

2003

## "Indigenous sovereignty-never ceded": sovereignty, nationhood and whiteness in Australia

Angela M. Pratt  
*University of Wollongong*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

### Recommended Citation

Pratt, Angela M, "Indigenous sovereignty-never ceded": sovereignty, nationhood and whiteness in Australia, PhD thesis, Faculty of Arts, University of Wollongong, 2003. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/271>

## **NOTE**

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

## **UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG**

### **COPYRIGHT WARNING**

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**“INDIGENOUS SOVEREIGNTY –  
NEVER CEDED”:  
SOVEREIGNTY, NATIONHOOD AND  
WHITENESS IN AUSTRALIA**

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**from**

**University of Wollongong**

**by**

**Angela Maree Pratt, BA (Hons)**

**Faculty of Arts**

**2003**

## Certification

I, Angela Maree Pratt, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Arts, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.



Angela Maree Pratt

27 February 2003

## Table of Contents

Certification .....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Abbreviations .....	vii
Abstract.....	viii
Acknowledgments.....	x
<b>Chapter One: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Claiming sovereignty.....	1
Sovereignty, nationhood, and Whiteness .....	3
Theory and standpoint .....	8
Notes on terminology .....	10
Outline of the thesis .....	12
<b>Chapter Two: Theoretical perspectives on Sovereignty, Nationhood, and Whiteness.....</b>	<b>16</b>
Introduction .....	16
Hegemonic Whiteness .....	19
<i>Conceptualising Whiteness.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Whiteness and colonisation.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Whiteness as hegemony .....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>The discursive repertoire of hegemonic Whiteness .....</i>	<i>37</i>
Sovereignty and legitimacy .....	40
<i>Conceptualising sovereignty.....</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Reconsidering sovereignty: Indigenous sovereignties .....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Justice, legitimacy, and consent .....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Towards a reconceptualisation of sovereignty .....</i>	<i>56</i>
Nationhood and identity.....	59
<i>Conceptualising nationhood .....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Whiteness, sovereignty and nationhood .....</i>	<i>62</i>
An ethics of engagement.....	67
<b>Chapter Three: From Land Rights to Sovereignty: The Aboriginal Tent Embassy.....</b>	<b>72</b>

Introduction .....	72
1972–1975: The Embassy’s initial establishment and early years.....	74
<i>“Aliens in our own Land”: The Embassy’s initial establishment.....</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>The White “separatist” anxiety .....</i>	<i>80</i>
<i>White sovereignty: Violently asserted, violently defended .....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Strategies of marginalisation .....</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>The Whitlam years .....</i>	<i>88</i>
1976 to 1977: The Aboriginal Embassy in Red Hill .....	91
<i>The shift to Mugga Way .....</i>	<i>92</i>
<i>Repertoires of Whiteness.....</i>	<i>93</i>
1978-1992: The treaty debates .....	98
<i>The Embassy on Capitol Hill .....</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>The Aboriginal Sovereign Treaty ‘88 Campaign.....</i>	<i>102</i>
1992 and on: The Embassy’s permanent re-establishment.....	107
<i>Battles over removal.....</i>	<i>108</i>
<i>Trespassers on their own land? .....</i>	<i>111</i>
Conclusions .....	114
<b>Chapter Four: Asserting Indigenous Sovereignty Within the Australian State:</b>	
<b>The Coe Cases and the Barunga Statement .....</b>	<b>117</b>
Introduction .....	117
The judiciary: <i>Coe v. Commonwealth</i> (1979) .....	120
<i>Coe v. Commonwealth</i> (1979): <i>The statement of claim .....</i>	<i>121</i>
<i>The “act of state” doctrine .....</i>	<i>125</i>
<i>The “domestic dependent nation” doctrine.....</i>	<i>128</i>
<i>The centrality of terra nullius.....</i>	<i>131</i>
<i>“Absurd and vexatious”: Coe as the troublesome indigene .....</i>	<i>133</i>
The executive and legislature: The Hawke Government’s response to the Barunga Statement .....	138
<i>Build-up to the White Bicentenary .....</i>	<i>139</i>
<i>Barunga.....</i>	<i>141</i>
<i>The genesis of “reconciliation” .....</i>	<i>145</i>
The judiciary: <i>Coe v. Commonwealth and NSW</i> (1993) .....	146
<i>Coe v. Commonwealth and NSW</i> (1993): <i>The statement of claim .....</i>	<i>146</i>

