FRONTIER, RACE, NATION

HENRY REYNOLDS AND AUSTRALIAN HISTORY

edited by **Bain Attwood and Tom Griffiths**

Australian Scholarly Publishing

© Bain Attwood and Tom Griffiths 2009
Copyright of each chapter remains with its author(s)

First published 2009
Australian Scholarly Publishing Pty Ltd
7 Lt Lothian St Nth, North Melbourne, Vic 3051
TEL: 03 9329 6963 FAX: 03 9329 5452
EMAIL: aspic@ozemail.com.au
WEB: scholarly.info

A Cataloguing-in-Publication entry for this title is available
from the National Library of Australia.

ISBN 978 1 921509 44 1

All Rights Reserved

Copyediting by Sandra McComb
Design and typesetting by Sarah Anderson
Printing and binding by Tingleman
Cover photograph by Bruce Miller, courtesy of the photographer and Penguin Books

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS vi

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1 FRONTIER, RACE, NATION
Bain Attwood and Tom Griffiths 3

POLITICS AND HISTORY

CHAPTER 2 ABORIGINAL AND SUBALTERN HISTORIES
Dipesh Chakrabarty 35

CHAPTER 3 'THE LANGUAGE OF ORDINARY MEN' *HENRY REYNOLDS, HISTORY AND THE PURSUIT OF JUSTICE*
Mark McKenna 71

CHAPTER 2 **ABORIGINAL AND SUBALTERN HISTORIES**

Dipesh Chakrabarty

I feel privileged to have been invited to contribute to this volume. I do not belong to the initiated in the field of Aboriginal history. I am a bystander to and a beneficiary of the debates that have marked and rocked this field in the last two decades. So I feel honoured to be allowed into this ceremonial space where we have gathered to honour Henry Reynolds.

I am privileged in another sense. It was an exhilarating experience to have been a young academic in Australia in the 1980s when, thanks precisely to the path-breaking scholarship of Reynolds and his colleagues, Aboriginal history was gaining recognition as a university subject and a field in its own right. The excitement was electric. It was

like watching a new star being born. I will never forget, for instance, the first time when a course on Aboriginal history was formally taught at Melbourne University with Patrick Wolfe as the tutor. Wolfe came to me after one of his very first tutorials to tell me how some of the Aboriginal students in his class refused to read historical accounts of massacres of Aboriginal people, saying that it hurt them to read this material. As their teacher of history, Patrick had to argue hard to convince them that they needed to develop the capacity to read those documents, and thus distance themselves from their immediate emotions, if only to challenge better the past that was embodied in them. That one conversation revealed in a flash the fact that historical consciousness was indeed an acquired taste. One learned it in the same way that in the history of modern medicine one learned to be a patient. If modern history was a subject that was born in Ranke's Germany through the ascendancy of a method called *quellenkritik* or source criticism, here was a late twentieth-century branch of history that was born in disputations about methods, about the very nature of history as a modern form of knowledge. My friend and mentor at Chicago, the anthropologist cum historian Bernard Cohn used to say in half-seriousness, 'It does not matter which discipline you belong to, so long as you are ashamed of it'. Well, Aboriginal history, and my field of subaltern history, gave me enough reasons to be both proud and ashamed of my own discipline.

I was at this time part of another historiographical rebellion, the South Asian project of Subaltern Studies, taking shape in the same years under the leadership of Ranajit Guha at the Australian National University. There was not much conversation in those early years between Subaltern Studies and Aboriginal history but Reynolds himself has lately remarked on the convergences that marked these two projects. In his Introduction to the 2006 edition of *The Other Side of the Frontier*, he writes:

> It was only much later that I realised that what I was trying to do closely paralleled the contemporaneous work of the historians of south Asia who launched the school of subaltern studies. A month or two after *The Other Side of the Frontier* was published in Townsville, in Canberra Ranajit Guha wrote the preface to the first volume of *Subaltern Studies*, which he explained would deal with those who were subject to subordination … [and] the failure of traditional history to acknowledge the subaltern as the maker of his own destiny.[1]

It is only in retrospect that one becomes aware of what was original about these projects and what tied them together. In themselves, however, they were isolated projects. It seems strange to think today that *The Other Side of the Frontier* was rejected by several publishers — one arguing that 'there were already too many books about the Aborigines' — and that this book that later became one of the best-sellers in Australian history was published in 1981 by Reynolds' own department for want of a publisher and was sold 'entirely by post'.[2] Parenthetically, I should add that I like to think of it as symptomatic of the demand for this rare first edition of the book that both the copies held by the National Library in Canberra should have gone missing!

