

Battling the Land and Global Anxiety

Science, Environment and Identity in Settler Australia

Libby Robin¹

Australia is still, for us, not a country but a state – or states – of mind. We do not yet speak from within her, but from outside: from the state of mind that describes, rather than expresses, its surroundings, or from the state of mind that imposes itself upon, rather than lives through, landscape and event... We are caught up in the nineteenth-century split of consciousness, the stunned shock of those who cross the seas and find themselves as the Australian ballad puts it, in a “hut that’s upside down”.

Judith Wright (1961)²

Being at home in the world

In 1995, a book appeared entitled *At Home in the World*. The author, Michael Jackson (a great name for a global citizen), discusses the meaning of “home” in what he calls “the century of uprootedness”. Since World War II, there has been an extraordinary movement of people around the globe, sometimes by force, sometimes by choice, he notes. Persecution and scarcity have driven some moves; others have been based on hopes for a new life “elsewhere”. Jackson describes the movement of people from “impoverished countries in the south to cities of the industrialised north” as creating a “crisis of belonging”. He observes, for example, that homeless people in Europe and North America are unknown and invisible; they “don’t count” since they are not numbered in the national census.³ The world of enforced mobility creates new questions about which people count and if they belong anywhere at all.

Part of the pressure of a brave new global world is that belonging, identity and place of abode are no longer cognate ideas. History has a trajectory independent of geography. Increasingly global power has become more important than national, and the citizen has limited ability to vote for or against such power. Economic pressures and damage in war-torn places have sometimes motivated whole villages to move together, creating small Greek or Estonian places and diasporas in large urban centres like Melbourne and Perth. Other migrants and refugees have lost all family and friends and have to start again entirely alone, without even the language of their new place. Forced moves can also occur within national borders but away from “country”, as Indigenous Australians know all too well.

Migrating diasporas and refugees have dramatically rearranged the borders and identities of nations in the twentieth century. They challenge the idea of nation itself and its aspirations, perhaps particularly in settler societies, such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States, where settling people (that is, people from elsewhere) on the land has historically been a national and civilising project. Nation is no longer about organic roots in place, but merely about finding a place to stop, or at least pause, in a mobile, rootless world. There is now very much less room for discussion of the people-in-place, the yeoman citizenry, the sturdy members of rural society raising agricultural and pastoral produce who were regarded as the backbone of settler nations, or at least the rhetoric of such nations. However, the yeoman rhetoric leant authority to a particular infrastructure of state that has continued long beyond its original purpose. Science, particularly the sort that enabled the “man on the land” to raise bigger sheep

and larger wheat crops more efficiently, became part of the bureaucracy of Australia and other settler societies. This conferred a right on science to provide the “knowledge of nature”, or a voice for the “land” which persists to this day. Science has a bias towards global generalisations, and within “state science” there was little space for an ecological and other sciences of place.⁴ As globalisation continues to accelerate in the twenty-first century and the nation state and its rural economies are increasingly marginalised, urban and post-industrial aspirations grow not just in settler societies, but also in the “tiger economies” of China and India. In this essay, I explore what happens to identity and relations to place under some of the pressures of globalisation. Who belongs where and why?

Jackson’s *At Home in the World* project explored the idea of home without a house. He acknowledged that migration is much older than the century of uprootedness, but did not pursue this angle. Nor did he explicitly tackle the distinction between migration (a once or perhaps twice in a lifetime event) and “constant mobility”, sometimes referred to as modern nomadism. In the United States, “migration” has a heroism about it, possibly by association with the Pilgrim Fathers. There is, however, according to Ursula Heise, a national anxiety about mobile American lifestyles dating back at least to the nineteenth century.⁵ Heise cites George Perkins Marsh on the “restless love of change” (1864), Nathaniel Hawthorne on Americans’ “vagabond habits” (1855) and philosopher Josiah Royce’s comment that “nobody is at home” (1902), a litany of perceptions of Americans as “nomads without roots forever on the road”. Homelessness is, however, broader than just north America, as Peter Berger explores in *The Homeless Mind*, a thesis about the global alienation caused by modernisation and bureaucracy.⁶

