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At the height of the 1965 Freedom Rides through New South Wales, a violent demonstration of angry whites confronted students and local Aboriginal people as they tried to gain entry to the racially segregated pool in Moree. It occurred to one of the local organisers of the protest (Alderman Bob Brown) that the absurd thing about the violent demonstration was that most of those participating (on opposite sides) were in fact related to one another: a huge number of people in Moree are related, they may not be registered down at the registry office. the stupidity of it was that it was cousins and uncles pitted against their nephews, it wasn’t totally isolated racism at all, it was an absolutely stupid thing and that’s what stuck in my mind (Brown qtd in Perkins:1993). A similar thing happened in nearby Walgett. In a re-enacted version of another clash between white and Aboriginal residents, an Aboriginal woman called out to a white person in the opposing crowd: ‘What did you say your last name was?:That’s mine too.you wanna go and ask your father where ’e used to spend his Friday nights, out there at the mission with my mother, that’s where ’e was.’ The effect of this revelation of shared paternity is described by Charles Perkins (student leader at the time of the Freedom Rides): ‘The white women couldn’t believe it so they turned on their husbands and they all started arguing amongst themselves and the crowd just disintegrated.the message was very clear for everybody to hear. After that discussion Walgett was finished, it had no answer to racial discrimination’ (Perkins, 1993).
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At the height of the 1965 Freedom Rides through New South Wales, a violent demonstration of angry whites confronted students and local Aboriginal people as they tried to gain entry to the racially segregated pool in Moree. It occurred to one of the local organisers of the protest (Alderman Bob Brown) that the absurd thing about the violent demonstration was that most of those participating (on opposite sides) were in fact related:

a huge number of people in Moree are related, they may not be registered down at the registry office. the stupidity of it was that it was cousins and uncles pitted against their nephews, it wasn't totally isolated racism at all, it was an absolutely stupid thing and that's what stuck in my mind (Brown qtd in Perkins:1993).

Brown and Perkins' recollection of these events, delivered with both outrage and with wry humour at the stupidity of white racism, evokes the triumph of 'fraternity' over racial discrimination: the discourse of the 1960s civil rights movement achieving its apotheosis in the revelation of actual family connections between local whites and Aboriginals. The symbolism of fraternity is based here on the very powerful and painful divisions played out in suppressed kinship networks and denial of white paternity. In the description of these scenes, Aboriginal women and white women look on from quite different vantage points, exposing, shaming, and protecting white men who seem to live two lives in different parts of town. These dynamics are cast into the town's 'intimate public sphere' (Berlant 1997) where racism and family rub against each other, unsettling the White family and, by extension, the White Nation that legitimises it.

An echo of this closed white family can be heard in Prime Minister John Howard's 'Motion for Reconciliation' (1999) where he rejected the need for apology to the Stolen Generations. Howard invoked a nuclear white family as equivalent to a moral horizon of responsibility: 'present generations cannot be held accountable ... for the overwhelming majority of the current generations of Australians, there was no personal involvement of them or their parents'. Might this nuclear family version of historical responsibility be challenged by extending that family to include Aboriginal members? In other words, could a similar argument to that heard in Walgett in 1965 work on Howard today? Some white liberal proponents of Reconciliation have attempted to do precisely that, by invoking what I am calling 'kin-fused Reconciliation', extending that 'white' family to include Aboriginal kin to dislodge a narrowly racist white view of family/nation and historical responsibility. It is a calculated rhetorical move which, on the one hand has powerful resonance (akin to what Perkins and Brown describe), but which is also problematic. The 'Nation as family' is a 'standard conceptual metaphor' according to George Lakoff (1996) which informs both conservative and liberal thought, and which is not 'rational' but rather 'moral'. Here I discuss the limitations of the family/nation conceptual metaphor within liberal calls for kin-fused Reconciliation.
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Perhaps an even more striking statistic is the much greater number of people who have been denied their heritage as Aboriginal citizens of Australia because they were the descendants of the Stolen Generations. By the removal of Aboriginal individuals, two generations ago, the four children and twelve grandchildren of those 70,000 Aborigines have also been denied a birthright to identify as the indigenous people of Australia. Seventeen Aboriginal people each of whom marks the Population Census form as being of ‘European descent’. All victims of the policy of separation (Read, 1998:9).

