

'Better to be mistaken than to deceive': The Fabrication of Aboriginal History and the Van Diemonien Record.

In the midst of claim and counter claim about white - black relations in Van Diemen's Land, two core haunting facts remain the solid rocks around which the waves of dissent swirl.

First, within thirty years of white settlement of the island, thousands of Aborigines were dead and virtually all of the remnant of a people who had lived on the island for at least thirty thousand years, were in exile in Bass Strait.

Second, that while was a significant level of peaceful black-white interaction in the first decades following white settlement, by the late 1820s this had been supplanted by very high levels of violence. There is no dispute that approximately 187 whites, were killed in the seven years from 1824 to 1831. The comparative number of Aborigines who died violent deaths at the hands of the British has been a matter of contention for 170 years, although all but the most recent entrant in the debate, Keith Windschuttle, have professed the issue to be uncertain.

Since the 1830s these twin facts have underpinned a belief among historians, writers and the informed community in Tasmania that the suffering of the Aborigines, and the violence between white and black, was a consequence of British settlement. Such a conclusion was also the view of most contemporary commentators. As Governor Arthur put it in 1834, the wrongs of the Aborigines were "many ... disguise it as we may, we are the intruders."ⁱ

The *Fabrication of Aboriginal History* by Keith Windschuttle does not dispute these two foundation facts of Tasmanian history. However, a radical new interpretation of them is presented that dismisses British culpability in Aboriginal deaths or black-white violence. The ethical/legal responsibilities and implications that, at least potentially, are usually seen to follow from British settlement are thus rejected. This reinterpretation is at the heart of *Fabrication's* thesis. It is what most sets it apart from 170 years of diverse historical writing about Van Diemens Land, that is lumped together by Windschuttle as the 'Orthodox school'.

Fabrication's thesis

How does Windschuttle reinterpret these two facts? In relation to the causes of Aboriginal deaths, *Fabrication* claims "the evidence for disease ... as the major cause of depopulation is compelling"ⁱⁱ. The secondary cause was Aboriginal culture's purported abuse of women. Lest any British culpability in such deaths linger, the vulnerability of Aborigines to disease is also linked to inherent negative characteristics of Aboriginal society. *Fabrication's* key chapter on *The death toll and the demise of the Aboriginal population, 1803-1834*, concludes:

*The real tragedy of the Aborigines was not British colonization per se but that their society was, on the one hand, so internally dysfunctional and, on the other hand, so incompatible with the looming presence of the rest of the world. Until the 19th Century, their isolation had left them without comparisons with other cultures that might have helped them reform their ways. But nor did they produce any wise men of their own who might have foreseen the long-term consequences of their own behaviour and devised ways to curb it. They had survived for millennia, it is true, but it seems clear that this owed more to good fortune than good management. The 'slow strangulation of the mind' was true not only of their technical abilities but also of their social relationships. Hence it was not surprising that when the British arrived, this small precarious society quickly collapsed under the dual weight of the susceptibility of its members to disease and the abuse and neglect of its women.*ⁱⁱⁱ

What of the second indisputable foundation fact of black-white relations in Van Diemen's Land concerning the very high levels of violence from the mid to late 1820s? *Fabrication* presents this as a one sided criminal action again linked to inherent negative characteristics of Aboriginal society. The 'orthodox' view that the violence was linked to the explosion in the numbers of white people and sheep moving on to the main Aboriginal hunting grounds, the woody grasslands and coastal bays and estuaries, during the 1820s is rejected by Windschuttle on the basis of his new theory of Aboriginal society.

Aborigines are described in *Fabrication* as "a people who not only had no political objectives but no sense of a collective interest of any kind." This enables Windschuttle to argue that there was no Aboriginal- British conflict as such, just a whole series of individual outrages, motivated on the part of Aborigines by nothing more than "crime or revenge." Aboriginal attacks are explained as raids primarily to obtain desired European goods while, "The reasons why Aboriginal thieves had little compunction about killing anyone they found in their way," was because "their own culture had no sanctions against the murder of anyone outside their immediate clan....They were killed simply because they could be."^{iv}

Thus the cause of both the near demise of the Aborigines and the high levels of black-white violence are seen as inherent to traditional Aboriginal culture. The two foundation facts of Tasmanian history are reinterpreted to argue that, other than representing "the inevitable arrival of the outside world"^v, British settlement was not the cause of either Aboriginal suffering or resistance.

Contrary to the perception created both by media coverage and Windschuttle's Quadrant article, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* is not primarily a review of other historian's work, but an argument in support of this radical new thesis about Aboriginal-British relations. As Windschuttle explained in *Fabrication*: "This series is not only a study of historians. Embedded within its critique is an alternative version of its subject, a counter-history of race relations in this country."^{vi} *Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle's*

Fabrication of Aboriginal History was primarily concerned to dispute the evidence presented in support for Windschuttle's 'counter history'.

Whitewash confirms the Fabrication of Aboriginal History?

In the October 2003 issue of *Quadrant* Windschuttle responded to *Whitewash*. This article, titled *Whitewash confirms the Fabrication of Aboriginal History*, argues:

The first volume of *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History* makes three main points. First, there was no genocide in Tasmania. Second, there was nothing that deserved the label of frontier warfare either. Third, those historians who have claimed there was either genocide or frontier warfare, especially Henry Reynolds, Lyndall Ryan and Lloyd Robson, have misinterpreted and grossly exaggerated the conflict between Aborigines and colonists that did occur and, in a number of cases, invented their evidence.

The body of the work is essentially an expansion of these opening lines. The principal claims made either ignore factual easily verifiable errors already pointed out^{vii}, repeat others,^{viii} or are based on false premises^{ix}. And indeed, another factual mistake is now asserted in a flawed attempt to ridicule one of Windschuttle's main targets: Lyndall Ryan.^x

Of greater concern, however, is that the article does not discuss the central issues in contention. It is legitimate and important to have a debate about genocide, although to do so in the context of responding to *Whitewash* is difficult since none of its contributors, with the possible exception of Lyndall Ryan, have advocated it.^{xi} It is legitimate to have a debate about whether there was frontier 'warfare', although, as *Fabrication* concedes, there can be no doubt that the British by the late 1820s defined the fighting as warfare, and the question of whether the Aborigines conceptualized their resistance in a way that exactly corresponds with the (disputed) English term 'war' will be difficult to establish. It is also legitimate to debate about whether estimates of the probable number of Aborigines killed both overall, and in particular massacres, have sometimes been exaggerated (indeed this is one of the oldest discussions in Tasmanian historiography). Finally it is legitimate to debate footnotes, sources and even historian's motives, although the case for deliberate 'fabrication' (rather than occasional mistakes) by so many for so long, would seem an ambitious one.^{xii}

It is not legitimate however to claim that these 'three main points' summarise *Fabrication's* thesis. Windschuttle argued against an 'orthodoxy' that was far broader than those who have talked of genocide, frontier war and high massacre tolls. *Fabrication* is quite clear that the 'orthodox' includes all those who, over the past 170 years, have believed that a high number of Aborigines were killed by whites, that there was "systematic Aboriginal resistance" motivated by negative impacts on Aborigines associated with the occupation of their land, and that British settlement was therefore the primary cause of the tragedy impacting on the Aborigines.^{xiii}

These orthodox essentials do not stand or fall on Windschuttle's 'three main points'. An even more illogical jump would be to imply that *Fabrication's* "alternative version of its subject" is proven by them, a sort of right by default logic which would be patently absurd.

Windschuttle's *Quadrant* defence has in fact ignored the main conclusions of his own counter history and on the debate concerning this. The primary question that has still received no response, and scant public attention, remains: What is the evidence presented in *Fabrication*, and countered in *Whitewash*, for Windschuttle's bold reinterpretation of the twin foundation facts of black-white relations in Van Diemen's Land? That is, how compelling is the evidence that was presented in support of *Fabrication's* views about the causes of Aboriginal deaths and the reasons for white-black violence, and the associated conclusion that British culpability was limited, or even non-existent?

Evidence presented for Fabrication's conclusions about the cause of Aboriginal deaths: a methodological fatal flaw.

First, consider the claims regarding *Fabrication's* disease thesis. In doing so it is important to remember Windschuttle's own standards regarding evidence, which he again spells out in *Quadrant*:

As a general and obvious point, if historians want to claim that something actually did happen they have to produce evidence that it did. If they lack the evidence, they should admit they don't know. To make claims without evidence, especially about Aboriginal deaths, is illegitimate.

In developing, and accepting revisions to *Fabrication's* Table 10, which purports to be a "to record every killing of an Aborigines between 1803 and 1834 for which there is a plausible record of some kind"^{xiv} Windschuttle applies a very restricted interpretation of acceptable evidence. Of all the many examples of primary sources chronicling violence against Aborigines ignored in *Fabrication* and presented in *Whitewash*, only one is now accepted by Windschuttle in *Quadrant* as relevant to his primary conclusion about the low number of Aborigines killed by whites. He is now prepared to concede the possibility of the "death of one Aboriginal woman, which I had not noted ... Needless to say this sole incident does not alter the picture of a very low indigenous death toll." Thus bloody descriptions of frontier violence by, among others, Hobler, Amos, Steele, Ross, Burn and Lloyd, apparently remain irrelevant to *Fabrication's* case. Even one of *Fabrication's* listed Christian exemplars, Roderick O'Connor still can't get a guernsey, despite having told the government appointed Aborigines Committee (that Windschuttle generally relies heavily on), that Douglas Ibbens has killed "half the eastern mob".^{xv} In short, unless there is an eyewitness description complete with body count, Windschuttle maintains his belief that there is no legitimate evidence, and, even more bizarrely, no death.

So, remembering such standards, what is the evidence provided in *Fabrication* for its own argument as to the cause of Aboriginal deaths? If *Fabrication* presented a Table 11, aiming to record every death by disease “of an Aborigines between 1803 and 1834 for which there is a plausible record of some kind”, what would, based on the evidence presented in the book, be in it? It is an extraordinary fact that, as *Whitewash* points out, Windschuttle has only one piece of evidence for any death from disease before 1829, a conversation recorded by Bonwick in a book published in 1870.

Windschuttle’s further difficulty is that by his own standards such second hand argument would not even be included or mentioned in a Table 11. Bonwick and other 19th Century historians record much similar oral testimony of deaths by violence. None of this passed on ‘hearsay’ is included in Table 10.

A Table 11 would of course list many deaths from disease from 1829 on, but these would cause even more serious problems for Windschuttle’s primary conclusion, as they would seem to add to white culpability, not reduce it. The west coast people, whose lands were been evacuated not settled at the time, had a full demographic when Governor Arthur’s emissary, George Augustus Robinson, captured them under force of arms in the winter of 1833 and confined them in the most feared punishment section of the most notorious gaol in the British empire, Macquarie Harbour.^{xvi} Thirteen Aborigines died in two weeks from 24 July due to this forced confinement. Yet when Robinson risked letting them go on August 7, in a desperate, if tragically belated, attempt to stop the carnage, it took less than a week until he reported they were “all well” again. These deaths directly followed from the armed capture and the forced imprisonment of the Aborigines. Do they then rightly belong in Table 10? If not, how can deaths from disease be honestly presented as a separate category from white violence, and only incidentally connected to British settlement? Do such deaths in fact defy any of Windschuttle’s methodological isolation cells? Just where would a Table 10 or 11 place Penenebope the Aborigine described by Robinson as a “fine young man about 20 years of age”, who killed (or saved?) himself by throwing his body on to the rocks surrounding his tiny island prison on 1 August 1833, in either despair or madness at such forced confinement?^{xvii}

The well known deaths in exile in Flinders Island would of course dramatically expand Table 11. Who possibly could document such deaths from ‘disease’, however, without the conclusion of limited white culpability wearing thin? How many would have lived if the ‘politics’ of the day, hadn’t so long prevented the Aborigines return to the mainland of Tasmania? If Aborigines were just inherently vulnerable to introduced disease, regardless of the circumstances forced on them, why did most of the Aboriginal women living with the sealers, enjoy such contrasting good health and longevity?

The hard fact, spelt out in *Whitewash*, and still ignored by Windschuttle, is that in Van Diemen’s Land, in contrast to most mainland regions, there is no direct evidence for significant levels of Aboriginal deaths from disease until there was forced confinement and concentration with whites from the late 1820s. *Fabrication* cites the early disease epidemics at Port Phillip and Port Jackson

as 'evidence', without pointing out the obvious problem, why was nothing similar ever seen in Van Diemen's Land?