Jackson sought to explore the “state of mind” of traditional nomads, Australian Aboriginal people in the desert, how such people “created and sustained a sense of belonging and autonomy when they did not build or dwell in houses and house was not synonymous with home”.⁷ His concern was with their thinking, not their environment. Indeed he seems to be entirely uninterested in their geography of place, and the ecological limits of survival in places like the Australian desert that frames Aboriginal “homelessness”. Here, in what is arguably the most variable and unseasonal climate on earth, Aboriginal peoples have lived successfully, maybe even sustainably, for 35,000 years or more, through many extreme (natural) climate change events.⁸ The key to their success has been “nomadism”. Jackson is not alone in his practice of dissociating “state of mind” from geographical place, and concentrating simply on psychological roots and sense of country, without considering the relationships between people and nourishment in the “nourishing terrain” that sustains them.⁹ The idea that one’s “place” is structured by walls is fundamentally anti-ecological.

I want to turn the anthropological gaze in the direction of the investigator who scoped this project and his motivations. Jackson established himself as a “global narrator”: it is clear that he is a man “at home in the world”, but not where he came from himself. Everyone comes from somewhere in particular (or a series of places) and brings baggage, hidden or overt, from this journey, and this is important to this sort of mission. Jackson’s language and metaphors are North American: one “freezing January afternoon” he places a “quarter in the panhandler’s Styrofoam cup”, he writes in an anecdote about a homeless man that is left out of the census in the United States because he does not have a fixed address.¹⁰ Jackson is interested in how history shapes people, but seems surprisingly uncurious about geographical circumstance, whether the people he is considering are on freezing streets or in burning desert. For him, North and South are sociological concepts, related to each other by power and labour relations, not compasses. His project sought art and literature as a tonic to what “hard science foregoes or forgets”, the fullness of human experience.¹¹ Because “life outstrips our vocabulary”, (as John Berger commented¹²), story-telling is necessary. Story-telling is the antidote to statistics, reason and the limitation of what is humanly possible imposed by the scientific, modern world. But ignoring the ecological context for the stories creates another imposition, a cultural imposition that denies the interpenetration of nature and culture.

So what was the story of Jackson’s own life? In a very late twist, it emerged that Jackson was not from Boston or New York, despite the anecdote about the homeless man. Jackson comes from the geographical south, where January is not “freezing”, but mid-summer. Jackson mentions in passing that he had inadvertently dropped in at “home” in New Zealand on his way to Sydney to commence his Aboriginal project. His search for home he said, unconsciously echoing Judith Wright’s words, must be *consonant with lived experience, with all its variety and ambiguity*. Pakeha New Zealanders

are great global citizens. They are not the *tangata whenua*, the people of the land. Yet they have developed a fluency with Maori language that yields them a personal descriptor “Pakeha”. This Indigenous view of themselves provides them with an authentic identity.

Non-Indigenous Australians are by contrast, “non” identified. An Un-identity is an issue, as the promoters of the political term “UnAustralian” know all too well. But an un-identity can help make a person invisible, or at least fluid and ambiguous: *the state of mind that imposes itself upon, rather than lives through, landscape and event* is also a perfect basis for global citizenship. Edith Campbell Berry epitomises this fluidity. She is the “pleasantly stateless” Australian heroine of Frank Moorhouse’s League of Nations novels, *Grand Days* and *Dark Palace*. “She thought that Geneva with its medley of languages helped people feel stateless”, Moorhouse wrote: “...being in Geneva was being nowhere”. Shedding some of her nationality liberated Edith to immerse herself in the “momentousness” of her work at the League, the work of the whole world.¹³ The League’s Swiss under-secretary, Bartou, a fictional character created by Moorhouse, asked Edith one day about her lack of loyalty to Britain as an Australian. “Interesting,” he remarked, “Your soul came from the same place but it has been altered. Altered by the sun and by the pioneering and by the distance in under a hundred and fifty years. I’m interested in what happens to the national soul when it’s transplanted.” To which Edith replied with another question: “What happens to our souls when we are transplanted to Geneva? ... Or what about you? Seemingly still on the soil of your own country but legally in a diplomatic nether region.” His reply: “The discovery of our international soul? ... You’re right. Those of use who come to work at the League are all immigrants.”¹⁴

Those immigrant eyes changed the way Edith saw her own country when she returned home. She found “a low revulsion” of the coastal bush landscape where she grew up. “What sort of falsely superior person had she become”, she asked herself, “what dreadful snobbish disloyalty had moved through her mind causing her to dislike the bush?”¹⁵ The contrast between old Europe and the international scene of Geneva, and Canberra in the 1930s – “the world’s newest, most unfinished and unhewn of cities” – is beautifully drawn by Moorhouse. It enables him to explore the possibilities for global thinking afforded to Edith because she is from “one of the still uncompleted nations”. There is a deep truth in this fictional character.