Read’s objection is to bring the issue (of the Stolen Generations) home to whites; this is/their our history too, and ‘whiteness’ is and should be displaced by the history of the Stolen Generations. It is, as I mentioned, a calculated risk because it causes reduction and sentimemtality where ‘true feeling cannot admit the non-universality of pain’ (Berlant 1998:641). Berlant argues that such sentimentality is distinguished by the fact that ‘cases become all jumbled together’ by a ‘pathos’ that is political ‘ideal of empathy’ (Berlant, 1998, 641) and this is why it is all the more striking. Moreover, as Carole Pateman (1988) has pointed out ‘fraternity’ is a political model that necessarily downplays the role of women in order to raise its symbolic stakes, and here it is not the (child/mother/culture) that is, at least rhetorically, of principle concern, but rather it is the Nation and its biopolitical structure that comes to the fore. Hence Read cites ‘population census,’ ‘generations,’ descent, heritage, statistics (biopolitical measures) rather than individual and their stories.

Of course there is evidence to suggest that kinship and close connections to other nation is particularly reduces the possibility to racial discrimination (Frankenberg 1993) and furthers cross-cultural understanding (see for example Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999). This is possible even in Australia where, (unlike the US where Frankenberg’s study is based), cross-cultural relationships were deemed instruments of assimilation by government plans to ‘breed out the colour’ (Canberra Conference in 1937). Greer and Spigelman, Perkins and Brown situate the recognition of kin across racial lines as having a powerful effect on racist attitudes. While this is true (particularly where the symbol is invoked), the family has also functioned within Australian colonialism in a biopolitical form to help shape the racial composition of the nation. Family and kinship are tied very closely to racial ideologies (Collins 1998, Bammer 1994, Nash 2003, Tonkin 1999).
continuity of Aboriginal family connections. Whiteness is leapfrogged in favour of a persistent Aboriginality. Critics noted how Sally Morgan's Place amply receives that criticism. In the beginning, it appears that the critical issue was her grandmother's passing, a passing that for Russell results in her being closed off from an Aboriginal identity. Sally Morgan's final chapter of My Place (1987) called 'The Bird Call' confirms Morgan's identification with her Aboriginal heritage. As her Nan lies dying, the 'Aboriginal bird' calls out but is only heard by Jill, Sally's sister. It signals Nan's recovery of a Koori identity, but she finds grounds for rendering the truth of her own identity (and those of her grandmother and great-grandmother) uncertain, multiple, hybrid. A similar ambivalence and considered articulation of the implications of discovering Aboriginality in a 'white family' is found in Henry Reynolds' (2005), where he writes about the limited positions available to those in Australia with 'mixed' descent.

In the call for a kin-fused reconciliation, there are a couple of important things to observe about the recognition of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal kinship relations. The first is that on the whole, but with exceptions (like Russell's), life writings have not been particularly interested in celebrating mixed race identities – rather, it is an Aboriginal identity that comes to the fore. There are few references to white parents and mothers in Aboriginal life writing. For instance, Melissa Lucashenko points out in the preface to Hillar Juarra's My Very Big Journey (2004) that 'it mattered little that her father was an unknown white man. This small girl had a name, a loving family, and a secure Aboriginal identity' (ix). Jesse Argyle is quoted in Alice Nampu's When the Pelican Laughed as saying 'My father never claimed me' Jesse said. 'But I don't care. I remember my mother and I got a life.' (120). Suzanne Parry argues that 'children born of colour to colourless parents were often seen as somehow inferior that didn't lack for the recognition that they were not their white father's legacy. They were not like the continent's Aborigines. (1970:240). White children in these cases are significant because they were major factors in removal from Aboriginal families. Life writings are commonly directed at mothers and grandmothers that were left behind, or in Morgan's case, attempted to pass as white. Doris Pilkington Garimara's Rabbit Proof Fence is one example of this, although as Anne Brewster points out, the Pilkington Garimara's work constructs a 'counter archive' (2002: 6 of 14) that strategically includes the naming of white fathers alongside other disavowed stories. In Donna Meehan's autobiography (2000), Meehan's father is mentioned only once in the book 'I was polite when I met him but I didn't like him' (88). Considerably more limited in the text's, it is important further to note the ambivalence and considered articulation of the implications of discovering Aboriginality in a 'white family'.

