.
283 ibid., 31 March 1877.
284 Northern Miner, 6 June 1877; Queensland, 22 April 1876.
285 Hodgkinson Mining News, 7 April 1877; and see also Inspector Police, Palmerville, to Commissioner Police, 6 September 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A244, in letter 4989 of 1877. As a result of the heightened press publicity the travelling correspondent of the Melbourne paper Argus was to report in 1877 that there was a “far greater outcry” against the Chinese in Brisbane than in the North where these aliens were actually concentrated. Q.P.D., XXIV, 19 October 1877, p. 1356.
286 Report, Warden Sellheim, 1877, in Queensland, 2 February 1878.
287 Warwick Argus, quoted in Queensland, 10 December 1877, p.25.
289 Nord Australische Zeitung, in Queensland, 5 May 1877, p.7.
290 J. Bell, Q.P.D., XX, 8 August 1876, p.390.
291 Sir William Cairns, Governor Queensland, to Secretary State for the Colonies, 16 May 1877.
292 Election campaigns at this time were conducted with reference to the Chinese question. See policy speech A.H. Palmer, Hodgkinson Mining News, 9 November 1878; and Cooktown Herald, 16 August 1876, which tells how the successful candidate in the election there stressed the importance of the Chinese issue.
293 Q.P.D., LVII, 21 May 1889, p.11.
296 The Gold Field Act Amendment Bill he introduced prohibited any person other than a natural born or naturalized British subject of European extraction from obtaining a mining licence.
297 Queensland, 10 March 1888.
298 Mackay Mercury, 23 August 1887.
299 Q.P.D., XX, 26 June 1876, p.362.
300 The average Chinese contributed far more to the revenue than did the average European colonist. In just two days in June 1877, the Chinese in Cooktown paid
our £4,500 in revenue on their imported goods (Queenslander, 16 June 1877, p.1).
See also Petition, Chinese from Mackay, V. & P., Qld., 1886. J.M. Thompson, Q.P.D., XX, 3 August 1876 p. 374.

Queenslander, 14 October 1876, p.7.

J.R. Dickson, Q.P.D., 9 August 1876, p.466.

Petition, Chinese, Cooktown, Cooktown Herald, 2 August 1876.

Q.P.D., 16 August 1876, p.516.

The avoidance of tax collectors by Chinese at this time became very noticeable and was reported by all officials on the northern fields. See Report, Dept. Mines, Qld., 1879 V. & P., Qld., 1880, II, p. 17; and Queenslander, 24 November 1877.

Report, Dept. Mines, 1878, V. & P., Qld., II, 1879, p.582. On the Palmer field when the ten shillings mining fee was reinforced there were 5,404 licences issued to Chinese, but in the six months previously when officials had tried to collect the increased fee of £3, they were only able to obtain 345 Chinese to take them out.

Despatch Secretary State for the Colonies to the Officer Administering the Government, Queensland, 27 March 1877, V. & P., Qld., 1877.

J.M. Thompson, Q.P.D., XX, 3 August 1876, p.374. J. Bell, ibid., XXIV, 19 October 1877, p. 1358.

J. Pettigrew, ibid., XX, 9 August 1876, p. 434.

C.H. Buzacott, ibid., 9 August 1874, p. 469.

J.D. Crawford, op.cit.

W.H. Walsh, Q.P.D., 9 August 1874, p. 450.


John Macrossan's bill was designed to exclude all Chinese from voting in municipal and divisional elections.

J.M. Macrossan, Q.P.D., L, 26 October 1886.


F. Richmond, Queensland in the Seventies, Singapore, 1927, p.44.

C.S. Mein, Q.P.D., 7 September 1876, p. 637.


Samuel W. Griffith, ibid., LXX, 1890, p.535.

J.M. Macrossan, ibid., XXV, 25 June 1878, p. 584. He introduced this clause three times, in 1874, 1875 and 1876.

W.H. Wilson, ibid., LX, 23 September, 1890, p.86.

ibid.

A.J. Thynne, ibid.

J.W. Collinson, More About Cairns, Smith and Paterson, Brisbane 1942, p.120.

Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 20 September 1882, Q.S.A., Col/A347, in letter 5117 of 1882.

The Gold Fields Act Amendment Act 1878, first introduced a clause prohibiting Chinese from being employed on any new field. This concept was retained in later legislation and in 1888, an unsuccessful attempt was made to extend this prohibition. The European Miner's Protection Bill placed penalties of £1 per Chinese per day on all those employers keeping Asiatic workers.

The whole rationale for this policy was provided by H.R. Beor, who claimed: “We did not want the Chinese to have the medium of exchange. If they added to it, there might not be so great an objection, but when they came just to take away the medium of exchange from the colony, then he did not see what benefit the rest of the colony got from the Chinese”. Q.P.D., XXV, 25 June 1878, p.584.

J.M. Thompson, ibid., XX, 3 August 1876, p. 372.

Petition from Deputation representing the Employers' Association to Colonial Secretary, 18 July 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A512, in letter 5034 of 1887.

W.G. Bailey, Q.P.D., XXIV, 19 October 1877, p.1357.

Queenslander, 25 September 1876, p.27.
NOTES 329

34 See especially *Northern Miner*, May and June, 1877; and Warden Millchester to Under Secretary Mines, 4 January 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A253, in letter 610 of 1878.
35 Under Secretary, Colonial Secretary's Department, to Warden Millchester, 10 January 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A253, in letter 610 of 1878.
37 *Queensland Figaro* 28 July 1883 reported complaints against the Chinese at Maytown; *ibid.*, 11 August 1883, reported that thirty Chinese had been arrested under *the Masters and Servants Act*, and their gambling house raided.
38 Police Magistrate Blackall, to Colonial Secretary, 23 April 1879, Q.S.A., Col/A276, in letter 1659 of 1879.
39 *ibid.*.
40 *Queensland Figaro*, 15 October 1883.
41 *Queenslander*, 15 July 1876, p.28 and 27 November 1875.
42 Hospital Committee to Colonial Secretary, 15 May 1886, Q.S.A., Col/A466.
43 *ibid.*; and President, Rockhampton Hospital, to Colonial Secretary, 21 November 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A248, in letter 5446 of 1877; H.O. James, Secretary, Geraldton Hospital, to Colonial Secretary, 16 March 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A494, in letter 2463 of 1887; *Cooktown Herald*, 5 April 1876.
44 President, Rockhampton Hospital, to Colonial Secretary, 21 November 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A248, in letter 5446 of 1877.
45 Wood Bros. and Boyd Ingham, to Colonial Secretary, 8 April 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A494 in letter 3034 of 1887.
46 Surgeon Superintendent, Woogaroo, to Colonial Secretary, 14 July 1880, Q.S.A., Col/A296, in letter 3919 of 1880.
47 Report, on Woogaroo Asylum, 1879, Q.S.A., Col/A292, in letter 2247 of 1879.
48 *Cooktown Herald*, 15 December 1877.
50 *Queenslander*, 16 June 1877, p. 24.
53 *ibid.*.
55 W.C. Little, Chairman Meeting Byerstown, to Minister Mines, 11 December 1876, *ibid.*.
57 Petition Chinese Louis, to Colonial Secretary, 11 February 1876, Q.S.A., Col/A219, in letter 563 of 1876.
58 Dr Pan On Hong, Dr Bo Wha Hong, Hi Low Chong, Man Tin On and Quong On Chong, to Under Secretary Mines Dept., 23 August 1877, *V. & P. Qld.*, 1878.
59 Telegram, Hodel, *Cooktown*, to Minister Mines, 17 October 1877, *ibid.*.
60 Dr Pan On Hong etc., *ibid.*.
61 Thomas Macdonald, Pine-tree Creek, to Under Secretary, Mines Dept., 29 October 1877, *ibid.*.
62 *Queenslander*, 18 August 1877, p.25.
63 Report, Resignation of Mr Coward, Late Warden on the Palmer Goldfield, *V. & P.*, Qld., 1878.
65 *Colonist*, 21 May 1887.
330 PART THREE

566 W.R.O. Hill, *op.cit.*, p.71; and *Brisbane Courier* 17 October 1877.
569 *Colonist*, 21 May 1887.
570 Cases of police brutality to Chinese reported in *Queensland Figaro* 29 November 1884, p.687; and 24 October 1885, p.663. See also court case reported at Goondiwindi where citizens complained about discrimination shown to Chinese by Police Magistrate; Petition, Goondiwindi; Citizens to Colonial Secretary, 28 October 1879, Q.S.A., Col/A286, in letter 3777 of 1879.
571 Often the heavier sentences given to Chinese crimes of theft or assault reflected the wide acceptance of these stereotypes. Petition, Charles Loo, to Colonial Secretary, 1 February 1885, Q.S.A., Col/A414, in letter 6771 of 1885. *Queensland Figaro*, 11 December 1886, p.877; Collector Customs, to Colonial Treasurer, 27 March 1876, Q.S.A., Col/A219, in letter 774 of 1876.
572 Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 15 August 1880, Q.S.A. Col/A298, in letter 4576 of 1880.
573 Thomas Fitzsimmons, to Colonial Secretary 21 March 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A494, in letter 2549 of 1887.
574 Secretary, Progress Association, Clermont, to Colonial Secretary, 12 July 1879, Q.S.A., Col/A282, in letter 2684 of 1879.
575 *The Peak Downs Telegram and Copperfield Miner*, 20 June 1879, *ibid.*
576 Charles Chubb, Ipswich, to Colonial Secretary, 11 July 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A261, in letter 2649 of 1878; Petition, Ah You, Roma, to Colonial Secretary, 26 April 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A256, in letter 1498 of 1878; T. Clohesy, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 30 April 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A257, in letter 1581 of 1878.
577 H. St George, Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 20 September 1882, Q.S.A., Col/A347, in letter 5117 of 1882.
579 *ibid.*
580 *ibid.*
581 C. Lack, “Christie Palmerston”, *Truth*, 3 December 1950. This states that Palmerston used to raid Chinese in their camps and when they had fled in panic, he would collect the sacks of alluvial gold they had left behind.
583 J.W. Collinson, *op.cit.*, p.120.
588 *Peak Downs Telegram*, 7 October 1876.
589 *Queenslander*, 9 October 1875, p.241.
590 *ibid.*, 14 July 1877, p.24.
593 Moreton Bay Courier, 25 September 1858.
595 *ibid.*
596 *ibid.*
597 *ibid.*
598 *ibid.*
NOTES

599 Minute from Colonial Secretary to ibid.
600 Gympie Times, 11 July 1868.
602 Port Denison Times, 5 June 1869.
604 G.C. Bolton, op.cit., p.35.
605 ibid., for instance at Cape River the riot occurred after a public room brawl.
607 Brisbane Courier, 15 February 1872.
608 ibid.
609 ibid.
610 Commissioner, Georgetown, to Minister for Works and Mines, 1 January 1872, Q.S.A., Wor/A47, in letter 541 of 1872.
611 Telegram, Police Magistrate, Ravenswood, to Colonial Secretary, 13 September 1872, Q.S.A., Col/A175, in letter 2332 of 1872.
612 Queenslander, 25 March 1876 and 11 December 1875, p.23.
613 Townsville Herald, 5 June 1875.
614 Queenslander, 28 August 1875, p.24.
615 ibid., 16 September 1876.
616 ibid., 2 June 1877, p.23. A Chinese in European dress and speaking good English was nearly lynched by Europeans when he started to mark off a reef claim. See also, ibid., 4 May 1878, p.150.
617 After the rush to the Conglomerate failed there were some skirmishes, ibid., 9 October 1875. The same situation occurred after the failure of the Hodgkinson rush ibid., 29 April 1876, p.16; 29 July 1876, p.27.
618 ibid., 8 September 1877, p.25.
619 ibid., 4 November 1876.
620 ibid.
621 ibid., 18 November 1876.
622 Petition, 129 Storekeepers and Miners, Cairns, to Colonial Secretary, 31 October 1876, Q.S.A., Col/A228, in letter 2870 of 1876.
623 ibid.
624 Queenslander 26 May 1877, p.24.
625 ibid., 11 August 1877, p.7; and 18 August 1877, p.25.
626 Hodgkinson Mining News, 24 November 1877.
627 Queenslander, 18 May 1878, p. 206.
628 Northern Miner, 26 May 1877; Secretary Meeting, Thornborough, to John Douglas, 7 May 1877, Q.S.A., Lan/A55, in letter 5478 of 1877; Hodgkinson Mining News, 30 June 1877.
629 ibid.; and Northern Miner, 9 June 1877.
630 ibid., 6 June 1877; and 13 June 1877.
631 ibid.
632 ibid.
633 In 1883 when anti-Chinese agitation was begun in Herberton, it was almost entirely controlled by the local Miners’ Protection Association, and the Irish National Land League. Queensland Figaro, 7 April 1883, p.224.
634 Northern Miner, 31 July 1886.
635 ibid., 19 August 1886.
636 Colonist, 21 May 1887, p.13.
637 Queensland Figaro, 23 October 1886, p.61.
638 Most of the support for the scheme came from the Townsville Anti-Chinese League. Northern Miner, 30 July 1887.
639 Queensland Figaro, 24 January 1885, p.103. On this occasion the miners groups
at the Johnstone River Goldfield held an open air meeting to argue against granting licences to Chinese for any Queensland goldfield regardless of how old it was. A similar situation occurred in Herberton in April 1883. *Queensland Figaro*, 7 April 1883, p.224; 5 May 1883, p.292.

Queenslander, 17 March 1888.

Evening Observer, 30 May 1888.

Town Clerk, Clermont, to Colonial Secretary, 11 August 1887 Q.S.A., Col/A512, in letter 6406 of 1882; Town Clerk, Clermont, to Colonial Secretary, 25 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A548, in letter 4848 of 1888.

Evening Observer, 30 May 1888.

Police Magistrate Croydon, to Colonial Secretary, 22 October 1886, Q.S.A., Col/A486, in letter 8296 of 1886.

Secretary Anti-Chinese League, Townsville, to Colonial Secretary, 8 October 1886, Q.S.A., Col/A486, in letter 7978 of 1886.

ibid.

Police Magistrate, Croydon, to Colonial Secretary, 22 October 1886, Q.S.A., Col/A486, in letter 8296 of 1886.

Telegram, Warden, Croydon, to Under Secretary Mines, 4 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 4340 of 1888.

Police Magistrate, Croydon, to Colonial Secretary, 8 April 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 3022 of 1888.

Queenslander, 21 April 1888.

C. Downey, Secretary, Croydon Branch of Amalgamated Miners Association, to Colonial Secretary, 10 April 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 3120 of 1888.

S.W. Griffith, Minute to Telegram, Honorary Secretary Anti-Chinese League, to Colonial Secretary, 17 April 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 0198 of 1888.

Boomerang, 28 April 1888.

Petition, 74 Members Anti-Chinese League to Police Magistrate, Croydon, to Colonial Secretary, 10 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 4816 of 1888.

Warden, Croydon, to Under Secretary Mines Dept., 4 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 4340 of 1888.

S.W. Griffith, Minute to Telegram, Warden, to Under Secretary Mines, 4 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 4340 of 1888.

Queenslander, 2 June 1888.

ibid., 19 May 1888.

ibid., 28 April 1888.

Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 23 June 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A549, in letter 05693 of 1888.


W.H. Walsh, Q.P.D., XXV, 18 June 1878, p.526.

J. Rex, *Race, Colonialism and the City*, op.cit., p.219.

ibid., pp.204-5.

Moreton Bay Courier, 2 August 1851.

Brisbane Courier, 13 June 1862.

Boomerang, 21 April 1888.


Queensland Figaro, 13 October 1883.

ibid., 12 May 1888, p.302.

ibid., 13 November 1886, p.729.

ibid., J. Potts, *One Year of Anti-Chinese Work in Queensland*, Brisbane, 1888, p.3.
NOTES

474 ibid., p.5.
475 ibid., p.4.
476 ibid.
478 ibid., p.15.
479 T. Glassey, Q.P.D., 18 October 1888, p.748.
480 J. Rex, Race Relations in Sociological Theory, op. cit., p.156.
481 Mackay Mercury, 18 January 1887.
482 J. Potts, op.cit., p.25.
483 ibid., p.9.
484 Northern Miner, 28 July 1887.
485 See Cartoons included, and Boomerang, 16 July 1888.
487 Boomerang, 30 June 1888.
489 See Cartoon included.
490 J. Potts, op.cit., p.28.
491 ibid.
492 ibid.
493 Colonist, 30 July 1887.
495 Worker, 2 April 1892.
496 Boomerang, 27 April 1889.
497 ibid., 4 August 1888.
498 ibid., 4 February 1888; 25 February 1888.
500 ibid.
501 Boomerang, 3 December 1887.
502 Worker, 19 March 1892, p.1, quoted in A. Markus, op.cit., p.82, (My emphasis).
503 ibid.
504 W. Lane, The Workingman's Paradise, Edwards, Dunlop, Sydney, 1892, p.75.
505 ibid., p.8. Nellie (the heroine) in this novel was described as "tall and slender but well formed, every curve of her figure giving promise of more luxurious development. . . and of an intense womanliness". Yet Nellie was entirely unconcerned with personal relations and motivated only to alleviate the suffering of the poor around her.
506 Colonist, 30 July 1887.
507 Boomerang, 4 August 1888, p.4.
509 ibid., 21 April 1888, p.9.
510 ibid., 31 March 1888, p.9.
511 A. Markus, op.cit., p.81. This writer argues that Lane's racial ideas "are in many respects a copybook of the teachings of Herbert Spencer". Yet Lane quite clearly regarded the different races as different species, and his obsessive horror of miscegenation and the "germs" of coloured men are actually more closely tied to the popular American pluralist debate. Like most of the racial publicists of this time Lane used Spencerian catch-phrases, particularly those referring to racial struggles for survival, but Spencer's theories remained academic ones and only rarely were they examined or assimilated by these writers.
513 See comment of Stella Stibbins in 'The Race War', Boomerang, 31 March 1888, p.9.
334 PART THREE

"ibid.

ibid., 2 April 1892.

"ibid.

Worker, 17 March 1888.

"ibid., 11 February 1888, p.3.

"ibid., 26 May 1888.


"ibid.

Boomerang 18 February 1888.

ibid., 21 April 1888.


J.T. Annear, Q.P.D., 30 August 1895, p.771. See also M. Reid, ibid., 30 August 1895, p.783.

Deputation Employers' Assoc., to Colonial Secretary, 18 July 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A512, in letter 5034 of 1887.

