University of South Australia

Interrogating social work: Australian Social Work and the Stolen Generations

This is the peer reviewed author accepted manuscript (post print) version of a published work that appeared in final form in:

Yu, Nilan 2018 'Interrogating social work: Australian Social Work and the Stolen Generations' Journal of social work, online, pp. 1-15

This un-copyedited output may not exactly replicate the final published authoritative version for which the publisher owns copyright. It is not the copy of record. This output may be used for non-commercial purposes.

The final definitive published version (version of record) is available at:
https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017318794230

Persistent link to the Research Outputs Repository record:
http://researchoutputs.unisa.edu.au/11541.2/133688

General Rights: Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Outputs Repository are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the persistent link identifying the publication in the Research Outputs Repository

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

https://search.ror.unisa.edu.au

Interrogating social work:

Australian Social Work and the Stolen Generations

Nilan Yu[1]

Introduction

This study investigated the question: What was said in the journal of the Australian Association of Social Workers about the taking of Indigenous children and the challenges confronting Indigenous Australians during the last two decades of the policies and practices that created the Stolen Generations? Whilst some may relegate this question to the distant past of a particular practice context, it is argued here that the answers to this question have relevance to contemporary practice in Australia and the rest of the world. Set in the context of Australian social work's 'past complicity' in the disadvantaging of Indigenous Australians (Young & Zubrzycki, 2011, p. 159), the study analysed the contents of the journal 'Australian Social Work' (formerly known as the 'Australian Journal of Social Work' and hereinafter referred to as 'the journal') over a 23-year period to examine the social work community's thinking at that time in relation to what has come to be known as the Stolen Generations. The term Stolen Generations refers to Indigenous Australians who, as young children, were taken from their biological families and placed in the care of non-Indigenous foster or adoptive families, missions and institutions between the late 1800s and well into the 1970s (Fejo-King, 2011; HREOC, 1997). The article uses the language of the Bringing Them Home report (Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission [HREOC], 1997) by employing the term 'Indigenous children' to refer to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children. Indigenous children were routinely taken since the early years of frontier expansion and warfare. However,

[1] Lecturer: Social Work and Program Director, Master of Social Work, University of South Australia

the taking of Indigenous children became widespread as various colonies sanctioned the practice in the name of protecting the children, granting authority to church workers and state welfare officers, including qualified social workers (HREOC, 1997; Robinson & Paten, 2008; Robinson, 2013). In Queensland, an 1865 legislation essentially designated Aboriginality as constituting child neglect and made it a sufficient ground for the removal of Indigenous children (O'Connor, 1993; Robinson & Paten, 2008). Similar policies and practices were adopted in other states and territories. Many of the children, taken under duress by decree, deceit, intimidation or force, never saw their families again. Whilst some of the children went on to live prosperous lives in nurturing environments, many of them suffered neglect and/or abuse in the care of church missions, institutions and foster families. All of them suffered an unshakable sense of loss, grief and bereavement throughout their lifetime, denied of their roots and identity.

Responding to the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families, the professional association acknowledged that social workers were involved in the forced removal of Indigenous children from their families 'in every state and territory in Australia during this century' (HREOC, 1997, p. 253). A number of Australian social workers went on to play a key role in pushing for the national apology that came more than a decade later (Fejo-King, 2011).

Purpose and scope

In its submission to the National Inquiry, the Australian Association of Social Workers expressed 'regret that social workers … were actively involved in the removal of aboriginal children from their families even up to relatively recent times' (HREOC, 1997, p. 253). Australian social workers were complicit in the colonial dispossession and oppression of Indigenous Australians for their role in what are now widely recognized as highly unjust

