The crimson thread of kinship: Ethnic ideas in Australia, 1870-1914*

As the bullocks sat yarning in the opening pages of Joseph Furphy’s *Such Is Life*, Cooper cursed the barren countryside with ‘the crimson thread of ip running conspicuously through his observation’. Furphy’s use of this political metaphor to describe the sanguinary adjective of bush speech was appropriate. Blood played a major part in the social and political ideas, as well as the vernacular, of the age in which Furphy wrote.

The ideas of race and stock, of blood and breed, played upon Australian thought on at least three levels in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and they furnished a connection between the ‘nationalism’, the ‘imperialism’ and the ‘racialism’ of the period. On their broadest level, haematic ideas were a significant force behind the desire for a ‘White Australia’ policy. Here the idea of race and blood was expressed in its most raw and virulent form, excluding from the blood-bond all those with pigmented skin. On an intermediate and more selective level, the corpuscular concept was put forward as Anglo-Saxonism, vernacular, of the age in which Furphy wrote.

The superiority of the white race was accepted without serious reservation. As the distinguished Melbourne scholar, Professor W. E. Hearn, wrote, the Aryan race was ‘confessedly the foremost in the world’. The history of that race ‘is more glorious, its renown more diffused, its progress in science and in art is more advanced, its religion is more pure, its politics and its laws are more beneficent and more just, than those which prevail elsewhere upon earth’. In material progress, in the arts of government, in the development of liberty and democracy, the white races had shown their superiority over others. The white ethnocentric aversion to out-groups found expression in racial slurs: non-whites were spotted lepers, foetid masses of humanity, bearers of strange vices, smellful, and unwashed.

Assuming a higher civilization and biological superiority, the developed ethnocentrism expressed its hostility to out-groups through the usual appeal for the preservation of the purity and strength of the in-group, and elevated this appeal into a moral category. Race purity not jobs, a natural instinct not selfishness, became the moral justification for exclusion. Fear of blemishing ‘race purity’ became an obsession. Race mixture meant an inevitable mental moral and physical decay, a tainting of the pure blood of the Caucasian race. A fouling of the life-blood of future generations by an infusion of the sluggish fluid of a petrified and animalized race. Such ideas became accepted dogma, and an


9 In material


11 *Advance Australia*, vol. 1, Jan. 1898; vol. 3, July 1890.


13 For Hearn as an economist and the influence of Spencer and Darwin upon his thought, see J. A. La Nauze, *Political Economy in Australia*, Melbourne 1949, pp. 45-97.

unblemished White Australia became a matter of ethics, rather than economics; as the 'one absolutely vital plank of Australian policy', it came to represent 'a principle, not an expediency, a religion, not a view'.

The concern with race purity was a corollary of a conception of racial conflict as the most potent factor in regional and international politics, a conflict which required the solidarity as well as the purity of the race. Professor C. H. Pearson of Melbourne was the most sophisticated prophet of race conflict, foreseeing a time when the globe would be girdled by a zone of black and yellow races, no longer unaggressive or dependent. 'We shall awake to find ourselves elbowed and hustled', he wrote, 'and perhaps even thrust aside by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile, and thought of as bound always to minister to our needs.'

The Bulletin was constantly concerned with inescapable race conflict, whether it was 'the old racial warfare' with domestic Chinese or the irrepressible racial war of extermination between Caucasian and Negro in the United States. This racial struggle, as a matter of instinctual nature, left little room for benevolence. 'Once a type has got a step up it must be jealous and "selfish" in its scorn of lower types, or climb down again,' Morality had no place; it was simply 'the white race, right or wrong'. Even the need for the eventual wholesale extirpation of the less desirable races to make room for the educated and scientific white man was not beyond contemplation.

