Australia’s heritage
Some 200 years ago Australia was just a natural landscape that had then been ‘home’ to this country’s Indigenous people for at least 40,000, possibly 100,000, years.

The complexity of the Indigenous culture and society, especially the people’s links with the land, was not understood by the early European settlers. In fact, the new arrivals thought the vast stretches of seeming ‘no-man’s land’ were theirs for the taking. The consequent impact on Indigenous people and their way of life was devastating.

It is only in recent decades that the misunderstandings of the past have begun to be acknowledged. This has strengthened efforts to recognise the injustices suffered by the first Australians — and to work towards a future that reconciles all who call this country home.

You will discover
• Why Indigenous people are such a vital part of Australia’s heritage
• How European settlers and Indigenous people regarded each other
• What impact European settlement had on Indigenous people
• Why the land is so important to Indigenous Australians

1 What problems might Australia’s Indigenous people have faced because early European settlers did not understand them?
2 How might this attitude have influenced ongoing relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians?
When Europeans first settled in Australia in 1788, Indigenous people had been living here for at least 40,000 years. The Indigenous people did not use the land as most Australians do today, but this did not mean that they did not regard it as theirs. However, this did not stop the European settlers from taking possession of it.

**Origins of Indigenous people**

The origins of Australia’s Indigenous people are strongly debated, and many theories have been proposed. Some say they have been here as long as the Australian landmass has existed. Others believe that they came here from somewhere else, most probably from lands to Australia’s north. Despite these varying opinions, there is, however, unanimous agreement that Australia’s Indigenous people were its first human inhabitants.

Radiocarbon dating of a number of ancient human settlement sites in Australia suggests that Indigenous people may have lived here for up to 100,000 years, possibly much longer. For example, it has been estimated that the buried skeleton of a man uncovered in 1975 on the ‘shores’ of Lake Mungo in New South Wales (a lake that has been dry for some 15,000 years) is about 40,000 years old. Human bones found at Keilor, Melbourne, are estimated to be even older — possibly about 45,000 years old.

Source A

Possible migration routes of the forebears of Australia’s Indigenous people. The lowest sea levels in the last 120,000 years occurred about 20,000, 70,000 and 90,000 years BP (before the present). Sea levels were lower then because huge volumes of water were locked up as ice at the Earth’s poles. During the last Ice Age, which ended about 20,000 years ago, Australia was connected by land to virtually the whole length of New Guinea. Sea levels were then about 100 metres lower than they are today. Lower sea levels might have enabled groups of people to ‘island hop’ (with the help of canoes) to Australia from places such as South-East Asia.
Language groups

Early European settlers called the people they found living in Australia ‘Aborigines’ or ‘natives’, suggesting they were all the same. In reality, the Indigenous people belonged to some 500 different groups, each with its own separate language (or dialect), laws, beliefs and customs.

Clans

Language groups were made up of a number of clans, each of which owned a part of the group’s land. A clan typically had about 100 people, and was made up of one or two extended families, called bands. Men commonly had more than one wife, and so typically had lots of children. Each band hunted for and gathered food in a particular section of the clan’s land. Clans would often meet to trade, arrange marriages, or hold ceremonies.

Totemism

Each clan within a language group had a totem that was a sign of its people’s spiritual link to the land. It might be an animal, a plant or some other natural feature such as a particular weather pattern or rock formation. As well, each individual had a totem or special land feature with which he or she spiritually identified, and hence protected. An individual’s totem was decided by the elders. What that totem was depended on where the person’s mother was when she first felt the person move as a baby in her stomach. Respect for common totems helped to bind people together.

Activities

REMEMBER

1. For at least how long is it now generally believed that Indigenous people have lived in Australia?
2. Which was the largest Indigenous group — a clan, an extended family, a band or a language group? Draw a simple diagram to show the relationship between these groups.
3. What is a totem? Why is an Indigenous person’s totem (or totems) significant?

THINK

4. Suggest what sort of evidence scientists would look for to support the hypothesis that the first Indigenous people entered Australia from the north.

SELF-DISCOVERY

5. (a) Is there any information in this chapter that is new to you? Explain.

(b) In light of what you already know, or have recently learnt, what is your view about the rights of Indigenous people to consider themselves the first landowners of the continent of Australia? Think carefully, and justify your view.

(c) Share your considered opinion to the above question with others in small groups and listen to their views.

(d) After sharing your opinion with others, write a short paragraph reflecting on how your opinions on this issue might have changed over time, and what might have influenced this.

Source C

The wedge-tailed eagle (Bunjil) was one of the two moiety totems of the Kulin people.
Early Europeans explorers and settlers saw no evidence of settlement or cultivation in the land we now call Australia. They believed, therefore, that it was land they could claim. Bit by bit, the continent was claimed in the name of the British monarch, and declared Crown land.

Under European law in the late eighteenth century, a people’s sovereignty over land existed only if they farmed and built permanent dwellings on it. The Europeans who arrived with the First Fleet in 1788 saw no buildings or roads, as in England, nor any sign of crops or stock animals. It was for them, therefore, a land over which no-one held sovereign rights.

What the new arrivals did not realise was that Indigenous people had lived here for tens of thousands of years before they arrived. The Indigenous culture was different and unfamiliar, as was the way they lived. Neither did they use the land as most Europeans did at the time; however, this did not mean the Indigenous people did not regard the land, and its resources, as theirs. Thus, the seeds were sown for misunderstanding and conflict from the start.

Whose land?

In the late 1700s, at least 19 Indigenous tribes lived in the region that is now Sydney. The land around Darling Harbour was the tribal land of the Cadigal people, part of the Eora language group.

Today, Darling Harbour, shown on the left, is one of the world’s most well-known and popular waterfront precincts. It has a host of leisure and entertainment facilities, including shops, restaurants, museums, theatres, historical centres and an aquarium. It is visited daily by tourists from all over the world.
Traditional Indigenous lifestyle

Australia’s Indigenous people generally lived a stable lifestyle, guided by elders who knew the local Dreaming stories and customs. The people worked together, sharing their food and knowledge, and living in harmony with their environment. As Captain Cook wrote in his journal about those he observed in 1770: ‘… in reality they are far more happier than we Europeans … In short they seemed to set no value upon anything we gave them, nor would they part with anything of their own for one article we could offer them’.