practices (Briskman, 2003; Gilbert, 2001). It is instructive to consider what was done by Australian social workers in the light of what was said in the professional association's journal during that period. This article examines what was recorded in the journal regarding Indigenous issues in general and, more specifically, the state-sanctioned removal of Indigenous children from their families at the time when the relevant policies and practices were still in place. The examination is focused on a snapshot of a particular period in the journal's history – 1948 to 1970. This period was chosen for its significance to what were then an emerging profession and an established practice. Publication of the journal began in 1947 (McMahon, 2002) and, according to most accounts, the state-sanctioned removal of Indigenous children, for the most part, ended in 1969 although the practice continued in some places well into the 1970s (HREOC, 1997). Thus, the first two decades of the journal's publication roughly coincided with the last two decades of what was then a century-old practice. Since the removal of Indigenous children formed a subset of the entire experience of Indigenous Australians under European colonization, the study also considered what was reflected in the journal concerning Indigenous Australians in general during the same period, especially in relation to the referendum in 1967 – a landmark in Australian history. The referendum saw the deletion of Section 127 of the Australian constitution which, until then, expressly prohibited the counting of 'aboriginal natives' in the reckoning of the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth or any part thereof.

The general question stated above were broken down in two:

1. What was reflected in the professional journal between 1948 and 1970 regarding the state-sanctioned removal Indigenous children? and
2. What was reflected in the professional journal between 1948 and 1970 regarding Indigenous Australians, particularly in relation to a landmark change in the Constitution in 1967?

These questions are being asked in the light of particular conceptions of social work that speak of critical (Allan, Briskman, & Pease, 2009; Fook, Hick, & Pozzuto, 2005), anti-racist (Dominelli, 2008) and anti-oppressive (Laird, 2008) practice. It must be acknowledged that these concepts were yet to be formulated during the period in question. On the other hand, as argued below, there were already frameworks and social movements in place that could have informed a critical interrogation of the treatment of Indigenous Australians and the Stolen Generations. Practitioners at that time already had access to theoretical handles that would have allowed them to critically appraise the relevant policies and practices. This article provides some historical context to explain the nature of the journal and the profession during that period. The study of social work history plays an important role in the shaping of social work identity (Mendes, 2005).

The experience of the Stolen Generations is still very much part of the lived experience of many Indigenous Australians whose lives are inescapably enmeshed in the intractable legacies of European colonization and subjugation and so this study has relevance to contemporary social work practice in Australia. But the significance of this study in contemporary practice is not confined to Australia. The insights from this interrogation of social work in this particular part of the world are meant to contribute towards a critical understanding and a 'usable history' (Tosh, 1999 as cited by McMahon, 2003, p. 86) of what is evolving into an international discipline. This investigation of a moment in Australian social work history is meant to draw lessons from the past in this particular part of the world for the purpose of offering insights for contemporary practice in Australia and elsewhere. The purpose of revisiting that particular period is not to form a judgment of the social workers of the past. The aim is to contribute to a critical understanding of social work as a discipline moving into the future.

Review of the literature

The forcible removal of Indigenous children, done in the name of child protection, is widely regarded in contemporary Australian social work as a dark period in the history of the country and the profession (Fejo-King, 2011). There are those who argue that the story of the Stolen Generations should not be viewed as an issue of a distant past considering how the repercussions of the policies and practices still reverberate in the lives of the living today (Ban, 2005; Galloway, 2005). Many of those who were removed from their families as children grew up with mental health problems and substance abuse and, as adults, are grappling with social and financial hardships and family problems requiring child protection interventions in relation to their own children (Ban, 2005; Bortoli, Coles, & Dolan, 2015; Haebich, 2000). The practice should also not be seen in isolation of Australia's colonial past and present (Briskman, 2003; Galloway, 2005). The discourses on child protection were intertwined with colonial motives of appropriation, integration and assimilation (HREOC, 1997).

The closest research undertaken in the area of interest in this study was that of McMahon (2002) who explored ethnicity and race in Australian Social Work. In examining 50 years of articles on Indigenous and immigrant Australians in the professional journal and its predecessors, McMahon (2002) found that very little was published about social work practice with Indigenous Australians and that articles on Indigenous Australians tended to uncritically accept social policies. McMahon (2002) indicated, that in the first 50 years of the journal, there were only five articles that made mention of the Stolen Generations, with only one article, that of Gale (1968), appearing within the period of interest in this article. The study failed to include one other article – that of LeSueur (1970). McMahon's (2002) survey, on the whole, answered the key question in this article to some extent. Apparently, very little was said in the professional journal about Indigenous Australians and Indigenous children. This study goes

beyond McMahon's work by focusing on what was said and what went unsaid in the professional journal in relation to the Stolen Generations.

