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ABSTRACT

Indigenous Australians have experienced the horrific consequences of European invasion and colonisation. Some of these consequences include wars, geographic displacement and attempted genocide. Both the high prevalence and experience of disability among Indigenous peoples remain directly linked to the events that followed European invasion. Critical Disability Studies and Media Studies can investigate the process of decolonisation. This chapter is cross disciplinary in so far as we are concerned with the representation of Indigenous people in the mass media and decolonising Indigenous disability. We examine data collected from an analysis of the print media during the colonial period; that is, representation of “disabled” Indigenous people in mainstream newspapers during the first 100 years of the press from 1830. We use Martin Nakata’s Indigenous Standpoint Theory and Decolonising frameworks to deconstruct and analyse the material collected.
INTRODUCTION

The newspaper industry is one of the oldest forms of news media in Australia. Many media studies scholars state that newspapers are an important source to understand how “our history can be accessed and interpreted.” Recent media studies involving Indigenous peoples and people with disability have shown that the news media provides a source of data for exploring how minority groups have been portrayed and treated within Australian popular culture since colonisation.

The news media and more recently social media play a vital social function in the dissemination of local and national information via radio, newspapers, magazine, and television and more recently the Internet. News media provides information for local citizens, migrants and foreigners about issues pertaining to the economy, politics, fashion and local and national cultural identity. The centralised ownership of the news media enables the industry to maintain its stronghold and limitless reach, representing and influencing the public discourse on matters the media deem important. It is for this reason the news media is often described as essential for “collective identity formation” in nation states around the world.

The links between colonisation and disability amongst Indigenous populations have been well documented. Schofield and Gilroy define colonisation as a process of coerced alienation of Indigenous peoples that serves the interests of the growing Western metropole. Scholars have long argued that the Western metropole, through its Eurocentric lens, defined and categorised the “Cultural/Racial Other” (Indigenous/Aboriginal/Native) was different and inferior to white European races. Decolonisation on the other hand remains the “ongoing, radical resistance against colonialism that includes struggles for land, redress, self-determination, healing historical trauma, cultural continuance, and reconciliation.”
The World Health Organisation reports there are around 370 million Indigenous peoples in at least 70 countries around the world. In Australia, Indigenous people represent over half a million people, around three per cent of the nation’s population. When the British invasion of Australia occurred in 1788, the colonial elite explored and stole the lands and resources of Indigenous peoples. The British elite did not respect Indigenous peoples as humans or as custodians. The ensuing wars between the British elite and the Indigenous peoples persisted for over a century. Indigenous peoples were subject to kidnap, rape and murder in the name of European imperialism. In effect, Indigenous peoples are among the unhealthiest and most disadvantaged people in Australia.

Australian Indigenous peoples with disability have received limited attention in disability studies and media studies. To the authors’ knowledge, there is no known research on how Indigenous peoples with disabilities were portrayed and treated in the colonial news media in any settler society. Taking a decolonising approach to disability studies involves creating a space to understand the present situation of Indigenous people from the perspective of Indigenous people themselves. This approach involves a deconstruction of the embodiment of social, political, economic, cultural processes of colonisation. Part of the process of a decolonising inquiry is to critique western constructs and conceptions of disability and ill health.

By using Australia as a case study, this chapter aims to illustrate the representation of Indigenous people with a disability in the print mass-media throughout the first hundred years of newspaper publications in Australia from 1830s to 1930s. This period was chosen as it followed the colonial government’s relaxing censorship of the news media. This study is positioned within a decolonising methodological framework, building upon the works undertaken by Gilroy and Gilroy, Donelly, Colmar and Parmenter. The research demonstrates how early media reporting played an important role in supporting colonial power structures such as the courts and policing, early welfare instructions and institution systems such as prisons. It also shows how the use of disability tropes in the print press supported discourses of indigenous inferiority and backwardness.
Print News Media and Minority Groups

Following the British invasion of Australia in 1788, many settlers migrated away from the city regions to set up large horticultural and agricultural outstations, becoming one of the primary industries for Australia’s growing colonial economy. The first newspaper, the *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, was published in March 1803 to improve the distribution of government official information throughout the colonies and outstations. The *Australian* (not the current newspaper with that title), the *Monitor* and the *Tasmanian and Port Dalrymple Advertiser* were the first known published provincial newspapers in Australia.\(^1^8\) Australia’s longest published newspaper, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, was first published in 1831, becoming the first popular daily newspaper in Australia.