The convergences between Reynolds' project and that of Subaltern Studies allow me to claim that Reynolds writes out of what I think of as the postcolonial condition. Since Reynolds may not like to think of himself as a 'poco', having publicly voiced criticisms of 'pomos' or the

'circling theoreticians' who found 'traditional history' 'old fashioned, unreflective, unsophisticated', let me hasten to explain what I mean by this.[2] The French philosopher Etienne Balibar has often insisted in recent times that we all share in the postcolonial condition in two respects: first, we all live in times that come after the big waves of decolonisation and in that sense are postcolonial, and second, we all live in proximity to peoples whose ancestors suffered modern European colonial rule. The postcolonial condition, Balibar avers, is thus an inescapable, global condition. Reynolds' awareness of this condition is the first point of convergence between Subaltern and Aboriginal histories.

Both Aboriginal history and Subaltern Studies were postcolonial attempts to democratise representations of the past. The postcolonial condition was global. Reynolds himself provided an account of this global context in the inaugural Trevor Reese Memorial lecture he gave in London in 1984. Aborigines had been written out of histories written in Australia between 1955 and the 1980s, he said; such histories focused instead on celebrating the progress of the nation and its success in transplanting 'free institutions' from Britain.[4] This historiography was thoroughly unmoved by the waves and impulses of decolonisation that had seized the world in the 1960s. 'The last 15 years', Reynolds said, had seen 'dramatic changes'. Aborigines themselves had organised the tent embassy of 1972 and launched a renewed land rights movement in a context that had seen, as Reynolds put it, a 'world-wide reassessment of European imperialism which followed in the wake of decolonisation and third-world assertiveness'.[5] Of course, Aboriginal activism itself, as Mudrooroo reminds us in his *Us Mob* (1995), was influenced and inspired by the doctrines of anti-colonial theories of Aime Cesaire and Frantz Fanon, and by examples of the democratic struggles of African

Americans, Maori and other subaltern groups. Reynolds wrote out of that shared sense of an anti-colonial *zeitgeist*. Subaltern Studies emerged from the same sensibility.

The second point of convergence is a certain close but problematic affiliation with Left traditions of British social history, in particular the one we associate with E.P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, Christopher Hill and others. It seems to me to be an interesting feature of Reynolds' intellectual evolution that the relation to British social history becomes problematic over time. In the beginning, the desire to write a history in which Aboriginal people appeared as the agents of history, and not simply as its victims, almost naturally found a precedent in the works of these important historians. One can think of Bain Attwood's first book *The Making of the Aborigines* (1989) that clearly references Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963), or Reynolds' own acknowledgement of this connection: 'I had been very impressed with the new social history and the work of English scholar E.P. Thompson with his commitment to see working-class history from below'.[6] The connection to 'English social history' is clear towards the end of his 1987 book *Frontier* where, referring to Hobsbawm's *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848* (1962), he assimilates Aboriginal dispossession to the larger sweep of European capitalism:

> The conflicts of settlers and Aborigines was an offshoot of the bourgeois revolution that swept across the face of Europe during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The revolution encompassed many things but land was at the centre of it. Even closer to the Aboriginal experience was the fate of Celtic-speaking Scottish highlanders who were forced off their traditional lands by new

landlords and new tenants who brought commercial sheep farming from the South.[7]

Yet, clearly, there was a sense that something was different in the Aboriginal case, that theirs was a story that could not be fully captured by the narrative models of class conflict. While much of the humanism of a Thompson was visible in *The Other Side of the Frontier*, Reynolds had already announced a topological metaphor that was different from the image of vertical relationships that was contained in the talk of class revolutions and turning the world upside down. In ending the book, he wrote: 'This is the first book to systematically explore the other side of the frontier, to turn Australian history, not upside down, but inside out'.[8] The importance of this metaphor in indicating a displacement of the original problematic of English social history is underlined in the 2006 Introduction where Reynolds observes that he was very impressed by the new social history's commitment to history from below but that writing 'about Aborigines and their experience of white Australia was quite a *different* task'. He notes: 'I attempted to explain the situation when I argued … that the book sought to turn Australian history not upside down, but inside out'.[9]

Subaltern Studies started with a similar sense of an uneasy affiliation with English social history. It is, of course, true that the tradition of history writing on the Left in India was deeply influenced by English Marxist or socialist historiography, the so-called 'history from below' tradition pioneered by Thompson, Hobsbawm, and others. Subaltern Studies inherited this tradition but from the very beginning there was a sense that there were some very important differences. The differences did not arise simply because we were writing the history of a place that

was not England. The differences were more fundamental than that. They were, in a word, political. Let me explain.

