

Private Lives, Public History:

Contemplating intimate and collective historical consciousness in Australia

Anna Clark

The so-called 'history wars' have waged in Australia for a generation now, as the nation's past continues to generate heated public and political debate. In 1988, in perhaps the largest public rendering of contested national memory, it was the nation's bicentennial celebrations conducted amidst powerful Aboriginal protest that captivated public historical discourse. Fast forward thirty years and the social media campaign to #changethedate (of Australia Day), and the defacement of monuments to Captain James Cook and Governor Lachlan Macquarie in Sydney's Hyde Park, confirm that divisions over Australian history continue.

These politicised public discourses of Australian history have generated extensive commentary from academic historians, politicians and media pundits. Yet little is known of their impact on the wider community. What do so-called 'ordinary Australians' think about the nation's disputed past? Are the historical questions raised by the history wars also debated in our sports clubs, living rooms and community centre kitchenettes? Does contested collective memory extend *beyond* opinion pages or academic journals, reaching out across the garden fences to the verandas of everyday life?

The 'Private Lives, Public History' project was to be an answer of sorts. For some years I had been deeply invested in the history wars, exploring contests over national commemorations, school syllabuses and history texts. Yet it niggled that the voices over whom such contests were being waged—so called 'ordinary Australians'—were almost completely absent from that national historical conversation. Aside from surveying letters to the editor in the op-ed pages of major daily newspapers and trawling online commentary on columnists' blog posts (both decidedly *unrepresentative*), there was little that revealed how people think about the history around them. In response, I devised a research project to

explore that very question: I wanted to understand how ordinary people think about history, from their most intimate life-stories to those public debates dominating the headlines. That meant understanding how Australians contemplate the national past in the context of their own personal narratives and, simultaneously, how people's intimate histories operate in the context of those powerful historical discourses that dominate public debate.

In devising the project, I drew on the idea of historical consciousness—an aggregation of public historical culture, family/community historical narratives and formal history education. After all, history 'can be constructed at the dinner table, over the back fence, in parliament, in the streets, and not just in the tutorial room, or at the scholar's desk', writes Tom Griffiths.¹ In order to understand such breadth of historical discourse, as the United States historian David Glassberg has elaborated, we need to contemplate 'how ideas about history are created, institutionalized, disseminated, understood, and change over time'.² Such an understanding of historical consciousness describes humanity's interest in its past—the ways we remember and why, as well as how we learn and engage with historical knowledge and practice.³ In particular, I was influenced by the German historical theorist Jörn Rüsen's definition of historical consciousness as a process, whereby individuals make sense of the past to understand the present and anticipate the future.⁴

But what do people themselves make of their own historical consciousness? The Private Lives, Public History project, on which this chapter is based, was to be an answer of sorts. Drawing on community-based interviews with focus groups from around the country, it attempted not only to map historical consciousness in Australia, but also delineate how people articulated and understood that map. For the most part, I was interested in what this sort of research—what I termed an 'oral historiography'—revealed about Australians' engagement with the multiple historical discourses that operate in their everyday lives. Could it extend our understanding of the role and function of history in Australian families and

communities? I also wanted to reflect on its limitations. Was there anything this approach to historical consciousness could not explain? And, if so, why?

The English historian Alison Light famously declared that family history 'is reckoned to be the third most popular activity on the internet after shopping and porn—and can be equally addictive'. About forty per cent of Britons have become 'armchair time-travellers, researching from their computers at home', she explained, indicating a community obsession with family history that has indeed become 'big business'.⁵

That historical condition certainly seems to be booming at a community level in Australia. There are tens of thousands of local history groups and museums around the country, as well as genealogical societies and family history groups that meet in libraries, community centres and cafes. The past is widely enjoyed, with people signing up for heritage tours and reading groups, as well as consuming vast quantities of historical fiction, film and television programs, such as *Who Do You Think You Are?* The widespread digitisation of archives has also enabled unprecedented access for people to research and write their own family histories, which would have been unimaginable only a generation ago. Online visitors to the New South Wales State Records Office and Public Records Office of Victoria reach into the millions annually. The National Library of Australia's Trove database contains hundreds of millions of digitised sources on Australian history that are free, open and increasing daily—every hour, tens of thousands of searches are conducted on its material. Meanwhile, commercial databases such as Ancestry.com have billions of searchable records, and the company has sold over six million DNA kits to subscribers eager to discover their genealogy.⁶ Anyone with an internet connection can *do* history. What's more, since the social historical turn in the 1960s and 1970s, anyone can now also *be* a legitimate historical topic. Historical methods such as oral history and memoir have further facilitated the expansion of history

beyond traditional figures, archives and narratives. All this has amounted to an increasing democratisation of historical practice and subjectivity in recent decades.