The European elite brought cultural values of *normative health* and *human functioning*, directly connected to Western biomedicine and free-market capitalism. The *eugenics movement*, a Eurocentric set of beliefs, ideals and practices that aims to improve the genetic quality of the human population, was well advanced in Westernised countries between 1880s and the mid-twentieth century and overlapped the period under study in this chapter.

In Australia, many institutions and asylums were established under law, such as the Queensland Benevolent Asylums Ward Act 1861, and “Lunatic Persons” became the responsibility of the prison system during the late 1800s. Yet many Indigenous peoples regard the Western biomedical approach to pathologically labeling and categorising people by their perceived *dis*abilities as part of an attempt to further alienate Indigenous peoples.\(^1^9\) Much research suggests that there exists no word in any Indigenous communities’ language equivalent to the English words “disability” or “impairment.”\(^2^0\)

Media scholars have used framing theory to demonstrate how information about Indigenous people influences and frames public attitudes and places Indigenous people within a particular “field of meaning.” Marcia Langton’s\(^2^1\) essay on the representation of Australian Indigenous
peoples argues that the news media was used as a tool to create an *imagined community* of a “white Australia” as *normative*, reflecting the hegemony of eugenics. For example, Figure 1 shows how one newspaper, *The Bulletin*, represented and supported the capture and trading of Indigenous peoples as free labor for the colonialists’ farms and homesteads.

*Figure 1 Cartoon depicting a slave trader luring buyers to his “niggers for hire” stand, The Bulletin, 1886.*

Indigenous peoples are often represented in the context of “civil disorder” to generate a *moral panic* about “race relations” in Australia. Many political and social issues, such as land rights, welfare policy, alcohol, crime and unemployment have been portrayed in a way that represents and treats Indigenous peoples as a *social problem*. Even though Indigenous peoples’ voices are included in some news stories, their views are often obscured or cordoned off by the views of White, middle-class professional peoples and organisations. Bullimore describes this issue well:

As a result of this domination, interpretations and evaluations of news events are routinely embedded in the ideology of the White elite. When ethnic or minority voices are heard in
the media—if they are heard at all—they are found to be less credible than elite speakers, such as police and government officials.

 Likewise, Ellis and Goggin\textsuperscript{24} review of media research on disability in the news media shows that people with disability were portrayed as a social problem in similar ways to Indigenous people. Zahang and Haller\textsuperscript{25} observed that the negative representation of people with disability in the mass media contributes to their oppression by reinforcing existing, or creating new, stereotypes and stigmas associated with disability and impairment. Thus, disability stereotypes that medicalise, patronise and dehumanise people with disabilities perpetuated in the mass media aim to normalise hegemonic ideologies. These objectifying representations and depictions of people with disability contribute to their social isolation, thus reinforce the hegemonic values of ableism as normative.\textsuperscript{26}

**Critical Disability Studies at the Cultural Interface**

Relying on newspaper publications in the period in question inevitably limits our analysis to material written only by the White affluent classes. However, these publications in the hands of the powerful elite frame popular meanings about Indigenous peoples and are thus an important source of information.

 One of this chapter’s authors claims “disability studies’ differentiation between chronic illness, impairment and disability cannot usefully explain the contemporary lived experience of indigenous peoples.”\textsuperscript{27} Scholars\textsuperscript{28} have demonstrated that Disability Studies regularly assume universality in their middle-class colonialist standpoints, thus imposing normativity of White non-disabled bodies. By adopting Indigenous research and decolonising methodologies we critically deconstruct how Indigenous people with disability were represented and treated at the cultural interface of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and critically reflect the implications this had for Indigenous peoples with disabilities.
The recent turn to Critical Disability Studies seeks to be “self-aware of its own historicity” and “engage in dialogue among cultures” while undergoing a process of intellectual decolonisation. This requires developing methodological frameworks that privilege Indigenous peoples and are developed either by or in cooperation with Indigenous peoples. An example of this paradigm shift is work by Gilroy that explores the applicability of Indigenous Standpoint Theory (IST) in disability studies. IST is not an “Indigenous” way of doing research. Rather it is a researcher’s positionality that prioritises the personal experiences of Indigenous peoples in the research process.

