

CIS OCCASIONAL PAPER 159

THE CENTRE FOR
INDEPENDENT
STUDIES



THE HISTORY WARS MATTER

Dr Jeremy Sammut

THE HISTORY WARS MATTER

Dr Jeremy Sammut

CIS Occasional Paper 159



2017

Published November 2017
by The Centre for Independent Studies Limited
Level 1, 131 Macquarie Street, Sydney NSW 2000
Email: cis@cis.org.au
Website: www.cis.org.au

Views expressed in the publications of The Centre for Independent Studies are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Centre's staff, advisers, directors, or officers.

©2017 The Centre for Independent Studies



A catalogue record for this
book is available from the
National Library of Australia

THE HISTORY WARS MATTER

Dr Jeremy Sammut

Getting the history of ‘racism’ in Australia
right is in the national interest in the age
of identity politics, according to
Dr Jeremy Sammut

The Big Picture: the national story and national interest

I was—and still am—a big-picture national history kind of historian. My PhD thesis examined the political ideas and ideals of the men who founded the Commonwealth of Australia. The federal fathers believed and hoped the new nation would be a new dispensation. In federated Australia, a free people—ruling themselves through virtually unrivalled free and democratic institutions—would rise to the task of self-government. The civic virtue that Australian citizens would display—by placing national interest above the interests of self, class, or sect—would manifest the ‘higher’ national character of Australians. My thesis traced what happened to these higher ideals for the civic life of the nation during the early period of federal politics, through the period of the Great War and its aftermath.

At a time when deconstruction is the intellectual fashion, my historical interests continue to lie in the national story. Not only as a historian interested in getting the national story right about contentious historical and social issues such as gender and race; but also as a think tanker interested in the contemporary importance of the national story to the national interest. As a think tanker engaged in the free speech debate, the arguments I have advanced in favour of repealing Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act have been deeply informed by my work as a historian on Australia’s (seemingly

miraculous) history of successfully overcoming the racist legacies of earlier eras to create the diverse and tolerant modern country we know today.

Despite what the post-modern theorists claim, the nation remains the ultimate political reality. The power of the national story to inspire our collective beliefs about ourselves as Australians, and for those beliefs to inspire the direction of our national life, is the reason the history wars matter. The history wars—the on-going debate about the practice and teaching of Australian history, and about vitally important and potentially divisive subjects such as the history of Australian racism—remain a critically important battle of ideas. Understanding the true meaning of Australian history, and debunking the perennial claims routinely made about the role our supposedly perpetual history of ‘racism’ allegedly continues to play in Australian society, is increasingly in the national interest today. In the current age of grievance-mongering identity politics, the use, abuse and distortion of Australian history lies behind the politicisation of racial issues by organisations such as the Australian Human Rights Commission. Getting the history of Australian racism right has therefore never mattered more than now to counteract the threat identity politics poses to the social harmony that has become the hallmark of modern multi-racial Australia.

The radical orthodoxy

Big-picture national historian though I am, I must confess to a gap in my formal education. I did not complete the first year undergraduate Australian history course; I withdrew after the lecturer announced the first seven weeks would exclusively cover women in convict society. I didn’t know much when I was 18: but I knew I didn’t want to spend seven weeks focusing solely on convict women. I didn’t know it then either, but this was the start of my intellectual journey at a tangent to the—once radical, but now orthodox—school of social history that has dominated academic Australian history since the 1970s.

The focus of this school—of this kind of history—was on specific social issues; mainly race and gender, at specific periods of time. This was underpinned by a political agenda—what we now call identity

politics— which the New Left practitioners of the new social history approach were anything but shy about declaring as the motivating force for the kind of history they were writing ‘from below’.

My problem with the social history orthodoxy is not with enquiry into topics such as gender and race per se; nor with acknowledging the discreditable aspects of Australian history that rightly prompt feelings of shame, if not the literal wearing of black armbands. There is no question that Australian history was incomplete when these subjects were understudied. To give the obvious example: it is unthinkable— thanks to the revolution in the field of Indigenous history over the last 50 years— to believe we ever thought about Australian history without thinking about the pre-history of European Australia, and without thinking deeply about the tragic impact of colonisation on Aboriginal society as an integral part of the nation’s continuing story.