**Activities**

**REMEMBER**

1. Why did the early European settlers believe they could take the land of the Indigenous people of Australia?
2. Use source A to list examples of different types of evidence historians have found that have revealed more about Australia’s prehistory.

**THINK**

3. To what extent could it be said that Australia’s Indigenous people had mastered the art of living in balance with nature? Give examples.
4. (a) Consider this scenario in small groups: a foreign power invades Australia and seizes all buildings and resources (e.g., dams). Your family is ordered to leave your house. Any attempt to return, even for food, risks imprisonment or worse. How would you feel?
   (b) Afterwards, discuss to what extent this task helped you to think about and better understand the plight of Indigenous people dealing with the impact of British colonisation.
5. What do the views of Captain Cook about the Indigenous people he saw suggest about the quality of their lifestyle then?

**COMMUNICATE**

6. Draw and complete a table like the one below to note how the region around Darling Harbour has changed and is likely to do so in the future. Use the images in the ‘Then and Now’ section, and your imagination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes over the last 200 years</th>
<th>Predicted changes over the next 200 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ICT**

7. Think about the different reasons why places where people live change over time and how this might affect the people who live there. Use the table you completed for activity 6 as a prompt. Share your ideas with two other classmates through online forums, using appropriate language and ICT conventions.

**I CAN:**

- appreciate how Indigenous people lived prior to their contact with Europeans
- empathise with the plight faced by Indigenous people following European settlement
- think about change over time, and how this change affects people’s lives.
On 26 January 1788, eleven British ships carrying about 1000 people sailed into Port Jackson on Australia’s east coast. Most on board were *convicts*, about to start life in a *penal colony*.

**Reaction of Indigenous people**

Aboriginal people thought the first Europeans they saw might have been ghosts, or evil spirits. Their *Dreaming* provided them with no clues as to who these pale-skinned, strangely dressed people might be. Some wondered if they might be women, as they had no beards. Some tried to find a place for them in their *kinship* system by treating them as spirits of their dead, and offering them food and women.

It soon became clear that the ‘visitors’ planned to stay. They were clearing land near sacred sites, fencing off properties, which cut access to waterholes and hunting grounds, and fishing without permission of the *elders*. Besides, more and more of them were arriving. *Indigenous* people became increasingly worried.

These ‘spirits of their former dead’ did not speak their language. Nor did they obey their rules and respect their rituals and sacred places. The view that they were invaders, not visitors, began to take hold.

Some Indigenous people may have been puzzled or fascinated by the first Europeans they saw; others were undoubtedly frightened. When exploring the Lachlan River in 1817, John Oxley described how two young Indigenous men reacted to the sight of his party: ‘They trembled excessively, and, if the expression may be used, were absolutely intoxicated with fear . . .’

**Reaction of the Europeans**

In 1788, Europeans held a range of views about Australia’s Indigenous people. In line with thinking at the time, many of the more educated would have regarded them as ‘noble savages’ — primitive people who lived a contented life in the natural world without the pressures of civilisation. The observant Captain Watkin Tench expressed a much more insightful view in 1793. He said that those he had met possessed ‘. . . a considerable portion of that acumen, or sharpness of intellect, which bespeaks genius’.

*Source A*  
Modern artist’s impression of first contact
Most of the new European arrivals, however, were neither educated nor sensitive. The majority were convicts, many of whom had been brutalised. For many, the view of the British explorer William Dampier might have been more acceptable. He wrote in 1688 that Australia’s Indigenous people were ‘… the miserablest people in the world … [who differed] but little from brutes’.

Many Europeans would have been scared by the sight of advancing dark-skinned, naked men with bones in their noses and ears. They would not have understood that multi-scarred chests and missing front teeth were not meant to terrify. They were signs of initiation the Indigenous people wore proudly.

Be like us!
Captain Arthur Phillip, Australia’s first governor, had been instructed to do everything he could to make friendly contact with the ‘natives’ and to ‘… live in amenity [friendship] and kindness with them’. Any Europeans who hurt or killed Indigenous people were to be punished.

The problem was that Europeans expected Indigenous people to act and live as they did. They could not, for example, understand why Indigenous people did not have a god or churches, towns or cultivated land. Their kinship systems seemed especially odd (where an ‘uncle’, for example, was also a ‘father’). Most importantly, they did not understand that the land they were clearing for farms, towns and pasture might contain sacred sites that the traditional owners had tended for generations, or hunting grounds that provided their food. Many Europeans assumed the Indigenous people could just be moved on.

As more towns sprang up, Indigenous people often clustered around the edges of these new settlements. Some found jobs as expedition guides for European explorers; others became Native Police under the command of British officers. A few, such as Arabanoo, Bungaree and Bennelong, were captured and coached to act like Europeans, in the hope that they might encourage others to become more like them.

Source B
Extract from address by Governor Gawler in 1838 to Indigenous people in Adelaide

Black men. We wish to make you happy. But you cannot be happy unless you imitate white men. Build huts, wear clothes and be useful. . . . you cannot be happy unless you love God . . . Love white men . . . learn to speak English.

Government Gazette, 3 November 1838

Source C
Late 1820s painting of Bungaree, who was a high-profile figure around Sydney for three decades. He sailed with the explorer Matthew Flinders on two of his voyages and was a personal friend of Governor Macquarie. He was said to be courteous, pleasant and a wonderful mimic, which was a source of much fun for the new settlers. Though supported by his Indigenous ‘brothers’ and white ‘friends’ until his death in 1830, many argue that Bungaree did what he did because it was the only way to survive.
What are the Indigenous people doing? What does this tell you?

Does their appearance or behaviour suggest some adherence to traditional Indigenous practices? How are the Indigenous people and Europeans interacting? What does this suggest?

Is there anything to suggest the artist was influenced by stereotypes?

If an Indigenous artist had painted this scene in 1830, what differences (if any) might there have been? Would some things have been included or left out? How differently might the people have been drawn? Think about what this reveals about point of view.

This 1830 painting by Augustus Earle entitled ‘Natives of N. S. Wales, as seen in the streets of Sydney’ shows Indigenous people in front of a Europeans-only hotel. It is a primary source.