As Indigenous (author one) and non-Indigenous with disability (author two and three) scholars, we position ourselves at the Cultural Interface as defined by Martin Nakata. In previous papers, Gilroy has demonstrated that critically exploring the cultural interface helps us understand why many problems experienced by Indigenous people with disability have persisted for many decades. The cultural interface is the domain where the trajectories of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples’ histories, cultures, ideologies and practices regarding disability and impairment intersect creating the social environments that impact on Indigenous peoples’ lives. The cultural interface is a metaphysical world where Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples constantly interact and negotiate matters pertaining only to Indigenous peoples’ lives. Nakata states that “for in this space there are so many interwoven, competing and conflicting discourses that distinguishing traditional from non-traditional in the day-to-day is difficult to sustain even if one were in a state of permanent reflection.”

**Indigenous People with Disability in the Colonial Press**

The Australian National Library’s Trove digitised newspaper database was searched for Australian newspaper articles published between the years 1830s and 1930s. This period was selected as it marks one century of the “freedom of the press” following the government lifting of press censorship in 1824. It was also the period when numerous newspapers were published on a weekly basis and witnessed Australia becoming a Federation of States under the British Commonwealth in 1901. Near the end of the nineteenth century there were 599 metropolitan daily
and weekly, suburban and country newspapers and magazines published in Australia. Of these, 466 were published in country areas.36

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 shows the key search-words used in the analysis and their meanings. The articles selected used disability terms in relation to Indigenous peoples. The search terms were obtained from the literature and our lifelong experiential knowledge on disability and Aboriginal affairs. The meanings and synonyms of these terms were searched in a 19th Century English dictionary to ensure the meanings are the same in the research period. Given that there were no adequate Australian published dictionaries for that period, the Oxford dictionaries published in London were used for this study. Many of the articles obtained have used more than one of these search terms.

*Table 1.1: Disability database search-words*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asylum</td>
<td>An institution for receiving maintaining, and so far, as possible ameliorating the condition of persons suffering from bodily defects, mental maladies, or other misfortunes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>No, or limited, sense of visual capabilities and sight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cripple</td>
<td>One who creeps, halts or limps; one who is partially or wholly deprived of the use of one or more of his limbs; a lame person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>Lacking the sense of hearing; insensible to sounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deformed/Deformity</td>
<td>To mar the natural form or shape of; put out of shape; disfigure, as by malformation of a limb or some other part of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumb</td>
<td>Blind and deaf; the two words are connected. The origin sense being then “dull of perception.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeble</td>
<td>Lacking strength; lacking capacity for the forcible action or resistance; weak; specifically reduced to a state of weakness as by sickness or age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap</td>
<td>To place at a disadvantage by the imposition of any embarrassment, impediment, or disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbecile</td>
<td>Mentally feeble; fatuous; having mental faculties undeveloped or greatly impaired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impaired</td>
<td>To make worse; diminish in quantity, value, excellence strength, or any other desirable quality; deteriorate weaken enfeeble as to impair the health or character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infirm</td>
<td>Be infirm or sick; to weaken enfeeble; not sound in health; impaired in health or fatality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insane</td>
<td>Unsound in the mind; unsound or deranged in the mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lame</td>
<td>Bruised or maimed; crippled or disabled by injury to or defect of a limb or limbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunatic</td>
<td>Mad; moonstruck, insane; affect by lunacy; periodically insane, with lucid intervals; crazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Belonging to or characteristic of the intellect; as the mental power or faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mute</td>
<td>Dumb; incapable or utterance; not having the power of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralyse/paralyze</td>
<td>To render helpless, useless, or ineffective, as if by paralysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Defect</td>
<td>A recognised defect of the physical body; diagnosed defect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>In a state of stupor; having the faculties deadened or dulled; stupefied, either permanently or temporarily; lacking ordinary activity of mind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.2: Indigenous database search-words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>The first inhabitants; pertaining to Aborigines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginary</td>
<td>An Aboriginal inhabitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aborigine</td>
<td>The primitive inhabitants of a country; the people living in a country at the earliest period of which anything is known; the original fauna and flora of a given geographical area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>A member of one of the dark-coloured races; a negro or other dark-skinned person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackfellow</td>
<td>A black person; a negro; An Aboriginal inhabitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacky</td>
<td>A black person; a negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darky/ie</td>
<td>A human being with dark coloured skin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gin</td>
<td>An Australian native woman; an old woman generally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>Born or originating in a particular place or country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>Of indigenous origin or growth; not exotic or of foreign origin or production belonging by birth;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigger</td>
<td>A native of the West Indies or one of the Australian Aborigines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccaninnies</td>
<td>A baby; a child; especially, the child of a member of any negroid race.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 75 articles were obtained. Five articles were excluded as the term “native” was used to describe the birthplace of a European, such as “a native of London”, rather than an Indigenous person. Four articles were excluded due to the article text being unreadable. A total of 66 newspaper articles were included in this study. Table 2 below shows the number of newspaper articles found for each decade from 1830. The largest number of matching articles were published in 1880s and 1890s.

