

‘A Dying Race’: The History and Fiction of Elizabeth Durack

Kylie O’Connell

On 25 May 2000, the eve of National Sorry Day and Corroboree 2000, painter Elizabeth Durack died, aged 84.¹

Durack grew up on her family’s stations in the Kimberley, north Western Australia. She began her artistic career illustrating children’s storybooks written by her sister, the late Mary Durack, in the 1930s and 1940s. Elizabeth painted throughout her life, mainly depicting the Aborigines who lived on and around her family’s properties. She gained national focus in March 1997, when art historian Robert Smith revealed that she had invented the persona of ‘Eddie Burrup’, an emerging Aboriginal artist. At the time, many non-indigenous critics were sympathetic to Durack’s vocalised aims. Smith noted that ‘Eddie Burrup’ could ‘be seen as not just a homage to Aboriginal Australia, but a concrete exemplar for reconciliation between two communities and two cultures’.² Other critics, such as the anthropologist Julie Marcus, disagreed. Marcus argued that Durack’s deception:

offers a timely opportunity to examine some of the ways in which a colonial politics of dispossession, race, gender and an undoubted sympathy for Aboriginal people play out through the work and thought of an individual artist.³

This article builds on Marcus’ argument, demonstrating how Durack’s art retraced the history of colonial relationships between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians.

Durack’s invention of Burrup, and in particular his ‘autobiography’, helped create and maintain his ‘material’ identity as an artist. Burrup stood before Durack’s ‘Aboriginal’ paintings, signifying their beginning or genesis. They became not just works of art, or visual images, but reflections of the Burrup identity, an identity that was mobilised by a network of discursive racial and sexual power relations. Smith’s ‘disclosure’ of Durack’s performance was part of a colonial narrative that attempted to hide its own construction in experiential accounts of artistic motivations and reconciliation. Readers of the Burrup art were blinded, before and after exposure of the hoax, to the history and the material implications of the repetition of colonial practices. By unpacking some of the discourses that have constructed the lives of Durack and Burrup, it is clear how Burrup’s identity was made intelligible through performance of his life in genres or styles of work; for example, how his oral history implied a notion of the self, and thus an authentic subjectivity. Rather than contributing to the representation of Aboriginal people, Durack’s impersonation or persona actually contributed to the erosion of Aboriginal identity and difference.

White Women of the Bush

Racial and sexual power relations are inseparable in the colonial context; in analysing the notions of identity and difference that underpin the ‘Eddie Burrup’ performance

it is therefore helpful to start with Durack's personal history, as considered through the figure of the white woman of the bush. Two powerful models of femininity in the Australian bush are the journalist and anthropologist Daisy Bates, and Mrs Aeneas Gunn, author of the novel *We of the Never Never*.⁴

Durack's relationship with Aborigines from the Kimberley parallels Bates' closeness and sense of belonging with the Aboriginal community she lived in for several years. Bates describes the place that she, as a white woman, held in the Aboriginal community:

They accepted me as a kindred spirit [...] They even allowed me free access to the sacred places and the sacred ceremonies of the initiations of the men, which their own women must never see under penalty of death.⁵

Discussing Burrup's genesis, Durack echoes Bates' statement:

That's largely why Eddie is a man — the men would tell me things, invite me to watch ceremony. I've never really understood why — except that I think to them because I wasn't an Aboriginal woman I was sexless — outside the bounds of what women perhaps should know.⁶

Bates and Durack each believed that their associations with Aboriginal communities made them somehow 'honorary Aboriginal people'. Similarly, in her discussion of Gunn's novel *We of the Never Never*, Laura Donaldson argues that white women in the bush, such as Mrs Aeneas Gunn, transgressed the gendered relations of white femininity by entering the worlds of white men and 'natives'.⁷ Donaldson points out that binary models of difference, employing a single distinction between oppressor and oppressed, fail to account for the complex and contradictory ways in which white women figure in the bush. White women are oppressed by patriarchal relationships, but while they are considered the inferior, weaker sex, they nonetheless have more power than the indigenous population.