This interest in 'who the father is' has given whites access to Aboriginal people and culture in an unprecedented way and has up until very recently, placed Aboriginal children in danger of being removed from their families. This removal was enabled by the white fascination for biological paternity as key to social identity. Male students argued in Anthropological work published in 1915 that fatherhood was not strictly biological in societies and that fathers of Aboriginal children were the husbands of their mothers. Mary Bennett talked about this to the Royal Commission in 1934: 'I have often heard the simple children pray that God will bless their father and mother, and then I have realised that they mean their aboriginal mother's aboriginal husband' (Bennett 1934). Bennett was arguing against child removal policies at the time. The knowledge that the children had fathers would have complicated the argument, used in particular by the NSW Aboriginal Protection Board, claiming that the survival of Aboriginal society required a knowledge that to risk the loss of the father. Spigelman's comment on the potential difference between the removal of children is significant: 'you used to see the hurt in her face for me to sit on her verandah and talk to her, and call her Granny' (29). Lalor also used to like 'getting back at them and making them squirm: like catching them on the street on a Saturday morning and running up: 'How you going, Uncle, how you going, Auntie?' See them squirm, amongst their so-called white relations' (29).

Spigelman identifies a common theme in the texts, it is important further to note the ambivalence and considered articulation of the implications of discovering Aboriginality in a 'white family'.

This interest in 'who the father is' has given whites access to Aboriginal people and culture in an unprecedented way and has up until very recently, placed Aboriginal children in danger of being removed from their families. This removal was enabled by the white fascination for biological paternity as key to social identity. Male students argued in Anthropological work published in 1915 that fatherhood was not strictly biological in societies and that fathers of Aboriginal children were the husbands of their mothers. Mary Bennett talked about this to the Royal Commission in 1934: 'I have often heard the simple children pray that God will bless their father and mother, and then I have realised that they mean their aboriginal mother's aboriginal husband' (Bennett 1934). Bennett was arguing against child removal policies at the time. The knowledge that the children had fathers would have complicated the argument, used in particular by the NSW Aboriginal Protection Board, claiming that the survival of Aboriginal society required a knowledge that to risk the loss of the father. Spigelman's comment on the potential difference between the removal of children is significant: 'you used to see the hurt in her face for me to sit on her verandah and talk to her, and call her Granny' (29). Lalor also used to like 'getting back at them and making them squirm: like catching them on the street on a Saturday morning and running up: 'How you going, Uncle, how you going, Auntie?' See them squirm, amongst their so-called white relations' (29).

Spigelman identifies a common theme in the texts, it is important further to note the ambivalence and considered articulation of the implications of discovering Aboriginality in a 'white family'.

This interest in 'who the father is' has given whites access to Aboriginal people and culture in an unprecedented way and has up until very recently, placed Aboriginal children in danger of being removed from their families. This removal was enabled by the white fascination for biological paternity as key to social identity. Male students argued in Anthropological work published in 1915 that fatherhood was not strictly biological in societies and that fathers of Aboriginal children were the husbands of their mothers. Mary Bennett talked about this to the Royal Commission in 1934: 'I have often heard the simple children pray that God will bless their father and mother, and then I have realised that they mean their aboriginal mother's aboriginal husband' (Bennett 1934). Bennett was arguing against child removal policies at the time. The knowledge that the children had fathers would have complicated the argument, used in particular by the NSW Aboriginal Protection Board, claiming that the survival of Aboriginal society required a knowledge that to risk the loss of the father. Spigelman's comment on the potential difference between the removal of children is significant: 'you used to see the hurt in her face for me to sit on her verandah and talk to her, and call her Granny' (29). Lalor also used to like 'getting back at them and making them squirm: like catching them on the street on a Saturday morning and running up: 'How you going, Uncle, how you going, Auntie?' See them squirm, amongst their so-called white relations' (29).

Spigelman identifies a common theme in the texts, it is important further to note the ambivalence and considered articulation of the implications of discovering Aboriginality in a 'white family'.
the lack of recognition from his 'white' family is related to this history of coercive interactions between black and white. Perhaps the recognition of white and black family interaction exposes this other history and Lalor's 'white' relatives did not want to be the first to do so. This is what kin-fused Reconciliation brings to the fore: both the continuity of relationships between Aboriginal women and white men and the shaming of them. Here shame's accomplishment is not pride, but acknowledgment.