**Table 2: Number of articles obtained from the database search per decade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Number of articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main theme identified from the analysis of the news articles examined focused on labeling and categorising Indigenous peoples within a Eurocentric medical framework. The articles commonly used the following phrases to describe an ab-normal Indigenous person:

- “Aboriginal cripple”\(^{37}\)
- “old lubra”\(^{38}\) who was blind”\(^{39}\)
- “old black cripple”\(^{40}\)
- “the gin was a cripple”\(^{41}\)
- “imbecile Aboriginal”\(^{42}\)
- “partially imbecile Aboriginal native”\(^{43}\)
- “old blind native woman”\(^{44}\)
- “deaf and dumb Aboriginal”\(^{45}\)
- “The native was an old helpless inoffensive cripple”\(^{46}\)
- “blind bobby”\(^{47}\)

There are five elements to this main theme presented under the headings below: disability a consequence of Indigenous inferiority; pathways to welfare; protection; criminalisation; institutionalisation.

1. **Disability a consequence of Indigenous inferiority**

This first element framed the prevalence and incidence of impairment in Indigenous communities as a consequence of the Indigenous peoples’ “inferiority/inability” to prevent, or adapt to, the European invasion. Disability was discussed as a consequence of the frontier wars during the first
century of European invasion. For example, one article stated that “... one native who was humpbacked and a cripple for life, as a result of injuries, understood locally to have been inflicted some time ago by a white man by means of a tomahawk.” Some articles presented statistics on the prevalence of impairments in the local Indigenous communities. Similarly, an interview with John Alce about the implications of European invasion on Indigenous peoples made the following statement about the spread of diseases and represents Indigenous peoples’ approaches to impairment and disability as inferior and archaic:

The ranks of the island natives, numbering between two and three hundred, have been decimated by a dire scourge, the effects of which are still visible on both old and young. Mr. Markey gives a harrowing description of some of the sufferers, who in their appalling ignorance are indifferent to the consequences of the disease. With these unfortunates, as well as seven blind men and twelve deaf and dumb children...

A letter from a Government Minister published in 1889 reported that “new-born children are frequently killed by their mothers—of twins the female, or if one sex the weaker, also all the children who are feeble or cripples and many bastards.” Some articles mocked Indigenous traditional approaches to defining and responding to impairments. For example:

A well-known figure in the streets of Palmerston for many years past—Cripple Jimmy, a Larrakeyah native—died suddenly … Jimmy’s sudden taking off will not tend to increase their confidence in the white man’s methods of healing. This is to be regretted, as the distrust entails much needless suffering. Had Jimmy chosen to see the doctor earlier, he might still have been alive, and as well as his deformity would ever permit him to be.