A. Low, to Colonial Secretary, 7 June 1915, Q.S.A., Pre/A503, in letter 06928 of 1915. See also: Queenslander, 29 April 1876, p.16; Progress, 29 April 1899; Bulletin, 28 September 1901.

Q.P.D., LV, 12 September 1888, p.247.

Deputation Employers' Assoc., to Colonial Secretary, 18 July 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A512, in letter 5034 of 1887.

Queensland Figaro, 16 October 1886, p.539; Cooktown Herald, 14 February 1877.

Progress, 1 July 1899.


ibid., 27 November 1886, p.779.

F. Richmond, Queensland in the Seventies, op.cit., pp.41-50.

C. Eden, My Wife and I in Queensland, Longmans Green & Co., 1872 p.41, also: J. Grant Pattison, "Battler's" Tales of Early Rockhampton, Fraser, Melbourne, 1939, p.49.

Boomerang, 11 February 1888.

ibid.


Deputation Employers' Assoc., to Colonial Secretary, 18 July 1887, op. cit.; Northern Miner, 26 July 1887; The Colonist, 18 June 1887; H. Parker, Chairman 1881, Conference, to Earl Kimberley, 22 February 1881, Q.S.A., Col/A308, in letter 803 of 1881.

Deputation Employers' Assoc., to Colonial Secretary, 18 July 1887, op. cit.


Progress, 24 March 1900.

B.C. Mansfield, op.cit., p.61.

Evening Observer, 3 April 1886; 3 July 1886; See also J. Potts, op.cit., p.8; Q.P.D., LIX, 9 October 1889, p.2093.

Boomerang, 27 July 1889, p.5.


Queensland Figaro, 27 November 1886, p.779; Queenslander, 30 December 1876, p.22.


J.D. Crawford, op.cit., p.19.
NOTES

335

59 General Wong Yung Ho, quoted in Northern Miner, 29 July 1887; See also collaborating evidence: H.M. Nelson, Q.P.D., LXXIII, 1895, p.776; W.H. Walsh, ibid., XX, 1876, p.472.
61 W.O. Hodgkinson, ibid., LV, 17 October 1888, p.725; J. Watson, ibid., LV, 12 September 1888, p.244.
62 J.F. Conway, Northern Miner, 26 May 1877.
64 ibid., p.53.
65 Boomerang, 14 April 1888, p.3.
66 Worker, 14 December 1895.
67 F.T. Brentnall, Q.P.D., LXVI, p.44.
68 Clermont Truth, 1 April 1899.
69 Dr Lyons, to Brisbane Courier, 26 April 1892.
70 As a result of the European preoccupation with coloured "germs", there was a spate of literature giving reasons for the contagion and listing their deadly effects. See M. MacKenzie, "The Dreadful Revival of Leprosy", Nineteenth Century reprinted in Worker, 14 December 1895.
71 "The Chinese Leper", Clermont Truth, 1 April 1899.
73 Worker, 21 September 1895.
74 ibid., 20 July 1895.
75 ibid., 21 September 1895, quoted in A. Markus, op.cit.
76 Boomerang, 19 January 1889, in ibid.
77 J. Hamilton, to Colonial Secretary, 17 June 1892, Q.S.A., Col/264.
78 Queensland, 20 April 1867, p.10.
79 J. Bancroft, "Leprosy in Queensland", Intercolonial Medical Congress Australasia, 3rd Session, 1892, pp.622-6; See also J.A. Thompson, "On the History and Prevalence of Lepra in Australia"; Aust. & N.Z. Assoc. for the Advancement of Science, 7 January 1898, pp.1040-51. Thompson states that there were cases of leprosy among Aboriginal tribes who had no contact with other coloured migrants, and he argues that 'lepra' may be indigenous to them.
80 J. Bancroft, op.cit.
81 M. O'Donohue, Geraldton, to Colonial Secretary, 9 April 1887, Q.S.A., Col/A497, in letter 3250 of 1887; Dr Ahearne, to Colonial Secretary, 11 March 1885, Q.S.A. Col/417.
82 Reports of Dr Mathison, November and December 1903, Q.S.A., Col/266; See also: H.T. Macfarlane to Colonial Secretary, 12 January 1884, Q.S.A., Col/A378; and D. Graham, to Commissioner Police, 29 September 1896, Q.S.A., Pol/119.
83 Worker, 14 December 1895.
84 Northern Miner, 28 July 1887.
85 The Eagle, 26 August 1893, quoted in A. Markus, op.cit.
86 A. Markus, op.cit.. The chapter included in this thesis gives a very good account of the press campaigns on leprosy.
87 See enclosed cartoon on leprosy with figure of blindfolded press.
88 "A Professional Secret", Worker, 14 December 1895. Tells of how doctors refuse to report cases of leprosy especially when the Chinese involved is wealthy.
89 Progress, 4 February 1899, p.3. Mr Stewart, M.L.A., Rockhampton argued that capitalists did not run the risk of contracting leprosy or having their children marry coloured men.
90 Worker, 23 March 1895.
91 Cooktown Courier, 6 November 1875; Cairns Post, 10 March 1887; See also: Queensland Figaro, 24 November 1888, told of the liquid manure that Chinese
cover their vegetables with in an effort to make them repulsive; _Australian Republican_, 18 April 1891, spoke of the “leprous breeding bread” of the Chinese bakers.

584 _Queensland Figaro_, 14 November 1885, p.779.

585 _ibid._, 9 October 1886, p.523; See also: Dr H. Finlay, Port Douglas, to Colonial Secretary, 15 October 1881, Q.S.A., Col/A324, in letter 4541 of 1881.

586 Return Showing Number Lepers in Queensland to 1899, Q.S.A., Col/73.

587 _Worker_, 23 March 1895.

588 Police Magistrate, Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 6 October 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A247, in letter 4917 of 1877.

589 _ibid._

590 Police Magistrate, Rockhampton, to Colonial Secretary, 20 November 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A248, in letter 5394 of 1877.

591 Pugh, to Colonial Secretary, 22 January 1877, Q.S.A., Col/A272.


593 Telegram, Police Magistrate, to Colonial Secretary, 25 March 1881, Q.S.A. Col/A309, in letter 1295 of 1881.

594 H. St George, to Colonial Secretary, 21 May to 13 June 1882, Q.S.A., Col/A363.

595 W.H. Hartley, to Colonial Secretary, 7 July 1882, Q.S.A., Col/A340, in letter 3631 of 1882.

596 _ibid._

597 R.L. Evans, _op.cit._, p.209.

598 W. F. Taylor, _Q.P.D._, LXVI, 14 April 1892, p.49.

599 Statistics, Lepers Friday Island and Dayman Island, _Intercolonial Medical Congress Australasia_, 1892, p.630; See also R.L. Evans, _op.cit._, pp.209-10.

600 A.E. Salter, report to Colonial Secretary, 15 April 1891, Q.S.A., Col/264. (My emphasis.)

601 Medical Officer, Townsville, to Home Secretary, 11 December 1897, Q.S.A., Col/A822. The minute to this correspondence maintained, “In the case of suspected leprosy of a white man get him if possible shipped by some steamer to Brisbane. If a black man . . . put him on Magnetic Island.”

602 H. Tozer, _Q.P.D._, LXVI, 1892, p.239.

603 W.F. Taylor, _ibid._, LXVI, 7 June 1892, p.47.

604 An Act to Provide for the Treatment and the Detention and Isolation of Lepers 1892; see also Draft Regulations for Lazaret, 1897; and R.L. Evans, _op.cit._, p.214.

605 _ibid._

606 _Worker_, 14 December 1895.

607 H. Tozer, case at Barclay, October to December 1892, Q.S.A., Col/A720 quoted in R.L. Evans, _op.cit._, p.217.

608 _ibid._, p.216.

609 Zillman, to Colonial Secretary, 3 July 1892, Q.S.A., Col/A703, in _ibid._.

610 Brisbane Courier, 17 March 1892, in _ibid._

611 Perry, to Colonial Secretary, Q.S.A., Col/A791, in _ibid._


613 This concept of Rex’s adheres closely to the ideas of Talcott Parsons and what he termed “pattern maintenance and tension management”.

614 _Queensland Figaro_, 5 July 1884.

615 _ibid._, 28 February 1885, p.267.

616 Charters Towers Times, 26 March 1888; and _Boomerang_, 31 March 1888.

617 P. O’Sullivan, to Editor, _Queenslander_, 28 January 1888;

618 A. Meston, to Ryder, 16 June 1897, Q.S.A., Col/140.

619 R.L. Evans, _op.cit._; see also: _Q.P.D._, XLIX, 8 September 1889, p.716. The imported opium that year was 21,000 lbs. which allowed an average consumption of 2 lbs. per Chinese over the year. W.O. Hodgkinson, _V. & P._, II, 1882, p.560.

620 Mr Macmaster, Clermont, to Inspector Meldrum, 3 March 1899, Q.S.A.
NOTES

Pol/J15.

422 E.M. Curr, "Our Aborigines", Queenslander, 22 December 1876, p.33.
426 A. Meston, Q.P.D., 8 October 1901, p.1142.
427 W. Roth, to Under Secretary, Home Secretary's Dept., 7 Sept 1900, Q.S.A., Col/143, in letter 14206 of 1900.
428 H. Archibald, Q.P.D., 23 October 1901, p.1422.
430 J. Deane, Q.P.D. 8 December 1897, p.1909.
431 Boomerang, 10 January 1891, "The streets of Charleville reek with the fumes of opium": One white man died in an opium den.
432 A. Meston, to Ryder, 16 June 1897. Q.S.A., Col/142.
433 Report, A. Meston, to Colonial Secretary, 1896 op.cit.; and A. Meston, Q.P.D., 23 October 1901, p.1422.
434 ibid.
435 ibid.
436 E.R. Baker, Mitchell, to Colonial Secretary, 27 July 1897, Q.S.A., Col/140.
437 A. Meston, Q.P.D., 8 October 1901, p.1142.
438 In October 1888 the Sale and Use of Poisons Bill was unsuccessfully introduced. Again in 1889 an opium bill was mooted. Q.P.D., XLIX, 10 August 1889, p.306.
439 J. Douglas, Thursday Island, to Colonial Secretary, 22 February 1896, Q.S.A., Col/140.
440 J. Boles, Q.P.D., 18 January 1897, p. 1632.
441 D. Graham, Georgetown, to Commissioner Police, 20 April 1898, Q.S.A., Pol/J16. Many of the Chinese who had become addicted to the drug were now suffering severely.
442 E. Dequine, to Colonial Secretary, 12 July 1892, Q.S.A., Col/A703; Police Magistrate, Roma, to Under Secretary, Home Secretary's Dept., 24 April 1908, Q.S.A., Col/A852, in letter 06218 of 1908; and Regina v. Ah Lin, Supreme Court, Qld., Q.S.A., Crs/157.
444 Inspector Brannelly, to Commissioner Police, 18 December 1900, Q.S.A., Pol/J15.
446 A. Douglas, Townsville, to Colonial Secretary, 26 July 1899, quoted in R.L. Evans, op.cit., p.55.
448 B.H. Purcell, Brisbane, to Colonial Secretary, 1891, Q.S.A., Col/A717, in letter 14999 of 1891.
449 Inspector Police, Cooktown, to Commissioner Police, 30 June 1898, Q.S.A., Col/143, in letter 08420 of 1898.
450 A. Meston, to Parry Okedon, 11 February 1898; W. Roth, to Commissioner Police, 28 January 1898, Q.S.A., Col/139.
451 W. Roth, Q.P.D., 8 October 1901, p.1141 and Report, W. Roth, to Home Secretary, 1 January 1901, Q.S.A., Col/142, in letter 4884 of 1901.
452 Barron Valley Progress Association, to Colonial Secretary, 15 July 1898, Q.S.A., Col/139.
653 Report, W. Roth, to Colonial Secretary, 20 October 1898, Q.S.A., Col/139.
654 A. Meston, Q.P.D., 8 October 1901, p.1145.
655 A. Meston, to Home Secretary, 14 September 1901 quoted in R.L. Evans, op. cit., p.66-7.
656 ibid.
658 From June 1916 to April 1918.
660 D. Power, Police Sergeant, Cardwell Station, to Commissioner Police, 8 September 1910, Q.S.A., Pol/J17.
663 Secretary, Anti-Chinese League, Brisbane, to Colonial Secretary, 7 December 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A268, in letter 4384 of 1878.
664 Brisbane Courier, December 1878.
665 S. Samper, Mayor Cooktown, to Colonial Secretary, 2 December 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A268, in letter 4509 of 1878; Mayor Mackay, to Colonial Secretary, 19 December 1878. Q.S.A., Col/A268, filed with letter 35 of 1878.
666 Customs Officer, Rockhampton, to Collector Customs, 27 December 1878, Q.S.A., Col/A268, in letter 4605 of 1878.
667 John Douglas, minute to ibid.
669 Correspondence, Police Magistrate, Thursday Island, to Colonial Secretary, 17 January 1879, Q.S.A., Col/A268, in letter 340 of 1879.
671 "Worker, 1 April 1890.
672 "Australian Republican", 20 September 1890.
673 Boomerang, 7 July 1888.
674 Queensland Figaro, 27 November 1886, p.779; Boomerang, 3 December 1887, p.13; Secretary, Furniture Warehousemen, to Colonial Secretary, 2 November 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A564, in letter 09518 of 1888.
675 Australian Republican, 23 August 1890.
678 Boomerang, 31 March 1888.
679 See W. Lane The Workingman’s Paradise op. cit.; "Lucinda Sharpe Column", in Worker, 1892.
680 Queensland Figaro, 7 August 1886, p.123.
681 ibid.
682 ibid., 12 May 1883, p.302.
683 ibid., Cartoon, 7 April 1883 and example; 25 August 1883, p.603.
684 ibid., 19 May 1883, p.318.
685 Queenslander, 30 July 1887, p.186; Cairns Post, 2 July 1887.
686 Colonist, 30 July 1887; Northern Miner, 22 July 1887.
687 Petitions, 189 Electors, Bundaberg; Chamber of Commerce, Charters Towers; Meeting, Ipswich, to Legislative Assembly, V. & P., Qld., 1887; and Northern Miner, 25 May 1887; Mackay Mercury, 23 August 1887.
688 Chinese Legation, to British Foreign Office (F.O.), 5 July 1888; British F.O. to C.O. (Colonial Office), No.17, 6 July 1888, in Further Correspondence relating to
Chinese Immigration into the Australian Colonies, Col 881/8, IX.

Northern Miner, 22 July 1887; 26 July 1887.

Queenslander, 25 February 1888.

Northern Miner, 26 July 1887; Queenslander, 31 March 1888; Queensland Times, 19 July 1887, pp.2-3.

Deputation, Anti-Chinese League, to Colonial Secretary, Queenslander, 14 January 1888. In the months previously petitions had been received from Anti Chinese leagues in Bundaberg, Mackay, Maryborough, Ipswich, Townsville, Rosewood, Brisbane, Toowoomba, Clermont and Gympie, and from the Miners Union Charters Towers and the Australian Natives Association, Brisbane. See. Q.S.A., Col/A512, in letter for file, 4857 of 1887.

Queenslander, 31 March 1888.

Boomerang, 14 March 1888, "John" Stevenson was pictured as "John Chinaman" with an opium pipe and pigtail; see also denunciation of Robert Bulcock, ibid., 5 May 1888, and 14 March 1888. John Potts elected to follow in the wake of many dubious parliamentary candidates.

Charters Towers Times, 30 April 1888.

Queenslander, 7 April 1888.

Charters Towers Times, 27 March 1888.

Brisbane Courier, 7 May 1888.

Boomerang, 10 March 1888 and 31 March, 1888; see also Colonist, 21 May 1887; Cairns Post, 13 July 1887.

Report, Inspector Lewis, to Commissioner Police, 6 May 1888, Q.S.A., Col/A552, in letter 4301 of 1888; and Queenslander, 12 May 1888.

Report, Inspector Lewis to Commissioner Police, 6 May 1888, op.cit.

W.H. Browne, Q.P.D., LXXIII, 1895, p.781.

Worker, 18 March 1899, p.2, quoted in A. Markus, op.cit.

Colonial Conferences were called in 1881 and 1888 to consider the Chinese question and enact uniform colonial legislation to deal with it.

In 1876 when the British Government refused to ratify Queensland discriminatory legislation there was a great deal of anti-British sentiment expressed within and outside the Parliament. See also: Letter John Douglas, Vice President Executive Council printed in Queenslander, 12 May 1877, p.19; and Queenslander, 29 April 1876.

Boomerang, 17 March 1888 and 14 April 1888, p.3.

Number of Chinese Arriving and Leaving from Queensland, Quoted in K. Cronin, "The Chinese Question in Queensland in the Nineteenth Century — A Study in Racial Interaction", Appendix. I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>921</td>
<td>1259</td>
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<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
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Memo., H. Tozer, 7 February 1898, Q.S.A., Col/74.

It is important to note the position of the wealthier Chinese merchants, for many historians would argue that they had been successfully assimilated into the colonial society. Yet, although in some local communities they had obtained some acceptance and even status, this pre-eminence resulted only from their position in their own community as the spokesmen for the poorer Chinese. Thus the concept of a plural society is very applicable to the Queensland situation, and in this type
of social organization, the leaders of the 'minority' racial group are still 'contained' within the hierarchy of their own community.
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And to cover our own guilt, we consoled ourselves from time to time with the theory of a "Doomed Race", casting upon Heaven, as Lord Glenelg wrote... "a destruction which is our own and saying the aboriginals [sic] are a doomed race when the guilt lies with ourselves".

A. Meston, 13 March, 1900

...we listened — we laughed, and we waited our Day, And marshalled our men in battle array. Our bugles they blew, and this burden they bore: "The Country we live in is White at the Core! White evermore Inland and shore, White in its dealings and White at the Core!" 'Queensland Federal Election Verdict 1901', Bulletin

...the basis of colonial racism is one of exclusion and negation.

