Making the Modern Mate

John McLaren

> John Howard has surrendered the self-reliance, for which we fought, to curry favour with the most dangerous military power in history … He boasts he stands for mateship and egalitarianism at the same time he attempts … to destroy the institutions on which these qualities have been nurtured.[1]
>
> Robin Gollan, historian and ex-serviceman.

Australians are often accused of being overly worried about their identity. I am not sure that we worry about this more than dwellers in other lands. Scots and Welsh are insistent that they are not English, and some friends of mine from Northern England are insistent that they have a quite different identity from their southern compatriots. Americans seem concerned with whether the rest of the world loves them, and Canadians are concerned that they are not mistaken for US Americans. New Zealanders are most insistent that they are not Australians. Yet a reading of the Mackay Reports on social attitudes over the last 25 years suggests that most Australians are quite happy with who they are. In terms remarkably similar to Russel Ward's in *The Australian Legend,* respondents describe the typical Australian as "masculine (and a bit of a larrikin), sociable and friendly, spontaneous, fun-loving, lacking in national pride, versatile and resourceful, a good sport, tough, resilient, self-deprecating, down to earth (no bullshit), … [and]…laid back, often to the point of laziness …"[2] Participants in an SBS Insight program similarly agreed that mateship and tolerance are central Australian values. However, one contributor, David Marr, characterised it in negative terms as "passivity", and another, Libby Gorr, suggested that "mate' is the "scariest word in the Australian vocabulary".[3] When asked in detail what they thought about particular issues, Mackay's respondents showed a growing anxiety undermining their ease. They worried about migrants and unemployment, poor education, drugs, the abuse of welfare, and corporatisation. In 1986 they suggested that our vaunted egalitarianism was an idealistic misrepresentation of a status-conscious society. Many attitudes were contradictory. They wanted a

fair go for Aborigines, but decried preferential treatment for them. They believed in multiculturalism, but were worried by the loss of Australian identity. Material progress did not relieve the pressure they felt on them as individuals. They worried about the "shambles' of politics and the economy, and what they saw as an attack on family values. While still believing in tolerance, they worried that it as not returned by others. In 1997 they described Australia as a "disappointed country", yet by the time of the 1988 Bicentennial a sense of wellbeing had grown and most people believed that the growth of a multicultural community, reconciliation with the Aborigines and the lessons of feminism had broadened the concept of mateship to become inclusive. By 1999 their anxiety had grown and they deplored the lack of political leadership or vision, and they feared social breakdown, they felt disengaged from the present, but they were still optimistic about their future. In 2005 they retained their personal optimism, but saw society as rougher, tougher, less compassionate, more conservative, and its people as edgy, angry and stressed. In general, the report shows that, whole many Australians still believe in the older values associated with mateship, there has been a progressive movement away from these values as they are expressed in public and social life.[4]

Yet the idea that mateship is at the centre of Australian identity is common and powerful. Oxford shows that the term mate in its present sense (which it describes as now obsolete, despite giving an Australian example from 1973) dates back in English to 1380. It dates "mateship' in its present sense back to Elizabeth Barrett Browning in the nineteenth century, but its later references are all Australian. The Oxford national Australian Dictionary has references to its use from 1864 to 1985, with connotations ranging from the religious to the political, the sardonic, the nostalgic and the national and the military. My favourite is from the *Bulletin* of 11 December 1897: "Seven weeks of lurid mateship—ruined soul and four pounds six." This has the genuine connotation of mates together against the world, regardless of cost or consequence.

A search of Google brings up 191 000 mentions of mateship, but the first ten all have an Australian reference. Google's Australian pages have 65 000 entries for the word. The first of these, surprisingly, is from Bob Dylan; who is quoted in an attack by an Australian real estate agent on Muslims for the assault by the Bali bombers on Australian mates. The next two, unsurprisingly, are from Henry Lawson: the sketches 'Mateship' and 'Send Round the Hat'. The Commonwealth government's official website on Culture and Recreation, in an article on folklore, explicitly links convict and bush experience with social values. It identifies "a folk

identity of Australians as resilient people who 'laugh in the face of adversity, face up to great difficulties and deliberately go against the establishment ... Gold diggers embraced the socialism of mateship already adopted by pastoral workers." An article on the same website identifies Henry Lawson as the first Australian writer to "give voice to interpretations of an 'Australian' character". It links these interpretations to the interest of *The Bulletin* in mateship, socialism and republicanism. These linkages show that the term is not itself definable, but rather is a signifier of those qualities of Australian identity that are seen as desirable at particular times in history.[5]