Some articles discussed the Indigenous cultural approaches to supporting Indigenous people that were experiencing the physical effects of illness and disease. For example, Leckie published a newspaper article titled “Black Magic”, which mocked and ridiculed Indigenous healers as inferior.
2. *Pathways to welfare*

Many articles used impairment to frame Indigenous people as dependents, unproductive and a resource burden on colonial farmsteads and outstations. Whilst constructing Indigenous people as a resource burden, many articles reported on the allocation of “government rations” and “handouts” to Indigenous people with impairments as fulfilling their Christian duties. Some colonial farm-station managers published opinion pieces to voice their dissatisfaction of owners and managers of colonial outstations who provided compensation to Indigenous people with impairment in order to retain the services of Indigenous peoples as laborers. An outstation manager’s letter to the Editor linked the “slaughter” of Indigenous peoples to the allocation of welfare to Indigenous peoples with disabilities on their outstation farmstead:

… when they [Indigenous people] are on the station it is cheaper to feed them than to let them help themselves … this mob of cousins, aunts, blind uncles etc, have to be looked after [by the station] so as to retain the services of two or three good ones [Indigenous people], of which there are still a few left in spite of the slaughter there has been lately.

The authors of these articles connected the prevalence of impairments to their desires of capitalism to expand the global colonial empire within a Christian philosophy. Below is an example from a farm-station manager’s letter to the editor expressing his dissatisfaction on how the government is treating Indigenous peoples with disabilities:

Frequently I observed old, decrepit n[sic]atives and absolutely blind, of no possible use to the station—useless and only waiting for the grave to receive them—all kindly treated, well looked after, generously fed, and provided with rugs at the station’s cost. I will not say that there are not now and then instances of unnecessary hardship and gross cruelty inflicted on the natives by their “bosses,” just as there are instances of unreasoning cruelties inflicted in the various social strata of civilisation.
The settlers were described as being generous by fulfilling their “duties” of Christianity. In effect, the handouts given to Indigenous peoples were a means of pacifying the Indigenous peoples and make the settlers feel like they were fulfilling their duties. Thus the violence of colonisation was immune to scrutiny both through the pathologisation of indigenous people and by the provision of minimal levels of welfare.60

3. Protection

The articles represented the Indigenous peoples as tractable and in need of protection and position, the Europeans as their “protectors.” For example, in an article titled “the last of their race”61 the author discussed how Indigenous peoples were removed from their traditional lands and relocated to farms and out-stations.

...the small remnant of the Aborigines of Van Diemen’s Land have been withdrawn from Flinders Island ... They consist of 18 adult men, 22 adult women, 5 boys and 5 girls ... one is nearly blind, one is imbecile, that of the remaining five ... two of them having been pretty regularly employed as boatmen, and one having for years done the duty of cowherd, with a steadiness which would have been praise-worthy in a man bred to labor. They have all lived about in civilised habits.

The articles that discussed “protection” often represented the Europeans as the “saviors” of Indigenous people.62 Some articles referenced how Indigenous geographic displacement is impacting on Indigenous peoples’ livelihood. For example, an opinion article63 from 1898 similarly stated that:

... the government ... should protect them [Indigenous people] from suffering starvation through legislation. Game [wild fauna] is scarce in the district, many of the blacks are old and decrepit, some even blind ... as their protector [government] should recommend that steps be taken to ameliorate their condition.

Protection and welfare worked hand in hand. An opinion article in the Western Australian64 stated:
... Europeans who take a sympathising interest in the race of human beings whose primitive habits and wretchedness we are bound, as their superior, to improve and ameliorate so far as we are able. It has been a mistake of longstanding on the part of the government—a mistake which I have long vainly endeavored to have removed—the neglect, socially speaking, of the feeble, the sick and the blind amongst our Aborigines.

4. Criminalisation of Indigeneity and disability

Indigenous people with disabilities who were involved in the criminal justice system featured strongly in the material collected. Some Indigenous people with disabilities who were involved in the criminal justice system were identified by their impairment, such as “deaf Johnny, an attempt to commit a capital offence” or “mad Tommy,” or by both their impairment and indigeneity, such as “Aborigine declared insane.” For example, an article about a murder stated that “there was no sign of lameness or any other physical defect about [the accused].” An article titled “half-caste Aborigine acquitted” reported that “the inspector general of the insane (Dr Bently) said that Johnnie was sane on August 23 but must have been insane on the date of the murder.” Similarly, an article titled “Aborigine declared insane” stated that “Thomas Shaw, the half-caste Aborigine... has been classified as insane at the time of the tragedy.”