Jean Cohen

During the year 1897, while Archibald Meston in Brisbane, Queensland was composing the clauses of a parliamentary bill which he hoped would solve the Aboriginal 'problem' for the Colony, Herbert George Wells in Woking, England, was putting the final touches to his science-fiction The War of the Worlds. Though these two works diverged immensely, both in relation to their literary content and social intention, they were nevertheless connected by a thematic thread which was probably passing through the minds of many concerned Westerners at this time. For a major factor inducing both Meston and Wells to write as they did was the image of a people being utterly destroyed by strangers of a superior technology. H.G. Wells had initially conceived his work as an allegory upon the total extermination of the
Tasmanians by European man. Out strolling with his brother Frank, Wells had been discussing this singular example of total genocide, and the two men had attempted to imagine how the Tasmanians might have felt in being confronted, suddenly, with the white intruder. It was Frank who suggested that the only comparable upset for Western man and woman would be the unheralded invasion of their society by technologically-superior creatures from another planet. In describing "the Coming of the Martians", Wells therefore gave an ironic twist to Spencerian dogma when he wrote:

- And we men, the creatures who inhabit this earth, must be to them at least as alien and lowly as are the monkeys and lemurs to us. The intellectual side of man already admits that life is an incessant struggle for existence, and it would seem that this too is the belief of the minds upon Mars... this world is... crowded with what they regard as inferior animals...

And before we judge of them too harshly, we must remember what ruthless and utter destruction our own species has wrought, not only upon animals, such as the vanished bison and dodo, but upon its own inferior races. The Tasmanians, in spite of their human likeness, were entirely swept out of existence in a war of extermination waged by European immigrants in the space of fifty years. Are we such apostles of mercy as to complain if the Martians warred in the same spirit.4

Whereas, in Wells' saga, however, the militarily superior invader succumbs to the inferior bacterial atmosphere of the Earth, and Mankind is saved by its own germs, the outcome for the Tasmanian and mainland Aborigines was, of course, the very opposite. When Wells depicted a group of dead Martians — "Here and there they were scattered, nearly fifty altogether... overtaken by a death that might have seemed to them as incomprehensible as any death could be" — he could equally have been describing a recurring scene in the prolonged drama of Aboriginal annihilation. Where, in his fiction, "a magnificent and almost complete specimen" of a Martian is preserved "in spirits at the National History Museum"5, in reality it would be the pitiful skeletal remains of "the last Tasmanian", the female Truganini, which would be placed on display in a glass case of the Hobart Museum.6

The total destruction of the Tasmanians had a symbolic impact upon contemporaries which they found hard to accommodate alongside their image of a beneficent British Empire, save in
relation to their prevailing racist suppositions. As an Imperialist writer, Sir Harry Johnston, in contemplating a Tasmanian's skull, felt moved to comment:

Happy Tasmania to have possessed the most apelike form of man. Unhappy Tasmania, to have been so ignorant as not to appreciate your privilege and to have exterminated in your wanton ignorance this priceless survival.7

In the Queensland Parliament, several months after Truganini's death in May 1876, the event was interpreted as a significant re-emphasis of the point that "... there was no denying that the aboriginal race was dying off". The Hon. J.M. Thompson informed the Assembly:

Looking at the history of the aboriginals in other colonies, what had they found? In Tasmania they totally disappeared since the white man went to that island, and in New South Wales there was a mere remnant of the once celebrated Hunter River tribes; the last of others had disappeared and in a few years there would be no specimens left on the face of Australia if something was not done to save them.

Thompson was, at this time, one of a shrinking minority of white colonists who still believed that 'something' could be done. Most were resigned to the conclusion that "... an attempt ... to save a small fraction of the aboriginals ... would be of no use at all"; although, happily, "... it was still possible to smooth their way to the grave".8 At this same time, the Queenslander informed its readers that, "It lies decreed in the unwritten yet potent Book of Fate that the 'Warrigal Man of Australia shall perish out of the land'"9 ...", while the Brisbane Courier wrote reassuringly:

It may be admitted that the spectacle of a whole race of men perishing before the advance of a people superior to them in every appliance of war or civilization is one well calculated to excite the sympathy of the looker-on, yet history and science have taught us that by the inscrutable degree of Providence, certain races are doomed to perish as their successors are at hand to take their place.10

Later, in October 1899, the ethnologist R.S. Walpole would interpret the seriousness of this situation by urging his fellow scientists to secure "... a complete set of ethnological specimens, male and female, of the Australian Aborigine, before this ancient race became extinct";11 whilst, later still, in August 1911, A.S.
Kenyon admonished other academics concerning "... a blot on our reputation as a cultured race" in relation to the "rapidly disappearing" Aborigines. The alleged 'blot', however, did not concern any European implication in the Aboriginal death rate; rather, Kenyon felt agitated because "... German and Continental museums have much better collections [of relics] than Australian museums".12

In the context of this fatalistic preoccupation with death and dying, Meston's concept of the native, and his original Aboriginal bill at least seemed to hold out some hope. In 1889, Meston had merely been one more writer to repeat and reinforce the current 'wild beast' stereotype when he commented, in regard to the Queensland Aborigines, that it was a delusion to consider that "the human savage differs essentially and radically in his nature from that of any other wild animal".13 By the mid-nineties, however, his opinions had been greatly altered by his growing personal contact with the Aboriginal people as well as by his reading of books like Richard Sadlier's *The Aborigines of Australia* which argued that "... these people ... are not, as has been openly declared, scarce human" and that "the chequered vices of civilization" were alone responsible for "their present debauched, degraded, perishing condition".14 When Meston wrote his *Geographic History of Queensland* in 1895, aiming it principally at the older school child, he depicted the natives in their pristine state as "healthy, free and happy". He claimed that there was no dishonesty among them, neither selfishness nor the ill-treatment of children; politeness and virtuous behaviour were paramount in their original society; vitality was higher then, senses were keener and personal cleanliness was scrupulously observed:

There was no baby farming, nor any need for societies for prevention of cruelty to children or animals ... There were no drunkards, no lunatics, no thieves, and none of the nameless class who form one of the most terrible reproaches of civilization. There were no hereditary diseases, and none that were the outcome of gluttony or depravity.15

Meston had, in short, resurrected the positive stereotype of the Noble Savage, and using this as a yardstick to measure the natives' present miserable and derelict condition, he concluded that action not resignation was the required response: If the natives had fallen from an elysium, he would place them back there again. On the other hand, if nothing was done, he calculated, "I place the period of their extermination at about
fifty years hence". Reserves seemed the logical choice to make if there was to be any chance of restoration, for Meston hoped to resuscitate Aboriginal life by communicating it once more with nature, and extricating it from the baneful effects of European civilization. He predicted confidently:

... these people, with their latent energies resemble the grasses of their native land, the grasses that a long drought apparently annihilates, but on which a few genial showers act like the wand of a magician creating a vitality and a verdure that seem little short of miraculous.

Almost one-third of the clauses of his draft bill "... to make Provision for the better Protection and Care of the Aboriginal and Half-Caste Inhabitants of the Colony, and to make more effectual Provision for Restricting the Sale and Distribution of Opium" therefore either dwelt or touched upon the subject of reserves. Within their confines Meston further hoped to initiate Aborigines into:

... industrious habits by placing them under those conditions which are essential to enable the primitive savage of the Stone Age to pass, by gradual transition, to the third, or agricultural stage of mankind. This will bridge the chasm between the hereditary hunting habits of the nomad and the fixed occupation of civilized man.

Including an initial removal of fifty-one Aborigines from Maryborough to Fraser Island, before the bill became law, Meston had, by the end of 1902, shifted 410 natives from fifty-three centres in South-Eastern and Western Queensland onto four main reserve areas, the largest group — a full 216 — being sent to the aforementioned reserve of Bogimbah Creek at Fraser Island. Like G.A. Robinson who had conciliated the remnants of the Tasmanian Aborigines by the late 1830s so that they might be transported to Flinders Island — that "place of sickness" — Meston soon found his vision of a fruitful social experiment turning into a nightmare. Not only did he overlook the crucial Aboriginal life-linkages with their tribal lands — dismissing their protestations of terror at removal as "caprices and sentimentalisms"; not only did he enforce the close and relatively fixed residence of disparate and often mutually antagonistic tribal remnants together upon the reserves — there being as early as April 1898 representatives of at least ten different tribes present at Fraser Island; not only did these fundamental errors of ignorance fore-doom the settlement: Meston additionally
seemed to believe that Nature alone should prove the healer for these broken and bewildered people, and that he merely needed to exercise — as he continued to boast — the "severest economy" in running the reserves.23

When in 1901, the Anglican Board of Missions assumed control of Fraser Island, and the new Matron, Mrs Mary Gribble made a desperate public appeal for clothing, basic medicines, utensils and foodstuffs for the natives, Meston responded angrily:

The first superintendent of Fraser Island [his son Harold] lived twelve months in an empty house, slept on the floor, washed in the creek and said nothing about it. It would be better if hardships were borne in silence.

Harold, for his part, however, confidentially warned the Home Secretary, in regard to the re-opening of Durundur reserve, "If the superintendence of this or any other reserve is to be solely under my father as it was at Fraser Island, there will be as much done in three years as you saw at that place."24 As late as 1903, the natives were still "... camping in all weathers under their suspended blankets".25 Sanitary conditions were described as deplorable and their diet of mainly maize-meal porridge was medically attacked.26 Archibald Meston believed, in recommending this deficient fare, that "Maize-meal alone kept the convicts in good health and working condition, and is equally successful in our gaols today".27 Yet, in November 1899, his complacency on this count had received a sharp setback when he made the alarming discovery that the native inmates of Bogimbah Creek had, in their deprivation, taken to eating white clay. A month later, six of the women and four children had to be hospitalized. Two of these children were not expected to live.28

A subsequent medical report upon the settlement attacked the absence of meat, milk or vegetables upon the diet scale. Dr Penny of Maryborough wrote:

The fact of no fresh milk being procurable and no meat or vegetables to be got renders it a very difficult matter to treat any of the ordinary forms of disease, let alone such a disease as Earth-eating where so much depends on a good generous diet.

How infants fresh from the breast exist I do not know ... and as children seem to be the principal sufferers from Earth-eating disease on Fraser's Island, it is not to be wondered at if they succumb.29

The disease was diagnosed by a Government Health Officer30 as
arising from acute anaemia and worm infestation of the small intestines — such causes being contingent upon poor diet and deplorable living conditions. Other diseases discovered among inmates by Dr Penny in “a hasty examination” included tuberculosis, syphilis, pyaemia, liver disease and ulcers.31 The scene where Meston had vainly and romantically hoped to rejuvenate the Noble Savage had rapidly become simply another dying place for the disinherited neglected natives where they suffered silently and ate from the alien earth. Several years later, Missionary E.R. Gribble made the following sombre charges concerning the condition of the camp when the Anglican church assumed control, exactly three years after Meston had begun it in February 1897:

Owing to the unsatisfactory condition of the aboriginal settlement on Fraser Island under Mr Meston, the then Government decided to hand over the management to any church which would undertake it . . . Mr Meston is decidedly inaccurate when he says that the people were perfectly healthy. As a matter of fact there was hardly a woman in the settlement free from some form of disease, and all with very few exceptions were addicted to earth-eating and this disease was creating great havoc among them . . . At the time of my arrival on the island there were two very full cemeteries in use, and those buried there I am sure had not died during the first week the new Anglican management took control. [In the first, which I closed] . . . I counted myself some thirty graves, and in the other some forty odd graves. There were other graves outside those cemeteries I did not trouble to count . . . it was far from being the well organized institution that Mr Meston would have all believe.32

The tragedy, as it was played out on Fraser Island, had been tortuously enacted previously by the deported Tasmanians shunted from Swan Island to Gun Carriage Island, then to Flinders Island and finally to Oyster Cove, South Tasmania.33 As Humphrey McQueen comments:

It was an effective means of failing to solve the problems of Aboriginal-European relations and it has been employed by administrators throughout the twentieth century. The entire policy of Reserves has been shot through with a desire to put the Aborigines out of sight and out of mind.34

Developing upon this theme Clive Turnbull notes:
If you want to get rid of someone, the most convenient place to put him is on an island and there have been many such islands — St Helena, Norfolk Island, Devil's Island, Alcatraz and of course the biggest island of all, Australia, and its dependant island, Van Dieman's Land, or Tasmania.\(^3\)

In Queensland, too, there had been many islands which had served the purpose of social sanitation, segregating undesirable colonists from the on-going concerns of a progressive community: For instance, there was Stradbroke Island for the aged, the permanently incapacitated, the tubercular and the incurably ill; Peel Island for the re-sentenced alcoholic, as well as for — upon its other shore — leprosy sufferers who had also been variously sent to Great Lizard Island, Dayman Island and Friday Island — the choice here actually being made upon racial grounds. St Helena Island, similarly, held a large proportion of the Colony's criminal rejects. Like these unwanted peoples, who were all considered doomed in their various ways, the Aborigine too had come to be defined only residually by the newly dominant white society.\(^3\) N.J.B. Plomley's comment on the Flinders Island regime: "The outlook was clearly that of the gaol" . . . \(^3\) could be applied equally well to Fraser Island, especially as it soon came to be used as a convenient place to isolate Aboriginal ex-prisoners and those branded "desperate characters" and "incorrigible blacks" by white residents in any district. As Meston wrote in 1901:

> It appears that Dr Roth regards Fraser Island as a sort of penal settlement to which all the worst blacks are to be consigned indiscriminately, and has already sent a number of notorious characters there from the North.\(^3\)

A correspondent to the *Bulletin*, under the fitting pseudonym of "John Brown" complained that the "worst enemies" of the blacks — the squatter, J.P.'s and the police:

> ... now have the power to deport to Fraser Island for life without trial any unfortunate who can be easily made out to be a *bad nigger*. . . . The methods employed are those of the slaveowner, to abduct, deport, and assign under permits, or otherwise, the aborigines to Fraser Island, the mission stations and employers to work for a peppercorn wage . . . the aborigines never had such a bad time all round as they have had since this so-called 'protection' started . . .
condition of the blacks, I contend, is practically that of slaves.  

A similar condition pertained upon Fitzroy Island, utilized by Yarrabah Anglican Mission as a "penal reserve", where "malcontents", "thieves and opium smokers" were sent so they could not "abscond". It was to this island that the sorry remnants of the Fraser Island Mission were eventually removed, after mission authorities, in desperation, had both failed to curb the earth-eating, or to raise sufficient interest or funds among the general public for the continuation of Bogimbah Creek. When Police Magistrate Grant visited Fitzroy Island in 1910, he found there ten married couples, three single girls and an old woman, all of whom he claimed to be former inmates of the "Fraser Island Mission". Grant wrote, with melancholy resignation, "How these people pass their time I cannot imagine ... I was very glad to leave the Island and its helpless inhabitants, being unable to alleviate their mode of life . . ." The availability of islands off the Queensland coast for use as natural prisons, however, remained a convenient factor which was not lost upon authorities concerned with Aboriginal 'welfare'. When Palm Island was being considered as a new Aboriginal reserve during the years of World War I, Chief Protector J. Bleakley wrote to the Under Home Secretary:

A reserve is needed for use as a penitentiary for troublesome cases and to which aboriginals from the Northern districts can be removed . . . A most suitable place in my opinion would be Great Palm Island, north of Townsville, which some time ago on my application was reserved for Aboriginals.

As the Protector on Thursday Island had already intimated, "Many of the individuals we desire to punish have been guilty of immorality", and Bleakley added, in May 1917, "Being an island, it ... provides the security from escape required with such characters". The reserve, which Meston had originally envisaged as a natural refuge from degeneration had — largely because the dominant social impulse compelling its necessity was one of exclusion rather than genuine humanitarian concern — soon assumed a character more appropriate to that of the prison or internment camp. John Rex's designation of the racial reserve as a "subsistence island", and as "a special form of exploitation" is here particularly apt.  

In this context, Rex further notes that "institutionalized racialism" — here represented by enforced population transfer
and geographical confinement under an authoritarian regime — often emerging from an atmosphere pervaded by "... a racist doctrine which led to the setting up of institutions" — here exemplified by the 'Doomed Race Theory' — can have the additional effect of making "the public confession of the doctrine unnecessary".4 It is indeed true, in confirmation of this, that public expressions of racist assumptions concerning the Aborigine, as represented by statements in the popular press, decline greatly during the eighteen-nineties and the early years of the twentieth century. It can additionally be argued that the Aboriginal question as a topic of interest diminishes in proportion to the degree in which the Aborigine is regarded as a threat to the white population. As an immediate physical danger, the Aborigine receives the greatest amount of serious consideration from the incoming settler; when resisting savages have been reduced to derelict and comic savages, however, they receive attention mainly in relation to their presence as moral nuisances and contaminating influences, or simply as figures of ridicule. When the reserve system finally can be utilized to remove even this embarrassment, they are usually excluded from significant press comment almost entirely, save for, say, periodical guesses upon their rate of extinction. For example, in September 1896, the Age commented:

The aboriginals [sic] were of too low a stamp of intelligence and too few in number to be seriously considered. If there had been any difficulty, it would have been obviated by the gradual dying out of the native race. What we have to be afraid of is that, from our geographical position, we shall be overrun by hordes of Asiatics.45

Similarly, on the occasion of the visit of the Duke of York to Australia during the Commonwealth festivities in 1901, the Bulletin carried a full page cartoon which pictures "the Jook" asking, "Are there no aboriginals in the district?" and being informed, hesitantly, "only a dozen or so left, not worth troubling about. The march of civilization has — er —". To which the Duke quickly responds, "Quite so! But I say, how do these other people fit in with the White Australia Policy?" — for, confronting the regal party, the cartoonist has drawn, in their conventional pictorial stereotypes, a welcoming crowd of Chinese, 'Kanakas', Malays, Indians and others, bearing addresses with titles like: "The Chows welcome the Juke".46

If the popular press was any indication of the state of public feeling, the frightening spectre of 'hordes' of variegated coloured aliens must have been constantly running through white
colonists' minds during these years. What was the Queensland working class person thinking, when the working-man's journalist, William Lane was writing:

The yellow pest should be cleared right out and anyway his haunts should be raised [sic] to the ground, if beyond the reach of disinfectants, for we don't want cholera, smallpox or leprosy to have a chance at us; nor can we afford to allow unprincipled heathens to spread a love of fan-tan and other forms of gambling amongst a virtuous people set aside for good works . . . what could we expect from the Chinese but contamination, what could we dream of getting from the hordes of Easterners but the East without its virtue, the East in all its loathsome nakedness and shame? . . . Is it a recommendation to us that a Chinaman is rich if, under the protection of his roof, Sodom and Gomorrah are put to blush, sanitation ignored, and decency defied?

