

L. S. W. DUNCAN

ABORIGINAL PROTEST: ONE MOVEMENT OR MANY?*

Abstract

It has been suggested that Aboriginal organizations and protest groups are so plagued by problems of factionalism, inability to generate and sustain effective leadership, lack of communication, clashing ideologies and such widely divergent goals and strategies, both within and between groups, as to make them at best relatively ineffective separate organizations. While it is clear that these may be real problems in many cases, this view underestimates much that is being achieved in Aboriginal protest at present.

Therefore, this paper will suggest evidence to support the alternative view that Aboriginal protest may be considered as predominantly one protest movement. Aboriginal protest and resistance will be considered in terms of their protest element. The nature of communication and liaison networks between rural, fringe and urban communities and between different organizations will be examined to determine the extent to which these are part of a common network and share common goals. It will be suggested that the factionalism that stems from clashing ideologies and divergent strategies, in part, generates effective leadership and is responsible for proliferating Aboriginal protest into ever wider areas.

Protest, even violent protest, is not a new phenomenon in Australia, as Shaw (1972) in his paper 'Popular Protest in Australian History' has demonstrated. Nor is it a recent development in relations between Aborigines and white Australians. The repeated use of words such as 'resistance', guerilla skirmishes', 'hostile incursions', 'depredation', 'unwilling compliance' etc. to denote Aboriginal action by Rowley (1970) in his reassessment of the role of Aborigines in Australian history clearly implies a long-term, widespread reaction, against Europeans at least during early contact. McQueen's (1973) re-analysis of this period is more explicit. He sees 'Aborigines as Australian patriots, fighting a justifiable war of resistance against the European invaders of their homelands'. These views of Aboriginal action impure a unity of purpose if not of organization and strategy to Aborigines over this period.

Although action which whites see as obviously protest seems to have occurred only spasmodically prior to the nineteen-sixties (Tobin 1972: 67), with the benefit of hindsight and the recognition that the early resistance was deliberate, the emergence of Aboriginal protest may be traced from the early contact period. Although Berndt

(1971) suggests otherwise, I feel contemporary protest may be viewed as a development of the 'war of resistance' to meet the radically altered circumstances. It would therefore be useful to examine Aboriginal protest to determine whether the early unity of purpose has been maintained and whether it may be viewed as predominantly one protest movement.

This examination will be made using the evidence to hand from research in progress to provide my interim understanding of what is in any case a rapidly developing phenomenon. When tracing the emergence of a nation-wide movement from many isolated incidents and disparate organizations, the exact point at which it is decided that it is one movement is arbitrary. The qualification 'predominantly' has therefore been used to indicate some latitude. It is however quite clear to me that one movement is emerging and this paper suggests evidence for a unity of purpose and a network of communication sufficient to coordinate action when necessary, encompassing the great diversity of protest in mission, settlement, station, fringe and urban Aboriginal communities.

It is, however, widely held though not often expressed openly in print, that Aboriginal communities and organizations are so plagued by problems of factionalism, inability to generate and sustain effective leadership, lack of communication, clashing ideologies and such widely divergent goals and strategies both within and between groups as to make them at best relatively ineffective separate movements. While the following statements may not support this view they do indicate the situation from which it arises. 'Aborigines are often reluctant to accept leadership from their fellows and are often inclined to *tear down* any Aboriginal who shows signs of pre-eminence' (Wentworth 173: 9; my emphasis); 'Conflicts between Aboriginal spokesmen and leaders may be indications of political maturation' (Rowley 1973: 193; my emphasis); 'Such divergent methods (of two South Australian Aboriginal organizations), however, sometimes lead to mutual recriminations. One group calls the other cautious to the point of sycophancy; in turn there are charges of irresponsibility and mismanagement' (Le Sueur 1972: 119); and 'How about forgetting petty differences? ... Please, at all costs, do not turn the ... (organization) into a three ring circus' (*The Koortier*: 4). The final statement was made by an Aboriginal participant.