English Marxist narratives of popular histories were moulded on developmental ideas of time and consciousness: the peasant would either become extinct or would be superseded to give rise to the worker who, through machine-breaking, Chartism, and other struggles for rights, would one day metamorphose into the figure of the citizen or the revolutionary proletariat. The situation in the colony was different. The peasant or tribal person of the third world, as if through a process of telescoping of the centuries, suddenly had the colonial state and its modern bureaucratic and repressive apparatus thrust in his face. To someone like Hobsbawm, this peasant remained a 'pre-political' person: someone who did not, as it were, understand the operative languages of modern, governing institutions while forced to deal with them. Subaltern Studies began by repudiating this developmental idea of 'becoming political'. The peasant or the subaltern, it was claimed, was *political* from the very instance they rose up in rebellion against the institutions of the colonisers.[10] Their actions were political in the sense that they responded to and impacted on the institutional bases of colonial governance: the Raj, the moneylender, and the landlord.

We did not initially think much about the implications of our assertion that the subaltern could be political without undergoing a process of 'political development'. Yet, these were writ large on our historiography. I should explain that the legacies of both imperialism and anti-colonialism speak to each other in this implicit debate about whether the subaltern became political over time (through some kind of pedagogic practice) or whether the figure of the subaltern was constitutionally political. Developmental time, or the sense of time

underlying a stadial view of history, was indeed a legacy bequeathed by imperial rule in India. 'This is the time of the 'not yet', as I called it *Provincializing Europe*. European political thinkers such as John Stuart Mill (or even Marx) employed this structure in the way they thought about history. But nationalists and anti-colonialists repudiated this imagination of time in the twentieth century in asking for self-rule to be granted right away, without a period of waiting or preparation, without delay. What replaced the structure of the 'not yet' in their imagination was the horizon of the 'now'."

This tension between the 'not yet' — the developmental model of political becoming — and the 'now' — the claim that humans anywhere are by definition capable of political action — is, I suggest, a third area of convergence between Aboriginal history and Subaltern Studies. From the very beginning, Reynolds was clear in the same way that Guha was clear on the nature of peasant insurgency in colonial India, that 'frontier violence was political violence' and that the Aboriginal people were always capable of being political subjects.[12] This is, of course, what allowed Reynolds to speak of Aboriginal sovereignty just as redefining the peasant as inherently political led Guha to speak of a subaltern domain of politics operating somewhat autonomously in Indian democracy.

To endow the figure of the Aboriginal with a political capacity was itself a bold move in the 1960s and 1970s, for remember that even into the 1960s anthropologists had seen Aboriginal people as constituting a 'people without politics'. But I cannot overemphasise the creative and theoretical importance of this move of imagining the Aboriginal (or the peasant in my Indian case) as inherently political. In India, it was this assumption that led to the decision to grant universal adult franchise

right after independence in 1947, going directly against Mill's dictum that universal adult franchise assumed universal education. The Indian peasant was formally non-literate and yet made a citizen. This, to my mind, is a quintessentially postcolonial move: to take a category such as 'politics' that is fundamental to the modern European and push it to its limits in the interest of a struggle to democratise the world. It is a move that Fanon made when he said, at the very beginning of *The Wretched of the Earth*, that every single category of Marxism would have to be stretched when applied to colonised people. Postcolonial political thought is all about displacing — or 'stretching', to stay with Fanon — European political categories.[13]