Images of mateship are still popular in Australian public rhetoric. When the miners emerged from where they had been trapped underground in the Beaconsfield mine in Tasmania, the Prime Minister saluted their rescue as an example of Australian mateship". He did not note that this kind of mateship is common to mining communities around the world, and is bred by specific working conditions.[6] In his proposed preamble to the Australian Constitution he attempted to generalise and nationalise the term when he included the statement that "we value excellence as well as fairness, independence as dearly as mateship."[7] The term also remains popular in Labor politics, although here it has a more cynical application, referring to mates in dirty dealing. Police forces use it in a similar manner. The Leader of the Opposition, Kim Beasley, put an altogether different, and ironic, spin on it when he said that Australians had "invented the word to cover when we forget someone's name."[8]

The sunnier meaning of mateship remains dominant in sporting commentary. In 2002, writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Adam Gilchrist claimed that the outstanding feature of Australia's one-day cricket side was its feeling of mateship. A Melbourne Football Club team member, Cameron Bruce, attributed a narrow victory over Sydney to the team's going to see the film *Kokoda* and talking "a lot before the game about courage and endurance and mateship". In the same paper the columnist Tim Lane wrote after a Carlton match that "A compelling image was that of old digger 'Bluey Whitnall', head bandaged, hit with everything early, stepping up to the front line and holding together the ranks of a beaten outfit. Bluey has the sort of stoicism that has always been so admired in the Australian serviceman. He reveals little, if anything, of his inner feelings on the field, never seems to complain, is modest, has seen the good times and the bad and always treated those two impostors both the same." Lane seems however to have got his class lines blurred when he continued by remarking that "The only thing that represents Carlton's class, tradition and history better ... is the navy blue jumper ..." Carlton, located in a working

class suburb, is now blue-blood rather than blue-collar. But the shift in class identification is itself part of the changes that have produced the modern images of mateship.[9]

This tradition of mateship, with or without the actual term, is repeatedly called on by Australia's political leadership to situate within a democratic and nationalist tradition policies that are profoundly reshaping the nature of Australian society, and to conceal the nature of the changes that have occurred. In his Australia Day address in 2006 the Prime Minister repeatedly invoked the egalitarian values that had formed part of the original connotations of mateship. He started by telling prospective migrants, presumably including refugees, that "the Australian family" expects all who come to the land to "make an over-riding commitment of Australia, its laws and its democratic values." He also expected them to learn English. He concluded his speech with the more general assertion that "the Australian greatness ... is found in the good and generous character of the Australian people." In between, he described this character in terms of fairness, decency and tolerance four times, equality or egalitarianism seven times, and shared values five times. But the key word in the speech is 'balance', by which he means the interests of the individual against society. Balance in his view leads to social cohesion. While he argued that egalitarianism is the ultimate source of social cohesion, there is an underlying assumption that economic development will underpin these values, and an explicit argument that they will be furthered by the emergence of a global middle-class. He made no reference to the marked inequalities of income that have accompanied economic growth, nor to the restrictions of the freedom to engage in collective action in pursuit of common goals. His social values are embodied in the concept of "mutual responsibility', which suggests the responsibility of the individual to the community, or in practice the powerless to the powerful. He castigates schools for not reaching an "objective' history that shows how these values have developed. He also dismisses any suggestion that the rights of the individual should be enshrined in law. In the name of unity and a common legacy he ignores the social divisions of class and race. Above all, he promotes "responsible behaviour and self-reliance' as the "essential pillars of a compassionate Australia".[10]

The attempt to portray current practices as a return to traditional values is at the heart of the culture wars that have ravaged in Australian institutions in the last decade.[11] Howard presents his ideal as the positive counter to the "postmodern culture of relativism" that in his opinion questions or repudiates "any objective record of achievement." Now that the "divisive, phoney

debate about national identity" has been put to rest, Australians again have the social cohesion that will enable them to "to contribute effectively to the international effort to combat terrorism."[12] While correctly perceiving the Enlightenment as the source of western values, he fails either to see the limitations of its concept of freedom or its dependence on scientific attitudes originally brought to Europe by Moslems. Like most conservative enthusiasts of Enlightenment, he completely ignores its hostility to all religions. He also ignores the fruits of the Enlightenment that were brought to Australia in the form of the convict system and the bitter racial and sectarian divisions it produced along side mateship.