PROTEST

Protest is an expression of dissent, a form of political activity, indeed a political resource used as Lipsky points out (1970: 173), by the relatively powerless to 'activate "third parties" to enter the implicit or explicit bargaining arena in ways favourable to the protesters', and so hopefully to bring about desired change. It occurs within a system of conflict-resolution and assumes at least a residue of a shared ethical language (Mazrui 1970: 1187). It often uses unconventional display or symbolic force; means which are considered legitimate at least by the protesters. Contemporary Aboriginal protest takes on many forms, and I have made suggestions toward a

* The original version of this paper was presented to the A.N.Z.A.A.S. Congress in Perth, August 1973.

typological approach elsewhere (Duncan 1974: 595-607). Clearly the form the activity takes depends on the situation. A brief survey of some recent protests will indicate the variety. Protest action in remote communities is very different from that elsewhere. For example, the strike at Wave Hill Station (1966-67) followed by the 'walk-off' at Watite Creek is possibly the biggest and certainly the most widely publicized event of this nature but is representative of other protests occurring on cattle stations (Berndt 1971: 34). The emergence of the Pindan movement and later the formation of Nomads Ltd. was another form appropriate to an area rich in minerals. Drunken riots with their very strong anti-white connotations, both with and without Black Power slogans have occurred at a number of missions and settlements for example, Papunya, Yuendumu and Umbakumba. The recent moves by small 'tribal' groups to 'walk-off' larger 'tribally' mixed settlements back to their country on the part of the Pintubi at Papunya, Pitjanjajara at Ernabella and Fregon, and various 'tribal' groups at Maningrida can also be seen as protest of a form appropriate in remote rural areas. Beckett (1964: 34-47) has drawn attention to the element of protest in the use of alcohol with particular reference to members of fringe settlements on western New South Wales towns. This form is by no means limited to this situation but occurs in most areas with an Aboriginal population. The vociferous series of protests by the Larakia, Brinkin and Wagait people from the fringe camps of Darwin with their 'sit-downs' blocking the heavy traffic of Bagot Road, their symbolic flag raising in the early hours of a Sunday morning claiming Darwin while there was no-one round to see or interfere and their most desperate protest, at least to date, the petrol bombings at Kulak, provides a dramatic example of protest by fringe dwellers.

In urban areas still other forms occur. Moratorium marches, demonstrations and the fiery speeches of radical spokesmen are obvious forms of protest. Less apparent but nevertheless real, is the protest of the survival programmes of the Black Panther Party of Australia, the Aboriginal Legal and Medical Services now in most capital cities and the much quieter welfare activities of Advancement Leagues and Progress Associations. Inherent in these activities is an indictment of the equivalent community services for their failure to meet the needs of Aborigines and thus they must be reviewed as protest. The same also applies to the diverse activities of other groups such as those for Black Theatre and Black Studies.

Most Aboriginal political activity *vis-à-vis* 'white society' is directed at redressing a situation which Aborigines find intolerable—therefore it may also be considered within the concept of protest. This means, for example, that the political action of the National Aborigines Consultative Committee (N.A.C.C.) is a form of protest.

SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Despite the great diversity which these activities represent they clearly fall within the concept defined by Geschwender (1971: 2, 3). They are, according to him, part of a social movement:

'a continuing, collective attempt to restructure some basic segment of the social order through means other than institutionalized elements working toward a common objective . . . (not necessarily) clearly defined or specific . . . there may be considerable disagreement in tactics . . . Sometimes these differences will be so extreme that the various segments may expend more time and energy in fighting each other than in contending with the larger society'.