Once again, let me elaborate on this theme through the example of Subaltern Studies before returning to Reynolds. What underwrote Indian anti-colonial and nationalist (though populist) faith in the modern political capacity of the masses was another European inheritance, a certain kind of poetics of history we can call romanticism. It is, of course, true that the middle-class leaders of anti-colonial movements involving peasants and workers never quite abandoned the idea of developmental time and a pedagogical project of educating the peasant. (Gandhi's writings and those of other nationalist leaders often express a fear of the lawless mob and see education as a solution to the problem.)[14] But this fear was qualified by its opposite: a political faith in the masses. In the 1920s and the 1930s, this romanticism marked Indian nationalism generally. For instance, many nationalists who were not Communist or of the Left would express this faith. One should note that this romantic faith in the masses was populist as well in a classical sense of the term. Like Russian populism of the late nineteenth century, this mode of thought

not only sought a 'good' political quality in the peasant but also, by that step, worked to convert the so-called 'backwardness' of the peasant into an historical advantage.[15] The inauguration of the age of mass politics in India was thus enabled by ideologies that displayed some of the key global characteristics of populist thought. There was not only the tendency to see a certain political goodness in the peasant or in the masses, but also the tendency to see historical advantage where, by colonial judgement, there was only backwardness and disadvantage. To see 'advantage' in 'backwardness' — that is, to see belatedness as an opportunity — was also to challenge the time that was assumed by stadial views about history. It was to twist the time of the colonial 'not yet' into the structure of the democratic and anti-colonial 'now'.

I give this potted history of the romantic and populist origins of Indian democratic thought — though not of Indian democracy as such and the distinction is important — to suggest a point fundamental to my exposition. The insistence, in the early volumes of *Subaltern Studies* (first published in 1982) and in Ranajit Guha's *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (1983), that the peasant or the subaltern was always, already political, and not 'pre-political' in any developmentalist sense, was in some ways a recapitulation of a populist premise that was implicit in any case in the anti-colonial mass movements in British India.[16] But there was a displacement of this term as well. The populism in Subaltern Studies was more intense and explicit than in the traditions of nationalism or even official Maoism. There was no 'fear of the masses' in Subaltern Studies analysis. Absent also — and this went against the grain of classically Marxist or Leninist or Maoist analysis — was any discussion of the need for organisation or a party. Guha and his colleagues drew inspiration from Mao (particularly his 1927 report on the peasant movement in the Hunan district) and Gramsci (mainly his *Prison Notebooks*), but their use of Mao and Gramsci speaks of the times when Subaltern Studies was born.[17]

Significantly, neither Mao's references to the need for 'leadership of the Party' nor Gramsci's strictures against 'spontaneity' featured with any degree of prominence in *Elementary Aspects* or *Subaltern Studies*. Guha's focus remained firmly on understanding the nature of the practices that made up peasant revolts in a period that was part of colonial rule but which preceded the times when the peasants were inducted by middle-class leaders into the politics of nationalism. Guha wanted to understand the peasant as a collective author of these uprisings by doing a structuralist analysis of the space- and time-creating practices of mobilisation, communication, and public violence that constituted peasant rebellions (and thus, for him, a subaltern domain of politics). There were limitations, from Guha's socialist point of view, to what the peasants could achieve on their own but these limitations did not call for the mediation of a party. But a cult of rebellion marked the early efforts of Subaltern Studies, reminiscent of one of Mao's popular sayings during the Cultural Revolution: 'to rebel is justified'. Rebellion was not a technique for achieving something; it was its own end. Indeed, from a global perspective, one may say that Subaltern Studies was perhaps the last, or the latest, instance of a long global history of the Left: the search for a non-industrial revolutionary subject.

The political potential of this romanticism is exhausted today. But looking back one can see the twin problems of naming and belatedness that plagued this search for a revolutionary subject in the relatively non-industrialised countries of the world. Such a subject by definition could not be the proletariat. Yet, it was difficult to define a world

historical subject that would take the place of the industrial working classes that did not exist in any great numbers in the peasant-based economies drawn into the orbit of the capitalist world. Would the revolution, as Trotsky said, be an act of substitutionism? Would the Party stand in for the working classes? Could the peasantry, under the guidance of the party, be the revolutionary class? Would it be the category 'subaltern' or Fanon's 'the wretched of the earth'?