Method

This study is a content analysis of the journal of the Australian Association of Social Workers. The methodology is an 'archeological dig' with the view of examining the recorded 'social work thinking' about the state-sanctioned removal of Indigenous children from their biological families at a time when such practice was well established and carried out. Although journals do not exhaustively reflect everything that is said and done within a given discipline, the contents of professional journals embody perspectives and views that were deemed to be relevant, legitimate and noteworthy at the time of their publication. Thus, journals can be seen as archives of received and accepted knowledge, embodying the state of the art and the state of mind of a discipline at certain points in time. In the journal itself, Ryan and Martyn (1996) pointed out how professional journals serve as repositories of the evolving knowledge base, scholarship and philosophy of a profession. The journal is seen here as a key repository (as opposed to THE repository) of Australian social work knowledge.

Why Australian Social Work? Stevenson (1974, pp. 3-4) described the journal of the Australian Association of Social Workers 'as a catalyst for social work thinking in Australia, a forum for reporting and recording members' experience, a record of members' perception of the profession and its responsibilities, a major factor for knowledge building in Australian social work'. Arguing in an editorial how it 'should reflect the concerns and interests of members' of the professional association, Fishburn (1983, p. 2) stated the following:

> Whether or not it represents social workers *per se* has been the subject of some discussion… but it is true that,… it is seen by many local and overseas

subscribers as representing the current state of social work, writ small or large, in Australia.

Data Collection

The index of Taylor and Francis, the current publisher of the journal, was used in conducting a content analysis of the journal between 1948 and 1970. The professional journal traces its roots to the publication of *Forum* in 1947 (McMahon, 2002) but the online index of Taylor and Francis only starts with the fourth issue of the second volume in 1948. All issues in the index in that said period were included in this study. Only substantive articles were counted in the study; editorials were included but letters to the editor, book reviews, news reports, advertisements and notices were not.

As with the approach employed by McMahon (2002), the first part of the study involved a content analysis to identify pertinent articles. The following search terms were used: 'Indigenous', 'Aboriginal', 'native', 'colored', 'children', 'young', 'foster care' and 'adoption'. Each article constituted a unit of analysis. There was no reliable means of undertaking an electronic search given that key words and abstracts were not yet standard features of the journal at that time and so the search had to be undertaken manually using the titles and first four paragraphs of the articles.

Data Analysis

Apart from enumerating basic information such as year of publication, name of author(s), title of article, volume number, issue number, and page numbers, the contents of substantive articles were examined in terms of whether or not they touched on Indigenous issues partially or mainly and whether or not they touched on children's issues generally and Indigenous children specifically. The few relevant articles found were then examined in more detail to identify themes and theoretical underpinnings relating to the practices in question. The study did not include a systematic review the professional backgrounds of the journal authors

and the extent to which they represented social work as a discipline but the professional backgrounds of authors of two relevant articles were noted. In an effort to gain a broader view of what had happened and what was happening in social work relating to the practice of taking Indigenous children from their biological families around that period, the findings from this study is set against a few relevant historical accounts from outside of social work and the journal.

Findings

A total of 331 articles were found within the specified publication period (1948 to 1970). Seventy-six (76) out of the 331 articles touched on children but, of these, only three – those of Carter, Koce and Vaughan (1970a; 1970b) and Gale (1968) – were expressly about Indigenous children, with only the latter tackling the issue of care for Indigenous children beyond their biological family and community. Most of the articles that touched on children, such as Kelley's (1953) discussion of 'Child welfare in Victoria', made no specific mention of Indigenous children.

Since the practice of removing Indigenous children may have involved adoption and the use of foster families, foster care and adoption were terms used in enumerating potentially pertinent articles. A total of 10 articles primarily dealing with the topic of foster care were found, with only one – that of Gale (1968) – explicitly examining the subject in relation to Indigenous children. Smith (1963, p. 27) and Nock (1963, p. 36) made vague references to 'colored' and 'half-caste' children in discussing the difficulties in finding suitable foster parents without touching on the question of how such children ended up in need of foster care. Of 12 articles on adoption, none made any explicit reference to Indigenous children. O'Collins (1966, pp. 2-3) made mention of children of 'non-european racial origin' and Vaughan (1967, p. 23) talked about the case of a child with 'mixed racial background' in exploring the challenges of finding suitable adoptive families for 'hard to place' children but there was no

effort in both articles to detail the circumstances that led to the need for adoptive services. Of a total of 331 articles published during the period in review, only two articles – that of Gale (1968) and LeSueur (1970) – substantively (albeit not centrally) touched on issues involving Indigenous children who had been removed from their families. What was said about the removal of Indigenous children in these two articles?