Yet the ideal of mateship was never inclusive. The concept was born among the convicts and miners, itinerant rural labourers and industrial workers of nineteenth century Australia, and cemented in the experience of front-line troops in the two world wars. The conditions of work left little room for the sectarian divisions that otherwise disfigured Australia, so that Lawson, the "Apostle of Mateship", could talk about his shearers "tramping side by side, The Protestant and 'Roman'". This experience bred their belief in equality, but it was the equality of class; "They call no biped lord or 'sir', They touch their hats to no man!" Certainly Lawson dreamed of a time when this equality would spread throughout society, when "the curse of class distinctions from our shoulders shall be hurled", but this would happen only after the "haggard, stern-faced" shearer preaching revolution has with his mates won the war and drafted the future."[13] But while the conditions of work may have bred the notion that 'Socialism is Being Mates'[14], they did not overcome distinctions of gender and race. In fact, in his short stories Lawson's bushmen repeatedly seek refuge in the mateship of the track or the pub to avoid the failure of their marriages. Their women remain on the selections, battling with the land and their kids. Critics from Humphrey McQueen to Ghassan Hage have shown the racism at the heart of the ideal of mateship, and Kenneth Cook's 1961 novel, *Wake in Fright*, has provided a devastating account of its destructive force. The Australian bush might be "nurse and tutor of eccentric minds, the home of the weird, and of much that is different from things in other lands," but only as long as the outsiders remained loners.[15] Nevertheless, during the twentieth century the casual and egalitarian attitudes of Australian workers spread generally through society, although the troubles in Ireland and repeated splits in the Labor Party also intensified sectarianism.[16]

The identification of mateship with the Australian tradition was fashioned by later writers, particularly in the years after the second world war. This was a time when those on the left saw

the possibility of creating a new Australia based on traditions of fairness and justice. This hope motivates the two key texts of the time, Russel Ward's *Australian Legend* and Arthur Phillips' *Australian Tradition*, both of which appeared in 1958. These two works helped to value Australia's past and provided images of democracy and egalitarianism around which society could coalesce. Although these images kept alive the hopes of the left during the long years of opposition, they were equally important in providing Australians with a sense of themselves as a people apart, untroubled by the excesses of other lands, their security guaranteed by the father figure of Robert Menzies and his powerful friends. Poets like David Campbell or Douglas Stewart continued to celebrate the bush ethos, with its connotations of mateship, and Les Murray combined the bush celebration with resentment of the cities. More, like James McAuley condemned this society not for its injustice but for its materialism, and promoted a vision of an Australia that turned its back on the irreverent larrikin and returned to the service of God. Writers on the left, like Frank Hardy, John Morrison or Judah Waten, who chaffed at what they saw as false comfort, returned to the old image of revolutionary mateship, but succeeded only in reinforcing the idea that in the end Australian virtue would guarantee that all would be well.

Since the seventies there has been reason to believe that diversity was becoming valued, that the voice of welcome was drowning out the voice of rejection. The Mackay Reports show that at the time of the 1988 Bicentennial most people continued to believe that the growth of a multicultural community, reconciliation with the Aborigines and the lessons of feminism had broadened the concept of mateship to become inclusive.[17] Since then, Prime Minister Howard has enjoyed electoral success while demonising refugees, "Moslem extremists", Aborigines and unionists. Australians, like many in Europe and North America, have grown more anxious and less tolerant. This change has been accompanied in Australia by a return to religious based politics, mobilised by fundamentalist Christian groups and directed against Moslems. Yet searches of the internet for Australian references to 'Islamic Terrorism' or 'Jihad', uncover little evidence of either organised prejudice. Individual hate-sites abound, and there are some extreme examples of anti-Semitism by Moslem clerics. Several Islamic sites also support jihad in the Middle East, but many point out that jihad is in itself a contested or misunderstood term. Most mainstream Christian and Moslem sites however seem to be reaching out for understanding.[18] Although there was evidence of hate literature being peddled and some students being recruited

for violent jihad overseas, I could find no evidence of Moslem leaders calling for violence within Australia.