When the young, left-Hegelian Marx thought up the category of the proletariat as the new revolutionary subject of history that would replace the bourgeoisie — and he did this before Engels wrote his book on the Manchester working class in 1845 — there was a philosophical precision to the category. It also seemed to find a sociological correlate in working classes born of the industrial revolution. But names like 'peasants' (Mao), 'subaltern' (Gramsci), 'the wretched of the earth' (Fanon) and 'the party as the subject' (Lenin/Lukacs) have neither philosophical nor sociological precision. It was as if the search for a revolutionary subject that was *not-the-proletariat* (in the absence of a large working class) was itself an exercise in a series of displacements of the original term. A telling case in point is Fanon himself. The expression 'the wretched of the earth', as Fanon's biographer David Macey has pointed out, alludes to part of the song of the Communist Internationale ("'Debout, les damnés de la terrre"/Arise, ye wretched of the earth"') where it clearly refers to the proletariat.[18] Yet, Fanon uses it to mean precisely a new and unnamed revolutionary subject. He cannot quite define this other subject but he is clear that in the colony it cannot be the proletariat.

A collective subject with no proper name, a subject who can be named only through a series of displacements of the original European

term 'the proletariat': this is a condition both of failure and of a new beginning. The failure is easy to see. It lies in the lack of specificity or definition. But where is the beginning? The very imprecision is a pointer to the inadequacy of Eurocentric thought in the context of a global striving for a socialist transformation of the world. Outside of the industrialised countries, the revolutionary subject was even theoretically undefined. The history of this imprecision amounts to the acknowledgment that if we want to understand the nature of popular political practices globally with names of subjects invented in Europe, we can only resort to a series of stand-ins (never mind the fact that the original may have been a simulacrum as well). Why? Because we are working at and on the limits of European political thought even as we admit an affiliation to nineteenth-century European revolutionary romanticism. Consider once again the foundational text of Subaltern Studies, Guha's *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. What is the status of the category 'political' in Guha's (and our) polemic with Hobsbawm that the peasants were not 'pre-political' but in fact as political as the British or the middle classes?[19] The status is ambiguous: the peasants were political in the already understood sense of the term — in that they dealt with the institutions of colonial rule — but they were also 'political' in some other sense, about which we were not clear at all. But the political claim that nineteenth-century peasant rebellions were political could only be made on the assumption — and this remains an assumption — that we already knew completely what being political meant. What was new about peasant resistance in nineteenth-century India could only be expressed anachronistically, in the guise of an old category: 'politics'.

A similar creative and politically-minded anachronism happens, I would suggest, in Reynolds' insistence, much like Guha's, on the fundamentally political nature of the figure of the Aboriginal in his historical narratives. Take his path-breaking book, *Fate of a Free People*, analysing Aboriginal resistance in Tasmania in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Reynolds is aware of the European roots of the modern idea of the political. He writes how some settlers were astonished to find among Aborigines 'ideas of their natural rights', which Reynolds regards, rightly, as attempts at interpreting 'in European terms' the world-making they encountered among the Aboriginal people. Yet, in resisting prejudiced histories written by earlier white historians and chroniclers, Reynolds insists on the applicability of the category 'political' in describing Aboriginal resistance. He challenges 'the clear assumption that the Tasmanians were incapable of taking political action' and describes the Aboriginal leader, Walter Arthur, as 'the first Aboriginal nationalist', thus tearing the idea of 'nationalism' from all its anchorage in the history of modern institutions.[20] Clearly, 'politics' and 'nationalism' are under-determined, part-sociological and part-rhetorical categories here, not completely open to the demand for clarification. And it is their rhetorical imprecision that actually enables Reynolds to let us see something new in history. He has, in Gayatri Spivak's terms, successfully brought the word 'nationalism' to a catachresis, which is the only way subalterns appropriate the categories of the dominant.

I want to end by speaking of another essential characteristic of postcolonial history and Reynolds' relationship to it. A little thinking will tell you that there is no history of the colonised unless and until the historian has access to their imagination. This makes language

learning an essential part of the historian's training. 'There will be no proper histories of Aboriginal peoples until we have good language programs going in the universities and train potential researchers in Aboriginal histories in those languages. And I do not mean a functional training in Aboriginal languages; I mean a training that allows you to enter someone else's poetry. Reynolds was, of course, extremely aware of this limitation even when he peeked, so courageously and creatively, into the other side of the frontier. As he himself said, *The Other Side of the Frontier* was an exercise in reading predominantly European material against the grain.[21] And his success in this can be measured by the intensity with which the book was read by or to almost every member of an Aboriginal community near Cairns.[22] But to his credit, Reynolds has never claimed to write 'blackfella history'. 'This work, I explained, was a white man's interpretation, aimed primarily at white Australians.'[23]

This is not an unproblematic explanation. But I do not want to explore this here. Instead I want to read it as a pointer to a success that Reynolds has achieved that falls to the lot of very few academics. By talking about a primarily 'white Australian' readership, Reynolds was not being so much a nationalist as registering a sense of both his limitations and his intended community of readers. It is well known that this audience has included judges and politicians and activists. That is in part what we celebrate here. But I want to say a word about that impact before I conclude this essay.