Moreover there is direct evidence that suggest deaths from disease may have been fairly low at least up to 1820, which Windschuttle has also still not responded to. The combination of long sailing times which meant that infectious diseases 'burnt out' at sea, protein rich diet, clean water, very low levels of people movement and an effective small pox vaccination program meant that until the 1820s Van Diemen's Land was a remarkably healthy place for Europeans. Surgeon Luttrell in Hobart Town told Commissioner Bigge in 1820, "Measles, hooping cough, small pox...None of them are known here, nor is scarlet fever. (*sic*)"

The limited evidence available suggests this low level of disease among Europeans may have reduced Aboriginal mortality also. In response to a direct question from Bigge concerning the diseases of the Aborigines, Luttrell replied, " I don't know any other than the cutaneous (skin) eruption I have just mentioned. We have had some in the hospital, that have been brought in the last stage of dysentery.....(*sic*)^{xviii}

Luttrell ran a sort of temporary hospital specifically for Aborigines in Hobart in late 1819 in response to a number being ill. None seem to have died however and Sorell soon told the surgeon he wanted it closed because of the rental cost of the building, and the good health of Aborigines. "The Lieutenant Governor finding Mr. Luttrell's report that the native peoples are in good health, excepting the cutaneous disorder to which they re more or less liable, will desire that they may be conveyed into the country, so that the hire of the place occupied by them many cease on Saturday next."^{xix}

Moreover, as *Whitewash* points out, since none of the sources available on Aborigines between 1804 and 1820 have been cited by Windschuttle, he was presumably unaware that no contemporary observers support his case. For example James Kelly's circumnavigation of the island in the summer of 1815-16 in an open five oared boat, involved a number of meetings with large groups of Aboriginal people including small children, suggesting that population numbers were holding up fairly well. No reports of disease were given.^{xx} There was also considerable other contact with Aborigines documented in various regions, even Hobart and Launceston, before 1825, yet Aborigines suffering from fatal disease, again in stark contrast to many other parts of Australia, is nowhere described in the available documentary record. Moreover, reports from the comparatively isolated Aboriginal populations of the North West before 1828 and the west coast as late as Robinson's visit in 1833, confirm more isolated Aboriginal groups still having a full demographic, including infants and the elderly, those most prone to death from disease.

Of course none of this means that many Aborigines did not die from disease, although the proportion of such deaths in the first two decades after settlement may well have been considerably lower than elsewhere in Australia. Certainly all historians of Van Diemen's Land have always

accepted that many Aborigines probably died from introduced disease. When white - black relations are considered in a broader context, all relevant evidence and not just eyewitness accounts are reviewed, and probabilities, not certainties, are put forward, significant levels of Aboriginal death from disease remains a reasonable conclusion to present.

The point is that the application of Windschuttle's courtroom definition of permissible evidence to his disease hypothesis, would make *Fabrication's* own conclusion untenable. The acceptable standard of evidence must be broadened, lest any historian be left spouting nonsense. Without such adjustment, the logic of Windschuttle's position would in fact be that all the 'plausible' deaths of Aborigines before 1829 were the result of violence, a conclusion which no one would defend. Further since *Fabrication's* Table 10 lists no 'highly plausible' aboriginal deaths from white violence until August 1830, there is, according to Windschuttle's logic, not one single account of a 'highly plausible' Aboriginal death, whether by violence or disease, for the first 27 years following British settlement. Given the undisputed central fact that thousands were confirmed dead in this time, readers are surely entitled to ask just what Windschuttle believed happened to them all?

Fabrication's methodology is, self evidently, fatally flawed. In this area of research historians must make judgements drawing on all documentary evidence available from a range of sources, not just eyewitness body counts. The overall questions must be considered in context, and conclusions reached on the basis of informed judgment. The vast majority of Aborigines died away from the eyes of a white person describing it for perpetuity, whether it is from disease or violence. Broad evidence criteria must be the basis of such judgments, lest radically misleading, very bizarre, and, obviously mistaken, conclusions, be reached. This is not some new 'politically correct' or 'post modern' view of history, it has always been so. Probably the best known defence of a traditional empirical approach to history is that of the late Sir Geoffrey Elton in his 1967 book, *The Practice of History*. Windschuttle has professed great respect for Elton,^{xxi} a conservative in both politics and method, who points out:

The ultimate problem of historical evidence, as has often been recognised, is that none of it occurs in isolation. The interaction and interdependence of things are...manifest...The discovery of truth requires not only...acquaintance with the available evidence and scholarly assessment of it – but also imaginative reconstruction and interpretation.

In short what is necessary, Elton recognised, is "the application of informed standards of probability."^{xxii} No where is this more important than in understanding why, in the space of three decades, thousands of Aborigines tragically died in Van Diemen's Land.

Evidence for Windschuttle's claims about the causes of black – white violence: unaddressed factual mistakes

What of Windschuttle's other principal conclusion that reinterprets the second foundation fact of black-white relations in Van Diemen's Land, concerning the causes of the violence? The death of approximately 187 whites from 1824 to 1831 has always been understood as a response to the impacts on Aborigines of white settlement. What was the 'alternative version' of the cause of these killings argued in *Fabrication*?

Fabrication claims that:

the spread of white settlement in the 1820's was certainly a major cause of the increase in black violence; but not for the reason the orthodox school proposes. Far from generating black resentment, the expansion of settlement instead gave the Aborigines more opportunity and more temptation to engage in robbery and murder, two customs they had come to relish.....It was a tragedy the Aborigines adopted such senseless violence.

Whitewash pointed out that *Fabrication*'s argument that Aborigines killed more whites in the 1820s because there was "more opportunity" and "more temptation" does not hold up to even precursory analysis. The British were living throughout most of the native grasslands of the island by 1820, and in their isolation and low numbers were far more potentially vulnerable to Aboriginal aggression than those who looked after the merinos of the gentleman land grantees of the late 1820s. As Lieutenant Governor Sorell pointed out in 1819, "It is ...most certain that if the natives were intent upon destruction...the mischief done by them to the owners of cattle or sheep, which are now dispersed for grazing over so great a part of the interior country, would be increased a hundred fold..." .

Whitewash also demonstrated that *Fabrication*'s analysis underpinning its conclusion was riddled with elementary error. *Fabrication* made four main points to discredit the two principal factors associated with white settlement that, especially from the mid 1820s, have generally been understood as motivating Aboriginal resistance; as Windschuttle put it, "the destruction of native game...and the alienation of Aborigines from their traditional lands." ^{xxiii} All four points have been shown in *Whitewash* to be wrong, not just in interpretation, but fact.

Fabrication confused white land ownership with land occupation to 'prove' that white land use hardly impacted on the Aborigines until the mid 1820's. ^{xxiv} It claims white hunting of "native game, mainly kangaroo...only lasted until January 1811", when the very well documented slaughter, that was to lead to the extinction of the Tasmanian emu and the near extinction of the forester kangaroo, had hardly then begun. ^{xxv} It believes that the paucity of fences shows that Aborigines could easily access their traditional lands, when in fact this combined with the need to separate and control valuable merino flocks in the face of Aboriginal hunting and land management techniques, that relied on dogs and fire, only exacerbated such conflict. ^{xxvi} Finally it argues that "The strongest argument that the colonists possession of their land was not the reason behind the Aborigines violence was that they took so long to respond

to the British presence.” In fact, Aborigines soon met with each of the three groups of British settling over 1803-4, at Risdon, Sullivans Cove and Port Dalrymple.^{xxvii}

Windschuttle’s *Quadrant* response to *Whitewash* does not address these errors or their implications for his ‘counter history’. Indeed the only (indirect) acknowledgment of any of *Fabrication*’s mistakes in *Quadrant* is on the question of Aboriginal attachment to land, where he seems to have moderated his position. In the eight pages of discussion on this specific issue in *Fabrication*, Windschuttle did not concede anything more than:

that some Aborigines did identify themselves with certain territories to which they had an emotional affinity because of childhood and family connections....Beyond this, however, there is no evidence from what we know of Tasmanian Aboriginal culture that they had a concept of what other societies know as ‘land’ at all. ...The Aborigines did not even have a word for it ... Nor did they have words for ‘own’, ‘possess’, or ‘property’, or any of their derivatives.”^{xxviii}

By contrast in *Quadrant* Windschuttle claims that Aborigines did not have a word for, or “mindset” of land “in terms of English usage, that is, as a two-dimensional space marked by definite boundaries...” However they “had obvious attachments to these territories.” He even belatedly accepts that they may “Love their country” and that “they obviously felt very possessive about the fruits of the land”, but still maintains that there “is simply no evidence that they felt the same about the land itself.”

Windschuttle does not, however, it seems, recognise the difficulty that even this small (and welcome), shift in emphasis has on his central argument. In *Fabrication* the argument that Aborigines had “no sense of a collective interest of any kind” is his main ‘evidence’ that they were not fighting to defend any such interest.^{xxix} Love of country and possessiveness of its resources would both seem to suggest otherwise, regardless of the discussion about the definition of the word ‘land’.

Windschuttle makes no other even indirect corrections, acknowledgments or justifications in *Quadrant* to the other elementary errors set out in *Whitewash* that riddle *Fabrication*’s analysis.^{xxx} The explanation for what seems an extraordinary level of ignorance about Van Diemen’s Land inevitably revolves around *Fabrication*’s selection and use of the primary sources.

Ignorance or deceit? Fabrication’s use of primary sources

Whitewash points out, on the basis of the footnotes and Bibliography contained in *Fabrication*, that Windschuttle has overlooked almost all the published and unpublished diaries, letters and personal accounts of Van Diemen’s Land. The result is a profound lack of context for *Fabrication*’s discussion of black – white relations, and an ignorance about the realities of Van Diemonien life.

Fabrication overwhelmingly relies on a selection of the Colonial Secretary Office papers concerning Aborigines. These are largely confined to the 1827 to 1832 period. These are indeed a rich collection and, as Windschuttle emphasizes in *Quadrant*, contain many settler letters and opinions, but only, as he neglects to add, as they were communicated to Government or official committees. They do not contain any record of the private opinions and experience of settlers. They contain nothing that they were not happy for the Government to know. The critical question of how much 'unofficial' violence against Aborigines occurred, or the story underpinning the explosion in such violence at the local level, can hardly be established by such. It is surely not surprising that their general theme is that blame for the violence rests mostly with the convict and exconvict stock-keepers, shepherds and bushrangers, the one group almost completely unrepresented in the consultation and committee processes recorded in it. (Although in the context of *Fabrication's* new paradigm, even this interpretation seems progressive.)

The assumption in *Whitewash* was that *Fabrication's* neglect of the many primary sources that would have balanced Windschuttle's account was due to his ignorance of them. *Fabrication* seemed to have been researched in a rush. Even the few non official sources listed were almost all characterised by the unusual gift of an index, and seemed to have been little studied beyond their direct references to Aborigines.^{xxxix} The result was not only that Windschuttle missed some eyewitness accounts of violence that record the number of Aboriginal dead, the only point he has now conceded in even a small way, but that he neglects a much larger body of evidence that acknowledges and reflects more broadly on frontier realities, including the very high levels of violence.

The conflict between the Aborigines and the British settlers and convicts can not be studied in a vacuum. Scholars need to understand the realities of Van Diemonien life, especially in frontier regions, if they are to understand black-white relations and the overall level of violence that occurred. Without such an understanding mistake compounded on mistake in *Fabrication*, because evidence taken out of context was evidence misunderstood.

For example, only someone who did not understand the enormous gap between Government proclamations 'ordering' restraint and on the ground frontier reality in all sorts of areas, could believe that in Aboriginal policy alone the two were magically one.^{xxxix} Only someone who had read so little of the private musings of the settlers real struggles, but fierce determination to defend home, investments, crops and families could present the settlers as so limited in their retaliation to Aboriginal violence. Only someone who had read almost no personal reflections and testimonies could imagine that the evangelical revival had a significant restraining impact on frontier behaviour. Finally only someone who had not lived with the implications of the profound gaps in even Government records before 1825 could have possibly believed that "except for a handful of gaps, there are good records of the activities of almost the entire colonial population from 1803 to the 1840s."^{xxxix}

However Windschuttle's *Quadrant* defence has made even this *Whitewash* discussion, and the charge underpinning it, redundant. The question of ignorance about the reality of Van Diemen's Land revealed in *Fabrication* must now give way to a far more serious matter, the possibility of deliberate deceit.