With the passage of time, many Indigenous people were ordered to live on special reserves. They were told it was to protect them. Christian missionaries at first, and later government officers, administered these reserves, which included the Lake Condah (Portland) and Coranderrk (Healesville) reserves in Victoria (see pages 16–17). Well-meaning efforts to make the Indigenous people ‘European’, however, cut across kinship rules and traditional cultural practices. For instance, the people were forbidden to speak their language or to take part in Indigenous cultural events.

At this time in history, there were no sustained efforts to preserve Indigenous culture or the basic rights of the Indigenous people to fair and equal treatment. More compassionate Europeans saw the land’s original inhabitants as a race that would sadly, but inevitably, die out, and tried to make the process as painless as possible. More heartless settlers saw them as ‘pests’ who kept ‘camping’ on their farms and ‘hunting’ their stock animals.

**Control and conquer**

In the decades that followed the arrival of the first Europeans, tensions were growing on both sides. Indigenous people were being shot at when they ventured onto European farms to get food — many of which were on their traditional hunting grounds — or when they tried to get to nearby rivers. In turn, European settlers and convicts were being attacked by raiding parties of Indigenous warriors.

In the end, the Indigenous people had no chance of resisting the growing flood of European settlers, with their guns and horses. They did try to fight back, but had difficulty in sustaining their efforts. Their numbers were also being very rapidly reduced by introduced diseases, against which they had no resistance. These included measles, whooping cough, influenza and smallpox.
It was the loss of the land which was worst. As time went on, the Aborigines retreated or were driven out of whole territories into the inhospitable foothills which formed their boundaries . . . The sustaining ceremonies could not be held, men and women could not visit their own birthplaces or carry out their duties to the spirits. The exiled camps were racked by new sicknesses; pale unfamiliar babes were born to the women . . . The blighted camps dwindled, their food inaccessible or the hunters and gatherers too weak to find and bring it in. The elders and the children died. Some began to leave the camps and cling to the settlements where by clowning, begging, and selling their women they could survive. Disease and listlessness increased. The rags they were given became noisome, damp and filthy, for they had not been taught to wash them; slept in by night they bred more disease, and the survivors coughed their way to death.’


**Activities**

**REMEMBER**

1. What was a ‘noble savage’? Why might some have regarded Australia’s Indigenous people this way?
2. Explain the changing nature of the Indigenous reaction to the European arrivals.

**THINK**

3. Think of three reasons (in each case) why Europeans and Indigenous people were puzzled by each other. Suggest why these misunderstandings led to conflict. Represent your response as either a **mind map** (see page 3 for an example) or a table.

**SELF-DISCOVERY**

4. If you had been an Indigenous person living at this time, what attitude or action taken by Europeans would have upset and angered you most? Why?

**Analyze art as evidence**

5. Select either source A, C or D. Complete the following for your chosen painting:
   (a) Is your selection a primary or secondary source? Why?
   (b) Describe the dress and any body decorations of the Indigenous people in the art. What does this tell you?
   (c) What evidence does the art contain, if any, about interactions between Indigenous people and the early European settlers? What interpretations can you draw?
   (d) Does the art show any suggestion of **bias** on the part of the artist, or representation of what are considered to be **stereotypes**? Explain.

6. Work in teams of five people. Work out a creative way, using body language, props and music, to convey for the class the information contained in source F. (Check the meaning of all unfamiliar words.) One member will slowly narrate the text during the presentation. Negotiate roles according to skills and interests of group members. After the presentations, reflect as a class on what new insights these presentations gave and how effective they were in helping you to learn.

**COMMUNICATE**

7. The nineteenth-century cartoon above shows two Indigenous people mimicking Europeans. At the time, Europeans thought that this behaviour was proof of the lesser intelligence of Indigenous people. What do you think? Share your views with a partner.

**I CAN:**

- understand how cultural misunderstandings can lead to conflict
- roleplay the presentation of a text, as an alternative learning strategy to demonstrate empathy
- analyse a painting to consider aspects of early Indigenous–European contact.
CONTACT WITH Europeans was to prove deadly for Australia’s Indigenous people. A great many died: introduced diseases against which they had no immunity, alcohol, starvation and depression all took their toll. Many others were killed. Estimates vary, but some historians suggest that around 20 000 Indigenous people may have been killed during raids and frontier battles. The good intentions of Captain Phillip, and the friendliness initially shown by many Indigenous people towards European settlers, soon soured into bitterness on both sides.

At the heart of most of the killings was a struggle for land. European settlers saw the land as an economic resource they could exploit. As they pushed out the frontiers of their settlements, they came increasingly into contact with those who believed they owned the land. Conflict was inevitable. European settlers generally resented the fact that Indigenous people were blocking the progress of what the settlers considered was a ‘superior race’. Indigenous people found such attitudes confusing. Yagan, a notable Indigenous resistance fighter in Western Australia, is quoted as saying, ‘A black man claims nothing as his own but his cloak, his weapons and his name … He does not understand that animals or plants can belong to one person more than to another’.

Not all new settlers were heartless though. Records report the kindness and friendship shown, for example, to the Bangerang people by the pioneer Edward Curr, who settled on the Murray River around 1840.

Some Indigenous captives were tied up in chains and had their feet burnt so they could not escape.

If Indigenous people returned to tend their sacred sites, hunt or drink from waterholes, they were often killed. Waterholes were sometimes poisoned, as was the flour or meat some settlers offered to starving Indigenous people.
Native troopers
In 1842, the Victorian Government set up a body of Native Police, made up of Indigenous troopers under the control of European officers. Similar forces were set up in New South Wales in 1855, and in Queensland in 1859. Native Police usually worked in areas other than those where their own communities lived. This meant they did not have to attack their own people. Because officers frequently led from the rear during a raid, those attacked did not always associate the attack with Europeans. This lessened the likelihood of survivors taking revenge on settlers.

Smallpox
Smallpox, a disease caused by the variola virus, kills in about 30 per cent of cases, leaving survivors badly scarred. The disease was declared eliminated from the world in 1977.

Source D
A published observation (1859) of C. H. M. Hull, a senior Tasmanian public servant

Source F
Smallpox was carried to the new colony by the settlers of the First Fleet. Indigenous people had no immunity against it. By May 1789, it had killed half the Indigenous people around Port Jackson.