Prisons were said to have an “invasion of Aborigines and lunatics.” Indigenous people with disability who were involved in the criminal justice system were also represented as dependent on handouts from settler communities. For example, a magistrate stated in an opinion piece that some Indigenous people with disability were committing crimes, such as theft, because of disadvantage. He gave the following account of a convicted Indigenous person:

I was resident magistrate of Bunbury ... I know the native, Banyan. He came to my house with other natives in 1858. He ... was partially deformed. ... he was brought here into court, and appeared helpless and decrepid [sic]. ... [and] began to draw rations as a sick native in 1859....

Treatment reflected the use of the medical model of “impairment” in the criminal justice system. The type and severity of a person’s impairment were assessed and diagnosed under the European medical model of impairment and functioning. For example, two news articles report of a Court
hearing in 1897. One article\textsuperscript{75} described “the case of an Aboriginal girl ‘Bluey’... who has the appearance of an imbecile [who] was remanded for medical examination.” Similarly, a report\textsuperscript{76} of a convicted Indigenous person stated that “the jury returned a verdict of manslaughter, but stated that it believed that the accused was insane at the time he committed the deed.”

Indigenous people with disability in the criminal justice system were discriminated against, humiliated and disrespected and they were neither treated as equal to an able-bodied Indigenous person or a European. An opinion piece\textsuperscript{77} mocked an Indigenous person with impairment who provided evidence in a criminal court hearing against a European suspected of property theft:

Can it be possible that the South Australian Government accept the evidence of Aborigines in a court of justice! I notice in your police reports that a blackfellow gave evidence in a portmanteau stealing case, and (tell it not in Gath) that darkie was deaf and dumb! Why, he might point to a portmanteau and mean a saddle, or a pair of boots, or any other article made of leather.

Another incident in a court setting demonstrated how an Indigenous person was not properly supported in providing evidence against a European who was suspected of selling alcohol to Indigenous people. The author of the article described this event as “funny”:

One of the funniest things in the way of Police Court work was the attempt made on Monday last to convict an Aboriginal grog-seller on the “evidence” of a deaf and dumb black-fellow, who (to add to the singularity of the thing) had his peculiar signs and antics interpreted by a Chinaman. Mr. Knight stood it for a while, but when the ludicrous nature of the joke had been played out he advised the police to look round for testimony that was more reliable. A deaf and dumb blackfellow assisted by a Chinaman in an Australian police court is not often met with.\textsuperscript{78}
The criminal justice system openly discriminated against Indigenous people with impairment due to cultural and language differences:

…the jury found the accused was unable to understand the proceedings owing to his ignorance of English. They also found him to be insane. He was committed to the lunatic asylum during the Governor’s pleasure.

The police and military institutions recruited many Indigenous people as police officers to maintain law and order within Indigenous communities. This process of divide and rule was also a means of controlling Indigenous resistance against the spread of European rule. A newspaper article from 1865 reported that “a black-fellow—a cripple—had left Mr Dutton’s station, and was shortly afterwards met by the black police … [and] was immediately shot dead.” Similarly, an article described how an Indigenous person with impairment was framed for a crime:

the case of Nabbagee Tom … a poor old cripple, who could hardly speak or hear, brought down from the North West because a smart native assistant, Jim Crow, had knocked an unintelligible confession out of him. Jim Crow and some white police, go out in a searching party. They see two blacks, and gallop them down.

5. Institutionalisation of Indigeneity and impairment

Analysis of the data suggested that the institutionalisation of Indigenous peoples with disabilities was discussed in three ways.

Firstly, the articles reported the advancements of the psychological sciences and the impact these “advances” had for Indigenous people. Indigenous peoples who were accused or convicted of a crime were assessed by a medical professional in psychological sciences. Indigenous people with impairment were imprisoned under the Insanity Act 1884 for people regarded as “insane.”
Wallinjera an Aboriginal belonging to the Uranna tribe ... inquiries showed that the accused was once in Woogaroo, and he was still subject to delusions. The judge then took evidence on the point as to accused’s sanity at the present moment, the principal witness being Dr Voss; and the jury, after fifteen minutes consideration, found him insane. The judge then directed the accused to be kept in strict custody in Rockhampton Gaol ... until death with as provided for by the Insanity Act of 1884.82