Many have written, both critically and otherwise, about the impact of Reynolds' work on judges in the High Court of Australia's *Mabo* and *Wik* native title cases. I am not qualified to pronounce on whether or not Reynolds read the histories of natural law or international law

right. I know there are debates on those points. But I am just struck by one signal achievement of Reynolds. I know that judges William Deane and Mary Gaudron in the *Mabo* case who read Reynolds also spoke of 'a national legacy of unutterable shame' that Aboriginal dispossession had left in Australia. Reynolds' histories had obviously succeeded not just in moulding legal and political opinions and knowledge; he had actually been able to produce new kinds of affect on a national scale. Historians often write with and from passion. But few history books actually give rise to passion in others, let alone in a large number of others. I don't think this was achieved by scholars of Subaltern Studies or by any other historians in my time who have written out of the postcolonial condition. Reynolds' distinction is unique, and from a corner in the distant field of Indian history I salute him.

CHAPTER 3 **'THE LANGUAGE OF ORDINARY MEN'**

HENRY REYNOLDS, HISTORY AND THE PURSUIT OF JUSTICE

Mark McKenna

At Gleebooks, Sydney, on 10 March 2008, Henry Reynolds and Marilyn Lake were in conversation with the *Australian* newspaper's Paul Kelly, who was launching their book, *Drawing the Global Colour Line*. For an hour, the conversation turned on the international dimensions of racial ideas in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But the first question that came from the audience to Reynolds was about something else. Standing, a retired high school teacher harked back to Reynolds' earlier work on Aboriginal history. 'As far as I'm concerned, 'you're an Australian hero', she declared. 'I've used your books for years in my teaching and I just wanted to say thank you. 'Thank you for

by the Governor-General, Sir William Deane, of his book *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* (see also Inglis, 'The Fogs of War', *Australian*, 1–2 January 2000). The case was again made in early 2009 by the war historian, Peter Stanley, in 'High Time for New Demarcation in War's Frontier', *Canberra Times*, 6 March 2009.

143 Reynolds, 'New Introduction', 10

144 Reynolds, *The Other Side of the Frontier* (Melbourne: Penguin, 1982), 201

145 Ken Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1998), 448.

146 This point has also been made by Dipesh Chakrabarty, who has contrasted Reynolds' position to that of Frantz Fanon. See his discussion in 'Reconciliation and its Historiography: Some Preliminary Thoughts', *UTS Review* 7, no. 1 (2001): 7, 11–12.

147 Reynolds, 'The Black War: A New Look At An Old Story' (The 1984 Eldershaw Memorial Lecture), *Tasmanian Historical Research Association: Papers and Proceedings* 31, no. 4 (1984): 1

148 Geoffrey Bolton, *A View From The Edge: An Australian Stocktaking* (Sydney: ABC Books, 1992); Reynolds, *North of Capricorn*, viii, 191.

149 Reynolds, 'The Black War', 7.

Chapter 2 Aboriginal and Subaltern Histories

1 Henry Reynolds, *The Other Side of the Frontier*, new edn (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2006), 4.

2 *Ibid.*, 1

3 Reynolds, 'The Public Role of History', lecture given at the National Library of Australia, available on <http://www.nla.gov.au/events/history/papers/Henry_Reynolds.html>, accessed 27 August 2008.

4 Henry Reynolds, *The Breaking of the Great Australian Silence: Aborigines in Australian Historiography, 1955–1983* (London: Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 1984), 4.

5 *Ibid.*, 4–5.

6 Reynolds, *The Other Side*, 4.

7 Reynolds, *Frontier: Aborigines, Settlers and Land* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1987), 193

8 Reynolds, *The Other Side*, 199.

9 *Ibid.*, 4, my emphasis.

10 See my 'A Small History of *Subaltern Studies*', in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, eds Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2004), 467–85.

11 See the discussion in the introduction to my book *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000).

12 Reynolds, *The Other Side*, 201

13 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 40.

