

Section I 25 marks

Attempt Question 1

Allow about 1 hour for this section

Answer the question in a writing booklet

Extra writing paper is available

In your answer you will be assessed on how well you:

- present a detailed, logical and well-structured answer to the question
- use relevant issues of historiography
- use relevant sources to support your argument

Using the Sources, answer the question that follows.

Source A

In *Whitewash*, Robert Manne has edited a collection of essays responding to Windschuttle's book. Manne has gathered some impressive authors. Some offer reflective comment, while others engage directly with Windschuttle's attacks on them. Windschuttle identifies Lyndall Ryan as a key culprit. In her contribution to *Whitewash*, Ryan explains that mistakes in the end notes of her book *The Aboriginal Tasmanians* occurred when some references were accidentally placed out of order. Her other misdemeanours include mixing up the names of colonial newspapers and mislocating one massacre - "minor infractions", asserts Ryan, "certainly not 'fabrications'". She is right to ask: "Who, pray, is the real fabricator?"

Henry Reynolds shows how Windschuttle "operates a system of filters" in his use of historical evidence. It is through a filter that he asserts the Aborigines in Tasmania "did not own the land". Windschuttle's only evidence for this claim is that the Aborigines "didn't have a word for property". Reynolds lists the many sources Windschuttle disregarded, including Tasmanian Aboriginal words for "my country" - clear evidence of a territorial claim.

Two welcome inclusions in *Whitewash* are the Aboriginal voices of Peggy Patrick and Greg Lehman. Lehman, a Tasmanian, explains how "truth" and "facts" of history-telling are secondary in Aboriginal culture to the notions of respect and trust.

Nowhere has Windschuttle more notably disregarded these concepts than in accusing Patrick of fabricating her story of the Mistake Creek massacre. Windschuttle said it was not possible that Patrick's mother was killed in 1915. He misinterpreted Patrick's Aboriginal English: "mum mother" means grandmother, not mother. "Bad enough this terrible thing bin happen," Patrick tells us. Worse that Windschuttle "make big shame for me all over".

Throughout *Whitewash*, we are reminded of Windschuttle's dispassion. He counts the dead but is unmoved by their passing. He concludes that 118 Aborigines were killed on the Tasmanian frontier. Mark Finnane, employing standard social science methodologies, concludes this death rate was proportionally three times higher than that of Australian soldiers in World War I. He wonders why Windschuttle, whose work demonstrates the violence of the colonial frontier, "evades his own conclusions".

Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle's Fabrication of Aboriginal History, Rebe Taylor, October 25, 2003 SMH

<http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2003/10/24/1066631621572.html>

Source B

The biggest single invention was made by Henry Reynolds in his book *The Other Side of the Frontier*. He claimed that 10,000 Aborigines were killed in Queensland before federation. The source he provides is an article of his own called "The Unrecorded Battlefields of Queensland", which he wrote in 1978. But if you look up the article you find something very strange. It is not about Aboriginal deaths at all. It is a tally of the number of whites killed by Aborigines. Nowhere does it mention an Aboriginal death toll of 10,000. Reynolds gave a false citation for his evidence.

For most of my adult life I was a true believer of the story of Aboriginal genocide and frontier warfare. I had never done any archival research in the field but nonetheless used the principal historical works of Henry Reynolds, Lyndall Ryan, Charles Rowley and others in lectures I gave in university courses in Australian history and Australian social policy. I used to tell students that the record of the British in Australia was worse than the Spaniards in America. However, in 2000 I was asked to review a book by Perth journalist Rod Moran about the infamous Forrest River Massacre in the Kimberley in 1926. Moran convinced me that there had been no massacre at Forrest River. There were no eyewitnesses and no bodies found. The charred remains of bones at first thought to be of Aborigines shot and cremated were shown by forensic examination not to be of human origin. They probably belonged to kangaroos and wallabies. So-called "massacre sites" were nothing but old Aboriginal camp sites. A list of Aborigines gone missing from the local mission, and suspected to have been murdered, turned out to be a fake, concocted by the white clergyman running the mission. Many of those on his list were recorded alive and well years later.

The fabrication of Aboriginal history; Keith Windschuttle: Paper to NSW Higher School Certificate History Extension conference, June 2, 2004

<http://www.sydneyle.com/NSW%20HSC%20extension%202004.htm>

Question 1 (25 marks)

With reference to the sources and other sources, what can the student of history learn about the nature of history from the Windschuttle/Reynolds debate?

Section II 25 marks

Attempt Question 2

Allow about 1 hour for this section

Answer the question in a writing booklet

Extra writing paper is available

In your answer you will be assessed on how well you:

- **present a detailed, logical and well-structured answer to the question**
- **use an appropriate case study**
- **present a balanced treatment of the historians and the areas of debate selected for discussion**

Question 2 (25 marks)

'The main concern of historians is to make history relevant for contemporary society.'

With reference to the above quotation, assess TWO areas of historical debate that highlight differing interpretations of your chosen case study.