The questions, of course, were purely rhetorical: Even the simplest readers knew the simple answer. Furthermore, what was a wider Australian reading public thinking when the Bulletin admonished them:

... if Australia is to be a country fit for our children and their children to live in, we must KEEP THE BREED PURE. The half-caste usually inherits the vices of both races and the virtues of neither. Do we want Australia to be a community of mongrels? There are now some 100 Queensland Kanakas married to white women; do we want an increase of such marriages or similar marriages? No; for such union is degradation. Brutal whites fall as low as brutal Asiatics; but Asiatics have not white possibilities. Whatever our failings, we are the heirs of European civilization; and we cannot merge our nationality in a barbarism or in an alien civilization to which European ideals are incomprehensible . . . The vital thing is to stop the coming flood.

European racial ideals and preoccupations are indeed well exemplified by editorials, staff and correspondents' features in the Bulletin of 1901 — that crucial year when a collection of colonies became a Commonwealth, when nationhood was nominally proclaimed, and when the decision for a White Australia was finally taken. This journal, for instance, carried throughout this year over fifty racially orientated cartoons, both large and small, fourteen of which were distinctly antisemitic, ten of which threw scorn upon Aboriginal stupidity, while the rest mostly pictured
the threat to White Australia from Chinese, 'Kanakas', Indians, Japanese or simply unspecified colored invaders. A poetical contributor from Queensland imagined what would happen if:

They oped the door and threw away the key,
And so a Speckled Grief they slowly grew,
The scorn of peoples pure in each degree
This motley country with its motley crew.

— whilst another Queenslander predicted that although the ubiquitous ‘they’ wanted the country as “... a nest for the nigger, the Jap and the Chow . . . we would show them our country was White at the Core”.49

A closer examination of this influential journal’s treatment of race-relation themes already investigated in this present volume — especially where Queensland information is concerned — can serve to illustrate vividly the perceived racial situation and to introduce some final comments upon the nature of racist thought and racistist practice in the general period and area under consideration. Items upon the Aborigine during 1901, for instance, were usually short and intent upon discovering ‘dying-race’ examples: declining numbers, Aboriginal burial practices and vanishing tribes were highlighted. In August, details of the death of the last of the Bogan River natives, “Jimmy Martell”, were recorded as well as of his rough burial by whites. West Queensland Aborigines were seen to be “dying off at a terrific rate” also, due partially to drink and disease, but mainly from opium — the “scourge of the poor niggers”. Although Walter Roth reported upon the fine example “now set by Queensland in her dealing with her autochthonous population” and another writer suggested more Aboriginal reserves on the model of “National Parks — Yellow-stones of Australia . . .”, the Bulletin in September nevertheless drew attention to the fact that Aborigines “collected near Woodford”, on Durundur Reserve, were “dying off fast”, due to the effect of the humid climate upon their prevalent tuberculosis. When a correspondent suggested that, instead of placing natives on reserves, “Queensland sugar-growers . . . [should] round-up what darkies are left in Australia” to replace their Melanesian work-force, and even increase their numbers by judiciously ‘breeding’ them, the Bulletin editor merely commented, “. . . it’s better in the interests of Australia to keep them where they are”. Perhaps the most significant single happening, however, was the involvement during January 1901, of a group of Queensland Aborigines in what the Bulletin labelled the “… most terrible show of Commonwealth Week” — the “Landing of Captain Cook” at Kurnell before a large crowd,
“more or less tight”. The report stated that, “Some of Meston’s tame niggers were brought down from Queensland to be the ferocious aborigines” and these cavorted and gesticulated wildly as “Cook” landed, for the predilection of the gathering of “3,000 people . . . shrieking with laughter under big umbrellas”.

The more sombre question of Aboriginal demise was blamed mainly upon the presence of other “colored inferior races” in the colony. “Vice and vice-disease statistics” were quoted to reveal “the terrible moral and social consequences of the admixture of Kanakas, Chinese, Malays and Aborigines in the far North . . . [the former’s] presence makes . . . [the latter’s] doom certain”. The degree of passionate illogicality exhibited by the Bulletin in adhering to this interpretation is plainly revealed in two consecutive items within its “Aboriginalities” columns reproduced here:

Dr Roth, protector of Northern Queensland Aborigines, estimates his flock at about 16,000 of whom some 6,000 are suffering from virulent contagious disease obtained by contact with the noble white man . . .

. . . Up this way (N.Q.) the aborigines are fast dying out; opium, or rather opium-charcoal being the chief enemy. What were a few years ago mere youths are now miserable-looking old men . . . the opium traffic . . . is chiefly carried on by Chows.

Later, the case of Atherton where, allegedly, seventy-odd white landowners leased farms to 230 Chinese who employed 250 Aborigines, would be quoted as ample evidence of this process. The paper commented:

Note the glorious trinity! The Cairns white who leases his land to the Chow; the Chow who employs the nigger; the nigger who poisons himself with Chow opium.

A further charge that Chinese on the Barron River lived “. . . with white women prostituted to their service” tended to complete the overall picture of oriental degradation in this district. The Bulletin also took a swipe at “the oily mystery” leasing land on the Tully River, and finally, in December, printed information claiming that “practically the whole of Queensland and portions of New South Wales are affected” by opium addiction.

Similarly, in dealing with Melanesians, the Bulletin emphasized the savage murderer and rapist stereotype, declaring throughout that “Queensland was not in any sense dependent on
its drunken and murderous Islander". In April, it was argued that:

... in a Kanaka a savage's murderous instincts are dormant, and he gratifies them (as at Ayr, Q., the other day) by hacking solitary white men into small pieces with a cane knife.

while Bundaberg and Mackay were represented as towns where "no woman or young girl dare venture about at night for fear of being indecently assaulted by the walkabout kanakas". An editorial also fulminated against "Bundaberg's houses of Kanaka prostitution" where:

The girl-daughters of white working men . . . who have been borne in travail by some poor mother, nourished by some toiling father, and educated at Queensland State-Schools — [are used] to satisfy the natural lust of the wifeless and womanless Kanakas.

In evidence of the innate violence of the savage, a riot of "last Christmas Eve" at Bundaberg was recalled, when:

. . . about one thousand Kanakas, maddened by alcohol and opium took possession of Bundaberg township, brawling, thieving, rioting, defying the police, and keeping the white residents in a state of panic behind locked doors.

A month later, Cairns had become "the town in terror" when approximately fifty "drunken savages" brawled with the police. Of the seventeen Melanesians arrested on this occasion, four could not later appear in Court as they had been hospitalized, one by a bullet in the thigh and one with an eye gouged out. Five of the thirteen who did appear had their heads swathed "in surgical bandages" and though no constables were injured, it was concluded that as "... only one boy, and not a dozen was shot, [this] is testimony in favour of the tolerance exercised by the police". The Bulletin commented sarcastically, "The good, old, cheap, reliable, honest, kindly, pet nigger!".52

 Obviously utilizing every ploy to argue against the continuation of coloured indenture, the Bulletin at other times could affect sympathy for the 'Kanaka', exploited as "... the planter's animal ... when he dies there is little more fuss about him than when a beast of burden dies". In a vividly macabre description, it affirmed:
The sugar-growing Kanaka dies like a fly on a window pane; his blood is on every cane field, and his bones are in every pound of sugar, and his bleached skull grins from every grocer's window . . .

Yet the paper was ultimately more concerned about the living than the dead as, for instance, when it warned that fully 707 exempted 'Kanakas' were remaining as gardeners and grooms and "... becoming quite common in the piebald State...[they] look like settling down and becoming a recognised strain in the local breed". Furthermore, the Sydney-based journal predicted:

... the cheap and unreliable man of ebony... threatens to swarm South even as the rabbit swarmed North and West, but with this difference — that poison can't be laid for Asiatics and a nigger-proof fence is an impossibility.

As a frightening example of what might be expected in such an eventuality, the distasteful condition of the 280 Islanders at Robb and Co's plantation, near Cudgeon on the Clarence River was carefully described:

Their huts, generally speaking are filthy looking, and in the doorstep may be seen a specimen of the white fair sex, while perhaps half-a-dozen youngsters of various tints are scrambling about the yard in foul rags... Presently a huge nigger as black as the ace of spades may be seen belting his wife (?) with a piece of wood while the youngsters scatter in all directions.53

Into this forbidding tapestry of moral degeneration and social danger posed by Chinese and Melanesians were interwoven even more ugly threads, representing the unwanted presence and stereotyped behaviour of other coloured alien minorities in the State. For example, "the Jap man and the Java man" flourishing on the Herbert River, "Manilamen" in knife affrays on Thursday Island, Afghans with their camel trains passing through Mareeba — "colored curses" coming to build stores and hotels in order to oust white competition. A regular correspondent, "Trotter" warned readers that Halifax, North Queensland was fast becoming "the true home of the alien" and his description of the scene there embodies many of the racial objections generally held by white Queenslanders in 1901:

Except for a few soul-weary, nigger-driving Scandinavian sugar cockies, the population is composed of Italians,
Syrians, Hindoos, Chows, Malays and Kanakas, and the rising generation is a piebald medley. As I write, two Dagos are fighting in the billiard room, two Syrians are disputing in the bar, a lot of Chows are jabbering in the front while a Jap has charge of the back. Coming along, saw 20 Japs repairing a tramline on one of the plantations, and saw a Malay driving a motor. The Kanaka drives about this district in his dog-cart accompanied by his dusky love; and the Chow is the boss store-keeper . . . There is a Chow quarter, a Jap quarter, and a Dago and Syrian quarter, redolent of macaroni hovels, tomato stew, opium and the omnipresent banana. In the last named quarter, a Malay runs a bagnio, with two white women, to one of whom he is married. The other day a small coastal steamer carried in the fore-cabin (12' x 10') 3 Japs, 2 Chows, a Hindoo, a Syrian and a white man bound for Halifax.

In July, “Trotter” was again reporting from Normanton that upon five consecutive stations the bachelor manager was:

. . . the only white man on the place. Niggers do all the station work, while the dusky damsels do the housework etc. The cook at the first place was a Malay; at the second, a Chow; at the third, a Jap; and at the other two, Chows . . .

By November, he was at Alpha, Central Queensland and found there:

Two pubs, 2 white storekeepers, 2 Syrians and 5 Chows. Population comprises every variety and color of humanity. Wood-carting, water-carting, carriage of goods and luggage from the railway, grooming, laundry-work etc., is all done by aborigines, who swarm about the hotels and stores picking up a stray sixpence, which immediately goes to the Chow for opium. But the Chow is the boss of the place, and acts it . . .

The general impact of such reports was to create a frightening impression of society in Northern and Western Queensland inundated and even dominated by the coloured intruder. The Bulletin contributed further to this suggestion by publishing figures to show that while, in the last six years, 10,637 colored aliens had left Queensland, a full 14,585 had arrived — a surfeit of 3,948 remaining. Thursday Island, especially, was used to exemplify a dangerous imbalance of Europeans and others. It was described firstly as “a Japanese community” and later as “a
piebald human camp". Figures were published in November to show that the mixed aggregate of Japanese, Chinese, Aborigines, Filipinos, Kanakas, Malays, Cingalese, New Guineans, Indians, Javanese and "other mixed races" outnumbered whites by nearly two to one. As a correspondent, A. Henry concluded apprehensively:

In North Queensland the colored population are now in the majority. At least they seem to be . . . Black, brown and spotted are met everywhere but whites are as scarce as free beers in a thirsty country . . . There is a very real danger of an Australian-born mongrel population growing up to make the decent white laborer, with a clean home and respectable white children an impossibility in the Northern State.\textsuperscript{54}

Needless to say, a census upon colored aliens carried out by the Queensland police as recently as 1898 had failed to support any of these contentions.\textsuperscript{55}

Overshadowing both these numerical fears and economic objections, however, was the spectre of sexual relationships between the races, indicating a fearful increase of miscegenation, inter-marriage and "piebald" offspring. At Thursday Island it was alleged that "... Chinamen, Cingalese, Manila natives, aliens of all sorts soon discover resting places for themselves upon British bosoms" — the bosoms in question being those of "strong lusty young female emigrants from Great Britain" who frequently landed there: Thus, "the mixed breed goes on". The greatest danger perceived was undoubtedly "Piebaldism" and, in July, the \textit{Bulletin} defined the term with two examples:

A sugar-planter has a half-caste illegitimate son, whose mother is an aboriginal gin. This young man recently married his half-caste cousin whose mother is a Kanaka woman who is now "kept" indiscriminately by Chows and other aliens. Another case is: An Aboriginal European half-caste girl had a child by her white uncle, and lives with her white relations as one of the family . . . Now, what sort of citizens will the progeny of these specimens be?

Another correspondent asked, in obvious despair:

Will the ultimate end of this mixture produce a new race like the lazy treacherous Guatemalans and Cubans? In and around Cairns, you see every possible combination of half-
caste — the most evil, that of a Chinaman and a black gin. When their son marries the daughter of a Syrian and his Kanaka girl, I don't know what will happen next.

The writer A. Henry, however, seemed more certain: The result could only be degraded semi-savages with "criminal instincts", in mixtures which would "defy identification" — and the only answer for this must be 'elimination'.

The Bulletin openly avowed that its objection to social relationships with "Asiatic, African or Kanaka tribe" was based upon the simple racist premise that "Australia doesn't want to be mongrel":

It objects to . . . [these races] because they introduce a lower civilization. It objects because they intermarry with white women and thereby lower the white type and because they have already created the beginnings of a mongrel race . . .

And this sexual repugnance overrode any other consideration, whether social or economic:

Who is there, however great may be his admiration of Jap energy, courage and progress, that would pleasurably regard the prospect of the most enlightened Jap forming a matrimonial alliance with one of his own family?

. . . Australia wants to remain white, and . . . it has just the same objection to seeing its people intermarry with Asiatics as the British Royal Family has to intermarriage with the Jap Royal Family, or as Chamberlain would have to seeing his daughter wedded to a Negro.

It should be noted, therefore, that however lurid and emotionally extreme these views may seem to many today, they composed in 1901 the policy of the most persuasive and effective journal in the country: "... to get rid of the black drop and the yellow drop altogether; and to preserve the White Breed pure". As A.T. Yarwood notes, "On the mind of the Australian Anglo-Saxon, with his special aversion to miscegenation and his race consciousness, the impact of the Bulletin's propaganda was immense". Nor should it be forgotten that such propaganda was re-echoed and substantiated over and over again by most colonial newspapers and journals — the views of some dozens of these being represented in this present study. One need look no further than to the columns of William Lane's Brisbane Worker or to the pages of his novel White or Yellow? A Story of Race War of A.D. 1908 — or again, to the contents of J.G. Drake's weekly Progress
with its regular “In Darkest Queensland” features — to perceive the familiar refrains of racist thought — the composite social, economic and cultural threat which immutably ‘inferior’ races posed to the society of the superior, civilized British colonizer.

Such views should allow us to regard, with at least an intense skepticism, the statement of N.B. Nairn that the basis of the White Australia Policy was simply and reasonably “… linked with the idea of nationhood on the British model and the economic development of the continent”;60 or, even more questionably, the argument of K.M. Dallas that “… it was never a case of racial antipathy here against Asiatics, Negroes or Polynesians”, but merely a rational “… opposition to the competition of ‘sub-standard’ labour in any form”.61 Such apologist writings, in tacit support of the concept of White Australia, depend ultimately upon the assumption that an emphasis of seemingly well reasoned economic objections to coloured labour releases the nation collectively from the possibility that the motives behind adopting this policy have anything to do with racist considerations. The fundamental weakness of this argument is — as even a cursory examination of racial questions in other European colonial situations will show — that economic fears and racist fears are not necessarily mutually exclusive — that racist attitudes invariably contain an economic component. The point is that, in a race-relations situation, economic objections are taken towards a physically distinguishable racial minority no matter what economic role it adopts, or is forced to play by the host society.

To begin with, these economic objections involve a tendency to proceed in argument to extreme limits — limits which in purely economic terms might be regarded as absurd, but in a racial context are still afforded serious consideration. Take again, the Bulletin of August 1892 reporting upon competition between white and “Chinkie” green-grocers. Suddenly, the article launches into the following diatribe against Indians and ‘inferior’ Southern Europeans engaged in petty commerce:

... hundreds of new-chum Levantines, Sicilians, Neapolitans, and Maltese have come out to New South Wales and found a living as fishermen and fishshop-keepers. These gentry have begun to seize upon the oyster-room business. And Italians and Sicilians have all but monopolised the fruit-selling business ... The bush settlements are being levied upon by Indian hawkers, and lately some Greeks or Bulgarians have commenced a really formidable onslaught on the lolly-trade.62
Such devastating evidence was provided to show the Caucasian being economically “played out”.

In a similar vein, the Bulletin of 1901 used, in all seriousness, the example of “a Kanaka pugilist” at Bundaberg “doing a European bruiser out of a job” as a telling case of ‘Kanaka’ competition with whites. Later in the year, Indian hawkers and peddlers — the “brown . . . multitudes of Ram Chunder” were opposed because of their tendency to harrass and haggle with lonely housewives in the bush.63

Secondly, and even more significantly, economic opposition to colored workers is often expressed in terms that are basically illogical and contradictory. On the one hand, these laborers were opposed because of their servility — ‘Kanakas’, for example, being execrated as “half-dead . . . quite submissive . . . pre­eminently kickable” — even though in this ascribed work role they performed necessary tasks which white workers distained to do.64 On the other hand, the small minority of colored aliens who did manage to avoid servility and enter the competitive labor market were equally, if not more soundly hated as an even greater economic threat. Thus Progress noted with alarm of the ‘Kanaka’ in 1899:

The sturdy well-fed black man . . . who parades the streets of Bundaberg or who is hanging about on strike in the Isis, is a very different person . . . from the ignorant, scared weakling who used to be landed with a metal ticket around his neck . . . These seasoned “islanders” are leasing land, marrying white females, entering into engagements, not only in sugar growing, but other occupations, in fact becoming a part of the population.65

The implicit contradiction revealed here is again exemplified by the Bulletin which, in September 1901, could attack the Hindoo for accepting without demur even lower wage rates than the Melanesians, then, in November that year, also attack the “Jap” at Thursday Island for “learning to strike” against his low wages and bad conditions.66 In short, coloured labor, whether unfree or free, was roundly condemned because of its racial nature. Competition was opposed because of the frightening prospect that the dictates of ‘the survival of the fittest’ might prove reversible; while, as John Rex shows, the indentured coolie laborer, assigned a fixed, non-competitive role, was equally and para­doxically seen as a positive threat. For such a laborer is cast into a ‘pariah’ status and, as such, performs a social function which, although considered necessary, is still regarded as undesirable and
in conflict with the dominant value system of the society. As Rex contends:

... in most societies, certain occupations and tasks ... are thought to be either incompatible with the values of, or beneath the dignity of the dominant group, and indeed of some minorities. In these cases an outside group may be informally licensed to perform the necessary task and [be] criticised, abused, blamed and punished for doing it ... apart from being discriminated against and performing unwanted tasks, some minority groups might be singled out as scape-goats by the dominant group. Such a contingency is always possible in a changing society which seeks to maintain the position of a dominant group even in times of crisis.