Source E
Native Police at Coen in Queensland in the 1890s. Many Native Police ended up adopting European values and attitudes, but were never really accepted by ‘white society’. A great many died lonely deaths due to alcohol poisoning.
Europeans had gained control of most habitable Australian land by the end of the nineteenth century. But this did not happen without a number of battles and massacres. Some were in retaliation for attacks on settlers by Indigenous warriors, who were angered by the loss of their land and the treatment of their people. Two Indigenous massacres are briefly presented here.

Myall Creek massacre
In June 1838, 12 local stockmen (11 of whom were ex-convicts) were on the hunt around the New South Wales town of Inverell for Indigenous people they suspected had stolen cattle. They rode to the nearby Myall Creek Station, where a stockman, Andrew Eaton, had befriended a clan of Indigenous people and offered them shelter. The younger men of the clan were away cutting bark at the time. The stockmen tied up the 28 people they found there — women, children and a few older men — and herded them into a stockyard. There they were brutally beaten and hacked to death, and their bodies burnt. After being acquitted following an initial murder trial, seven of the attackers were later retried and hanged.

Kurnai massacres
By 1858, the Kurnai population had reduced from about 2000 (in 1840) to only 80 as a result of settler attacks and massacres and the new diseases introduced by sealers and whalers. The official reasons given by the Victorian Government for this decline were starvation due to ‘scarcity of game’, alcoholism, and ‘in some cases’ cruelty and poor treatment by settlers.
**Identify gaps in the evidence**

Primary sources are important documents for historians. Yet a primary source does not necessarily provide a true or complete picture of what happened in the past. Some facts might be distorted; others might be left out (leaving gaps). The following two primary sources each describe reasons for the disappearance of Australia’s Indigenous people.

**Source C**
A view, expressed by a European government spokesperson in Melbourne’s *Age* in 1896

The favourite theory . . . is that the disappearance of the native races is due to the cruelty and malignity of the white settlers. Those who are acquainted with the history of this colony from its first settlement are aware that no such charge can be alleged against the Victorian people, and that the black race has decayed and is rapidly dying out from causes quite outside the power of the white man to control.

**Source D**
The view of Dalaipi, an Indigenous person from Queensland, expressed in the late 1800s

We were hunted from our ground, shot, poisoned, and had our daughters, sisters and wives taken from us . . . What a number were poisoned at Kilcoy . . . They stole our ground where we used to get food, and when we got hungry and took a bit of flour or killed a bullock to eat, they shot us or poisoned us. All they give us now for our land is a blanket once a year.

Who is the speaker in each case? Was each speaking from a position of strength or weakness?

Who do you think might have been the audience of each ‘speaker’? What reaction might each speaker be hoping his words will create in the audience? Think about how this would influence what was said and what was not said.

Based on what you know, can you identify any gaps (left-out facts) in what each speaker says? Why might these details have been left out?

The article on this attack reported that ‘every man who could find a gun or a horse’ joined in. The Kurnai people were surrounded as they gathered around a large waterhole. The attackers kept shooting until they had run out of ammunition. The report concludes: ‘More than a hundred of the blacks were killed’.

There was no European law-enforcement body in Gippsland until 1844. It was a time of attack and counterattack: Kurnai warriors plundered European barns and crops and speared cattle (as access to food sources on their traditional lands had been denied) and Europeans formed hunting parties to massacre groups of Kurnai people.

Kurnai contact with Europeans was at first limited to a few sealers, sailors and shipwreck survivors. After 1840, they came increasingly into contact with European settlers wanting to develop Kurnai traditional lands.

**Activities**

**REMEMBER**
1. What prompted the Myall Creek massacre?
2. By what approximate percentage did the population of the Kurnai reduce between 1840 and 1858?

**THNK**
3. Study source A carefully.
   (a) Explain why the Kurnai people were at a great disadvantage.
   (b) Suggest why the attack on them by the European settlers was so brutal.

**Identify gaps in the evidence**

4. Work with a partner. Based on your analysis of source A and related text, negotiate who will write each of these dialogues:
   - what a Kurnai warrior who survived this attack might have told his family about this event
   - what a settler involved in this attack might have told his family.
   (a) Compare and discuss your two accounts. How did your point of view (who you were) influence your description? Which of the two accounts do you think best reflects the reality? Justify your view.
   (b) What does this exercise teach you about the difficulties faced by a historian who wants to know what really happened?

**ICT**

5. Use the Internet to prepare a word processed report on one of the following massacres:
   (a) the Pinjarra incident in Western Australia or (b) the Battle Mountain incident in Queensland. Use a spellchecker to minimise error.

**I CAN:**
- appreciate how brutally many Indigenous people were treated
- research details of some Indigenous massacres
- use ICT tools to research and document a report.
Many stories about the conflict between European colonists and Aboriginal people suggest the latter were easy targets. Indigenous people may not have had the guns of the Europeans, or often their manpower, but they did not lack courage or skill. Their bush skills, for example, could not be matched by the Europeans. Here are the stories of two Indigenous men who fought back.

**Pemulwuy**
The Bidjigal warrior Pemulwuy, sometimes called the Rainbow Warrior, belonged to the Eora language group (the area surrounding Sydney). Between 1790 and 1802, he led many attacks against colonial farms and settlements, some of which were highly organised, large-scale guerrilla operations. He and his men fought so fiercely in a battle in 1797 that he almost gained control of the newly settled town of Parramatta.

At first, his tribe lived in harmony with the Europeans, who had established a colony on the Swan River in 1829. However, arguments soon arose over land and resources. The British mistook the Nyungar tradition of burning the land as an act of aggression. In 1831, a Nyungar was shot while taking potatoes from a settler's garden. The settler saw it as theft; the Nyungar would have seen it as taking the land’s resources, to which he was entitled. Yagan sought revenge for this killing. After more battles, a reward was offered for his head.

When Yagan was finally captured, a European named Robert Lyon fought hard to spare his life. He admired Yagan’s courage and wished to study him. Yagan was exiled to a small rocky island, but escaped after six weeks. The colonists were angry about this; as punishment, they killed Yagan’s father and brother, and increased the reward on Yagan’s head.

