

This file is part of the following work:

Killoran, Tianna (2017) *Queensland's History curriculum: negotiating spaces and tensions, 1970-2000*. BA Hons thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<https://doi.org/10.4225/28/5af8b88391aa0>

Copyright © 2017 Tianna Killoran.

The author has certified to JCU that they have made a reasonable effort to gain permission and acknowledge the owner of any third party copyright material included in this document. If you believe that this is not the case, please email researchonline@jcu.edu.au

**Queensland's History Curriculum:
Negotiating Spaces and Tensions,
1970-2000**

Thesis submitted by

Tianna Killoran

2017

**in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honours in History
in the College of Arts, Society and Education
James Cook University**

Statement of Access

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make the thesis available for use within the University Library and, by microfilm or other photographic means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting the thesis will have to sign the following statement.

“In consulting this thesis, I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without written consent of the author; and to make proper written acknowledgement for any assistance that I have obtained from it.”

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restrictions on access to this thesis.

.....

(Signature)

Dated:

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any University or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

.....

(Signature)

Dated:

Table of Contents

Statement of Access	ii
Author's Declaration	iii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Abbreviations	vi
Terms and Usages	vii
Abstract	ix
Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Shape of History	13
Chapter Two: 'Australian' Narrative(s)?	24
Chapter Three: The Asian Century	38
Chapter Four: Curriculum for a Nation	51
Conclusion	60
Bibliography	63

Acknowledgements

I am truly grateful for the guidance, advice, and encouragement I have received from all who assisted me in the preparation of this thesis. Particularly, I would like to thank my supervisors Dr Claire Brennan and Dr Peta Salter for their time, guidance, and patience. Your honest and helpful feedback has aided me substantially, with your knowledge proving invaluable.

I would like to thank the countless librarians and staff who kindly assisted me in locating the curriculum documents that provided the basis for this research. The Eddie Koiki Mabo Library at James Cook University and John Oxley Library were invaluable sources and staff were always patient and helpful with my endeavours. I would also like to acknowledge the Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority for providing some particularly difficult to locate curricula.

To the countless others who have offered their support, suggestions, and friendship; I especially want to thank the History Morning Tea group and my fellow Honours students for the coffee, baked goods, and interesting conversations.

To my family, I would like to express my gratitude for your unconditional support throughout my studies. To my parents, thank you for your endless encouragement and for enabling me to follow such a path. For my partner, Jared, thank you for always providing a listening ear, a shoulder to cry on, and a home cooked meal whenever I needed it.

List of Abbreviations:

Anzac:	Australian and New Zealand Army Corps
CARE:	Campaign Against Regressive Education
CCP:	Cross-Curriculum Priority
GC:	General Capabilities
HTAA:	History Teachers' Association of Australia
KLA:	Key Learning Area
MACOS:	<i>Man, A Course of Study</i>
NSW:	New South Wales
QBSSS:	Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies
QBSSSS:	Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies
QCAA:	Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority
QHTA:	Queensland History Teachers' Association
QSCC:	Queensland School Curriculum Council
QTU:	Queensland Teachers' Union
SEMP:	<i>Social Education Materials Project</i>
SOSE:	Studies of Society and Environment
STOP:	Society to Outlaw Pornography
WA:	Western Australia
WWI:	World War I
WWII:	World War II

Terms and Usages:

'History' and 'history'

In *Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum After 'the End of History'* Robert J. Parkes makes explicit reference to the capitalisation of History and history. He explains that in his work, History (capital H) is used to refer to the subject taught in schools and universities (as with English, Geography, Science) whilst history (lowercase h) refers to the academic discipline or "the past" itself. Exceptions to these rules only occur when the reference is left deliberately ambiguous or when normal punctuation conventions dictate the use of capitalisation (such as at the beginning of a sentence).¹ Parkes' usage will be employed in this thesis to avoid ambiguity.

Syllabus and Curriculum

The 1991 state government document "Managing Curriculum Development in Queensland" clearly distinguishes between curriculum and syllabus documents: curriculum is the range of documents for a specific subject which includes the rationale, aims, objectives, framework and syllabus; the syllabus is only one component within the curriculum and is the "statement of the content to be used in the achievement of a particular set of objectives."² Although Anna Clark points out that in practice there is little distinction made between curriculum and syllabus,³ this designation will be maintained for clarity. Exceptions will only occur when referring specifically to the title of a curriculum or syllabus document.

¹ Robert J. Parkes, *Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum after 'the End of History'* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), xiv.

² Phillip Hughes, "Managing Curriculum Development in Queensland," ed. Queensland Department of Education (Brisbane: Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, 1991), xii.

³ Anna Clark, *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006), 70.

Indigenous Australians

This thesis will follow the “Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Perspectives in Schools” framework and use the term Indigenous to describe Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples of Australia. ‘Indigenous’ means ‘belonging naturally to a place’: using this term acknowledges Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the first peoples of Australia.⁴ This term is used with full recognition of the complexities of the term, and not as grammatical shorthand. This includes a recognition of the diverse nations, languages, cultures, and histories of the Indigenous peoples of Australia. Exceptions to this designation occur when directly referring to other texts, particularly curricula, that use other terms of reference for Indigenous Australians and where making clear reference to a specific group of individuals.

Asia

The term ‘Asia’ is a widely used and highly problematic term. This thesis will follow Alison Broinowski’s suggestion that the term Asia should always be read as if written between quotation marks.⁵ In using the term, I am recognising the baggage this language carries—including the assumption of homogeneity in language, culture, religion, and politics across Asia—while also attempting to engage with the discourse used in the curriculum as an historical source to ensure an accurate reflection of its values and assumptions.

⁴ Department of Education and Training, “Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Perspectives in Schools (Eatsips),” (Brisbane: Queensland Government, 2011), 8.

⁵ Alison Broinowski, *The Yellow Lady: Australian Impressions of Asia* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992), x.

Abstract

History education is a contentious matter due to its civic and nation-building capabilities. As an explicit statement of intent, History curricula therefore have the power to shape the nation and its identity. Yet these curricula have within them spaces of negotiation and tension as they aim to develop students' historical knowledge and skills. However, the negotiation of these tensions is guided by various political priorities, which demonstrate attempts to create a cohesive grand narrative of Australian history to define the nation's identity. In the process of negotiating History curricula's spaces and tensions, very little attention has previously been given to state history curriculums, with Queensland particularly neglected.

This thesis historicises Queensland History curricula between 1970 and 2000 and analyses it using a framework of Michael W. Apple's Official Knowledge. Drawing upon History curricula and key policy documents, it identifies significant sources of tension and analyses how these have been dealt with in successive curricula.

This thesis argues that the History curriculum's 'unresolvable' nature means that negotiations about its structure and content will remain ongoing. Whilst successive History curricula since the 1970s have made attempts to balance points of tension surrounding histories about Australia and Asia, this has often perpetuated a Eurocentric and celebratory grand narrative. The pervasive power of this grand narrative to define Australian identity has been maintained through a process of Mentioning the histories of minority groups. These rival histories have been included in the curriculum's grand narrative, but often framed as Other and insubstantial. This thesis points to the importance of making the negotiation of History curricula's tensions visible, rather than hidden.

Introduction

History education has been a point of concern and anxiety in Australian schools for many decades. Various factors have caused these concerns, ranging from declining enrolments, community perceptions of History's relevance to secondary students, and public alarm at the 'identity politics' of History emphasised within schools. Despite similarly suffering from such nationwide concerns, Queensland since the 1970s has appeared at odds with the rest of the nation with its highly conservative political scene, comparatively large regional population base (in contrast to the largely metropolitan populations of other states), and its northern location. As a result, Queensland's History curriculum and education policy show intersecting national and state concerns at work, making them worth examining as they demonstrate the particularities of Queensland approaches to History education.

This thesis provides a broad analysis of the Queensland History curriculum for secondary schools from 1970 to 2000, concluding by discussing the current 2017 *Australian Curriculum*. It historicises successive History curricula during this period and analyses them in terms of the content emphasised, excluded, and contested. This content is linked to the successive political agendas of state—and to some extent, federal—governments as they intervene in History curriculum development in Queensland. This is a broad topic and there are many points of tension in the History curriculum. Consequently, this thesis focuses on changes in educational policy and their influence on History curricula's pedagogy and content. Analysing the process of developing curricula has further implications on the ways historical narratives are shaped and negotiated by the curriculum, including those that focus on histories of Australia and Asia.

'The 1970s History education revival', as educationist Tony Taylor refers to it, marks the beginning point for this analysis.¹ Early during this decade, the perceived decline in History education in Australian schools caused alarm amongst historians and educationists. The subject was revived by 'reinventing' itself, at least in some ways. Such

¹ Tony Taylor, "The Future of the Past: Final Report of the Report of the National Inquiry into School History," (Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 2000), 16.

a reinvention was helped along by the shift from 'Old History'² towards 'New History' during this period.³ Chief among the causes of the Revival were: ideas imported from British History education policy developed during the early 1970s; new research into student-centred inquiry-based learning; and external pressures demanding educational content relevant to the growing population of secondary school students. This analysis use the 2000 *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE) curriculum as an end point because it is the most significant curriculum in Queensland History education prior to the shift to the *Australian Curriculum* in 2011. The continuation between the 2000 SOSE curriculum and the *Australian Curriculum*, however, is significant. Evidence of developing nationally aligned educational goals from as early as 1989 show that preparations were being made for a national curriculum at least 25 years prior to the release of the national curriculum.⁴ Key points of tension and change in the Queensland History curriculum from 1970 to 2000 have mostly arisen at junior, middle, and senior secondary levels.⁵

This thesis recognises the distinction between syllabus and curriculum, despite the general synonymy of these terms in educational practice.⁶ A 1991 Queensland Department of Education document clearly distinguishes between curriculum and syllabus: curriculum is the range of documents for a subject area that includes the rationale, aims, objectives, framework and syllabus; the syllabus is only one component within the curriculum and is the "statement of the content to be used in the achievement of a particular set of objectives."⁷ This thesis analyses the whole of the intended curriculum, rather than limiting itself to the syllabus.⁸ There are also

² Brian Hoepper, "Who Says You Can't Change History?," *EQ Australia* 2004, 13. 'Old History' was a term developed during the 1970s. It describes History education that is Eurocentric, celebratory, and emphasises rote learning of historical facts.

³ Anna Clark, *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006), 96. In contrast to 'Old History', 'New History' places importance on the critical use of historical sources. This approach allows students to "participate in the process of historical inquiry and develop critical skills of practising historians."

⁴ Marie Brennan, "National Curriculum: A Political-Educational Triangle," *Australian Journal of Education* 55, no. 259 (2011): 259.

⁵ The designation of junior, middle, and senior secondary curriculum has changed significantly in Queensland History education during the period 1970 to 2000. For this reason, reference to each of the curricula will make explicit the year levels of the intended students. Further, secondary school in Queensland included Year 8-12 between 1970 and 2000, but extended to include Year 7 in 2015.

⁶ Clark, *Teaching the Nation*, 70.

⁷ Phillip Hughes, "Managing Curriculum Development in Queensland," 1991, Cairns Main Collection, James Cook University Library, Cairns, xii.

⁸ The term syllabus will only be used when in direct reference to the name of a curriculum e.g. *Syllabus: Modern History Years 11&12* by the Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies.

differences between the ‘intended’ and ‘enacted’ curriculum. This thesis focuses on ‘intended’ curriculum as an official statement of intentions, objectives, and content that indicate what curriculum developers intend students to learn.⁹ As a statement of intent, the curriculum is an explicit confirmation of curriculum writers’ expectations for the subject area’s rationale, pedagogy, and content that will be learnt in the classroom.

Primary sources that form the basis of this thesis include Queensland secondary History curricula. However, the record of these past curricula is highly fragmented. Preservation has been complicated by the frequent name changes of the governing body that writes curricula, and by the attitude within education to view past curricula as irrelevant. Even when attempts have been made to preserve curricula, many are mysteriously missing from archival stores (despite remaining in the catalogue). As a means of overcoming these issues with preservation, this thesis has used ‘Social Studies’, ‘Social Sciences’, and ‘Studies of Society’ curricula within its analysis for instances when those subjects replaced History in Queensland entirely, and where those curricula demonstrated detailed use of historical content and skills. This thesis also analyses state and federal education policy documents, curriculum reports and reviews, as well as articles from the Queensland History Teachers’ Association’s (QHTA) and History Teachers’ Association of Australia’s (HTAA) publications to contextualise the discussions and debates in the background of Queensland’s History curricula development. Taken together, these primary sources allow analysis of the significant negotiations and discussions of tensions within Queensland History curricula during the period between 1970 and 2000.

Curriculum and Policy Directions

Anna Clark’s work *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History* was significant in providing context and background for this thesis. Clark explores Australia’s ongoing anxiety—in both public and political spheres—about the national narrative that is conveyed through History education.¹⁰ Although primarily focused on

⁹ The alternative ‘enacted curriculum’ refers to the curriculum that is actually implemented in the classroom. Examination of this relies on a number of intersecting factors including school aims and administration, individual teachers’ philosophies, and classroom environments. The ‘enacted curriculum’ is beyond the scope of this thesis.

¹⁰ Clark, *Teaching the Nation*.

History education during the 1990s and 2000s, Clark provides relevant background. She argues that public and political debates about the teaching of Australian history are expressions of the 'politics of memory' and are indicative of concern for Australian identity itself. Consequently, perceived subversion of the traditional Australian narrative is a source of public—and more importantly—political, dispute.¹¹ *Teaching the Nation* draws on Clark's personal experiences and observations of History education in New South Wales (NSW) and Victoria, but remains relevant to Queensland's History curriculum development.

Political tensions over History education, with its implications for Australian identity, is a pervasive theme in the literature. Ann Scott's research publications during the 1980s provide Queensland-based evidence of the political disputes about History. Published jointly with Roger Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North: Education and Policy-Making in Queensland* provides an overview of education policy processes at Queensland state level from 1960 to 1980.¹² Scott's doctoral thesis extends that work, examining the short and long-term effects of the Ahern Committee's recommendations. It finds that although the committee's report was instrumental in diffusing conflicts about contentious curriculum issues between community interest groups, it failed to remove education from the state government's political agenda at the time.¹³ Scott's work centres on the controversy surrounding *Man, A Course of Study* (MACOS) and *Social Education Materials Project* (SEMP) curricula during the late 1970s.¹⁴ Her analysis of both the immediate and long-term implications of key educational policy processes between 1960 and 1980 explicates the extent to which those processes have influenced Queensland's History curricula. The MACOS/SEMP debate is a pivotal example of the influence of interest groups on political agendas and state-level

¹¹ Ibid., 4.

¹² Ann Scott and Roger Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North: Education and Policy-Making in Queensland* (Parkville: University of Melbourne, 1980). The key organisations and documents identified by the Scotts include the 1960 Watkin Committee, the 1970 Radford Report (undertaken in the Education Act Amendment Act 1971), and the Ahern Committee which sat from 1978 to 1980.

¹³ Ann Scott, "The Ahern Committee and the Education Policy-Making Process in Queensland" (The University of Queensland, 1984).