Two voices on removed Indigenous children

Gale's (1968, p. 5) discussion on 'Foster homes for Aboriginal children' presented the findings of a study about Indigenous children that were placed by the South Australian Department of Aboriginal Affairs in foster homes from 1954 to 1966, focusing on such information as the number of children involved, the age profile of children in foster care and the challenges to foster care placement. Roughly around 300 Indigenous children a year were reportedly in the care of South Australia's Department of Aboriginal Affairs between 1961 and 1965, with around half in foster homes and the rest in institutions (Gale, 1968). Without discussing the circumstances that necessitated foster care, Gale provided a descriptive account of the psycho-social condition of the children who were in care:

> Many of the children were too emotionally disturbed to be transferred from their relatives to a foster home without intensive case work, and, in some cases, psychiatric treatment. .... One such child inflicted severe and permanent physical damage to himself when transferred from a foster home to an institution. (Gale, 1968, p. 10)

Gale (1968, p. 8) made no mention of the practice of state-sanctioned removals in talking about 'orphaned, neglected or destitute children' who 'could not be satisfactorily cared for in the Aboriginal community'. She explained the increased need for foster care for Indigenous children as resulting from: (1) in-migration from reserves, (2) increasing 'Europeanization' of Indigenous communities and, (3) a disciplinal shift away from

institutional care (Gale, 1968, p. 8). Whilst noting that the Aboriginal Protection Board – not the parents – bore legal guardianship of all Indigenous children in South Australia up to 1962 and that the Board had exercised its power 'by placing children in institutions and foster homes', Gale (1968, p. 8) did not expressly problematize the expansive power of the State over the lives of Indigenous children and their families.

Markedly uncharacteristic of the tone of most of the articles at that time, LeSueur (1970) advanced a singular critique of state policies and services for Indigenous South Australians by pointing out the fundamental and irreconcilable differences between the assimilationist ends reflected in state initiatives and alternative visions embodied by the campaign for Indigenous land rights. In briefly considering the state-sanctioned removal of Indigenous children, LeSueur (1970, p. 10) poignantly noted that whilst 'it is possible to criticize Missionary societies for separating children from parents,…', such cannot be made without regard for how this action reflected the prevailing views and values in Australian society. He was, in essence, framing the issues faced by Indigenous Australians – including the removal of Indigenous children – within the context of the White-dominated Australian state. But within the 23-year period (1948 to 1970) covered by this content analysis of the professional journal, this critical piece was the only one of its kind among 331 articles that were published.

Indigenous issues and the 1967 Referendum

Of the 331 articles, only six articles (less than 2%) – those of Carter et al (1970a, 1970b), Dowling (1969), Gale (1966, 1968) and LeSueur (1970) – were expressly about Indigenous issues. This suggests that Indigenous Australian issues did not form a substantive part of the conversations in the social work profession. Four of these, those of Carter et al (1970a, 1970b), Dowling (1969) and Gale (1966), were mainly descriptions of services or patterns of access to such services by Indigenous Australians.

This study puts in context the single article found by McMahon (2002) within the period of interest in this study that made mention of the Stolen Generations, particularly in terms of the overall profile of the articles published and articles that dealt with related issues, including those concerning Indigenous Australians in general bearing in mind the significance of the 1967 referendum. If there was one issue concerning Indigenous Australians during this period that would not have failed to grip the attention of the general public and social workers in Australia, it would have to be the 1967 referendum – a critical juncture in Australian history. The original Australian constitution declared that 'In reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or of a State or other part of the Commonwealth, aboriginal natives shall not be counted' (Section 127). This constitutional provision effectively rendered Indigenous Australians as non-entities – invisible and voiceless within the White Australian state and excluded them from the Australian body politic. The results of the 1967 referendum saw the striking out of this constitutional provision, representing a radical change in the place of Indigenous Australians in the Australian state. The 1967 referendum came and went without a single article being published in the journal that made mention of it much less arguing for its necessity or acknowledging its significance. As far as the professional journal during that period was concerned, it was as if the referendum never happened.