In *Quadrant* Windschuttle asks the readers of *Fabrication* to accept that he had read the many sources that don't make it into *Fabrication*'s Bibliography, because the "bibliography is a list of what I footnoted, not what I read. It was produced by cutting and pasting from the footnotes." Presumably this also explains the inclusion of sources that have not been read, but cited by others, such as the account by the French explorer, Francois Peron. Windschuttle's Bibliography therefore excludes sources that he has read but not quoted from, but includes other important primary sources that he has seen cited but not read. By the standards of traditional historical scholarship, that Windschuttle professes to uphold, this would have been a serious matter. As Arthur Marwick put it in 1970, the Bibliography was originally "intended as kind of adjunct to the footnotes: a final statement of the sources upon which a certain piece of historical writing claimed to rest. It was (and, in the realm of pure scholarship, still is) reckoned the most serious of crimes to mention in the bibliography a source you have not actually consulted."^{xxxiv} (brackets original)

Still, it is true that standards and practices in this area among historians now vary. It remains important, however, for the historian, as Marwick puts it, "to be clear what kind of bibliography he is compiling".^{xxxv} Windschuttle has not been and it is now incumbent on him, if his bibliography is in fact a reference list, to state this and exclude from it all sources he has not cited.

This however is not the most urgent or serious issue raised by Windschuttle's *Quadrant* defence. It is the credibility and honesty of *Fabrication*'s references that have now become the critical question. The importance of footnotes was explained by Windschuttle in *Fabrication*:

The role of the footnote is to make historians publicly accountable....The footnote's role is to permit a reader to check the author's sources, references, facts, quotations and generalisations....In particular, if a work of history makes a contentious claim, the author often gives a footnote and uses that footnote's text to comment on the evidence about the controversy itself.^{xxxvi}

In public debate since, Windschuttle has continued to emphasise the undoubted importance of referencing: "all historians have a public responsibility to report their evidence fully and accurately and to cite their sources honestly."^{xxxvii}

Honest citation is not just about accuracy in citation. All relevant sources accessed for a particular argument need to be acknowledged, not only those that fit neatly into the bigger story. As Windschuttle has recently put it, it is not acceptable for a historian to only present "evidence that fits their preconceptions...For a genuine historian it is the evidence itself that

determines what case it is possible to make.”^{xxxviii} Directly pertinent primary sources read by the historian therefore need to be honestly presented before the reader even when it challenges and disturbs the preferred line of argument.

The undoubted importance of honest referencing to credible history means that Windschuttle’s *Quadrant* claim that he has read the many examples given in *Whitewash* of accounts of violence against Aborigines but chosen to not cite them in any footnote, let alone give them space in the text, is thus a very serious matter indeed.

In *Quadrant*, the only one of the many neglected primary sources Windschuttle acknowledges he may not have read is the dairies of the surveyor John Helder Wedge (itself a remarkable omission given they were first published in 1962, are well known, and, covering the period from 1824 to 1835, provide one of the very few examples of personally documented extensive travels around Van Diemens Land in the most critical period of Windschuttle’s study).

Windschuttle claims that his "own research...included a complete reading of all the relevant files in the Tasmanian archives plus all the local newspapers up to 1832, as well as all the contemporary diaries and journals I could find". The implication is that this included all the other examples of neglected primary sources provided in *Whitewash*, none of which are "hard to find", all in fact being located either in the Tasmanian State Archives or a few doors away at the State Library. Windschuttle’s reason for reading these diaries and letters but not citing them is "because few of them contain accounts of deadly conflict." But besides still leaving readers in the dark as to any examples of such previously unacknowledged reading of peaceful black-white interaction (that would seem directly relevant, and a serious challenge, to *Fabrication*’s central explanation of why Aborigines committed so many ‘murders’, i.e. they had “no restraint on killing outside their immediate clan”); this explanation ignores the main question raised: what of the actually quite high proportion of diaries, letters and personal accounts that do ‘contain accounts of deadly conflict’?

What for example, did Windschuttle make of the contents of George Hobler’s diary that was cited in *Whitewash*? (given that this even made it to *Fabrication*’s Bibliography). This is what *Fabrication* did not tell us about Hobler’s account of frontier life. On 15 December 1827, after one of his splitters was speared by Aborigines, he writes: “I have armed four men who I hope will get sight of their night fires and slaughter them as they be around it”. On the 11 May 1830, he "shot a very beautiful bird of the thrush kind, but my pellets were meant for kangaroos or Black Fellows, so that my bird was unfit to be preserved." On 6 October 1830, Hobler reflects, “these horrid savages have committed many cruel murders of late and if not severely chastised will destroy the exposed settlements and materially check the progress of the colony – One fellow taken a short time ago who could speak English said that the different tribes had leagued together sinking their own disputes and determined to exterminate the whites if possible.”^{xxxix}

Surely such material is directly relevant to *Fabrication's* extensive discussion about the extent of white retaliation, and settler views about what should be done, even if there is no actual Aboriginal body count. In *Whitewash*, the possibility was presented that Windschuttle had not actually read this directly pertinent material, despite its inclusion in *Fabrication's* bibliography. To now admit to having deliberately withheld it is, however, far worse.

This point can be made many times over.

In *Whitewash*, the experience of Michael Steele, as revealed in a private letter to his brother Joseph on 21 February 1827 was quoted: When the Aborigines were seen, "I instantly armed all my men some on horseback and some on foot.." and set off in pursuit. The next day, "we fell in with them on the top of a mountain and poured a strong fire into them and killed their leader and one more...had the country been even and clear we should have killed or taken the whole of them.." They also killed 50 of the Aborigines heroic dogs..."it would have astonished you to have witnessed the dogs when the attack was first made how they bravely defended their masters."^{xi} This direct eyewitness account of the killing of Aborigines, however, it seems from *Quadrant*, still does not deserve even an 'implausible ranking'. Why? Has it been read and withheld or not read and ignored?

In *Whitewash* it was also pointed out that Adam Amos knew and dealt with frontier realities on the east coast. On December 13/ 14 1823, not long after his arrival, when the Aborigines attempted to continue their customary burning regime, Amos immediately acted to defend his home, crops and family. On the 13th, he sent his, "oldest son to shoot them again but missed by minutes." On the 14th, "...the natives who have of late been in the woods near my hutt (sic) have this day set the grass on fire near my farm... .I sent my oldest son who was joined by two of Mr Meredith's men who fired at them and wounded one of the mob...(who) fled over the hill they pursued them for some time and returned after dark with a quantity of spears." It was an ongoing and difficult struggle. On the January 18 1824, "I had a hunt after the natives on Friday they appeared above my plain. The boys and me set after them, when we came up to their fires they were gone across the river. We followed them for two hours and found them on a marsh about two miles from my farm on the east side. About 30 men. We fired they run away and left their dogs and spears which we destroy and brought some of them home and two dogs." Amos did not relish this conflict, and there is no reason to doubt his closing lament, "I hope they will trouble us no more." However there is equally no reason to doubt that the violent conflict continued. For example, on May 23 1824 he was again "after natives" and on the 12 July 1824 he recorded "My son James returned from hunting the blacks without ever seeing them."^{xli}

This diary is in the Tasmanian State Archives, of which Windschuttle now claims to have made a "complete reading" of all "relevant files". On what basis was this directly relevant information about the facts of life in Oyster Bay, one of the front lines of the war, and mentioned many times in *Fabrication*, withheld?

Hamilton Wallace was another new settler who wrote of the realities settlers lived with when they took another's land. He writes to his father in 1825, "on the second day under the Ben Lomond Tier we fell in with about 250 Aborigines" who they pursued on horseback, with the Aborigines eventually spearing a stock keeper."^{xlii} Is it really legitimate to withhold such information from the reader because no Aboriginal casualties are admitted to? How probable is it that an armed groups of whites pursuing a large group of Aborigines, and who suffer casualties themselves, would inflict none in return? Even more pertinent, why were the whites pursuing the Aborigines in the first place, especially as early as 1825 when the violence was, according to *Fabrication*, about the activities of a couple of black 'bushrangers'?

Other examples of personal accounts of violence and/or black white relations containing material directly pertinent to *Fabrications* arguments including those of Ross, Burn, Lloyd, Boyes, Curr, Parramore, and Evans are also given in *Whitewash*.^{xliii}

Windschuttle's response that he read these sources but they were not relevant to his overall argument is a preposterous position. There is far more to *Fabrications* thesis on black-white relations than providing what purports to a definitive Aboriginal body count. In fact the tally of documented dead bodies is presented as 'proof' for *Fabrication's* conclusion that "British colonists killed very few Aborigines in Van Diemen's Land"^{xliv}. Further, this argument relies on the evidence presented to claim that settler opinion and actions were generally benign. Readers are surely entitled to feel profoundly cheated now it is revealed that Windschuttle has apparently read so many unofficial accounts of violence and differing settler attitudes, but decided to withhold their contents.

In *Fabrication* Windschuttle claimed to be open to revisions to Table 10, his tally of incidents where Aborigines were killed by whites and to publish these on his web site if any overlooked information came to hand. In fact Table 10 has had only two killings added in the past year. These are the two injured Aboriginal prisoners shot by the 'founder of Melbourne, John Batman after capturing them in a raid by his roving party in 1828. Given that a sanitised version of this incident is in *Fabrications* text this correction is hardly surprising^{xlv}. But what remains totally hidden in *Fabrication*, in either footnote or text, is that Batman's own estimate is that 15 Aborigines were killed or would die from their wounds.^{xlvi} Windschuttle is entitled to disagree with Batman's own estimate of the number of Aboriginal dead, but readers are surely entitled to know on what basis.^{xlvii}

Indeed it seems that such unacknowledged interpretations of the data have occurred on a number of occasions. H.A Wills, using a similar strict evidence criteria to Windschuttle, has come up with a tally of 188 confirmed Aboriginal dead and 145 others reported dead but with insufficient evidence to confirm it.^{xlviii}

A detailed example of the implications of Windschuttle's research practices, including an admission of withholding non official primary source material where it does not accord with *Fabrication's* conclusion, is provided in Windschuttle's *Quadrant* defence. Here *Quadrant* Windschuttle explained why, despite having read the relevant diary, he excluded any mention of the account by Rosalie Hare of the killing of 12 Aborigines in the North West in early 1828. Hare was a young ship captain's wife on board the *Caroline* which had come from England to the new Van Diemens Land Company holdings in north west Tasmania where she was based from January to March 1828. She wrote in her journal that:

*Natives are terrible robbers and do all the mischief they can to the settlers
...Burning the huts of the shepherds and stealing their dogs are also the works of these incendiaries...But we are not to suppose the Europeans in their turn take no revenge. We have to lament that our own countrymen consider the massacre of these people an honour. While we remained at Circular Head there were several accounts of considerable numbers of natives having been shot by them (the Company's men), they wishing to extirpate them entirely if possible. The master of the Company's Cutter, Fanny, assisted by four shepherds and his crew, surprised a party and killed 12. The rest escaped but afterwards followed them. They reached the vessel just in time to save their lives.^{xlix}*

Fabrication has a whole chapter containing 46 pages and 109 footnotes which reviews the claims of violent killings of Aborigines in VDL Company holdings (not confining itself to the infamous Cape Grim deaths as the chapter title suggests), most of which were concentrated in the months corresponding with or immediately preceding Hare's stay. However *Fabrication* never mentions, in text or footnote, Hare's account. In *Quadrant* Windschuttle is explicit that Hare's journal was read, and indeed is scornful of those in *Whitewash* who "pretend I was unaware" of it.¹

Windschuttle justifies the omission in *Quadrant* on the grounds that it was "itself seriously undermined by two quite separate pieces of information. That is why this incident does not appear in my book." The first is the "doubts raised by the diarists own editor." The second is "a dispatch by the Van Diemen's Land Company on 14 January 1828 (that) described the *Fanny* incident. It reported that their was an attempt by the boat's crew to shoot some Aborigines but their powder was wet and their guns would not go off."

Ida Lee, the diary's editor, did doubt the veracity of Hare's account. She believed that "it is probable that in writing of the conflicts between the two races Mrs Hare refers, in her journal, to this second attack at Woolnorth. She says that twelve natives were killed, but possibly the numbers were not given to her accurately."ⁱⁱ The reason for Lee's belief is easily explained, but ignored by Windschuttle. Lee was writing in the 1920s (the diaries were published in 1927), and the Van Diemen's Land Company papers were therefore not available to her, as they only began to be released in the 1950s.

These papers, as Windschuttle himself points out in *Quadrant*, have subsequently confirmed that a separate incident did take place in early 1828 to the ones known to Lee and that this involved the crew of the company ship *Fanny*. That there was a separate foray from that referred to by Lee, and that Hare was not confusing the *Fanny* attack on Aborigines with any other, is therefore no longer in any doubt. The basis of Lee's doubts have been completely removed.