To give a different example: our understanding of the political revival and success of Robert Menzies, beginning with his famous war-time ‘Forgotten People’ radio address, has been immensely enriched by appreciating Menzies’ appeal to women as wives, mothers, and homemakers. Note, however, that these historical insights into Menzies’ political fortunes and genius are revealed by studying the past on its own terms, based on the traditional values of the time about the role of women in society— which were shared by both men and women alike. The problem with the social history orthodoxy is that it ahistorically re-writes modern political preoccupations into the past, thereby distorting history for current political purposes.

A case in point: woman suffrage in Australia

The history of the woman suffrage movement in Australia is a good example. According to the orthodox feminist histories of gender relations in Australia, when first wave feminists began to challenge the gender order in the late-19th century, a gender war between men and women supposedly broke out, which was allegedly fought out over the extension of the suffrage to women

Australian men, led by the all-male politicians in colonial parliaments, are said to have resisted giving women the vote for

‘masculinist’ reasons—because they feared the feminist challenge to the men’s traditional privileges. This is hard to reconcile with the obvious fact that Australia was the second country to give women the vote, far more quickly than in the US and Britain. In an article I wrote about the woman suffrage debate (‘Why women really got the vote’, *Quadrant*, December 2011), I debunked the feminist history by showing that a different set of political preoccupations were in play, centred on the great colonial political struggle between democratically-elected (by universal male suffrage) lower houses and conservative upper houses.

Female suffrage was supported by the Liberal and Labor parties, whose democratic ambitions were frustrated by upper houses whose members were sometimes appointed, sometimes elected on narrow property franchises, and were gerrymandered in favour of sparsely populated country seats. The democratic parties, whose strongholds were in populous cities, wanted women to secure the vote to accentuate the imbalance between lower houses elected by all the people and un-representative, conservative upper houses, thereby increasing the pressure for electoral reform.

It was only die-hard conservatives who played the gender card and claimed that giving women the vote would lead to a gender revolution, as some feminist suffrage activists tried to claim. Democratic leaders—the politicians most men voted for—dismissed the conservative bogies and the activists’ rhetoric alike as distractions. They understood that most women, like most men, were conservative or traditionalists on questions of gender, and would not, if the suffrage was extended, vote based on their ‘gender interest’, but based on class interest—as indeed both men and women continued to do once the universal adult suffrage became the law.

Not surprisingly, the male politicians who gave women the vote—not unlike Menzies in a later period—had a much better understanding of the values and motivations of the women and men who voted for them, compared to the feminist historians who tried to retro-fit the past to force men and women to play designated roles in a gender political war.

The political point—the identity politics point—the feminist historians tried to make by claiming that Australian men sought to

deny Australian women political equality to keep them down in their traditional roles, was that Australia was, and more importantly remained, a sexist country requiring structuralist solutions—everything from free child care to gender quotas for parliament—to overcome rule by the patriarchy. By this method, history is turned into propaganda, into agitprop; to create a politicised narrative about the nation, claim the high moral ground in social debates, and advance a policy agenda.

History as agitprop: a timelessly racist country?

Another example of this kind of history demonstrates that my real concern about history wars is not only about promoting historical accuracy and correcting distortions of the past. Even more important considerations pertain to distortions of the present that twist our understanding of what kind of country Australia is today. These concerns apply to the orthodox histories of Australian racism, and to the potentially divisive and socially damaging kind of identity politics they encourage.

The history of Australian racism has been my abiding preoccupation—both as a historian concerned about getting the national story right, and also as a think tanker concerned about the political and policy implications of how we understand our national story in relation to issues such as free speech and Section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act.

I was an undergraduate in the first half of the 1990s when the history wars were at their height under the Keating government. What lay behind what was then called the ‘national identity’ (rather than identity politics) debate was the view that Australia was a racist country, based on its racist history, which it had to make up for by—among other things—becoming a republic, embracing hard multiculturalism, and through Reconciliation with Indigenous Australians.

The national identity debate injected the new orthodoxy directly into national politics by challenging the so-called dominant discourse and alleged myths about the nation’s history of egalitarianism and the fabled ‘fair go’ for all—not by distorting the past so much, as by distorting the present.

The orthodox histories of Australian racism were not solely focused on setting the record straight about the undoubted and often hitherto under-acknowledged racist aspects of our past. By focusing on the formation of the White Australia Policy, or on goldfield violence against the Chinese, or on frontier conflict, these events were not treated as artefacts of times past, but as living legacies that identified the ‘dark underbelly’ of racism pervading modern Australian society.

Through these instances of racism, high school and university students exposed to this ‘slice approach’ to history were taught about the history of Australian racism by citing examples of Australians being nasty—and worse—to other races.