The perception of an external racial threat increased the emphasis upon white solidarity. As the Australian Natives' Association expressed its 'intense loyalty to the race', so did Henry Lawson regret the divisive Boer War because 'the white man is pretty well the same all over the world'. The Bulletin supported Russia, a white race, against Japan, emphasizing the blood relationship between Russians and English. Randolph Bedford, a radical journalist associated with the Bulletin, had little fear of a German invasion: 'The greater danger from yellow and brown destroys any fear of the fellow white.'

This broad ethnocentric feeling of white kinship, solidarity, and struggle blended with a consciousness of British kind, narrower in its scope, but part of a pattern of ethnocentric ideas. The British or Anglo-Saxon consciousness expressed itself in an emphasis upon the grandeur of British civilization and the similarity and solidarity of the Anglo-Saxon.

The key assumption of Britannic ethnocentrism was the greatness, even the

superiority, of the An-glo-Saxon stock. The very existence of Australia confirmed for many the colonizing capacity and the indomitable energy of the race. The British had proven themselves to be the fittest race to occupy the world's vacant spaces; they were a people born to lead, to teach, and to better. We are, declared Dr. James Moorhouse, Anglican Bishop of Melbourne, 'a great race, with a great past, with great faculties and a great future . . .'.

Assuming the unique value of British stock and civilization, the Britannic ethnocentric strand stressed the kindred nature of Australia and Britons. Commonality of ancestry, heritage, history, language, and literature were used to confirm the common identity of the British race. Professor Heam felt that the Australian colonists 'form equally with it [England] a part of the great British nation', and shared the mission of spreading the British language, religion, laws, and institutions, while A. P. Conway, an Oxford-educated Sydneysider, emphasized that the various sections of the British people 'are one by descent, one by speech, one by law, one by their love of civil liberty and the constitution which secures it'. Britain's ideals, wrote H. d'E. Taylor, perpetual secretary of the Imperial Federation League of Victoria, were Australia's ideals; they were 'our heritage for ourselves and for our children'. Taylor, like many other Anglo-Australians and imperialists, stressed the ethnicity of Australians' British sentiment, which 'is as deep as national origin, rests upon national existence, grows with national expansion, and flows in the national blood'. E. Morris Miller of Melbourne, just returned from Edinburgh University, similarly cited 'the consciousness of kinship, the consciousness of common blood, and a common sense of duty', as well as 'the pride of race and history', as the limits of Empire. The Rev. W. H. Fitchett, principal of Melbourne's Methodist Ladies' College and author of numerous Empire thrillers, possessed one of the most developed ethnocentric senses. To Fitchett, the great contemporary force was race, and the bonds holding together the British race were subtle, invisible, with roots in the imagination and the blood—'one tongue, one proud sense of great birth and destiny, one noble heritage of heroic deeds, one rich literature, one type of robust freedom. Behind all was 'that strange quickening of the consciousness of race ties . . .'.

Such sentiments were, to a large extent, shared by Australian radicals and 'nationalists'. Though they might despise Britain, they seldom expressed anything...
but a warm and sympathetic feeling for the British people. The Bulletin, for example, raved against aristocracy and sweating, condemned British cant, greed and hypocrisy, but it expressed admiration for 'British blood, grit and force', yielding to no one in its respect for the achievements of the British race. Australian Nationalists, wrote an anonymous pamphleteer in 1888, 'are the first to appreciate the past and present glories of England...', while A. J. Taylor, Librarian of the Tasmanian Public Library, wrote that, though a separatist, he would always work with those endeavouring to strengthen the natural ties among the English-speaking races. The Australian, decrying race instinct and the attempt to awaken tribal enthusiasm, wrote W. G. S., that 'we are unified and always will be, because we are the same people'. Even Robert Thomson, that arch-expONENT of Australian nationalism, spoke of the Democracy of Britain as 'one of our bone, flesh of our flesh', and could look forward to Australia as an indent of the Anglo-Saxon race, to which Britain shall look in the far-off future with eyes full of trustful love and pride...'