Theoretical and philosophical context

It may be argued that the theoretical and philosophical foundations of the discipline may have circumscribed its capacity to recognize and respond to the issues faced by Indigenous Australians, in general, and those who were subjected to the forcible removal of children, in particular. It was, therefore, relevant to look into the theoretical and philosophical contexts of that period. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was already in place during that time and this could have been used as a strong basis for advancing the rights and welfare of Indigenous Australians. As for the forcible removal of Indigenous children, Bowlby's work on

Attachment Theory was already recognized within the journal itself. As early as 1953, Kelley (1953) underscored the significance of Bowlby's work on attachment to child welfare. In arguing 'The need for revaluation and assessment of Australian foster care programmes', Smith (1963, p. 25) reminded readers of 'the knowledge we now have of the meaning of maternal deprivation to a child and the importance of mothering to a child's emotional and social development'. Roberts (1967) and Vaughan (1967) also acknowledged the relevance of this knowledge in their discussion as part of a special issue on adoption in 1967. The value of the mother-child bond was already recognized then (Haebich, 2011).

Discussion and analysis

An understanding of how social work is positioned within the socio-political arena in which it operates requires knowledge of the political, ideological, organizational and occupational dynamics of the profession (Mendes, 2005). Australia was, in many ways, a very different – some might say, strange – country back then. For example, many professionally-qualified social workers were not in the labor market because women employed in the public sector then (and most professionally-qualified social workers were women) were routinely required to resign upon marriage or upon having children (Napier & George, 2001). It was also a state predicated on the systematic dispossession and exploitation of Indigenous Australians, with a Constitution expressly denying them politico-legal franchise (Bird, 1997; Robinson & Paten, 2008; Robinson, 2013). Indigenous peoples may have largely been a distant concern for most White Australians at that time. If any thought was given to Indigenous Australians at all, White Australians may have felt that the practice of taking Indigenous children was 'a humane and just society caring for its Indigenous charges' (Haebich, 2011, p. 1036). This was the dominant worldview in the socio-political-historical context in which the nascent discipline evolved.

Social work as a discipline was also still in its early stages of development during that period. The first training course for hospital almoners – among the precursors of professional

social work in Australia – was established in New South Wales in 1929 and the first degree in social work, a three-year program, was offered at The University of Sydney ten years later (Healy & Lonne, 2010; McMahon, 2003; Napier & George, 2001). By 1940, only 120 had been trained nationwide and, given the high demand for workers in postwar reconstruction, 'untrained' workers were often employed for what would have required 'professional' qualification by today's standards (Napier & George 2001, p. 77). Napier and George (2001) noted that there were just around 1,000 qualified graduates in Australia by 1958.

Understandably, many academic leaders of the profession at that time and many contributors to the journal did not have advanced degrees and were far removed from the issues of Indigenous Australians. Early contributors to the journal came from various backgrounds including history, demography, psychology and sociology. Gale (1966) was a lecturer in geography. It may have helped that LeSueur (1970) was a social worker of the Council of Aboriginal Women of South Australia Inc. As can be gleaned from the debate between Smith (1948, p. 3) and Goding (1948, p. 8) on the question 'What is social work?', the main focus then was on direct practice, specifically 'casework', with 'maladjusted persons' informed by a social 'adjustment' orientation. The three definitions cited and a fourth definition offered by Smith (1948) made no mention of anything relating to human rights, social justice and social policy. Critical or radical conceptions of social work practice exemplified by the works of Freire (1972) and Alinsky (1971) were yet to be codified.

The development of the profession was nested within the larger socio-political context. Given how far removed the realities of Indigenous communities were from the White-dominated mainstream society, not too many social workers would have been exposed to Indigenous issues and the Stolen Generations. The systemic exclusion of Indigenous peoples from the politico-legal framework may have stood in the way of conceptualizing them as a legitimate concern. In this sense, the conception of social work as an undertaking that can serve

the interests of Australia's Indigenous populations was yet to be invented. Kidd (1997, p. 77) did note that the Social Workers' League based in the then newly-formed University of Queensland had pushed for what became the proposal for an 'Aboriginal Betterment Scheme' in the late 1910s. This suggests that at least one group of social workers saw the plight of Indigenous peoples as part of their cause in the very early years of the development of the discipline. How widely this view was shared is uncertain.