Note that here I am repeating the standard criticism of the orthodox school, particularly as it is taught in school curriculums. The major criticism is that this is history in the most limited sense of the word, because it lacks genuine historical context. What is missing is an over-arching narrative that explains, not the continuity of Australian attitudes to race—which is ahistorically assumed—but the great changes that have occurred in Australian society since the days of goldfields, the frontier, and the White Australia Policy.

Instead, played out through the orthodoxy are present-day political preoccupations, via history as propaganda and agitprop, to promote contemporary political causes, including—under Keating in the 1990s—the insertion of Section 18C in the Racial Discrimination Act.

As an Australian from a family with an ethnic background, I found the stock standard Left progressive account of Australia as an inherently and timelessly racist country very puzzling. It certainly did not tally with my, or my family’s, experience in this country—which like many people from migrant backgrounds has been one, on the whole, of tolerance, acceptance and opportunity regardless of race.

The past is *not* the present

As an historian, I set out to unravel the seeming puzzle of how racist white Australia became tolerant modern Australia, and why so many academic historians did not think this was so.

Hence one of my early articles ('The Long Demise of the White Australia Policy', *Quadrant*, November 2005) explained the process by which the legacy of the White Australia Policy was gradually overcome after World War II, and how Australia has been transformed into probably the world's most successful multi-racial nation; principally by means of extending the 'fair go' ethos on a colour-blind basis to all comers regardless of origins.

This history I outlined in the article has directly informed my think tank work on freedom of speech. It has shaped my argument that it is the national culture of tolerance and acceptance that has developed under the 'fair go' ethos—not so-called hate speech laws such as Section 18C and institutions like the Australian Human Rights Commission—that explain Australia's success as an 'immigrant nation'.

This understanding of our history has also informed my criticism of the role the Federal Race Discrimination Commissioner, Tim Soutphommasane is playing in contemporary debates about race and racism. This includes Soutphommasane's interventions into the free speech debate, where he has argued that Section 18C should be retained to keep the 'dark underbelly' of Australian racism in check.

But even more concerning is Soutphommasane's assertion that structural solutions are needed to address the so-called problem of structural racism, through racial quotas in Australian business to increase the number of Asian CEOs and board members. This kind of affirmative action proposal goes completely against the grain of how we have achieved our multi-racial success story—which is by overlooking racial and other differences and finding commonalities, not by institutionalising difference, let alone by politicising it.

The Race Discrimination Commissioner has even used the inflammatory term "professional coolies" to describe alleged attitudes towards high-achieving Asian graduates in high-paying industries such as finance. The reason Soutphommasane's grievance-mongering worries me is that his ideas are being cast before a receptive audience.

The orthodoxy has largely won the battle of ideas within academia, which is one of the reasons we live in an age of full-blown identity

politics. We have at least one generation of university-educated people who have been politicised, and are deeply invested in the identity politics notion that certain groups are perpetual victims of sexism, racism and homophobia at the hand of the dominant culture.

This is despite the enormous social changes of recent decades, which, by any objective measure, make a nonsense of this claim. For despite what the orthodoxy insists, the past is not the present: we no longer think a woman's place is in the home, any more than we think of Asians as coolies — professional or otherwise.

History fit for nation-building

The identity warriors should be careful what they wish for. I fear — and not without good reason, based on Trump, Brexit, and the revival of One Nation locally — that identity politics could prove a disastrously self-fulfilling prophecy. If so-called 'white privileged' Australians have their equality of opportunity denied, along with their fundamental rights such as free speech curtailed, in the name of promoting diversity, I fear that identity politics is a recipe for the racialised politics and social divisions — a nightmare scenario that should be avoided at all costs in the national interest.

Hence I remain — and never more so than right now — a big-picture national historian; and what a wonderful national story there is to tell about the history of Australian racism. Over the past 70 years, we have achieved what the federal fathers — who were staunch supporters of the White Australia Policy almost to a man — thought was impossible. They believed other races had to be barred from the new nation because a multi-racial country would inevitably lead to racial strife. That ordinary Australians, through the collective commitment to the principle of the 'fair go' regardless of race, have proven the founders of the nation wrong is, in my opinion, our greatest national achievement and demonstration of our national character at its finest.

This is the kind of nation-building history that should to be learned by Australians, to avoid politicising race and ensure continued social harmony. Ensuring all Australians know the Australian dream of fair go and opportunity for all — enjoyed by migrants and non-migrants alike — is not a myth but reality, will also help sustain popular

support for a large, legal, non-discriminatory immigration program in the national interest. And this true and meaningful account of the national story will also, most importantly of all, continue to promote the acceptance and successful integration of new Australians, by upholding the tolerant social attitudes essential to make a multi-racial society function freely and fairly.