**Governor King** became increasingly frustrated by Pemulwuy. He offered rewards, including a free pardon, to any convict who would bring him his head. That happened in 1802; Pemulwuy was murdered. His decapitated head was sent to England to be studied by scientists. They had heard a lot about the native Australians, but had never seen one. Although glad he was dead, Governor King had a grudging respect for Pemulwuy. He said of him: ‘Altho’ a terrible pest to the colony, he was a brave and independent character and an active, daring leader of his people’.

**Yagan**
Yagan (see also page 10) was part of the Nyungar tribe of south-western Western Australia. A tall man (described as being over 1.8 metres), he was both feared and admired by the British colonists.
For 12 months, Yagan managed to avoid capture, continuing to fight for his people. Then, in July 1833, he approached two shepherds he knew, asking for flour. When his back was turned, one of them, William Keats, shot him. A reward was given for the killing of Yagan, but the editorial of the *Perth Gazette* described it as a ‘wild and treacherous act’: ‘We are not vindicating [forgiving] the outlaw, but, we maintain it is revolting to hear this lauded [praised] as a meritorious [good] deed.’

Yagan’s head was sent to England in 1835. The hair was combed, and black and red cockatoo feathers were tied to the head as decoration. It was exhibited in Liverpool until 1964 when it was buried in Everton Cemetery. In 1997, almost 165 years after being sent to England, Yagan’s head was returned to Australia for a proper burial.

Today, the remains of a great many Aboriginal people are still scattered throughout British museums, causing great distress to Aboriginal communities. They believe the souls of their ancestors cannot rest until their bodies are returned. So far, British museums have been reluctant to oblige.

### Activities

**REMEMBER**

1. Why did Pemulwuy develop a supernatural reputation among his people? Explain.
2. What evidence is there in this spread to suggest that both Pemulwuy and Yagan were both feared and respected by some European colonists?

**THINK**

3. Look at source D below. It was taken on 3 March 2005 in the North Head Sydney Harbour National Park. The remains of a number of Indigenous people that have been handed back to their people are being buried.

   - (a) How do you think the Indigenous people in the photograph might be feeling?
   - (b) Why were Indigenous remains, such as these and Yagan’s and Pemulwuy’s heads, not given a proper burial in the first place? Why might museums be interested in wanting to continue to display such remains?
   - (c) How would you feel if the remains of a member of your family were displayed in a museum? What underlying beliefs do you have that make you feel this way?

4. (a) From the list of adjectives (describing words) below, select those you think most European colonists in the early nineteenth century might have used to describe people like Pemulwuy and Yagan. Then select those most Indigenous people might have used to describe them.

   - troublesome
   - disobedient
   - wild
   - brave
   - violent
   - fearless
   - savage
   - rebellious
   - bold
   - clever
   - uncontrollable
   - courageous
   - irritating
   - noble
   - intelligent
   - motivating

(b) Write two paragraphs about one of these Indigenous men from each point of view. Build your adjective word choices into what you say.

(c) What does this task teach you about how emotional words can be used to support a point of view?

**TEAMWORK**

5. Work in small groups to design/create a monument to commemorate the life of Pemulwuy. It might be a life-like statue, similar to that of Yagan in source B, or a more contemporary piece that symbolises his life (based on the information in this spread). Allocate tasks according to group members’ abilities and interests. Present your completed work to the class as a group, providing and accepting feedback on its likely cultural impacts.

**I CAN:**

- appreciate the contribution of people such as Yagan and Pemulwuy in fighting for their rights
- recognise that there will always be two or more perspectives about historical events
- use my creative thinking and skills to design a commemorative monument to Pemulwuy.
Coranderrk was an Aboriginal reserve set up in 1863. It was home for nearly 60 years to many Kulin people, who came from around the present-day Port Phillip area. Farming, baking, schooling and house building were commonplace activities during much of the reserve’s often thriving existence. Its closure in 1924 was a severe blow to the Indigenous people.

Coranderrk was established when the Victorian Government set aside land near present-day Healesville. The decision followed a petition presented by Aboriginal people which read, in part: ‘could we have our freedom to go away shearing and harvesting, and come home when we wish’.

**A thriving settlement**

In 1863, around 40 Indigenous people moved to live on what was then uncleared bushland at Coranderrk. By 1874, the population had grown and the rich land had been largely cleared, fenced and sown with crops. Hop production began in 1872; two years later the people were also managing 450 head of cattle and running a dairy. The reserve’s **superintendent**, a lay preacher named John Green, had been donating money from his own salary to help the Indigenous people develop their settlement. In 1874, however, he was forced to resign after an argument with the Victorian Government. He wanted the Indigenous people to retain more of the profits from the reserve’s hops farms.

By the 1880s, Coranderrk was making enough money, and harvesting enough food, to support itself. In fact, it did so well that local European farmers and landholders were envious of its success. The problem this posed for the residents of Coranderrk was that they did not legally own the land. There was also the view, popular at the time among many European colonists, that it was the ‘manifold destiny’ (obvious fate) of the Aboriginal people to eventually die out. Hence, encouraging and promoting their efforts to be self-sufficient and successful would be counter-productive.

**Coranderrk closes**

The Board for the Protection of Aborigines had wanted to close down Coranderrk since 1874. When this prospect became an imminent risk, residents of Coranderrk marched on the Victorian Parliament in protest. Their actions prompted a government inquiry and subsequent report, lodged in 1882. The report criticised the board, recommending that the reserve be helped, not closed.
Four years later, however, the Victorian Aborigines Act of 1886 was passed, which did what the board had been unable to do. People of mixed descent under the age of 34 were no longer allowed to live on reserves. This order reduced Coranderrk’s able-bodied and enthusiastic workforce. Stock was sold, and most of the remaining people on the reserve were moved to the mission station at Lake Tyers. In 1924, Coranderrk was officially closed.

But the story continues. In recent years, Aboriginal people have made efforts to reclaim Coranderrk. In 1998, the Indigenous Land Corporation bought some land on the old reserve, which was returned to descendants of the original community.

**Activities**

**REMEMBER**
1. What was Coranderrk, and why was it so successful?
2. Name two factors that worked against Coranderrk’s continuing existence once it became a successful and profitable venture.

**COMMUNICATE**
3. Prepare a timeline to record some key events during the existence of Coranderrk.
4. Besides Coranderrk, name the other Aboriginal reserves set up in Victoria in the late nineteenth century. Use an atlas to help you locate the modern-day town closest to each of these six reserves.

