

Bernard O'Dowd and the 'Problem' of Race

Frank Bongiorno

Department of History, Australian National University

'Racism is the most important single component of Australian nationalism.'¹

So wrote Humphrey McQueen in 1970: and historians have largely accepted his contention that Australian nationalism and racism were inseparable bedfellows in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The aim of this paper is to explore the racial ideas of one radical nationalist intellectual of this period, Bernard O'Dowd (1866-1953), who seems to be an exception to the McQueen thesis. Its object, however, is not merely to provide a sketch of the ideas of an eccentric man. Instead, I am pursuing a method advocated by the cultural historian Robert Darnton of attempting to understand the past by exploring it at the points 'where it seems to be most opaque':

... other people are other. They do not think the way we do. And if we want to understand their way of thinking, we should set out with the idea of capturing otherness ... We constantly need to be shaken out of a false sense of familiarity with the past, to be administered doses of culture shock ... When we cannot get a proverb, or a joke, or a ritual, or a poem, we know we are on to something. By picking at the document where it is most opaque, we may be able to unravel an alien system of meaning.²

The appositeness of this ethnographic method to an examination of a *fin-de-siècle* opponent of racial exclusion seems self-evident. When one encounters a critic of racial prejudice in an era of rampant bigotry, among the most alluring of enticements that face the historian is the temptation to 'understand' the past by accommodating the knowledge of 'other' people to our own. The result of this 'false sense of familiarity' in studies of Australian racial ideas is that turn-of-the-century critics of White Australia (such as O'Dowd) become forerunners of an enlightened multiculturalism, irrespective of the philosophical foundations of their notions. We neutralise their otherness. This perspective might be useful for those who believe that the main purpose of the past is to furnish fuel for the fire of modern political controversies; but it is hardly calculated to the unravelling of 'an alien system of meaning'. If we are to approach a solution to this latter problem, we need to avoid this powerful temptation of habitually recognising ourselves and our values as mirrored in the past. Other people, even when on a superficial examination their views seem rather like our own, are often indeed 'other'. As historians, we need to respect this otherness, rather than assimilate past knowledges and beliefs to our current preoccupations.³

A study of Bernard O'Dowd's ideas might thus cast light on tensions in Australian attitudes to race, and doubt on interpretations of turn-of-the-century radicalism and nationalism which treat racism as a dominant ideology that can help to explain everything from union militancy and anti-conscription to militarism and anti-imperialism. We need to be more attentive to the fissures, tensions and ambiguities in ethnic and racial ideas, so that the concept of 'racism', to the extent that it is useful at all, becomes a launching pad for historical understanding rather than its terminus. Such a method might also cast light on contemporary debates about race, racism and national identity.

It would, of course, be unwise to rest too great a weight of argument on a study of a single individual, particularly on

such a notorious gadfly as O'Dowd. Yet it is significant that O'Dowd has often been identified as a representative of a radical nationalist tradition in Australian history assumed to be racist in character;⁴ and, at least in certain circles, O'Dowd did exercise some cultural authority in the years between the 1890s and the 1950s. More generally, historians have recognised O'Dowd as having grappled with many of the problems that exercised Australian liberal and radical intellectuals in the period of transition from colonialism to nationhood and modernity.⁵ And, for all of the supposed agreement about the White Australia Policy, the question of race was on the agenda in this period. This exploration of the ethnic and racial ideas of Bernard O'Dowd will focus on his attitudes to Asia, and to the Australian Aborigines.

Attitudes to Asia

O'Dowd's opposition to the White Australia Policy has not escaped historians' notice, but most of their attention has focussed on his role in the debate on 'Brotherhood' that occurred in the pages of the *Socialist*, the organ Victorian Socialist Party (VSP), in the first decade of the twentieth century.⁶ O'Dowd had, in fact, been criticising racial bigotry for at least ten years by the time this debate was initiated in 1907 by Amelia Lambrick (writing under the name 'Hypatia'), who was a somewhat confused and inconsistent critic of racial prejudice. Lambrick had previously lectured for the Theosophical Society, and it is tempting to surmise that O'Dowd's own involvement in the activities of spiritualists, secularists and theosophists had been a formative influence on his racial attitudes, since members of these groups frequently held unconventional views on such questions. For example, the autocratic president of the Australasian Secular Association in the 1880s, Joseph Symes, was a critic of anti-Chinese agitation.⁷ While there is no evidence that O'Dowd had unconventional attitudes on racial questions at this time, the possibility cannot be ruled out that Symes's internationalism influenced him to some extent.