In suggesting that white femininity transcends difference in the bush, gaining access to the 'primitive' world of the 'other', Donaldson draws on the colonialist term 'piccaninny' which originated in the West Indies, but quickly came to refer to indigenous men, women or children throughout the British colonies:

as the 'piccaninny' became more widely disseminated within the Anglo-European grammar of power, its discourse of difference bound racial and sexual inferiority together through articulating practices.⁸

Donaldson argues that the figure of Gunn as a 'little Missus' relies on an enthymeme, or incomplete syllogism. This enthymeme entwines 'small white woman' (weaker sex) with the Aborigine (figured as weaker race):

Premise 1: The Missus is a woman.
(Suppressed) Premise 2: Women and Piccaninnies are little.
Conclusion: The Missus is a Piccaninny.⁹

Durack uses the same argument as justification for her invention of Burrup. The discourse of the 'piccaninny' is used to account for, or articulate, Durack's own feelings of dispossession. The enthymeme now reads:

Premise 1: Durack is a white woman.

(Suppressed) Premise 2: White women and Aboriginal men are dispossessed.

Conclusion: Durack is an Aboriginal man.

Durack thus justifies her invention of Burrup via colonialist discourses which position femininity and indigenous culture in inferior positions to the white male.

Durack claims to be one of the first Australian painters to paint a distinctive Australian cultural identity through her paintings of Aboriginal people. She was painting Aborigines before Sidney Nolan began his Eliza Fraser series, for example, and is certainly one of many female artists in Australian art history who have not been treated in the same manner as 'great' white male artists. Robert Hughes, art historian and critic, suggests in *The Art of Australia* that the 'question "why do Australians paint?"' is readily answered: because they are men, and art is a social and perhaps a biological necessity'.¹⁰ Hughes is misled by his use of the generic masculine: while Durack has been a successful Australian artist she, like many other women artists, is not mentioned in Hughes' text. Nor is she credited with having made a significant contribution to the formation of (male) Australian (artistic) identity.

The discrimination that Durack has faced as a woman may have led her, via a discourse of the 'piccaninny', to identify with the indigenous population (especially when she considered herself an 'honorary man' because of her attendance at men's ceremonies). This may have been intensified by the loss of what she considered her own rural home(land). Her father, Michael Durack, sold the family home in the 1970s and this eventually led to formation of the Ord River Dam and flooding of the two family stations: Argyle and Ivanhoe.¹¹ Her brother, Kimberley Michael Durack, was pro-development and as eldest son inherited the bulk of the family estate. Elizabeth Durack thus lost her home(land) through patriarchal power relations, just as the Aboriginal people lost theirs through colonialist power relations. Durack could therefore, following (colonialist) enthymeme logic, have seen herself as being the *same* as Aboriginal people.

At the same time as she identifies with Aboriginal dispossession and discrimination, however, Durack remains firmly positioned within the colonialist discourses which establish that dispossession. Elizabeth and Mary Durack began their careers writing and illustrating children's stories for the *Bulletin* and producing a series of children's books.¹² Two of these storybooks, *Chunuma*, *Little-Bit-King* and *Piccaninnies*, are of particular interest here.¹³ Both stories were modelled on Jeff Chunuma Rainyerri, a Miriwoong elder who was Elizabeth's kinship son. Rainyerri has several times been cited as inspiration for, and justification of, the Burrup impersonation,¹⁴ while Durack's kinship relationship with him has been cited as evidence of her ongoing commitment to the Aboriginal people around 'her traditional home', and the love they in turn have for her.

The discourse of the 'piccaninny' is clearly in operation in the Rainyerri children's texts: 'Little-Bit-King' translates as 'Picaninny King', or 'King of the Picaninnies'. Mary Durack describes Rainyerri's birth and physical features in the following way:

The older members of the camp had set themselves assiduously to the task of smearing charcoal and fat over the new born, lest he grow up 'little bit white fella' due to their neglect of this colouring process [...] He was as 'properly' a black

piccaninny as ever was; a pixie-like person with little pointed ears and merry eyes sloping upwards with straight black brows and a mouth — the pixiest of all his features — that expanded into sudden laughter, revealing a stretch of gum as pink as a piece of watermelon.¹⁵

Interestingly it is the older Aboriginal members of the camp who are responsible for Chunuma's 'colouring process' and not the (possibly white) father.