**SELF-DISCOVERY**
5. Look carefully at the photographs of Coranderrk and its people in this spread. What do these primary sources reveal about Indigenous people in the late 1800s that most surprises you? Explain.
6. Predict what impact Coranderrk might have had on Australian history if it had been allowed and encouraged to develop as a community.

**THINK**
7. What does the story of Coranderrk, and the example set by the superintendent John Green, suggest about the dangers of accepting stereotypes when studying history? Discuss as a class, listening carefully to the views of others, even if they are different from your own.

**I CAN:**
- appreciate why Coranderrk was such a successful Indigenous venture
- understand the demoralising impact that the closure of the reserve had on its residents
- recognise the importance of keeping an open mind about stereotypes.
Truganini now at peace

One hundred years after Truganini's death, her skeleton was cremated yesterday, following the Tasmanian Government's decision to return it to the Indigenous people. It has been stored in the Tasmanian Museum for the last 29 years.

So why was there such an interest in Indigenous remains? Nineteenth-century scientists thought they were witnessing a human species becoming extinct. (Many then agreed with Robert Knox who argued in his 1850 publication *The Races of Man* that Asians and dark-skinned people were a different race to Europeans.)

Truganini was the daughter of Mangerner, who was the chief of the people of Recherche Bay in Tasmania. By the time she was 18, she had seen European sealers kill her mother and her uncle, abduct her sisters and mutilate the man she was to marry before leaving him to drown. She was also raped.

Between 1830 and 1834, she and her then partner Wooraddy accompanied George Robinson on several expeditions into the wilds of Tasmania. Robinson, a lay preacher and builder, had been appointed by Governor Arthur to persuade Indigenous people to come and live on missions. Robinson gave Truganini food, shelter and blankets to be his guide and interpreter.

In 1835, the 200 or so survivors of those people Robinson had rounded up were transported to a makeshift settlement called Wybalenna on cold, windy Flinders Island. Here Robinson set about teaching them to dress, speak and behave like Europeans.

The people thought their move to Flinders Island was temporary. When it became clear this was not so, they became resentful and depressed. Their links with their ancestral lands were broken. They tried to hold onto some of their traditions, but were continually being forced to adopt a new culture and new ways of thinking. New diseases were killing them. Three years later, only 93 people remained.

By 1847, Wooraddy had died and there were only 45 people left. That year, Truganini and the other survivors were moved to Oyster Cove in Hobart.

Truganini was a proud, strong and very resourceful woman, though petite (she was only 130 centimetres tall).

Truganini's body was buried in a women's jail in Hobart in 1876. Two years later, the Royal Society of Tasmania obtained her remains, and her skeleton was displayed in the Tasmanian Museum until 1947. This gross indignity was something Truganini had greatly feared. Museums and medical scientists had argued over the rights to the remains of her friend William Lanney, who died in 1868. She had been promised this would not happen to her.

*Residence of the Aborigines, Flinders Island, 1846* by John Skinner Prout
The Black Line

Robinson’s mission was another attempt by Governor Arthur to ‘round up’ the country’s remaining Indigenous people. In 1830, Arthur had ordered the Black Line — a ‘sweep’ of the south-east region. More than 2000 European men formed a human chain to herd any Indigenous people they found in this area down into the Tasman Peninsula. But they captured only an old man and a boy.

Governor Arthur’s actions were a response to the growing unease of many new settlers, who feared attacks by Indigenous people. Many of these attacks, however, were a retaliation against the Europeans for killing Indigenous people and taking over their land. Over the 27 years since Tasmania’s first convict settlement was established on the Derwent River in 1803, the Indigenous population was rapidly reduced by murder and introduced disease.

STOP PRESS

Truganini’s ashes will today be cast over the waters of D’Entrecasteaux Channel, which lap her ancestral home of Bruny Island.

SELF-DISCOVERY

6 How would you feel towards people who treated you as the Europeans treated Truganini (in life and death)? Express your feelings in an abstract painting, a poem, song or dance. Display or perform it for the class.

COMMUNICATE

7 In the light of your response to activity 4, suggest why Truganini was prepared to help Robinson. What does this tell you about her?

8 In 2002, remains of Truganini’s hair and skin, held in Britain for over 100 years, were finally returned to Tasmania for cremation. Discuss as a class what this reveals about the way attitudes towards the Indigenous people have changed over the last century. Prepare two or three relevant questions before or during discussion to help you contribute meaningfully to what is said.

I CAN:

- appreciate why Truganini was such a significant Australian
- discuss how attitudes towards Indigenous people have changed
- contribute to a class discussion.
The Torres Strait Islanders

The Torres Strait Islands are the hundreds of islands, many tiny, scattered between the tip of Cape York, in Queensland, and Papua New Guinea. Many have been inhabited for thousands of years. Their Indigenous people are a culturally unique group, distinct from the Indigenous Aborigines of mainland Australia. Little is known of them prior to 1871, as written records do not exist and detailed study of them and their culture was not carried out until the early 1900s.

Before the Europeans arrived, it is known that the Torres Strait Islanders (hereafter called Islanders) traded with Cape York Aborigines and the people of Papua New Guinea in goods such as turtle oil, shells, spears and red ochre. They also had their own religious cults; some practised calling up the spirits of the recently dead, ritual beheadings and cannibalism. It seems Island society was brutal and violent at times, particularly when raiding surrounding islands for food.

Here come the visitors...

Initial European contact was made in 1606 when the Spanish navigator Luis Vaez de Torres sailed through what is now called the Torres Strait. Although it is likely that others passed through these waters earlier, there is no evidence to support association with the Islander people.

Source A

Some of the Torres Strait Islands (the bigger ones)

Source B

Painting of a village on Darnley Island (now known as Erub Island) by Edwin Porcher, painted around 1845
After 1770, when Captain Cook proclaimed part of Australia’s eastern coast as Crown land (see page 29 for more details), many British ships favoured Torres Strait as a passage to the Pacific. It was not long, therefore, before European pearlers and fishermen began occupying the resource-rich waters. Their competition with Islanders for the sea’s resources caused many confrontations.