In short, it is now clear that there are, simply, two versions of the one event. That of the VDL Company's agent, Edward Curr, that says no Aborigines were killed as the powder on the muskets was wet, and Hare's, that says a dozen were. It is legitimate to discuss the two sides, to have a conclusion about the balance of probability on the matter (as another doubting historian, who Windschuttle quotes in support, Geoff Lennox, does). It is not legitimate, however, to be ignorant of critical evidence, the point that was being made in *Whitewash*. It is far worse to have read both Hares and Curr's description, and then deliberately withheld any mention of the incident from the reader altogether, as Windschuttle now says he has done.

Again this is not just a matter of establishing the 'correct' Aboriginal body count. Even if Windschuttle believes Curr to be 'right', (although given the lack of evidence, including any eyewitness accounts, it is difficult to see how any firm conclusion could be reached), the indisputable evidence that there was an undoubted intent to kill Aborigines by a party made up of Van Diemen's Land Company men, using the Company's ship, is directly relevant to Windschuttle extensive discussion and conclusions about the violence on the North West frontier in early 1828. To have deliberately withheld all mention of this matter in such a lengthy chapter reviewing the actions and attitudes of the VDL Company to Aborigines, is of obvious and serious concern.

Nor is it the only example of deliberate neglect regarding this incident. The quote provided by Lee, on the page directly after her now much vaunted skepticism, and therefore undoubtedly read by Windschuttle, may also have interested *Fabrication's* readership. Curr (as both agent and magistrate) makes it clear to authorities in far away Hobart Town that "wholesale slaughter of stock" by Aborigines, in his view, "can have no other motive than our expulsion and it will justify our taking strong measures in our defence". As *Fabrication* acknowledges, Aborigines killed 118 sheep on 31 December 1827, about a month before the *Fanny's* foray.^{lii}

Deliberate censorship by any historian treats readers with contempt. Given the importance, relevance and wide public interest in *Fabrication's* conclusions about the low level of black- white violence, Australians surely have a right to now know all the accounts of violence that have been withheld by Windschuttle and on what basis. He needs to respond to the very serious charges concerning his knowledge and use of primary sources. For *Fabrication* to have any credibility Windschuttle must provide a simple description of what sources he read. Sources that he was simply ignorant of, the lesser and earlier charge, can then be acknowledged. And those that have been read, but pertinent contents withheld from text or reference,

explained. Until then the charge of deliberate deception now hanging over *Fabrication* will remain.

Fabrication and Aboriginal culture

There is one matter, however, on which no such clarification about sources is needed. The lack of any primary research base for *Fabrication's* claims about pre-settlement Aboriginal culture were thoroughly documented in a number of *Whitewash* essays. An investigation of Windschuttle's footnotes in this area revealed that not even the most elementary primary research had been done and that the references provided do not support, and sometimes do not even pertain to, the claims made. In *Quadrant* Windschuttle made no response to this most serious charge.

Such was the level of transparent contempt for Aboriginal culture in *Fabrication* that even most of Windschuttle's political supporters have kept their distance from him on this. The problem for them, and *Fabrication's* credibility, is this material is not incidental to Windschuttle's overall thesis, as some early reviewers assumed, but central to it. Windschuttle's "alternative version", his new "counter-history of race relations in this country" collapses without it. As already seen, Windschuttle's arguments about both the Aborigines vulnerability to death by disease and the reason they resorted to such extensive violence, are directly dependent on his theory of pre-settlement Aboriginal culture. Further, if the cause of death and the cause of violence can not be sourced back to inherent characteristics of Aboriginal society, the overall conclusion that British settlement was not the primary cause for the undoubted suffering and death of Tasmanian Aborigines, collapses.

Windschuttle's claims about Tasmanian Aboriginal culture have no primary research base. It won't surprise any sensitive reader to find that *Fabrication's* view that Aborigines deposited their faeces 'close to the fires where they slept ... went about completely naked, even in the snow-covered highlands..(and) could not make a fire, a skill that even Neanderthal man has mastered" (377) are unsubstantiated nonsense.

The first bizarre statement is not supported by any direct observation. *Fabrication's* footnote for this claim refers to two pieces of 'evidence'. The first is a statement by James Backhouse in the mid 1830s of what he believed were Aborigines' former customs that, anyway, makes no mention of faeces or toileting practices.^{liii} The second is a settler's observations of an abandoned, probably hastily, east coast camping site, made during the height of the war in February 1830. No one who spent time with the Aborigines, or indeed it seems anyone else at all, ever mentioned such a bizarre custom.

The latter two claims, while still unfortunately part of popular folklore, are directly contradicted by those who actually met the Aborigines. Windschuttle would have been well advised to remember his own criticisms of historians who 'have not checked the original sources' and who repeat old claims 'without corroboration'.^{liv}

When the Aborigines were reported to be 'naked', European observers meant that they did not cover their genitals – the European cultural meaning of nakedness – not that they always wore no clothes. This began with Cook: 'The females wore a kangaroo skin ... tied over their shoulders and round their waist ... They were quite naked.'^{lv} In warm weather, when nothing was needed, nothing was sometimes worn. However, Baudin noted that as soon as the weather got bad, even in summer, all the natives wore a kangaroo skin.^{lvi} Jeffreys also noted the climatic variations, and that during winter the natives dressed in kangaroo skin and 'the women are always partially clad in a robe of the same kind.'^{lvii} There are no accounts of what Aborigines wore in the 'snow-clad highlands', mostly because, until forced to do so by the imperatives of war, they usually chose not to be there in the winter. The notion they would not use warm skins in such circumstances, a clothing of such effectiveness that it replaced European fabric for both races on the frontier, is too silly to merit any serious response. Windschuttle provides no footnote for his claims about this matter.

As for the repetition of Plomley's 1962 claim that Aborigines couldn't make fire, Windschuttle would again have been better served by reading the primary sources for himself. The Aborigines, like the British in this era before matches, carried fire with them. As Thornley noted, 'They have discovered ... that two pieces of lighted stick, or charcoal, crossed and in contact will keep alight ... the settlers have borrowed this trick from the natives.'^{lviii} Most people in Van Diemen's Land, however, believed that the Aborigines knew how to make fire. Windschuttle's claim that the "The colonists were astonished to observe that they could not make fire"^{lix} only confirms how little he has read of settler opinion. *Fabrication* provided no example or footnote to substantiate the purported 'astonishment'. In fact there was considerable speculation as to *how* Aborigines made fire in Van Diemonien times. But the judgement they could not do so is largely a much later one. The only significant evidence in support of Windschuttle's claim is that an Aborigine once told Robinson this was the case. However, as Breen's review of this issue has pointed out, there are many examples of Aborigines withholding cultural information from Robinson by giving him a misleading answer, and taken alone this evidence counts for little.^{lx} *Fabrication's* footnote in support of his argument is, not surprisingly, only the diary reference (even though Windschuttle is generally highly critical of Robinson's credibility).

These are by no means the worst examples of *Fabrication's* unsubstantiated slurs. Windschuttle believes that "The aspect of their society that left them most vulnerable in the face of the European arrival was the treatment of their women". He argues that Aborigines were "active agents in their own demise because their men hired out and sold off their women without seriously contemplating the results. Only men who held their women cheaply would allow such a thing to happen." To back this up, there is, according to Windschuttle, "Abundant evidence of the violent nature of relations between the sexes."^{lxi}

So what is this 'abundant evidence'? The only direct observation *Fabrication* provides of the violent nature of male-female relations is from November 1830, when a group of Aborigines were detained on Swan Island, and a few other Robinson journal entries during this last period of tribal disintegration. The people had by then been exposed to a long period of systematic brutalization on the front line of the war, including a long period of forced separation. Just as in Aboriginal communities today, dispossession and severe cultural disruption almost always bring a range of tragic social impacts. These however do not provide any evidence at all about traditional Aboriginal customs or practices.

Windschuttle does claim that: "The first European observers called the men 'indolent' and 'extremely selfish' and said they treated their women like 'slaves' and 'drudges'"^{lxii} But what is his footnote reference for this claim? It is Ling Roth's book written at the height of the Social Darwinist orthodoxy in 1899. To his credit, Roth actually presents the views of a range of contemporary observers, while Windschuttle's quotes are taken from only two of these: a selected citation of the French naturalist Peron, and someone who did not even arrive until 1829, J.E Calder, and is thus hardly a "first observer" of Aborigines.^{lxiii} Peron did observe scars on the women, and believed this to be evidence of domestic violence.^{lxiv} However Peron did not witness such violence, nor was provided with any information on the matter. Moreover other explorers and later observers (as *Fabrication* acknowledges) recognised that these scars were a cultural practice. Peron's assumption as to the cause of the scars, therefore, probably says more about the extent of domestic violence in contemporary French society than Aboriginal.

Despite this less than promising start, Windschuttle makes much of his belief that Aboriginal men encouraged the prostitution and selling of Aboriginal women to justify *Fabrication's* central claim that Aborigines were "active agents in their own demise"^{lxv} *Fabrication* goes so far as to conclude that "the fact that they traded and prostituted their women to such an extent that they lost the ability to reproduce themselves" was, along with Aboriginal vulnerability to introduced disease, "almost entirely" the cause of the dramatic Aboriginal population decline.^{lxvi} Further, so that there is no white culpability in this, such destructive sexual contact between white men and Aboriginal women is seen to reflect inherent characteristics of traditional Aboriginal culture, (indeed provide primary evidence for its dysfunctional nature). No pressures or impacts caused by white settlement which may have impacted on the choices and options for the Aboriginal women or men involved are acknowledged: "Traditional Aboriginal society placed no constraints on the women's sexual behavior with white men. Their husbands and fathers appeared to encourage their prostitution...Far worse however, were those Aboriginal men who actually sold off their women."^{lxvii}

What is *Fabrication's* evidence for this? The only example that is not drawn from Aboriginal groups facing very high levels of strain and disruption in the late 1820s is a story passed on to James Backhouse in 1833 about west coast Aborigines over a decade before. Windschuttle claims that, 'Backhouse described one case on the west coast where local Aborigines traded a

fourteen-year-old girl to the pilot at Macquarie Harbour in exchange for a dog".^{lxviii} What Backhouse actually recorded is that *one* Aborigine "exchanged a girl of about 14 years of age, for a dog, with the people at the pilot station; but the girl not liking her situation was taken back, and the dog returned."^{lxix} This would in fact seem to be evidence of a much more complex cultural situation, even in post-settlement times, than that presented in *Fabrication*.

The records presented from the later period only highlights the weakness of *Fabrication's* case. Consider the 'evidence' presented from Bruny Island in the late 1820s: "While Trugannini was prostituting herself with convict whalers on Bruny Island in 1829, her father was also living there but did nothing to stop her". It was supposedly a similar story with two other Nueonne (Bruny) women "who sold themselves to island whalers...yet their Aboriginal husbands made no apparent complaint about what their wives were doing."^{lxx}

Fabrication makes not even a cursory mention of the terrible tragedy so evident to all observers at Bruny Island at this time. There is no context given for the actions of the men or women. The self evident fact that there were few, if any, options available to the small surviving remnant of the Nueonne in the new white mans world by 1829, given that the destruction of their society was almost complete, is ignored. The awful symptoms of dispossession and death are presented as evidence of the inherent characteristics of traditional Aboriginal culture.

For anyone with even a passing familiarity of Van Diemen's Land history, *Fabrication's* Bruny Island example raises even more obvious concerns about the quality of Windschuttle's research. Bruny was visited many times in pre-settlement times by French and British explorers. It was a well know site for safe anchorage and ready access to fresh food, water and timber, making it one of the main supply bases for voyages throughout the Pacific. The French in particular left extensive records of their experiences of the culture of the Nueonne during what were on occasions, quite prolonged stays. Yet *Fabrication* cites none of it. Why was such obvious primary source material ignored in making such central claims about the nature of pre-settlement Aboriginal culture? Could it have been ignorance of an expedition as important as that of Nicolas Baudin that spent over a month in the summer of 1802-3 anchored near Bruny with a specific charter to meet with and document the culture of the people? Or is it related to the fact that these explorers and pioneer anthropologists directly contradict Windschuttle's claims? Peron, who was with Baudin, reports he was repeatedly rebuffed and kept at a safe distance when he tried to make any physical contact at all with Aboriginal women. While Baudin wrote that he believed that none of the amorous French crew had any sexual relations with the Aborigines and it was not for want of trying^{lxxi}. The same people's very different behaviour a generation later with the whalers at Adventure Bay on Bruny is self evidently a product of the extensive disruption of traditional life that had by then occurred. Only someone who is totally blind to the impact of changing power relations, of declining choices, of the profound impact of cultural disintegration and of repeated personal violence and abuse, let alone the simple imperatives of

survival, could cite the unfolding tragedy evident at Bruny Island in this period as evidence for the sexual mores and domestic relations of pre invasion Aboriginal society.