This great historical expansion also revealed an alarming paradox about the state of historical consciousness in many Western democracies: the boom in intimate historical consciousness belies an ongoing sense of ‘crisis’ in the state of citizens’ historical knowledge.⁷ Ongoing doubts about national literacy in Western liberal democracies such as the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia and many European countries—with arguments over national canons, public commemorations and educational standards—reveal a curious disconnect between the history people ‘should’ know, and the sorts of history they’re actually doing. As the historian John Tosh explained in relation to the British experience, ‘We are confronted by the paradox of a society which is immersed in the past yet detached from its history’.⁸

It is a view widely held, and several significant attempts in the US, Australia, and Canada have already been made to explore that contradiction of historical consciousness in particular nations and communities. Like Tosh, these researchers confirmed a distinct lack of community engagement with more formal national narratives, which people sense are too prescribed and disconnected from their everyday lives; and they noted a simultaneous popular contemplation of history that was booming at a community level.⁹ In other words, the studies sensed an uneasiness between two forms of historical consciousness—what the Australian public historians Paul Ashton and Paula Hamilton have described as a ‘disjuncture between professional practice and “people’s History” or history in the “everyday world”’.¹⁰ One is official and nationally oriented, what the historical theorists Berber Bevernage and Nico Wouters call ‘state sponsored history’,¹¹ which is taught in schools, tested in surveys, and promoted by public institutions; the other is more intimate, experiential, and tactile, and is deeply connected to people’s own lives and communities.

In contemplating my own research project, I wondered whether we could see that space not simply as a disjuncture, but also a possible *intersection*: do these distinct types of history ever come together? And if so, how? How do people consider their family histories in the context of broader public historical discourses? And how do they negotiate Australian history in light of their own family and community pasts? These are the questions that framed my work and provided the rationale for its method and approach.

The Private Lives, Public History project was significantly influenced by those larger mixed-method studies that preceded it, but wasn't modelled on them. Rather than representative qualitative surveys, I conducted embedded, grounded research in local communities. To do that I convened community-based focus groups where I listened to participants talk about history among themselves. These small affinity groups offered a way to capture life histories, as well as community and national histories through prompted, but also spontaneous, conversation. Using what Adele Clarke calls a 'situational analysis', I wanted to plot the voices of 'ordinary people' alongside public debates and discourses as a way of producing a map of historical consciousness in Australia.¹²

I chose for the study five communities that broadly reflect Australia's geographical, cultural and socio-economic diversity: Marrickville (a municipality and suburb in Sydney's inner south); Chatswood (a community on Sydney's affluent North Shore); Brimbank (a multicultural and working-class community in outer-western Melbourne); Rockhampton (a large country town and regional hub in Central Queensland); and Derby (a remote town with a large Indigenous population in far north-western Australia). This was not a random or demographically representative snapshot of the Australian population, but a purposive sample of participants who came from different generations, schooling, ethnic backgrounds, and class. I was keen to include a range of voices and experiences which would be critical to my exploration of historical consciousness. Across the five communities I listened to twenty-

three such groups, which included sporting clubs, historical or heritage societies, bush regeneration groups and art groups, as well as seniors' centres, migrant resource centres, and youth groups. The groups averaged four to five participants, which tended to generate fluent, engaged discussion, and lasted for about an hour. In total I spoke with 100 people, prompting them with questions about family, community and national histories using questions from an interview schedule that covered topics about their local and family histories, as well as the ways they connected to national and public historical events, such as Anzac Day, or the 2008 Apology to the Stolen Generations.