The first clear evidence of a shift in O'Dowd's attitudes to race, however, is from the 1890s: earlier, his views seem to have been rather conventional. In a letter to fellow-poet Marie Pitt in 1907, O'Dowd admitted that he had been repelled by the Chinese as a school-boy,⁸ and there is evidence that in the 1880s he was no critic of racial stereotyping. In an unpublished sketch written at this time ('The Tutor'), we gain an insight into O'Dowd's racial ideas as a young man of about eighteen. The setting is a pastoral station, where there lives 'a mischievous, playful, but withal, kind-hearted boy fond of practical jokes and the favourite of everyone on the station with the exception of the Chinaman Too Gee'. George's father, Mr. Wyatt, 'in his heart believed in the equality of man and as far as he consistently could, acted up to that belief'. Consequently, he 'had taught his son to respect all', encouraging him to mix with the sons of the poor farmers in the district; and, 'being of a generous disposition', George experiences no difficulty in forming such friendships. It soon becomes clear, however, that young George's kind-heartedness and generosity does not extend to non-whites.

O'Dowd indulges in the most blatant racial stereotyping when he comes to describe Too Gee:

Too Gee was engaged at the station doing whatever was necessary about the house ... He worked very well but was not liked on account of his selfishness & besides he had a great and lasting antipathy to little boys.

He lived by himself in a hut a little way from the house, 'and unlike the other station hands he did not have his meals in the kitchen but cooked his own'. There were continual clashes between George and Too Gee. George frequently called him 'monkey', which was 'the name with which John Chinaman is dubbed by the majority of Australian youths, in whom, by-the-by there seems to be a natural-born hatred to Chinamen'. The Chinaman reported George's taunts to Mr. Wyatt, who would 'administer a slight castigation'; then George would gain his revenge in some practical joke. It comes as no surprise at this point to learn that Too Gee is a superstitious man, who was especially afraid of a grandfather 'who had died many years before, but whose funeral offerings had been omitted for several months on one occasion'. On one occasion, George and his friend made a 'ghost' with which to terrify the Chinaman; on another, they locked him in his house with his pig, which Too Gee believed would bring him bad luck.⁹

There is nothing in this story to suggest that O'Dowd had any qualms about popular images of Chinese among white Australians. Indeed, another fragment of writing on the Chinese from the same period makes a similar point:

Many of them ... gain a livelihood by haunting the neighbourhood of successful miners and when the opportunity presents itself they scrape the crevices of the puddling machines & carrying off their plunder in a bag, wash it when the[y] get to a safe distance. For they are expert thieves, as indeed they ought to be if it be true that the refuse of the Canton & Shanghai gaols are packed on board ship to be transported from their own Celestial land to places where they will never be likely to disturb the native peace again. It is said that they will never cheat each other, considering it a great dishonour, but by no means so if they cheat Europeans. This is not strictly true, although it may be generally so, for I know of many instances in which Chinamen have made complete dupes of several of their countrymen.¹⁰

In this passage, we meet a young democrat and radical, born and bred in the Ballarat district: there is nothing unexpected or unconventional about his prejudices once set in this context. What is remarkable is the later trend of O'Dowd's thought on racial questions. From the 1890s, O'Dowd was perhaps the most outspoken critic of racism in the labour movement and Australian society. For example, in his writings on the Federal Bill of 1898, O'Dowd raised an objection that did not figure prominently in the labour movement's criticisms of the proposed constitution: its endorsement of racial discrimination. He condemned 'the undemocratic branding of "inferior" races ... Pure democracy is colour-blind'. 'I hate the notion of castes in a community', he added.¹¹ A few months after federation had been achieved, in a remarkable editorial in the radical weekly the *Tocsin*, O'Dowd recognised the right of Australians to exclude for their shores anyone who threatened their standard of living. He could not, however, find any justification for distinguishing in this regard between whites and 'coloured races':

I know that the coloured races are called inferior races, but I must admit that I cannot see evidences of their inferiority which do not equally brand the white races of Europe and America as inferior. The notion of inferiority appears to me to be a myth sprung originally from European ignorance and nourished now by a foolish self-conceit.