<i>"No support whatsoever" for Indigenous sovereignty</i> .....	148
<i>Terra nullius and Whiteness in the Coe cases</i> .....	153
Conclusions .....	155
<b>Chapter Five: Acting Sovereignty: The Aboriginal Provisional Government.</b>	<b>158</b>
Introduction .....	158
The prelude to the establishment of the APG .....	161
<i>Mansell goes to Libya</i> .....	161
<i>Policing political borderlands</i> .....	165
Acting sovereignty: The APG's establishment and the model for the recognition of Indigenous sovereignty .....	167
<i>Reasons for and responses to the APG's establishment</i> .....	167
<i>APG structure and organisation</i> .....	171
<i>The APG model for the recognition of Aboriginal sovereignty</i> .....	173
<i>The Aboriginal passport</i> .....	179
The spectre of Indigenous sovereignty: Critiques of the APG model .....	181
<i>Indigenous sovereignty denial, Part I – If in politics, marginalise, silence, and         ignore</i> .....	182
<i>Indigenous sovereignty denial, Part II: Keith Windschuttle and the conservative         bandwagon</i> .....	186
<i>Indigenous sovereignty denial, Part III: The "progressive" critique of the APG</i> .196	
"The court gives an inch but takes another mile": Land and sovereignty in <i>Mabo (1992)</i> .....	204
<i>Overview of the judgment</i> .....	205
<i>Native title as an inferior form of title</i> .....	206
<i>The construction of Aboriginal identity within the native title regime</i> .....	207
<i>Critiques of the APG's position on Mabo (1992)</i> .....	209
<i>"The White man's dream continues the Aboriginal nightmare": The APG critique         of "reconciliation"</i> .....	214
Conclusions .....	218
<b>Chapter Six: Treaties versus terra nullius: Sovereignty and Indigenous rights in Canada</b> .....	<b>222</b>
Introduction .....	222
Trick or treaty? A historical background to treaty-making in Canada .....	226

<i>The Royal Proclamation of 1763</i> .....	226
<i>Three periods of treaty-making</i> .....	227
<i>Treaties v. terra nullius</i> .....	232
Modern treaty-making in British Columbia.....	234
<i>The political context of modern treaty-making</i> .....	234
<i>The Nisga'a Final Agreement</i> .....	237
<i>The British Columbia Treaty Commission</i> .....	245
<i>The Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs</i> .....	255
Treaty-making in BC: "Negotiating space in the master's house"?	258
<i>Sovereignty, legitimacy, and treaty-making</i> .....	259
Conclusions.....	261
<b>Chapter Seven: Conclusions</b> .....	<b>265</b>
Whiteness, nationhood, sovereignty, and legitimacy.....	265
Theorising the relinquishment of power.....	267
Struggles "for and of freedom".....	269
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>271</b>



## List of Abbreviations

AFN – Assembly of First Nations  
AIATSIS – Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies  
ALP – Australian Labor Party  
APG - Aboriginal Provisional Government  
ATC – Aboriginal Treaty Committee  
ATSIC - Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islander Commission  
BC - British Columbia (Canada)  
BCTC - British Columbia Treaty Commission  
DAA – Department of Aboriginal Affairs  
FNS – First Nations Summit  
FNTNA - First Nations Treaty Negotiations Alliance  
NAC – National Aboriginal Conference  
NACC - National Aboriginal Consultative Committee  
NFA – Nisga’a Final Agreement  
NIWG – National Indigenous Working Group on Native Title  
NSW – New South Wales (Australia)  
NTA - Native Title Act  
RCIADIC – Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody  
TAC - Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre  
TUCAR - (NSW) Trade Union Committee on Aboriginal Rights  
UBCIC - Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs

## Abstract

This thesis examines the connections between Whiteness, sovereignty, and nationhood in Australia in relation to the issue of Indigenous peoples' sovereignty. The thesis has two basic premises. The first is that, before White people arrived in the 1770s, Indigenous peoples exercised sovereignty over the continent now known as Australia. The second premise is that their sovereignty has never been ceded. Recognition of Indigenous sovereignty raises fundamental and unresolved questions about the legitimacy of non-Indigenous people's occupation of the continent and claims to sovereignty over it, because these claims are based on the mistaken belief that this place was terra nullius before non-Indigenous people arrived. Accordingly, in this thesis, the issue of legitimacy is central to the analysis of sovereignty and of White responses to assertions of Indigenous sovereignty. The thesis argues that understanding the relationship between Whiteness (understood as the hegemonic norm and thus as the source of power and privilege in Australian society) and dominant conceptualisations of sovereignty and nationhood is central to understanding why issues of sovereignty and legitimacy remain unresolved and substantially unaddressed. The theoretical framework employed draws on recent critical literature on Whiteness and theoretical work on hegemony to critique dominant conceptualisations of sovereignty and the discourses of nationhood on which these conceptualisations are based.