Other Aboriginal figures who feature in the Durack sisters' stories maintain the 'Piccaninny' discourse, for example Jubbul and (Argyle) Boxer who lived near the Durack's station appear in *Chunuma, Little-Bit-King*.¹⁶ Mary Durack gives these 'characters' a dedication in *All-About*:

A Dedication to 'All-About'
(The Black Community at Argyle)

You will never read this, for to learning you have no pretensions. You cannot sue us for libel though we have exposed your characters, your secrets and your private lives. Forgive us! Our protection lies in your unworldliness.

Most of the sketches you have seen you have laughed heartily at each, if a little disappointed that you did not appear more beautiful. 'Young Missus' might at least have drawn you at your best, not gone so slyly to the kitchen, the laundry, and all uninvited to the camp, with her notebook and her uncharitable pencil.

But this to you, 'All-About, there is much you can teach us that is not in the white man's knowledge. Yours is the gift of laughter and human kindness and true philosophy. Were you ever savages?'¹⁷

The 'dedication' is written for those who will never read the texts, and thus it functioning not as a (patronising and problematic) thankyou to the people of Argyle Station, but as a marker of the position that the Durack sisters hold as 'translators' of these 'savages'' lives. The dedication implies that the fictions are based on the 'true' lives of the community, without acknowledging that they are colonialist representations of Aboriginality.

Burrup is the synthesis of several Aboriginal men Elizabeth Durack has known *together with* the representations in the fiction and illustrations executed by the Durack sisters. To contest that Burrup is based only on simple collation of several real people is to read the Durack sisters' stories as biographies, ignoring the fact that, while the names of the characters in the stories have some connection to 'real-life' people, the characterisations of them are the product of (colonial) fictions. Durack views Aboriginal subjectivity and cultural practices through her position as a white woman. Her understanding of 'authentic' Aboriginal identity is articulated through colonial discourses about Aboriginal identity, the same discourses that construct Aboriginal people as 'Piccaninnies'. Durack created Burrup as though he was still a (man)child, a 'piccaninny', or a character in a storybook, and she was his mother/protector. She does not view herself as *like* a 'piccaninny', as Donaldson's argument would suggest; rather, she is (author and) *mother* of the 'piccaninny'.

Eddie Burrup's Oral History: Spiritualised Origins

'Eddie Burrup' still exists well after the revelation that he is actually Durack. He has his own website containing images of his paintings and a lengthy monologue (with English translation).¹⁸ The website explains that Perpetua Hobcroft interviewed Burrup on several occasions. Burrup's text appears in Aboriginal English or Kriol.¹⁹

Temporarily suspending the knowledge that Burrup is actually Durack enables us to read how 'he' articulates his identity and personal history, and how this 'self' is then read over and onto 'his' artistic work. Deconstruction of Burrup's 'artistic profile' and oral (personal) history as 'literal' texts shows how his identity as an Aboriginal man actually erodes his difference as an Aborigine. He is reduced in the texts to one of a spiritualised dying race of people who are being ignored by current attempts at reconciliation.

Central to the representation of Burrup as an 'authentic' Aborigine are non-indigenous understandings of the meaning of art and an artist's relationship to their work. A dominant model of analysis suggests that the artistic value of a piece of work is visible when looking at it, ie, that an artwork transcends its author or its material origins and stands alone. Its value is assumed to be identifiable and assessable objectively; either a piece has artistic worth or it does not. By this argument, it matters not whether an Aboriginal man or a white woman was the originator of Burrup's art, since it is the art itself that is of importance.

This argument does not acknowledge artwork as the site of discourses that produce meaning for readers, depending on the subject position from which they gaze. If Durack's paintings could stand alone as significant artistic work, why was there a need to invent Burrup as their creator? Durack was aware that paintings are not just images on flat canvas, but are inscribed with social meaning that is produced through the relationship between author and artistic text. Art is the site of discursive articulations that entwine the author with the text.