14 See Gyanendra Pandey, 'Peasant Revolt and Indian Nationalism', in *Selected Subaltern Studies*, eds Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 133–87

15 For an excellent discussion of this point, see Andrzej Walicki, *The Controversy Over Capitalism: Studies in the Social Philosophy of the Russian Populists* (1969), (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), Chapters 1 and 2, in particular the section 'The Privilege of Backwardness'.

16 Ranajit Guha, *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), Chapter 1.

17 Shahid Amin, 'De-Ghettoising the Histories of the Non-West', Gyan Prakash, 'The Location of Scholarship', and Chakrabarty, 'Globalisation, Democracy, and the Evacuation of History?', in *At Home in Diaspora: South Asian Scholars and the West*, eds Jackie Assayag and Veronique Benei (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2003), 95–100, 115–26, 127–47

18 David Macey, *Frantz Fanon: A Biography* (New York: Picador, 2000), 177.

19 Guha, *Elementary Aspects*, Chapter 1.

20 Henry Reynolds, *Fate of a Free People* (Melbourne: Penguin, 1995), 11, 23, 69

21 Reynolds, *The Other Side*, 4.

22 *Ibid.*, 6.

23 *Ibid.*, 8.

Chapter 3 'The language of ordinary men'

1 This description of the Gleebooks' event is my own.

2 Personal papers of Henry Reynolds, held Launceston: letters from Lesley O'Shea, 19 August 1999; John Fysh, 2 August 1999; and Jocelyn Moen, 3 October 2004.

3 Tom Griffiths, 'The Language of Conflict', in *Frontier Conflict: The Australian Experience*, eds Bain Attwood and S.G. Foster (Canberra: National Museum of Australia, 2003), 146.

4 Sales figures courtesy of Henry Reynolds. Reynolds' comments to me, Launceston, July 2008.

5 *Aussie Pint*, 18 November 2000.

6 Reynolds to me, Launceston, July 2008.

7 Bain Attwood, *Telling the Truth About Aboriginal History* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2005), 55; for Kelly, see *Courier Mail*, 7 July 2007; for Cave see <http://www.senses of cinema.com/contents/06/38/proposition.html>; and for Gordon Bennett see Eve Butler, 'The Revolutionary Colouring History', *Australian*, 31 August 2007

8 Personal papers of Reynolds.

9 In *The Age* on 27 November 1998 Reynolds called for a memorial to be built at the Australian War Memorial to the 20,000 Aborigines who died defending their

CONTRIBUTORS

Warwick Anderson is a professorial research fellow in the Department of History and the Centre for Values, Ethics and the Law in Medicine at the University of Sydney. He is the author of *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health and Racial Destiny in Australia* (2002), *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines* (2006), and *The Collectors of Lost Souls: Turning Kuru Scientists into Whitemen* (2008).

Alan Atkinson is an honorary professor in the Department of History at the University of Sydney. He is the author of *Camden: Farm and Village Life in Early New South Wales* (1988), *The Commonwealth of Speech* (2002), and *The Europeans in Australia*, vols 1 and 2 (1997 and 2004).

Bain Attwood is a professor in the School of Historical Studies at Monash University and an adjunct professor in the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, The Australian National University. He is the

author of *The Making of the Aborigines* (1989), *Rights for Aborigines* (2003), *Telling the Truth about Aboriginal History* (2005), and *Possession: Batman's Treaty and the Matter of History* (2009).

Larissa Behrendt is a professor at the Jumbunna Indigenous House of Learning, University of Technology Sydney. She is the author of *Dispute Resolution in Aboriginal Communities* (1995) and *Achieving Social Justice* (2003), and co-author of *Treaty* (2005).

James Boyce is an honorary research associate of the School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania. He is the author of *Van Diemen's Land* (2008).

Dipesh Chakrabarty is the Lawrence A. Kimpton Distinguished Service Professor of History and South Asian Studies at the University of Chicago, and an adjunct professor in the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, The Australian National University. He is the author of *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (2000) and *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies* (2002).

Elizabeth Elbourne is an associate professor in the Department of History at McGill University. She is the author of *Blood Ground: Colonialism, Missions and the Contest for Christianity in the Cape Colony and Britain, 1799–1853* (2002).

Lisa Ford is a lecturer in the School of History and Philosophy at the University of New South Wales. Her book, *Settler Sovereignty*, will be published in 2010.