This purposive approach to the focus groups enabled me to hone in on particular groups and demographics to explore questions about historical practice that were playing out in my mind as I devised the project. I was particularly interested in whether there were differences between urban and rural respondents in relation to histories of place, for example, and attitudes to Australian history between older, dominant participants (for example white Anglo-Saxon) and those held by Indigenous people and people from migrant backgrounds, which have generated important vernacular counter-narratives to the 'Australian story'. Sometimes it felt like I had thrown a pebble into a pond as these concentric rings of historical engagement neatly framed the group discussions. At other times, respondents nudged and jostled with those clear demarcations (of 'family', 'community' and even 'nation'), and the conversations headed into uncomfortable historical territory.

These conversations were wide-ranging and challenged assumptions that ordinary people do not have much to say about Australian history. They also confirmed oral historians' observations of the unsettling experience of being thanked by their subjects—after all, isn't it *us* who should be indebted?¹³ But as I quickly discovered, people want to be listened to: they want their stories heard, and they want to be understood. As my session at the Chatswood Migrant Research Centre neared the sixty-minute mark, I let people know that they could head off if they needed to. 'I'm okay', insisted Anu. 'This is far too interesting to miss!' It went

on for another hour. At the end of several other interviews, participants thanked me profusely for coming along to hear their thoughts.

Admittedly there were those who couldn't quite believe I was really after 'the ordinary', that their thoughts were good enough to be included in a 'research' project. 'God', sighed Deborah after her interview. 'I hope I haven't raved on!' Transcribing another interview, I could just make out right at the end a quietly spoken woman from the Rockhampton Country Women's Association commenting, 'Now let me ask you, were we interesting?' The answer was 'yes', of course—for these interviews are insightful and revealing, not just about the state of historical consciousness in Australia, but oral historiography as a method of understanding it.

In their interviews, participants were asked to discuss their attitudes and engagement with the histories around them—intimate and personal, as well as national and public. Broadly, the characteristics of historical consciousness highlighted in earlier studies played out. Participants in this project confirm that intriguing historical paradox noted by others: collectively, they maintain deep, familial historical connections day to day; they also express a distinct lack of engagement with more formal national narratives, which they consider to be much more prescribed and remote.

These respondents explained in detail the objects they had kept to pass on to their own children or grandchildren, they described family reunions they participated in, genealogies they had researched and compiled, the museums and heritage trails they visited, and the historical societies and community groups they belonged to. What's more, they revealed how much they enjoyed talking about the past with their friends and families, and the extent to which they consumed histories (as well as making their own)—in the form of life-writing, historical fiction, documentaries, and popular history books. While their own life-stories generated very strong connections with the past, the community conversations also

revealed a distinct lack of connectedness to the sort of official, national history participants learned at school, or were expected to observe publicly.

When I asked Reg, a retired bank manager from Brimbank, how connected he felt to his family history, he said ‘very connected, actually’, and proceeded to recount in detail a ‘nostalgic journey’ he had recently taken to the sites of his childhood near the Murray River in South Australia. For Trevor, an Indigenous participant from Derby, history was also clearly marked along family lines:

There are things passed down to most of us, but in my immediate family I actually do all that, because I’ve got all the histories of my great grandparents, my grandparents on both sides, and my mum’s—I’ve got all the welfare stories from the welfare days when she was a Stolen Generation—taken away. I’ve got all her history, plus her oral history that she told me about.

At Chatswood, Anu, a recent migrant from Britain of Indian heritage, similarly described how conversations about family history and identity were playing out at home:

My daughter, who’s pre-teen—she’s twelve years old—she’s just getting into that stage now of ‘Who am I?’, ‘Where do I belong?’ So she’s beginning to ask for more stories. She’s asking me, ‘Oh, tell me that one again’. So I think with the two of us, we’re both reaching out to re-establish links [to our past]. Like now she’s saying, ‘I want to go back to London so I can see my family there’. So I said, ‘what do you remember?’ She doesn’t remember a lot, but she seems to remember feeling *good* in a different way. So that’s interesting, it’s helping me as well, in my search for community and history and contact.

And yet, while history figures in participants’ lives, they don’t particularly sense a collective inheritance of Australia’s national narrative, as a group of university students from Brimbank in Melbourne reveal:

Do any of you feel connected to Australia's past?