Examination of some structural characteristics of 'Movements of Revolutionary Change' by Gerlach (1971: 812-836) provides a model which I feel can assist the understanding of Aboriginal protest and reinforce the notion that it is relevant to consider this as one movement. It also goes some way to demonstrating positive aspects of those elements which many consider dysfunctional, as suggested above. Gerlach notes (*ibid.*: 813) that such movements are composed of autonomous competing segments, some engaged in concerted action but most with a 'basic pattern of schism, factionalism, and ongoing segmentation', which observers characterize as disorganized or at least inefficient; a consequence of community disorganization or lack of organizational experience (*cf.* Le Sueur 1972: 122). Gerlach also describes (*ibid.*: 817) movement organization as 'segmentary, polyccephalous and reticulate'. By segmentary, he means composed of diverse groups which fission and fuse, expand and contract, grow and die. It is polyccephalous in that it is decentralized and has many leaders and rivals for leadership both within the groups and the movement as a whole. Such a movement is reticulate because these groups are organized into a network of cross-cutting links, travelling spokesmen and shared objectives which allow for joint participation and overlapping activities.

In this form of organization the redundancy and duplication of function, rather than being inefficient, provide protection against infiltration and suppression by those who may oppose the movement. Unlike a centralized organization which may collapse with the removal of key leadership in a hostile situation, this form will remain relatively unimpaired. It is not surprising from the work of Eggleston (1972: 88-94), Tatz (1972: 97-109) and others on the relationship between Aborigines and the law, and the reports of callous police treatment in many areas, for example by Horner (1972: 211-27), Tobin (1972: 65-76), and Harris (1972: X), that many Aborigines view white society as hostile. The constant necessity for McNally (1975) to reassure his informants while gathering data for his book *Goodbye Dreamtime* gives but one indication of this. While such an organization may not have been deliberately constructed by Aborigines, at least some active participants are aware of its advantages and deplore some of the moves toward greater centralization as indicated by some of the opposition to the formation of the N.A.C.C. It remains to demonstrate that Aboriginal protest may be encompassed by such a model. This will be done by considering the objectives of Aboriginal protest and the nature of the communication network.

OBJECTIVES

Behind the multitudinous demands such as those related to health, housing, employment, education and justice which Aborigines have made in many forms over

recent years is their demand for their right as Aborigines to control and be responsible for Aboriginal affairs with freedom from white interference in all matters affecting them as Aborigines. Such autonomy is, I believe, the major objective of all Aboriginal protest. For example, at Kulaluk, the notice nailed up by the Gwalwa Daraniki (which means 'our land' in Larakia), an incorporated protest group composed of members of Larakia, Brinkin and Wagait 'tribes', stated, 'this Aboriginal Land Claim is under negotiation with the Land Rights Commission — buy or build at your own risk'. As their spokesmen, Bobby Secretary (president) and Fred Fogarty (vice-president) stressed to me (June 1973), they want the land on which they have camped and the privacy it had before the housing development commenced; they want the remaining bush for hunting and the beach for its coastal food resources, together with a few basic services like water, sewage and perhaps a telephone. But most of all, they want *recognition of their right* to at least the little that remains of land which was theirs prior to European occupancy. They also want their claims treated seriously and not just ignored by local authorities and land-developers. They are justifiably disturbed when little regard is paid their grievances as:

We wrote to the lands branch about the builders cutting down the mangroves and taking tons of beach sand for the new subdivision (encroaching on their land). 'That was illegal', said the land branch. They took no action (Day 1973).

Although their demands and objectives are couched mainly in terms of specific things these are instrumental, though by no means less important on that account, for attaining the autonomy and respect to which their community aspires.

The stated objectives of Aboriginal organizations, protest groups and spokesmen may not always make this explicit. Many issues have been raised, some shared by a few or many groups, some specific to particular organizations. Of all the issues that have been raised in recent years, 'Land Rights' is the issue on which the majority are most united. This is probably because Land Rights, and the concomitant issues of control of mineral and other land resources and compensation for the alienation of land from, for example, urban people, are seen as most instrumental in gaining Aboriginal autonomy. For 'tribal people' land is the sacred basis of their society. For 'non-tribal groups' it may not only have sacred significance, but also supply the economic resources required to maintain a separate community. For urban people the granting of Land Rights may be of more symbolic than tangible benefit by giving status; denoting that Aborigines are more than second-class citizens and have a special stake in Australia as a country.