Thirdly, and just as importantly, economic opposition is not expressed as an isolated objection, but is usually integrated in discussion into a wider corpus of social fears, most readily identifiable with racist considerations. In concert with regarding racial intermixing as a form of infectious contamination, coloured labour was often emotively depicted as some threatening form of disease — a "sore", a "plague spot impossible to eradicate" or "a gangrene in the body politic" which will "poison the health of Australian society". Thus Progress, opposing the "cancer of black labor" was preoccupied with items like "Leprous Kanakas", "Leprous Cargo" and "More suspected Lepers" in its columns. The Bulletin also called coloured labour "a cancer in a white community" and argued that "even the restricted influx of coloured races means social disease for the present, social danger in the future". Northern plantations were attacked not simply as undesirable economic entities in their present format but as "disease spot[s] from which radiate piebald children" and which required "... prompt and drastic treatment to prevent them infecting the body general of White Australia". In this way, therefore, the supposed threat to the health and economy of the white community was interlinked with prevalent moral and sexual objections to racial minorities. As the Bulletin argued in November 1901:

The objection to colored immigrants is racial and economic, an objection founded on the fact that we cannot eat with them, work with them, marry with them, without the certainty of national deterioration and degradation ... in the mind of every healthy white Australian PROVIDENCE or something has planted an ineradicable repugnance to asso-
ciating with these racial inferiors, a *conscience* which warns
us against intermarrying with them.⁷⁰

These non-economic rejections, indeed, could even be seen as
over-riding any purely economic considerations — as when
William Lane stated, "The Kanaka, the Chinese and the Coolie
have got to go even if without them, the white man cannot get
two crusts to make a sandwich with".⁷¹ That sexual objections,
especially, should be so openly proclaimed as they were, in this
period of acute sexual repression, calls for particular comment.
As one writer recognized, inter-racial sexual reality was an "unsavORY ASPECT" which needed "very careful handling, so that, while
it may receive due consideration, its public discussion may not
become offensive".⁷² Economic argument against either a caste
society or racial competition, on the other hand, never had to
come into conflict with any such prudish restrictions.

Despite the seemingly obvious patterns of racist attitude and
racialist behaviour which the sources reveal, however, Australian
historians have been slow to accept the full implications of their
existence. Myra Willard in 1923, for instance, would go no further
towards a recognition of racial prejudice than to suggest that:
"The fundamental reason for the adoption of the White Australia
policy is the preservation of a British-Australian nationality". She
then proceeded to argue that "... in the formation of their
policy the leaders of the people were not actuated by any idea of
the inferiority of the mentality or physique of the excluded
peoples", and that, since this time, the existence of this policy had
meant "... the absence of any cause for hostile racial feeling in
Australia"⁷³ — as if a relative absence of coloured aliens logically
meant an absence of repugnance towards such races, and as if a
substantial repressed Aboriginal remnant simply did not matter.
A prevailing theme in every section of this study has been the
marked antipathy and violence accompanying most aspects of
race-relations in the colony. Reprisal raids and race-riots were,
indeed, only the most pronounced examples of this violence,
which manifested itself even more tenaciously in the unchecked
spread of venereal disease among Aborigines, and in the
institutionalized permission of force implicit in the reserve
system, the plantation structure or in official discrimination
against the Chinese.⁷⁴ Yet, even in their most explicit forms, the
violence and the enmity continued in the twentieth century. Con-
sider, for instance, the following report:

**Encounter With Blacks**

*Constable Dalley, stationed at Turn-Off Lagoon, has had a*
rough time with the blacks. It appears that he and the trooper were out about the copper mines the other side of Burketown. He came on the blacks he was looking for, got off his horse and laid [sic] down on the ground. One of the niggers spotted him and came at him. Dalley fired at him but the bullet did not take effect, and the nigger knocked him insensible with his nulla. The trooper came up and drove off the nigger, got Dalley on his horse and managed to get him to an adjoining station, where he is still lying.

Items such as this were common frontier fare in the nineteenth century. Yet this paragraph appeared in the *Croydon Mining News* in June 1918. At the same time, J. Lyng, noted social scientist and demographer, was writing of indentured Solomon Islanders receiving rations in New Guinea:

The excitement is of the kind we find in the Zoo when animals are being fed, each one being moved by the same desire for food and each little group using different sounds and expressions to give vent to their emotions . . .

Closer to home, Frank Gordon, a Brisbane journalist was arguing in October 1918:

One of the more prominent national policies universally accepted by contending factions is that of racial purity, demanded in the claim for a “White Australia” to the exclusion of black and colored races of every shade from the coal black negro, ignorant and superstitious to the refined and cultured Japanese . . . of a coppery hue. This policy touches the very heart of the science of eugenics and is adopted as a measure of protection against the introduction of undesirable alien strains calculated to depreciate the mental, moral and physical stamina of the white man.

The article then launches into a savage attack on white inmates and staff of the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum who intermixed with natives from the Myora Aboriginal Settlement, both institutions being situated on Stradbroke Island. Gordon contended that “... the male racial pervert and ignorant offender against the laws of eugenics” who married Aboriginal women were responsible for the “rapidly increasing progeny of healthy little niggers and others of indefinite shades of complexion” — “a moral crime against the established policy of a white Australia”. All these examples, it should be noted, are contemporaneous with Myra Willard’s study.
Again, in 1953, Carlotta Kellaway argued that in the formulation of White Australia, "racialism" was simply used as a "cloak" or "... a kind of haze behind which more 'realistic' political objectives could be pursued". Her argument was effectively answered the following year by Bruce Mansfield who debated forcefully that "racialist or nationalist considerations" were always uppermost. His article was eclipsed in turn by the economic emphases of Dallas and Nairn in 1955 and 1956, and it was not until 1964 that A.T. Yarwood once more tentatively re-emphasized "... the race consciousness that underlay the 'White Australia' policy". Since then, Frank Stevens in his edited survey of racial prejudice in Australia has claimed that although "racism, the combination of ideology and system, is clearly established" in the European experience of Aborigines, it is not so certain that "proof of racism in Australia" exists in regard to other historically identifiable racial minorities, though racialism, the practice of prejudice, undoubtedly does. Finally, Humphrey McQueen, after apologizing in *A New Britannia* for being "... far too peremptory in my treatment of the aborigines", argues unwaveringly that "Racism is the most important single component of Australian Nationalism", three of its salient elements being "... the destruction of the aborigines; the dominance of the Pacific; the fear of an Asiatic invasion". It should be clear from the line of argument taken in this detailed study of Queensland's racial history, that the present authors find more support for the position taken by McQueen than that adopted by any other investigator to date.

Yet a disinclination to accept the racist strand in Australian history still persists. This denial is apparent when a correspondent writes to a national newspaper, "Aboriginals [sic] have not suffered 200 years of unrelieved oppression as their radicals and some white sympathisers are fond of claiming" and then goes on to question the "idea" that the "Aborigines were forced off the land by wanton violence". It is shown, too, when Russel Ward writes that there is "a relative lack of race prejudice in early Australia", that this prejudice was "recently acquired", has been almost "sloughed" off since the 1940s and is, furthermore, "not necessarily a part of the Australian ethos". More recently, P. Biskup in his historical study of Aborigines and Europeans in Western Australia has reflected Ward's views when he assumes:

There is no evidence of colour prejudice among the White Australians at this time [from 1874 onward]; if a man could "stand up", he was generally accepted as equal.

The ambiguous nature of this contention is then compounded by
the examples Biskup chooses to illustrate it. He states that, in the novel *Such is Life* by "Tom Collins", (actually Joseph Furphy), the "half-caste of the eighties" is depicted as "... a sturdy fellow and every bit as insolent to his employer as his white peers". Yet this choice of example is rather curious, for *Such is Life* also provides us with a vivid racist stereotype of the "yellow agony". But perhaps the most outstanding case of open denial is also the most recent. C.E. Cook's paper *Racism and Aborigines — Spontaneous or Induced?* published in 1973 argues that "racism" has no reality in Australian historical fact, but instead, is a recent "phobia", concocted by "the mass-media" and "actively cultivated" by other "propagandists" — a "masochistic" indulgence which has resulted in misguided "hostility", especially among "part-Aborigines". Cook claims that although he has lived "... in proximity to Aborigines for long periods since the turn of the century... In Australia, I have been able to find in the whites no such antagonism towards the Aborigines as will fall within our definition of racism". The point is reiterated, while the author takes pains to emphasize instead "... in the history of this country, innumerable stories of selfless devotion on the part of both black and white, each for the other", as well as the "affectionate regard for Aborigines" shown by the "great mass of white Australians". Yet, he adds sadly, "... these incidents and their background are never recalled".

As ones who have lived in proximity to the repeated folk-myths told by whites about Aborigines for long periods since the late forties, however, the present authors are inclined to think that stories about 'Jacky-Jacky' have had more than their fair share of exposure. They are also inclined to believe that, from their close study of documentary sources upon race relations, the evidence of racial antagonism in Queensland history — a significant sample of which is presented in this present study — is both widespread and overwhelmingly convincing in its accumulated impact. Such material and its background has, however, only just begun to be properly recalled. Is C.E. Cook aware, for instance, of what happened to a large number of the Aboriginal remnant of Barcaldine, the town where we are told he was born in 1897? After 'the turn of the century', in 1902, forty Aborigines, described as "... cast off by stations no longer needing employment", were found there to be thoroughly destitute and prostituted. After white residents complained about their being 'free to ramble about town", "going about indecent", getting "drink and opium" and "continually quarrelling among themselves", they were branded "a public nuisance" and the "remedy" suggested was "deportation to Fraser Island". Thirty-five of them were, however, finally and forcibly "removed on the special
request of the Municipal Council" from their tribal lands and sent south to Durundur reserve, almost 400 miles away. Their subsequent fate is not officially recorded. Yet the basic fallacy of Cook’s argument is that he employs a definition of racism, seemingly of his own devising and in support of his own convictions, which is insufficient for the purpose of properly understanding the phenomenon. He states: “I shall define ‘racism' as hostility to and rejection of an individual or a group solely on the grounds of descent or colour”. This definition fails to sustain him, however, for he goes on to say:

If some Aborigines appear to be dirty, verminous, diseased, indolent, improvident, socially or morally undisciplined, then revulsion and rejection are to be expected in the more “refined” groups of the black or white population. This is not racism and should not be regarded as such.

But, his definition conveniently neglects to explain the process by which ‘some Aborigines’ come to be in such a state, and why many whites tend to stereotype virtually all Aborigines in this way. Workable definitions of racism have, however, been available since 1940, when Ruth Benedict described it as “... the dogma that one ethnic group is condemned by nature to congenital inferiority and another group is destined to congenital superiority” — though there has been a lively debate upon the usefulness of ensuing definitions ever since. While the UNESCO definition emphasizes the belief pattern of racism: “... that there is a scientific basis for arranging groups hierarchically in terms of psychological and cultural characteristics that are immutable and innate”, writers like P. Van den Berghe and O.C. Cox have directed their definition at the structural situation which both gives rise to and is supported by such ideas. Cox, for instance, defines “race prejudice” as:

... a social attitude propagated among the public by an exploiting class for the purpose of stigmatizing some group as inferior, so that the exploitation of either the group itself, or its resources or both may be justified.

John Rex seems to have been the most successful scholar to date in interrelating social structure and belief system. In particular relevance to what has been argued for colonial Queensland in this book, Rex states:

We seem in fact, to be concerned in race-relations studies with two broad classes of situation. One is that which arises
directly from the business of colonial conquest and which involves the assignment of the conquered to the most menial roles. The other is the case in which . . . an alien group of immigrants, culturally or physically distinguishable from the rest of the population, are allowed or required to perform what in the society's own terms are morally questionable roles. The unifying social theme is that groups of differing ethnic or national origins live together in a single socio-economic system in circumstances where some of the groups involved have less access than others to legitimate political power.93

This definition can be applied fruitfully to the case of the decimated and subjugated Aborigine, the exploited and coerced Melanesian, Chinese and other Coolie indentured laborers, as well as to the Chinese alluvial-grubber and market gardener who laboured under considerable harrassment and discrimination. In the Queensland example, however, there is an additional refinement, for the groups did not continue to 'live together in a single socio-economic system' but were eventually 'negated' and 'excluded'. Those Aborigines who were considered to be more of an eye-sore, a nuisance or a danger than a help to the white community were either allowed to die or transferred, without their consent, to distant enclaves called 'reserves', where they were likewise expected to await their predicted end. Melanesians and Chinese, weighed in the balance, and ultimately found to be more 'hurtful' than 'helpful' to the European community, were similarly removed as 'superfluous', being both 'repatriated' and 'deported'.

However, this is not the full story. Rex goes on to show that "... the system is justified by appeal to some kind of deterministic theory".94 He believes that:

The clearest example of such a deterministic theory is the one to which the term racist is most often confined. What happens in this case is that the fact that a particular group suffers discrimination is attributed to an incapacity to perform a role or a special capacity to behave in particular ways that is determined by genetic inheritance.95

Thus, Aborigines, Melanesians and Chinese were, by virtue of the characteristics generally ascribed to them by Europeans, either regarded as fit only to perform certain menial roles and specialist functions, like wood-chopping and buck-jumping, thrashing cane or growing vegetables — or defined residually, and seen to be fit for no worthwhile role at all. The writings of evolutionists,
Social Darwinists, mono-genesists and poly-genesists — pan-national in their appeal to the enterprising white imperialist or colonist — were utilized in turn to depict the pattern of 'genetic inheritance' and the consequent behavioural traits of these 'inferior' races. Their conclusions, as popularized by the journalist, the politician and the common man and woman, took the form of stereotypes, normally regarded at any one time as being both repugnant and immutable. Thus the Aborigine was reduced to a virtual animal, either 'wild' or 'tamed' — or to the condition of a perpetually and hopelessly ignorant child; the 'Kanaka' became, to a working and middle class audience, the violent and unpredictable savage-cum-rapist or, to his planter-master, the obedient, idiotically grinning 'coon'; and the Chinese stereotype, redolent of vice, disease and deception made excellent copy for popular journals and was considered equally fair game for all, from the thundering politician, through the violently hostile ranks of miners, workers and larrikins, down to even the taunting gangs of young white children.

It might surely be possible to demonstrate that Europeans in the colony were, in the aggregate, persistently more 'beastly' towards Aborigines than Aborigines were to them; that Melanesians received more cruelty than they ever collectively inflicted and that more individual white men raped either European or coloured women than individual 'Kanakas' ever did; that Europeans were just as prone to criminal behaviour, gambling, and drug addiction as the Chinese were, and that they were eminently more capable of conveying 'their' diseases to other peoples than were the latter. It might be possible to show all this — but, even if it was — what would be the point or satisfaction in doing so? The vital point is, however, that colonial whites never used such labels to describe themselves as they invariably did to depict the 'Myall nigger', the 'black scourge' or the 'yellow agony'. And in doing so, they created, for their own minds to endure, potent images, both irrational and confounding, which would serve to haunt them persistently, and influence their destinies far longer and more successfully, than a lurking Aborigine, or a riotous 'Kanaka', or a leprous Chinese ever would or could.
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DOCUMENT A: The massacre of eleven people including the Fraser family by Aborigines at Hornet Bank Station, inland from Maryborough on 27 October 1857 served as a catalyst for a violent European retaliation in South East Queensland upon a massive and merciless scale. This letter by G.D. Lang is a vivid account of a cross-section of that reaction along the Hornet Bank—Maryborough axis, persisting for months after the original assault. George Lang was the eldest son of J.D. Lang, the stern Presbyterian clergyman and colonial propagandist; who had earlier sponsored the Nundah Lutheran Mission to Aborigines. In later life, George Lang became a noted Australian journalist. (Source: Mitchell Library, Ref: A63).

Maryborough Wide Bay
31 March 1858

My Dear Uncle,

... I write to you at the present moment ... to make you acquainted with the proceedings of the Native Police Force in this district and of the inhabitants generally, in reference to the Blacks, and I am sure you will not only be astounded but indignant and disgusted with the details that I have to communicate to you.

When I first arrived in this district the topic of general conversation was the murder of the Frazer family on the Dawson by the Blacks of that district and the hope was universally expressed that the atrocious actors in that tragedy would meet with condign punishment. I joined in this hope believing in good faith that no illegal nor dishonourable nor to say barbarous or inhuman means should be resorted to for that purpose. On my way to the interior however, I was undeceived as to the proposed method of punishing the Blacks and I now know that nothing could have been more unworthy of human beings than the procedure both of the members of the Police Force and the white population than their horrid indiscriminate murders of the Blacks.

I learned from various sources that a party of twelve — squatters and their confidential overseers — went out mounted and armed to the teeth and scoured the country for blacks, away from the scrubs of the murder of the Frazers altogether, and shot upwards of eighty men, women and children. Not content with scouring the scrubs and forest
country they were bold enough to ride up to the Head Stations and shoot down the tame blacks whom they found camping there. Ten men were shot in this way at Ross's head station on the Upper Burnet [sic]. Several at Prior's station and at Hays and Lambs several more. The party in scouring the bush perceived an old blind blackfellow upon whom they immediately fired sending a ball through his back, another through his arm which shivered the bone to pieces and a third grazed his scalp. This old man had been for a long time a harmless hanger-on at the different head stations and of course could have been in no way identified with the Frazer murderers. A black boy belonging to Mr Cameron of Conambula long employed by that gentleman in carrying messages and rations to his out stations and in going with drays to Gayndah and Maryborough went to Mr Prior's station on the Burnett and was shot there. A blackfellow was captured in the bush by an armed blackfellow in the employ of Mr Hay and supplied him with a carbine for the purpose. The black brought his prisoner to the Head Station, tied him to a sapling in the presence of all the white residents and having addressed him in broken English in the most cruel and disgusting manner, placed the muzzle of his carbine to the helpless man's arm and broke it with the first shot. He then addressed him again in the same strain as before and shot him through the head.