The Bulletin, like most of the 'nationalists', succumbed to the ethnocentrist call of British blood. In its early career it played down the oneness of Briton and Australian, decrying race instinct and the attempt to awaken tribal enthusiasm, though it felt that separation would best preserve the 'unstained and affectionate relations' between Australia and Britain. While it continued to fulminate about the 'clannish tie of a common blood and a common language', by the turn of the century the weekly was praising the Anglo-Saxon type, and tradition with the Red Page commenting that most Australians were of British stock and that there did not imply disunity- 'we are unified and always will be, because we are the same people'.

In 1903 the switch was almost complete: the Australian had become 'as much a British race as is the Britisher himself'- more so, perhaps, since the Londoner was often a Pole or a Jew. The Bulletin, like most so-called 'nationalists', actually adopted its ethnocentric emphasis as the sense of a group crisis increased. It was safe to emphasize the non-British character of Australia while there was no external threat; when, however, the Asian situation seemed menacing, the functional ethnocentricity of in-group solidarity was not slow to assert itself. As the old unionist, W. G. S., wrote in 1909, talk of republicanism and a sense of oneness for unity between self-governing parts of the British Empire and the American nation. 'True patriotism', he wrote, 'should be racial.' Australia's 'eat national ideal' was now 'purity of the race and the preservation of Greater Britain for the Anglo-Saxon stock',

Imperialists had been prompter in emphasizing the solidarity in crisis of the Imperial Anglo-Saxon race. J. Warrington Rogers, a London-educated Victorian judge, demonstrated in 1888 an almost perfectly developed ethnocentrism when he proclaimed the need to strengthen the national unity of the Empire. 'All other nations', he wrote, 'must be to us as aliens', and he recognized that the 'bond of union will never be so strong as when it is required to face a foreign foe'. A decade later, G. C. Craig was writing of the internal out-groups, the large number of foreign peoples within Australia, who 'cannot think; feel, and reason like "oor ain folk"'. The Sudan contingent, like the financial contribution to striking British dockworkers, demonstrated the essential unity in crisis of Australians and Britons. Is a crisis, predicted an A.N.A. speaker in 1887, 'all of England's race would rally to her defence. The demonstration of this in 1899 and 1914 needs no elaboration. The constant theme of the re-union of kindred races of loyalty to our race', of 'the racial instinct', and of 'the spirit of racial unity' was unanswerable. Kinship and language, race and traditions, tell...'

The ethnic consciousness of being British was never sharply distinguished from that of being white. 'Scratch White Australia and you find British Australia', wrote W. D. Forsyth. The purpose of White Australia, emphasized Myra Willard, was to preserve a British-Australian nationality. In the literature of the Anglo-Saxon, Anglo-Saxons were the ideal people, often meaning Anglo-Saxon. The A.N.A. journal, Advance Australia, expressed the typical ethnocentric determination of Australians to preserve their white type, to fight for race purity, and to keep Australia the preserve of the Anglo-Saxons and kindred races. Australians', wrote 'Lux', 'like the white man best'-those of the Empire first and then the Americans. While Australia was, according to Arthur Woodhouse, the racial resolve that Australia shall be dominated by people of British blood'; the Bulletin it meant the right to shut out 'Asiatics', to preserve Australia for the Briton here and coming here. While but non-Anglo-Saxon groups fell victim to this blending of ethnocentrist strands. Keeping Australia 'morally white, white in the broadest sense of the term', meant...
aversion even to 'technically' white groups. Jews were a frequent target of such hostility, being viewed in the usual ethnic stereotypes of 'sweaters', pawnshop specialists and instinctual parasites. Similarly, 'the lower Latin type' and new-comers from south-eastern Europe were viewed with suspicion. The preference was for British, for Teutons and Celts, though many were sensitive to any large influx of even Germans and Scandinavians. The Irish also were targets of Anglo-Saxonist ethnocentric feelings.