IDENTITY

This raises the question of Aboriginal identity; a question which is more than just, 'Who is an Aboriginal?' and includes 'Who has the right to claim the autonomy that is being sought?' As Wentworth states (1973: 9), Aborigines originally:

'saw themselves as members of a tribe or group of tribes . . . or of a group whose minimal cohesion depended upon the sharing of specific ceremonies. In a sense, the creation of an "Aboriginal identity" is in itself a very un-Aboriginal process, for which there is no historical substructure.'

As Berndt explains (1971: 41), many of those people of Aboriginal descent, especially in southern areas, who are far removed from their traditional Aboriginal heritage:

'seek common social, identity in that Aboriginal past — in the idea of it, because anything else, anything closer to the traditional actuality, would find them completely at sea. This trend toward Aboriginality is gaining ground . . . common identity in contrast to other Australians can mark them off from those others as being unique or somehow different — a status-seeking device, as a reaction against the injustices and discriminations of the past.'

Ros Forgan, herself a southern person of Aboriginal descent, highlights the difficulty inherent in this issue. She says (1973):

'They (urban blacks) scream that they want to be Aboriginal, yet they know nothing of the culture. If they did, they would not have insulted the tribal elders the way they did by standing up shouting them down in the seminar.'

It should, however be noted that the 'tribal elders' referred to caucused, then moved to the effect that all persons of Aboriginal descent be recognized as Aborigines; 'you are our sons and our daughters'; a motion which several militant urban spokesmen felt achieved more in the few minutes it took to pass than they had managed in several years. Although denying the validity of Ms. Forgan's criticism and being severely critical of the article in which it was written, some of those to whom it may have been directed, while attending the Land Rights Conference in Darwin (13-16 June 1973) were noticeably concerned about relating as Aborigines to the more tribalized people from the north. They were at least conscious of the areas of interaction to which the criticism applied. Similarly, in the majority of cases northern people rejected the notion, 'Urban and especially urban part-blood Aborigines are seen somehow as less Aboriginal' (von Sturmer 1973: 16), which they may have accepted in the past under the strong influence of whites since this is a widely held belief in the Northern Territory. Statements like 'Full-blood, Part-blood, all Aborigine', were made very frequently by both northern and southern people.

Since the objective of Aboriginal autonomy is an issue in relation to white society the question of Aboriginal identity is also, but it is more than this. It is an issue within the movement itself. Many Tasmanian Aborigines want recognition of their existence by those on the continent; many persons of Aboriginal descent who have grown up in white families or institutions, and who are in most respects culturally 'white', want recognition from those who have always belonged to an Aboriginal community. Many southern urban people seek acceptance by the more 'tribal' northerners and these latter want the assistance of the 'white' skills possessed by the former to assist in the management of their affairs *vis-à-vis* white society. It is a call for the according of the privileges and responsibilities of Aboriginal identity by both Aborigines and whites to

substantiate that this exists in practice as well as in theory, let me illustrate by showing one small section of such a network in operation. It is assumed in what follows that if protest leaders or spokesmen come into contact with other Aborigines they may communicate about protest if they feel it is necessary. On 10 May 1973, four of the nine members of the Aboriginal delegation to China addressed a meeting in the Fitzroy Town Hall. They were Cheryl Buchanan and Lila Watson from Brisbane, Terry Widders and Gerry Bostock from Sydney. These and their colleagues on the delegation were selected from their awareness of, and concern for, the feelings of Aborigines and knowledge of protest activities in their own communities. In the audience there were quite a number of Aborigines who live in Melbourne, including some known to be active in local groups and organizations and a man, formerly of Palm Island, who has travelled the East Coast extensively. Thus, the ideas exchanged and discussed may spread beyond Fitzroy to at least other parts of Melbourne, possibly Victoria and even farther afield. Shortly before this meeting Cheryl Buchanan in her capacity as A.U.S. race relations field officer had been in Tasmania speaking with Aborigines, establishing links with the Aboriginal Information Centre and gathering information about Aboriginal conditions. Gerry Bostock is a member of the Bandjalang tribe and while in Melbourne for this meeting informed his cousin Gary Foley, Monash Association of Students race relations field officer, who incidentally comes from the same 'tribal area', and Bruce McGuinness of the fears his people had that the A.U.S. Nimbin Festival would increase the desecration of certain of their sacred areas. Leaflets protesting at this were distributed at Monash University, press releases were given and other efforts made to raise this issue.