The view that paintings are psychic or spiritual projections of an interior essence of the painter's identity is *the* concept that underpinned Durack's creation of Burrup. Expression of a material 'artist's identity' was reinforced by autobiographical statements written in Kriol that accompanied all of Burrup's paintings, while his signature signified the presence of the author, marking the text as 'authentic'. When people viewed Burrup's paintings they were encouraged not only to think that they were painted by an Aboriginal artist but that they were a *reflection* of his essential being or life, and hence of Aboriginal subjectivity and history. The reader 'knows' the texts have been produced by an Aboriginal man because he has said so. The gap between the painting and the reader is filled with the distinctive 'voice' of the artist, and the circuit of meaning about Aboriginality, history and Burrup's Dreaming, is complete.

Burrup's artist's note, reproduced on his website, appears, like his other written 'statements', in Kriol with an English translation following. It reads:

Well now, I tell'm you
My old uncle 'e bin learn'm me for read'n country —
We two gissa-gissa —
We follow'm up all t'em oldenday track
Place where Dreamin' mob

Bin put'm first time ...

Alright — by'n'by, 'e'n allabout fella knock up —
'e go underneath' for sleep.

Place where 'e go down 'e leave'm mark longa rock —
You see'm?
'e there alright!
'e d'e one dat all day singin' out b'la me ...

Same now I put'm 'la picture.

(The work of Eddie Burrup is influenced by the petraglyphic images of the Creation Ancestors and the many symbolic and anthropomorphised renderings of them that are spread throughout Western Australia. He is activated by a deep concern for the erosion of the old totemic bonds that once united all creation, linked past, present and future and ensured the continuance of life on earth).²⁰

Burrup's speech signifies the Aboriginality, extended familial relations, rock painting and representations of Dreaming that are read onto his paintings, hence the statement:

Place where 'e go down 'e leave'm mark longa rock—
You see'm?
'e there alright!
'e d'e one dat all day singin' out b'la me...

Same now I put'm 'la picture.

The rock paintings are now put on canvasses for others to consume. Burrup's 'speech' maintains the specificity of his Aboriginal identity.

The Anglicisation of Aboriginal English has long been discussed by Aboriginal critics who find that, even in autobiographies of Aborigines the editing process can erode or 'translate' their voice and perspective into a white one. The Aboriginal cultural theorist and writer Mudrooroo, suggests that '[i]n the past, Anglo-Celtic recorders of indigenous oral narratives rarely sought a way to handle indigenous discourse patterns and preserve them in a written text'.²¹ Hobcroft's apparent care in detailing the 'real' voice of Burrup, followed by a statement of clarification in English, would appear to break with this history of conducting and recording the oral interviews of indigenous people. Her apparent desire to maintain Burrup's Kriol speech marks the interviews with a certain sign of authenticity, or an 'untouched' presentation of an Aboriginal life. The presentation of Burrup's story or dialogue, punctured separately by English translations, allows for the maintenance of his subjectivity. The bracketed statements even provide a commentary on the physicality of Burrup. His oral interview begins:

Well, alright
I tell'm you now —
I tell'm you b'l'a
All t'em olden time

Where we bin sit down
Long time — loong time
Longa dis country —

(At this point Eddie Burrup stood up and stretched out his arms to the four points of the compass)²²

Later in the text, a note appears which explains Burrup's feelings about being taped:

(On hearing this opening section of the interview replayed Eddie Burrup showed a certain impatience with it or with his ability to express himself through this medium. However, on his next visit to Broome he was prepared to continue).²³

The bracketed statements contextualise and provide a material basis for the monologue. While on the one hand it could be argued that the placement of Hobcroft's statements of clarification helps maintain the integrity of Burrup's Kriol speech, one could also argue that her statements, in 'proper English', actually make his speech, and therefore his subjectivity, childlike. At one point Burrup even refers to Aboriginal children as piccaninnies, thereby repeating the term colonialist discourse used to describe Aborigines as inferior. As he speaks about his Dreaming, his life growing up on a station, his employment with the railroad, and his artistic work, Burrup's speech provides the reader with a sense of authentic identity that is then translated to the (white) reader by Hobcroft. Burrup's monologue, like his paintings, is presented as a reflection of his identity. In actuality, it functions to preclude questions as to the authenticity of Burrup's identity.