The increasing concern over Australian defence in the twentieth century brought the ideas of Anglo-Saxonism and White Australia even closer together. The Minister of Defence, Thomas Ewing, wrote to the Prime Minister, Alfred Deakin, before the 1905 election that their first plank was 'Loyalty to Empire', 'thus rendering possible the permanent white occupation of Australia'. White Australia, wrote the New South Wales politician and author, B. R. Wise, in 1909, 'is a policy of high patriotism, conceived and executed in loyalty to the Empire and calculated to conserve its strength . . .'.

Many looked to a united Pacific policy of the United States, Britain, and Australia, united by blood, 'to hold this country, for the white race', to keep the Pacific for the white man, for the Anglo-Saxon race. The visit of the American fleet in 1908 was welcomed in this spirit. 'In flashing white, it comes, as if it were a symbol of a racial ideal to be upheld', wrote the Lone Hand, while the London Morning Post correspondent, Deakin, emphasized the potent ties of kinship, the strong Australian sentiment of race unity, and 'the blood tie that tells'.

Viewing the immense proportions of the external Asian threat, some felt that the day might come when it would take more than even a united Anglo-Saxon effort to withstand the hosts of Asia. The crisis might demand a united Australian race. Wallace Nelson, former Western Australian Labour M.L.A., hoped the Empire would pave the way for this wider white union. This ethnocentrism of Australia, united by blood, 'to hold this country, for the white race', to keep the Pacific for the white man, for the Anglo-Saxon race. The visit of the American fleet in 1908 was welcomed in this spirit. 'In flashing white, it comes, as if it were a symbol of a racial ideal to be upheld', wrote the Lone Hand, while the London Morning Post correspondent, Deakin, emphasized the potent ties of kinship, the strong Australian sentiment of race unity, and 'the blood tie that tells'.

The idea of an ethnic change, as old as the descriptions of Currency Lads and Cornstalks, was a constant theme of contemplation in the later part of the nineteenth century. Most Australians took it as axiomatic that a new breed was evolving under the Southern Cross, though not all were satisfied or sanguine about the tendencies of its temperament and nature. The most famous piece on the subject was Marcus Clarke's playful essay, The Future Australian Race. Writing in 1877 Clarke saw the future Australian as a 'tall[,] coarse, strong-jawed, greedy pushing, talented man, excelling in swimming and horsemanship'. Characteristically, he would be fretful, perverse, self-reliant, non-intellectual, and turbulently democratic. Later writers frequently characterized the New Man as taller, leaner, and darker. Many agreed with Clarke that he would be less reverent and traditional, more cheerful, with greater self-reliance and audacity, vigorous and athletic rather than intellectual—though some saw Australians as new Greeks, blending genius with athleticism. A few even found Aboriginal parallels in the thin, wily, and dark features of the embryonic breed.

On the whole, commentators were optimistic, seeing a higher development in the new stock. Some, however, expressed doubt about this New Man. Clarke's future Australian had been a mixed type, and an anonymous writer of 1879 reiterated the idea that the salvation of the Empire depended upon the solidarity of the white races within it.

At yet a third level ethnocentrism found its expression in an indigenous Australian ethnic consciousness. There was a generally shared belief in the advent of a new and better race of white men in the novel environment of the southern continent. Though confused and unsophisticated, this peculiar Australian ethnocentrism stressed the virtues of the new Antipodean, the commonality of all Australians, and, through an appeal for unity, reinforced Anglo-Saxon and White ethnocentrism.

This third variant found its most memorable expression in the almost universal contempt for the 'Pommie' new chum. Of the same genre was the dislike of European values, institutions, and social conditions, usually perceived as negative stereotypes such as that of an effete, poverty-stricken, and caste-ridden England. The positive mythology usually conceived of Australia as being, or becoming, a new continent free from class distinctions, overbearing aristocracy, sweated pauperism, and oppressive militarism. Australia, with its free conditions and open spaces, its mild yet invigorating climate, its unencumbered resources, was its own New World, free of the cake of custom that overburdened the people of the Old.