Soon after the Fitzroy meeting Cheryl Buchanan's name appeared in the A.U.S. paper *'National U'* and also in *'The Digger'* as a contact for information about or donations toward fares for delegates to the Land Rights Conference in Darwin. She travelled through Queensland to organize delegates from that State and assist them to the conference which she also attended as a delegate. Other delegates represented many of the missions, settlements, stations and fringe areas of the north of Australia were from the urban areas of the South.

Reference has already been made to the protests of the Gwalwa Daraniki over Kulaluk and other issues. These fit into this network and link it with other areas. On 23 February 1972, Vincent Lingiari (the Gurindji spokesman from Watie Creek) spoke at a meeting at Kulaluk, "Do not be afraid", he said (Day 1973). In other words, he expressed the support of the Gurindji and no doubt took back to them information and support from the people at Kulaluk. On 14 June, Bobby Secretary and Fred Fogarty informed the Land Rights Conference that the sign, warning that their land was subject of a land claim, had been pulled down by a man who threatened to shoot any Aboriginal who attempted to replace it. This information elicited strong support from the Conference: a sit-down demonstration on Bagot Road which banked up four lanes of traffic for 3 to 4 miles in each direction and lasted twenty minutes followed by a march to replace the sign was very quickly organized.

After the conference six southern Aborigines, Cheryl Buchanan, Phyllis Harrison

and Nola Ferguson from Melbourne, Lincoln Wood from Sydney, Bob McLeod and Ambrose Golden-Brown from Canberra stayed on at Bagot to assist collating conference material and support Aboriginal action in Darwin. These people have, I am sure, kept themselves abreast of the concerns of the Kulaluk people. They may not have been directly involved, I have no evidence that suggests they were, but they will have given moral support and communicated to other areas about the dramatic Gwalwa Daraniki protests of 5 and 6 July 1973. *'Bunji'* the Gwalwa Daraniki newsletter outlined these as:

'The Battle of the Allamanda Gardens Estate.'

All the Kulaluk people stopped surveyors who were marking a road down to the beach. The police could do nothing. At Kulaluk the people worried "will they come back tomorrow?" *A truck burns* 6th July—The Surveyor came back again. The Gwalwa Daraniki defended their land as their ancestors had done. A truck caught fire. David Daniels, Bob Secretary, and Fred Fogarty were arrested.

Two days later Fred Fogarty flew to the Labor Party Conference at Surfers Paradise, where a statement was issued prepared by him, Len Watson, Lila Watson (who was mentioned above), Ross Watson and Cheryl Buchanan. Fogarty then flew on to Sydney to raise support there. His fares were paid by Edison Zvobgo from Zimbabwe, an example of tangible international support from another liberation movement (*ibid.*).

This account started with four people from the delegation to China. Most attention has been focused on one of these members, Cheryl Buchanan, whose activities have provided liaison between individuals and groups in the eastern States, Tasmania and the Northern Territory. The others have not been inactive. Terry Widders has visited communities in Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Gerry Bostock has spent time in Melbourne, has attended a Conference in Canberra and worked in Sydney on a report of the China trip. He has been selected for another delegation to China early in 1974. Other people mentioned in this account have also been active. Gary Foley, for example, made a week long lecture tour in Tasmania during which he heard reports of the Darwin conference from one of the Tasmanian delegates. He spent some time in Sydney and will lead the China delegation.