¹⁴ Richard A. Smith and John Knight, "MACOS in Queensland: The Politics of Educational Knowledge," *The Australian Journal of Education* 22, no. 3 (1978); Richard Smith and John Knight, "Political Censorship in the Teaching of Social Sciences: Queensland Scenarios," *The Australian Journal of Education* 25, no. 1 (1981). The MACOS and SEMP curricula were officially banned by the Bjelke-Petersen state government in 1978. These two articles also analyse this controversy and the ways in which it reveals political values and agendas. This controversy will henceforth be referred to as the MACOS/SEMP debate.

education policy, which as Clark explicates in *Teaching the Nation*, gives the community immense power to shape the 'politics of memory'. Such incidents make it clear that History education in Queensland since the 1970s has been highly politicised because of its relationship with national identity.

The pattern of increasing government intervention in Queensland History curricula is also evident elsewhere. Alan Barcan analyses the broader trends of political interference in Australian education from the 1960s through to the 2000s. Barcan argues that political intervention in History education has increased markedly since 1987 due to widespread public perception that the Department of Education bends to determined and influential interest groups. Barcan neatly periodises broad trends in Australian education, arguing that the seventies saw an expansion of choice, the eighties a growing emphasis on performance and accountability, and the nineties a return to a greater governance of the curriculum in the national interest.¹⁵ Political intervention in the curriculum was also driven by economic goals for education, particularly with regards to vocational education and post-school pathways.¹⁶ As economic policy dictated that more students remain longer at school, History had to prove its relevance to a broader demographic of secondary students, and this played a significant role in shaping New History curricula. These implications on History curriculum development in Queensland will be examined in Chapter One.

Quite what History is meant to teach students has attracted public and scholarly attention, with debates about whether a relevant History curriculum should be based upon students' ability to 'know' or 'do' History. Rob Gilbert asserts that ongoing public debate reflects a lack of consensus regarding the purposes of History.¹⁷ Declining enrolments in History have extended debate over the purpose and relevance of History, pushing academic historians to share their views on the state of History in schools. Alan Ryan is not alone in asserting that History as a subject is losing its academic rigor;¹⁸ other academics argue that a strictly academic-orientated History is irrelevant to the

¹⁵ Alan Barcan, "The Nineteen Eighties: Prelude to Curricular Reform," *Melbourne Studies in Education* 42, no. 1 (2001): 75.

¹⁶ Alan Barcan, "Why Political Intervention in Education Has Increased," *Australia and World Affairs* 33, no. Winter (1997): 38.

¹⁷ Rob Gilbert, "Can History Succeed at School? Problems of Knowledge in the Australian History Curriculum," *Australian Journal of Education* 55, no. 3 (2011): 255.

¹⁸ Alan Ryan, "Developing a Strategy to 'Save' History," *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 87 (1998): 41.

majority of students on vocational pathways.¹⁹ Stuart Macintyre considers that History, with its narrow appeal, was being squeezed from both the academic and vocational school sectors and suggests it might find a future as a performative task.²⁰ Macintyre's suggestion seems out of place as History had been doing exactly that: Lyn Yates and Cherry Collins argue that between 1975 and 2005 a broad shift from 'knowing things' to 'doing things' occurred in the History curriculum.²¹ They point to the introduction of the Key Learning Areas (KLAs) across all Australian states in 1991 as a bureaucratic rapprochement of conflicts between student-centred learning and instrumental economism. The product was "a strong utilitarian vision of education, a particular form of Australian egalitarianism, and a focus on the developing child/learner/person as the key agenda."²²

Examining changes in History Curricula in the context of national politics and its vision for centralised utilitarian History education, Andrew Bonnell and Martin Crotty argue that during their prime ministerships, both Paul Keating and John Howard exercised control over narratives of Australian history (albeit imposing vastly different values and perspectives).²³ Operating under the guise of a national study on the state and quality of History education in Australia, Taylor's 2000 *The Future of the Past* report—which was created at the time of Prime Minister John Howard's increased governance over History education—demonstrates this pattern of political involvement in curriculum development. Despite concluding that international case studies show how political interference in History education "is generally a counter-productive distraction from the fundamental business of improving learning,"²⁴ Taylor supported Howard's interference in History education. He recommended that "the 1990s had been

¹⁹ Louise Finch, "Historian Heal Thyself? [Response to Alan Ryan]," *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 88 (1999): 29.

²⁰ Stuart Macintyre, "The Genie and the Bottle: Putting History Back into the School Curriculum," in *Queensland History Teachers' Association Conference* (1996), 18.

²¹ Lyn Yates and Cherry Collins, "Australian Curriculum 1975-2005: What Has Been Happening to Knowledge?," in *Australian Curriculum Inquiry as 'Really Useful' Educational Research: A Symposium* (Brisbane 2008), 8.

²² *Ibid.*, 9-10, 15.

²³ Andrew Bonnell and Martin Crotty, "Australia's History under Howard, 1996-2007," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 617, no. 1 (2008): 151.

²⁴ Taylor, *The Future of the Past*, 145.

the decade of SOSE ... 2000 should see the beginning of the decade of a revival of school History as a school subject placed more centrally in the school curriculum.”²⁵

Curriculum, Theory, and Power

Although focusing on the United States and British education systems, Michael W. Apple’s *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age* is useful when examining Queensland History curricula. Apple argues that spaces of conflict within History curricula mark sites of struggle for power to determine curricula’s political and ideological orientation. Clark argues that in the Australian case, these struggles are contests over national identity. This argument is supported by Robert J. Parkes when he points to the significance of the ‘school History Wars’ and that they should not be overlooked as a key battlefield over identity. Particularly, he points to History curricula as a vehicle for historical narratives that “connect the development of individuals to narratives and images of nationhood,” resulting in the “social reproduction of national identities.”²⁶

This thesis uses Apple’s analytical framework of ‘Official Knowledge’, which is useful for examining History curricula’s power relations in the Australian context. He describes the selective tradition of Official Knowledge, where political ideology operates through education and curriculum to select histories and perspectives that perpetuate a cohesive national identity. Clark backs this up, arguing that History curricula’s capacity to define national history allows it to develop grand narratives of the nation and construct collective memory. This exact capability of History curriculum is what “makes it so contested and fraught.”²⁷ The curriculum therefore stands to empower individuals that feature in that Official Knowledge, whilst disempowering those who are ‘Mentioned’ or absent from these ideological constructs.

²⁵ Ibid., 147. Reaction to this report included the 2006 Australian History Summit in Canberra and the release of *Making History: A Guide for the Teaching and Learning of History in Australian Schools*, authored by Tony Taylor and Carmel Young. Tony Taylor and Carmel Young, "Making History: A Guide for the Teaching and Learning of History in Australian Schools," ed. Lan Wang (Carlton: Curriculum Corporation, 2003).

²⁶ Robert J. Parkes, *Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum after ‘the End of History’* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 87.

²⁷ Clark, *Teaching the Nation*, 4.

However, the curriculum's construction of Official Knowledge is not a straightforward or finite process. Parkes' approach to History curricula within a postmodern environment identifies the impossibility of creating standpoint-free history. He assesses that pitting rival histories against each other uncovers vested interests and opposing values rather than resolving them. Issues such as the History Wars demonstrate that alternative interpretations of history—those that are supported by substantial evidence and scholarship—cannot simply be reconciled or 'solved'.

The 'school History Wars' are a site of struggle between rival histories for power over national identity and those rival histories are characterised by their 'unresolvable' nature and relative 'trueness'. The impossibility of resolving competing histories means History curriculum development is a continuous process of negotiation. Apple stresses that curriculum is the product of a series of choices made by curriculum writers and is thus a selective tradition. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg neatly express this idea when they write about the selective nature History curricula, explaining that, "One cannot avoid choices, one cannot simply 'include more.' The question then becomes on what grounds choices are made."²⁸ Power to select legitimate knowledge is maintained through a practice of Mentioning, which Apple defines as the inclusion of "limited and isolated elements of the history and culture of less powerful groups" within the grand narrative being conveyed.²⁹ Thus, whilst minority groups' histories are included in the curriculum, they are imprisoned within the frame of an Official hegemonic grand narrative and their world views are not given significant substance.

The complex layers of negotiation between Official and Mentioned content is explored by Sirkka Ahonen. She describes how post-colonial approaches in history result in the inclusion of previously repressed groups within historical narratives. However, the inclusion of their micro-narratives alongside the macro-narratives (the grand narrative) make obvious points of disagreement and tension between these

²⁸ Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg, "Introduction," in *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 7. The introduction states that "the teaching of history, like all aspects of historical study, involves choice and selection: One cannot avoid choices, one cannot simply "include more." The question then becomes on what grounds choices are made."

²⁹ Michael W. Apple, *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*, Second ed. (London: Routledge, 2000), 53.

histories. Ahonen refers to the tension points as 'white spots' which reveal the ethically questionable factors of the grand narrative. As a result, the inclusion of minority groups' micronarratives in the grand narrative are positioned as questioning the discursive togetherness of identity the grand narrative provides to communities. Intertwining rival histories is complex and Ahonen's work indicates that, in the interest of creating a cohesive grand narrative within a post-colonial context, selections must be made with regards to what should be Official Knowledge, and what should be Mentioned knowledge.

Curriculum and Content

Analysis of History curricula in Australia between 1970 and 2000 consistently demonstrate disordered and temporary resolutions to tensions in the curriculum that, overall, remain unresolved. Reinhard Kühnel's doctoral thesis undertakes a comparative analysis of the treatment of transnational histories in NSW and Western Australian (WA) History curricula between 1978 and 2007, while William J.R. Allen's thesis analyses policy processes operating behind History curricula in WA between 1980 and 2000. They demonstrate the influence of national and international factors in curriculum development using evidence of the impact of globalisation and multiple policy directions.³⁰ Their work supports the view that History curricula are a melting pot of relatively conflicting and incoherent policy approaches; where accusations of curricula lacking academic rigour and of Leftist subversions of History occur, there are also reactionary exclamations of the threat to celebratory Eurocentric versions of Australian history and identity. These manifestations of the History Wars affect the content of History curricula.

Other works demonstrate the intersection of policy and historical content in History. Parkes theorise the History Wars in the context of NSW's 1990s History curricula. With NSW as a key battlefield, Parkes suggests, in agreement with *Teaching the Nation*, that the ideological connections between History curricula and politics exist

³⁰ William J. R. Allen, "An Analysis of Curriculum Policy for Upper Secondary School History in Western Australia from 1983 to 2000" (University of Western Australia, 2004); Reinhard Kühnel, "Beyond the National: Transnational History in Australian Schools 1978-2007" (University of Western Australia, 2012).

in the realm of collective memory and national identity.³¹ In considering such History Wars in History education, Heather Sharp provides an analysis of 1960s and 1980s Social Studies curriculum sourcebooks using Apple's Official Knowledge and Mentioning framework.³² Sharp's work finds that despite significant social and civil gains in Indigenous Australians' rights following the 1960s, these advances are not evident in the curriculum of the time. Using Apple's concepts, Sharp articulates that frequently this mentioning of Indigenous Australians in sourcebooks is largely a-historical and communicates representations that are 'exotic', 'savage' or 'primitive'.

While some works demonstrate alternative approaches to curriculum analysis that are complementary to Apple's framework of Official Knowledge, they demonstrate useful functions of power in the curriculum. Kühnel, for example, uses the terms 'centre' and 'periphery' to discuss what is constituted as legitimate historical knowledge in the curriculum and that which is simply incidental, or peripheral, to this central knowledge. In terms similar to Apple, Kühnel is demonstrating the issue of choice when positioning narratives as central or relegated to the sidelines. Comparatively, an article by Parkes and Sharp uses Friedrich Nietzsche's historical discourse framework—considering monumental, antiquarian, and critical histories—to analyse representations of Gallipoli in History textbooks endorsed for the *Australian Curriculum*. Although focusing on textbooks rather than curriculum content, Sharp argues that *Australian Curriculum*-approved textbooks constitute Official documents and are statements of intention for History teaching and learning.³³ Their use of Nietzsche's framework as a typology of the different purposes of history, although a significant departure from Apple's framework, demonstrates the ways in which history can function to serve national identity.

Building upon this analysis, Parkes and Sharp wrote an additional article about representations of the Gallipoli Campaign in Australian History textbooks using Apple's Official Knowledge framework. They find that the operation of the textbooks in normalising a nationalistic narrative of Gallipoli means that goals of providing global

³¹ Robert J. Parkes, "School History as Postcolonial Text: The on-Going Struggle for Histories in the New South Wales Curriculum," in *Second World Curriculum Studies Conference* (Tampere, Finland 2006).

³² Heather Sharp, "What We Teach Our Children: A Comparative Analysis of Indigenous Australians in Social Studies Curriculum, from the 1960s to the 1980s," *Social and Education History* 2, no. 2 (2013).

³³ Robert J. Parkes and Heather Sharp, "Nietzschean Perspectives on Representations of National History in Australian School Textbooks: What Should We Do with Gallipoli?," *ENSAYOS. Revista de la Facultad de Educación de Albacete* 29, no. 1 (2014).

perspectives on historical events are undermined. The Official Knowledge of the curriculum maintains a nationalistic perception of History through its mythologising of Gallipoli.³⁴ Parkes makes specific reference to the ways in which the History Wars have played out in the History curriculum in New South Wales in his work "Reading History Curriculum as Postcolonial Text: Towards a Curricular Response to the History Wars in Australia and Beyond". He argues that curriculum backlash claiming to represent history as it 'really was' and remove 'political correctness' represents normalised invisible whiteness in histories. That normalised invisible whiteness is a view of European culture as innately superior to all others and the political strength of its proponents allows a 'fixing of history.'³⁵ Sharp and Parkes' articles represent an analysis and interrogation of the Official 'Australian' perspectives and narratives that are transported into History classrooms using the vehicle of History curricula and textbooks. Apple's framework deconstructs the normalised world views that are selected and positioned by curriculum writers, making it a significant basis for curriculum analysis in this thesis.

Conclusion

The secondary literature discusses broad patterns of policy in History education and analyses the content of History curriculum across Australia, making it clear that History curricula have become a 'battlefield' for Australian national identity. This interest in History as a national project explains increasing state and federal attempts to centralise political control over education, and the resultant complex battlefield of conceptual contradictions within History curricula demonstrate this unresolved and 'unresolvable' issue of Australian histories and identities. Whilst significant work on these various tensions in Australia's History education between 1970 and 2000 has been undertaken, little of that work has focused on Queensland's History curricula.

This thesis argues that Queensland History curricula, from the period of 1970 to 2000, have been highly politicised as a function of History education's commanding power to define national identity. In Queensland's case, History curricula have

³⁴ Heather Sharp, "Historical Representation of Gallipoli in the Australian Curriculum: What Does a Critical Analysis of Textbooks Reveal About the Gallipoli Campaign?," *Agora* 49, no. 2 (2014).

³⁵ Robert J. Parkes, "Reading History Curriculum as Postcolonial Text: Towards a Curricular Response to the History Wars in Australia and Beyond," *Curriculum Inquiry* 37, no. 4 (2007): 391.

consistently lagged behind national conversations regarding the inclusion of more diverse perspectives and histories. Consistently demonstrating a political insistence to normalise and make Official a Eurocentric, 'white', and celebratory grand narrative of Australian history, the Queensland History curriculum has still at times attempted to incorporate diverse perspectives and histories. However, in negotiating these inclusions, the process of mentioning has ensured these histories are marginal and 'Other' to the grand narrative. The persistent anxieties about History curriculum have been framed against the image of the student as receptor of the curriculum's knowledge. This representation of the student is symbolic of both the nation's identity and the visions for its future. As a result, increasing state and federal intervention between 1970 and 2000 has been concerned with exploring Australia not simply as it was, but also to serve a cohesive and utilitarian vision of Australia's future.