Burrup, his paintings and his 'life' are now seen as a theatrical mask, an impersonation. His Aboriginality (and Aboriginal art in general) is viewed as unauthentic. Burrup is really Durack. She now stands before Burrup as the origin of Aboriginality. When the reader is first presented with the 'artist's note', Burrup's speech precedes Hobcroft's translation or interpretation. With the revelation of the impersonation, the translation becomes *the original* text. Thus, Hobcroft's 'proper English' comes before the childlike monologue of Burrup, and the position of white colonial discourse in relation to Aboriginal subjectivity is restored: Durack comes before Burrup, mother before son.

In the sense that a notion of spirituality comes before Aboriginal people's relationships of land ownership, as it has been represented by Native Title, Durack's interpolation of herself into Aboriginal identity leaves her in a position of particular opposition to the Mabo and Wik decisions. In translation, a section of Burrup's interview shows how Durack and Hobcroft articulate cultural difference in such a way as to remove Aboriginality from the landscape of race relations in contemporary Australia.

In the oral interview, Burrup says:

A'right — listen now —
I tell'm you —
Young pella nowday
'm don' know nothin' —
'm don' careless —
'm no more 'ear'm now — can't listen —

old pella justa bad
'm no more talk up for learn'm now —
'm on'y allday drunkin' —
'm fall down — poor ol' pella
fall down
chleep longa street — I see 'm —

Gudea walk top right over'm —
'm takim' no notice ...
dead — d — world ...

A'right!
I tell'm you straight now —
T'at yella pella — t'at arbcach — (half-cast)
might be little bit black pella long time —
might be 'm granny —
might be Chinaman daddy
'Afgahn might be —
mise be Gudea —
My word!'m can talk alright —
You bin 'ear'm 'igh talk?
I hear'm longa transistor —
I see'm longa television —
I'ere'm allday 'igh talk —
On'y'e don' know nothin' —
'e no more got'm Tjukurrpa —
nothin' Dreamin'
Gooming all binish now ...
Wall, we t' fella reckon yella fella —
on'y waste'm
'm fella can't look after'm

on'y wast'm time
for learn'm arbcas' —
Bye- 'n-bye gub'ment take'm
Grow'm up white fella way ...
t'at t' why yella fella no got'm Tjukurrpa —
nothin' Dreamin' —
'm allasame Gudea now —
Gudea no got 'm Dreamin' ...²⁴

My translation of this text reads as follows:

Listen now
I'm telling you
Young people these days
They don't know anything
They don't care less about anything —
They do not listen nowadays
Old people are thought of as bad
Young people don't want to listen or learn now

Fresh Cuts: New Talents 2001

They just drink all day
They collapse in the street
All along the street — you can see them

The Dreaming walks right over them
But they take no notice of the Dreaming
They are dead to the world

I'm going to tell you straight
Those half casts
They might have been a bit of a black fella a long time ago
They may have got their 'Aboriginality' from their grandmother
Or the father may be Chinese or Afghan
But they can talk alright
Have you heard them talking up big?
I have heard them on the radio
I have seen them on the television
I have heard them talking as if they know it all
Only they don't know anything
They are not Aboriginal anymore
They know nothing of the Dreaming
It 's all finished now ...
The Chinese fellow is wasting his time
He cannot look after the children

The government took the children away
They grew up like white men and women
That is why yellow fellow or Chinese have got no Aboriginality about them
They have not got any Dreaming
We all have the same Dreaming or God now
God has no Dreaming now

In the translation, Dreaming, or one's relationship to the Dreaming, is what makes a person Aboriginal. But with colonialisation and the 'mixing of races', people were removed from their families and communities and therefore also from the Dreaming. Having been raised as white, Burrup states that these people are either drinking to excess or they are speaking out with a claim to Aboriginality. They appear on television and radio arguing for indigenous self-determination; but they are not, Burrup claims, Aboriginal. He implies that the history of colonialisation was bad, but it is over; white and black are now the same.