From just this one example, it can be seen that links forming a network for communication and available to mobilize support for Aboriginal Protest ramify over a wide geographical area and link very diverse groups and people. It will be noticed that the links are such that individuals and groups of wide political outlook are included and may be mobilized for situations which they wish to support. The re-creation of the Embassy (30 July 1972) provides a clear example of the effectiveness of such links. Bruce McGuinness from his wide experience of Aboriginal Protest noted not only the remarkable 'solidarity expressed, both verbally and spiritually, by those Blacks present (1971: 1)' but also the range of normally conflicting ideologies.

'The Minister of Defence of the Brisbane chapter of the Australian Black Panther Party, Denis Walker, . . . Pastor Frank Roberts, Paul Coe . . . a self-professed cultural Nationalist . . . add to this the support of the politically unsophisticated Blacks present . . . There were also Black members present from almost every

Aboriginal and Islander oriented organisation throughout Australia, e.g., The Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, The National Tribal Council, The National Council of Aboriginal Islander Women, the Black Panther Party, Abscol, The Congress of Black Radical Australians (C.O.B.R.A.), . . . and many others including prominent institutional type Aborigines, . . . in no uncertain manner expressing their solidarity and support for the re-establishing of the Embassy. Other Blacks . . . although unable to attend . . . expressed themselves per medium of the mass media (*ibid.*).

FACTIONALISM

The Embassy also demonstrated there is sufficient communication and unity of purpose despite factionalism and divergence of specific goals or strategies to enable the Aboriginal protest movement to function effectively. Within such a movement there is constant need for innovation, for new strategies or new emphases, for new ways of gaining the sympathy of 'third parties' so that they will exert pressure for the desired changes, or new ways of exerting pressure directly on those in a position to initiate change. With the mass media forming an important third party, there is constant need to focus its attention by producing newsworthy events, especially events which are both imaginative and symbolic of Aboriginal concerns. Thus there is scope for a high level of flux within the movement and this allows for a great deal of rivalry between groups and organizations and competition for leadership both of the movement as a whole and its component segments.

Nicholas (1968: 22) implies that in circumstances such as these, factionalism may be 'regarded as one mode of organizing political relations under conditions of rapid social change'. He sees factions as having five characteristics. They are conflict groups, and political groups. They are not corporate groups. Members are recruited by a leader and recruitment is on diverse principles (*ibid.*: 27-29). It is apparent that some of these characteristics are to some extent applicable to factions within Aboriginal groups. The four statements quoted earlier indicated that there is conflict and rivalry within many groups. The clusters of individuals supporting competing leaders are rarely formalized into corporate groups unless the process goes as far as complete fission resulting in two new groups as occurred in the case of F.C.A.A.T.S.I. and the formation of the National Tribal Council (McGuinness 1972: 9). It is not obvious that recruitment is always by the leader but it may be on principles as diverse as ideology and kinship, as the analysis by McGuinness of the inter-factional fighting that led to the so called 'Black Power take-over' of the Victorian Aboriginal Advancement League (1969) indicates (*ibid.*).

Bujra notes (1973: 133) that the difficulty of identifying factions in reality by reference to definitions, a difficulty noticeable in the paragraph above is because,

'factions are dynamic phenomena. Factional processes are in a dialectical relationship with other social and political processes going on both within and outside the community being studied, and the informal political groupings which they create may thus, be in any one of the several stages of development.'

She sees factions as forming one end of a continuum of increasing complexity of organization to political party at the other end. Leadership within a faction arises spontaneously and provides a focus for action. Thus the skills of a particular individual may offer the necessary leadership to meet a given situation but not be appropriate in other circumstances. A good example of this could be provided by considering the changes in leadership of the Aboriginal Embassy through the six months of its existence. Factionalism facilitates the emergence of new leadership, it promotes the competition which may allow for innovation. It could be noticed in passing that some Aboriginal groups are consciously seeking the symbols and values of traditional society, and those aspects of organization which they find effective for use within their group as a result of the factional process, may well owe their effectiveness to their close relationship with similar aspects of traditional society. Indeed the form of factional leadership in parts of the protest movement seems not unlike that traditional leadership outlined by Meggitt (1966: 73-74).