Chapter One of this thesis provides historical background to the key policies that shaped History in Queensland from 1970 through to 2000 with a focus on the 'shape' and goals of History in the Queensland curriculum. Following this contextualisation, Chapter Two discusses the construction of Australian history in the Queensland History curriculum. It identifies the emphasised and Mentioned elements in the assemblage of the Australian grand narrative and investigates the extent to which this narrative negotiates diverse perspectives and interpretations. It focuses on points of tension and analyses the attention given to the Anzacs at Gallipoli, Indigenous histories, and the inclusion of critical skills in dealing with rival histories. Chapter Three then analyses the fluctuating focus on Asia as a policy imperative in Queensland's History curricula. This chapter draws upon the relationship between educational policy and the curriculum's selection of content, finding that Asia has largely been simplified and Othered. The Othering of Asia serves instrumentalist aims of Australian politics and sharply delineate Australian identity. Chapter Four focuses on the *Australian Curriculum*. It draws on analysis of key tensions in curricula between 1970 and 2000 to demonstrate a pervasive continuation of centralised political interference in History curricula, ensuring they serve political purposes in shaping Australian history, and by effect, Australian identity. Broadly, it demonstrates a perpetuation of the tensions that were fought over within Queensland History curricula of previous decades.

Chapter One:

The Shape of History

Between 1970 and 2000, the Queensland History curriculum was ensnared in debates about the shape and organisation of the subject in secondary schools. Taken at face value, these contentions focused on whether History should be integrated with other social science subjects or be taught as a stand-alone subject. Lurking beneath this discussion were implicit concerns about the purpose and relevance of History education. Queensland History curricula between 1970 and 2000 demonstrate that political perspectives on History's purpose, organisation, and relevance were the deciding factor in curriculum debates and that political goals and values shifted over time.

This chapter argues that during the widespread cultural upheaval of the 1970s, Queensland experienced the distinctive influence of Premier Joh Bjelke-Petersen from 1968 to 1987. That era laid the foundation for a period of change and controversy in Queensland's educational sphere. Following the Bjelke-Petersen era, the 1990s saw a decline in state involvement in History curriculum as it became centralised at a federal level through statements of national goals. Fundamentally, the shape of the Queensland History curriculum between 1970 and 2000 has reflected the opinions of politicians who have had the power to actively shape it, imposing their ideas about the purpose and goals of History. This chapter examines the context of shifts from 'Old History' to 'New History' taken place at a national level and the repercussions of that shift in Queensland. It explores the significance of state education reports and policies such as the Radford Report, and the Ahern Committee's Report, as well as providing context for discussions in subsequent chapters.

Foundations of Change

During the 1960s and 1970s many political and educational forces were at work that favoured the emergence of New History. Anna Clark discusses the surfacing of this influence in *Teaching the Nation*, paying particular attention to the significance of The

British School Council's History 13–16 program and of public perceptions of History being in decline.¹ An examination of the broader context of Queensland politics during the 1970s reveals the conditions that favoured the growth of New History and its resulting influence on Queensland History curricula.

The Joh Bjelke-Petersen state government from 1968 to 1987 strongly influenced the development of the History curriculum in Queensland. Ann Scott explains that during the initial period of Bjelke-Petersen's leadership, the state government had inherited the Radford Report. They took up the recommendations of the Report relatively passively and followed it with the *Education Act Amendment Act 1971* which maintained the Report's recommendations. Summarily, this abolished external examinations in Queensland and replaced them with internally moderated assessments in schools. As a result, schools experienced a sudden administrative strain, which in addition to the increase in school enrolments that had been occurring since the 1960s, meant there was an increased demand for teachers.² Many trainee teachers were 'fast tracked' into classrooms. Scott describes the consequence of this situation, explaining that, "It was not long before the public examination system was being looked back upon by many people as one of the hallmarks of the golden age of education."³

Public discontent provided an opportunity for Bjelke-Petersen to increase his influence on Queensland education policy. Scott argues that education became the epicentre of division and discord between the Queensland Country Liberal government and Gough Whitlam's socially progressive federal government.⁴ The Queensland Teachers' Union (QTU) aligned itself with the Whitlam government's progressive educational goals, which created further discord as the conservative Bjelke-Petersen group were suspicious of the "dictates of a centralised bureaucratic machine based in the metropolitan capital."⁵ One particular battle between these two groups was over the

¹ Anna Clark, *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006), 94.

² Ian Creighton, "A History of Curriculum Development in Queensland," in *Report of the Review of the Queensland School Curriculum 1994: Shaping the Future* (Brisbane: The State of Queensland, 1993), 90. This increased secondary school enrolment was a result of the Watkin Committee's recommendations to abolish the Scholarship Examination. This was accepted by the government and from 1962 students could continue to secondary school without needing to pass a qualifying examination.

³ Ann Scott, "Chapter 8: Education," in *The Bjelke-Petersen Premiership 1968-1983: Issues in Public Policy*, ed. Allan Patience (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1985), 132.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 133.

⁵ Ann Scott and Roger Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North: Education and Policy-Making in Queensland* (Parkville: University of Melbourne, 1980), 20.

ability to shape political and ideological discourse in the Queensland History curriculum.

During the late 1960s and early 1970s History was a declining discipline within schools. Before the 1970s History emphasised the transmission of facts, focused on political histories, was highly Eurocentric, and favoured teacher-centred learning. Tony Taylor argues that up to the mid-1960s, History education was, in most of Australian schools, “still regarded as a necessary but uncontroversial form of civic inculcation that benignly examined the development of Anglo-Celtic Australian society within an imperial past.”⁶ This type of History was of little utility to students other than those who were continuing on a university pathway.⁷ Growing secondary school enrolments alongside declining History enrolments combined with a re-evaluation of the purpose of History education, forced History teaching in schools to change. Clark notes, “Students who wanted to finish school but did not want to continue with further study needed to be accommodated, and these different student expectations required different models of education.”⁸

The success and influence of international programs such as The British School Council’s History 13-16 Program showed that integrating subjects such as History within a general Social Sciences curriculum was the answer to this problem. Russell Cowie, an important figure in both the History Teachers’ Association of Australia (HTAA) and the Queensland History Teachers’ Association (QHTA), explained in a 1973 *Australian History Teachers’ Association* editorial on the implementation of ‘Study of Society’ courses that:

History ... bears the obloquy for having been the means of fostering blind passionate nationalist prejudices, and it is largely this perception of History that has led some educationists to place their faith in social science courses, rather than History, as a source of education in the brotherhood of man and as a means of promoting international understanding.⁹

The resultant shift to an integrated approach to History education during the 1970s promoted learning that was inquiry-based and student-centred; this was a

⁶ Tony Taylor, "Under Siege from Right and Left: A Tale of the Australian School History Wars," in *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*, ed. Tony Taylor and Robert Guyver, Studies in the History of Education (United States of America: Information Age Publishing, 2012), 29.

⁷ Clark, *Teaching the Nation*, 92-97.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 93.

⁹ Russell Cowie, "Editorial," *The History Teacher* October (1973): 3.

radical departure from the “mechanistic and rote learning approaches to the teaching of history” in past decades¹⁰ and constituted Taylor’s ‘1970s school History revival.’¹¹ In making History student-centred, New History was a force that reshaped the curriculum to prioritise historical skills and processes that were relevant to developing capable citizens, as opposed to previous emphasis on rote learning of historical places, events, and dates. Clark goes further, arguing that New History’s “child-centred education aimed to ‘liberate’ students from an education system that was thought to entrench social hierarchy and inequality.”¹² The focus on the child at the centre of the curriculum was significant, and redirected History’s responsibility towards preparing the student for the world, rather than delivering the world to the student.

New History’s inquiry-based approach de-emphasised historical facts in favour of critical analysis of sources. In this way, History education became thematically based, and knowledge became questionable. However, Brian Hoeppe admits that some of the approaches to inquiry in the early stages of New History were a “bit half-baked.”¹³ Regardless, these fundamental differences between Old History and New History—the de-emphasis of rote learning of facts that “inculcate nationalistic pride and prejudice”¹⁴ towards critical inquiry approaches that posited historical sources could be limited, problematic, partial, and biased—sowed the seeds of discord between the conservative Bjelke-Petersen government, the QUT, and the progressive federal government.

This discord erupted later in the 1970s with the controversy that surrounded *Man, A Course of Study* (MACOS) and *Social Education Materials Project* (SEMP) curricula.¹⁵ Although MACOS and SEMP are not curriculum texts that are analysed in this thesis—primarily because MACOS was a curriculum developed internationally

¹⁰ Russell Cowie, "History in Schools: 'The Wisdom of the Ages' or a Response to the Needs of a Society Today?," *The Australian History Teacher*, no. 5 (1978): 2. Cowie wrote this criticism of traditional approaches to teaching History with reference to an English school history book from 1966 that was indicative of Old History approaches.

¹¹ Tony Taylor, "The Future of the Past: Final Report of the Report of the National Inquiry into School History," (Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 2000), 16.

¹² Clark, *Teaching the Nation*, 97.

¹³ Brian Hoeppe, "Who Says You Can't Change History?," *EQ Australia* 2004, 14.

¹⁴ Cowie, "History in Schools," 2.

¹⁵ Scott and Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North*, 23-24. The controversy will be henceforth referred to as the MACOS/SEMP debate. *Man, A Course of Study* was a Social Sciences curriculum for upper primary that had been developed by Jerome Bruner in the United States and implemented in Australia. By 1978, this had been trialled in sixteen Queensland schools for a period of up to five years. *The Social Education Materials Project* was similarly a collection of Social Science materials that had been developed and released by the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra.

without the specifics of Queensland in mind, whilst SEMP was a set of curriculum resources—they are an important case study in the extent to which political intervention in Queensland History curricula occurred under the Bjelke-Petersen government. The MACOS/SEMP debate, and the Radford Report, are significant markers of the '1970s school history revival.' Fundamentally, the MACOS/SEMP debate reflected concerns regarding the purpose and goals of History curriculum in Queensland during the period of New History.

MACOS was an inquiry-based curriculum built around thematic units. It encouraged learning through questioning bodies of knowledge and developing systems for testing and questioning evidence and conclusions.¹⁶ However, fundamentalist Christian lobby groups including the Society To Outlaw Pornography (STOP) and the Campaign Against Regressive Education (CARE) argued this curriculum encouraged students to reject their nation, religion, and parents, further claiming it promoted adultery, incest, violence, and sexual permissiveness.¹⁷ Less extreme public concerns included worries that History curricula such as MACOS were irrelevant in an Australian context and transmitted values inconsistent with Australian society. Some of these concerns pointed to the very nature of New History curricula: Richard Smith and John Knight propose that MACOS' conceptual and inquiry-learning approach poses a questioning of traditional social institutions and values in ways traditional Old History curricula does not. MACOS' treatment of knowledge and conclusions as tentative therefore appeared as a subversive attempt to undermine traditionally conservative values.¹⁸

In 1978, the STOP and CARE campaigns were successful in pressuring the Bjelke-Petersen government to ban and confiscate the MACOS/SEMP curricula. This ban reveals that where the Bjelke-Petersen government saw an intersection between its specific interests—namely concern for the values imparted upon Queensland History students—and the concerns of conservative voters and lobbyists, it was willing to interfere with curriculum policy and development. In the MACOS/SEMP debate, that

¹⁶ Richard A. Smith and John Knight, "MACOS in Queensland: The Politics of Educational Knowledge," *The Australian Journal of Education* 22, no. 3 (1978): 227.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 228.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 240.

interference was made despite advice to the contrary from education experts and other states.¹⁹

The reactionary decision by the state government in this instance demonstrates the importance of political power in determining 'Official Knowledge' within the curriculum, rather than simply ideology. L. A. Duhs supports this analysis, stating that governing parties are not necessarily free to seek idealised long-term plans for education systems, which would enable an ideological justification of the curricula:

Rather it may be more expedient in a two-party state for a governing party to seek to distil a political climate such as is likely to perpetuate its own reign of power. To this extent, improvements in the educational system could conceivably be electorally hazardous ... It should not be simply assumed that governments are interested in developing, or are even (electorally) free to develop an educationally optimal school system.²⁰

Essentially, the curriculum is a slow-moving system of power that is shaped and guided by highly responsive governments seeking to use educational change to make political statements, thus preserving their leadership. Such changes might cause ideological shifts in the foundation of the curriculum, but that is a consequence rather than a goal. Similarly, Smith and Knight explain that "the decision to ban MACOS (and later SEMP) can be understood then as a political move to ensure that the schools reinforce the views of the political elite."²¹ More importantly, it indicates that curriculum development is a politicised process where governments who assert the authority to design and enforce curriculum organisation are able to designate History's values and purposes. This was typical of state government involvement in the Queensland History curricula, and was particularly the case under the Bjelke-Petersen government where the "National/Country members were thus able to dominate the parliamentary coalition and the party leader, Bjelke-Petersen, came to exercise a wholly personal and idiosyncratic control over the destinies of the whole of Queensland."²²

¹⁹ Scott and Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North*, 22.

²⁰ L. A. Duhs, "MACOS/SEMP Debate in Queensland, 1978: Some Central Issues," *The Australian Journal of Education* 23, no. 3 (1979): 271.

²¹ Smith and Knight, "MACOS in Queensland," 225.

²² Scott and Scott, *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North*, 20; Smith and Knight, "MACOS in Queensland," 225.

Pressure and Politics: The 1980s

From 1970 through to 2000, recurring tensions over the shape, aims, and values of Queensland History curricula are evident. Whilst the 1974 *Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10* existed as a discrete subject, this was followed by a period of approximately 10 years where History was a subject integrated with other social sciences including Geography, Economics, Politics, Sociology, and Philosophy.²³ A result of the apparent success of the STOP and CARE groups, as well as the Ahern Committee's encouragement of interest groups, the 1980s was characterised by vociferous public debate about curriculum development. Consequently, the government repeatedly placated interest groups through shifts in education policy during this decade.²⁴ Following the Ahern Committee's recommendations in 1980, it became evident that public attitudes towards the role of History in secondary schools were changing. In her 1984 doctoral thesis, Ann Scott explained that:

The committee succeeded in defusing one particular controversial issue and legitimated a decision already taken by the Queensland Government to ban particular social science curriculum materials. Overall, however, it failed to remove education from the political agenda.²⁵

The submergence of History within the social sciences is evident in *A Draft Junior Syllabus in Study of Society* released in 1981. While that curriculum draws on a degree of historical study in developing knowledge of broad patterns in societies, it is essentially sociological in shape. For example, studies of Australian history were positioned within an optional study of early Australian society.²⁶ However, in November 1981, a series of subsequent 'social studies' curricula were released. This included the November 1981 *Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Studies*, and a January 1982 *Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Science*.²⁷ Although it is unclear the relationship between the quick succession of these draft curricula, rationale for these subjects indicate the *Study of Society* was an integrated sociological humanities subject, while *Social Studies* was a foundation subject

²³ Taylor, "Under Siege from Right and Left," 28.