Settler Australians and New Zealanders are in a sense people of the southern North. Economically “first world”, but geographically challenged by ecological circumstance. Our sense of nation is perhaps still “emerging”, when other northern nations are losing or denying theirs. If the northern seasons are right, Antipodeans are somewhere else. Christmas turkey and roast vegetables are the wrong food, the wrong time. December is a time for summer activities, not candles to light the darkness, but religious observance demands that Christmas be celebrated at the same time all over the world, and traditional Christmas celebrations are an important part of northerly citizenship, even for people in southern places who are non-believers.

The edginess between our northern and southern selves makes settler antipodeans natural travellers. We are displaced persons, ever seeking a home or a place in the world. One Aboriginal man commented wryly on this when a host of foreigners came from Melbourne, Canberra, Sydney, Europe, and the United States to a meeting in Timber Creek in the Northern Territory to look at “nomadic lifestyles”. The so-called nomads walked there, or drove. They knew the country as home. It was the so-called “investigators of nomads” who flew in from elsewhere places.¹⁶ Such irony was not lost on the nomads at home in their country.

The right or obligation to travel

If you come from a “centre” you do not *need* to travel. You can choose to travel to see sights, or to contrast home and “other”. But there is another sort of travelling, a “being at home in the world”, to use Jackson’s phrase, that suits transnational citizens of middle class origins who frequently make homes for themselves in nowhere places like the financial markets of the world, London, New York, Hong Kong, Tokyo; the international diplomatic scene, including the United Nations and its associated organisations; and in the travelling markets of academe: the universities of Oxbridge and Ivy League, as well as the red-brick and the new Asian varieties. Some first-world global travellers adopt another identity, either by marriage or by formal citizenship, but many do not need to denounce the old. They simply blur into an in-between transnational citizenship in the global institutions of everywhere/nowhere. Europeans

participate in this global nowhere culture too, of course. The European Union creates a whole alternative culture to being Dutch, Belgian, Croatian or Swedish – but it often struggles to be acceptable in the big old European nations like Britain, France and Germany, except when they are seeking distinction from the singular super-power of the United States of America. Australians, New Zealanders and mobile white South Africans are officially outside the TransAtlantic club of Northern nations, but are very much more part of it than the people who come from the nations of the economic South.¹⁷ The critical difference between the settler travellers from the geographical south is that many feel they *need* to travel. The rite of passage for a young person is often the Big Overseas Trip. By contrast, if you come from the “real” centre of the world, it is acceptable *not* to travel.

I once took a very long ride in a car with Tim from Rhode Island in the United States. He was born and raised in Providence, Rhode Island, and had lived there for 43 years, which I gathered was his age. He visited New Hampshire, an adjacent part of New England about once every six weeks or so to maintain touch with his only daughter, now sixteen and in the eleventh grade at school. He vacationed at home. Through his work – he was a taxi driver – he was very much part of the transnational world, but expressed no curiosity about it. He was confident the world would come to him. And it did. On this particular snowy night, my plane could not land at New York, so I took the option of the Rhode Island plane, the only one out of Pittsburgh that night. “Ice rain” had crippled Pittsburgh airport all afternoon and looked as if it would continue to do so the whole of the next day. I had an Australian sense of distance, and an urgency to get to New York to catch my plane to Australia the next day. My Rhode Island driver had not driven to New York for three years and had never been on an aeroplane in his life. But we set off at 1.30 in the morning on icy roads in steadily falling snow and he drove continuously for three and a half hours, arriving in Manhattan just before five in the morning. The traffic was already building and the weather getting ugly, but I think he made it back to Rhode Island before the worst of the storm struck, closing roads as well as airports later that day. Travelling the full length of the long, skinny state of Connecticut in the dead of night was our shared moment. I returned to Australia on a somewhat delayed plane that night, arriving home to the baking heat of high summer. I doubt Tim will ever consider visiting Australia.