Europeans as permanent residents
There was no significant European impact on Islander life until the arrival of the London Missionary Society on Darnley Island in 1871. The Islanders generally embraced Christianity; but this decision had a significant impact on the way they lived. For example, women now had to completely cover their bodies and discard any traditional accessories. In the hot, equatorial climate, such clothing would have been uncomfortable; however, they risked being disciplined by the mission court if they did not conform.

Missionary teachers also discouraged traditional songs and dances in order to minimise adherence to the ‘old ways’. Some destroyed Islanders’ artefacts; others were sold to passing ships or buried.

Islanders were also required to take a second name. These were selected in a number of ways: some because they were the name of known Europeans (for example, Joe, Tom), some by a connection with a type of job (for example, Cook, Captain) and some from the Bible (for example, David, Matthew).

Initially, the Islanders enjoyed more independence under European control than did mainland Aboriginal people. This was mainly because the then Queensland Government Controller, John Douglas, would not allow Islanders to be classified as Aboriginal people under the Queensland Aborigines Protection Act 1897. However, this changed with his death in 1904. Thursday Island, for example, then became a European settlement that Islanders could now only visit, and only during the day.
Independence — lost and gained

The Queensland Government in the early twentieth century systematically discriminated against Islanders, deliberately limiting their freedom. They were not, for example, permitted to enter bars, and were not allowed to have sexual relations with anyone outside their race. Those of mixed descent were transferred to the islands of Moa and Kiriri. The government also appointed representatives for the Islanders, but these were ineffective and were later replaced with elected Island Councils.

Frustrated by the loss of ability to run their own affairs, Islanders working on government-owned boats rebelled against the Queensland Government in 1936 by staging a strike. It lasted nine months; the outcome was that Island Councils were allowed to have more substantial input into the management of their boats and other affairs.

Side by side as soldiers

During World War II, around one-quarter of the Islander population enlisted to fight, enjoying equal treatment and acceptance alongside their fellow Australian soldiers (even if receiving only half their pay!). This experience was a turning point in the attitudes of many white Australians (particularly those who fought alongside Islanders), and former restrictions against Islanders began to be lifted. In 1947, the first Islander was allowed on the mainland to cut cane, and by the 1960s all were free to seek work and settle anywhere on the mainland.

Torres Strait Islands today

In 1990, the status of Islanders as a separate Indigenous group within Australia was acknowledged with the formation of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission.

The isolated location of the Torres Strait Islands, and the limited access Islanders have to adequate finance and professional services and core skills, have made advancing economic development challenging. Despite these obstacles, many island communities and individuals are becoming more proactive in developing businesses and projects that contribute towards employment and increasing income. Economic opportunities are being boosted by tourism; many visitors come to the Islands wanting to see traditional Islander ceremonies such as the Coming of the Light Festival (which celebrates the arrival of Christianity) and the Tombstone Unveiling Ceremony (which traditionally concludes a three-year mourning period after the death of a loved one).
European colonisation and modern influences have had an enormous impact on the retention of traditional island customs. Currently, efforts are being made to revitalise traditional culture; Islanders are being encouraged to promote and observe island customs, teaching the younger generation, to ensure that the cultural identity of Torres Strait Islanders remains intact.

**Activities**

**REMEMBER**
1. When were the Torres Strait Islands claimed in the name of the Crown, and what did this mean?
2. What was John Douglas’s contribution to the history of the Torres Strait Islands?

**THINK**
3. (a) Copy and complete the following table to document the impact of the arrival of European settlers on the Islanders. Take the viewpoint of a typical European settler.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change to way of life</th>
<th>Positive outcome from change</th>
<th>Negative outcome from change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Now draw a similar table in your notebook. This time, take the point of view of a typical Islander.

(c) Discuss your two completed tables with a partner to identify similarities and differences. To what extent did this exercise help you to understand the different viewpoints that may exist in a multicultural society?

(d) Explore, through discussion, what values you think are needed to support a society made up of different ethnic groups.

4. Would you have classified the years between 1871 and 1904 as a time of European settlement or European invasion? Explain, and justify, your response.

**COMMUNICATE**
5. Compare sources B and D.
   (a) Are these primary or secondary sources? Explain.
   (b) One is an illustration. Explain what potential problems this might pose for a historian.
   (c) Write a short statement in your notebook identifying as many similarities and differences as you can between the images. What can you conclude from this comparison about the impact of the arrival of Europeans on the Islanders?

**DESIGN AND CREATIVITY**
6. Use sources G and H for inspiration to design a headress suitable for an Islander ceremony. Use information in this spread and Internet research about the traditional Islander ceremonies. Before you start, write a list of points against which the success of your design can be judged. Critically judge your finished product against these criteria, and email your ‘report card’ to your teacher.

7. Do you think the design of the Torres Strait Islander flag is an appropriate one? Explain, suggesting how you might change it, and why.

**INQUIRE**
8. Discover more about one of the larger Torres Strait Islands of your choice. Investigate any issues it currently faces, and what is being done to address these. Evaluate the extent to which the arrival of the Europeans has affected people’s way of life there and write a short report on your findings.

**I CAN:**
- appreciate the similarities and differences between the history of Australia’s Indigenous peoples
- explain how Torres Strait Islanders and Europeans might have reacted to each other and why
- critically evaluate two sources of evidence to reach conclusions.
1. What typical reactions did European settlers and Indigenous people have to one another immediately after the first settlers arrived? Why did this change? (pp. 6–11)

2. Study the image below. Explain how it demonstrates the vital dependence of Indigenous people on the land and its resources. (p. 5)

3. Why did the early settlers assume they could simply take over the land on which Indigenous people lived? (p. 4) Roleplay a conversation with a partner to demonstrate the settlers’ attitudes. Present your roleplay for the class if asked.

4. Why might Pemulwuy and Yagan be called two of the first Indigenous resistance fighters? (pp. 14–15)

5. List key factors that caused the dramatic reduction in the Indigenous population following European colonisation. (pp. 8–11)

6. How would you feel if you heard that an invading force was setting out to herd your community into a corner of your local region?
   (a) Describe your emotions in a diary entry.
   (b) In a paragraph, suggest why Indigenous people caught up in the Tasmanian Black Line hunt may or may not have felt as you do.