²⁴ Scott, Education, 137. The Ahern Committee was a committee of parliament headed by Michael Ahern that undertook the first major review of the Queensland education system since 1875. The committee sat from 1978 to 1980 and in that time produced seven reports (six interim and one final).

²⁵ Ann Scott, "The Ahern Committee and the Education Policy-Making Process in Queensland" (The University of Queensland, 1984), 7.

²⁶ Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies, "Draft Junior Syllabus in Study of Society," 1981, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 4.

²⁷ "Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Studies," 1981, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane; "Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Science," 1982, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane.

that supported students who were not at the appropriate level to access *Study of Society*. However, this is inconsistent with the original 1981 *Draft Junior Syllabus in Study of Society*, which referred to “Junior Syllabuses in Citizenship Education, Geography, History, and Study of Society which are designed to cater for the needs of all students in Queensland schools ...”²⁸ This would suggest that the *Study of Society* curriculum exists separately to a History curriculum, although no such History curriculum has been located. Instead, the January 1982 *Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Science* contains significant material focusing on the study of historical content and skills.

Although the shape and organisation of History in Junior Secondary curricula during the early 1980s might appear muddled, that is precisely the point. The late 1970s saw the creation of greater administrative work for schools due to the Radford Report, the controversy of the MACOS/SEMP debate, and a reconfiguring of the ‘social science’ curricula by the Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies (QBSSS). History’s changing structure during this period demonstrates experimentation and discussion as the QBSSS attempted to placate many core debates regarding History’s purpose and goals. Scott’s description of the state of Queensland curriculum development during this decade supports this interpretation, describing the Bjelke-Petersen’s style of governance following the Ahern Committee’s reports as characterised by increasingly reactionary politics with regards to the curriculum, including the appeasement of “high levels of pressure group activity.”²⁹

Many of these points of tension, particularly with regards to the use of inquiry-based approaches, become apparent when changes between subsequent History curriculum drafts are considered. For example, a significant restructuring of the curriculum occurred between the release of the second *Draft Junior Syllabus in History* in 1986 and the *Junior Syllabus in History* in 1988. Gaps in the record mean it is unclear whether this *Junior Syllabus in History* marks continuity with previous curricula in *Social Studies*, *Study of Society*, and *Social Sciences* or is an entirely ‘new’ curriculum. However, it is likely that the final 1988 *Junior Syllabus in History* replaced these earlier social sciences curricula as records do not demonstrate their progression beyond the draft stages; only the History curriculum appears as a final copy.

²⁸ "Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Studies," 1981, 1.

²⁹ Scott, "Education," 142-43.

The New History's influence on student-centred learning and 'enquiry' are especially evident in these curricula.³⁰ Whilst the 1986 draft of the curriculum makes a specific reference to the importance of 'enquiry' in History, it also differentiates between a "Process of Enquiry" and a "Pattern of Enquiry."³¹ It makes the distinction that a Process of Enquiry describes a sequence of learning experiences that would follow an 'enquiry' process, while a Pattern of Enquiry refers to a cohesive set of questions across different units that "involve a search for comparisons and elements of causation" that "give meaning to the evidence."³² The explication of these points in the 1986 draft demonstrates an attempt to structure the curriculum around an inquiry approach. Whilst the Process of Enquiry dictates an inquiry-based pedagogy, the Pattern of Enquiry enforces an inquiry-based treatment of historical content. However, this emphasis on inquiry in the final 1988 History curriculum is noticeably absent. Although this final copy makes repeated mention of a "balanced, inquiry-based approach to the study of History in the Junior school", which appears to be a description similar to a Process of Enquiry, the weighting given to this pedagogy marks a significant decline compared to the earlier draft.³³

Furthermore, the curriculum structure in the 1986 *Draft Junior Syllabus in History* states that the "selection of study areas and topics should follow the wish to provide an appropriate balance of specific experiences,"³⁴ whilst the final 1988 curriculum states that "the topics selected for depth study should be placed in both thematic and chronological contexts through the study of other topics at lesser depth as linking or comparative studies."³⁵ This change between draft and final version led to a significant change in the selection and organisation of the units of study, particularly a declining emphasis on inquiry-based teaching and learning. Although the influence of New History is evident in both versions, between the draft and the final curriculum there is a shift from a thematic and issues-based curriculum to a chronologically focused

³⁰ The spelling 'enquiry' as opposed to 'inquiry' is explicitly used in these curricula. Although this thesis uses inquiry as the standard spelling in this context, 'enquiry' will be used with reference to these curricula and indicated by quotation marks.

³¹ Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies, "Draft Junior Syllabus in History: Second Draft," 1986, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 4.

³² *Ibid.*, 7.

³³ "Junior Syllabus in History: January 1988," 1988, Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 6.

³⁴ "Draft Junior Syllabus in History: Second Draft," 1986, 4.

³⁵ "Junior Syllabus in History," 1988, 6.

conception of history. The use of historical significance, as opposed to 'different themes', as a criteria for content's inclusion in the final curriculum might be considered a more 'balanced' approach to History. But, despite these changes, an inquiry-approach is evidently firmly established in the 1988 curriculum. Regardless of the heightened controversy of the MACOS/SEMP debate, New History had a significant impact in Queensland. However, it was the situation of the MACOS/SEMP debate in Queensland that made obvious the contestable nature of the curriculum and community groups felt increasing responsibility to critique it. These community groups were able to apply pressure to a state government responsive to a broadly conservative agenda.

Balancing History

In 2000, the *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE) curriculum integrated History with Civics and Geography, and SOSE became a Key Learning Area (KLA). This meant all students were required to study History in some form up to Year 10. Brian Hoepper, in reference to New History's influence of inquiry methods and critical source analysis in History, summed up the tension in this situation: "It may seem paradoxical that, just as the above developments were establishing school History as a rigorous, critical subject, the place of History in the school curriculum came into question with the advent of *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE)." ³⁶ Hoepper points out the potential advantages for History within SOSE, but it was obvious History had been relegated to a single strand within the curriculum called 'Time, Continuity, and Change'. Taylor aptly critiques this change: "The totality of historical understanding, skills and knowledge [were] neatly confined to just those three descriptors." ³⁷

History was integrated within SOSE to prioritise the transferrable skills that students could gain through the humanities, de-emphasising the rote learning of facts and dates. It was through SOSE that teaching aims were flipped: rather than attempting to impose pre-determined knowledge of the world on the learner, the intention was to prepare the learner for the world beyond school. ³⁸ Preparing students for the world meant that processes were emphasised over facts. However, the issue of balancing facts

³⁶ Hoepper, "Who Says You Can't Change History?," 14-15.

³⁷ Taylor, "Under Siege from Right and Left," 28.

³⁸ Lyn Yates and Cherry Collins, "Australian Curriculum 1975-2005: What Has Been Happening to Knowledge?," in *Australian Curriculum Inquiry as 'Really Useful' Educational Research: A Symposium* (Brisbane 2008), 15.

and skills in History is entwined with balancing celebratory and critical narratives in History. In 2000, Prime Minister John Howard stated that SOSE contained too much of a focus on issues and that students need to get back to the facts of history.³⁹ This was part of Howard's larger pattern of influence in History education, including attempts to align state education priorities, to integrate a noticeably celebratory and Eurocentric narrative of history. This firmly placed school History with the larger context of the History Wars.

Conclusion

Debates about the placement of History within secondary school and the organisation of skills and content in the subject illuminate the ways in which New History effectively disrupted the established purposes of History. Although the most obvious outcome of introducing New History was the integration of the subject with other Social Sciences disciplines, a more important consequence was the way in which historical knowledge became questionable; inquiry-based learning provided a basis for student-centred learning in which critical thinking and critical analysis of sources was foregrounded. Whilst it is evident Queensland during the 1970s experienced significant backlash to New History, it was the 1980s that saw political interference in order to placate and balance multiple interest groups concerned with History curriculum development. In Queensland, the highly conservative Bjelke-Petersen government was actively involved with the school History curriculum. It was following the Bjelke-Petersen era that state involvement in History curricula waned, giving way to federal intervention in the curriculum. The shift towards centralised curriculum management became evident with the development of national goals to achieve comparability amongst the states. However, this shift correlated with a greater management of the curriculum's content, especially with regards to Australian history. This tension is dealt with in the following chapter.

³⁹ Peter Ker, "Howard Rewrites History Curriculum," *The Age*, 2007.

Chapter Two:

'Australian' Narrative(s)?

Australian history is a contested subject. More than simply an account of 'what happened in the past,' Australian history (for Australians) is an account of the past with an explanation of the present. This chapter argues that constructions of Australian History reflect not just the past, but also the future we wish to prepare students (our future citizens) for. The History curriculum is key to this project as it has the capacity to present an 'Official' account of the nation. The Official Australian history it produces is central to developing a national narrative that shapes collective memory; how the nation remembers and reflects upon itself. Anna Clark supports that, compared to other sources of history and identity making, the curriculum is particularly fraught because of its relationship to the image of the student as the future. In this way, 'our past' is conveyed to 'our children' who are 'our future'. The political symbolism of the child is obvious, then; "the child-citizen is at once the nation and its future."¹

This chapter analyses key points of tension over Australian history within Queensland History curricula between 1970 and 2000, including the ways in which politically-motivated interpretations of the past have shaped the Official Knowledge of these curricula. This active-shaping has significant ramifications in terms of perpetuating what is considered relevant and valuable to the student, and reflects the desired national identity. As the curriculum is a conscious negotiation between various groups and is always a work in progress,² it is questionable whether it is possible to have a singular narrative of Australian history in the curriculum. This chapter examines the more important questions about content that is included and excluded in building a grand narrative of Australian history and the broader visions for the future that History serves.

¹ Anna Clark, *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006), 15.

² Catherine Doherty, "Forging the Heteroglossic Citizen: Articulating Local, National, Regional and Global Horizons in the Australian Curriculum," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 35, no. 2 (2012): 6.

History, Memory, and Identity

Michael W. Apple argues that the formation of the curriculum is a powerful act, reinforcing hegemony within society through the means of seemingly ahistorical and apolitical curricula that saturate the views of teachers and learners.³ In terms of Australian history, this process of generating a national narrative is an act of creating a nation itself,⁴ as according to Benedict Anderson a nation is an 'imagined political community' that is both limited and sovereign. This imagined community is necessarily exclusive and the national narrative obstructs the inclusion of other groups. Anderson explains that collective memory is essential in creating imagined communities.⁵ Through the development of collective memory, emotional legitimacy of the nation is reinforced, and it is through official channels such as the History curriculum that the nation and its identity is defined.

Both Apple's and Anderson's arguments imply the curriculum's establishment of an Official grand narrative of Australian history reinforces the emotional legitimacy of citizens in order to maintain the nation's legitimacy. The curriculum has an immense power to shape collective memory that reinforces citizens' feelings of belonging and collective identity within a community. However, this emotional legitimacy is threatened by 'sub-communities' that demand recognition within the nation's narrative. Apple theorises that threats to the grand narrative are dealt with by a process of 'Mentioning'. Fundamentally, hegemonic patterns of influence are not simply maintained through their inclusion in the grand narratives, but also in their power to select the Official Knowledge of the curriculum. Mentioning occurs when "limited and isolated elements of the history and culture of less powerful groups are included in the texts."⁶ This process of negotiation means that whilst the perspectives of minority groups are included in the grand narratives, they are framed with reference to the grand narrative and are therefore imprisoned within it; minority world views and values are simply Mentioned and their histories become simplistic and insubstantial. This is

³ Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, Third ed. (New York: Routledge, 2004), 5.

⁴ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, Revised ed. (London: Verso, 1991), 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁶ Michael W. Apple, *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*, Second ed. (London: Routledge, 2000), 53.

significant, as this process of negotiation of the narrative means that ‘our’ nation’s identity is consistently positioned against ‘them’.

Henry Reynolds succinctly summarises this argument, writing that “the suggestion is that to tamper with history is to subvert the nation.”⁷ But does an alternative or new perspective on Australian history necessarily subvert the dominant national historical narrative? Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of heteroglossia adds an additional dimension to the relationship between Official Knowledge and national identity.⁸ Heteroglossia function by recognising the multiplicitous nature of national narratives, which are constructed with multiple ‘threads’ of historical narratives. While many threads are included, some are more dominant and constitute Official threads. In particular, the existence of seemingly contradictory threads form heteroglossic connections against which national identity can be defined. Jay Lemke’s framework allows the idea that multiple dialogic facets of Australian national identity offer a better response to Australian history’s complexity than any single monologic narrative might. The curriculum is hence framed as a tangled web of both contradicting and complementary discourses that whilst framed as occasionally competing, are mutually dependent and together weave a ‘truer’ historical narrative than any single narrative might.

Apple, Anderson, and Lemke’s arguments have a significant shared acknowledgement of delineating clear boundaries of national identity through definitions of ‘us’. The drawing of such boundaries around national identity relies on what is considered ‘Other’ to definitions of ‘us’. Official texts such as History curricula become vehicles for delivering historical narratives for shaping national identity across these boundaries. It is easy to see why these boundaries are sites of battle in the contestation for national identity; minority groups’ struggle for the inclusion of their historical narratives in the History curricula provide sounding boards against which national identity can be defined. Applying Apple’s concept of an authoritative grand narrative of history to Australian history highlights the ways in which the curriculum

⁷ Henry Reynolds, *Why Weren't We Told?* (Melbourne: Penguin, 1999), 154.

⁸ Jay Lemke, *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics* (London: Taylor & Francis, 1995). Mikhail Bakhtin was the original theorist, however Jay Lemke’s conception of textual politics, as outlined in *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics* is used more extensively here. Particularly, Lemke theorises about the intertextual (between texts) and heteroglossic (within texts) connections and the ways in which they frame and define political discourses.

reinforces the dominance of groups who have the power to define it. This makes all other knowledge, histories, and perspectives Other to Australian history and identity. It is not in the resolution of such battles that national identity is confirmed, but in the definition of those who are in opposition to 'our' views.

The Grand Narrative

A national narrative is a statement of national identity that functions through the mode of History, differentiating 'us' from 'them'. However, the development of such a national narrative demands the negotiation of many tensions at governmental, community, and educational levels. It requires the enmeshing of multiple group memories into a single collective memory that identifies with the character of the nation. Moreover, as Clark points out, this is especially contentious as that negotiated national narrative is inserted into a curriculum that will be delivered into classrooms and into the minds of students. As Clark puts it, "schoolchildren have been centrally cast as vital but vulnerable receptors of the national past."⁹ For many stakeholders, the construction and organisation of national history within the curriculum is seen as providing an opportunity to build the civic capabilities of students. Many stakeholders consider that only students with sufficient knowledge of their nation (including its foundations, institutions, rights and responsibilities), will be capable of becoming active citizens. Such stakeholders include politicians, the media, and concerned members of the public.¹⁰

When considering the curriculum as an expression of collective identity, the extent to which a national narrative is significant becomes clear. An investigation of the remaining fragments of the 1970s curricula indicates the priority given to including Australian history. Thus, a 1973 article in the Queensland History Teachers' Association's (QHTA) journal *The History Teacher* provides a brief overview of a new, optional curriculum for Year 8 which allowed one semester of the year to be dedicated to studying three different periods in Australian History.¹¹ The *Syllabus in Social Studies*

⁹ Clark, *Teaching the Nation*, 1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 145.