While O'Dowd believed that Westerners had been more successful in overthrowing tyranny than the people of

the East, this was not evidence of white superiority but rather 'of the superior effectiveness of Eastern methods of tyranny over Western' (Not even O'Dowd could disregard the image of Oriental despotism!). Legislation that discriminated on the basis of race – and O'Dowd nominated several examples – was a danger to democracy because it recognised the principle of inequality: 'we must take our fellow man in Africa, in Asia and in Europe by the hand as a man and a brother (nay if she is willing as a brother-in-law)'. 'The true enemies of white workers', declared O'Dowd, 'are bosses, not coloured workers, as the true enemies of the coloured workers are bosses, not white workers'.¹²

O'Dowd resurrected these ideas during the VSP's 'Brotherhood' debate in 1907. Graeme Osborne and Verity Burgmann have discussed these debates in some detail:¹³ my concern here is specifically with O'Dowd's contribution, and its place in his intellectual development. The exclusion of people from Australia on account 'of the colour of their skins' and 'the application of disabilities' to non-whites in Australia was 'high treason against that democracy which, ignoring race and colour equally with sex, birth and caste, builds on manhood alone'. (O'Dowd did not explain why a democracy that ignored sex should be built on manhood!) He provided a clue about his own change of mind on this whole subject since the 1880s: 'I owe too much to the religion, the philosophy, and the literature of the Eastern countries to be able to summarily degrade their intellectual classes below those of European countries'.¹⁴ In the following week, the *Socialist* published a poem O'Dowd had written on the subject some time before with the title 'Democratise the World!':

Shall we who bade the baron go,
The serf become a man
Acknowledge baron races? No!
Such heresy we ban.¹⁵

In a subsequent article, O'Dowd touched on the most sensitive subject of all – miscegenation – a matter he had only alluded to in passing in 1901:

The favourite argument used by the White Australian debater is, "Would you like to have a Chinaman for a brother-in-law or son-in-law?" The answer is, "Some Chinamen would probably be preferable to many white men ... and many white men would be preferable to some Chinamen ... in any case, it is not a question of our preferences, but of our sisters' or daughters' preferences".¹⁶

This sensible comment prompted predictable responses from correspondents such as W.J. Baxter and Marie Pitt, who agreed on the undesirability of miscegenation and woman's instinct for racial purity.¹⁷ O'Dowd had other opinions, and went so far as to speculate that 'prolonged in-breeding of the white race' might account for 'its rapid nervous degeneration in recent years'. 'Asia', he thought, was 'superior to Europe and Australia in ethics and the religious sense, but inferior in economic ideals' It was the duty of Australians to teach them such ideas as a step towards the democratisation of the world.¹⁸

Theosophy, Race and the Aborigines

O'Dowd continued courageously to profess such ideas in the years before the Great War. In a 1912 review of Louis Esson's one-act play 'The Sacred Place', he suggested 'that Socialists might do worse than get in touch with the finer types of Asiatic sojourners in Australia ... with a view both to getting more of them into our movement, and to ultimate correspondence and friendly co-operation with advanced bodies of political and economic thinkers in their countries'.¹⁹ It is at this point that O'Dowd seems most clearly to be a

prophet of Australian social-democratic modernity, but there is a danger in regarding him in this light. This danger is perhaps best exposed by turning to O'Dowd's attitudes to the Aborigines.

O'Dowd was concerned, perhaps above all else, with the creation of an antipodean national culture that would draw on the best that European and Asian civilisations had to offer, but also rest on a powerful sense of place and a mature and distinctive Australian historical consciousness. For O'Dowd, one way in which this romantic national consciousness – an 'indigenous' sense of the past – would be created among a mainly white population was by connecting the history of the Australian continent and the Aboriginal people to the history of humanity. He saw in Aboriginal cultural practices, myths and legends circumstantial evidence of a secret history of a lost white civilisation of central Australia, a vision connected to the 'Lemurian' speculation that historians have seen as characteristic of the 1890s in Australia (and elsewhere).