It is easy to explain this development as a consequence of Howard appealing to the older voice of intolerance as a way of providing assurance in a time when personal insecurity accompanies economic expansion. This has been the line taken by dissident commentators, including Robert Manne and Donald Horne. Yet Gregory Melleuish suggests deeper reasons for the change when he argues that the positive ideals of the tradition did not merely accompany its negative elements, but were dependent on them. "The Australian settlement, he argues, proposed to engineer a 'fair' Australia on the assumption that fairness could be achieved only in a society that was racially and culturally homogeneous. The White Australia policy was a condition of the settlement, just as the removal of Aborigines to a European environment was a condition of their advancement and eventual integration in white society. There is strong evidence for Melleuish's argument in the statement made by TW White, the Australian representative at the Evian conference in 1938, that "as we have no racial problem we are not desirous of importing one," and therefore would not offer asylum to Jewish refugees from Europe. [19] This is the same outlook exploited by Howard and his ministers in turning back a generation of refugees from Asia.

The original sentiments of mateship arose from a sense by workers and selectors that they, the true makers of Australia, and had been dispossessed by Lawson's 'Old Greed' of the just fruits of their labours.[20] This sense of deprivation sustained the pioneers of the labour movement, and continues to sustain the National, née Country Party. It explains the rise of the One Nation Party in 1996 and the successful adoption of many of its policies and rhetoric by the Coalition. But rather the Old Greed, the target now is the managerial and academic elites of the cities. These are the teachers, lawyers, doctors, social workers, artists, writers and bureaucrats who embraced the agendas of social inclusion, but they may constitute a new professional middle class they do not represent any mass movement or majoritarian party. Other parts of society, particularly those placed uneasily between working and middle classes, identified by Howard as 'battlers' or 'aspirationals', felt differently. The working conditions of these groups do not provide the collective source of social identity that earlier generations had found in the work place, but they do nurture insecurity and resentment. As David McKnight argues, "rather than experiencing liberation, some began to experience disintegration. Rather than feeling free, they felt fractured. Instead of gains, many felt the loss of stable families and stable jobs and the ebbing of familiar

truths."[21] At the same time, country towns have experienced a continuing decline in size, amenity and power.[22] For these groups, the association of mateship with the secure values of a former time seemed to promise the social stability they sought without the egalitarianism that would threaten the individual wealth they ardently pursued. As the journalist Paul McGeogh summed it up, we have abandoned the inclusiveness of "She'll be right Jack' [or mate] to the exclusiveness of "I'm all right Jack.[23]

Under the Whitlam government, old Labor was brought together with new intellectuals and artists, and the ideals of egalitarianism for a time throve alongside a wider sense of internationalism and social liberation. When the attempt to sweep away the edifices of conservatism failed, the contradictions were revealed and the alliance fell apart. Hawke came to power on a promise of social cohesion symbolised by the Accord, through which the interests of labour and capital would be brought into harmony. His government's agenda of economic advancement through globalisation commenced the social disintegration that would eventually bring Howard to power, without improving the lot of those who produced the wealth. By the end of his term, mateship was associated not with the cohesion of workers but with the close associations between leading ministers and some of the less savoury capitalists.

As the Howard government has refined mateship in terms of cohesiveness based not on equality but on exclusion, numbers of novelists have returned to the contradictions of the Australian colonial settlement. In doing so, they extend the physical event of settlement on the land to the metaphorical dimension of the settlement between land and people, and between the different peoples in the land. Their work goes behind mateship to question the conditions that originally bred it, and beyond the simplistic conception of the Deakinite settlement between capital and labour, exclusion and inclusion, that guaranteed the security of the Commonwealth. Earlier writers, like Lawson, Penton and Herbert, had shown the land as destructive. Others, like Katherine Susannah Prichard, Miles Franklin or Eleanor Dark, had found in it redemption from old world ills. The most recent novelists see it rather as a place defined by old world struggles. Andrew McGahan, in *White Earth*, revives the form of the family chronicle to show the violence of neo-fascism generated by the sense of dislocation and dispossession, and haunted by spectre of the dead tribes on whose remains the whole decaying edifice of civilisation has been erected. Christopher Koch and Thomas Keneally track this violence back Britain's suppression of Ireland, but while Koch finds this conflict ultimately unmanning, in the literal sense, Keneally discovers

possibilities of redemption. Brian Castro, in *Shanghai Dancing*, traces a cosmopolitan genealogy to place the issue of national identity in the perspective of a complicated history of individuals seeking to find a home amidst the violence, greed, lust, love, betrayal, trust and affection that constitute imperial history. In *The Gardener* he returns literally and metaphorically home, telling the story of attempts to plant a garden and build a home in the hills near Melbourne. Again, the story is as much about betrayal as about love, with the brutal figure of the gardener pitted against the frail beauty of his lover as they each seek vainly to construct permanence and harmony. Chris Tsolkas turns away from the land entirely, as his central character in *Dead Europe* he traces the origins of violence to both the recent history and the traditional mythology of Europe.