All: No

Sylvie: Personally, no.

Why is that?

Sandra: I think, I don't know, for me, like, we never even really learnt much Australian history in school. I can't even remember learning about explorers, I mean, let alone Indigenous Australia, or anything.

A group of youth workers I interviewed nearby also expressed an explicit lack of interest in an official national history:

Do any of you feel at all connected to Australia's past?

Adam: I don't feel particularly connected. Because I see myself as an Aussie and stuff, but like, my family tree and stuff just cut into Australia's history. So we weren't there from the beginning and we don't really have any Australian ancestors or anything like that. So I don't feel particularly connected, but it's interesting. It's not really a part of me so much.

Mike: The thing is, we all pretty much know the Australian history. The Hume and Hovell monument is over there [pointing], we know about the goldrush and all that stuff. But all that stuff happened however long ago, and all that stuff changes so quickly, it's just not us.

I tended to visit these communities, like Brimbank, over the course of about a week in order to locate and contextualise the groups *in situ*. In between interviews I walked around taking notes, I read local history books, I visited community and historic sites, and listened to the ways people talk about local history around their monuments, memorials and museums. Clearly, while Mike and Adam were aware of the Hume and Hovell monument, they did not

feel any strong literal connection to that history of colonial exploration. Those young Australians feel as if they have been exposed to an official national narrative, but that narrative does not properly speak to their own experiences—'it's just not us', as Mike admitted.

It is not only young people who feel disconnected from that national narrative. Older respondents, such as Douglas from Marrickville, said that he felt connected to Australian history 'in an intimate unofficial way'. But in 'an official sense', he continued, 'I feel totally alienated from what it means to be an Australian'. At the Derby Bowling Club, Simon also expressed more interest and connection to his local community than to a broader national story. 'I'm more interested in the local stuff. What happens outside of here probably doesn't concern us that much,' he said, before clarifying: 'That's probably the wrong way to say it. We all take notice of things that happen, it just doesn't mean as much as it does around the local area'.

This was a clear illustration of that paradox of historical consciousness Rosenzweig and Thelen had tried to unravel. More than simply highlighting the contradiction between family and official historical connectedness, however, it seemed that several respondents were actually working through that conundrum themselves. *Do these family stories make you feel more connected to the past than, say, history that you learn in class?* I asked Manisha, a university student from Brimbank. 'I think it's different,' she said, 'because you're connected to that history or that part of history, rather than history as a whole.' For Liu in Derby, while history 'was taught in school', she felt those connections perhaps were not so apparent 'because of the fact that it was a long time ago and you can't make that personal connection with it. When you can make a personal connection to history I think it means more to you than just reading about how Captain Cook discovered Australia.'

The project certainly confirmed a gap between national and intimate, public and private. Participants' responses also help explain *why* personal histories often connect and

resonate more deeply with a historically-minded public audience. Yet the research also found several vital points of intersection between ‘private lives’ and ‘public history’, which simultaneously confound interpretations of a booming popular interest in the past, as public and official narratives languish beside them. In fact, historical consciousness is composed of *constant* intersections between public and private encounters with the past, such that it is sometimes hard to distinguish between the official and the intimate.

First, the interviews demonstrate that Australians frequently discuss and describe collective historical consciousness through the prism of their own attitudes and experience. *Do you feel connected to the past on a historic day such as Australia Day?* I asked a Bushcare Group in Chatswood:

Daniel: Absolutely. I think it’s a great celebration. [The Bicentenary in] ’88 was fantastic—you could almost walk across the harbour! It was a sensational day. One big party, I suppose, that’s why it appealed.

For its history or its celebration?

Daniel: Um, well the history was when Australia was discovered—that’s what they were celebrating.

Nick: Or invaded, if you want a different perspective, I do sympathize with the Aboriginal point, that this is not an appropriate day to celebrate, and that maybe we should have a different day.

National, public narratives constantly overlap with our personal historical views, as this group at the Chatswood men’s shed reveal in a conversation about how they felt about the apology to the Stolen Generation:

Nigel: What gets me with the Stolen Generation is that it was going on when I was alive and I didn’t know anything about it, and I’m embarrassed by the fact that my parents didn’t do anything about it, in a political way.