This New World, according to the indigenous ethnocentrism ethos, had to be inhabited by new men, to be the 'Delos of a coming Sun-God's race'. The idea of an ethnic change, as old as the descriptions of Currency Lads and Cornstalks, was a constant theme of contemplation in the later part of the nineteenth century. Most Australians took it as axiomatic that a new breed was evolving under the Southern Cross, though not all were satisfied or sanguine about the tendencies of its temperament and nature. The most famous piece on the subject was Marcus Clarke's playful essay, The Future Australian Race. Writing in 1877 Clarke saw the future Australian as a 'tall[,] coarse, strong-jawed, greedy pushing, talented man, excelling in swimming and horsemanship'. Characteristically, he would be fretful, perverse, self-reliant, non-intellectual, and turbulently democratic. Later writers frequently characterized the New Man as taller, leaner, and darker. Many agreed with Clarke that he would be less reverent and traditional, more cheerful, with greater self-reliance and audacity, vigorous and athletic rather than intellectual—though some saw Australians as new Greeks, blending genius with athleticism. A few even found Aboriginal parallels in the thin, wily, and dark features of the embryonic breed.
warmed that 'we must be prepared for an inevitable degeneration of the AngloSaxon stock'.

To the outback missionary, C. H. S. Matthews, almost 30 years later, it was quite conceivable, even probable, that in southern dimes the race might degenerate, as certain already seemed to indicate. There was also a frequent concern over the decline in birthrate, and the Bulletin, in the face of these concerns, expressed its own doubt about the possibilities of the continent. Its insects animals and Aborigines were all the lowest forms: maybe, the journal and sever, of its correspondents speculated, there was something wrong with the continent.65

Although there might be disagreement as to the direction of the evolution of the Australian there seemed to be few who doubted that evolution of a distinct Australian would take place. There were only a few outright dissenters. A. Patchett Martin, a Victorian editor and writer, dismissed the sweeping generalizations of a new racial type as nonsense, and Wallace Nelson, defending his countrymen against charges of degeneracy, called up biological science's new findings that acquired characteristics were not transmitted. Breed and only breed, insisted Nelson in his own evocation of ethnocentrism, was what counted.67

Others vacillated on the extent of the change from the parent stock. Frank Fox, former editor of the Lone Hand, spoke of the Australians as British, 'or rather that modification of British which is Australian'. B. R. Wise saw an 'entirely different type' developing among the overseas Briton, but, contradictorily perhaps, 'in essentials' he had preserved the ancient and inbred integrity of the race.68

The reasons ascribed for Australian racial modification were various, from geology to legislation, but the most frequent modifier was climate, variously described as bright, sunny, energizing, languid, with diet, soil, air, and contour running close behind. Not a few writers saw in the new social conditions a modifying factor. Though writers perceived a modification of the stock, most were prepared to grant that the original breed had been very good. The Australians, wrote L. F. Miller in the Argus, already came from natural selection. They were the most energetic and enterprising of the Anglo-Saxon race. A letter to the Bulletin described Australia's stock as having been drawn from the best European sources; another represented Australians as descending from the pick of England, born and bred in sunshine and fresh air.69