¹¹ Queensland History Teachers' Association, "New Syllabuses," *The History Teacher* May (1973): 53. Optional in the sense that schools can choose to adhere to the preceding syllabus or transition to the new 1973 syllabus for Year 8.

for Primary Schools: Book 3—Grades 6 and 7 also includes two units focusing on Australian history from a selection of ten units across the two-year course.¹² The first of these is in Year 6: “Unit 1: Throughout time man has sought to meet his needs by exploring and settling new areas” which is followed in Year 7 by: “Unit 2: As a society changes, the form of government may change.”¹³ Interestingly, the narrative told by this curriculum is one that begins with European exploration of Australia, and the unit’s main focus is the ways in which settlers adapted their way of life to the Australian environment. Exploration and settlement are presented in a positive and normative light, and the unit makes explicit that “man’s knowledge of the world has been extended by exploration” and “European nations frequently claimed and settled lands discovered by explorers.” These main ideas are positioned in relation to learning activities that explore the voyages of famous sailors, the discovery of new lands and their settlement.¹⁴ The following Unit Two in Year 7 follows on from the narrative of exploration and settlement in Unit 1 to cover the way of life of settlers, the expansion and growth of settlement, and the gradual progression towards federation in Australia.

This identification of Australia’s history as beginning with the settlement of Australia in 1788 and progressing towards federation is similar to the view put forward in *Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10*.¹⁵ Australian history dominates a majority of the 4 semester units, and the curriculum espouses the view that students should “develop an awareness of factors in the past that have helped produce the values and attitudes currently in practice or dispute.”¹⁶ Although ‘white’ Australia’s perspective is emphasised through the units, it is the Semester 4 unit, “Significant features of Australian history from 1788 to the present” that particularly promotes this grand narrative. It prompts teachers to cover a selection of possible topics from the convict system, expansion from the first settlement, economic, social, and political development, the gold rushes, trade unions, federation, and other economic and social development in Australia’s history.¹⁷ Part B of the Semester 4 unit in the *Syllabus in*

¹² Department of Education Queensland, "Syllabus in Social Studies for Primary Schools: Book 3; Grades 6 and 7," 1978, Personal Collection.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 3-12, 53-58.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁵ Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies (QBSSS), "Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10," 1974, Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

History: Grades 9-10 focuses on 'Australia and the Contemporary World', continuing the national narrative following federation. Primarily, this focuses on the growing internationalism of Australia in the twentieth century as a result of the World Wars, and examines Australia's national and international politics with regard to Australian relationships with Britain and the United States.¹⁸

Curricula during the 1970s reveal that the grand narrative of Australian history positioned 'white' Australians as the main historical actors. The emphasis on these characters meant the History curriculum focused on settlement and exploration of Australia, then examined economic and political development. It should be noted, however, that over time, the scope of Australian history in the curricula broadens. Whilst 'white' Australians remain key historical actors, other elements emerge through the process of negotiation and Mentioning, adding breadth to studies of Australian history in the Queensland History curriculum.

The national narrative presented in the curriculum is interesting in its mono-cultural perspective. Although there is some reference to the difficulties encountered by European settlers adapting to the new environment, what W.E.H. Stanner has referred to as 'The Great Australian Silence' reigns in these curricula. This reflects a standard omission of Indigenous perspectives, an omission critiqued in Stanner's 1968 Boyer Lecture 'After the Dreaming'.¹⁹ He points out that "a partial survey is enough to let me make the point that inattention on such a scale cannot possibly be explained by absent-mindedness. It is a structural matter, a view from a window which has been carefully placed to exclude a whole quadrant of the landscape."²⁰ This statement about wilful ignorance of Indigenous histories remains a challenge to Australian historians, a challenge compounded by the complexities of those histories and the need to recognise a multiplicity of Indigenous groups and experiences.

In its fumbling attempts to Mention Indigenous histories, the History curriculum tended to marginalise Indigenous Australians as artefacts and relics of the past. The curriculum's reference to studying Indigenous Australians' 'traditional' way of life

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 20-21.

¹⁹ W. E. H. Stanner, "The Great Australian Silence: After the Dreaming," in *Highlights of the Boyer Lectures 1959-2000*, ed. Donald McDonald, The Boyer Collection (Sydney: ABC Books, 2001), 119. In this quote, the term 'us' refers to white, European Australians.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

suggests there are Indigenous Australians who are, in effect, not traditional.²¹ Robert J. Parkes has examined this tension, arguing that historical scholarship and curriculum development can make events and people “hypostatized.”²² This means that the specific individual or event becomes ‘fixed’ and ‘motionless’ in history, losing its rich and varied contexts. The framing of Aboriginal Australians as artefacts of the past with no continuity to the present day is evident in the 1978 curriculum, which directs teachers to:

Investigat[e] in greater depth the influence of the coming of the white man on the traditional life of the Australian Aborigines ... [and refer to] ... the importance of bora rings and other sacred places in their beliefs and customs. If any such special places exist in the locality, pupils should be encouraged to discuss the significance these had for the Aborigines.²³

This approach to learning about Indigenous Australians in the context of Australian history gives students a static understanding of Aboriginal culture. Students are positioned to view Indigenous Australians as artefacts of the past, making reference to places that once ‘had’ significance. It is a problem that Clark discusses in *History’s Children* where she reports that students become increasingly bored and disengaged with repetitive Australian history that does not extend beyond teaching students about the daily life of Indigenous Australians in the distant past.²⁴

The curriculum’s treatment of Aboriginal history as a simple narrative of the distant past positions students to view the histories of Indigenous Australians as existing separately to the narrative of Australian history. In this way, whilst the curriculum refers to Indigenous Australians and their pre-colonial history in Australia, it concludes their narrative at the point of European settlement and excludes them from the dominant Australian narrative. The place of Indigenous peoples and their histories in these curricula constitute a clear example of Apple’s Mentioning. Although they are included in the curriculum, they are presented as disconnected and Other to the central

²¹ This indicates an attitude that any variation of the strict ‘traditional’ way of life disqualifies Aboriginal Australians from being Aboriginal and therefore excludes them altogether from Australia’s historical narrative.

²² Robert J. Parkes, *Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum after ‘the End of History’* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011), 77.

²³ Department of Education Queensland, “Syllabus in Social Studies,” 1978, 4.

²⁴ Anna Clark, *History’s Children: History Wars in the Classroom* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2008), 65.

narrative. A striking example is demonstrated in Unit 1 of the Year 7 curriculum, where a suggested learning experience is to:

Examine briefly the parallel between rules in a family group in our own society and rules in a simple society such as that of the Australian Aborigines ... Show that simple societies such as those mentioned are usually small, and, as in the family group, their rules are simple and part of the everyday life of the people.²⁵

Beyond the concerning implications of referring to Indigenous society as simple, successive curricula for History in Year 9 and 10 focus on Australian history from 1788 onwards with no mention of Indigenous Australians.

This repeated Mentioning of the Other in the curriculum's study of Australian history is also evident in the 1974 curriculum for Years 9 and 10 which places Aboriginal Australians within compartmentalised spaces of History that have been lent to them by the dominant narrative. With a similar frame of reference to considerations of Australia's dealings with other foreign nations, it poses the example inquiry question of 'What were the policies towards the Aborigines?'²⁶ Rather than positioning Indigenous Australians within their own varied historical contexts and narratives, it presents Indigenous perspectives in the context of 'where were they when ... *insert important European historical event here ...*?' This Mentioning reflects attempts at incorporating Indigenous perspectives in Australian history that are simply 'tacked onto' the pre-existing dominant narrative. This is continued through to the 1987 Senior Modern History curriculum, where in a sub-topic of 'The Making of Australia', it is suggested that students study "the European background, the convict experience, the expansion of settlement and the destruction of Aboriginal society, the gold rushes..."²⁷ This implies that Aboriginal Australians are incidental in the scope of Australia's grand historical narrative. However, it also demonstrates that within the small space they have been given in the grand narrative, the conditions of such inhabitation require them to 'fit in' to the narrative and avoid points at which interpretations directly conflict.

Histories relating to the fight for recognition by Indigenous Australians first appear within the 1988 *Junior History Syllabus*. They continue to appear in subsequent curricula with the development of the section "Land rights in Australia: A study of the

²⁵ Department of Education Queensland, "Syllabus in Social Studies," 1978, 46.

²⁶ QBSSS, "Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10," 1974, 18.

²⁷ QBSSS, "Senior Modern History," 1987, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 40.

campaign for land rights for Australian aborigines.”²⁸ Framed within the Year 10 unit “The Crises We Face”, this inclusion embraces Aboriginal struggles into the narrative of the curriculum.²⁹ Interpretations of the ‘we’ might be either positive or negative, but certainly indicate a significant turning point. In 1995 the *Modern History Senior Syllabus* broke new ground by stating the objectives that “students should acquire and use knowledge and understanding of: the continuing debate about how the history of Australia should be written, including the implications of the perspectives of Aboriginals, Torres Strait Islanders, women, different classes, different ethnic groups and people of various ideological beliefs.”³⁰ Despite these changes, the History curriculum still treats Indigenous history as a monolithic entity and fails to recognise the distinct and complex cultures of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Australians. The term Indigenous, as well as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, is problematic in that it homogenises the diversity of these cultures. It is indisputable that Aboriginal Australians are the world’s oldest living culture,³¹ have multiple languages and nations, and demonstrate diverse cultural differences.³² Simplifying this diversity to a single term overlooks the deep history and complexities of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

Moreover, the issue of the History Wars is relevant here, not only in the context of the limited inclusion of Aboriginal histories in the curriculum, but also as indicative of the type of History that is presented.³³ Tony Taylor argues that the proto-History Wars go back to the early 1980s, when conservative historian Geoffrey Blainey described the dangers implicit in histories that emphasised multiculturalism and claimed that Leftist historians misrepresented Australia’s past. Blainey described the way in which Australia’s history had moved from a benign “Three Cheers” version that made light of Australia’s achievements and success, towards a “Black Armband” view of Australian

²⁸ QBSS, "Junior Syllabus in History: January 1988," 1988, Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 18.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 47.

³¹ Chris Clarkson et al., "Human Occupation of Northern Australia by 65,000 Years Ago," *Nature* 547, no. 7663 (2017).

³² Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, "AIATSIS Map of Indigenous Australia," <https://aiatsis.gov.au/explore/articles/aiatsis-map-indigenous-australia>.

³³ Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2003). Although ‘The History Wars’ was a term coined in 2003 by Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark’s work of the same name, it is still a useful term to describe the continual ‘war’ between supposedly Leftist and Rightist interpretations of Australian history.

history that highlighted past wrongs committed against Indigenous Australians.³⁴ Assuming political bias in the curriculum and attempting to correct it, this resulted in a shifting of the orientation of political bias rather than a removal of it. As explored in the previous chapter, during the 1970s educators became aware of an inherent political bias in the History curriculum. They attempted to create a more socially progressive and relevant curriculum that defused History's jingoistic tendencies by integrating it within Social Studies.³⁵ Although this was resisted in Queensland, the History curricula during the 1980s and early 1990s were formed through the placation of, and negotiation between, interest groups and the state government. As a result, Queensland's History curricula dealt with public concerns by negotiating curricula that maintained both 'traditional'—fundamentally Eurocentric and conservative—values and a 'half-baked' inquiry method in the format of a social sciences curriculum.³⁶

Stanner's description of Australia's "intense concentration on ourselves and our affairs..." is quite an accurate statement considering the curriculum's oversight when it comes to social justice issues and racial relations in the History curriculum.³⁷ This tension is evident throughout the 1976, 1988, and 1995 Modern History curricula, within a recurring unit 'Imperialism and Racial Conflicts and Compromises'. The unit is divided into a background study, as well as Part A (Imperialism), and Part B (Racial Conflicts and Compromises). The inclusion of study about racial conflicts in Australia is restricted to Part B, for which one of the suggested topics is "An historical study of race relations in Australia: Aborigines, the White Australia policy, migrants in Australian society."³⁸ This indicates that whilst the Queensland curriculum acknowledges that racial conflicts and tensions occurred in Australia's past, it is segmented as a sub-topic *within* a sub-topic of less than half a semester's unit of work. The semester unit in totality prescribes a minimum of 15 hours to the sub-topic. This placement indicates

³⁴ Tony Taylor, "Under Siege from Right and Left: A Tale of the Australian School History Wars," in *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*, ed. Tony Taylor and Robert Guyver, Studies in the History of Education (United States of America: Information Age Publishing, 2012), 26.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 31.

³⁶ For more detailed discussion of the particularities of SOSE in Queensland History curricula, see Chapter One.

³⁷ Stanner, "The Great Australian Silence," 119.

³⁸ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History; Years 11 & 12," 1976, Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane, 42; Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (QBSSSS), "Senior Modern History," 1987, 47; QBSSS, "Modern History: Senior Syllabus," 1995, Personal Collection 59.

that studies of the civil rights movement in America and other studies of international racial tensions are judged to be of greater historical significance and relevance by Queensland History curricula writers. Moreover, it entirely ignores the significant connections between Imperialism and the history of Indigenous Australians.

Although there was an increasing push to incorporate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories within Australian history, this was often achieved in one of two ways: Either Indigenous Australians were viewed as a challenge or event on the periphery of the main Australian narrative or; Indigenous Australians were viewed as artefacts of the past. This treatment of Indigenous Australian perspectives in Australian history topics amount to what Apple refers to as Mentioning within an Official Australian grand narrative. This demonstrates the ongoing tensions between the Three Cheers and Black Armband' views in Australian history. Where the curriculum overcomes this 'cult of forgetfulness',³⁹ there is still a tendency to hypostatize and Other the history of Indigenous Australians to that of the grand narrative of Australian history.

Similarly, histories of the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps, or Anzac as they are known, are a contentious part of Australian history, bound up in the politics of nation and memory.⁴⁰ Although 'Anzac' has become an umbrella term for all past and present veterans and serving members of the Australian Defence Force, the 'original' Anzacs are considered to be those Australians who fought in World War I (WWI) during the Gallipoli Campaign of 1915.⁴¹ This part of Australia's history is often memorialised as Australia's 'coming of age' and since the era of Paul Keating has seen itself pushed by successive governments, dominating a large part of the Australian History curriculum. It has become a 'sacred myth' of Australian History, which Marilyn Lake and Reynolds contend has often come at the expense of misrepresenting and forgetting our broader history.⁴² In terms of the *Australian Curriculum*, this is certainly the case.⁴³

³⁹ Stanner, "The Great Australian Silence," 119. 'Cult of forgetfulness' was a term specifically used by Stanner to describe the persistent and systematic forgetting of Indigenous peoples in the history of Australia.

⁴⁰ Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *What's Wrong with Anzac?* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010), 1. Anzac is an abbreviation of Australian and New Zealand Army Corps. This thesis follows the usage Anzac, rather than ANZAC. The use of ANZAC will only occur when directly quoting a source that uses this acronym.

⁴¹ The Australian view of Anzac tends to exclude the New Zealand soldiers central to the term itself.

⁴² Lake and Reynolds, *What's Wrong with Anzac?*, 10.