For those seeking a much more balanced and sympathetic view on Aboriginal society than what is presented in *Fabrication*, it is enough to do what Windschuttle has not done, read what is our only documentary source on the issue, the French, and to a lesser extent , the British explorers.

In *Quadrant* Windschuttle makes no defence of the serious *Whitewash* charge that he has not read even one of these sources.^{lxxii} If Windschuttle does subsequently does claim to have read any of them, readers will surely be entitled to have answered why all his quotes are taken from the selection contained in Ling Roth's 1899 *Aborigines of Tasmania*. If he read any of the actual source material (as in the case of Peron, claimed in his Bibliography), why not cite it direct?

Whitewash also pointed out that Windschuttle not only appeared to have not read these sources, but knew so little about them that *Fabrication* was five years late in the dating of the Baudin expedition and a decade out with the D'Entrecasteux Expedition. Windschuttle believed that Baudin visited Van Diemen's Land in 1807 and D'Entrecasteux in 1800,^{lxxiii} although these errors were corrected in a recent reprint of *Fabrication*.

While, as with other errors of fact, Windschuttle did not respond to the significance of this mistake in *Quadrant*, on being directly challenged on it he has recently said: "That's the most minor issue that anyone could possibly raise...The time that a French exploration came into Van Diemen's Land has nothing to do with what happened to Aborigines."^{lxxiv} But, as any student of Van Diemen's Land, knows, of course it does. The Baudin Expedition was the direct catalyst for the British settlement. Governor King in Sydney believed that the French exploration was the precursor to French colonization. In response to these fears he rapidly dispatched a settlement party under the command of John Bowen to the Derwent, while London organized a larger expedition under the command of David Collins. Yet Windschuttle twice dates the Baudin Expedition to four years *after* the first British settlement of Van Diemen's Land. A mistake about a date may at first seem minor, but in this case it illustrates a profound, almost unbelievable, ignorance about the subject matter.

Moreover such ignorance about the Baudin and D'Entrecasteux expeditions is no "minor issue" given that they are the only explorers who systematically set out to study and observe Tasmanian Aborigines. Windschuttle had not read their readily accessible accounts when he wrote *Fabrication*, but nor had he read enough about them to know that Baudin was even here in pre-settlement times.

The reason for Windschuttle's omission of such obvious primary source material is uncertain. It is clear, however, that if it was widely known that James Cook, and not just post 1960's academics, who disagreed with

Windschuttle's assessment of Aborigines, the political and cultural response to *Fabrication* would have been very different indeed.

Perhaps in his *Quadrant* response, Windschuttle was unable to respond to the significance of his mistakes, because *Fabrication's* whole fragile edifice of 'argument' depends on maintaining its theoretical social construct, regardless of whether there is evidence for it. Even the probably unintended partial back down in *Quadrant*, (that was part of a defence on another matter), exposes the fallibility and vulnerability of *Fabrication's* case. Windschuttle's explanation of why he ignored the personal records of settlers in *Fabrication* was that they did not write about frontier violence because, "In the first twenty years of the colony, the settlers generally agreed the Aborigines were "a mild and peaceful people" and "the most peaceable creatures in the universe.". This is certainly a long overdue, if unacknowledged, modification to *Fabrication's* caricature of Aborigines as a people who took "pleasure in the death and pain they could inflict on anyone outside their own group" and "enjoyed killing."^{lxv} However it leaves *Fabrication's* central thesis about the primary cause of Aboriginal "murders" in tatters. Why would a "mild and peaceful people" kill whites just because "they could"? How could such peaceful black-white relations have occurred if Aborigines had "no cultural restraints on killing outside their immediate clan?"

Moreover, if for the first two decades settler relations and contacts with Aborigines were generally (although far from exclusively) peaceful, the critical question surely becomes, what changes? So marked was the shift that this question was the preoccupation of contemporaries and became primary to almost all studies of black –white relations in Van Diemen's Land. *Fabrication's* explanation that there was more violence in the 1820s because there was "more opportunity and more temptation" because there was more whites collapses if Aborigines were not inherently motivated to kill those outside their clan group whenever they had a chance. *Fabrication*, which purported to provide a serious new thesis about white - black relations in an Van Diemen's Land is thus left with no explanation as to why Aborigines killed nearly 200 whites from 1824 to 1831.

The "Last Test": How probable is Fabrication?

Sir Geoffrey Elton's, "last test" advise for any historian was to ask the question 'could this have been? And if it clearly could not he is entitled – indeed obliged – to reconsider this evidence imaginatively." For a historian's "answers must be probable; they must agree with what is known about human experience."^{lxvi} The inherent improbability regarding *Fabrication's* central conclusions is the common underlying theme of almost all the essays in *Whitewash*. Indeed once *Fabrication's* main conclusions and the evidence for them is clearly spelt out, its thesis becomes transparently implausible for any careful reader, regardless of their level of expertise in the subject matter.

There are many probability questions that have been raised, none have been addressed. How probable is it that Aboriginal culture survived over at least 30 000 years through major climatic and environmental change, primarily through

'good fortune? How probable is it that the colonial government would issue a warning against killing Aborigines in 1813 when no Aborigines had been killed for 5 years? How probable is it that in 1819 they would issue a strongly worded condemnation against "undeniable" former "cruelties ...repugnant to humanity and disgraceful to the British character" and the continued "occasional outrages of miscreants" if there had been only four deaths from two incidents since 1808? How probable is it that Windschuttle is right that we know of almost all killings in the frontier lands even though Lieutenant Governor Sorell, as did others in authority, pointed out that the "scene of crime is so remote as to render detection difficult"? How probable is it that the explosion of violence from 1824 to 1831 had nothing to do with the granting of nearly two million acres of the woody and native grassland in these years, about 95% of the total ever granted and comprising almost all the main Aboriginal hunting grounds? How probable is it that a five-fold increase in sheep numbers from 1823 to 1830 and an increase in the white population from 7400 in 1821 to 26 640 in 1831 had similarly little effect on the indigenous people? How probable is it that from 1824 to 1831 there were 187 highly plausible white deaths in black-white conflict but only four "highly plausible" Aboriginal deaths and none at all until near the end of the main period of conflict in August 1830? How probable is it that the in this seven year period even the "plausible" number of Aboriginal dead was only 72, well under half the white figure? How probable is it that the settlers would put the details of the killings of Aborigines in writing to the Government or provide them to a newspaper when, except during the martial law period in the settled districts, this was would potentially open them to criminal charges? How probable is it that in 1830 the colonial government would arm over 1000 convicts, and deploy them along with almost all the military, many government officials and a large contingent of settler volunteers in a sweep across the island that cost around half the colony's annual budget, unless the threat posed by Aborigines was perceived to be very serious indeed?

Finally, how probable is it that all the Governors,^{lxxvii} most of the settlers and almost all the early historians and commentators were so taken in, so easily deceived about the extent and underlying causes of violence? Would such a deception been likely to have taken in so many for so long? How probable is it, in short, that Windschuttle is right while almost everyone else, including those who lived through the actual events, are wrong?

The Tasmanian tradition and Fabrication's case: How 'left' are the 'orthodox'?

Whitewash pointed out that what *Fabrication* calls 'orthodoxy' is neither new nor left wing. *Fabrication's* orthodoxy is a remarkably broad church. As already noted, it included all those who, over the past 170 years, who have believed a high number of Aborigines were killed by whites, that there was "systematic Aboriginal resistance" motivated by negative impacts on Aborigines associated with the British occupation and that white settlement was the primary underlying cause of the self evident tragedy.

Windschuttle acknowledged that "what I call the 'orthodox' interpretation...is actually very old..", but defends the fact that "my main target is the orthodoxy that has been produced by academic historians over the last 30 years", on the basis that, "it is the academics who have taken up the old story and given it a new scholarly authority who have been the most influential...". With this dismissal, *Fabrication* largely ignores the extensive tradition of historical writing about the Black War, and all the published personal memoirs containing accounts and records of the violence.^{lxxviii}

Consider, for example the views of Governor Arthur himself on the responsibility for black –white violence. He wrote in 1828 that this is "is a subject most painful under every consideration; we are undeniably the first aggressors."^{lxxix} Arthur was also the model of 'orthodoxy' in his views of the causes of war. In rejecting the policy option of island exile in 1828 he wrote: "nothing short of that last necessity could tolerate such an aggravation of their injuries, as they would unquestionably consider removing them from their native tracts. They already claim that the white people have taken possession of their country, encroached upon their hunting grounds, and destroyed their natural food – the kangaroo; and they doubtless would be exasperated to the last degree, to be banished from their favourite haunts..."^{lxxx}

Arthur also believed matters could have been handled differently. He rejected the view that the tragedy impacting on the Aborigines was due to the impacts of the "inevitable arrival of the outside world" on a small, precarious and dysfunctional society.^{lxxxi} Arthur believed there should have been a treaty underpinning a legal recognition and defence of Aboriginal rights. In September 1832 he wrote "It was a fatal error in the first settlement of Van Diemens Land that a treaty was not entered into with the natives, of which savages well comprehend the nature, - had they received some compensation of the territory they surrendered, no matter how trifling, and had adequate laws been from the very first introduced and enforced for their protection, His Majesty's Government would have acquired a valuable possession without the injurious consequences which have followed our occupation and which must ever remain a stain upon the colonization of Van Diemen's Land."^{lxxxii}

Moreover Arthur respected the tenacity and endurance of his foe, lamenting in 1833 his regret at being "reduced to the necessity of driving a simple but warlike, and, as it now appears, noble-minded race, from their native hunting grounds."^{lxxxiii}

Surely the conservative evangelical Arthur, the proud colonial representative and faithful servant of the Empire, is something of an odd ball in a left wing conspiracy to deceive?

He was not alone. None of the long list of contemporary writers doubted that, at the least, there was extensive violence on both sides. And most recognised that it originated in white occupation, with "systematic Aboriginal defence" commonly a theme. Support for the 'orthodox' interpretation comes from all groups of colonial society. The pioneer of the Shannon, and literary

man, James Ross had “no question whatever but that aggressions of the most brutal and unprincipled kind had at different times before been made on the Aborigines both male and female.”^{lxxxiv} The ex convict Danish adventurer Jorgen Jorgenson reflected: ‘What must then be the feelings of our descendants; when reflecting that they could not hold their possessions but for the fatal policy which had delivered over to extermination a people who were guilty of no other crime than accidentally coming in contact with strangers, from a far country, and who by title of law nor justice could exercise the right of despoiling them of their natural inheritance. Haven avert so foul a stain on the British character.’^{lxxxv}

Most contemporaries made some attempt to articulate the context of white violence. Jorgenson defended the economic and political realities that ultimately determined Arthur's colonial policy. Colonists, “who were out of reach of danger, appeared of opinion that the Aborigines were not much to blame for resisting the invaders of their native soil. Yet...if things went on in the old way it would be better to give up the country altogether.”^{lxxxvi}

The popular press set out such political dilemmas, and the usual priorities of war, more colorfully. As early as December 1 1826, when, according to *Fabrication*, violence had been largely confined to the criminal actions of two black ‘bushrangers’, the *Colonial Times* had this to say:

It would be worse than useless to show how different things might have been – it's enough to state things as they are...the natives are no longer afraid...it is necessary to look at naked truths. It is too late to discuss the question...nothing but a removal can protect us from incursion similar to the Caffrees in Africa or the back-woodsmen in North America....We make no pompous display of philanthropy – we say unequivocally, SELF DEFENCE IS THE FIRST LAW OF NATURE. THE GOVERNMENT MUST REMOVE THE NATIVES. IF NOT THEY WILL BE HUNTED DOWN LIKE WILD BEASTS AND DESTROYED.
(emphasis original)

Windschuttle is right that extermination was generally not the preferred option, but does not understand that, not surprisingly, self defence and self interest ultimately were. The *Colonial Times* continued:

It is impossible to suggest a perfect plan but...the first thing is our own security, the second the due and proper protection to the natives and last and least, the expense of the measure to the Government.

In the first place they must be removed....we are certainly bound by every principle of humanity to protect them as far as we can...”