Ellia Simon's memoir Through My Eyes (2007) also depicts a rural town that is racially divided and connected by kin. Her father is mentioned often in her remarkable life story, but his last name is not given: 'I just couldn't bring myself to like my father's name. I won't disclose what it was, because of his relatives and because I loved my father' (12). Simon's father worked as a Saddler, recognised Ella and was in contact with her. Her mother worked in the house of Sam but died when Ella was little (having remarried and left Ella in the care of her grandmother).

Later in his life, Ella Simon's father Sam went to live with her and her husband at Purfleet near the reserve. Her father's family (including her Uncle the Town Clerk) objected to this and contacted the Aborigines Protection Board to have him removed. Her Uncle's powerful position meant they were able to make so much fuss about his staying with me. Oh, it wasn't just that he was in the open, though. They managed to keep it very quiet, in fact (18). Soon after her father was ordered away he became ill and ended up in hospital. It was some time before Simon came to know about it (not being informed by the rest of the family). She was very worried about how to contact him: 'Black people just didn't go and visit white people in hospital, let alone advertise that an old white man was their father' (20). When Simon finally got to the hospital (with the support of her white employee) she finds that her father had already died days ago and that the hospital still had no details of his family: 'Where was the rest of the family? None of them had been near him' (21). It seems that the white family did not want contact with him, but even more than that they did not want to have contact with his Aboriginal daughter. After Ella makes arrangements for the funeral, she tells us, only to 'tell them that the family had cancelled their arrangements and made new ones and agreed to pay for it on the proviso that she not attend' (22). At this she writes: 'I think that's the very first time that I felt so desperately angry about prejudice' (22).

The story of the white family here is one of shame over Ella, and for Sam's recognition of her: 'They just wouldn't let him alone' (19). And in response to their shame and rejection, Ella also rejects them. The pressures on individual white men not to recognise their children were greater than the pressures to be a 'good father' to their children. Does Ella Simon's story fall into the paradigm of kin-fused Reconciliation that Spigelman calls for? Ella Simon inserts her narrative into a broader context:

I'd nearly always run into this little old fellow buying a paper. He'd always be looking me up and down out of the corner of his eye. I used to wish I could read his thoughts. I mean, was there ever just a little doubt in his mind about the family dismissing me out of hand? Did he ever wonder what I was really like? Did he ever think that my father might not have done something so dreadfully bad in conceiving me as they had made out he had. If he did, he never said a word. I didn't speak to him either. I never gave him a chance (25).

The story of the white family here is one of shame over Ella, and for Sam's recognition of her: 'They just wouldn't let him alone' (19). And in response to their shame and rejection, Ella also rejects them. The pressures on individual white men not to recognise their children were greater than the pressures to be a 'good father' to their children. Does Ella Simon's story fall into the paradigm of kin-fused Reconciliation that Spigelman calls for? Ella Simon inserts her narrative into a broader context:

I don't think it would ever arise today. The attitudes of people are so different, thank God. I think all this publicity about racial prejudice and prejudice against illegitimates too has helped to bring things out into the open more. Yet I suppose somebody had to suffer at first, so that we could all know how people who have to suffer such things feel. In this shift from 'I to 'We' we also see her shift from an 'I' to a 'somebody' and a 'people', a 'people' who 'had to learn the hard way'. This could be read as a manoeuvre that sees her personal battle swallowed up by the Nation or it could also be seen as an expansive manoeuvre whereby she maps her personal experience on to the Nation to teach it, and the people, something about themselves. Does she turn her narrative into the nation or over to the Nation? Ella Simon invites the readers to learn from her work and her account of her white relatives. Her account amounts to recognising the difference of her story and the differences of her white relatives.