A sense of “other” environments and cultures is enriching and liberating, but globalism comes at a cost. Environment and identity are fundamental to a sense of belonging or being “at home”, but paradoxically, it is the citizens of the world, the people who have a sense of how their home is part of a bigger one, who use up planetary resources in long-distance aeroplane travel. Such people feel “at home” in a range of places, but are restless about being at home. To use Jay Arthur’s apt phrase their “default country” is not a real place, but an amalgam of environmental imaginings. These can have real implications for local environments.¹⁸ Australians and New Zealanders seem to need to establish their place in the global world. They also know there is still so much to do at home to reconcile themselves with people who *know* they belong there, and not to “everyplace”. Both local and global dialogues define their relationships to country, place and their Indigenous fellow citizens.

Michael Jackson and I both travelled to reflect on home. We sought some sort of peace about our place in the world, while we also expressed concern about environmental justice for people of the economic south. We must each live with the anxiety of what such travel does for carbon emissions and the climate change we observe wherever we go, offering up carbon-offsets to assuage guilt, while we try to develop a sense of our place in the world by comparisons with other places.

We also need dialogues between the people who construct “hard science” views of what the global environment is doing, and those who tell the stories, the “facts that are beyond vocabulary”. If the twentieth century was the century of uprootedness, the twenty-first is undoubtedly the era of the Anthropocene, the geological era where people are affecting biophysical systems at a global scale. The Anthropocene is the child of uprootedness, defined as beginning with the Industrial Revolution in 1784 and rapidly increasing since the 1950s, the Great Acceleration, fed by the rapidly multiplying effects of post-war reconstruction and migration.¹⁹ Australia’s history has been tied to the era in which people have changed all the natural systems of Earth, and on a *per capita* basis, it has contributed very significantly to global change. 1788 marked a transition from an Aboriginal culture to an industrialised European culture (without ever having an “agricultural revolution”). Just as global changes were moving Earth into the Anthropocene, this whole continent was ecologically revolutionised. And the

Great Acceleration has disproportionately affected the same continent, with population tripling since 1945, because of immigration and post-war development. The urgent dialogue between the data sets and the stories, the environmentally displaced and disadvantaged and the people with the privileged global view has barely begun. We should do as Judith Wright did and begin at home.

Battling the land and identifying with mongrel country

No doubt droughts and soil erosion and strikes are outstanding features in Australian life, but we are not the only country suffering from these troubles. On the other hand we are the only one that shouts itself hoarse telling all the world what a rotten country this is.

W.M. Hughes (1949)²⁰

Finding “home” in Australia has meant coming to terms with Australian nature with all its richness, and its limitations and ecological exceptionalism. Historically, this struggle has always seemed less important for the country than economics and society. Indeed much of our national citizenly pride is tied up with proving ourselves against the odds, against our “mongrel country”, as Henry Lawson called it.²¹ Shouting ourselves hoarse *telling all the world what a rotten country this is* has been a way to boast about our citizenly prowess. Battling the land, the climate and the nutrient-poor soil has made us the citizens we are today, in the rhetoric of this era. As we enter the twenty-first century and the planet seems set to warm at an escalating pace, relations between environment and identity take on new significance. Being at home in the land is part of environmental management, not just national identity. If home is not imagined via motifs of the Lakes District or yeoman countryside and hollow lanes of England, nor through the financial global markets of the world, London, New York, Tokyo, Beijing – how can it be imagined in Australia? What is an ecologically Australian view of the world?

“Battling the land” has historically been a central motif peddled by politicians and public figures more concerned with present political battles than the long-term effects of this rhetoric on the country and the rest of the world. In this politics we encounter the discomfort between the city – the place where most voters live – and the bush, where most of their food comes from, as well as a significant part of the export income for the country. Perhaps not as significant as in the past, when the Australian economy “rode on the sheep’s back”, but nonetheless the political tensions between country and city persist and nag the state.

Since federation in 1901, urban Australians have always outnumbered rural. The number of primary producers involved in food and fibre production for Australia and the export economy is very small indeed, and shrinking. But an imagined bush life has been important to Australian identity, and the celebration of bush-workers continues in such impressive museums as the Stockman’s Hall of Fame, in Longreach, Queensland, and even in parts of the National Museum of Australia. Such an imagined identity creates a perception that the rural sector is the heart of the nation. Government initiatives endorse primary industry as “national business”, just as defence is regarded as national business, even for those who are not part of the military service. Australians are expected to care about their soldiers and settlers, those who battle with enemies abroad and at home.