The Native Police say they have shot over 70 blacks. One of their acts deserves especial notice. They arrived at Humphrey's station, went to the Blacks encamped near the house, bound two of the men and led them into the scrub and deliberately shot them, the cries of the two poor wretches were heard by the superintendent's family at his house. I had supposed that these things although acted with seeming openness in the far interior and with evident impunity would not be tolerated in more civilized society and that the neighbourhood of Maryborough the chief town in the District could not be disgraced by any such barbarities. I was mistaken however. On the evening of Friday or Saturday last the white police accompanied by some white volunteers proceeded to the Blacks Camp near Mr Cleary's homestead between the old and new townships of Maryborough and drove every man, woman and child out of it, then set it on fire destroying all the clothing, bark[,] tomahawks and weapons of the blacks and burning wilfully the blankets which at no inconsiderable expense are served out to the blacks yearly by the Government. The party of whites then followed and shot a boy of twelve years
of age dead — a lad well known in the town as a harmless, helpless lunatic and wounded a man with a ball in the thigh, besides. Yesterday the Native Police force under the orders of their white officers performed the same meritorious action for the Blacks in Maryborough setting fire to their camp destroying their clothing and blankets and driving numbers of them into the river in sight of the whole town population. Not content with this the Native Police proceeded to the boiling-down Station about a mile from town and deliberately shot dead two old black men and a young one. I have witnessed no actual murder but I have witnessed scenes that I considered occurring where they did, in the heart of the town, libels on the very humanity of the people, a disgrace to its magistrates its storekeepers its fathers and sons and everything British in the place. For instance the spectacle of a blackfellow endeavouring at the public wharf at eight o'clock last Sunday night to construct a frail raft of sheets of bark to carry over a river as broad as the Hunter at Raymond Terrace and twice as rapid, a child twelve months old and another but ten days old and all this because he had been chased from his fire and threatened with a ball from a carbine by a ruthless wretch wearing the queen's livery. I may say that the current was so strong and the mother of the infant so alarmed for it that the black in mercy returned when half over the river and gave her the child. I thought that single act more eloquent of the wrongs of the blacks than a hundred lectures and I almost regretted I belonged to the same race as those who caused it. The Blacks must be protected. They suffer a hundred times more at the hands of the whites, than the whites do from them. When it is found necessary to punish the blacks a rigid search must be instituted for the cause of the necessity and no indiscriminate selections allowed. The whites punish and persecute without discrimination: is it to be wondered at then, that the blacks, following the example set them, revenge their wrongs without discrimination too. Blood for blood is the only remedy I can see; if the Government will not institute a proper search, protect the blacks and punish the whites; seeing moreover that the blacks conduct themselves properly and be made thoroughly acquainted with the laws of property and the consequences of infringing them, the result of it will be that some person will furnish the blacks with firearms and set them in the way of revenging themselves upon their oppressors.

Such interference on the part of Government is necessary not only for the safety of the Blacks but for the security of all
such persons as the members of the Frazer family, who were made to suffer for the misdeeds of others. I suppose you have said long ago where are your magistrates. What are they all about. I reply, our magistrates are all here and they might just as well be at Jericho, they do not care a fig for either law or justice and in short knowing how matters stand they are as guilty of every act of cruelty as the actual perpetrators of them. They are traitors every man of them and unworthy [of] the confidence of the people.

I do not mean to apologize for troubling you so far . . . the fact is I feel so strongly on the matter that I deemed it necessary to write to save me from taking actual proceedings at once . . .

I Remain
Your Affectionate nephew
George D. Lang

DOCUMENT B: This unusual document, purporting to detail the treatment and tribulations of a Native Trooper from his own viewpoint, casts a revealing light upon procedural behaviour within the Native Mounted Police. In this respect, the response forthcoming from R.G.W. Herbert and Sir George Bowen is a telling comment upon what the authorities were prepared to tolerate as 'normal' behaviour in the Force. It is perhaps noteworthy that the professional partner of James Garrick, the solicitor who prepared this petition, was Charles Lilley who, in 1879, was to become Chief Justice of Queensland and who, in the early eighteen-nineties, was the official head of the Aborigines Protection Society in Queensland. The subsequent fate of “Georgy” is, unfortunately, not documented. (Source: Q.S.A. Col/A39 in letter no. 934 of 1863.)

To His Excellency Sir George Ferguson Bowen[,] Knight Grand Cross of St Michael and St George. Governor General of the Colony of Queensland.

The petition of Georgy an aboriginal native of the District of Darling Downs in the Colony of Queensland.

Humbly sheweth
That I entered the Native Police about two years and a half ago and continued a trooper until about December last when the Camp Serjeant [sic] a white man having taken from me my Gin and upon my speaking to him about it having cruelly illtreated me I left the force without leave of my officer.

That on or about the first Moon of this year for having left
the Force I was arrested at the place of . . . W.H. Coxen Esq Bendemere by Lieutenant Carr without shewing to me any Warrant or authority and who at the time of such arrest said before the Servants of my Master W.H. Coxen Esq: after reading a paper given me by Mr Coxen to shew to the Native police of whom I was afraid "I don't care for this, but if I did my duty I should shoot you on the spot as I have done two others and you know them".

That after such arrest I was fastened to the stirrup of one of the troopers of Lieutenant Carr and dragged to the police Barracks at Elutha about forty miles distant from Bendemere and there I was placed in irons in the Guard Room.

That having had my irons taken off I ran away from the Barracks and got to the Station of my Master W.H. Coxen Esq. where I have been ever since.

That I ran away because I knew that the Native Police had shot Boys who left the Force without leave as I knew a Boy had been shot in the Camp under arrest for desertion and that I was threatened to be shot too.

That I will give myself up to be punished if I have done wrong if I am protected from the Native Troopers.

That I do not wish to remain in the Native police any longer and I would have left the Force when my Officer asked me if I wanted to leave whilst in the Rockhampton District but I was being afraid of being turned into the Bush naked amongst Blacks who hated my people and so far from my own Tribe.

And I humbly pray that your Excellency will take my case into your favourable consideration and grant me that protection which I am told as a Boy and an aboriginal Native I am entitled to from the Queen and the Governor.

And I will always thank your Excellency

dated 6th May 1863

The mark of Georgy X

Witness (having first read over and explained the petition to Georgy)

James F. Garrick
Solicitor
Brisbane.

[Marginal comments from Council, signed by R.G.W. Herbert, Colonial Secretary and Sir George Bowen]:

The force not being at present properly constituted by law
this petition had perhaps better be let go. Mr Carr does not appear to have acted otherwise than in accordance with the general instructions.

GFB; R.G.W.H.

DOCUMENT C: The writer of this pamphlet which, seemingly, was never published, was the Rev. Father Duncan McNab, a Scottish Catholic Missionary and lonely protester for the Aborigi­nal cause in the Queensland of the late eighteen-seventies. McNab, outraged by the general treatment of the natives, was one of the very few to perceive that alienation from the land was a central reason for the Aborigines' vulnerability, powerlessness and deprivation. His consequent attempt to obtain land rights, as well as a recognition of full civil rights for the Aborigines, failed miserably in a society which regarded the natives as ignorant savages or perpetual children. Thwarted at every turn, McNab left the Colony in 1879 but continued to press for reform with Colonial Authorities in England — again unsuccessfully. Returning later to the Antipodes, he was to become a pioneer missionary to the natives of North Western Australia. An outstanding and undaunted life-long fighter for Aboriginal rights, McNab is yet to receive the attention he deserves in Australian history. (Source: Q.S.A. Col/A316 in-letter No. 2895 of 1881.)

Notes on the condition of the Aborigines of Queensland

According to the Statement of the Chief Commissioner of Police in Brisbane, the natives of Queensland in their wild state where they have not been injured by the Colonists, are of a gentle and friendly disposition. He also said that in seven of every ten cases of outrages committed by the Blacks, provocation had been given by the Whites. Yet the Queensland Government maintains a standing army of native troopers under European Officers for the protection of the Colonists, and of their flocks, by the destruction of the Aborigines. The occasion of the existence of such a force will readily be gathered from the following address of the aboriginal Yagan to Mr G.F. Moore, Advocate General of Victoria in 1843.

"Why do you white people come in ships to our country and shoot down poor blackfellows who do not understand you — You listen to me! The wild blackfellows do not understand your laws, every living animal that roams the country, and every edible root that grows in the ground are common property. A black man claims nothing as his own
but his cloak, his weapons, and his name... He does not understand that animals or plants can belong to one person more than to another.

Sometimes a party of natives come down from the hills tired and hungry, and fall in with strange animals you call sheep. Of course away flies the spear and presently they have a feast! Then you white men come and shoot the poor black-fellows!" Then with his eagle eye flashing, and holding up one of his fingers before Mr Moore's face, he shouted out: "For every black man you white fellows shoot, I will kill a white man!... I will take life for life". (Brough Smith's Aborigines of Victoria, Vol. II, p. 228).

Although many of the Queensland natives include some other things in their idea of personal rights, yet should they find themselves similarly circumstanced, they would act in the same way.

When a squatter has his men or his cattle speared by the Blacks (no matter that they may have been impelled to the commission of the outrage by hunger, or by the seduction of their women, or by the murder of a comrade, possibly through the timidity of the shepherd) he sends for the Native Police "to disperse the Blacks" which means to shoot them.

... At times the black troopers are taken up when drunk, or entrapped, or forced into the service. They are taken from the South and sent to the North or the North West of the Colony.

They exasperate the natives by taking as wives for a time the black gins (women) of the district in which they are located.

I have never heard of such a force in existence against the Blacks in any other Australian colony. Why should it be necessary in Queensland? Even if necessary, its action ought to be discriminating, so as not to involve the innocent in the punishment of the guilty...

On Hinchinbrook Island the Missionary Mr Fuller found only women and children all the men having been shot by the Native Police a few weeks previous to his arrival. Not only the troopers but even some of the officers have been charged with cruelty and murder, yet allowed to escape with impunity. Especially not very long ago one called Wheeler, who thus accused, was released on bail and of course, left the Colony and could not be found.

... the Messrs Low, Brothers and Squatters in Queensland declined the offered aid of the Native Police for the dispersion of the blacks, gave them notice of the approach of
the Police and sent them to the mountains till after the departure of the force.

Shortly thereafter some of their cattle were speared by the Blacks. They secured the culprits, bound them to trees for a night, and in the morning producing their guns convinced them that they were in their power and deserving of punishment. They then pardoned and released them on condition that they should not repeat the offence. From that day forward the Messrs Low never lost anything by the Blacks. On the contrary they became very friendly and useful. In fact the Squatters have worked their station mainly by them. The natives were about three hundred in number there.

The existence of the Native Police Force might be a great advantage, were it only used in necessary self defence and with proper moderation; and were it to hinder the killing of the natives with impunity by private individuals.

But unhappily hundreds of them have been so killed and many of them are still so killed. Yet I never heard of the execution of a Colonist for the murder of a native in Queensland.

To maintain the Native Police the Government annually expends over six thousand pounds sterling; as may be seen from the Estimates.

By the double agency of public and private force the Blacks are destroyed too quickly, even for the interest of the squatters, whose runs in some districts are eaten up by marsupials, so that they are compelled to put a price upon their heads, for their extirpation. Without being killed the natives are often grievously injured by the Colonists.

Last Spring on my way from Townsville to Brisbane, on board a Steamer, I met an explorer by name Carboid (whose father resides at Charters Towers) who had in his possession a black boy, whom he had captured in the interior, and was bringing to Ipswich. He told me that frequently the Whites seize the Black gins and after keeping and abusing them for a few days, let them go. He also said he had seen a carrier run down a black boy, tie him in chains on his dray and after two days sold him to another carrier for two pounds ten shillings.

I have known a case in which a settler engaged a party of blacks to ring trees for him, promising them food during the time of work and five pounds sterling when finished. He supplied the food; but when after two months the job was finished, he said he had no money, but would give a cheque for the amount. In payment he gave a piece of paper on which he had written — "Give the bearer a kick".
These things I mention not as solitary instances of what the poor natives have to suffer, but as samples of the treatment they too often receive. Although the Aborigines are British subjects they are practically without a Government beyond the protection of the laws even in the settled portions of the Colony. They have no rights, or they are generally ignored.

When they suffer wrong they have no redress as their evidence is not received in Court.

There are laws affecting them but as a rule they are not enforced.

Lately a law was made to authorize the reception of their declarations, in certain circumstances, as equivalent to an oath [The Oaths Act Amendment Act 1876] . . . but the judges do not act upon it.

There is a law prohibiting the sale to them of intoxicating liquors; but habitually disregarded with the exception of a raid made a couple of years ago on some publicans in or about Brisbane.

. . . The Natives frequently wound and maim, and sometimes kill each other in the vicinity of towns, or at destined battle fields, known to the neighbouring white selectors, and which might also be known to the Police, who might, and ought to prevent these evils, but, as a rule they heed them not, and do not interfere.

Even when the Aborigines become Christians, and are regularly married by a clergyman duly authorised by Government to celebrate marriages in Queensland, difficulties are thrown in the way of their registration . . .

The country of the Aborigines is occupied by Europeans and their descendants, without their consent, without any compensation being made to them (beyond a blanket given annually to each of a number resident in the occupied districts of the Colony) or any adequate provision for their maintenance. They are not yet allowed to possess in their own right one foot of land in the Colony unless they have purchased it and paid for it in the same way as aliens . . .

In the occupied districts of the Colony, I have found the Aborigines quick of apprehension and susceptible of instruction and training; and many tribes have expressed to me their desire of being civilized and I found them disposed to give a fair hearing to the truths of Christianity. These remarks are applicable especially to those between fifteen and thirty years of age. The old are opposed to a change for fear of want, as they depend for their subsistence mainly on the labours of the young. But when assured of help in their
decrepitude, they acquiesce to the proposed change. Till instructed they have no idea that they can become possessed of property like the whites: although they had their separate hunting grounds and some families the monopoly of the game on a particular mountain and individuals the fruit of particular trees by hereditary right.

When once they learn that they can possess property, they are willing to labour for its acquirement, and wish to transmit it to their posterity.

Like all men they are unwilling to labour if they can do without it, or are inadequately compensated, but when fairly paid they work well.

The principal impediments to their civilization are their communism, their nomad habits and the polygamy of their chiefs.

The Queensland Government annually furnishes a quantity of blankets to the natives of the occupied districts of the colony. For the last four or five years it has commenced feeble attempts at their civilization, and has expended about five or six hundred pounds per annum in these efforts . . .

Yes and the first Commission, as I learned from one who claimed to have been mainly instrumental in calling it into existence, was instituted for the purpose of shelving the question, and serving as a blind to the Home Government.

The second consists of members incapable by their own admission . . .

After four years training no social or moral improvement was perceptible at the Mackay Reserve. Even the children had not received any religious instruction.

After a lengthened correspondence, the late Queensland Government in 1876 authorized Reserves to be made for such Aboriginals as might express a desire to settle on the lands of the Colony. Consequently the settlement of the natives was successfully begun at Binambi at Durundur.

The natives of diverse parts wanted settlements, and application was made for those of Kenilworth, Jurbil, Mooroochy, Bell Vue, Kilcoy and Mount Brisbane, but were refused: the Commissioners for the aborigines, all but one, disapproving of grants of land to individual Blacks and the White selectors petitioning against the Reserve at Binambi (because it was good land and they wanted to leave to the Blacks only the mountains and the scrubs) the Minister of Lands declined to carry out any farther the resolution of the Legislative Assembly.

Subsequently the late Government refused to let the
natives have Homesteads on the same terms as the Colonists, *minus* the Survey fees. Thus although many of the natives are anxious to settle on the land and support themselves by industry, they are left without a home. Of course Diper, Ghipora and Nilahi did not get the land applied for. What is the Reserve at Mackay; the only one now worked by the Commissioners, to the whole Colony: even if its soil were fit for agricultural production: which it is not; as it consists of sand and what is called devil-devil land, that is a species of swamp in winter and crab holes in summer — Many natives would occupy homesteads who will not live on a reserve . . . It may be said that the natives never had a home. That is true in the sense of a fixed abode; but they had a territory which was their own, on which they had a right to reside and did so and used it for their maintenance to the exclusion of all others.

This home and right they never resigned, It was taken from them. Then they lived on the spontaneous productions of the soil and by hunting and fishing. Now that the circumstances of their country are changed or rapidly changing they must live differently mainly by pasturage and tillage, and it behoves the Government that has brought about the change to enable them to do so.

Notwithstanding the extent the variety and munificence of the philanthropic, educational and religious institutions of the Colonists: notwithstanding their progress in opulence, in refinement and civilization they may justly be reproached with having for a long time in the midst of them a people in want of the necessaries of life, without the benefit or protection of a Government and without, I do not say Christian, but even human instruction sufficient to preserve them from cannibalism. They live frequently, not from choice, but by necessity, on reptiles and such food as men resort to only when reduced to the last extremity by siege or famine. In our time all condemn the institution of slavery and many feelingly lament the miseries to which slaves are subjected. But what are these compared to the sufferings and degradation of the Queensland Aborigines? All slaves are better fed, clad and housed than our blacks! They are at any rate protected from foreign violence and extermination, whereas the natives have too frequently been and still are occasionally subjected to an indiscriminate slaughter of the guilty and the innocent. Their misery is greatly increased, and I may say completed, by the physical and moral corruption and degradation derived from their intercourse with Europeans . . .
For the greater part of four years I have camped and lived with the natives of Queensland, and was one of the Commissioners appointed to look after their interests till I resigned in consequence of my associates having declared their incompetence and my finding the then existing Ministry and the country nibbling at, or rather trifling with the question of Aboriginal Civilization.

(Sgd) Duncan McNab

London
24 October 1879

DOCUMENT D: This moving report upon the pitiful condition of Aborigines in Western and Northern Queensland speaks for itself. It also serves to reinforce the point that European violence did not necessarily have to proceed from the barrel of a gun. No other information is present upon B.H. Purcell, but he was one of a number who reported upon such sufferings at this time. His opening comments are significant. A.J. Vogan also was later to recall the public pressure urging secrecy and “white-wash” concerning such events, when he wrote that, between 1887 and 1898 he did “little enough, God knows” in publicizing such a situation, but that he had done “all I could dare to do”. (Source: Q.S.A. Col/A717 in-letter No. 14199 of 1892.)

The general condition of Aborigines in the Western and Northern parts of this Colony.

14 November 1892

... I have been asked and begged of repeatedly by many timid (I may say) persons not to ... [report this] — but I think I would be failing in the cause of humanity and guilty of a gross injustice if I shirked what I consider my duty to these poor suffering people — why should they be allowed to suffer any longer (having done so long enough) through fear of expressing their notoriously vile treatment and allowed to fade away without a helping hand being extended to them[?]