The thesis examines the relationship between sovereignty, nationhood, and Whiteness by analysing the ways in which non-Indigenous responses to Indigenous peoples' assertions of their inherent sovereignty are mediated by Whiteness and by dominant conceptualisations of sovereignty and nationhood. Specifically, the thesis examines White responses to the demands for recognition of Indigenous sovereignty that have been made by the Aboriginal Tent Embassy, situated on the lawns outside Canberra's Parliament House, since 1972. The thesis also analyses the High Court of Australia's judgments in *Coe v. Commonwealth* (1979) and *Coe v. Commonwealth and NSW* (1993), in which Paul Coe and his sister Isabel sought to have Indigenous

peoples' sovereignty recognised by the Australian judicial system. It goes on to examine the Australian government's response to the Barunga Statement, presented to then Prime Minister Hawke in 1988. This statement called on the Australian Parliament to negotiate with Indigenous people a treaty that recognised Indigenous peoples' sovereignty. The thesis further scrutinises White responses to the assertions of Indigenous sovereignty made by the Aboriginal Provisional Government (APG) since 1990 – in particular, it considers responses to the model for the recognition of Indigenous sovereignty that the APG has proposed. Finally, the thesis contains a comparative analysis of sovereignty, nationhood, and Whiteness as it is played out in the treaty-making process currently underway in the Canadian province of British Columbia (BC). This comparative analysis demonstrates that, despite the apparent promise of the BC process as a potential alternative to the processes in which Indigenous–non-Indigenous relations are currently framed in Australia, the BC process is more limited and conservative than its proponents suggest. Subsequently, this analysis shows how the conclusions the thesis draws about the relationship between sovereignty, nationhood, and Whiteness are applicable beyond the Australian context.

The thesis reveals that, in White responses to Indigenous peoples' assertions of their sovereignty, there are various tools and strategies that function to marginalise, silence, ignore, and/or make invisible Indigenous people and groups who argue that their inherent sovereignty should be recognised by White people. Consequently, these tools and strategies work to reinforce Whiteness as the hegemonic norm in Australian society and to preserve the White race privilege that hegemonic Whiteness itself maintains. Accordingly, the thesis demonstrates that, if we are to come to terms with the important questions about sovereignty and legitimacy raised by Indigenous peoples' never-ceded sovereignty, we must interrogate and undo White race privilege. In turn, this requires a critique of and challenge to the conceptualisations of sovereignty and nationhood upon which White race privilege depends.

## Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the Wadi Wadi people, on whose country I lived and worked over the course of completing this thesis, and whose sovereignty over their land has never been ceded. I would especially like to acknowledge Barbara Nicholson, who is a very important mentor and friend.

I am indebted to my two fantastic supervisors – Associate Professor Susan Dodds and Dr Catriona Elder, from the Faculty of Arts at the University of Wollongong. Their unstinting help, support, guidance, insight, engagement, patience, and confidence has been integral to this thesis. This thesis has benefited enormously from their intellectual enthusiasm, encouragement, and generosity, and I have also benefited personally. Their expert supervision has made the process of producing this thesis much more enjoyable than it might otherwise have been. I would also like to acknowledge the help of Drs Ellie Vasta and Dianne Snow, who supervised me in the early stages of the thesis. Thank you also to staff and postgraduate colleagues in the Sociology Program, and to many others in the Faculty of Arts, for providing me with a supportive, productive, and constructive collegial environment over the last four years.

There are many people without whose assistance the research for this thesis would have been difficult to complete: I would like to thank Gary Foley for generously giving his time in an interview on the subject of the Aboriginal Tent Embassy. I wish to thank the Association for Canadian Studies in Australia and New Zealand (ACSANZ), the University of Wollongong Faculty of Arts, and the Institute of Social Change and Critical Inquiry for research grants, which enabled me to conduct research in Canada. I am grateful to the Australian Studies Centre at the University of British Columbia for hosting my visit to Vancouver in August and September in 2001. I would like to thank the ever-helpful and friendly staff of the AIATSIS Library in Canberra for their assistance on many occasions. I would also like to thank AIATSIS for permission to quote material on the Aboriginal Embassy which is used in Chapter Three.

I am privileged to have so many excellent friends, all of whom have, in various ways, helped to make writing this thesis much easier, smoother, and happier. I am very grateful for all their encouraging words, supportive advice, and thoughtful conversations, over many coffees, meals, long-distance telephone calls, and beers.

I am also ever grateful for the love, support, and encouragement of my family. Without the support of my parents, Paul and Veronica, my university studies would not have been possible. I would especially like to thank my Dad for being perhaps the first person to teach me about the importance of being aware of one's own privilege. I am also very grateful to my sister Catherine for lending her meticulous editing skills to this thesis.

Finally, it is difficult to find the words with which to adequately express my gratitude to (and for!) Greg Smith. He has lived and breathed this thesis over the last four years almost as much as I have, and he will be almost as glad as I am that it is now complete. His love, support, friendship, faith, patience, understanding, good humour, and good grace have inspired and sustained me over the last four years. I am more grateful to him than I can say.