The rhetoric of supporting “battlers on the land” started during war-time, when the home-front rallied and grew crops for the national good and the soldiers abroad. Patriotism was built on wars fought elsewhere, on “British-Australian” identity and loyalty to the Queen. The glory of the ANZACs brought honour to England’s “elsewhere lands”, Australia and New Zealand, fighting together, showing they were still patriotically British and fighting British wars. Their blood was spilled, but not on their soil. Gallipoli had nothing to do with defending either Australia or New Zealand. After the Great War, the soldiers came home and were granted parcels of local soil to build a peacetime life. Soldier settlement schemes followed both world wars. The social vision was to provide soldiers with a place to “come home to” – whilst simultaneously developing and populating the interior in Australia. Boosters like writer Ion Idriess exhorted Australians to “get to work then in faith and confidence” and to demonstrate a nationalist independence: “It depends on us alone whether we make or mar it”.²² But the ecological understanding was flawed and the villages of “closer settlement”

designed to provide mutual human support, were predicated on land parcels too small to feed a family. The war continued, with the land itself. Successive governments willingly supported scientific expertise in support of agricultural and pastoral dreams. The “officer corps” for the new battle with the land were government scientists.

The idea that Australians needed to overcome “environmental problems” is deeply embedded in this culture. It has historically privileged science as the leader of “solutions”. Scientists are often called on to represent nature: they are prominent speakers for rivers, land management, air quality, marine microbiology and now climate change. In studying “natural resources”, scientists work closely with managers, policy makers and governments, federal and state, and often define the ways these groups understand nature. Scientific stories have a history and cultural ramifications. Funding for science in Australia has been directed overwhelmingly at overcoming difficulties and solving problems such as rabbits, droughts, floods, and erosion that arose through the mismatch between the dominant settler vision for the country, and the way the place worked ecologically. There has been much less funding for the sciences that studied the ecological workings of the place under Aboriginal management, those that develop understanding of the plants and animals that were there before the “battlers” were granted their blocks for settlement.

The twentieth-century settler project wrested an impressive income from “developing” the world’s driest, inhabited continent. It also ennobled the “battling”. Rhetoric about “developing the nation”, has underpinned the economy of the nation and of the science working in its service. Since the 1920s when the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) was established, and in the era of post-war expansion when CSIR became CSIRO, science too has “battled”, and appeared throughout history as a foot-soldier in a hostile place.²³ When, following the bombing of Darwin in 1942, defending the Empty North became an issue of national security, scientists were “sent in” to battle long and hard to defeat the elements of tropical Australia: humidity and heat, rugged terrain, isolation, poor soil and massive floods.²⁴ In 2007 there were still politicians like Bill Heffernan, calling for more northern development, to use the water that lands there in such plenty (and is predicted to increase) while the southern farmers “battle” the latest drought and the forecast for declining rainfalls under most climate change models.²⁵

A practical science of the possible laid the foundations for a peculiarly Australian version of the international project of “sustainability” in the twenty-first century. To date science has worked within the constraints of national economic aspirations, but sustainability demands considering what sort of *home* such aspirations produce, and what the local choices made in Australia might mean for the world at large.

Australia in the world

Ecologists now describe Australia as a “megadiverse” country with a tarnished reputation.²⁶ Australia has the doubtful honour of leading the world in mammalian extinctions. It continues to have the highest number of threatened species on the planet. Climate scientists observe that conditions on this continent are already more variable and uncertain than in the rest of the world, and they point out that this story can only become more complicated as global warming and human-induced climate change affect areas already under stress. In short, questions of survival and sustainability in Australia demand reconciliation between an old land and a nation, and a recognition of Australia’s responsibility to global biodiversity.