Within this context the 'bush legend' has, of course, its highly significant
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68 place. The bushman was, as Francis Adams proclaimed in 1893, 'the one powerful and unique national type yet produced in Australia'. He was 'the fons et origo of the New Race'. The bush, echoed Bedford, was where one found the 'real Australian'.
69 The idea of the bush as the home of the new, the real, Australian was also closely tied to the strong sentiment, prevalent in Australia as throughout the English-speaking world, that rural living was superior to the urban environment. In the tainted, 'spurious and blue-moulded civilisation of the littoral', the national fibre was being slacked and destroyed. The bush was best. It was there in the back country that the most profound modification of British stock was occurring, where a distinct and superior national type was forming. It was the stuff out of which C. E. W. Bean could write his paean of praise on the men of the wool track and the Darling and contribute so greatly to the Anzac legend.
70 The confused, unsophisticated, even ludicrous, attempts to differentiate a uniquely virtuous Australian race out of breed by environment had its ethnocentric companion in the attempt to appeal to a consciousness of Australian kind. The assertion of a commonality among Australians, the appeal to their ethnic unity, was as ambivalent and confused as the description of the new race. It attempted to base itself upon common characteristics, yet it was forced to find much of the commonality of Australians in a kinship whose roots reached far beyond Australia.
71 The most obvious appeal to commonality was based on the territorial unity of the colonies. The mettore of the federation movement was belaboured with statements of natural geographic unity. Colonial barriers were always artificial and arbitrary, unsanctioned by geography and unblessed by nature. 'Our country, by the law of God', commanded Robert Thomson, 'is one and indivisible'. This call was essentially non-ethnocentric, though calling in God and nature provided strong support for the ethnic appeal to Australians as a single people. The rhetoric did this, though in so doing it wiped away most of what was distinctly Australian. The crimson thread of kinship led back to Britain as much as it twined across the Murray or the Nullarbor Plain.
The great rhetorician of the ethnic commonality of Australians was Sir Henry Parkes. At least as early as 1879 he had intimated that 'we are one people', and, then as always, he traced that unity to its British source. There were, he wrote, no discordant elements amongst Australians, no incompatibilities of race, no divergent influences in the phylological conditions of Australian life. All were one people whose destiny was the building up of a free nation of British stamp and character. At the Corowa Conference of 1893, which adopted his 'One People, One Destiny', Parkes let loose another flood of consciousness of kinship, with the same ambi- 

Others placed a similar stress upon the ethnic homogeneity of all the Australian colonists, emphasizing the lack of racial or creedal distinctions, the commonness of colour, language, lineage, blood, law and literature. This ethnic homogeneity, however, was almost invariably extended to the common kin elsewhere. The consanguineous theme, played upon so strongly by Parkes, was conspicuous throughout the federal movement, and nowhere more than in an article by the future Victorian Premier, W. A. Watt:

The same blood that tinges in our veins throbs in the hearts of our brothers across the Murray, and in other provinces separated from us only by arbitrary and artificial political boundaries. We were all cradled by the great Mother of the British Race. We inherit the same qualities and purposes. The dauntless enterprise and indomitable perseverance which heralds Australia as the most progressive country in the world, springs from common parentage in those northern Isles, whose influence is indelibly imprinted on every page of universal history.

While the 'coming Sun-God's race' was linked by a crimson thread not only among itself, but to the Anglo-Saxon world beyond, it also had to be white. White Australia made it possible for Australians to conceive of themselves as 'the vanquished of the white race'. White Australia was necessary both for the continued kinship of Australians and for the realization of the new Anglo-Saxon race.

The existence at three levels of a common phenomenon, ethnocentrism, served to make Australian attitudes misleadingly distinct. Australian ethnocentrism became identified with nationalism, Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism with imperialism, and Caucasian ethnocentrism with racialism. The first two, at least, have often been seen as antagonistic. At times they were, but more often, as expressions of a common ethnic consciousness, all three blurred and blended rather easily with each other. The varying functional value of the three determined which would be emphasized at any particular time and by whom. By the turn of the century, the indigenous ethnocentrism had fulfilled many of its functions. Self-government had been bolstered and extended by a central Australian authority, and there was little need to continue to fulminate against the British or the decadent Old World. More important, an emphasis upon an Australian ethnocentrism was considerably less useful than stressing a British, Anglo-Saxon or white kinship. The relatively rapid shift, which occurred at about that time, from flamboyant Australian 'nationalism' to fervent imperialism was easily accomplished. It was not, as W. K. Hancock thought, that pride of race counted for more than love of country. The two did not clash, and when pride of race became more useful, it was stressed. Indigenous ethnocentrism was not dropped, though it did become less conspicuous. The process required no tortuous revision of assumptions; the idea of ethnic value and the consciousness of kinship remained. All that was necessary was a revision of emphasis from one kinship group to a broader one. Anglo-Saxonism had always been, even in radical and 'nationalist' circles, inter-
twined with and in support of local ethnic values. Australians were the pick of everyone could fit himself into the bush-oriented image of the New Australian which would sink all the ethnic ideals and standards it professed. A local Australian ethnocentrism could never become full-blown Australian nationalism, monolithic in its loyalty to an Australian ethnic community, because it was so vitally dependent upon Anglo-Saxonism and Caucasian racialism. It was simply a variant of ethnocentrism in Australia, blending almost imperceptibly into the pan-Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism of Britannic 'imperialism'. The latter was itself simply a shade in the spectrum, blending easily into white racial ethnocentrism which could protect Australians against inferior out-group norms and preserve the country for the descendants of Australians and for the British yet to come. White Australia, as one historian has commented, 'was both an element in Australian nationalism and an expression of the racialism associated with the imperialist ideology'.