⁴³ See Chapter Four for discussion of tensions related to the Anzacs in the *Australian Curriculum: History*.

Since the 1970s, Queensland History curricula's examination of Australia's involvement in war has shifted from consideration of political and economic aspects to an intensely empathetic inculcation of the role of the Anzacs in shaping Australia's identity. Earlier curricula of the 1970s allude to the role of WWI in Australia's 'coming of age' and its impact on Australian society, but place these issues within the context of both World Wars.⁴⁴ For example, within a broader investigation of "Foreign Policy to the Outbreak of World War II," students considered Australia's "foreign policy-attitudes" to WWI within the scope of world power politics. This included a background study on the connection between foreign policy and Australia's "entry into World War I ... [and the] impact of World War I upon Australian nationhood."⁴⁵

Each of the History curricula from 1974 through to 1995 addresses Australia's foreign policy within the context of World War I—including reasons for Australia's entry in to the War and its role—but they lack a single mention of the term 'Anzac.' In fact, the term Anzac and its direct cultural and social links to Australian history is first evident in the 2000 *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE) curriculum. In this curriculum, teaching and learning about the political implications of Australia's involvement in WWI are considered background knowledge and are relegated to the introductory section of the unit.⁴⁶ Content descriptors for levels 5 and 6⁴⁷ suggest that "students know about ... consequences of Australia's international relations (the ANZAC tradition...)" and also "particular heritages that benefit or disadvantage individuals or groups (ANZAC Day, Labour Day, Queen's Birthday, Australian identity myths)."⁴⁸ Mentioned twice within this curriculum is the suggestion that students investigate an "ANZAC Cove to ANZAC Day (Queensland School Curriculum Council [QSCC] module) ...[which] focuses on Australia's involvement in World War I, the contributions of culturally diverse veterans and how ANZAC Day has contributed to Australia's national identity."⁴⁹ Obvious in these units is emphasis on Anzac commemoration rather than the historical event of Anzacs at Gallipoli. This highlights the civic importance of such

⁴⁴ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History," 1976, 28; QBSSS, "Senior Modern History," 1987, 41; QBSSS, "Junior Syllabus in History," 1988, 8; QBSSS, "Modern History: Senior Syllabus," 1995, 50.

⁴⁵ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History," 1976, 28.

⁴⁶ Queensland School Curriculum Council, "Anzac Cove to Anzac Day: Australian International Relations," 2000, https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/p_10/kla_ose_sbm_505.pdf, 2.

⁴⁷ Equivalent to Years 9 and 10.

⁴⁸ Queensland School Curriculum Council, "Studies of Society and Environment: Years 1 to 10 Syllabus," 2000, Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 35.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 4, 111.

commemorations rather than the historical event itself. As a result, Anzac is positioned not for its historical significance, but for its significance to political notions of Australian identity. This emphasis flies in the face of historian David Stephens' suggestions that "Anzac, the ideal, should have context ... The obsessions with remembrance has grown stronger as the reality has faded ... What we are today urged not to forget is a false image."⁵⁰ This sudden inclusion of the Anzacs in the 2000 SOSE curriculum, represents a distinct shift towards History that is celebratory and inherently aimed at students' civic knowledge and nation-building.

The prominence given to Anzac within Queensland's SOSE curriculum is indicative of a certain brand of Australian mythology as a result of federal influence, particularly under the governments of Paul Keating and John Howard.⁵¹ It demonstrates a capacity for History, ironically within a SOSE curriculum,⁵² to dabble in patriotic inculcation of the nation. Stephens and Alison Broinowski argue that "when a single thread of our nation's story is teased out to excess, it strangles the other threads."⁵³ This is an apt observation in this instance where the curriculum emphasises civic values rather than historical knowledge.

Conclusion

Between 1970 and 2000 the Queensland History curriculum's construction of Australian history demonstrates a repeated propensity for mono-cultural, celebratory narratives of Australian development. There are some apparent challenges to a grand narrative of Australian history that begins in 1788 and continues with a story of settler expansion, growing political independence, and Anzac-based nationhood. However, the tension between grand narrative and counter narrative is negotiated by mentioning historical events and actors to the extent that they are incidental and Other to the main narrative. This is demonstrated by the way in which Indigenous histories exist in a

⁵⁰ David Stephens, "Anzac and Anzackery: Useful Future or Sentimental Dream?," in *The Honest History Book*, ed. David Stephens and Alison Broinowski (Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2017), 130-31.

⁵¹ Andrew Bonnell and Martin Crotty, "Australia's History under Howard, 1996-2007," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 617, no. 1 (2008): 151.

⁵² Ironic, because the original notion of SOSE was to overcome History's perceived nationalistic inculcation by replacing it with a more critical and progressive approach.

⁵³ David Stephens and Alison Broinowski, "Introduction," in *The Honest History Book*, ed. David Stephens and Alison Broinowski (Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2017), 4.

'blind spot' of Australian development and are considered Other to Australian identity in the curriculum. The positioning of Aboriginal Australians as artefacts of the past demonstrates a repeated silence with regards to unsettling aspects of Australian history. The increasing significance placed upon Anzac—from no explicit mention during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s to overblown significance in the 2000 SOSE curriculum—signals the growing significance of this historical event to Australian identity. The product of these negotiations is the maintenance of the Australian grand narrative, although one that is untidily integrated with limited and superficial aspects of other histories.

Narratives within the curriculum demonstrate an Official statement of the nation and its history with students as its receptor. The Queensland History curriculum's conscious inclusions and exclusions in the grand narrative of Australian history indicate an attempt to shape collective memory of a celebratory and Eurocentric Australian identity that is maintained through negotiation with rival histories. As the next chapter discusses, the boundaries across which Australian history and identity is defined are the result of explicit decisions regarding 'us' and 'them'.

Chapter Three:

The Asian Century

In the era dubbed the 'Asian Century', globalisation and transnational agendas have become increasing forces within Australian education to ensure that students are 'Asia literate'¹ and prepared to engage in this 'new' era. The ambiguous assumption that Asia is rising, or that our encounters with it are new, fundamentally hides the shared, and at times 'messy', histories between Australia and Asia. Simultaneously, it positions politicians, commentators, and academics alike as brave visionaries.² As David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska diagnose this condition, Australia has a "habit of forgetting the past, and assuming that theirs is the first generation to face a rising Asia."³ However, the push for this Asia engagement within the curriculum has been a theme recurrent in the curriculum since the 1970s despite statements, such as that in the 2012 White Paper, *Australia in the Asian Century*, that reinforce the perception of 'Asia rising'. Making explicit use of language including 'new' and 'frontier' in reference to Australia's engagement with Asia only perpetuates this assumption.⁴ 'Asia' in the curriculum is often conspicuously absent in relation to Australia's identity and heritage, although it frequently 'reappears' when it serves the purpose of defining Australia's place in the world. As Alison Broinowski has described, Australia as a 'new' country has always been historically West, but geographically East.⁵ In this way, the Queensland History curriculum makes the choice of history over geography and frames Asia as a monolithic beast that is either a threat or a viable opportunity. These functions of Asia are reflected

¹ Christine Halse, "Introduction: (Re)Thinking Asia Literacy," in *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, ed. Christine Halse, Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 3. 'Asia literate' or 'Asia literacy' refers to the knowledge and skills required to know, understand, and engage with societies and cultures from Asia.

² David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, "Introduction: Australia's Asia," in *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, ed. David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska (Crawley: UWA Publishing, 2012), 2.

³ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴ Australia in the Asian Century Task Force, "Australia in the Asian Century: White Paper," (Canberra: Australian Government, 2012). A simple keyword search will demonstrate the widespread use of this language within this document. The foreword and executive summary alone use the word 'new' in excess of ten times.

⁵ Alison Broinowski, *The Yellow Lady: Australian Impressions of Asia* (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992), 198.

in both the curriculum and the succession of Asia-focused bodies that have been assembled by a variety of governments since the 1970s.⁶

This chapter demonstrates that a focus on Asia, and assumptions of it 'rising' or being 'new' are not in fact new phenomena within the Queensland History curriculum. The History curriculum has been attempting to engage with Asia, albeit with varying degrees of enthusiasm and success, since the 1970s. Although the curriculum outlines the content and aims to be used when studying the past, it represents broader national concerns with a firm eye on the future. The wavering enthusiasm for engaging with Asia in the History curriculum is clear and the 'grafting on' of Asian histories in order to engage with 'new' opportunities perpetuates the idea that Asia is 'Other' to Australian history and identity. This grafting on marks a continuation, rather than a break, of the notion that White Australia's history developed in isolation at the very ends of the world. Such views reinforce East-West dualism and repeat a system of forgetting Australia's historical ties to Asia. These ties have included economic, political, diplomatic, and personal connections. History-making through the curriculum indicates political influence and a desire to draw a line in the sand, unmistakably separating the identity and history of 'us' from 'them'.

Language Choices

Any discussion of the tensions and negotiations regarding the inclusion of Asia in the Queensland History curriculum must begin by recognising the baggage carried by language used within the curriculum and the wider literature. 'Asia' itself is a highly problematic term. This thesis follows Broinowski's suggestion that the word Asia should always be read as if written between quotation marks as it homogenises an expansive and populous region that primarily exists within the historical imagination of the 'West'.⁷ Defined in general geographical terms, Asia is a continent that shares boundaries with Africa and Europe, is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the east, the Indian Ocean to the south, Turkey in the west, and the Arctic and Russian Federation in

⁶ Such governmental bodies include the Asian Studies Council, National Asian Languages and Cultures Working Group, and the Asia Education Foundation.

⁷ Broinowski, *The Yellow Lady*, x.

the North.⁸ However, Asia is more than a geographical term. It is home to more than half of the world's population and a third of the planet's land mass. As a region, Asia also has vastly divergent and dynamic cultures, religions, languages, politics, and social systems. To represent Asia as a single object is to marginalise the diversity and depth of the geography, nations, cultures, religions, and individuals that populate it.⁹ The use of a single term such as Asia to identify this continent positions it as an isolated, static entity and makes it a subject of Australia's imaginings.¹⁰ Thus Asia is an object of Australia's particular perspectives and imaginings rather than a subject in and of itself. The presence of Asia as an Othered and hyper realistic caricature of itself creates an imagined division between Australia as the West and Asia as the East.

Many of the historical ties that exist between Australia and Asia are varied and multiple. Evidence of contact between Makassan trepangers from Indonesia and Aboriginal Australians along northern coasts of Australia as early as 1700 demonstrate that shared histories pre-date settlement. Although many points of contact have also occurred along the lines of imperial connections, such as British imperialism in India and Papua New Guinea, the points of connection are various. Australia's relations with Japan are demonstrative of the ways in which histories shared with Asia are multiple, ranging from intimate domestic connections to international networks. This has included trade connections through the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Commerce and Navigation in 1894, Training Japanese Squadron visits to Perth and Adelaide in 1903,¹¹ warfare against Japan during World War II (WWII) throughout the Pacific, post-war reconstruction in Japan, and the establishment of sister cities between the two countries. Australia has been involved in conflicts in Korea (1950-1953), Vietnam (1962-1975), and East Timor (1999) to name but a few examples. Asian diasporas in Australia also demonstrate the internal connections Australia shares with Asia. For example, the gold rushes that led to influxes of Chinese workers, the 'Afghan cameleers', and the Vietnam War that led to an influx of refugees.

⁸ Christine Halse, ed. *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 3.

⁹ Fazal Rizvi, "Learning Asia: In Search of a New Narrative," in *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, ed. Christine Halse, Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 65.

¹⁰ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (London: Penguin Group, 2003), 12.

¹¹ David Walker, *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939*, Second ed. (New Delhi: SSS Publications, 1999), 85.

Australia defines its values, interests, and identity by measuring itself against representations of Asia. This classic Orientalism perpetuates an 'us' and 'them' binary across which Australia is able to identify itself, forgetting that Asia has history too.¹² Through coordinating 'the silent Orient', Asia is marked with Otherness and framed as passive and non-participating. This view is a distorted image of reality contained and managed by others: Edward Said's work *Orientalism* concentrates his analysis on European texts, but the same process has occurred within Australia.¹³ The problem of studies of Asia within the curriculum must therefore be understood dually: A 'study of Asia' comes to be seen as the fact, or reality, of Asia by students and is reproduced; and Asia becomes more so an indication of "our" identity than Asia's. Multiple imaginings and manifestations of Asia consequently exist in Australia's collective memory and speak for Asia, dominating attempts at 'Asia literacy'.

Christine Halse argues that Asia literacy is "a convenient shorthand for the complex amalgam of knowledge, skills and intercultural capacities involved in knowing, understanding and interacting with the societies, cultures and peoples in/from/with Asia."¹⁴ More than just literacy, or even intercultural understanding, Asia literacy refers to a specific knowledge and skill set for Australians to interact with Asia and its peoples. However, Australia has repeatedly failed in its goal to become Asia literate; Chengxin Pan points out that "the problem lies not so much with Asia *literacy* as with the conception of *Asia* in the Australian self-imagination."¹⁵ To assume a literacy of Asia is required to engage with Asia, is also to assume that Asia is entirely separate and exotic to Australian identity and history. So whilst there is a genuine attempt to understand and engage with Asia, this space is inhabited by preconceived notions of what it is to know Asia. The issue of Asia literacy invokes issues of the term Asia itself and perpetuates 'us' and 'them' Orientalist notions of Asia's exotic and foreign nature in Australia's imagination.

The term 'Asian Century' is similarly fraught. Its use identifies the movement of Asia from peripheral to central in Australia's national narrative, ultimately denying

¹² Walker and Sobocinska, "Australia's Asia," 12.

¹³ Said, *Orientalism*, 6; Broinowski, *The Yellow Lady*, 198.

¹⁴ Halse, "(Re)Thinking Asia Literacy," 3.

¹⁵ Chengxin Pan, "Australia's Self-Identity and Three Modes of Imagining Asia: A Critical Perspective on 'Asia Literacy,'" in *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, ed. Christine Halse, Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia (Abingdon: Routledge, 2015), 198.

historical narratives where not only is 'central' a subjective view of the world, but also dismisses the complex and nuanced history that Australia shares with Asia.¹⁶ Halse outlines how the term 'Asian Century' has been used to describe more than one period of history¹⁷ and is therefore more indicative of Europe's (and by extension, Australia's) vision of itself, rather than events in Asia. Although not entirely synonymous with the Asian Century, the term 'Rising Asia' also refers to a growth in Asian power and influence and was first used during the 1880s as a political shorthand for a looming geopolitical conflict.¹⁸ Concepts of the Asian Century and Rising Asia draw on Samuel Huntington's macro-history of the clash of civilisations in which the East and West are perpetually in conflict for global dominance. Huntington's work refers to the 'Asian challenge' as Western Civilization declines and Asian assertiveness is rooted in economic growth¹⁹ and involves a 'cultural renaissance' as growing self-confidence sweeps across Asia.²⁰ Despite the popularity of Huntington's views, the political and economic shifts associated with the Asian Century have occurred across several centuries, rather than being limited to one. The Asian Century is a representation created by the West rather than a reality. Using these loaded terms—Asia, Asia literacy, the Asian Century, and Rising Asia—within the curriculum must be dealt with in terms of their representation of the concerns, fears, hopes, desires, and identity of *Australian* society.