Lemuria was the name which P.L. Sclater, a zoologist, gave to a lost continent that had once supposedly extended from south-east Asia nearly to Africa. As the Mosaic chronology became widely discredited in the second half of the nineteenth century, there was considerable room for speculation about lost continents and 'primitive' peoples.²⁰ In this connection, O'Dowd might have been influenced by the ideas of H.P. Blavatsky, one of the founders of theosophy: Bernard had been associated with the Society, sometimes as a member, since the 1890s and read many of its publications. Blavatsky believed that Australia had once been 'an inland region on the Mother Continent', which had come into being at the time of the third root-race. This view gave Australia 'profound importance' in world history.²¹ (No wonder it appealed to a cultural nationalist such as O'Dowd!) According to Blavatsky, the Lemurians were one of the five root-races that had thus far featured in world history; and the Australian Aborigines – or at least some of them – were descended from the Lemurians:

The Secret Doctrine teaches that the *specific unity of mankind* is not without exceptions even now. For there are ... descendants of these half-animal tribes or races, both of remote Lemurian and Lemuro-Atlantean origin. The world knows them as Tasmanians (now extinct) [and] Australians.

This perspective could offer powerful support for colonisation and dispossession. The Australian descendants of the Lemurians, after all, belonged to 'a very low sub-race, begotten originally of animals, of monsters, whose very fossils are now resting miles under the sea floors'. They had existed for thousands of years 'in an environment strongly subjected to the *law of retardation*', and so had become 'degraded men'. The Aborigines, she claimed, were 'the descendants of those, who, instead of vivifying the spark dropped into them by the "Flames", extinguished it by long generations of bestiality'. They were thus not merely a doomed race; Blavatsky also denied the Aborigines a full measure of humanity, attributing to them a spurious hybrid quality – part animal, part human. Consequently, the Aborigines were unfitted 'to occupy the forms of men destined for incarnation in higher intellectual Races'. Indeed, their passing seemed to provide proof of Karma, for the races whose time was up were being destroyed all over the globe. Esoteric philosophy regarded them as 'the senile representatives of lost archaic nations'. 'It is inaccurate', Blavatsky asserted, 'to maintain that the extinction of a lower race is *invariably* due to cruelties or abuses perpetrated by colonists'. The ancient Australian continent could 'produce no new forms, unless helped by new and fresh races, and artificial cultivation and breeding'.²²

This type of speculation, which spawned a body of popular literature considerable in size if not in quality, appealed to some white Australians who desired to furnish themselves with

a history which had happened on their own continent; theirs was an effort to find deeper roots in the soil, to resolve the 'problem' of being colonial by inventing an ancient history for this continent in which the whites had a part. Yet as John Docker has remarked, Lemuria's antiquity also 'allows for ... the discomfiting thought that history is not necessarily a narrative of linear progress ... nations and societies wax and wane in strength and power, they rise and fall, even the mightiest of them, often ending, after some kind of cataclysm, in disappearance or barbarism – when they have to start all over again'.²³ We cannot be sure of the extent to which O'Dowd took theosophical speculation about Lemuria on board, but it did provide a part of the framework he used to understand the Australian Aborigines and their place in world history. He remarked that

[m]any things tend to confirm our instinct of a past ... The singular relics of Easter Island ... taken in conjunction with the Darwinian theory of coral reefs, and the coralline surroundings of so much of our coast line, point to a connection between Australia and some strange civilisation that has weirdly flitted into temporary oblivion. The customs of our aboriginal tribes often hark us back to some strangely-wise statesman or divine prophet who, unassisted by even an alphabet, winged his devices for securing the greatest good of his race through countless generations of as hopeless brain material as ever this world has owned. The legends of these peoples are full of ... startling suggestions of Caucasian – or at least high-grade Turanian – influences ...²⁴

The implication here is that the complexity of Aboriginal society is only explicable if one can find evidence of the influence of the so-called higher races. One is reminded of the explorer George Grey's belief that Aboriginal rock paintings he encountered in north-west Australia could not 'have been executed by a self-taught savage', and so might have been painted by an alien race.²⁵ Through the popular lost white race of the inland convention and the theosophical idea of reincarnation, O'Dowd invents an ancient history of Australia that does not allow Aborigines to have their own history. He was, moreover, unable to resist locating the Aborigines within a crude evolutionary framework. In an unpublished autobiographical piece written in the 1880s, he had put in the mouth of a character obviously based on himself the view that 'there was as great a difference between the Caucasian and the Australian black as there was between the latter and the gorilla'.²⁶ O'Dowd was unable to account for the presence of the Aborigines, except as some dross subsequently thrown up by a strange continent:

The wretched horde whom Europe's host
In this strange land found
Are but the flotsam of our coast
Mere exudations from the ground.²⁷

By the late 1890s, probably as a consequence of his reading of the report of the Horn Scientific Expedition to Central Australia and the early work of Baldwin Spencer and F.H. Gillen, he had modified his attitude and was particularly impressed with Aboriginal marriage customs.²⁸ Yet something rather stronger than mere traces of his earlier views remained. On the contrary, the older attitude is refracted by Lemurian discourse, as when O'Dowd asked whether 'our dirty black brother' is 'the sole relic of an Atlantean civilisation, which, weighed in the balance and found wanting, had paid the price of extinction, by some great divine tide, for the abuse of its holy trust?'. O'Dowd places Aboriginality at the disposal of the British colonial culture: here was 'a piece of the past on which to build epics and comic stories'.²⁹

Literary critics and cultural historians have often drawn attention to O'Dowd's vision of Australia as 'Delos of a coming Sun-God's race' in his most famous sonnet,

'Australia', without considering the possibility of a theosophical inspiration for the idea. It has instead been located within colonial discourses of the emerging national type and the coming nation, which is reasonable so far as it goes, but somewhat imprecise.³⁰ At the very least, O'Dowd's theosophical connections must be considered to form a part of the intellectual background for the poem. In an article written for the magazine *Theosophy in Australia* in 1912, O'Dowd declared that

[t]he differences of men disappear with their differing environments, and with brotherhood felt as a brotherhood in fact, all the rich elements of all the human varieties can and should and shall mingle together in one great human stream, bearing with it in the fulness of time the noblest and most complete race, physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual that has ever lived on this planet.³¹

Here was an argument for racial admixture, although it was a judicious racial mixture that O'Dowd had in mind. His theosophy and evolutionary perspective on racial development permitted him to distinguish between different races. As he told Nettie Palmer in 1915, he did not 'happen to like the Jap soul much' but liked 'the Chinese very much' and went as far as to advocate 'a judicious mixture' with both the Chinese and the Afghans.³²

There is, however, other evidence in O'Dowd's writings that he was influenced by Blavatsky's ideas. In his long poem, *The Bush*, there are references to the doctrine of the Great Year, which O'Dowd derived from his reading of Plutarch, and which he recognised as similar to Blavatsky's root-race theory, with its vision of world history as the rise, decline and fall of great races and civilisations. In the same article referred to above, he discussed

the transitory nature of human glory and the inevitableness of decay ... the ... contemporaneous existence of races in the first flush of their springtime bloom, races in the full vigour of their culminant accomplishments, races in the peace of decline, and races in the awful winter of death waiting the fateful moment when their new birth-hour, the springtime of their next Great Year, will be sounded...

There can be little doubt where he placed the Australian Aborigines in this scheme of things. Yet, for O'Dowd, the cosmic law of love transcended the rise and fall of civilisations. It proclaimed human brotherhood, the highest truth that all races were really one, like members of a single family. O'Dowd endorsed the Theosophical Society's belief in 'universal brotherhood, irrespective of race, creed, sex, caste or colour' and seemed to reject the most outlandish aspects of Blavatsky's ideas concerning the Aborigines, since they contradicted this ideal of brotherhood. As in his earlier writing on White Australia, he condemned discrimination on the basis of skin-colour, and dismissed the dictation test used by Commonwealth authorities to exclude undesirables as a 'hypocritical device'. There were no 'essentially and inevitably inferior races', and the 'essential oneness and blood-brotherhood of all men' could be proven scientifically. Accordingly, O'Dowd marshalled a wide range of sources to show that it was only in recent times that theorists had provided scientific justification for racial hatred. All human progress depended on rebellion against the fatality proclaimed by the doctrine of the Great Year. 'Love', he declared, was 'not of earth ... not subject to Fate, or Space, or Time'. It defied decay.³³ O'Dowd went so far as to question, in verse, the popular doomed race theory in so far as it had been applied to the Aborigines:

But if the tale we daily hear
Too glibly from each tongue,
Of races doomed to disappear,
Of tribes whose songs are sung,
Is based on cosmic law of Good,
You too our sad ones must

Renounce the Hope of Brotherhood
And be to serfdom thrust.³⁴

O'Dowd's hostility to theories of racial inequality was derived not only from his democratic ideals, but from opposition to materialism. Although he had once accepted phrenological ideas himself, he now ridiculed writers such as Count de Gobineau who relied on such evidence as the shape of the skull as the basis of their 'hypotheses that, although mutually contradictory to an almost incredible degree, are yet held as gospel by thousands of investigators, and have even affected the students of our own aboriginal tribes'. His strictures extended to Francis Galton and 'the extremely subtle and plausible and dangerous pseudo-science of Eugenics'. For O'Dowd, it was 'not any magic of race' but 'the moulding fingers of environment that give their characteristics, physical and mental, to all human varieties'.³⁵ In the 'nature versus nurture' debate which was raging within bourgeois progressivism in these years, he would thus have come down firmly on the side of nurture.

The Foundations Bernard O'Dowd's Racial Ideas: A Conclusion

It is difficult to account for the development of O'Dowd's unusual racial views although, as Verity Burgmann and Graeme Osborne have shown, there were others in the labour movement who had anti-racist opinions. As we have seen, it appears likely that theosophy was an important influence. By O'Dowd's own account, it was a closer acquaintance with Chinese culture – especially the writings of Mencius and Confucius – that did most to melt his racial prejudices. Eastern literature and philosophy had a powerful impact on his imagination and spiritual life. He was acutely conscious of the debt of Western civilisation to the East; on the other hand, he sensed rather than appreciated what European civilisation in Australia might have to learn from Aboriginal spirituality. In this period 'when acknowledgement of the violence and illegitimacy of the European invasion of Australia was most strongly suppressed and denied', it is not surprising that such an appreciation eluded even his fertile racial imagination.³⁶

Historians of racial attitudes in Australia face the difficult task of untangling the diverse influences that shaped attitudes to race in Australia. They will need to incorporate in their accounts some consideration of the ways in which European ideas were received and adapted in an antipodean colonial context, by both the pro-White Australia majority and the dissidents, such as O'Dowd. In this paper, I have stressed the influence of theosophy on O'Dowd, but to identify such influences in insufficient: we must also be attentive to the ways in which theosophical ideas found colonial expression. The Lemurian fantasy, for example, did not originate in the colonies, but it met certain needs of the colonisers. Theosophical ideas, moreover, could be used either to uphold the White Australia policy or to criticise it, depending on how one chose to apply this 'knowledge' to Australian circumstances. One theosophist, C.W. Leadbeater, spoke of an 'occult reason at the back of the prejudice in favour of "White Australia" – the desire on the part of the Great Ones behind that there may not be too much of a medley in the population'. While 'two recent sub-races' could be profitably combined, it was inadvisable to mix root-races; and in Blavatsky's scheme, Aborigines and white Australians belonged to different root-races.³⁷

In general, the complexity of O'Dowd's racial views should act as a warning to historians who wish to ransack the past for examples of 'racism'. What this paper has shown is that his attitudes to race were marked by complexity and ambivalence. The categories 'racist' and 'anti-racist', 'enlightened' and 'unenlightened', can have little place in such an historical account. Indeed, we should

no more expect to identify stable racial or ethnic identities in such writings than we would expect to find fixed meanings of class or gender in the languages used by radical intellectuals. The result of such a recognition will be a more nuanced understanding of the ways in which intellectuals involved in Australian public debate have grappled with problems raised by the relationship of race and ethnicity to their project of creating a common national culture and historical consciousness in a young settler society.