Feminists – most notably Mary Bennett – had fought against the 'official smashing up of native family life' in the 1930s and parliamentarian William Grayden struggled against the forcible removal of Indigenous children in the 1950s (Haebich, 2011, p. 1034). Thus, there were critical voices in the wider community that recognized the issues surrounding the treatment of Indigenous Australians and the Stolen Generations. But the findings in this study suggest that these voices were largely not heard in the professional journal. Social activists were systematically ignored and written out of the few social welfare and social work histories about Australia (McMahon, 2003; Mendes, 2005). It may well be that this was also the case for those who spoke about Indigenous issues. Albeit scientific objectivity may form part of journal administration, editorial imprimatur can privilege certain voices and silence others (Editorial: The AASW and the Journal, 1974). For this reason, it cannot be assumed that what was reflected in the journal represented the whole range of views and perspectives in Australian social work during that period. They may have simply reflected the dominant thinking within the professional community at that time.

The year 1973 was, in a way, a watershed for Australian social work in relation to the Stolen Generations. An Indigenous girl born 350 kilometers east of Darwin had been placed with a White family at the age of eight months after needing intensive care following a premature birth, but her family was still helplessly waiting for her return six and a half years later. The foster father vehemently opposed the return of the girl telling social workers 'she's

got no time for the Aboriginal race' (Haebich, 2011, p. 593). Taking into account relevant politico-legal considerations at that time, the director of the Welfare Branch of the Northern Territory and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs instructed the social workers involved to keep the girl in the care of the foster family and advised her biological family to seek a legal injunction against the Department to preempt the possibility of them ending up losing contact privileges with her altogether. Anticipating a drawn-out court case that in the end would likely be resolved in favor of the foster family, a group of social workers led by John Tomlinson contravened the order and surreptitiously engineered the return of the child to her biological family (Haebich, 2011; Tomlinson, 2015). John was suspended and demoted as a consequence which, in turn, sparked a protest by a group of social work colleagues in the Northern Territory in support of him (Haebich, 2000; Tomlinson, 2015). Curiously, however, the only reference made in the journal to this 'strike by the social workers in the Northern Territory' focused on the issue of understaffing, with no mention of the girl or the incident that sparked the protest (Editorial: The first duty, 1974, p. 3). As with the 1967 referendum, John's brave (some might say foolish) act never happened far as the professional journal was concerned.

It would not be until 1993 – well over two decades after the state-sanctioned removal of Indigenous children officially had ended – when an article critically outlining the practice first appeared in the journal. In examining the law, policy and practice in Queensland in the period 1865-1989, O'Connor (1993) pointed out how state-sanctioned child welfare practices played a key role in the dispossession and social displacement of Indigenous people. Around this time, there was already growing recognition in other quarters of the impact of such practice on the lives of the children and their families (see for example Chisolm 1985 and Edwards & Read 1989). Since then, Australian social workers have actively taken steps to redress this inequity (Briskman, 2003). Indigenous Australians were recognized in the 1999 AASW Code of Ethics and the AASW was a signatory of the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS)

statement of apology to the Stolen Generations. There has been an increasing number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander social work academics and practitioners who have contributed significantly to the discourse in this area, several of whom have published in Australian Social Work. In its 'Acknowledgement Statement to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People', the Australian Association of Social Workers (2004, p. 21) acknowledged that the forcible removal of Indigenous children was contrary to the values and ethics of the social work profession.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that it was confined to the contents of the professional journal and did not include other possible sources like textbooks and gray literature. The focus on the contents of the journal may have excluded the voices of those who did not closely identify with the professional association or those who were silenced by editorial imprimatur. The findings here, therefore, only provide a partial account of the thinking in the evolving profession during that period.