As Bujra implies above, factionalism may be a stage of development. Groups which begin as factions may well evolve along the continuum toward becoming political parties. The development from factions within F.C.A.A.T.S.I. to the formation of the National Tribal Council may be a case in point. She also sees that,

'both factionalism and party politics demand a structural-functional equivalence of the competing groups . . . (although) this is essentially a matter of long term, dynamic tendencies toward equilibrium' (*ibid.*: 135).

This suggests that the inauguration of the N.A.C.C. with its formal constitution, bureaucracy and forthcoming national democratic elections, indicating a structural-functional similarity to the Australian Government, marks a new stage in the development of Aboriginal protest. This development has been generated and is sustained by a unity of purpose, widely ramifying communication and effective leadership. It has come about through a dynamic process to which factionalism, clashing ideologies and divergent goals and strategies have contributed and will continue to contribute.

It therefore seems clear from the type of evidence suggested by this paper that the diverse activities of the many groups and individuals that constitute Aboriginal protest are encompassed by the long-term objective of Aboriginal autonomy, unified by a common distrust of whites and linked by an informal communication network into predominantly one movement. The widely deplored processes of factionalism, clashing ideologies, divergent goals and strategies, rather than being detrimental, have generated effective leadership and are those processes which give this movement the resilience and flexibility to proliferate protest into ever wider areas.

REFERENCES CITED

- (August, 1973): Black studies in Prison: an Interview with Bob McCloud. *National U. News*, paper of the Australian Union of Students.
- BECKETT, J. (1964): Aborigines, Alcohol and Assimilation. In *Aborigines Now* (M. Reay, ed.). Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
- BECKETT, J. (1965): Kinship, Mobility and Community among Part-Aborigines in Rural Australia. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 6, No. 1: 7-23.
- BERNDT, R. M. (1971): The Concept of Protest within an Australian Aboriginal Context. In *A Question of Choice* (R. M. Berndt, ed.). Nedlands: University of Western Australia Press.
- BUJRA, Janet, M. (1973): The Dynamics of Political Action: a New look at Factionalism, *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 75, No. 1: 132-52.
- CLEAVER, E. (1971): *Soul on Ice*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- DAY, W. B. (1973): *Burji Newsletter of the Gwalwa Daramiki* (July).
- DUNCAN, L. S. W. (1974): Protest and Aborigines: an Initial View. In *Social Change in Australia: Readings in Sociology* (D. Edgar, ed.). Melbourne: Cheshire.
- ECKERMANN, A. K. (1973): Group Identity and Urban Aborigines. In *Aboriginal Identity in Contemporary Australian Society* (D. Tugby, ed.). Milton: Jacaranda Press.
- EGGLESTON, Elizabeth M. (1972): Aborigines and the Administration of Criminal Law. In *Racism: the Australian Experience* (F. S. Stevens, ed.). Sydney: A.N.Z. Book Co. (Vol. 2).
- FORGAN, Ros (1973): An urban-tribal dispute. *National U* (June).
- GERLACH, L. P. (1971): Movements of Revolutionary Change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 14, No. 6: 812-36.
- GESCHWENDER, J. A. (1971): *The Black Revolt*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- HARRIS, S. (1972): *This Our Land*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- HORNER, J. (1972): Brutality and the Aboriginal People. In *Racism: the Australian Experience* (F. S. Stevens, ed.). Sydney: A.N.Z. Book Co. (Vol. 2).
- LE SUEUR, E. M. (1972): Aboriginal Assimilation: an Evaluation of some Ambiguities in Policy and Service. In *Australian Social Issues of the 70s* (P. R. Wilson, ed.). Sydney: Butterworths.
- LIPSKY, M. (1970): Protest as a Political Resource. In *Black Conflict with White America* (J. R. van der Slik, ed.). Columbus: Merrill.
- MAZRUJI, A. A. (1970): Postlude: toward a Theory of Protest. In *Protest and Power in Black Africa* (R. I. Roberg and A. A. Mazruji, eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- MEGGITT, M. J. (1966): Indigenous Forms of Government Among the Australian Aborigines. In *Readings in Australian and Pacific Anthropology* (I. Hogbin and L. R. Hiatt, eds.). Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- MCGUINNESS, B. B. (1972): Aboriginal Culture of Protest, unpublished ms.
- MCGUINNESS, B. B. and M. BARTFELD (1972): *Black Fire*, a film.
- MENALLY, W. (1973): *Goodbye Deamtime*. Melbourne: Nelson.
- MCGUINNESS, H. (1973): Defending Australia. *National U* (July).
- NICHOLAS, R. W. (1968): Factious: A Comparative Analysis. In *Political Systems and the Distribution of Power* (M. Banton, ed.). London: Tavistock.
- OWLEY, C. D. (1970): *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society*. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- ROWLEY, C. D. (1973): From Humbug to Politics: Aboriginal Affairs and the Academy Project. *Oceania*, Vol. XLIII, No. 3: 182-97.
- SHAW, A. G. L. (1972): Popular Protest in Australian History. Paper presented to History Section, A.N.Z.A.A.S.
- TATZ, C. M. (1972): Aborigines: Law and Political Development. In *Racism: the Australian Experience* (F. S. Stevens, ed.). Sydney: A.N.Z. Book Co. (Vol. 2).
- THE EDITOR (n.d.): *The Koorier*, Vol. 1, No. 11.
- TOBIN, P. (1972): Aborigines and the Political System. In *Racism: The Australian Experience* (F. S. Stevens, ed.). Sydney: A.N.Z. Book Co. (Vol. 2).
- VON STURMER, J. (1973): Changing Aboriginal Identity in Cape York. In *Aboriginal Identity in Contemporary Australian Society*. (D. Tugby, ed.). Milton: Jacaranda Press.
- WENTWORTH, W. C. (1973): Aboriginal Identity, Government and the Law. In *Aboriginal Identity in Contemporary Australian Society* (D. Tugby, ed.). Milton: Jacaranda Press.