An Australian consciousness of kind could help bring about federation, but that consciousness was itself largely based upon a commonality of race and Anglo-Saxon heritage. Simultaneous with the federation movement went a sympathetic support of the kindred Americans in their war against Spaniards and Filipinos and fervent assistance to kinsmen in South Africa. And few factors were more important in federation than the desire to find a final and effective agent to safeguard the purity of the white race in Australia.

All three forms of ethnocentrism functioning in protecting or promoting Australian interests or in-groups. An Australian ethnocentrism was useful in promoting 'Australia for Australians' against British imperial interests, British capitalists, and undesired British immigration. (As such, it frequently served as a weapon in the internal struggles between classes.) Anglo-Saxon or Britannic ethnocentrism emphasized internal homogeneity and unity at the same time as it promised to call in ethnic allies against external threats. White ethnocentrism fortified the country against the 'growth of domestic out-group norms while serving to express international solidarity towards threatening forefathers. It, together with Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism, came to supreme functional usefulness by the turn of the century, and the stress of ethnic identification was easily changed to these forms of group solidarity. The Bulletin quietly altered its focus from 'Australia for the Australians' to 'Australia for the White Man'. By that time Australia's 'strongest weapon' had become her solidarity—her free white race, her single homogeneous nation, and her unity of parentage, sentiment, and interest with the British Empire. The functional interrelation of these variants of ethnocentrism was summed up much later by George Cockerill, a reporter for the Age and an ardent 'nationalist' of the period. White Australia, he wrote, 'guaranteed more strongly the British character of the [Australian] race . . .'.

Ethnocentrism in Australia, of which Parkes's remarkable metaphor is but a lively expression, was endemic and useful. As a virtually universal phenomenon, ethnocentrism pervaded but was not particular to Australia. Indeed, it was especially prevalent and exaggerated throughout European societies during the period. Australian ethnocentric expressions were closely, often directly, related to ethnic ideas elsewhere in the English-speaking world. Moreover, many ideas, such as anti-Semitic stereotyping, probably stemmed from past interrelations outside Australia, but through cultural transmission outlasted the particular circumstances which gave rise to them.

Not only is ethnocentrism universal, but it may be necessary. It is certainly useful in building or fostering group integration and solidarity (in-group norms), and stereotyping are characteristic of group formation and consciousness, not least among classes). It is invariably the product of interaction between in-groups in which the vital interests, goals, and values of the out-groups are in conflict. Some segments of the in-group, however, may riot share to the same extent these out-group norms. Such differences within Australia have been only alluded to here; the stress has been upon the general consistency of an ethnocentrism of unity and solidarity, in which the inclusiveness of the in-group white, British and Australian Australians was of circumstances required, and upon how much ethnic feeling was common to the ideas of 'racialism', 'imperialism' and
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'nationalism'. Ethnocentrism was one of the most important forces of the age. 'The hard fact', the Bulletin noted early in the period, 'is that national and racial sentiments are more powerful than any abstract ideal.'