Robert: They wouldn't have thought that it was wrong. They thought that they were doing what was right at the time.

Taken together, the comments reveal a tension between historical empathy and judgement across time: Nigel is dismayed that he could have been ignorant of the Stolen Generation, and that his parents 'didn't do anything' about it, connecting that current national debate over Australian history with his own family; Robert empathises with the historical protagonists, sensing they acted in the belief that what they were doing 'was right at the time'. Such comments reveal how participants wrestle, at a personal level, about the extent to which there can be historical agreement across time and space. Their conversation might not be sophisticated in a scholarly sense, but the tension is still genuine, and suggestive of an emergent capacity for complex historical engagement and critique.

I also think that they show that more work is needed to understand exactly how historical consciousness works in prompting the skills of historical thinking (such as empathy, judgment and an understanding of historical relativity). For example, participants' discomfort with pure historical relativism, which emerged in the interviews as a tension between historical 'truth' and 'interpretation', also indicates that the challenges of historical thinking do not simply exist in academic seminars and departmental tearooms, but in everyday life. As Jarrod from Rockhampton insisted, 'there are two sides to the story and they're in conflict. And we have to get past that and start looking at what are the real problems'. Trevor from Derby similarly suggested that while historical contest is inevitable, that should not be at the expense of the quest for historical 'truth': 'I think people are always going to disagree on some subjects, but there are some things where they should have some understanding or mutual agreement about some of the stuff in history—most of it's documented'. In other words, participants' sense of historical subjectivity should not be dismissed as a superficial belief in endless pluralism.

In some ways the conversations document a collision of historical consciousness—between the history of Australia, and people’s personal experiences of that history. Given the high-stakes of the history wars, that everyday capacity to understand not only history’s subjectivity, but also the difficulty of historical judgment was surprising. I had not anticipated that the groups would be so gently accommodating of each other’s historical differences. Secondly, and perhaps more critically, the community conversations hint at the radical potential of this sort of oral historiography. Jerome de Groot has written persuasively about the enfranchising power of public and popular history. Not only are ordinary people making and doing history, they are able to see themselves—their own historical subjectivity—within that narrative. ‘The insertion of the personal “I” into the historical “narrative,”’ writes de Groot, ‘the curation of identity in public and online, suggests new ways of thinking about the performance of the historicized self.’¹⁴

While de Groot acknowledges the inherent conservatism of ‘family history’ (research is inevitably patrilineal and archive-based, it is reliant on access to leisure time, it requires a high degree of literacy, and is founded on Western forms of knowledge that are text-based), it also presents new opportunities.¹⁵ These interviews confirm it: here are family and community stories that fundamentally unsettle conventional modes of history-making. Take Trevor’s comments about his family’s experience of the Stolen Generations—despite a century of silencing Indigenous perspectives, families like his dutifully and diligently passed on Australia’s shameful history of child removal.

Aboriginal family histories demonstrate that historical silence is not absolute; sometimes it just requires some new ways of seeing, and listening, as these Aboriginal teachers’ aides in Derby argued in their interview:

Kylie: I think the main one is just Aboriginal people not having it written down. If you go back to it, the white Australia had theirs written down, you know? Where, you go to black Australia, it’s all pictures, it’s oral. And who’s going to say what’s the truth?

Like, how can we justify that did happen, and we know well, and you guys have no paper written down.

Heather: Like written down and acknowledged.

Kylie: That's it. If we had all our events written down and acknowledged, then we can go back to the written days, but it is oral. You know, you're telling your kids who's who, who's what, and where's this, and everything like that.

In a sense, these comments represent a form of what Miranda Johnson and Fiona Paisley define as a form of Indigenous historiography that challenges disciplinary modes of historical practice.¹⁶ It is also a form of historical consciousness that is both personal and implicitly national. The historical consciousness in this research hints at the radical potential of vernacular narratives that include intimate discourses around broader conversations on national history, as well as gender, race, sexuality, culture and family life. As Maria Nugent has argued in relation to Aboriginal history-making, 'Aboriginal family history is always more than just family history.'¹⁷ Those stories, passed down through Aboriginal families during much of the twentieth century, which Trevor's comments attest, provide a powerful counter-narrative to the academic and official histories from which they were occluded.