CHRISTINE INGLIS

PARTICULARISM IN THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION OF THE CHINESE IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA*

I

Overseas Chinese communities have frequently been typified as communities where ascriptively based characteristics such as kinship and ethnicity are extremely important in the initiation of particularistic social relationships and in the formation of institutional structures. This is accounted for by reference to the Chinese society from which the original settlers came and as a response to the new environment wherein the Chinese often found themselves a racial group intermediate in terms of jobs, legal and social status to the colonial settlers and the indigenous population. From another perspective, the apparent success of Chinese and other minority groups prominent as middlemen and traders in such societies is often at least partially accounted for by reference to their utilization of various intra-community particularistic ties. These ties are felt to provide them with ready-made networks which can be utilized to recruit staff, obtain supplies, distribute produce and exports and obtain credit.

The extent to which such particularism is found among the Chinese businessmen in Papua New Guinea is the issue which I shall be looking at in this paper.¹ In discussing certain aspects of economic organization in Papua New Guinea the distinction between 'particularism' and 'traditionalism' is important. Although certain 'traditional' ways of doing business are based on or utilize particularistic relationships, this need not apply to all 'traditional' ways of doing business. In 1966² there were 2,935 New Guinea Chinese community by virtue of birth or else the establishment of kinship or other close ties with those born there. Since 1966, the community has increased in size but immigration has played a very small part in this since restriction on non-European entry follows the Australian pattern very closely.

The Chinese are concentrated in the urban area of Papua New Guinea and only on New Ireland and the Gazelle Peninsula are there any significant number who live on plantations in the rural areas. Retail and wholesale trade is the major industry in which the Chinese are employed with approximately 50% of the male work-force and

* This is a revised version of the original paper presented to the A.N.Z.A.A.S. Congress in Perth, August 1973.