Recognition of such competing and contradictory priorities, and the policy conundrums that followed, were not only the domain of the government or sensationalist press. At an individual and local level, most settlers would probably have chosen to be left in peace provided their right to exclusive access to the native grass plains they now ‘owned’ was left undisturbed by

Aboriginal land use. But from the 1820s few concessions were made to what coexistence and mutual land ownership required. Aborigines were forcibly moved on, 'taught lessons' and when they fought back, killed.

The more thoughtful and compassionate of the settlers, and there were a number, expressed the ethical dilemmas of this at a personal level, but still acknowledged the pragmatic demands of war. George Lloyd knew and spent what he recalled as happy times with Aborigines in earlier, and more peaceful, times. But after admitting to the "telling delivery of 7 double-barreled guns, heavily charges with good duck shot" that left a "wholesome impression upon the notoriously cruel Big River Tribe" (in yet another source neglected by *Fabrication*) he honestly acknowledged that "to turn the other cheek is a grace but rarely to be met with ... not in erring mortals like myself." ^{lxxxvii}

These men did not shy away from presenting the full horror of war on both sides. David Burn for example recalled seeing: "The remains of a stock keeper, slain upon the writer's estate, (who) presented an appalling picture of their fury. The eyes were torn out of their sockets, and waddies (sticks not unlike office-rulers) thrust into the apertures. The skull was dreadfully smashed, and the mouth filled with cow dung. It was conjectured the waddies were placed to resemble the horns of oxen, and that their revenge was emblematical of the occupation of their victim – a cattle-herd." But Burn, unlike Windschuttle (who never read him), also understood the underlying causes of violence:

the atrocities which were perpetrated against these unoffending creatures may well palliate the indiscriminate, although heart rending slaughter they entailed. Both governor and governed were placed in a dilemma; they scarcely knew how to act how to preserve their own lives, and yet protect those of their sable foes. It is true, there were those who had no scruple on that head; but the reflecting portion of the community knew well that they were 'invaders', who had despoiled the original possessors of their hunting-fields and that therefore what some folks denominated murder, was virtually 'slaying the enemies of their country', according to their mode of battle, and that, however the grantee might endeavour or reconcile his acquisition as a gift of the British crown, still it was a legalized plunder, which the flattering unction, that he was converting an inadequately appropriated wilderness into a resort for civilized man, could not entirely smooth away." ^{lxxxviii}

Ultimately it seems, however, that there were few, if any, large land owners, who shared the sentiments of the landless worker, quoted by Thornley, who when asked what he will do with the small land grant to be provided to him as a reward for his role in capturing bushrangers, replied, "Do with it? Why, give it back to the natives! We should never have taken it off them in the first place." ^{lxxxix}

The views of thoughtful contemporaries were largely reflected in the conclusions of early historians, who widely discussed and debated such matters. The usual theme was shame, regret and occasionally outrage at events, tempered by a spirit of sympathy and understanding for the policy gridlock that followed from the reality of the British invasion. Henry Melville's *History of Van Diemen's Land*, published in 1835, correctly dates the dramatic increase in Aboriginal resistance to 1824, arguing the Aborigines "could no longer brook the treatment they received from the invaders of their country. Their hunting grounds were taken from them and they themselves were driven like trespassers from their favourite spots..."^{xc}

In language reminiscent of Windschuttle's "academic missionaries" of the 1960s,^{xcI} Melville described Aborigines as 'legitimate owners of the soil', that their resistance was 'guerilla war' and questions the legality of the "laws brought by the invaders to the country". Melville is, along with Robinson and to a much lesser extent, Calder and Bonwick, one of the 19th Century 'orthodox' given relative prominence in *Fabrication*. The claim that his views of the conflict can be dismissed because of his anti Arthur crusade does not, however, hold up.^{xcii} This was the one matter on which Melville was sympathetic to Arthur's policy dilemmas, pointing out that the Black Line was undertaken 'with the best intentions' and 'that something was necessary, either to intimidate the blacks or the capture of them, there cannot be a question.'^{xciii}

Far and away the most impressive and influential of the 19th Century historians of Tasmania, the Rev John West, drew on extensive oral and written sources to write his lengthy chapters documenting the terrible ferocity of the "Black War" in his *History of Tasmania* published in 1852. West regretted that

The English of modern times will not comprehend joint ownership, notwithstanding the once "common" property of the nation has only been lately distributed by law. The rights of the Aborigines were never recognised by the crown; yet it is not less certain that they saw with intelligence the progress of occupation, and felt that the gradual alienation of their hunting grounds implied their expulsion and extinction.^{xciv}

In a far more balanced and thoughtful defence of English settlement than managed by *Fabrication*, West posed the question that troubled many Tasmanians then as now: "The original occupation of this country necessarily involved most of the consequences which followed: was that occupation, then, just?" West believed it was and, "that the royal standard was planted, need occasion no remorse; but though the native had not exclusive natural rights, he possessed the attributes of man, and the government was bound to ascertain his wants, and protect his interest in the country. England, however, forgot the Aborigine; she secured him no refuge..."^{xcv}

Such prose, and such conclusions, will seem conservative and outmoded to many Tasmanians today. Most Aborigines will condemn both the patronizing tone and the conclusion reached. However compared with the language and findings of the *Fabrications of Aboriginal History*, West's is a reasoned and compassionate position.

Windschuttle failed to consider the main arguments or the bulk of the oral and documentary evidence presented by West despite some of the detail within it being occasionally cited as a source for *Fabrication's* own arguments.

Whitewash raised the question of how this could be, as the importance of West, and the evidence he presents, is undoubted. Was it simply ignorance of his significance? Or, given the book at least has been definitely read, was the argument that this great thundering prophet of his age could be so deceived about the horrible reality of the "Black War" simply too bizarre a case to argue? Was this leading anti transportationist, forerunner of Federation, and eventual long time editor of the Sydney Morning Herald, just too impressive a figure to even try and fit into *Fabrication's* prefabricated box?

Other historians of the 19th Century, of all political persuasions, also continued to acknowledge the facts of extensive black-white violence, with high casualties on both sides and the reality of "systematic resistance"^{xcvi} by Aborigines. At the same time their many substantive differences defies *Fabrication's* argument that there was an orthodox mind set, whereby historians repeated the false claims of others rather than going back to the primary source material. How could orthodox writers have had such diverse conclusions if this was the case? Calder for example, one of *Fabrication's* "four most influential nineteenth-century voices in framing opinion about the fate of the Tasmanian Aborigines"^{xcvii}, believed that "Numerous fictitious fights are recorded as having taken place in the early times of the colony, and which, though still repeated by the marvelous and horrible, were found to be utterly false on investigation." Calder believed that Aborigines "had by far the best of the fight"^{xcviii} Were these claims too an example of how the early historians piled "myth upon myth?"^{xcix}

The 'orthodox' are in fact a feisty group of independent and disparate characters who set out to chronicle what happened in Van Diemen's Land, and believed that it was important that the past not be forgotten. There was, and is, much room for difference with, and within, this distinctive and diverse tradition. But there is no evidence that these writers set out to deliberately deceive. And it is very significant that in the essential matters of recognising a systematic Aboriginal resistance to white occupation, the existence of high levels of violence on both sides, and English culpability in the tragedy impacting on Aborigines, they are as one. Indeed almost without exception they concluded that a profound injustice had occurred.^c

It is also very difficult to find any Tasmanian historian or writer over the past 170 years who has held the Aboriginal culture in such low regard as Windschuttle. At the very least the Aborigines success in fighting has moderated comparable assessments for all but *Fabrication's* author, who,

paradoxically, places one of the greatest emphasis on their superiority in the fight.

The 19th Century histories were also enriched by considerable oral testimony from those with first hand experience of the conflict. Even nearing the end of the century, James Backhouse Walker, who like Calder, believed that accounts of massacres and one sided fighting were being exaggerated by some (a propensity that increased with the presentation of Tasmanian Aborigines by Social Darwinists as the lowest form of humanity, and therefore incapable of much effective resistance to a 'superior' civilization) noted that, "The reign of terror which ensued in the remoter districts of the Colony has not yet faded out of local memory."^{ci}

The generation who had lived through the Black War was, however, to soon pass away and a silence generally descended on matters Van Diemonien in the first half of the 20th Century. Clive Turnbull's best selling *Black War* gave the story of the conflict renewed prominence when it was published in 1948. While Levy's respected biography of Arthur, published in 1953, argued that 'the justice of the Englishmen's disseizin of the Tasmanian natives lands has never ...been seriously assailed by the English'^{cii}. Like Melville and others, Levy was sympathetic to Arthur's difficult policy context, and thus, arguably, overly forgiving of its tragic outcome. Levy pointed out that this was "a war to the knife – a case of exterminate or be wiped out yourself...the reason for this new phase lay in the accelerated speed of settlement, with an extension of farms, sheep walks and cattle runs in the back areas, and an increase of population."^{ciii}

The 'new history' of the 1970s and 1980s did of course differ in interpretation and argument from these historians, and the age old tradition of writing on such matters, but not in the 'orthodox' essentials questioned in *Fabrication*. The emphasis of Ryan and Reynolds was on Aborigines as active agents in a struggle that continued to the present. Aboriginal adaptation and resistance were given a renewed emphasis, but the most distinctive change was the fact that their story did not 'end' in 1833 or with the death of Trugannini in 1876.

In so doing, paradoxically for *Fabrication's* case, Reynolds in particular challenges the cultural view that had emerged, especially since the rise of a Social Darwinist perspective at the end of the 19th Century, that Aborigines were easily massacred and killed. It is Reynolds who has emphasized the many advantages of the Aborigines in the struggle and the local impact of the changing political context in England with the rise of the socially aware evangelicals to positions of influence and power. It is therefore odd that these points have been taken up in *Fabrication* to attack 'orthodoxy'.

It is quite legitimate for *Fabrication* to critique the work of Reynolds, Ryan and Robson. It is not legitimate however to dismiss the contribution of the unique and, at times, distinguished, 170 year old tradition of writing about and documenting black-white conflict, without providing any evidence of having read most of its content. The failure to have cited almost any of this material lessened the chance of *Fabrication's* readership pondering the obvious

question raised here: How probable is it that Windschuttle was right and everyone else, including most of those who actually lived with and fought Tasmanian Aborigines, were wrong? And if the 'fabrication' of 'orthodoxy' is primarily motivated by contemporary political concerns, how can it have such a long and politically varied tradition?

Conclusion

There is perhaps one final 'last test' probability question that gets to the heart of the inherent implausibility, of *Fabrication's* thesis. All readers of *Fabrication* should ask: 'Just how probable is it that the early settlers of Van Diemens Land were so dramatically different from us? Does it fit with what we know of human experience that retaliation would be so limited and attitudes so benign?

Such a question is important because in the end it is real people that this debate is discussing, not make believe fantasies of either Windschuttle's or anyone else's imagination. The probability is surely that the majority of settlers and convicts will be neither saints or sinners, but complex flawed human beings, vulnerable to fear, revenge and hysteria, as well as regret, doubt and compassion. *Fabrication* seeks to redeem our ancestors. It ends up presenting a caricature of them that denies their humanity. What we have in common with those who lived in the past is a shared human brokenness. Illusions of sanctification projected on to the living or the dead can never be good history, or even a life enhancing myth.

The arrival of the British in Van Diemen's Land did not mean only violence. This point has been a theme of much recent research although, perhaps because no academic thesis written since 1977 has been cited in *Fabrication*, Windschuttle seems unaware of this. There was an extensive meeting that resulted in wide cultural change and adaptation, and not only on the part of the Aborigines. But violence was always one aspect of this interaction, and by the mid 1820s by far the dominant one. By 1833, the twin foundation facts of our island home are asserted, almost all the Aborigines were dead and the few survivors mostly in exile in the Bass Strait.

Most contemporary commentators and historians of all political persuasions have acknowledged that this terrible tragedy followed from British settlement, and that matters could have been handled differently. There was no 'inevitability' about what occurred, as Windschuttle believes, either by the standards of their time or ours. There is no historical law or invisible hand at work, only people. The "inevitable coming of the outside world" was the coming of real human beings, not some force of history.

Windschuttle's attempt to reinterpret the twin facts to remove any British culpability though presenting a new theory of Aboriginal society has no research basis. Indeed it is directly contradicted by the documentary record. *Fabrication's* theorizing represents a failed attempt to justify a contemporary political agenda that would seek to remove any right of Aborigines to compensation or redress based on past wrongs. But, whatever the worth of

this campaign, the historical record remains clear: the “real tragedy of the Aborigines” followed directly from British settlement.