A supplementary statement is appended to Burrup's narrative:

Eddie B appears to refer to the Assimilation policy when the government, assuming paternity of children of mixed race, assigned them to missions and foster care where they received formal education and training aimed to facilitate their entry into mainstream Australian society. This policy was later overturned and replaced by the current national philosophy: Self-determination and Multiculturalism.²⁵

This statement is offered as clarification of Burrup's words. The view that colonialisation is over and that we are all the same now appears to be first offered by Burrup. Upon the revelation that Durack is Burrup, the statement of clarification

becomes the origin of Burrup's experience. That is, it is Durack (and Hobcroft) who feel that Aboriginality may be characterised as a spiritual relationship with the land, and that this type of Aboriginality does not persist in the young people today. They are 'half casts' whose Aboriginality has been lost with 'entry into mainstream Australian society'. In the epilogue to Burrup's monologue, it is argued that Burrup's paintings are representations of his Dreaming, and therefore, his Aboriginality. The epilogue argues that Burrup's and his people's Dreaming has been ignored by the High Court decisions of 'Mabo' (1992) and 'Wik' (1996) because they have imposed a European notion of land and land ownership onto Aboriginal people. The court decreed that Aboriginal people were the *original* custodians of their land; whereas the epilogue suggests that Aboriginal people *are* the land. A subtle, but insidious, argument that recognition of Native Title is unnecessary, since it is a European understanding of land ownership and, therefore, at odds with the Dreaming of Aboriginal people. A passage of the epilogue reads: 'It would appear from the decisions made the judges were unaware of the original situation vis-à-vis the land and its original inhabitants'.²⁶ In other words, had the judges known about the original relationship between Aborigines and the land, they would never have made the 'Mabo' or 'Wik' decisions because 'with settlement and the introduction of alien and unrelatable creatures the closed circuit was broken'.²⁷ Into the land/people circuit came the Europeans.

Thus Durack's position is that Australians cannot return through history, or change the deadly and devastating effects of colonialism, only accept what has taken place and move forward, recognising all people now have a relationship to the land. The young Aboriginal people who speak out, together with governments proposing self determination and multiculturalism, should enter a 'true' period of reconciliation and see that history is in the past.

Durack and Hobcraft's argument is 'fantastic', because the very originality of Aboriginality is used to displace Aboriginal sovereignty and identity, and replace it with a more 'authentic' white Anglo-Celtic identity. Unaccustomed, despite her kinship relations, to engaging with Aboriginal subjectivity and creativity, Durack works only within the realm of representation — where indigenous identity can be controlled, manipulated and used in the maintenance of white, Anglo-Celtic identity.

The process of reconciliation is re-defined by Durack as a recognition that Aborigines are a dying, or 'dead' race. She explains that she has painted Aborigines or used Aboriginal iconography and painting techniques because:

'I felt as though I was looking at the last of something [...] Events such as the walks — the journeys for ritual purposes — were declining. I suppose I wanted to record it before it disappeared altogether'.²⁸

This view of Aborigines as 'poor remnants of a dying race' has a long history in Australian cultural history.²⁹ Susan Sheridan identifies it in the work of some white women writers, such as Louisa Lawson writing in her feminist newspaper *The Dawn* in 1897 and Katharine Susannah Prichard, in her 1929 novel *Coonardoo*. Although these were considered positive representations at the time, given that they recognised the devastating effects of colonialism, they were nonetheless based on essentialist notions of Aboriginality which failed to recognise its survival in the colonial context.³⁰ Durack shares with these women a respect for spiritual representations

of Aboriginality, yet uses such representations to reduce the reconciliation process to all Australians reconciling themselves to the idea that colonialism has 'wiped out' Aboriginality in Australia, leaving white people as the new, legitimate land holders.

Durack died just before Corroboree 2000, an event which in part recognised the survival of Aboriginal people and the desire by many non-Aborigines to develop reconciliation relationships outside colonial models of cultural difference. Whatever Durack's private motivations for the creation of Burrup, it was not an act which can be made to fit such relationships or reconciliation processes. Far from being simply her 'last creative phase' or articulating a desire 'to reflect a genuine experience through art',³¹ Durack's Burrup hoax was executed in such a way as to manipulate its readers' understanding of Aboriginality, authenticity, art and the reconciliation process. If the Burrup incident leaves any legacy for reconciliation between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australians, it is in raising awareness of the importance of the ways that identity and difference are constructed through cultural performances, even those that claim to represent a genuine appreciation of cultural difference.