If Australia is a “state of mind”, as Judith Wright suggested 45 years ago, we need to consider the role of science in creating that state of mind. Science has the potential to contribute new states of mind and to entrench old ones. It is a matter of choice whether it can be drawn in to the big questions of reconciling our lifestyle and our place, and whether other stories will be heard. The global ecological crisis demands that we bring together locally a diversity of voices, Indigenous and settler, with the skills of science and the art of the humanities, in creating a nation that is truly fitting for its continent. We need to create the possibility of a home where we stop “battling”, and live in peace within our ecological limits.²⁷

Notes

1. Libby Robin, author of *How a Continent Created a Nation* (2007), is a historian at the Fenner School of Environment and Society, Australian National University and the Centre for Historical Research,

-
- National Museum of Australia. Her latest book, co-edited with Chris Dickman and Mandy Martin, is *Desert Channels: The Impulse to Conserve* (2010).
2. Judith Wright (1961), "The Upside-Down Hut", *Australian Letters* 3(4), pp. 30-33. Part of this quote was used by Martin Mulligan to stimulate discussion at the Two Fires Festival, Braidwood, 2007.
 3. Michael Jackson (1995), *At Home in the World*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, p. 1.
 4. Libby Robin (1997), "Ecology: A science of empire?", in Tom Griffiths and Libby Robin (eds) *Ecology and Empire: Environmental History of Settler Societies*, Keele University Press, Edinburgh, pp. 63-75.
 5. Ursula K. Heise (2008), *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global*, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 48-49.
 6. Peter L. Berger, Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner (1973), *The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness*, Random House, New York.
 7. Jackson, *At Home in the World*, p. 4.
 8. Libby Robin and Mike Smith (2007), "Science in Place and Time: Archaeology, Ecology and Environmental History", in Chris Dickman, Daniel Lunney and Shelley Burgin (eds) *Animals of Arid Australia: Out on Their Own?*, RZNSW, Mosman, pp. 188-96.
 9. Deborah Bird Rose (1996), *Nourishing Terrains*, Australian Heritage Commission, Canberra.
 10. Jackson (1995), *At Home in the World*, p. 2.
 11. Jackson (1995), *At Home in the World*, p. 4.
 12. John Berger (1983), *Jonah Who Will Be Twenty-Five in the Year 2000: A Play*. North Atlantic Books, Berkeley, CA, p. 77.
 13. Frank Moorhouse, *Grand Days*, Picador, Sydney, p. 400.
 14. Moorhouse (1994), *Grand Days*, p. 516.
 15. Frank Moorhouse (2001), *Dark Palace*, Vintage, Sydney, pp. 261-62.
 16. Darrell Lewis, pers. comm., March 2007.
 17. There are of course middle class Indians (for example) who would also fit this stereotype. Many well-to-do Indians have travelled throughout the old Commonwealth for generations. Their situation is quite unlike Indians whose circumstances have never given them the opportunity to travel. Such travellers might still identify as "Indian" but carry another passport – Canadian, Australian, US, etc.
 18. J. M. Arthur (2003), *The Default Country: A Lexical Cartography of Twentieth-century Australia*, UNSW Press, Sydney.
 19. Paul J. Crutzen (2002), "Geology of Mankind", *Nature*, 415, p. 23; Paul J. Crutzen and Eugene F. Stoermer (2000), "The 'Anthropocene'", *IGBP Newsletter*, 41, pp. 17-18; Paul J. Crutzen and Will Steffen (2003), "Editorial Comment: How Long Have We Been in the Anthropocene Era?", *Climatic Change*, 61(3), pp. 251-57; Libby Robin and Will Steffen (2007), "History for the Anthropocene", *History Compass*, 5(5), pp. 1694-719.
 20. Letter from W. M. (Billy) Hughes to Russell John Dumas, 29 December 1944. NLA Hughes MS 1538, S48.
 21. Henry Lawson, "His country after all", from *While the Billy Boils*, 1896, p. 51.
 22. Ion L. Idriess (1944), *Onward Australia: Developing a Continent*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, p. 264.
 23. Brad Collis (2002), *Fields of Discovery: Australia's CSIRO*, Allen and Unwin, Crows Nest, NSW; Libby Robin, "Ecology: A Science of Empire?"
 24. Libby Robin (2007), *How a Continent Created a Nation*, UNSW Press, Sydney, pp. 123-51.
 25. Prime Minister's Australia Day Speech, 26 January 2007. See: Peter Michael, "North could be transformed by run-off", *Courier Mail*, 26 January 26, 2007. See also Libby Robin, "The Empty North", ABC Radio National, *Perspective*, 15 March 2007.
 26. David Lindenmayer and Mark Burgman (2005), *Practical Conservation Biology*, CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne, p. 1.
 27. Robin (2007), *How a Continent Created a Nation*, pp. 183-212.