I was extremely conscious of my own academic training and identity at these moments, and I tended to back off when participants explained the ways they understood their own life-histories and Australian history more broadly. I also backed away from academic critique when writing up the research, sensing that my academic intervention might undermine my own participants with its urge to analyse and critically engage. The discipline's 'blind eyes', as Hall describes them, means history has the capacity to silence as well as illuminate.¹⁸ Community-based histories can be an important attempt to work outside a scholarly discipline implicated in the process of historical occlusion, as Fabri Blacklock articulated when describing the process of doing oral histories in her own Aboriginal

community: 'I love listening to the stories and recording them. Some are sad, some are happy. But at least we are telling it our way.'¹⁹ And if recognising the 'fragmented and unreliable status of archival sources' is a critical step in recognising the limits of the history discipline, as Kirsty Reid and Fiona Paisley insist, then this sort of quotidian discourse—presented in the Private Lives, Public History project without extensive scholarly intervention—has a vital role to play.

That is not to say that the reluctance to step in and offer my own critique of these interviews did not have some sort of cost. We have a desire to let participants demonstrate their own forms of history-making, but that can sometimes mean uncomfortable comments going unchecked and historical assertions remaining untested. Surely, this is the dilemma of all forms of family and community history? My project was no exception. In an attempt to let everyday voices speak for themselves, I hoped they would populate public discourses about the past, challenge national narratives and question disciplinary conventions about what history is. As collaborators in my research, moreover, I was also determined not to undermine their contributions. But in prioritising participants' historical consciousness, there is also a danger that you retreat from critical historical practice.

And if I am honest with myself, critical historical practice is what I am trained do, a tension not lost on others in the field. In a review of Rosenzweig and Thelen's *Presence of the Past*, the late Michael Kammen argued that despite the pressure to democratize the discipline of history, everyday historical understandings are not equivalent to scholarly expertise: 'family and pastness are clearly not the same as history and should not be casually conflated with it.'²⁰ John Tosh made a similar claim when he insisted that 'thinking *about* history' and 'thinking *with* history' are not the same thing.²¹ 'Increasingly, the popular embrace of history is an emotional embrace,' the Australian historian Mark McKenna recently added, 'one that runs counter to the more critical understanding brought to the past by historians.'²² Such

comments reveal a wariness of that historiographical expansion into popular and vernacular modes of history-making.

Such critique also raises further important questions. For example, if people connect to the past through personal experience, is it possible to have historical critique and interrogation that does not offend or silence other people's 'pasts' and 'stories'? And if they are drawn to histories that connect them, how should citizens learn about more removed, or 'boring' histories that are also deemed important? These are issues that warrant further research.

What others might judge as a gap in my research is at least in part a result of its design: because I wanted to populate public historical discourse with the voices of everyday Australians, the sort of critical interrogation of their transcripts required for such analysis never felt quite right. Building on de Groot, I wanted to give my participants a form of historical agency and voice with this research, as well as producing a piece of work they would be interested to read. But in taking that approach, I can now see moments in the interviews and data analysis where an edgier critique might have produced some meatier answers—although they might also have risked offending the participants and introducing an academic voice that diminished theirs. That is surely one of the conundrums of work in community or family history and historical consciousness more broadly: to what extent do we (as researchers) need to understand it as a social process, or as a way of discerning hierarchies of historical understanding? Even now, I am not certain I have the answer.

Over the last thirty or forty years there has been a great *peopling* of history. History has become more inclusive, both in its content and its practice: 'ordinary people' are more visible in historical narratives and increasingly equipped to produce their own. This dramatic enfranchisement of the discipline has challenged professional assumptions about what history is, who does it, and how.²³ If anything, the Private Lives, Public History project confirms

that expansion and reveals that the personal and official historical domains overlap continuously in everyday life. The impact of the history we learn at school, view in museums, and commemorate collectively is simultaneously shaped by our family and community histories. Contests over the past between historians, politicians and public commentators echo our own historical subjectivities. Such research pushes the boundaries of how we do history and what history can be, suggesting a complex, if nascent, form of historical thinking in Australians' historical consciousness. Critically, it also points to the radical potential of vernacular history as a practice that unsettles national narratives, and historical debates—although that historiographical revision raises important methodological questions about the practice of disciplinary and everyday history that demand further contemplation.