Roger McDonald and Kate Grenville both go back to the beginnings of Australian settlement and the violence it inevitably involved. Grenville's novel is explicit in its search for some kind of humanity that may overcome the conflicts of race and power that are constituted by the act of settlement. These are dramatised in the opening pages of her novel, where William Thornhill's first night in the new colony is interrupted by the apparition of a human "as black as the air himself. His skin swallowed the light and made him not quite real, something only imagined."[24] Thornhill's problem is that he is unable ever to fully imagine the Aborigines he encounters, and eventually helps to massacre. He is a decent man, a London waterman forced into crime partly by chance, partly by the need to support his family. Had his illegal activities in New South Wales been discovered, his story could have been a tragedy. Instead, they provide him with the means to success as a settler on the Hawkesbury. For a while in his new territory, he imagines that the Aborigines could adopt to his ways and that they could all live in harmony, but even those he befriends remain strangers. Eventually, motivated by fear for his family and fear of dispossession, he joins in a massacre. This alienates him partly from his wife, entirely from his benefactor and closest friend, from his son, and even from the land he sought to possess. He has avoided one tragedy only to become victim of his own.

John Hirst has objected that Grenville's novel is unhistorical, an example of the twenty-first century "liberal imagination" projecting its concerns into the past without realising that people then were different, and that "You need to work hard to understand them" He contrasts Grenville's novel with Inga Clendinnen's study of the first years of settlement at Sydney Cove. Clendinnen, he writes, understands the differences. She recognises the Aborigines as warriors, and coolly appraises how violence worked in their society. The contrast he makes between the two

books is a part of the opposition he sets up between the approach to Australian history of the "liberal imagination" and his preferred "hard realism". The liberal imagination, he suggests, not only misunderstands the legal and practical framework of settlement, but through its fantasies of a possible peaceful occupation distorts present policy towards Aborigines. The hard realist recognises that "according to their lights the settlers were right to invade and the Aborigines were right to resist them. It is our common lot to live with the consequences of that conjunction."[25]

Yet this is precisely what Grenville seeks to do in her novel Like Keneally and Koch, she has written what Chad Habel identifies as ancestral narrative, a story that falls between history and genealogy and links both.[26] These narratives fill a gap in our present by linking us to the past, and joining the specific facts of our family circumstances to general histories of settlement. Grenville has used what she has learned of her own forebears to imagine the events of first contact as they were experienced by a man and woman from London. Unlike Clendinnen, she does not develop the character of the Aborigines from within, because her purpose is to show how they appeared to the settlers, and how their quite understandable resistance produces tragedy. The female settler, Sal Thornhill, rejects them as part of a country she finds literally unsettling. For most of the novel she remains mentally tied to London, where she hopes to return once they have made their fortune. Her husband William is also tied to London, but as the starting point of a journey outwards into a new land. Her he hopes to build the property and fortune that will free him and his family from the circumstances that had blighted their lives at home. The land appeals to him, attracts him, gradually changes him, but then it too, in the form of the Aborigines, betrays him. His kinder instincts are thwarted, he sees the Aborigines simply as savages, a threat to his family, and he participates in their slaughter. Although Grenville does suggest an alternative possibility, in the life of Thornhill's mentor, Thomas Blackwood, who takes a native wife, his white family and the need to protect them deny Thornhill this possibility. His killing of the local tribesmen gives him his prosperity and Sal her home and garden, but their achievement is incomplete. Their son deserts them, the house is not as it should be, Sal's garden does not flourish. The story, as Hirst notes, is a metaphor for Australia, and at the end of the novel it remains incomplete. Grenville's telling of it does not sentimentalise the past, but enters into dialogue with it, demanding of its readers not that they accept guilt, but that they recognise the unfinished business of the Australian settlement.