Conclusion

This article set out to examine social work thinking reflected in the journal in relation to the Stolen Generations at the time when relevant practices and policies were still in place. One would think that the availability of pertinent theoretical and philosophical frameworks would have afforded a critical reflection and interrogation of the practice. However, the study found that very little was said about Indigenous issues and more so about the policies and practices that shaped the lives of the Stolen Generations.

The privilege of hindsight – a luxury that the writers and editors of that time did not have – enables the kind of critical examination carried out here. Though this may appear to some as a judgment of the past by the standards of the present, the intention was not to take to task the authors and editors of that period. Instead, it is hoped that the insights gained from this

critical interrogation can prompt critical reflection on contemporary social work practice. In apologizing for the role of non-Indigenous social workers 'in the creation' of the Stolen Generations, the Australian Association of Social Workers (2014, p. 21) pointed out what these workers had acted 'in accordance with the prevailing values, norms and policies of that time'. An important implication for practice is that social workers must be vigilant in critically interrogating the values, norms and policies that inform their work. They must also be able to negotiate and critically engage with the organizational and policy environments in which they operate. Social work education would have to equip practitioners with the analytical and political acumen to be able to do so. This underscores the value of training in work with and in human service organizations as well as policy practice. In terms of further research, there is argument for the critical interrogation of contemporary practice approaches in terms of the values and ideologies they advance. The conduct of similar studies in other countries in relation to key periods in their history can help forge a critical account of the history of the profession and contribute to the crafting of the profession to one that truly embodies the values of human rights and social justice.

Research Ethics

This research examined published materials and involved no human subjects.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this article.

References

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals*. New York: Vintage.

Allan, J., Briskman, L., & Pease, B. (Eds.). (2009). *Critical social work: Theories and practices for a socially just world* (2nd ed.). Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

Australian Association of Social Workers. (2004). Acknowledgement statement to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People. *National Bulletin (AASW), 14*(1), 21.

Ban, P. (2005). Aboriginal child placement principle and family group conferences. *Australian Social Work, 58*(4), 384-394. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0748.2005.00234.x

Bird, C. (1997). *The stolen children: Their stories*. Sydney: Random House.

Bortoli, L. D., Coles, J., & Dolan, M. (2015). Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in child protection: A sample from the Victorian Children's Court. *Journal of Social Work, 15*, 186-206. doi:10.1177/1468017314529511

Briskman, L. (2003). Indigenous Australians: Towards postcolonial social work. In B. Pease, J. Allan, & L. Briskman (Eds.), *Critical social work: An introduction to theories and practices* (pp. 92-106). Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.

Carter, J., Koce, S., & Vaughan, I. (1970a). Pre-school part-Aboriginal children on two reserves in West Australia: A dietary, medical, bio-chemical and socio-economic survey. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 23*(1), 27-30. doi:10.1080/03124077008549287

Carter, J., Koce, S., & Vaughan, I. (1970b). Pre-school part-Aboriginal children on two reserves in West Australia: A dietary, medical, bio-chemical and socio-economic survey. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 23*(2), 12-25. doi:10.1080/03124077008549315

Chisolm, R. (1985). *Black children: White welfare?* Sydney: Social Welfare Research Centre.

Dominelli, L. (2008). *Anti-racist social work*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Downing, J. H. (1969). Community organization project for the development of Aborigines in an area North and North-East of Alice Springs. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 22*(1), 27-30. doi:10.1080/03124076908549254

Editorial: The AASW and the Journal. (1974). *Australian Social Work, 27*(3), 3-4. doi:10.1080/03124077408549436

Editorial: The first duty. (1974). *Australian Social Work, 27*(1), 3-4. doi:10.1080/03124077408549554

Edward, C., & Read, P. (1989). *The lost children: Thirteen Australians taken from their Aboriginal families tell of the struggle to find their natural parents*. Sydney: Doubleday.

Fejo-King, C. (2011). The national apology to the Stolen Generations: The ripple effect. *Australian Social Work, 64*, 130-143. doi:10.1080/0312407X.2010.542564

Fishburn, J. (1983). Editorial. *Australian Social Work, 36*(2), 2-2. doi:10.1080/03124078308549749

Fook, J., Hick, S., & Pozzuto, R. (2005). *Social work: A critical turn*. Toronto: Thompson Educational Publishing.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Sheed and Ward.