I used to make an exception to my account of our national success in overcoming the legacy of racism in the case of Indigenous Australians. But I no longer make the qualification that Indigenous people remain the victims of historical prejudice and disadvantage. This is because the nation has travelled most of the way towards overcoming the most vexing racial issue in Australian history. Nowadays, 80% of Indigenous people—who mostly live in metropolitan Australia—have the same social outcomes as their non-Indigenous peers. As I showed in an article critiquing Stan Grant's book *Talking to My Country* ('Not so black and white: Stan Grant's Nostalgia for injustice', *Quadrant*, June 2016), these Indigenous Australians enjoy the full freedoms and opportunities of the Australian Dream as all other Australians regardless of race. The remaining 20% of most disadvantaged Indigenous Australians with appalling social outcomes are excluded from the Australian Dream not due to racism, but due to the continuation of the failed separatist experiments in 'Aboriginal Self-Determination' in rural and remote Indigenous communities.

It follows that my concerns about identity politics and politicising race equally apply to Indigenous identity politics, and the movement for Recognition of Indigenous Australians in the Commonwealth Constitution. Empowering the 'Aboriginal industry' with what will effectively be a supra-parliamentary power of veto over Indigenous policy, will not help close the last 20% of the gap between Indigenous underclass and all other Australians. It will only entrench within the Constitution the race-specific policies that are the cause of contemporary Indigenous suffering and exclusion from the 'fair go' that is otherwise universally enjoyed in modern, multi-racial Australia. This kind of 'Recognition' will perpetuate the Indigenous nightmare—not extend the Australian Dream to all Australians as the true meaning of our history demands.



The Centre for Independent Studies is a non-profit, public policy research institute. Its major concern is with the principles and conditions underlying a free and open society. The Centre's activities cover a wide variety of areas dealing broadly with social, economic and foreign policy.

The Centre meets the need for informed debate on issues of importance to a free and democratic society in which individuals and business flourish, unhindered by government intervention. In encouraging competition in ideas, The Centre for Independent Studies carries out an activities programme which includes:

- research
- holding lectures, seminars and policy forums
- publishing books and papers
- issuing a quarterly journal, *POLICY*

For more information about CIS or to become a member, please contact:

Australia

Level 1/131 Macquarie Street,
Sydney NSW 2000 Australia
Ph: +61 2 9438 4377
Fax: +61 2 9439 7310
Email: cis@cis.org.au

www.cis.org.au

Council of Academic Advisers

Professor James Allan
Professor Ray Ball
Professor Jeff Bennett
Professor Geoffrey Brennan
Professor Lauchlan Chipman
Professor Kenneth Clements
Professor Sinclair Davidson
Professor David Emanuel
Professor Ian Harper
Professor Wolfgang Kasper

Professor Chandran Kukathas
Professor Tony Makin
Professor R. R. Officer
Professor Suri Ratnapala
Professor David Robertson
Professor Steven Schwartz
Professor Judith Sloan
Professor Peter Swan AM
Professor Geoffrey de Q. Walker

The History Wars Matter

Despite what the post-modern theorists claim, the nation remains the ultimate political reality. The power of the national story to inspire our collective beliefs about ourselves as Australians, and for those beliefs to inspire the direction of our national life, is the reason the history wars matter. The history wars — the on-going debate about the practice and teaching of Australian history — and about vitally important and potentially divisive subjects such as the history of Australian racism — remain a critically important battle of ideas. Understanding the true meaning of Australian history, and debunking the perennial claims routinely made about the role our supposedly perpetual history of ‘racism’ allegedly continues to play in Australian society, is increasingly in the national interest today. In the current age of grievance-mongering identity politics, the use, abuse and distortion of the Australian history lies behind the politicisation of racial issues by organisations such as Australian Human Rights Commission. Getting the history of Australian racism right has therefore never mattered more than now to counteract the threat identity politics poses to the social harmony that has become the hallmark of modern multi-racial Australia.



Dr Jeremy Sammut is a Senior Research Fellow at The Centre for Independent Studies and the Director of the CIS Healthcare Innovations Program. Jeremy has a PhD in Australian political and social history from Monash University and has published on historical topics including Australian federation, the WWI conscription referendums, the women’s suffrage movement, and the White Australia Policy and multiculturalism.