Roger McDonald's *The Ballad of Desmond Kale* is also an ancestral narrative, although in this case there does not appear to be any familial link between the author and his characters, apart from the fact that he comes of grazing stock. Like Grenville, McDonald is interested in the interaction of colonists and the land, but whereas she searches for the origins of community, he loos rather at the way the land produces social disintegration. His novel opens with an horrifying account of the convict Kale being flogged, but the n shows him escaping captivity and disappearing with his sheep into the interior. From this point he does little in the novel. He is absorbed into the land, where he becomes a mysterious presence, an object for others to seek. These others—the parson who had him flogged, the officer who betrays his class to allow Kale's escape—become obsessed with sheep, and particularly with the sheep Kale manages so successfully. The women these men lust for, on the other hand, find with Kale a kind of sanctuary from the settled lands and their violence. The emphasis of the novel comes to be laid on the part the land plays in the construction of gender. Kale himself, who starts as a figure of heroic, enduring but aggressive masculinity, becomes both sanctuary and bulwark, both masculine and feminine. But he remains sturdily individual, and the society that forms around him is as hierarchical as the society of Sydney.

Yet, if the novel celebrates individualism rather than collectivity, it is a different kind of individualism from that of, say, the American west. Those, like Parson Stanton, who are driven by greed are destroyed by it. Kale's ambition is closer to that of William Thornhill, although without the sociability, or to Ivan Doig's farm selectors in America's Pacific Northwest, than to the characters of a Larry McMurtry novel. McDonald's novel is a plausible account, not of an alternative history of settlement, but of what may well have happened beyond the confines of the law. The few Aborigines who appear in it are figures resisting inevitable destruction, but Kale and his companions do not represent progress. They simply are, but by so being they bring into question the kind of accounts of ordered settlement, a steady progress towards responsible government and representative democracy, that Howard favours. Metaphorically, the novel represents a society that has penetrated the land and found a measure of success, but has yet to find what it is all about. The fact that its symbol of prosperity is wool, the staple that no longer sustains Australia, underpins the theme that material progress is illusory. Yet through the novel wool is more important than people. "Men betrayed, wool rewarded." (p. 20)

These novels, written at the beginning of a new century of the Commonwealth, throw into question both material and social achievement. Their characters discover an affinity for the land, but this leads to no deepening humanity. Grenville's convicts are a scruffy lot; McDonald's are coarser, sticking together with Irish solidarity, but scarcely mates. His officers and gentry are quarrelsome, vain, greedy. The most admirable men in the book are the Irish bullocky and the Jewish trader, the one a loner, the other a family man. The women are nurturing but independent. They have a strength found sometimes in Lawson's women, not at all in Baynton's, but this is directed to survival rather than community.

Despite their strong negative elements, the positive ideals in the concepts of mateship and egalitarianism have served Australia well. They enabled the construction of a society that after the second world war provided work and tolerable living standards for most of its people, and enabled millions of migrants and their families to be absorbed relatively quietly. But the Tampa incident and the Cronulla riots are warnings that the barriers are again going up against outsiders fears of the different spreading.[27] The novelists I have discussed are have revisiting the foundational myths of Australia to discover new relationships with the present and its fears. Some have re-imagined the sources of the settlers' ambitions in the imperial centre, and the changes brought about in the settlers by their encounter with the land and its earlier inhabitants. Others have examined the cultural sources of more recent migrants from Asia and Europe. Together, they suggest that the problem for Australians is not identity, but the question of what they want to do with a land that remains stubbornly itself, resistant to all human ambition, and what role we may have to play in a global culture that has fear and violence at its centre. These challenges require a more inclusive framework than the ideal of mateship offers in either its original concept or its more recent use.

---

[1] Robin Gollan, *Canberra Times*, quoted in *Recorder* no. 25, Melbourne, May 2006, p.2.

[2] Hugh Mackay and others, *Mackay Report*, no 41, 'Being Australian', March 1988, p. 45.

[3] 'Aussie Rules: Australian Values', 'Insight', SBS television, moderator Jennie Brocks, 25.4.06.

[4] Hugh Mackay, *Wrap; a distillation of the key themes from 25 years of the Mackay Report; 21 Years that Shaped the Mind and mood of Australia, Mind and Mood June 2005; Mackay Report, 19779-2005.*

[5] 'Henry Lawson: Australian writer', *cultureandrecreation.gov.au*, , quoting a 1997 paper by Tony Moore; *Australian Folklore ,idem.*; both pages accessed 20.6..06

[6] ABC news. 9.5.06.