Another alternative to the archic (as in State-building) rhetoric of Spigelman, Greer and Read can be found in the work of Stephen Kinnane Shadow Lines (2003). It recreates the lives of his grandmother, Jessie Smith (nee Argyle), an indigenous woman from the East Kimberley, and his grandfather Edward Smith, an English immigrant to Perth. Jessie Argyle was a member of the Stolen Generations, taken from her mother at the age of five in 1906, then kept in 'settlement' homes and sent out to work in white homes. She met Edward Smith and they fell in love, amid threats of prosecution for 'cohabitation' which could see Edward jailed and Jessie sent back to the notorious Moore River Settlement. It was nine years until the couple were able to marry. They had to ask the permission of A O Neville, who approved the marriage at a time when he became increasingly convinced that 'biological assimilation' was the key to eliminating the 'half caste problem'. The couple took up residence in a house opposite Hyde Park in Perth 's northern suburbs and together Jesse Smith (Mum Smith) became a centre of cultural activity, looking after other people's children, hosting card games with indigenous and non-indigenous friends and neighbours and protecting her friends and families from surveillance. In his research Steven Kinnane gained access to the file kept by the Aborigines Department about his grandmother and describes it as 'thick as telephone directories' (Kinnane 2003). Kinnane writes it as 'thick as telephone directories' and 'containing correspondence of officials between Edward, Jessie and Mr Neville, police reports, annotations of gossip surrounding her house and her visitors, letters from her requesting clothes, requesting access to her own money – in every aspect of the everyday over which Mr Neville and others had power'. In searching through this file and others Kinnane is wary of their double edged nature, much like Kim Scott's protagonist in Baneng (2000). Through these files Kinnane can revisit something of his grandmother's experience, and resistance and find links with more family, but they also represent the dominance of a white paternalistic culture that obsessively recorded, collected and biopolitically 'managed' the lives of those it attempted to file away. Kinnane treats these files as productive of shadow lines: he looks for the moments when the files break open new perspectives, leading him back to the community for alternative, oral histories of those years. These files betray their own secrets and complicate the 'ability of others to make us inhabit their story of you'. (379) Shadow lines are also points of connectivity between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people which are, as Kinnane puts it, often 'rough and difficult to reconcile' (379). They do not collapse differences, they draw attention to them. For instance, one shadow line lies between the graves of A O Neville and Jessie Smith, buried near to each other in the same cemetery; same ground, different memories of place. Another shadow line exists between Edward Smith and Jesse Smith, both of whom resisted rigid lines of race drawn against their relationship. Other shadow lines exist between Jessie and her white father, M P Durack. Jessie Argyle was named after her father, who lived on, not her biological father who did not recognise her. The shadow lines are lines of alternative cultural memory which underscore official histories, settler 'pedigrees', the land and interactions between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in Australia. They do not appeal to the nation's capacity to reconcile (to symbolically unify), rather they appeal to its capacity to give way to difference: 'These lines of story shadow all of us. They are not always eloquent, or enlightening. Some are rough and difficult to reconcile.' (379) Shadow lines draw attention not to the imaginary of kin-fused reconciliation but rather to the recognition that connections with Aboriginal people need not provide whites a way 'in', to bring us home, to do the work of settling us, welcoming us to country, into the family, guiding us into the country, reconciling. Shadow lines might be better thought of along the lines of Secomb's 'fractured community', a community that allows itself the contestations, the differences, the disputes and doesn't attempt to 'resurrect old structures of commonality' (133). A fractured community is one that can trace its shadow lines without seeking solace in the promise of unity, that congeals and calcifies difference. It is symbolic still, but a symbol that is attentive to the ramifications of shifting between family, Nation and State in a way that highlights the differences between them and within them. Kin-fused Reconciliation is seen as a solution to racial discrimination, but it is also rooted in it; after all, those who advocated family ties to bind Aboriginality to whiteness, argued that they too were alleviating discrimination against 'coloureds' by whites (Deville). Dr Cecil Cook also argued that it, implicitly, it was a better way to make the settlers indigenous, by breeding out certain undesirable white traits like skin cancer. This biopolitical interest in the fostering of family ties between Aboriginal and white was dreamed of initially to 'breed out the colour' (and the colour), and now it re-appears as a way to breed out the racists and to biopolitically unify, reconcile a Nation that has not yet come to grips with difference. Family slips easily into Nation, so that bringing them home means bringing us with them, or so kin-fused Reconciliation seems to suggest. Consequently, both the liberal 'extended family' response (or kin-fused
Reconciliation) and the conservative nuclear family exclusivity (kin-fused erasure), are problematic. One maps the Nation on to a family that deals with difference by denying it (not in my family) while the other deals with difference by assimilating it (my family’s difference itself).
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