Windschuttle defence of his thesis in *Quadrant* against the claims made in *Whitewash* ignore the main critique of *Fabrication’s* “counter history of race relations” . *Fabrication* was not a book review. It is not legitimate to persistently focus only on some detail in the work of others. An “alternative version” of history can never be established as right by default. The claims made in *Whitewash*, and summarised here, would seem to undermine the whole basis of Windschuttle’s case. They deserve a response.

Just as important is the need to clarify the records and sources that have been used in developing *Fabrication’s* argument. The usual assumption is that historian’s oversights are honest mistakes. Windschuttle himself has, however, now ridiculed those who say he was not aware of the neglected sources. All historians involved agree this is a very important debate, of wide interest and direct contemporary relevance, and that it is based on competing readings of the available documentary records. It is therefore essential that Windschuttle provide a list of the pertinent sources read and used. For someone who stresses the importance of accountability in works of history, especially the essential role of proper and honest referencing, this is surely not an unfair ask.

Will *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Volume Two*, be any different from the volume considered here? If it is not written yet, is it as good as? Windschuttle claims to believe that “When genuine historians go looking for evidence, most will find things they had not anticipated. If the historian is honest, then this unexpected evidence will suggest alternative arguments, interpretations and conclusions, and different problems to pursue...”^{civ}

These are worthy and true sentiments. Yet there did not seem to be any “unexpected evidence”, “alternative arguments, interpretations and conclusions”, let alone “different problems to pursue” evident in *Volume One*. The records of the Tasmanian Archives, it seems, only confirmed the main arguments set out in three long articles in *Quadrant* between October and December 2000 before the research began. On this basis it would seem unlikely that there will be much new in *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Volume Two* or *Three*. Indeed if Windschuttle is not already sure he will find a similar level of ‘fabrication’ across the nation, was not his series title somewhat premature?

But every person is, like good history, always capable of the unexpected. So perhaps I am wrong in my expectations regarding *Fabrication Volume Two* . Given the extent of the unnecessary damage division and pain caused by the Van Diemonien *Fabrication*, we can only hope this is so.

ⁱ Chapman P (ed), *Historical Records of Australia: Series 3, Volume 7, AGPS, Canberra 1997*, p.xxxii

ⁱⁱ Windschuttle, K. (2002). *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Volume One Van Diemen's Land 1803 - 1847*. Sydney, Macleay Press p.375

ⁱⁱⁱ *Fabrication* p.386

^{iv} *Fabrication*, pp. 99, 101, 128

^v *Fabrication*, p. 400

^{vi} *Fabrication* p.3

^{vii} Examples of unaddressed mistakes are given later in this article and at footnote xxx.

^{viii} In relation to the specific charges of fabrication still leveled at them, Ryan and Reynolds have made their own defence. Robson, being dead, deserves however a mention. The most serious charge against him, comprised three pages in *Fabrication*, in response to one sentence in his *History of Tasmania: Volume one*, that ended a paragraph discussing the uncertainty in the historical record in the pre 1820 period. Robson simply made a mistake; he attributed a direct observation to a man, James Hobbs, of a killing of Aborigines at Oyster Bay in 1815, when he had only heard of it. However the bulk of *Fabrication's* discussion of this issue is flawed, and the serious charges leveled at Robson, baseless.

Fabrication denigrates Robson for assuming the presence of white people, sheep and soldiers at Oyster Bay at some point in 1815, on the basis that no land grants had yet been made and there is no record of the soldiers going there. Windschuttle it seems seriously believes that the "The first settler to discover land suitable for pastures at Oyster Bay was George Meredith in April 1821", because there was no land granted before then. Moreover apparently Robson's assumptions reflects "poorly on his scholarship, or...poorly on his integrity." It is clear that Windschuttle has no understanding of the extensive unofficial land occupation occurring at this time, or even more remarkable of the "licenses for grazing occupations" that preceded land grants, including one on the east coast. Meredith himself writes of being directed to these lands after arriving in Hobart by the Governor and Surveyor on the basis of the good, as yet ungranted, pastures known to be available. While the fact is that the soldiers are very likely to have gone to Oyster Bay in pursuit of Michael' Howe's gang given the level of emergency they were causing (martial law had even been proclaimed) and that one of Howe's gang was eventually captured in the area. Finally any researcher can quickly establish that there are more gaps than content in the Government record at this time (as many papers are missing) and it can not be relied on for knowledge of troop movements.

^{ix} Most obviously, Windschuttle's claims of 'victory' on the genocide issue is based on false premises. The reason that "The case for genocide has not been sustained" and that "its principal advocates have walked away from the topic, unwilling to defend it": is that none of the *Whitewash* contributors, with the possible exception of Lyndall Ryan have ever advocated it. Even Ryan's 1981 *Aboriginal Tasmanians*, referred to "a conscious policy of genocide" at the end of the chapter on the twentieth century and discussion on the assimilation agenda. There is no reference to such a claim in the chapters which covers the pre 1847 period. Perhaps Ryan's point was more general, and she does believe there was a policy of genocide in Van Diemonien times. If so, there is a legitimate argument to be had. Indeed a fair criticism of Tasmanian historical research over the past two decades is that it has been too understanding of Governor Arthur's genuinely difficult policy context in relation to Aborigines, and not sufficiently focussed on the largely foreseeable consequences of the policy outcomes. Except for Reynolds, who, as is well known, explicitly rejected the genocide position, the view that there was no systematic policy of genocide by Government has largely been assumed rather than debated.

This point is indirectly made by Windschuttle himself in his *Quadrant* article where the only examples he can muster of genocide proponents are Robert Hughes and Nial Ferguson, who are neither examples of the university academics purportedly blamed for the '*Fabrication*', or contributors to *Whitewash*. The only point Windschuttle is left to make, given this, is that historians are to blame when others don't read their work.

^x Windschuttle says in *Quadrant*, regarding Ryan's chapter in *Whitewash*:

Ryan's rationale for her roving party death toll is blatantly untrue. In the *Aboriginal Tasmanians* she defined the term as follows: Each roving party was led by a constable of the filed police and consisted of an Aboriginal guide and four or five assigned servants (convicts) with a knowledge of the bush.".... Nowhere did her original book mention that military patrols or troops might be regarded as roving parties. In *Whitewash*, Ryan has made yet another dissembling response which her editor could have easily checked for himself, but obviously chose not to.

The simple fact is that, as odd as it sounds, and the military certainly were not happy about it, before the Black Line in October 1830, such was the premium value of bush knowledge and experience, that military patrols were often placed under the command of convict, (ticket of leave) field police and had assigned convicts accompanying them. The distinction between 'non military' roving parties and military patrols was, in the pragmatic reality of frontier conflict, blurred.

^{xi} See footnote ix

^{xii} see footnote viii

^{xiii} The closest *Fabrication* gets to a succinct summary of this is on pp. 398-9

^{xiv} *Fabrication*, p. 364

^{xv} *Van Diemen's Land: Copies of all Correspondence between Lieutenant Governor Arthur and His Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject of the Military Operations lately carried on against the Aboriginal inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land (including minutes of evidence taken before the Committee for the affairs of the Aborigines, 1830)*. Hobart, Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1971, .pp 54-5

^{xvi} The Aborigines were placed first in Macquarie Harbour's main penitentiary, then as the death toll mounted, the hospital (under guard) and finally, seeking to both isolate and secure them, on the most feared punishment section of all, an island in Macquarie Harbour so small that, as Robinson put it, "The building stands on top of the rock and almost covers it. The people are no sooner out of the door than they are on the verge of the precipice." N. J. B. Plomley *Friendly Mission: The Tasmanian Journals of George Augustus Robinson 1829-1834*, Tasmanian Historical Research Association, 1966, .p 773. For Robinson's full description of this tragedy see pp. 771 - 781

^{xvii} *Ibid.* p 774

^{xviii} *Historical Records of Australia: Series 3 Volume 3.*, Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, 1921, p.501

^{xix} *Historical Records of Australia: Series 3 Volume 2.*, Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament, 1921, pp.741-2.

^{xx} Calder, J. E (ed). *The Log: Circumnavigation of Van Diemen's Land by Captain James Kelly and other accounts of early exploration of the west and north west coast of Tasmania from Parliamentary Papers*. Hobart, Sullivans Cove, 1984, pp21 -34

^{xxi} Windschuttle K, *The Killing of History: How a Discipline is being murdered by literary critics and social theorists*, Macleay Press, Sydney, 1996, p 223

^{xxii} Elton G.R., *The Practice of History*, Blackwell, Oxford, 2002, , pp 76-77

^{xxiii} *Fabrication*, p.77

^{xxiv} *Fabrication* pp77-8 and *Whitewash*, pp.50-4

^{xxv} *Fabrication* pp 88-9 and *Whitewash* pp. 47-51

^{xxvi} *Fabrication* pp 77-82 and *Whitewash* pp. 55-6

^{xxvii} *Fabrication* p.111 and *Whitewash* pp.57 -59

^{xxviii} *Fabrication* p. 110

^{xxix} *Fabrication* p.101

^{xxx} Some Major and minor examples of *Fabrication's* errors presented in *Whitewash*, besides those given in the text, include Flinders Island weather (supposed to be like that of a southern Mediterranean port); apparent comprehensiveness of VDL records (when before the 1825, VDL is noted for its gaps); the level of the evangelical influence in VDL, (far more limited than NSW even from 1823 and scarce an evangelical to be seen before that); the claim that in 1824 the Supreme Court convicted a man of the manslaughter of an Aborigine (he was black but definitely not Aboriginal); failure to recognise that convict bushmen, not the military, were the most effective white force; belief that Bowen's September 1803 sketch of Risdon done within three weeks of settlement shows the location of the huts at the time of the Risdon massacre in May 1804; that the Derwent settlements had no lime at their disposal for packing Aboriginal bones when there was a permanent post established virtually from the beginning to burn shells for lime at Ralph's Bay; the fundamental linguistic and methodological confusion between 'plausibility', or the likelihood of truth, with quality of evidence (degree of plausibility, low or high, in fact can only be claimed with supporting evidence); the belief that until the mid 1820s VDL was characterised by "small mixed farming" when it had already been a predominantly a pastoral economy for over a decade; mistakes about Tasmanian topography including misunderstanding the limited area of grassy woodland suitable for kangaroo and sheep and the location of places that show the early spread of settlement; belief that the artist John Glover only saw Aborigines in Hobart when Robinson documents the other meetings; incorrect date of small pox epidemic in NSW; incorrect date of Aboriginal killing reported in the HTG in 1819; incorrect claim that the term 'Black War' was first

used by West in 1855 when it was used regularly before this, including in two sources apparently read by Windschuttle, Melville and Jorgenson; claims that there is little documentary evidence of Aboriginal views of the fighting and attachment to land even though *Fabrication* ignores the main documentary source of this, the Flinders Island exile; failure to understand that a form of Aboriginal English had emerged by 1830 so that quotes in such can not be dismissed as a “Negro vernacular” that could not have been spoken; belief inherent in tally of Aboriginal dead that no Aborigine ever died from wounds, belief that Aboriginal women were never abducted despite this being a principal finding of the Aborigines Committee that *Fabrication* extensively cites; bizarre statement that Aborigines couldn’t feel compassion when there are many examples to the contrary; misrepresentation of the current state of state of Risdon Cove under Aboriginal management, it being quite different from the sorry and neglected state Windschuttle presents; the photographic evidence for this degradation being of a temporarily damaged, and long since repaired, sign; claim that the British cannon at Risdon could only have fired a blank; claim that the fact that there were 40 Aborigines in Glovers painting proves that Glover couldn’t have painted the Big River Tribe in January 1832 because there were only 26 of them, thus ignoring the 14 Aborigines accompanying Robinson and with him at the time; complete ignorance of tickets of occupation, the dominant form of land tenure in the interior from 1818 to 1823; the reproduction of a sketch of a hut on such a leasehold presented as evidence of the low impact nature of land use under land grants; failure to understand the regular changes in place names and thus claiming the Cape Grim massacre could not have happened as claimed; failure to understand Aboriginal seasonal movements to made the same mistaken point; failure to recognise that the VDL company records were not available until the 1950s, with this explaining, rather than sinister political motives, the ‘new’ prominence since then to killings in the north west; failure to see Aboriginal deaths in proportion to population when claiming VDL was the site where the least indigenous blood of all was shed, (even on *Fabrication*’s figures, extrapolated to the nation, Reynolds estimate of 20 000 Aboriginal dead is too low); wrong on the archeological record; probably wrong about Aboriginal population numbers; wrong about the Aboriginal tool kit (Aborigines never had the tools listed by Windschuttle that he claims they abandoned as proof of their ‘decline’); and probably wrong about the reasons they stopped eating fish. Indeed on almost all claims about Tasmanian Aboriginal culture *Fabrication*, is as is later presented in the text, mistaken. Given that it relies on a book published in 1899, *The Aborigines of Tasmania*, and the theorizing of a contemporary American, Robert Edgerton, this is not surprising.