Many Indigenous people with impairment were institutionalised in “Destitute Asylums” or “Mental Asylums.” Some articles reported on the number of “asylum inmates” by Indigeneity, age, sex and type of impairment.83

Secondly, segregating Indigenous peoples onto reserves, outstations or missions. This practice is linked to the power to “protect” (category three above) Indigenous people with impairment. Many organisations established to “protect” and represent Indigenous peoples, such as the Aborigines’ Friends’ Society, reported on the Indigenous “inmates” (age, sex, impairment etc) at some missions. Many journalists and writers84 of the time reported on their “travels” to Indigenous missions. For example, a letter to the editor85 stated that “these reserves should be under the control of specially qualified white protectors ... [to enable Indigenous people to care for] the old, the lame or the blind.”

Thirdly, some Indigenous people who were diagnosed as either “deaf”, “dumb” or “blind” were placed in the Deaf and Dumb Institution or the Deaf and Dumb and Blind Institute.86 During the 1890s, these two institutions reported on their services and “inmates” in the print media. The Deaf and Dumb Institution87 would only accept Indigenous people if the Aborigines Protection Board would allocate funding.
The Future of Disability and the News Media

The field of Disability Studies has until recently neglected the people with disability outside of the non-metropole. This chapter is a contribution to the project of decolonising disability studies by critically analysing the representations of Australian Indigenous peoples with disabilities in the colonial print media. This was achieved using Martin Nakata’s standpoint theory, the Cultural Interface and supports the new paradigm emerging from Critical Disability Studies.

Our analysis of the colonial newspapers has identified five main discourses in the representation of Indigenous people with disability within the theme of Eurocentric medical framework.

1. Disability a consequence of Indigenous inferiority
2. Pathways to welfare
3. Protection
4. Criminalisation of Indigeneity and impairment
5. Institutionalisation of Indigeneity and impairment

The findings of this study have implications for disability and indigenous media studies. Our findings show that the Australian media was used as a tool in the first 100 years of settlement to impose a white able-bodied normalcy and racial superiority in a colonised nation state. The print press acted to support white power structures and non-Indigenous occupation of Indigenous lands and resources. The study adds support to Gilroy’s and Donelly’s claim that disability research inherently serves the interests of the non-Aboriginal affluent classes by falsely justifying “whiteness” and “ability” as normative. Gilroy stated that:

There are volumes of knowledge, a whole epistemological library in fact, on Indigenous people with a disability. This knowledge is not owned by Indigenous people, rather this library operates as a resource for non-Indigenous researchers and government decision makers to legitimate themselves as the controllers and bearers of the “truth” on disability.
During the period under consideration, the media helped create and portray an *imagined* “superior-being” (White/ male/ European/ able-bodied) and a “non-superior-being” (Black/ Indigenous/ disabled/ impaired-bodied). This was done in two ways. Firstly, the Indigenous peoples were “culturally othered” as the inferior human race when contrasted to predominantly European communities. As such, eugenic philosophies influenced both media and public policy that encouraged the institutionalization of impaired persons. Professionals (white middle classes, medically trained men) were positioned as experts to determine the inclusion or exclusion of “defectives” influencing the removal of “defectives” from society. Impairment and indigeneity counted as “defective” within this dominant hegemony.

The findings have implications for future research in critical disability studies, media studies and colonial history. The findings support that we need to read disability differently[^90] not only in texts but in the media. The findings support Meekosha’s claim that “we cannot meaningfully separate the disabled subaltern from the colonised subaltern.”[^91] The articles authors represented in this study were focused on labeling and categorising Indigenous peoples on the basis of their Indigeneity and impairments. This was done in the context of European “superiority.”

The newspaper articles categorised, represented and treated *the Indigenous* and *the disabled-bodied* as one *embodied identity*. As such, Indigenous peoples with impairments were “doubly labeled” within a White *medicalised* and *racialised* system that *inscribed and normalised Indigeneity* and *functioning*. The articles represented *Indigeneity* on the basis of racialised stereotypical body features, such as skin colour, and the practice of “traditional” cultures and languages. This double labeling resulted in the *criminalisation* and *institutionalisation* of Indigenous people with a disability as a “social problem” to be addressed within taken-for-granted Western practices, thus reinforcing the normalcy of colonisation.
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