7. (a) Explain why the ‘Coranderrk experiment’ was such a severe blow to Indigenous people.
   (b) What impact might this venture have had on the people’s attitudes and behaviour in the longer term? (pp. 16–19)

8. This primary source is a photograph of Aboriginal trackers taken in the nineteenth century. Their bush skills were extraordinarily good.

   What advantages would these skills have provided Indigenous people in:
   (a) evading capture
   (b) making lightning raids on European camps
   (c) surviving on the land?

9. Give one example in each case to demonstrate why the attitudes of many early settlers towards Indigenous people were (a) ignorant, (b) arrogant, (c) deceitful, (d) cruel.

10. Create a timeline listing some of the more important events affecting Indigenous people referred to in this chapter.

11. Explain why the Mabo decision was such a landmark for Torres Strait Islanders and for Indigenous people generally. (p. 22)
Early European settlers drove Indigenous people off any land they wanted. Describe why this action would have had such a significant long-term effect on Indigenous people.

Write a short speech that Truganini might give if she were able to come back to our society. Be prepared to present your speech to the class.

Many early settlers treated Indigenous people very badly, but not everyone was unfair. The poster below, called ‘Governor Davey’s Proclamation to the Aborigines, 1816’, was commissioned by Colonel George Arthur, the fourth governor of Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania). He ordered that copies of this poster be nailed to trees.

(a) What is the message of this poster?
(b) In what way does it show that the rights of Indigenous people are to be respected?
(c) Why do you think the story shown in the poster is depicted with no words?
(d) Suggest why Indigenous people might have been suspicious of such a poster.

In 1868, an Aboriginal cricket team toured England, scoring better than the first white Australian team. Nearly 40 years later, despite being regarded by many as the fastest bowler in Australia, Jack Marsh was asked not to appear at the NSW selection trials. He would not be chosen as he was Aboriginal.

(a) Why was the treatment of Indigenous cricketers so unfair in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century?
(b) Based on what you know of Indigenous sportspeople today, how have attitudes changed? Why do you think this is so?

Jimmie Barker was only 11 when he was recruited, along with other Indigenous boys, to work as a stockman. Kevin Gilbert recorded in his book Living Black some comments Jimmie made about his early lessons in life:

I learnt ... that an Aboriginal ... was little better than an animal; in fact, dogs were sometimes to be preferred. As I was less than twelve years old it was impossible to disbelieve men of authority who were much older. I tried to stop their remarks from bothering me too much, but it was hard to adjust to being treated with such cruelty and contempt.

Discuss in small groups what you would say to Jimmie today if he visited your classroom. Think of three specific questions you would like to ask him and indicate why you would like them answered.

Think about what you have learnt in this chapter and any activities you could have done better. Describe in what ways you expect to do better on similar tasks in the future.


Summary of key terms

ancestral beings: ancestors of Aboriginal people believed to have emerged during the Dreamtime. They created all life forms and landscape features, some merging back into these when their work was done.

artefact: an object made by humans

bias: a leaning towards one particular view

brutalised: describes a person who has been so cruelly and harshly treated that they, in turn, become heartless and unfeeling towards the suffering of others

cannibalism: the act of eating one’s own species

clan: the part of an Indigenous language group that owned a particular section of land (about 100 people)

colony: a settlement whose ruling authority is linked to or directly controlled by that of another country

convict: a person declared guilty of a crime and (during the nineteenth century) sent to distant colonies to serve out his/her term

Crown land: land belonging to the government (the Crown)

cult: a branch of religious worship of some kind, often (but not always) associated with more extreme beliefs and behaviour

dialect: a language that is a version of another. Speakers of different dialects will not necessarily understand one another.

Dreaming: information that describes the Dreamtime, explains Aboriginal people’s relationship to the land and sets out their traditional rules of behaviour

economic resource: a resource that can be used to make money

elder: an older Indigenous man or woman highly respected for their knowledge of culture and customs

exploit: to take full advantage of, although this might mean disregarding the rights of others

frontier: the outer boundary of a settled area

Governor Macquarie: the fifth governor of the colony of New South Wales (from 1810 to 1821). After his term in office, Britain began to regard the colony more as a free settlement than as just a convict prison.

hypothesis: an opinion about how something might have happened, based on what evidence is available, but which has not been proved correct

hunters and gatherers: people who are members of what is usually a group that wanders from time to time within a set territory to find food

immunity: the state of being protected from catching a particular disease

Indigenous: describes the original known inhabitants of a region. Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders are Australia’s Indigenous people.

initiation: a sacred ceremony in traditional Indigenous culture in which a boy becomes a man

kinship: describes the relationship that exists between members of an extended family

language group: a group of Indigenous people who speak the same language; sometimes a language group is called a ‘tribe’.

Matthew Flinders: an English explorer who was the first known European to circumnavigate Australia in 1802

mind map: a sketch that connects loosely arranged facts and ideas by linking lines (and brief statements) to show their connections

mixed descent: describes someone whose parents do not come from the same racial group (e.g. a Chinese mother and a Afro-American father; or, in the case of Australia, an Indigenous father and a non-Indigenous mother)

 moiety: describes one of two parts of a clan. Children inherited the moiety totem of either their mother or their father. The other moiety totem of the Kulin people besides the wedge-tailed eagle was the Australian raven.

Native Police: Indigenous men who were paid and trained to help European officers put down resistance by other Indigenous people

native title: a ‘bundle of rights’ that may include the right to hunt, fish and conduct ceremonies and to be consulted about future development

ochre: a particular type of soil, which ranges in colour from pale yellow to dark red. Mixed with water, it becomes a type of paint.

penal colony: a settlement for prisoners being punished for their crimes by being removed from the place or country in which they lived

petition: a request for something that is asked of a governing body (e.g. a government agency) and detailed in a formal document

prehistory: history before recorded events

pioneer: a person who was among the first to settle in a particular region

primary source: a source of evidence that existed or was created during the period being studied

reserve: a set area to which many Indigenous people were sent to live, initially under the control of missionaries and, later, government authorities

sovereignty: describes a situation where a group of people has authority over something (e.g. land)

stereotype: an image that someone may have of another person or place based on first impressions or preconceptions (e.g. colour of skin, dress, observed behaviours, general appearance)

superintendent: a person responsible for overseeing the activity of a particular operation

terra nullius: a Latin term that literally means a land without owners, or ‘land of no-one’