... Round Cloncurry I found the Kalkadoon tribe — which a few years ago was as healthy as any I ever saw ... more or less diseased with syphilis now and fast dying out, in fact it is most difficult to find a thoroughly sound black except a very young child and I have seen some of these with sores all over their bodies.

Down the Burke River ... I had a long talk with my old friend ... Mr John Buckley: he experiences the greatest difficulty in keeping his black boys' gins free from disease —
the Chinamen travelling are more or less affected with loathsome diseases and they seem to make it a practice of communicating it to all the gins that they see while travelling.

At Boulia matters are even worse and at the native police barracks I saw one young gin with the whole of her stomach eaten clean out — while at the township there were men and women dragging themselves from camp to camp — "Big fellow Wee Wee" (sick) is their pitiable expression when questioned as to their sickness.

On the Hamilton at . . . Waterford I saw about 200 blacks in camp: they were all more or less rotten to a degree, there were blacks from all parts of the country, some of the women were in a terrible state. It was heartbreaking to see unfortunate children at the breast of mothers so affected and half-castes of tender age living in these camps of disease vice and filth.

Down the Georgiana and Mulligan Rivers their conditions are equally bad while up the former river from Herbert Downs they are reeking with loathsome diseases. I never in all my life long experience with the Aborigines of nearly all the Australian Colonies saw them in such a state as they are on the Georgiana.

At Glenormiston they are in a frightful state — the diseased gins camp being a sight that will be vividly impressed in my memory forever.

Mr James Craigie at Roxborough treats his station blacks as they should be. They do all the work of the station for him and faithfully too — in the camps here I saw some bad cases, one of cancer of the chest of a man, and syphilis in many others.

Carandotta seems to be the centre of disease and there I saw men and women their faces sunken in, their bodies so shrunken, and eyes so small and far back in their heads that at first sight they appeared like mummies of centuries gone by walking about the camps.

The Urandangie blacks presented the same appearance while at Headingly many of them were starving without blankets and reeking with disease — poor old men of 50 and 60 years of age dying slowly from syphilis — what a sight. They held out their wasted hands crying out "hungry hungry wee-wee". In some cases I lifted the cloths that covered their sores: they are too sickening to relate.

I saw one poor child not 12 years that had syphilis for 12 months or more — can anything be more horrible than this
— it is bad enough to know how they have been shot down without allowing these things to continue.

Lake Nash had some bad cases and my friend the manager Mr M. Costello informed me that white travellers do their very best to disease the black gins.

... At some of the Hotels in the Western Towns gins are kept for prostitution. The police try hard to cope with it but they find it almost impossible to do so. Occasionally a man is fined for being in a blacks' camp — the Chinese gardeners get them to their huts and keep their women ...

I would suggest that the Police get strict instructions about this matter and further that all JPs should be struck of [sic] the rolls that are known to keep their black harems; this is a fine cloak to cover their licentious cravings and I must say an excellent example to evildoers and the Police — The wild myall blackfellow with his shining skin and healthy appearance even in his wild state is a King compared to the vile and degraded whites and Chinese who barter with the wandering, starving half-civilized station blacks for their women.

[Purcell then goes on to make various suggestions about work-agreements, blanket distribution, a night curfew on Aborigines near towns, immediate and competent medical treatment, schooling for the children and rationing for the indigent in order to "raise the tone of our Western Country". He continues:]

Should things be allowed to go on as they are five years will wipe out the whole of the blacks in Western Queensland; here is a magnificent opportunity for these "croakers" about the Kanaka traffic to shew their truly Christian spirit (?) if they have any.

My only plea for writing you on this wretched subject is that I am certain you cannot possibly conceive the frightful condition of these people, no one could unless they saw them — and again there is the chance of other dangerous diseases getting amongst them in their worn out and emaciated state of health ...  

... B.H. Purcell, Brisbane

[To] The Colonial Secretary,  
Brisbane

DOCUMENT E: Archibald Meston's determination to bring
"This question of the aboriginals" to a head by the mid eighteen-nineties is amply demonstrated in this letter to the Colonial Secretary. His open threat to detail past wrongs in the forum of the Queensland Assembly is a significant example of the pressure exerted upon the Government to goad it into action. It also makes Tozer's subsequent statements — in his memo of 1897 — that the Native Police had never been "unduly aggressive" and that his Government had acted out of "our sense of national justice . . . our common humanity" — ring somewhat hollowly. (Source: Q.S.A. Col/A801 in letter No. 15056 of 1895.)

Sussex St S.Brisbane
11 September 1895

Hon. Horace Tozer
Dear Sir

. . . You have a rare opportunity of which, so far, you give no indication of an intention to avail yourself.

This question of the aboriginals [sic] is not to be indefinitely postponed. If you decide to do nothing, it will come before the colony in a shape that will not be pleasant for Queenslanders to contemplate. If this parliament is indifferent, the next will be appealed to in a very emphatic manner even if the whole question has to be laid bare from 1842 to 1895 in all its naked hideousness.

I hope to have a seat in the next Assembly and once there I shall doubtless compel attention to the state of our unfortunate native race.

Tongue and pen will not be spared in the course of which I have started and from which I am not likely to be turned aside except by death.

It seems to me you are not quite clear concerning the public opinion of Queensland on this subject of the aboriginals, even that of your own constituency.

It is incredible to me that you delay so long over some decisive action especially when so much is expected from you by all friends of the aboriginals.

In Heaven's name whom can you please by not acting decisively? In whom can you excite hostility by decisive action?

If you delay much longer you will lose much or all of the credit attached to action of any kind.

If you listen to this man and that man, to endless conflicting theories from all sorts and conditions of men, you will probably end in doing nothing. Hesitation in the
face of a work that has been crying to Heaven for half a century seems a fatal kind of weakness.

Still gladly believing that you will realize the expectations you excited among friends of the aborigines in all parts of the Colony and with my best wishes

Sincerely Yours
A. Meston . . .

[Marginal comment from Colonial Secretary, Horace Tozer:]
Away.
H.T.
Section 2: Melanesians

DOCUMENT A: The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery and Aborigines' Protection Societies were the chief humanitarian organizations which pressured the Imperial Government to regulate the labour trade to Queensland and check abuse within the colony. These Societies' main informants were Protestant missionaries resident in Melanesia and concerned individuals in Queensland like Alfred Davidson and William Brookes, M.L.A.. (Source: Q.S.A., Col/A.189, in letter 2492 of 1873.)

Secretaries of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, London to Lord Kimberly, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. 6 September 1873.

My Lord,

... we contemplate with alarm the danger of importation of boys into Queensland and the evil influence which [this] ... is calculated to produce on the minds of parents and Chiefs in the Islands. The disinterested testimony of Rev. R.H. Codrington is ignored, whilst that of interested parties in Queensland who are mixed up in these transactions, is accepted as conclusive. It is impossible to observe without a great regret the way in which the Marquis of Normanby (the Governor) sets aside the evidence of the Rev. R.H. Codrington who, as the successor of the lamented Bishop Patterson, has the advantage of personal knowledge of the Islands and is acquainted with some of the languages of the natives ... No doubt the Governor is correct in stating it is "customary to make small presents to savages", but we think it will not be supposed that this is ever alone without an object ... in the present case, the allegation is that the return is received in the shape of boys of tender age, who, by what appears to us, a stranger fiction, are said to be "making engagements for their own benefit." ...

The argument that they are better off than they were in their native islands forcibly reminds us that it is identical with the plea put forth by the first slave traders and that the same argument is used in the defence of the African slave trade at the present day.

DOCUMENT B: This is one of the very few letters written by a Melanesian servant in Queensland. Significantly, it is a protest against abuse and ill-treatment. Before 1875, only a minority of
Islanders could speak and write English, having been taught by Protestant missionaries in the New Hebrides and Loyalty Islands. Despite their ability to protest to government officials, the intimidation they suffered at the hands of an irate master or the indifference shown towards them by 'protectors', was seemingly enough of an effective deterrent upon their literary efforts.


Bievat [a Melanesian engaged at Northampton Downs, Tambo] to the Government Agent for South Sea Islanders [the Immigration Agent]. 22 September 1872.

I am requested by Vee Vat, a South Sea Islander, to inform you of the cruelty he underwent by flogging with a stockwhip, receiving thirty-six lashes on his bare back after being tied up by the two hands to a tree. Three other South Sea Islanders underwent the same punishment. South Sea Islanders were shepherding and they requested rations from Mr Rome and he refused to give them. And then the South Sea Islanders refused to work without rations and then Mr Rome, the owner of Northampton Downs Station and his overseer, Mr Gilespie, tied them up and gave them the above punishment and these men request you to redress their grievance.

[Comment by Police Magistrate of Tambo to Colonial Secretary. 17 December 1872:]

I do not think they have any reason to complain of ill-treatment.

DOCUMENT C: Alexander McDonald's criticisms of the appalling death rate among Melanesian servants 'enlisted' from New Guinea and adjacent areas in 1883-4 was the first official step towards a full exposure of kidnapping, murder and government neglect during those years. In 1885, the Griffith administration initiated a Royal Commission to investigate these allegations, which were proven to be accurate. Those Melanesians from these areas who survived their residence in Queensland were returned home in 1886. (Source: A.R. Macdonald to I.A. 26 January 1884, Q.S.A. Col./A381 in letter 1073 of 1884.)

Alexander McDonald, Inspector of Pacific Islanders at Mackay to Immigration Agent, Brisbane. 26 January 1884.

Sir,

I bring to your attention the large number of deaths of Pacific Islanders at Homebush Estate . . . the whole arrangement [there] is in the highest degree, satisfactory. Every precaution has been adopted to guard [sic] against the
spread of dysentery... in spite of all care, twenty-five deaths were reported during the current month and immediate preparation is now being made at the Islander Hospital for the reception of thirty patients from that Estate alone.

...[the people] of New Britain, New Ireland and adjacent islands, and even the Santa Cruz and the Northern Solomons are physically ill-adapted to contend with the change in climate and a mode of life entailed by a residence in this district...

It is beyond a doubt that the late arrivals from strange islands have come here with very imperfect notions of the nature of the work required of them. It is quite impossible to convey to an untutored savage precise ideas of the novel conditions of life that he will be called upon to encounter on his arrival in the colony. This experience alone can teach him; and there is nothing very surprising in the spectacle of an islander who has perhaps never done a continuous day's work in his life, endeavouring to escape from a discipline that must be excessively irksome to him.

... The general community is angered by the depredations committed by absconders in their search for food, and from the display latterly of a spirit of resistance, any attempt at recapture, which may easily enough assume an attitude of active defiance...

This class of labourer is at best of doubtful benefit to their employers and are very certainly a source of infinite trouble.

DOCUMENT D: This article, published in a prestigious and widely-circulated magazine, read both in Australia and Great Britain, gives the clearest and most comprehensive exposition of the "uncivilized child" stereotype. Blake's article is important because he has taken pains to depict all aspects of the "Happy-go-lucky, infantile" image of the Melanesian, most authors being merely content to describe a few features, usually the benevolence and paternalism of the masters and the fawning and faithful tendencies of the 'Kanakas'. Another author who published an article that year (Archibald Forbes, The Kanaka in Queensland in the New Review, VI, 1892) also attempted to give a rounded generalization of the Pacific Islander in service. (Source: H.I. Blake, "The Kanaka. A Character Sketch", The Antipodean, 1892.)

"The Kanaka". A Character Sketch.

The predominate note in the Kanaka character is certainly a merry one... He takes life as he finds it, and does not prematurely age himself trying to solve the complex, ever-
varying problems of civilization . . . a Kanaka is always a “boy” . . .

On a sugar plantation, whether cutting and burning scrub, weeding or cutting cane and loading it on the trucks for the mill, the “boys” are always a cheerful feature in the landscape . . . Board and lodging, clothes, blankets, soap, pipes, tobacco, and medical attendance are questions about which the cane-tillers need take no thought. At the first tingle of the “knock-off” bell, “Bell, oh!” is repeated from field to field in every degree of shrillness, and soon the cane-rows are deserted. Not like tired labourers, but rather as frolicsome urchins school-released, do the gangs make for their huts. Some have long reeds with which they practise throwing the spear, others skylarking, all are talking or shouting, with the exception of a few musical enthusiasts who stride along to the strumming of their jews'-harps or reed mouth-organs. A gentleman from the Solomon Islands, perhaps, brings up the rear; with a small cloth round his waist, a black clay pipe stuck in the lobe of one ear, a round tin match-box in the other, and a red hibiscus flower in his hair, he looks an imposing object on the face of nature.

The Kanaka likes to be his own architect; he therefore generally builds his own grass hut, and refuses to live in the brick or wooden barracks with a galvanised roof which the plantation owner may erect for him. Although he scornfully rejects the idea of living in the barracks, he has no objection to keeping the precious box there, as they are not so liable to be burnt down. Every Kanaka has a trade box, in which he stores those treasures dear to his soul and pocket. His clothes, weapons, ornaments and musical instrument are all locked away together. The key he always carries with him, and it is a most exceptional thing for a box to be touched by anyone save the rightful owner. The rights of personal property are strictly regarded among Kanakas, but then, of course, they are only savages. They are however thoroughly communistic in their habits . . .

When the evening “ki-ki” is disposed of, the Kanaka begins to lay himself out for amusement. The musical contingent produce their mouth-organs, jews'-harps, and concertinas, and round the fires the boys from the different islands sing their songs of the immortal themes of love and warfare. Once fairly started, they will “meké” or dance and sing together for hours . . .

The weekly half-holiday on Saturday brings the Kanaka out in a new light. He dons those cherished garments stowed away in his box, and, accompanied by his Mary, also
gorgeously attired, proceeds to "walk-about". He visits his friends, and if there is a town within reasonable distance, it will be thronged with a law-abiding dusky crowd on Saturday night. The stores are never-ending sources of pleasure, for if a Kanaka does not want to buy anything for himself, he can always comment on the purchases of his friends and tender his advice. These are privileges of which, being of an eminently sociable disposition, he is never slow to avail himself. If he buys two or more articles at the same place, he pays for each separately, receiving his change each time. Thus he escapes the pitfalls of mental calculation.

As a sportsman the Kanaka is not a shining example. A Mallicollo boy was one day observed taking aim with a very old musket at a very small bird not twenty yards from him. The weapon was heavy and rusty, and probably required a twelve-pound pull on the trigger; consequently the barrel was dropped a little, the charge buried itself about ten yards from the muzzle, and the bird flew unharmed. "My Word!" said the would-be bird-slayer, rubbing his shoulder, "me no bin pull strong fellow that time." He was evidently under the impression that the harder the trigger was pulled the farther the shot would go — a conclusion to which his experience with his native bow and arrow would naturally lead him . . .

The Kanaka and his Mary, if he is fortunate enough to possess one, as a rule dwell happily together, each devoted to the other. They are, however, very jealous, and have a unique manner of venting their feelings if aroused by the green-eyed monster. For the offended party at once proceeds to the other's box, breaks it open, and proceeds to tear up every shred of clothing that may be in it; new or old, cheap or expensive, it all goes into small pieces . . .

He is, moreover, a vain personage, much given to adding to his personal appearance by strange ornaments. He also bores holes in his nose and ears. These are used in lieu of pockets . . .

At intervals the Polynesian blood boils over, the instincts of a line of fighting ancestors are aroused. The natives of different islands take sides, spears and bows and arrows are looked to, and the favourite tomahawk is sharpened . . . Thus armed, the antagonistic bands parade, each side keeping its spirits up by loud abuse of the other. At last a meeting comes off, generally on a holiday. The first performance consists of representatives of the rival forces, like
heralds of old, hurling defiances, from a safe distance, with truly Homeric fluency . . .

The Kanaka is easily influenced by kindness, and becomes greatly attached to those who understand his character and treat him intelligently. He often refuses to leave the plantation when his time has expired, and, instead of returning to his native shore, insists on being re-engaged for another term . . .

But whether at home or abroad the Kanaka is always an interesting entity, a member of a much misunderstood and generally disappearing race.
DOCUMENT A: In September 1886 anti-Chinese publicists in north Queensland decided to renew and intensify their campaigning against the aliens. The Chinese in response, sent a host of petitions and letters to newspapers, politicians and government departments asking for their protection and support against the “demagogues” and agitators. This petition forwarded by Chinese in the Mackay district best exemplifies the fears and the disenchantment experienced by most of them during this period of excessive radical excitation. (Source: Votes and Proceedings, Legislative Assembly, Queensland, 1886.)

Petition from 173 Chinese Residents in the Mackay District.

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled. The humble Petition of the undersigned Chinese Residents in Mackay and Districts, some of whom are naturalized British subjects —

Sheweth,

That your petitioners view with great alarm the state of public feeling amongst the British — antagonistic towards your petitioners' countrymen generally.

That your petitioners and their fellow-countrymen are law-abiding, and endeavour to obey the laws of this Colony, in which they are privileged to live, as the records of the Courts of Justice attest.

That the chief complaint against your petitioners' countrymen is their frugality, and that they can do work and sell for less money than Europeans.

That your petitioners' countrymen are objects of antipathy to Europeans, by whom they are assaulted, as, to wit, lately at Charters Towers, and on the thirteenth day of October, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, at E.K. Russell's wharf, Townsville, and the law seems powerless to afford protection.

That by the treaty of peace, friendship, commerce, and navigation, signed on the twenty-sixth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight, between Great Britain and China, British subjects are permitted to reside
and trade in China, and the utmost protection is guaranteed them by the Chinese Government.

That prior to that treaty very few Chinese resided in British dominions.

That on the discovery of gold in Australia, most notably in Victoria and New South Wales, people of all nationalities, without any distinction, were invited to Australian shores, and the authorities of Australia caused all to be welcomed, and in response to the wishes of the then colonists, your petitioners' countrymen, in common with others, proceeded to Australia. Now it would appear to your petitioners that, the want having ceased, Australia has altered its mind and wishes on that subject.

That your petitioners' countrymen contribute to the revenue of the Colony, and beg most respectfully to draw the attention of your Honourable House to the enormous quantity of merchandise imported into Australia from China, adding very largely to the revenue. From one steamer lately, the "Catterthun", was discharged in Australia merchandise the duty on which amounted to one hundred thousand pounds. In Mackay two of your petitioners' countrymen, storekeepers, pay between them upwards of three thousand pounds duty yearly on imports.

That many of your petitioners' countrymen are old residents of Mackay and surrounding districts, and have been at considerable outlay in farming and otherwise cultivating land. That by steady, tedious, and hard labour, and careful farming, they have increased the value of land under their supervision.