Asia in the Curriculum

The 1974 History curriculum for Years 9 and 10 offers a limited study of Asia. First mentioned in Semester I (of 4 semesters), a study of 'Past Eastern Civilisations' is offered as one of three sub-topics for half of Semester I's content. It is framed in the unit 'Isolating the Main Issues Confronting Australia Now'. Additionally, there are three options to study Asia out of a total eight, for one-third of the semester's content. This

¹⁶ Walker and Sobocinska, *Australia's Asia*, 6.

¹⁷ Halse, "(Re)Thinking Asia Literacy," 3-5. Halse outlines the term was first used in the 15th and 16th centuries after the expansion of the European spice trade into the region, and again in the late 19th and 20th centuries following the growth of Japan. It also gained traction following the recognition of the Pacific as a significant trading arena.

¹⁸ Walker and Sobocinska, *Australia's Asia*, 4.

¹⁹ Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order* (London: The Free Press, 1996), 102.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 104.

semester focuses on 'Significant Features of World History in an Age of Nationalism'. In each of these cases, the study of Asia emphasises either a study of the East in terms of its potential threat to contemporary Australia or its relationship to European colonial powers. A study of China in this curriculum focuses on 'The Last Two Dynasties' and concludes at "the decline of traditional Chinese civilisation."²¹ Similarly in other sub-topics, study of Japan and India focuses on the Tokugawa period and 'Life on the eve of European arrival' respectively.²² Whilst the curriculum glosses over the detrimental impact of colonialism in China, Japan, and India, it also frames their histories as beginning on the "eve of the impact of the West" (particularly for China).²³ This approach camouflages problematic colonial contacts, whilst simultaneously denying the importance of Asia's history prior to colonisation. This reflects the view that Asian history is only relevant where it involves the West.

The 1976 Modern History curriculum similarly reiterates this self-interested view of Asia. Although Asian countries are mentioned in passing in several units, the primary 'Asian studies' unit is 'Asia and Australia in World Affairs.' The General Aims state that:

In this century, Asian Countries have emerged as significant world powers. To understand the emergence and growth of influence of some of the major Asian powers, it is essential that students develop an appreciation of Asia's political patterns, economic problems and social developments.²⁴

The reference to "*this century*" correlates with conceptions of the Asian Century. However, as has been previously discussed, the term Asian Century has been equally applied in earlier periods of history.²⁵ The description of the emergence of Asia's influence in world affairs speaks to a Eurocentric perspective that denies any past Asian influence or power and promotes a 'West and the rest' approach to history. Like previous curricula, this unit also suggests a background study with a "general survey of Western imperialism in Asia" to serve as the beginning point of the unit.²⁶ Following this, the detailed study is divided: half the semester is designated for study of Asia, and

²¹ Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies (QBSSS), "Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10," 1974, Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane, 8.

²² *Ibid.*, 10-12.

²³ *Ibid.*, 8.

²⁴ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History; Years 11 & 12," 1976, Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane, 20.

²⁵ Halse, "(Re)Thinking Asia Literacy," 3-5.

²⁶ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History," 1976, 22.

the other half for study of Australia. The half-semester study of Asia is further divided between sub-topics of South East Asia (with a choice from Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, or Malaysia-Singapore) or East and South Asia (with choices from China, Japan, or India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh).

Despite the unit's attempt to recognise a greater diversity of Asian nations and their individual 'achievements',²⁷ the descriptors for each of the sub-topics reveal that Asia's power is framed only with reference to Western power. For example, the curriculum suggests beginning a study of Indonesia with "the character of Dutch rule," followed by a study of foreign policies and independence movements within Indonesia.²⁸ This is similar to suggestions for studies of Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia-Singapore, Japan, India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh.²⁹ Furthermore, the attempt to cover such a large portion of Asia within half a semester—out of a total four semesters of study in Modern History—is indicative of an attempt by the curriculum to quickly and succinctly 'cover' Asia whilst failing to recognise the region's depth of history, diversity, and connectedness to Australian affairs. This unit is one choice from five, but it is required only for half of the unit, the other half of which focuses on Australia's "defence and foreign policy" *in relation to Asia*.³⁰ Evidently, the curriculum is carefully constructing the position that Asia's significance rests upon its relations to the West and furthermore that defence and security are key characteristics of such relations. The selective Mentioning of Asia further positions it as Other to Australia and perpetuates the systematic forgetting of Australia's shared—international and domestic—histories with Asia.

The 1978 *Syllabus in Social Studies* continues the pattern set by previous curricula in framing studies of Asia with reference to Western nations such as Australia.³¹ As an integrated Social Studies curriculum, it operates in terms of 'Main

²⁷ This curriculum takes a broader view to the nations that constitute Asia, including Russia; China; Korea; Vietnam; Japan; Indonesia; Philippines; Vietnam; Malaysia-Singapore; India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh; and Papua New Guinea. This is in comparison to the paltry Asia that consisted of China, Japan, and India in the 1974 *Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10*.

²⁸ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History," 1976, 23-24.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 24-27.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 27.

³¹ It is important to note that the 1978 curriculum is a Social Studies curriculum and takes an interdisciplinary approach that includes aspects of sociology, anthropology, geography, and History. Analysis of this curriculum focuses on the 'history' aspects of the units in which Asia is mentioned. This include Unit 1 in Year 6, Unit 2 in Year 7, and more significantly Unit 4 in Year 7.

Ideas' (generalised statements that connect content) where each of these units Mentions contacts between Europe (and by extension Australia) and Asia only in the context of colonialism. For example, Unit 1 contains the Main Idea, "People of one culture face problems of adaptation when they come into contact with people of another culture." It is elaborated that teachers might "lead the pupils to an appreciation of the difficulties faced by both newcomers and the original inhabitants ... consider the influence of one culture on another ... [such as] the British in India ... [and] a European nation in a particular part of Africa or Asia."³² It does not include examples of culture contact between Asian nations.

Unit 4 in Year 7 emphasises Asia's great diversity, the various needs of different cultures—with direct comparison to Australian culture—and the increasing interdependence and influence amongst cultures. This discussion positions Asia as both beneficial and threatening. The curriculum advances a theory that contact with the West has ultimately led to progress in Asia and provided several benefits, while also recognising that there has been some 'loss' of culture.³³

The lead up to the Bicentenary focused public attention on history and politicians made a point of declaring national goals and strategies. The 1987 Modern History curriculum was followed in 1988 by A National Strategy for the Study of Asia in Australia, released by the Asian Studies Council (a body of the Commonwealth of Australia). That strategy document opens with the statement:

Leaders of Australia have said that our destiny lies in the Asian region.

The Government has called for a National Strategy in education to equip Australians to deal with that destiny.

We wonder how many Australians realise quite how profoundly Australia lacks the means to plan for and manage its future as part of the Asian region.³⁴

³² Department of Education Queensland, "Syllabus in Social Studies for Primary Schools: Book 3; Grades 6 and 7," 1978, Personal Collection, 6.

³³ This is an interesting point at which a similarity with the treatment of Indigenous Australians in the curriculum can be noted; the suggestion of a loss of traditional culture as a result of contact with Europeans—both for Asian peoples and Indigenous Australians—perpetuates the idea that only 'traditional' individuals are genuine peoples of that culture. This is problematic as the definition of 'traditional' relies on narrow Western understandings of this 'traditional' culture and gives them the power to define the authenticity of a culture.

³⁴ Asian Studies Council, "A National Strategy for the Study of Asia in Australia," (Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1988), 1.

Emphatically there was a policy drive to prepare Australians—through the school curriculum—for their ‘destiny’ in the Asian region.

The 1987 curriculum demonstrates a slight but significant shift from previous versions in its perspectives on Asia. This shift is evident with the addition of a unit designated ‘Transformation in Modern East Asia’ (The Asia and Australia in World Affairs unit was retained unchanged).³⁵ The statement of objectives in the new unit both recognises the barriers to Australia’s engagement with East Asia and positions the region as pivotal to realising the Australia’s economic goals.³⁶ This view of education as an investment in human capital, and thus a means of improving Australia’s economic position, is an undercurrent to this unit. Perceptions of the economic potential of East Asia were also apparent in the 1989 Garnaut Report which referred to ‘North-East Asian Ascendancy’ and prioritised engagement with the region to secure Australia’s future and develop a solution to Australia’s economic problems.³⁷ This view of Asia was central in Prime Minister Bob Hawke’s approach to policy. During his leadership, Hawke set out to reconstruct the Australian economy and capitalise on the emergence of Asia’s ‘tiger economies’.³⁸ The sudden appearance of a study of East Asia is not coincidental; rather than its inclusion on the basis of historical significance, it was included for the benefits accruing to the nation if future citizens were able to engage with Asia.

In terms of content, the ‘Transformation in Modern East Asia’ unit prescribes a background study of China and Japan— ‘Traditional Confucian Society and Traditional Japanese Society’—and at least one depth topic for each country. Although it is important to recognise the timeframe limitations within a Modern History curriculum, the inclusion of ‘traditional’ China and Japan perpetuates a view of these states as static and two-dimensional. Conversely, a depth study of ‘Revolutionary Change in China’

³⁵ It is important to note that these two units are incompatible with each other and cannot both be studied within a 2-year course of study. The implication of this is that students’ study of Asia is limited to either a study that emphasises Asia’s existence in relation to colonial powers (Asia and Australia in World Affairs) or one in which only a ‘relevant’ Asia is studied. These two options create a limited, Eurocentric and Othered representation of Asia.

³⁶ QBSSS, “Senior Modern History,” 1987, John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 34. The beginning section of the objectives state that “China and Japan have emerged this century as significant world powers. Their relationship with Australia has grown in importance. An understanding of their historical development can add much to overcoming many of the misconceptions about East Asia which are still common in Australian society.”

³⁷ Halse, “What Makes Asia Literacy a ‘Wicked Policy Problem’?,” 17.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 16.

focuses on the growth of nationalism, communism, and revolution in China whilst a study of 'Japan in Transition' focuses on the Westernisation, militarism, and economic relations of Japan.³⁹ Although Unit 6 on 'Transformation in Modern East Asia' is incompatible with 'Unit 5: Asia and Australia in World Affairs', both topics indicate Australia's concerns regarding the emergence of a modernised, militarised, and masculine 'Asia.'⁴⁰ This is placed in stark contrast to the representation of a 'pre-modern' and 'traditional' effeminate East Asia.

Beginning in the late 1980s, a series of national policy 'vision' statements for Australian schooling were released. The 1989 *Hobart Declaration* was the first of such statements, marking an official attempt by schools, and governments at State, Territory, and Commonwealth level to develop coordinated and aligned goals for education. It made no specific reference to Asia, only to the goal of "develop[ing] knowledge, skills, attitudes and values which will enable students to participate ... in our democratic Australian society within an international context."⁴¹ The 1999 *Adelaide Declaration* made a similar claim that "these national goals provide a basis for investment in schooling to enable all young people to engage effectively with an increasingly complex world..." and to "... contribute to Australia's social, cultural and economic development in local and global contexts."⁴² The national goal statements consistently prioritise improving students' engagement with global contexts; this is an obvious method for securing future citizens' international engagement and hence Australia's international engagement. The 1999 *Adelaide Declaration* refers to this goal as an *investment* for the future. Positioning students' education as developing human capital demonstrates economic instrumentalist aims at work, rather than a natural engagement with a region in proximity to Australia.

Clearly Australia has consistently recognised the importance of education in international relations, but the extent to which its Asian neighbours feature in such

³⁹ QBSSS, "Senior Modern History," 1987, 36-38. It should be noted that there are some suggestions for study of Chinese art and literature within this depth study. However, they are framed by references to nationalist and communist ideology and constitute a small portion of the suggested sub-topics.

⁴⁰ Walker, *Anxious Nation*, 130.

⁴¹ Employment Ministerial Council on Education, Training, and Youth Affairs, "The Hobart Declaration on Schooling (1989)," Education Council, <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/EC-Publications/EC-Publications-archive/EC-The-Hobart-Declaration-on-Schooling-1989.aspx>.

⁴² Training and Youth Affairs Commonwealth Department of Education, "The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling the Twenty-First Century," *Journal of the HEIA* 7, no. 1 (2000): 41.

concerns has varied. The curriculum frequently indicates that Asia and its relations to Australia are significant factors that determine Australia's position in world affairs. Curricula reiterate that "in this century Asian countries have emerged as significant world powers."⁴³ Overall, whilst the emphasis on Asia in the Queensland History curriculum has increased, this has been driven by the instrumentalist aims of the federal government, rather than any specific Queensland agenda.

The 1990s were a time of growth for Asia studies in Australia, particularly under the Hawke and Paul Keating governments.⁴⁴ The *Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future* report (chaired by Kevin Rudd) was indicative of a further rush to engage with Asia.⁴⁵ The 1995 Modern History curriculum marks another shift in the curriculum's approach. Again, it includes the unit 'Asia and Australia in World Affairs', but reworked the second Asian history unit, renaming it 'Transformation in Modern Asia and the Pacific' (previously Transformation in Modern East Asia). It takes a broader view of what constitutes Asia, referring to regions in Asia and the Pacific. Emphasis on Australia's changing relationship with Asian nations since WWII, and indicates that students should understand the events that have influenced this changed relationship. It attempts to overcome barriers of East/West dichotomies, stating that it focuses on relationships surrounding "Eurocentric assumptions about the peoples of Asia and the Pacific and the practice of colonialism and imperialism." The unit also interrogates the concepts of nationalism, democracy, socialism, regionalism, and internationalism.⁴⁶ Consequently, the 1995 Modern History curriculum demonstrates a renewed prioritisation of engaging with Asia with a recognition of Australian-constructed perspectives of Asia.

Notice must also be taken of a recurring unit titled 'The Historical Background to Contemporary Society' that spans the 1976, 1987, and 1995 Modern History curricula. The purpose of this unit is to study aspects of society including population, industrialisation, urbanisation, family life, education, religion, philosophy, art and

⁴³ QBSSS, "Senior Modern History," 1987, 34.

⁴⁴ Halse, "What Makes Asia Literacy a 'Wicked Policy Problem'?", 17-20. Halse describes how John Howard recognised the importance of engagement with Asia, but balanced this with a conservative commitment to Australia's historical allies. His catchphrase was 'Asia first, but not Asia only'.

⁴⁵ Kevin Rudd, "Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future," (Brisbane: National Asian Languages & Cultures Working Group, 1994).

⁴⁶ Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies (QBSSSS), "Modern History: Senior Syllabus," 1995, Personal Collection, 40.

literature, and morality. Of interest are the repeated references to 'the dwarfing of Europe' and the export of European goods and ideas to 'other parts of the world'. The 'population' and 'industrialisation' unit sub-topics in both the 1976 and 1987 History curricula state:

1. Population ... *What do you understand by the concept of the dwarfing of Europe? ...*
2. Industrialisation ... *What has led to the export of European technology and knowledge to all quarters of the world? How has this affected societies in various parts of the world? ... In what ways has industrialisation contributed to the 'dwarfing of Europe'?*⁴⁷

The 1995 curriculum, however, changes the wording to state:

1. Population ... *What is meant by 'the dwarfing of Europe' and what have been the consequences? ...*
2. Industrialisation ... *What led to the export of European technology and knowledge? How has this affected societies in various parts of the world?*⁴⁸

The seemingly small change from "what do you understand..." to "what is meant by ..." reorients the inquiry questions more explicitly towards a critical examination of the phrase 'dwarfing of Europe'. This critical reorientation is further supported by a suggestion in the 1995 curriculum that students question the consequences of the meaning of this phrase.⁴⁹ In this way, the East/West binary that is positioned through the phrase 'dwarfing of Europe' is positioned as given knowledge in the 1976 and 1987 curricula, whilst the 1995 curriculum frames it as a statement requiring critical analysis. It demonstrates a shift to a critical approach that views the East and the West in the context of different interpretations of the world that may or may not be taken up by the student.