Notes on page 212

'A Dying Race': The History and Fiction of Elizabeth Durack
Kyle O'Connell

- 1 Elizabeth Durack died at her Perth home on 25 May 2000. 26 May 2000 is National Sorry Day, when many Australians acknowledge the devastating effects of official government policies that saw the removal of Aboriginal children from their families and placed into institutionalised care or adopted into non-Aboriginal families. National Sorry Day attempts to 'say sorry' to the 'Stolen Generation' and to all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Corroboree 2000 was part of Reconciliation Week 2000. Corroboree 2000 saw the Australian Declaration Towards Reconciliation tabled. On the following day, the 27 May 2000 over 150 000 people walked over Sydney Harbour Bridge as part of Corroboree 2000.
- 2 R Smith, 'The incantations of Eddie Burrup', *Art Monthly Australia*, March 1997, p 5.
- 3 J Marcus, "'... like an Aborigine'" — empathy, Elizabeth Durack and the colonial imagination', *The Olive Pink Bulletin*, vol 9, nos 1 and 2, 1997, p 46.
- 4 D Bates, *The Passing of the Aborigines: A Lifetime Spent Among the Natives of Australia*, Melbourne, 1966; A Gunn, *We of the Never Never* [1908], 1990.
- 5 Bates, *op cit.*, p 24.
- 6 McCulloch, *op. cit.*, p 21.
- 7 L Donaldson, 'Piccaninnies' and Peter Pan: the problem of discourse in a Marxist never never land', in her *Decolonising Feminisms: Race, Gender and Empire Building*, Chapel Hill and London, 1992, pp 83-87.
- 8 *ibid.*, p 86.
- 9 *ibid.*, p 84.
- 10 R Hughes, *The Art of Australia*, Victoria, 1970, p 23.
- 11 S Powell, 'The Durack dynasty', *The Australian*, 12 March, 1997, p 13.
- 12 Marcus, *op. cit.*, p 45.
- 13 M Durack, and E Durack, *Chunuma Little-Bit-King*, Perth, 1941; M Durack and E Durack, *Piccaninnies*, Perth, 1942.
- 14 Smith, *op. cit.*, p 5.
- 15 M Durack, and E Durack, *op cit.*, 1941, p 9.
- 16 *ibid.*, p 13, p 50
- 17 M Durack and E Durack, *All-About: The Story of a Black Community on Argyle Station, Kimberley*, Sydney, 1935, p 6.
- 18 (<http://www.ozpages.com/eddieburrup>), accessed 31 May 2000.
- 19 'Eddie Burrup's Story — editor's foreword' on (<http://www.ozpages.com/eddieburrup>), accessed 31 May 2000.
- 20 'Artist's note on his work', (<http://www.ozpages.com/eddieburrup>), accessed 31 May 2000.
- 21 Mudrooroo, *Indigenous Literature of Australia: Milli Milli Wangka*, South Melbourne, 1997a, p. 139.
- 22 'Eddie Burrup story', (<http://www.ozpages.com/eddieburrup>), accessed 31 May 2000.
- 23 (<http://www.ozpages.com/eddieburrup>), accessed 31 May 2000.
- 24 *ibid.*
- 25 *ibid.*
- 26 *ibid.*
- 27 *ibid.*
- 28 McCulloch, *op. cit.*, p 20.
- 29 S Sheridan, *Along The Faultlines: Sex, Race and Nation in Australian Women's Writing: 1880s-1930s*, St Leonards, 1995, pp 121-134. See also Russell McGregor, *Imagined Destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the Doomed Race Theory, 1880-1939*, Carlton, Vic., Melbourne UP, 1997.
- 30 *ibid.*, p 122, pp 142-150.
- 31 McCulloch, *op. cit.*, p 18, p 21.