¹ Tom Griffiths, *Hunters and Collectors: The Antiquarian Imagination in Australia* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1.

² David Glassberg, *Sense of History: The Place of the Past in American Life* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 18.

³ Jörn Rüsen, "The Didactics of History in West Germany," *History and Theory* 26, no. 3 (1987): 281.

⁴ Jörn Rüsen, "Tradition: A Principle of Historical Sense-Generation and Its Logic and Effect in Historical Culture," *History and Theory* 51, no. 4 (2012): 45.

See also: Paul Ricoeur and John B Thompson, *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1981), 274.

Greg Denning, *Performances* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1996), 35.

⁵ Alison Light, "In Defence of Family History," *The Guardian*, October 11, 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/oct/11/genealogy-not-historys-poor-relation-family>.

⁶ <http://www.records.nsw.gov.au/state-archives/resources-for/historians/family-historians>, viewed 15 August 2013; <https://www.opengov.nsw.gov.au/publication/14888>, viewed 15 April 2015; <http://prov.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/PROV-Annual-Report-2013-14-V1.0-FINAL.pdf>, viewed 15 April 2015; <http://trove.nla.gov.au/>, viewed 15 April 2015; <https://www.ancestry.com.au/cs/legal/Overview>, viewed 5 June 2018.

⁷ Alan M Sears and Emery J Hyslop-Margison, "Crisis as a Vehicle for Educational Reform: The Case of Citizenship Education," *Journal of Educational Thought* 41, no. 1 (2007): 47–62.

⁸ John Tosh, *Why History Matters* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 6.

-
- ⁹ Paul Ashton and Paula Hamilton, *History at the Crossroads: Australians and the Past* (Ultimo, NSW: Halstead Press, 2010); Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998); Margaret Conrad et al., *Canadians and Their Pasts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013).
- ¹⁰ Ashton and Hamilton, *History at the Crossroads*, 8.
- ¹¹ Berber Bevernage and Nico Wouters, eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of State-Sponsored History after 1945* (New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2017).
- ¹² Adelle E Clarke, *Situational Analysis: Grounded Theory After the Postmodern Turn* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2006). See also: Jean Burgess, Helen Klæbe, and Kelly McWilliam, "Mediatization and Institutions of Public Memory: Digital Storytelling and the Apology," *Australian Historical Studies* 41, no. 2 (2010): 152, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10314611003716861>.
- ¹³ Alistair Thomson, "Oral History," in *Australian History Now*, ed. Anna Clark and Paul Ashton (Sydney: New South Publishing, 2013), 83.
- ¹⁴ Jerome de Groot, "On Genealogy," *The Public Historian* 37, no. 3 (2015): 105.
- ¹⁵ de Groot, 106.
- ¹⁶ Fiona Paisley, "Living Empire," in *Sources and Methods in Histories of Colonialism*, ed. Kirsty Reid and Fiona Paisley (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 178–93; Miranda Johnson, "Writing Indigenous Histories Now," *Australian Historical Studies* 45, no. 3 (2014): 317–330.
- ¹⁷ Maria Nugent, "Aboriginal Family History: Some Reflections," *Australian Cultural History* 22 (2003): 144.
- ¹⁸ Catherine Hall, "Thinking Reflexively: Opening 'Blind Eyes,'" *Past & Present* 234, no. 1 (February 1, 2017): 254–63, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtw059>.
- ¹⁹ Fabri Blacklock, "Telling It Our Way: Koori History in NSW," *Australian Cultural History* 22 (2003): 160.
- ²⁰ Michael Kammen, "Carl Becker Redivivus: Or, Is Everyone Really a Historian?," *History and Theory* 39, no. 2 (2000): 234.
- ²¹ Tosh, *Why History Matters*, 6-7.
- ²² Mark McKenna, "The History Anxiety," in *The Cambridge History of Australia*, ed. Alison Bashford and Stuart Macintyre, vol. 2 (Port Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 580.
- ²³ Jerome de Groot, "Empathy and Enfranchisement: Popular Histories," *Rethinking History* 10, no. 3 (2006): 391–413.