Gale, F. (1966). Aborigines and the normal social welfare channels. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 19*(2), 5-9. doi:10.1080/03124076608656139

Gale, F. (1968). Foster homes for Aboriginal children. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 21*(1), 8-14. doi:10.1080/03124076808549225

Galloway, G. (2005). Equivocating on reconciliation. *Australian Social Work, 58*, 257-274. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0748.2005.00219.x

Gilbert, S. (2001). Social work with Indigenous Australians. In M. Alston and J. McKinnon (Eds.), *Social Work – Fields of Practice* (pp. 46-57). South Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Goding, A. (1948). What is social work? *Australian Journal of Social Work, 2*(5), 8-9. doi:10.1080/03124074808522299

Haebich, A. (2000). *Broken circles*. Freemantle: Freemantle Arts Service Press.

Haebich, A. (2011). Forgetting Indigenous histories: Cases from the history of Australia's Stolen Generations. *Journal of Social History, 44*(4), 1033-1046. doi: 10.1353/jsh.2011.0042

Healy, K., & Lonne, B. (2010). The social work and human services workforce: Report from a National Study of Education, Training and Workforce Needs. Strawberry Hills, NSW: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC). (1997). *Bringing Them Home*. Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families. Sydney.

Kelley, M. (1953). Child welfare in Victoria. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 6*(5), 16-24. doi:10.1080/03124075308522556

Kidd, R. (1997). *The way we civilise*. St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press.

Laird, S. (2008). *Anti-oppressive social work: A guide for developing cultural competence*. London: Sage.

LeSueur, E. (1970). Aboriginal assimilation: An evaluation of some ambiguities in policy and services. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 23*(2), 6-11. doi:10.1080/03124077008549314

McMahon, A. (2002). Writing diversity: Ethnicity and race in Australian Social Work, 1947-1997. *Australian Social Work, 55*, 172-183. doi:10.1080/03124070208410973

Mendes, P. (2005). The history of social work in Australia: A critical literature review. *Australian Social Work, 58*, 121-131. doi:10.1111/j.1447-0748.2005.00197.x

Nock, E. (1963). A consideration of foster family care in Queensland. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 16*(2), 35-37. doi:10.1080/03124076308522482

O'Collins, M. (1966). Some aspects of research in the field of adoption. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 19*(1), 2-6. doi:10.1080/03124076608656132

O'Connor, I. (1993). Aboriginal child welfare law, policies and practices in Queensland: 1865–1989. *Australian Social Work, 46*(3), 11-22. doi:10.1080/03124079308411086

Roberts, P. (1967). The child. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 20*(1), 14-15. doi:10.1080/03124076708549644

Robinson, S. (2013). Regulating the race: Aboriginal children in private European homes in colonial Australia. *Journal of Australian Studies, 37*(3), 302-315. doi: 10.1080/14443058.2013.814581

Robinson, S., & Paten, J. (2008). The question of genocide and Indigenous child removal: The colonial Australian context. *Journal of Genocide Research, 10*(4), 501-518. doi: 10.1080/14623520802447818

Ryan, M., & Martyn, R. (1996). Writing about social work education: A content analysis of Australian Journal articles 1983–1993. *Australian Social Work, 49*(4), 19-23. doi:10.1080/03124079608411184

Smith, H. (1963). The need for revaluation and assessment of Australian foster care programmes. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 16*(2), 25-29. doi:10.1080/03124076308522479

Smith, S. G. (1948). What is social work? *Australian Journal of Social Work, 2*(4), 3-4. doi:10.1080/03124074808522528

Tomlinson, J. (2015). Challenging state aggression against Indigenous Australians. In N. Yu & D. Mandell (Eds.), *Subversive action: Extralegal practices for social justice*. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Tosh, J. (1999). *The pursuit of history* (3rd ed.). London: Longman.

Vaughan, B. (1967). Placing unadoptable children. *Australian Journal of Social Work, 20*(1), 21-24. doi:10.1080/03124076708549647

Young, S., & Zubrzycki, J. (2011). Educating Australian social workers in the post-Apology era: The potential offered by a 'Whiteness' lens. *Journal of Social Work, 11*, 159–173. doi:10.1177/1468017310386849