That many of your petitioners have large sums invested in commercial pursuits, and have extensive stores well stocked, and property of every description, all of which are liable to damage or destruction at the hands of the great body of Europeans, who are holding meetings, denouncing the right of your petitioners' countrymen to trade, work, or even reside in Mackay, or other parts of this Colony.

That your petitioners feel certain that the antipathy now held by Europeans against your petitioners' countrymen will become still greater, as public meetings continue to be called, said meetings not being held for the purpose of trying to adopt just course of action between British subjects, but for the purpose of exciting the populace to rise with one voice and say "we will not have Chinamen in our midst" — urging the Europeans to band themselves together, and do their utmost to render it impossible for
your petitioners' countrymen now settled in the Colony to carry on any business, follow their several vocations, or even to make a quiet and peaceable living.

That as the bitter feeling daily increases, acts of oppression and violence will follow, and so long as your petitioners' countrymen abide under, obey, and conform to the laws of this Colony, they respectfully submit that they are under the laws of the land, and claim it as a right that their houses, property and interests should receive the same protection as that awarded to any Europeans living under the same laws.

That your petitioners are of opinion that if the Government of this Colony have acted unwisely in making terms on which your petitioners' countrymen could come and reside in this Colony, your petitioners' countrymen are not accountable for said action, and consequently should not suffer unjust oppression at the hands of the European public.

That your petitioners humbly submit that should it be the opinion of your Honourable House that the interests of European subjects in this Colony are injured by your petitioners' countrymen living, trading, and working amongst Europeans, and that the rights and interests of the European subjects in this Colony can be better maintained and supported by your petitioners' countrymen leaving the Colony, just and reasonable action can and should be taken to carry out the views and wishes of your Honourable Government.

That your petitioners view with alarm the result of meetings similar to one lately presided over by the Mayor of Mackay, the speakers and supporters of said meeting all agreeing that it would be desirable that all the Europeans in Mackay and districts should be called upon to sign a document whereby they would one and all, separately and collectively, bind themselves not to lease land, let houses or stores, buy from or sell to, employ, or in any manner whatsoever trade with, your petitioners' countrymen.

That your petitioners view with the greatest anxiety and fear the result of such threatening acts of oppression, and cannot imagine that inhumanity so great will be carried into effect. Should the European population of this Colony thus act with your petitioners' countrymen, the labouring class would soon be reduced to want and starvation; otherwise they would be forced on the hands of your Honourable Government for support.

That your petitioners state that the labouring class of
your petitioners' countrymen ask only what is just when, rather than work or live under oppression, they solicit at the hands of your Honourable Government a free passage back to their own country and a refund of the price paid by them for admission into this Colony.

That your petitioners view such threatened oppression with alarm, not only on behalf of the labouring class of their countrymen — merchants, storekeepers, and all would soon be ruined.

That your petitioners pray that your Honourable Government will not encourage such threats of oppression being carried out. On the other hand, should your Honourable House, after due deliberation, determine that it is for the interests of the Colony that no inducement should be offered for your petitioners' countrymen to remain in this Colony, that only just and reasonable steps should be taken in the matter, and that your Honourable House will adopt such action as can be carried into effect without the oppression of your petitioners' countrymen, or unjust sacrifice of their property in this Colony.

That your petitioners are aware from past experience that public agitations nearly always result in serious loss, not only of property, but of life, and humbly pray that your Honourable Government will, on necessity arising, punish with the utmost severity the law admits any European act of violence towards your petitioners' countrymen or their property.

That your petitioners' countrymen have always demanded the highest possible wages, and have never done any act that would enable the sugar planter to come forward and state that they had in any way reduced wages on plantations.

That there are in Mackay and district only about five hundred of your petitioners' countrymen, and the thirty pounds levied on each new comer will reduce this number from time to time rather than increase same.

That your petitioners humbly seek protection against oppressive, violent, and offensive acts at the instance of Europeans.

That your petitioners will do all in their power to induce their fellow-countrymen to abide by the laws of the Colony, and in every way conform to its usages.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will be pleased to receive this Petition into most favourable consideration and deal therewith as your Honourable House may deem meet.
DOCUMENT B: The defendant in this case, Christie Palmerston, was one of the best known of the early North Queensland explorers. He was also famed as a virulent opponent of the Chinese, and in the 'frontier-type' conditions of the North, he was able on several occasions to rob or maltreat them. Significantly his exploitation of the Chinese on the Russell River, described by Walsh as "very serious events in the history of crime" not only went unpunished, but attracted very little notice outside the limited confines of Geraldton. This document effectively illustrates the relative power and status of the explorer and his Chinese victims. (Source: William G. Walsh, Police Magistrate, Geraldton, to the Colonial Secretary, 5 December 1887. Report on the Assault Cases against Christie Palmerston, Q.S.A. Col/A536 in letter No. 9984 of 1887.)

Sir Report re assault cases against C. Palmerston
Lee Cook V Christie Palmerston assault
Same V Same
wilful destruction of property
... I think it will be my duty to place you in possession of the very full and very fully verified record of the doings and the deeds which preceded the — defendant's appearance before the Court.

[Christie Palmerston], early in November 1886, reported to the people of Geraldton the discovery of gold by him on the Upper Russell River and received as his reward £300 in cash. A rush of Europeans ensued, but, owing to difficulty of obtaining supplies of food, all save about a dozen persons as quickly dispersed. In April of the present year, that is 5 months after the discovery, there still were not more than 25 persons on the diggings.

Mr Palmerston, during the month of April, interviewed the Chinese of Geraldton with a view of attracting them to his discovery. He informed them they could obtain 3 or 4 dwts each per day, and offered to escort any number of them to that portion of his discovery known as the Lower Russell and there, for a time, to protect them from the blacks at £1 per head. The proposal was after a week's further negotiation accepted by three Chinese business men here, See Poy, Lok Hin and Sun Chong Shing who, limiting the number
of Chinese — diggers to 30, thereupon on 28th April, in a European store at Geraldton and in the presence of European witnesses paid Mr Palmerston by way of deposit, £10 in cash. The balance was afterwards paid. The 30 Chinese put themselves in readiness and in a few days all started for the diggings, following their guide Mr Palmerston. Arrived at the field the venture proved unsuccessful and, after an absence of 14 days, all 30 Chinese were back at Geraldton with 6 ozs. of gold. About ten of the number though disappointed yet resolved to return to the field, so, furnishing themselves with fresh supplies, they, within a fortnight, started back to the Russell and hereupon a rush of fully 200 Chinese from Geraldton and Cairns ensued.

Mr Palmerston now claims £1 per head from all comers, and, to give his proceedings the appearance of right, he gives to the few who are able to pay on arrival and to the many who pay after arrival receipts for their moneys . . . The bulk of the Chinese who were unable to pay on arrival were afterwards visited at their tents or at their workings on the field by Mr Palmerston, supported by his troop of blacks, and requested to pay . . . Those who were unable to pay anything and refused were, as in the case of Lee Cook, subjected to abuse, had their places torn down and their implements and trifling effects thrown into the river or otherwise destroyed.

During the earlier development of his business in this line Mr Palmerston obtained from Johnstone Allingham his butchers of Geraldton 6 fat bullocks and started a butcher's shop on the diggings, charging 9d. per lb for his meat and bones. The Chinese refused to purchase at this price and proceeded to pack their own supplies of pork and preserved meats from Geraldton. Mr Palmerston, however refused his assent to this arrangement. He, surrounded by his armed blacks, meets the advancing importers as they arrive and destroys their meat, supplies; rice, flour and such like commodities were exempted and allowed to be taken on to the field. Several were illtreated in this manner notably "Ah Due" who besides having his considerable supplies of pork and preserved meats and fish thrown into the river, was himself much personally illtreated. Palmerston selected for his camp a point on the river bank where — from the presence of the thick scrub and other impediments peculiar to that locality — all travellers to and from the diggings must necessarily pass. The place had now a population of considerably over 200 Chinese. No Chinaman was allowed
to pass outwards without paying his pound in cash or as it mostly happens in gold; and all who could not pay were turned back towards the diggings, escorted for a distance on the way by an aboriginal troupe. A man named Han Shing had a small box which he carried broken open and smashed up but he was suffered to escape to Geraldton with the brass lock, which he, in seeking for redress, produced to a local Justice of the Peace. In this as in the case of nearly all the other outrages committed Palmerston was supported by a body of armed blacks. All the Chinese speak distinctly of the presence of firearms. And the move effectually to provide against the possibility of any Chinese escaping towards Geraldton by passing Mr Palmerston’s encampment unseen, — parties of blacks were stationed on the road a few miles to intercept such escapees . . . The great majority of those who attempted to escape were men who were destitute of means and of food. They pleaded destitution and hunger and some of them sickness but they had to return . . .

As a matter of course several Chinese did succeed in escaping . . . The doings of Palmerston had, through the information brought down by the Chinese escapees, sprang upon the public suddenly and were now become the subject of general remark. . . . I determined under Section 139 of the Justices Act of 1886 to admit the aggrieved parties to the Court of Geraldton and I accordingly instructed the C.P.S. Mr O’Donohue to receive their complaints . . . Lee Cook on the 7th July made formal complaint against Palmerston for assault and in a second information he charged him with willfully destroying property. Palmerston on the 9th that is two days after he had received summons from Lee Cook, goes before a Justice and makes sworn complaint against Lee Cook for stealing from him at the Russell River on the 1st. July 40 ounces of gold. He obtained a warrant and had Lee Cook imprisoned till the 15th July when I was again up from Cardwell and heard the cases . . . The proceedings in the two cases against Palmerston are explicit and require no explanation. They disclose evidence of the accused’s guilt and would have justified convictions in both cases. Both were however dismissed.

In the case Palmerston V Lee Cook on the robbery of 40 ozs of gold there was no evidence adduced in support of the complainant’s most ludicrously improbable statement. This case I also dismissed . . . As Police Magistrate charged with the duty of maintaining order in this district and of affording protection to the defenceless, I should hail with extreme satisfaction the appointing of a tribunal indepen-
dent of me to examine witnesses and otherwise searchingly investigate the incidents of Mr C. Palmerston's 8 weeks sojourn with his Chinese captives on the Lower Russell. The events which I have without comment merely shadowed for your information would then be seen to have been very serious events indeed in the history of crime and very distinctly marked with the character of an accomplished criminal. A full knowledge of these events would moreover by disclosing the number of devices availed of and the variety of methods employed in first abetting next betraying, then robbing and afterwards maligning these unfortunate Chinese prove interesting reading and useful to reflective minds. I did not seek to punish or disgrace the accused else he might have been punished upon three summary convictions and a committal for trial for robbery under arms. I sought rather to preserve him from that formal transference to the criminal class to suppress the offences complained of upon the Lower Russell and to reform the offender.

I have the honour to be
Sir
Your obedient Servant
William S. Walsh P.M.

The Honourable the
Colonial Secretary
Brisbane

DOCUMENT C: The following documents are representative of the virulent and persistent press campaign directed against the Chinese presence in the Colony of Queensland.

(i) This "Yellow Agony" column from the Queensland Figaro of 1883 is an early example of Anti-Chinese propaganda items which throng the pages of weekly papers like the Boomerang, the Worker and the Bulletin over decades of publishing history. It was developed from a regular "Mems. [Memos] for Sam" item in Figaro — the 'Sam' in question being liberal politician Samuel Griffith who would become Premier of Queensland exactly one month after this column appeared. By emphasising aspects of 'Chinese' disease, trickery and 'lower' civilization, Figaro hoped to impress upon Griffith the danger of this alien presence — a danger concerning which, they believed, he had shown himself to be insufficiently aware. 'Thady O'Kane', referred to in the first paragraph, was the highly influential editor of the Northern Miner — a newspaper which
also took an uncompromisingly anti-Chinese line in its reportage. (Source: *Queensland Figaro*, 13 October 1883, p.748.)

**YELLOW AGONY**

*(Keep this heading standing, dear printer, Figaro will evidently need it. Perhaps, you’d better get it stereotyped. Ed.)*

Steamer *Suez* from Hong Kong arrived (worse luck). She brought three whole European passengers from the Flowery and Smallpocky Land, and only 221 Chinese. Now, that the elections are all over, I want to know, “Is Queensland really going to be kept for white men?” I, for one, agree with Thady O’Kane that the only way to squelch the irrepressible Chinese is to take each individual Celestial by the queue and swing him to the depths of the Pacific if he won’t clear out for the asking.

That Central District Chinaman isn’t a leper after all. So say the doctors. Be that as it may, the Blackall Hospital shunted him along to Bogantungan, and now Bogantungan has shifted him along to Rockhampton. If not a leper, he’s a leaper.

One of the many vile dodges of the almond-eyed Heathen located on the Palmer, is to burn the natural grasses all away, so that the white man must buy horse-feed from them. For miles around Maytown there is not a blade of grass — nothing but charred timber and gravel — the Chinkies having laid it waste. When the white man wants food for his horse, he is compelled to give 4s for a small bundle of grass.

A jolly item for all Chinky-haters. Amongst the crew of the *Ceres*’ boat spoken of containing “the master and five men”, were two Chinamen. After being shipwrecked, these yellow devils were arrested for not having paid their poll-tax! Whoop!

No matter how the waves may roll,
Let ev’ry half-drowned rat pay toll.

(ii) These items from the regular “In Darkest Queensland” column of the weekly *Progress* appeared almost sixteen years after the document printed above. If anything, the tone had become even more virulent and panic-tinged. The column publicised reports appearing in, usually, the Northern local press among a vaster bulk of Southern readers, as well as adding its own voice to
the clamour. These descriptions culled from the *Geraldton World* and the *Cairns Advocate* emphasise widespread white preoccupations with the loathesomeness of 'Chinese' leprosy and the decoying of white women into Chinese dens of infamy by means of opium and other, more unspeakable Oriental blandishments. In closing, it is worth a mention that neither the *Queensland Figaro* nor the *Progress* were strictly working-class newspapers. Their tone was, roughly, liberal-radical — and they aimed their appeal, like the *Bulletin*, at the widest possible audience. (Source: *Progress*, 17 June 1899, p.7 and 1 July 1899, p.7.)

**IN DARKEST QUEENSLAND**  
(by *Searchlight*)

**THE GERALDTON LEPER**

Sergeant Casey deserves the thanks of the community for the intelligent action he has taken in connection with the latest case of leprosy discovered at Geraldton. Several weeks ago reports reached him that a Chinese gardener, Ah Dick, living near the cemetery, was suffering from a disease that had every appearance of leprosy. He sent out Constable Brennan in plain clothes to investigate the matter . . . and Dr Leavy, the Government Medical Officer went out and examined the man. His report was such that instructions were received from Brisbane for Sergeant Casey to immediately place Ah Dick under **ARREST AS A LEPER**.

On Wednesday, a *World* representative went out to see the man, and when Ah Dick came to the door of his house that *World* man received somewhat of a shock. Ah Dick had his face covered with ointment and bandages very much like an Egyptian mummy; the knuckle joints were terribly swollen, and his arms and legs were covered with leprous sores. The poor fellow, who had no idea of his coming fate, was quite cheerful and said, "Doctor make me much better". In the course of the conversation it was elicited that Ah Dick had been twenty-six years in the colony, having come out from Canton to Queensland at the outbreak of the Palmer rush. Since then he had been in Cairns, and for the past six years had been residing on the Johnstone River. He denied ever having been intimate with aboriginal women, but admitted to **AMOURS WITH THE JAPANESE** in Geraldton about four years ago, about which time "sore fellow first come". Ah Dick fortunately did not offer to shake hands with the *World* representative at the close of the
interview, but extended his hospitality by waving a leprous arm towards some orange trees laden with ripe fruit and saying, "You like em orangee, take em plenty". The World man "wasn’t having any at the time". Constable Casey, who displayed considerable tact in the whole pitiable affair, intends burning down the premises as soon as Ah Dick has been taken away en route to his living death in the leper lazarette, far away in one of the Islands in the Torres Straits. Geraldton World.

THE CHINESE IN CAIRNS

The police are inquiring into the case of a bare-headed demented-looking woman who was found by the Salvation Army officers roaming about the streets last Saturday night, and who, upon being questioned told a most extraordinary tale of Chinese dens where the opium — and worse, is. The woman (aged about twenty-seven) was in a pitiable state bordering on delirium and evidently very weak with sickness and possessed of a great terror. She said she was a married woman and had come to Cairns three weeks ago and "they" — she would not say whom — had taken her direct to a Chinese den and told her that one of the Chinamen was her husband. Here she had been kept without being allowed to go out and she had had the fever and had been made sick with the smell of opium and evil-looking food she could not touch. There was a lot of Chinamen there and white women and they smoked opium and laughed and jeered at her, and the one they said was her husband beat her and she was all bruises. But she was not married to him, she weakly declared, her husband was named M — . . . She refused for a long time to return to Chinatown and show the Constable (who had appeared on the scene) where she lived, but ultimately agreed to do so if someone would come in with her, else, she declared, the Chinamen would not let her out again as she had had a hard job to get away the first time. Once inside the Chinamen’s place, however, she told the Constable that she really was married to the alien. How far any of this is true, or whether the whole story and dishevelled miserable appearance of the woman is traceable to opium, has not yet transpired. Cairns Advocate.
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Racism was central to the kind of society that developed in tropical and sub-tropical Australia. This thorough study of the social and historical situations that gave rise to this racism is a major landmark in Australian historiography. Originally published in 1975, Race Relations in Colonial Queensland was the first book to deal with the problem of racism in the Australian context in a theoretical and structural manner, and to incorporate all the major ethnic minorities. The blend of social, economic, military, eugenic and sexual fears that underlay White Australia are here clearly revealed. Frontier conflict, Aboriginal resistance and white "extermination" policies, the systematic exploitation of Melanesian indentured labourers, and the often violent competition between Chinese and whites for gold, are all examined in detail. This third edition contains a comprehensive set of prefaces and an additional bibliography covering recent scholarship in the field.

"This book now represents a pioneering classic in the study of Australian 'race' relations ... It remains a model of cooperative general history."

Ann McGrath, *Australian Journal of Politics and History*

"One of the major works which helped transform the history of Australian race relations ... The writing is powerful, the conclusions are forceful."

Henry Reynolds, *Weekend Australian*

"It is totally fitting that this work be reissued. Because of its appearance ... the less-than-happy history of White Australia's attitudes and actions towards its coloured neighbours has suddenly started receiving increased attention."

Robert A. Huttenback, *International History Review*