Endnotes

- 1 Humphrey McQueen, *A New Britannia: an argument concerning the social origins of Australian radicalism and nationalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1970, p.42.
- 2 Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*, Allen Lane, London, 1984, pp.4-5.
- 3 The foregoing discussion is indebted to Greg Denning, *Mr Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- 4 See, for example, W.H. Wilde, *Three Radicals*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1969, pp.3, 25.
- 5 See, for example, Victor Kennedy and Nettie Palmer, *Bernard O'Dowd*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1954; and John Docker, 'Politics and Poetics: Bernard O'Dowd's *Dawnward?* and Nineteenth-Century Chartist Poetry', *Southerly*, Vol. 53, No. 2, June 1993, pp.13-33.
- 6 Graeme Osborne, 'A Socialist Dilemma', in Ann Curthoys and Andrew Markus (ed.), *Who Are Our Enemies? Racism and the Working Class in Australia*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1978, pp.112-28; V. Burgmann, *Revolutionaries and Racists: Australian Socialism and the Problem of Racism 1887-1917*, PhD thesis, Australian National University, 1980, pp.162-76.
- 7 *Liberator*, 25 March 1888.
- 8 O'Dowd to Pitt, 22 October 1907, Pitt Papers, in J.K. Moir Collection, Box 22A/1(a), State Library of Victoria (VSL).
- 9 Bernard O'Dowd, 'The Tutor', unpublished manuscript, n.d. [c.1885], O'Dowd Papers, Box 2/6, VSL.
- 10 Bernard O'Dowd, loose fragment, n.d., O'Dowd Papers, Box 2/6, VSL.
- 11 *Tocsin*, 26 May 1898; 2 June 1898.
- 12 *Tocsin*, 25 April 1901.
- 13 See endnote 6.
- 14 *Socialist*, 25 May 1907.
- 15 *Socialist*, 1 June 1907.
- 16 *Socialist*, 25 May 1907.
- 17 *Socialist*, 1, 15 June 1907.
- 18 *Socialist*, 8 June 1907; 20 July 1908.
- 19 *Socialist*, 12 January 1912,
- 20 See J.J. Healy, 'The Lemurian Nineties', *Australian Literary Studies*, Vol. 8, No.3, May 1978, pp.307-16; John Docker, *The Nervous Nineties: Australian cultural life in the 1890s*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991, chs.15-22; Robert Dixon, *Writing the Colonial Adventure: Race, Gender and Nation in Anglo-Australian Popular Fiction, 1875-1914*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1995, chs.4-5; Tom Griffiths, *Hunters and Collectors: The Antiquarian Imagination in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1996, pp. 43-4; Roslynn D. Haynes, *Seeking the Centre: the Australian Desert in Literature, Art and Film*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, ch.7.
- 21 Lewis Spence, *The Problem of Lemuria: The Sunken Continent of the Pacific*, Rider & Co., London, pp.86-90; Jill Roe, *Beyond Belief: Theosophy in Australia 1879-1939*, New South Wales University Press, Kensington, 1986, p.78.
- 22 H.P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. II, The Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, 1993, pp.162, 195-7, 318, 779-80.
- 23 Docker, *Nervous Nineties*, p.222.
- 24 *Advance Australia*, 1 June 1897.
- 25 George Grey, *Journals of Two Expeditions of Discovery in North-West and Western Australia during the years 1837, 38, and 39 ...*, Vol.1, T. and W. Boone, London, 1841, p.263. See also Healy, 'The Lemurian Nineties', pp.312-13.
- 26 Bernard O'Dowd, 'The Tutor'.
- 27 Bernard O'Dowd, 'A Synod of Australia's Olympus; Scene - The summit of Chamber's Pillar; Time - Sunset. Midsummer; Enter the Muse of Australia', loose sheet, n.d., in exercise book, O'Dowd Papers Box 2/7, VSL.
- 28 *Tocsin*, 7 September 1899.
- 29 *Advance Australia*, 1 June 1897.
- 30 See, for example, Vance Palmer, *The Legend of the Nineties*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, pp.10-11.
- 31 *Theosophy in Australia*, 1 October 1912, p.178.
- 32 O'Dowd to Palmer, 10 January 1915, Palmer Papers, National Library of Australia (NLA) MS 1174/1/1371.
- 33 *Theosophy in Australia*, 2 September, 153-6; 1 October 1912, pp.175-9.
- 34 'Democratize the World', in *The Poems of Bernard O'Dowd: Collected Edition*, Lothian, Melbourne, 1944, pp.181-2.
- 35 *Theosophy in Australia*, 1 October 1912, pp.175-9.
- 36 Griffiths, *Hunters*, p.151.
- 37 C.W. Leadbeater, *Australia and New Zealand as the Home of a New Sub-Race*, Batson & Co. Ltd [Printers], Sydney, 1915, pp. 34-5.