^{xxxvi} This point is developed in *Whitewash*, p 26-7. The main primary sources used in *Fabrication* other than the CSO Papers are Robinson’s journal, HRA, the early Hobart Town Gazettes and Knopwood’s Diary. Each of these have an index, and, with the exception of Robinson journal only seem to have been read where they have made specific mention of Aborigines. The evidence for this is the obvious errors of fact in *Fabrication* that would have been quickly corrected by a fuller reading of such sources. The claimed end to hunting in 1811 is the most obvious example, as the prominence of this activity after this is everywhere described.

^{xxxvii} Examples of this wide gap between Government proclamation and frontier reality include bans on keeping dogs for hunting, Aboriginal children, keeping stock on crown land on the thirds system, and the myriad of regulations and conditions around land access and land grants more widely ignored than not. As the Land Commissioners reported in 1827, many a settler ‘may properly be termed a complete outlaw.’

^{xxxviii} *Fabrication* p.27 . The gap in records is discussed in *Whitewash* pp 27 –28. Before 1824, Van Diemen’s Land is noteworthy for how many gaps are in the government record, not for it’s completeness. This was a major concern of Commissioner Bigge in 1820, who heard many excuses from different Government officials on the matter.

^{xxxix} Marwick Arthur, *The Nature of History*, Macmillan, London, 1970, p. 156

^{xl} *Ibid* p 156

^{xli} *Fabrication* pp. 132-3

^{xlii} www.sydneyline.com. Debate March 5 2003.

^{xliiii} *ibid*.

^{xliiii} Hobler, G. *The Diaries of Pioneer George Hobler October 6 1800 - December 13 1882*, C & H Reproductions, 1992. Original is in the Mitchell Library

^{xli} Dow, G. and H. Dow, *Landfall in Van Diemen's Land: The Steels Quest for Greener Pastures*. Footscray, Footprint. 1990, p 45. The originals are in the Tasmanian State Archives that, as noted, Windschuttle claims to have made a complete reading of all relevant files.

^{xli} Diary of Adam Amos, TSA NS323/1

^{xlii} Richards, J. *Fifteen Tasmanian Letters 1824 - 1852*, Hamilton Wallace to his father, James Wallace, September 10 1825, Unpublished manuscript, no page numbers

^{xliii} Chapman, P. ed *The Diaries and Letters of G.T.W.B. Boyes Volume 1 1820- 1832*. Melbourne, Oxford University Press 1985; Burn, D. *A Picture of Van Diemen's Land*. Hobart, Cat and Fiddle Press 1973; Parramore William, T. and D. C. Shelton *The Parramore letters : letters from William Thomas Parramore, sometime Private Secretary to Lieutenant Governor Arthur of Van Diemen's Land, to Thirza Cropper, his fiancée in Europe and England, the majority from 1823-1825*. Epping, NSW, D. and C. Shelton 1993. Ross, J. (*The Settler in Van Diemen's Land*. Melbourne, Marsh Walsh Publishing 1975. Lloyd, G. *Thirty Three Years in Tasmania and Victoria.*, Houlston and Wright London 1862. Evans George, W). *A geographical, historical, and topographical description of Van Diemen's Land : with important hints to emigrants, and useful information respecting the application for grants of land*. Adelaide, Griffin Press 1967

^{xliv} *Fabrication*, p. 364

^{xlv} The text of Batman's report is as follows: In pursuit of the Aborigines who have been committing so many outrages in this district ...I fell in with their tracks and followed them with the assistance of the Sydney native blacks until we came to a number of huts....we proceeded in the same direction until we saw some smoke at a distance. I immediately ordered the men to lay down; we could hear the natives conversing distinctly, we then crept into thick scrub and remained there until after sunset...and made towards them with the greatest caution. At about 11 o'clock PM we arrived within 21 paces of them. The men were drawn up on the right by my orders intending to rush upon them before they could arise from the ground, hoping that I should not be under the necessity of firing at them, but unfortunately as the last man was coming up, he struck his musket against that of another party, which immediately alarmed the dogs (in number about 40) they came directly at us. The natives arose from the ground, and were in the act of running away into the thick scrub, when I ordered the men to fire upon them, which was done, and a rush by the party immediately followed, we only captured that night one woman and a male child about two years old,...next morning we found one man very badly wounded in the ankle and knee, shortly after we found another. 10 buckshot had entered his body, he was alive but very bad, there were a great number of traces of blood in various directions and learnt from those we took that 10 men were wounded in the body which they gave us to understand were dead or would die, and two women in the same state had crawled away, besides a number that was shot in the legs...We shot 21 dogs and obtained a great number of spears, waddies, blankets, rugs, knives, a tomahawk, a shingle wrench etc etc. On Friday morning we left the place for my farm with the two men, woman and child, but found it impossible that the two former could walk, and after trying them by every means in my power, for some time, found I could not get them on I was obliged to shoot them." A. H Campbell, *John Batman and the Aborigines*, Melbourne, Kibble Books, 1987, pp.31-2

^{xlvi} *Whitewash* p 32

^{xlvii} Even now, however, mention in the text of *Fabrication* remains no guarantee of inclusion in Table 10. The manslaughter charge in 1824 that Windschuttle claims in *Fabrication* was a trail for the killing of an Aborigine, cited as proof of the official resolve and capacity to punish the killers of Aborigines, still does not get included in the revised table 10. Is this an indirect admission that *Fabrication* was mistaken on this matter and that the dead "black man" referred to in the only documentary record, the Hobart Town Gazette was not an Aborigine, and that, far from the courts being an effective restraint on frontier behaviour, no white was ever brought to trial in Van Diemen's land for violence against an Aborigine?

^{xlviii} H.A Wills, A Tally of those killed during the fighting between Aborigines and settlers in Van Diemens Land 1803-34, 2002 www.historians.org/forumsupport/casualtiesVDL

^{xlix} I. Lee (ed) *The voyage of the Caroline from England to Van Diemen's Land and Batavia in 1827-28*. Longmans London 1927, pp.40-1

^l I, like all historians, am indebted to Ian McFarlane's expertise in this matter. His chapter in *Whitewash* provides an overview of violence in the north west frontier discussed in more detail in his PhD. Windschuttle's claim in *Quadrant* that McFarlane had never heard of the VDL Company version of the Fanny incident until he pointed it out to him at a conference in May 2003 is ludicrous given that the despatch is discussed in the PhD thesis, submitted well prior to this date.

^{li} Lee, p.180

^{lii} *Ibid* p 181

^{liii} Backhouse, *A Narrative of a visit to the Australian Colonies*, London, Hamilton Adams, 1843, p.79

^{liv} *Fabrication*, pp. 254, 43

^{lv} A.W Reed (ed.) , *Captain Cook in Australia*, A.H and A.W Reed, Wellington, 1969, p.173

-
- ^{lvi} Plomley, N. J. B. *The Baudin Expedition and the Tasmanian Aborigines 1802*, Blubber Head Press.1983 pp.40–1.
- ^{lvii} Jeffreys, C. *Van Diemen's Land : geographical and descriptive delineation's of the island of Van Diemen's Land.*, J.M. Richardson, London 1820, pp. 125–6.
- ^{lviii} Thornley, W. and J. Mills. *The adventures of an emigrant in Van Diemen's Land.*, Hale, London 1973, p. 113.
- ^{lix} *Fabrication*, p. 377
- ^{lx} Breen, S. (1992). "Tasmanian Aborigines - Making Fire." *THRA Papers and Proceedings* **39**(1): 40-43.
- ^{lxi} *Fabrication* pp.379-80
- ^{lxii} *Fabrication*, 379
- ^{lxiii} Calder is also according to *Fabrication*, a creator of orthodoxy whose evidence is otherwise not to be trusted
- ^{lxiv} Plomley 1983, p.32
- ^{lxv} *Fabrication* p. 386
- ^{lxvi} *Fabrication* p.398
- ^{lxvii} *Fabrication* pp. 384-5
- ^{lxviii} *Fabrication* p. 383
- ^{lxix} J. Backhouse, *A Narrative of a visit to the Australian Colonies*, London, Hamilton Adams, 1843, p.58
- ^{lxx} *Fabrication*, pp 384-5
- ^{lxxi} Plomley 1983, pp 33 & 41
- ^{lxxii} Archaeologists Tim Murray and Christine Williamson writing in *Whitewash* make it clear that his ignorance of the this record is nearly as great
- ^{lxxiii} *Fabrication*'s mistake was not a typo as the mistake about Baudin was repeated twice, on pages 105 and 379. Windschuttle's dates were actually the dates of the first publication of accounts of the voyages
- ^{lxxiv} ABC's Lateline 3/9/2003
- ^{lxxv} *Fabrication* p 128
- ^{lxxvi} Elton, *The Practice of History*, p.78
- ^{lxxvii} Windschuttle continues to have no explanation as to why the government orders warning against committing acts of violence to Aborigines were necessary. As *Whitewash* pointed out on page 38:
- Why was one issued in January 1810, when according to Windschuttle there had been no Aborigines killed by whites for two years? The June 1813 order is even more odd, since there had apparently not been a single killing for five years. While the following March 1819 Government Order it seems must remain as nothing more than uninformed slander to Windschuttle, given his belief that there had been only one plausible killing of an Aborigine since August 1816: "It is undeniable that in many former instances, cruelties have been perpetrated repugnant to humanity and disgraceful to the British character...The impression remaining from earlier injuries are kept up by the occasional outrages of miscreants whose scene of crime is so remote as to render detection difficult; and who sometimes wantonly fire at and kill the men, and at others pursue the women for the purpose of compelling them to abandon their children...." (HTG March 13 1819)
- ^{lxxviii} Even the few relevant pages where the 19th Century tradition is discussed, pp35-40, are almost all devoted, somewhat oddly, to Las Casas rather than the content of the authors under review.
- ^{lxxix} Chapman P (ed), *Historical Records of Australia; Series 3, Volume 8*, Melbourne University Press, 2003, p.xxxviii
- ^{lxxx} HRA 3/8, p. xxxv11
- ^{lxxxi} *Fabrication*, p.399
- ^{lxxxii} HRA 3/7 pp xxxi-xxxii
- ^{lxxxiii} Reynolds in *Whitewash* p. 127
- ^{lxxxiv} Ross, p.91
- ^{lxxxv} Plomley, N. J. B. (1991). *Jorgen Jorgenson and the aborigines of Van Diemen's Land : being a reconstruction of his 'lost' book on their customs and habits, and on his role in the Roving Parties and the Black Line*. Hobart, Blubber Head Press.p,36
- ^{lxxxvi} *Ibid* p. 99
- ^{lxxxvii} Lloyd, pp 110 and 117
- ^{lxxxviii} Burn, pp12 & 23

-
- ^{lxxxix} Thornley, pp.148-9
- ^{xc} Melville, *The History of Van Diemen's Land from the Year 1824 to 1835 inclusive*, Hortivity Publications, Sydney 1965, p 30
- ^{xc}i *Fabrication* p 401
- ^{xc}ii *Fabrication*, p.35
- ^{xc}iii Melville pp 33, 37 & 90
- ^{xc}iv West J, *The History of Tasmania*, Angus and Robertson, 1981, pp 272 - 273)
- ^{xc}v *Ibid*, p. 331
- ^{xc}vi *Fabrication* p 399
- ^{xc}vii *Fabrication* p 37
- ^{xc}viii Calder, J. E. *Some Account of the Wars, Extirpation, Habits etc of the Native Tribes of Tasmania.*, Fullers Bookshop, Hobart 1972, pp7-8, 25
- ^{xc}ix *Fabrication* p 37
- ^c James Bonwick for example believed “the Aborigines are pronounced by the laws of England to be without right and title to the land on which they had dwelt for ages...it was reserved for modern Christian civilization to advance and maintain a theory which ancient heathen philosophy would have declared inhuman and unjust.”
- ^{ci} Ling Roth, H. *The Aborigines of Tasmania.*, F.King and Sons, Halifax, 1899 p.2.
- ^{cii} Levy, M. C. I. *Governor George Arthur: A Colonial Benevolent Despot.*, Georgian House Melbourne 1953, p. 98
- ^{ciii} *Ibid* p. 101
- ^{civ} www.sydneyle.com, White settlement in Australia: Violent Conquest or Benign Colonisation, March 5 2003