[7] 'The Prime Minister's Draft Preamble', 23.3.99, www.home.aone.net.au/~byzantium/preambles/pm.html

[8] ABC news, 25.4.06.

[9] Melbourne *Age* Sport, 24 April 2006, pp 2, 9.

[10] John Howard, 'A Sense of Balance: the Australian Achievement in 2006', http://pm.gov.au/news/speeches/speech1754.html, accessed 6.2.06.

[11] Institutions affected include the ABC, the National Museum of Australia, an d the History and English Departments

[12] Howard, 'The Australian Achievement 2006', pp. 5, 6.

[13] Henry Lawson, 'The Shearers', "For'ard', , in *Poems*, edited by Colin Broderick, John Ferguson, Sydney, 1979, pp. 178, 99; 'The Men who Made Australia', quoted in Stephen Murray-Smith, *The Dictionary of Australian Quotations*, *p. 154.*

[14] William Lane, heading to an article collected in *The Australian*, edited by Bill Wannan, Australasian Book Society, Melbourne, 1954, p. 253.

[15] Lawson, 'The Bush Undertaker', *Short Stories and Sketches 1888-1922*, edited by Colin Roderick, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1972, p. 57.

[16] On Catholics and the Labour movement, see Brian McKinlay (ed.), *A Documentary History of the Australian Labor Movement 1850-1975*, Drummond, Richmond, Vic., 1979; Ireland, p. 589; Archbishop Mannix, ; pp.. 84, 222, the Movement, pp. 206, 216-8, 693-5; Catholic radicals, p. 747; Bill Guy, *A Life on the Left: a biography of Clyde Cameron*, Wakefield Press, Kent Town, SA, 1999, p. 131; on sectarianism generally, Janet McCalman, *Struggletown: public and private life in Richmond 1900-1965*, pp. 14, 18, 21, 72, 83-5, 103-4, and *passim.*

[17] 'Being Australian', *Mackay Report*, no. 41, March 1988; ibid., *The Wrap: a distillation of key themes from 25 years of the Mackay Report,*. June 2003.

[18] Google searches were conducted, 3-5.6.06, for various combinations of terms, including 'Islam terror Australia', 'Islam jihad Australia', 'Lakemba Mosque', Bali bombings Australia'. The Lakemba Mosque, often accused of being a centre of radical Islam, promotes a series of lectures promoting understanding of Islam. One Anglican site, in Western Australia, published work claiming that Moslems are committed to violence, but the Sydney diocese, a strong hold of evangelism, promotes understanding and tolerance. Several sites explain that the Lakemba Mosque has been involved in a power struggle between long-established clerics and more radical newcomers from Malaysia and Indonesia. An article from the strongly pro-Israel *Australian/Israel Review* documents anti-semitic hate literature being sold in some Moslem bookshops, and peddles to university students. ABC Four Corners program documents attempts to recruit young Australians for violent jihad abroad.

[19] Quoted by William Malley, 'Australia's New Afghan refugees: context and challenges', ...

[20] See Lawson, 'Freedom on the Wallaby', in *Poems*, p. 46.

[21] David McKnight, *Beyond Right and left: new politics and the culture wars*, Allen & Unwin, NSW, 2005, p. 154. McKnight cites Michael Walzer's analysis, "What's Going On?' US *Dissent*, Winter 1996.

[22] See Graeme Davison and Marc Brodie (eds), *Struggle Country*, particularly 'Introduction', p. xi; Don Aiken, 'Afterword', Monash University ePress, pp. 11.1-11.6.

[23] Paul McGeogh, Media Report, ABC Radio National, 27.4.06.

[24] Kate Grenville, *The Secret River*, Text Publishing, Melbourne, 2005, p. 5.

[25] John Hirst, ''How Sorry Can We Be?', *Sense and Nonsense in Australian History*, Black In. Agenda, Melbourne 2005, pp. 84-89.

[26] Chad Habel, 'Ancestral Narratives in History and Fiction: transforming identities', unpublished PhD thesis, Flinders University, 2006.

[27] In one sense the Cronulla riots were simply gang riots of a kind familiar among alienated male adolescents in many western cities, but the gangs identified ethnically and they and subsequent responses in the media mobilised racist imagery.