Conclusion

Considering Australia's historical orientation to the West, and its geographical location in the East, this has presented a consistent tension that forces a choice. Queensland History curriculum from the 1970s and through to the 1990s takes an instrumentalist view of Asia. Evidently, policy has directed Australia's attention to its history, rather than

⁴⁷ QBSSS, "Syllabus: Modern History," 1986, 42; QBSSS, "Senior Modern History," 1987, 47. Emphases added.

⁴⁸ QBSSS, "Modern History: Senior Syllabus," 59. Emphases added.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

its geography. In all its foreignness, Asia is represented as either dangerous or enticing. Both Mentioned representations are self-serving and are more revealing of Australia's view of itself as a far-flung Western democracy that is also a vulnerable middle power than they are of Asian realities.⁵⁰ In this way, the mixed view of an Asia that is simultaneously threatening and promising reflects the interference of government policies and directives, particularly throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

The Othering of Asia in the History curriculum reinforces East-West dualism and perpetuates a recurrent 'forgetting' of Australia's historical connections to Asia both internally and externally. Australia's declaration of the opportunities presented by Asia's rising power makes the obvious distinction that Asia and Australia are two distinct entities. In this way, Asia becomes a construct of Australian fears, interests, motivations, and is Mentioned with regards to its perceived relevance to Australian history. In orientating Asia as Other to Australian identity, this is clearly a process of constructing a repository of collective memory. As Said describes, this involves the continuous reinterpretation of the differences between 'others' and 'us' to establish identity.⁵¹ Although emphasis on Asia in the Queensland History curriculum has been growing, that growth is representative of political concerns and tends to reveal more about recent Australian political history than Asia's history.

⁵⁰ Pan, "Australia's Self-Identity," 203.

⁵¹ Said, *Orientalism*, 332.

Chapter Four:

Curriculum for a Nation

The previous chapters have analysed the negotiation of key tensions in Queensland's History curricula between 1970 and 2000. Considering this, Chapter Four analyses the prevalence and continuation of tensions dealt with in the *Australian Curriculum: History*. Particularly, analysis demonstrates pervasive political interference in History curricula, especially at the federal level. This has been to ensure History curricula serve political visions of Australia's past and its future. This persistent intervention in curriculum development attests to a continuation of, rather than a resolution to, previous decades' curricular tensions. Evidently, History curricula are characterised by their 'unresolvable' nature.

The 'leap' from the 2000 *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE) curriculum to the 2016 v8.3 *Australian Curriculum* has been made for two reasons: firstly, the *Australian Curriculum* is the most significant change in Queensland History curricula since the 2000 SOSE curriculum; secondly, this Honours thesis has time and words limitations and must focus on the most significant elements of the curriculum rather than being comprehensive. Although this chapter is a discussion of the *Australian Curriculum*, it focuses on concerns relevant to Queensland's History curriculum. Whilst the Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority (QCAA) has previously released resources to support the transition of Queensland schools to the *Australian Curriculum*, these have become outdated. At present, most schools are within Phase 3 of implementation of the *Australian Curriculum*. Whilst it has undergone multiple drafts, the History curriculum was part of Phase 1 of implementation.¹ As such, v8.3 of the *Australian Curriculum* has been used for analysis within this chapter as it is currently in use in most Queensland schools.

¹ Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, "Australian Curriculum Implementation Strategy," <https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/p-10/aciq/implementing-aciq/implementation-strategy>. In 2010, Draft 1.0 of the Draft Consultative History curriculum was released, and Queensland's implementation began in 2011. With the eight Key Learning Areas endorsed in 2015, the current national curriculum is at v8.3 of the curriculum which will be in place by 31 December 2017.

Background to the *Australian Curriculum*

The *Australian Curriculum* is a centralised national curriculum that has been developed by various federal governments since 2003, although its background of development stretches back at least 25 years.² Progress towards a centralised and nationally cohesive curriculum has been occurring since the late 1980s, beginning with a series of national statements on education. The 1989 *Hobart Declaration* is an obvious origin point in this shift, marking the first official, national attempt to develop aligned educational goals across schools and governments at State, Territory, and Commonwealth level.³ The key recommendation from the *Hobart Declaration* was to implement agreed Key Learning Areas (KLAs) across all states to ensure educational equivalence and accountability. The SOSE subject area was one of the eight Key Learning Areas (KLAs) established in the *Hobart Declaration*. The 1991 National Report of Schooling in Australia built upon the *Hobart Declaration's* 'pilot goals', further implementing arrangements for regular state reporting to maintain educational accountability. The achievement of Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia were released within this report.⁴ The reports were quickly followed by the 1999 *Adelaide Declaration*⁵ and the 2008 *Melbourne Declaration*.⁶ Each national statement developed more 'relevant' and state-agreed goals for education. In the initial stages of the *Australian Curriculum's* development, History was prioritised as one of the four core subject areas to be written first.

It was discussed in Chapter One that the political intervention and placation inspired by New History caused Queensland's History curricula during the 1980s to be 'messy'; in trying to pacify a variety of stakeholders, the curriculum became incoherent

² Marie Brennan, "National Curriculum: A Political-Educational Triangle," *Australian Journal of Education* 55, no. 259 (2011): 259.

³ Employment Ministerial Council on Education, Training, and Youth Affairs, "The Hobart Declaration on Schooling (1989), 1989," <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/EC-Publications/EC-Publications-archive/EC-The-Hobart-Declaration-on-Schooling-1989.aspx>.

⁴ Australian Education Council, "National Report on Schooling in Australia," (Carlton 1991), 17.

⁵ Employment Ministerial Council on Education, Training, and Youth Affairs, "The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century," 1999, <http://www.scseec.edu.au/archive/Publications/Publications-archive/The-Adelaide-Declaration.aspx>.

⁶ Employment Ministerial Council on Education, Training and Youth Affairs, "Melbourne Declaration: On Educational Goals for Young Australians," 2008, http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf.

and disordered. The 1990s move towards comparability between the states offered an opportunity to develop—or rather, reconstruct—a cohesive historical account of the nation. The restructuring of the curriculum resulted in changed attitudes towards pedagogy and national political goals for developing a grand narrative in History. Sirkka Ahonen argues that "after 2000, a post-liberal era dawned. The liberal approach ... was eventually replaced by educational pursuits related to nation-building projects. Nationalistic politics of History overtook the liberal idea of critical and multiperspectival History education."⁷ Evidently, the national curriculum is a continuing conversation that goes back decades and transports the goals of previous curricula. However, the *Australian Curriculum* has been caught between competing visions for History education.⁸

Introducing the Great Balancing Act: The *Australian Curriculum*

One of the most significant trends during the period from 1970 to 2011 is the increase in frameworks and requirements that operate across the curriculum. Compared to the 1970s and 1980s where History curricula were single documents that outlined general aims, content, and assessment for the subject, the current *Australian Curriculum* takes a three-dimensional approach to education. This includes the intersection of content descriptions specific to each subject area with General Capabilities (GC) and Cross-curriculum Priorities (CCPs). The GCs "[encompass] knowledge, skills, behaviours and dispositions" that students can apply in their learning at school and beyond school. In comparison, the CCPs give students "tools and language to engage with and better understand their world at a range of levels." The GCs and CCPs are applied across subject areas and are developed through learning content, rather than as learning areas individually. The intersection of the learning areas' content, the GCs, and the CCPs is described as a three-dimensional approach to learning.⁹

⁷ Sirkka Ahonen, "The Lure of Grand Narratives: A Dilemma for History Teachers," in *International Perspectives on Teaching Rival Histories: Pedagogical Responses to Contested Narratives and the History Wars*, ed. Henrik Åström Elmersjö, Anna Clark, and Monika Vinterek (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2017), 42.

⁸ Catherine Doherty, "Forging the Heteroglossic Citizen: Articulating Local, National, Regional and Global Horizons in the Australian Curriculum," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 35, no. 2 (2012).

⁹ Assessment and Reporting Authority Australian Curriculum (ACARA), "The Australian Curriculum: 7-10 History," (Sydney 2016). Currently, at 2017, the General Capabilities (GC) in the *Australian Curriculum* are

In addition, the *Australian Curriculum* claims to take a world history approach that helps students to appreciate Australia's development, its position in the Asia and Pacific regions, and its global connections.¹⁰ Broadly, these contextual frames and general skills demonstrate the curriculum's attempt to balance the priorities of state and federal governments, as well as concerns regarding the notion of the student as a future citizen. Top-heavy and cumbersome, the Australian History Curriculum is bursting at the seams with regards to content as well.

The *Australian Curriculum: History* is the product of attempts to balance 'deep' content with state and federal-directed broad-scope frameworks for education. Criticisms of 1990s SOSE-based History curricula were that they were too broad and ambiguous and thus suffered from inconsistent teaching and learning. As a reaction, there has been a push in the opposite direction, where the curriculum has added depth to content but narrowed the focus of study areas.¹¹ However, frequent concerns of a 'crowded curriculum' in the Australian context demonstrate that this remains an ongoing battle. Like the Radford Report, which attempted to increase teacher autonomy through increased internal assessment (but backfired by overburdening teachers who were perceived as unprepared), the *Australian Curriculum* has similarly overburdened teachers with layers of frameworks and guidelines. This fundamentally limits teacher autonomy in the classroom, rather than increasing it. Geraldine Ditchburn describes this issue, explaining, "This prescribed content, overlaid by other prescriptive requirements, creates a type of 'knowledge ceiling' that deflects the intrusion of content knowledge much beyond what has been decided and prescribed, because there is just so much to 'get through', to try to make sense of and to 'tick off' the checklist of content items."¹²

Literacy; Numeracy; Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Capability; Critical and Creative Thinking; Personal and Social Capability; Ethical Understanding; and Intercultural Understand. The Cross-curriculum Priorities (CCPs) as at 2017 are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures; Asia and Australia's Engagement with Asia; and Sustainability.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹¹ Tony Taylor, "The Future of the Past: Final Report of the Report of the National Inquiry into School History," (Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 2000), 145-46.

¹² Geraldine Ditchburn, "The Australian Curriculum: History – the Challenges of a Thin Curriculum?," *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 36, no. 1 (2015): 35.

Analysing the Australian Curriculum: History

The intersection of factors—a centrally-developed curriculum designed to function across the nation, deep content within learning areas, three-dimensionality of the curriculum with the intersection of GCs and CCPs—has resulted in an impossible balancing act. The *Australian Curriculum: History* is trying to balance many priorities whilst also attempting to a cohesive narrative of History for all Australian students. As a result, that which the History curriculum has chosen to include and exclude, is revealing of the identity and values that are emphasised in the national curriculum.¹³ Considering what Ditchburn claims—that a neo-liberal global hegemony has provided the overwhelming rationale for a national curriculum—the continuing political interest in the History curriculum is obvious. At the very least, it provides a rationale for state and federal government attempts to intervene in the curriculum with the intention of dictating a grand historical narrative.¹⁴

One of the key characteristics of the *Australian Curriculum: History* is its formulaic and Western neo-liberal approach to the subject. Although there are explicit references made to ‘diversity and perspectives’ in the rationale, the content descriptors tell a different story. In Year 7, where students learn about the ancient world, a study of the comparatively small Mediterranean World—comprising of Ancient Greece, Rome, and Egypt—is situated in opposition to an elective choice of the comparably larger ‘Asian World’ (with options of studies for ancient China or India).¹⁵ Not only are the structure of these depth studies tediously formulaic, but the content elaborations for each sub-topic indicate inherent bias. This type of bias positions certain sub-topics as more relevant by making explicit reference to Australian heritage. For example, the study of Renaissance Italy in the Year 8 Unit ‘The Western and Islamic World’ explains that students should understand “the spread of Renaissance culture to the rest of Europe, and its legacy.”¹⁶ Although a seemingly innocuous statement, this content

¹³ Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg, "Introduction," in *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, eds. Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 7.

¹⁴ Geraldine Ditchburn, "A National Australian Curriculum: In Whose Interests?," *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 32, no. 3 (2012): 263.

¹⁵ ACARA, "Australian Curriculum," 20-22.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 29.

descriptor is notably absent from a sub-topic about the Ottoman Empire (c. 1299- c. 1683) and its legacy within the same unit.¹⁷

Moreover, although the curriculum attempts to situate national narratives within a ‘world history’ focus, Indigenous Australians are relegated to a single descriptor in the Ancient World as artefacts of this past. This is notably alongside content descriptors that refer to archaeological remains.¹⁸ Indigenous Australians reappear in ‘Making a Nation’ where they are considered with regards to the impact of contact between Indigenous and European settlers.¹⁹ Although there is the cross-curriculum priority of ‘Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Histories and Cultures’, it ambiguously operates across the curriculum. The selective inclusion and exclusion of Indigenous histories in the 7-10 *Australian Curriculum: History* perpetuates a compartmentalised and limited view of Indigenous histories and their relationship to the dominant Australian narrative. A Eurocentric and celebratory grand narrative of Australian history is continued, whilst Indigenous histories are only lent spaces in which they do not disrupt the Australian narrative. These spaces of Mentioning include only the Ancient Past and points of contact with European Australians. This trend is persistent, demonstrated by the same discussions that were had in Chapter Two with regards to the simplification of Aboriginal Australians’ histories. The Othering of Indigenous perspectives demonstrates their Mentioning with this grand narrative, and their position as peripheral to the History curriculum’s narrow definition of Australian identity.

The *Australian Curriculum* continues the emphasis upon Anzac as was also discussed in Chapter Two. The curriculum makes some attempts to create a balanced approach to this topic—evident from suggestions to study “debates about the nature and significance of the Anzac legend”²⁰—by foregrounding the contested nature of such concepts. Despite this, the curriculum obviously stresses the significance of Anzacs at Gallipoli. A content descriptor for the World War I (WWI) unit in Year 9 states that students should study “the places where Australians fought and the nature of warfare during WWI, including the Gallipoli campaign.”²¹ Only in the content elaborations are

¹⁷ Ibid., 28.

¹⁸ Ibid., 17.

¹⁹ Ibid., 43-44.

²⁰ Ibid., 46.

²¹ Ibid., 45.

other places where Australians fought mentioned, specifically Fromelles, the Somme, Gallipoli (*repeated*), Sinai and Palestine, which students are merely required to identify.²² The following content descriptor makes further reference to Gallipoli, stating that students should “us[e] sources to investigate the fighting at Gallipoli, the difficulties of trench warfare, and the use of tanks, aeroplanes and chemical weapons (gas).”²³ The curriculum reveals its bias not only through the repeated references to Gallipoli, but also by positioning substantially greater opportunities to understand Gallipoli in depth. Whilst other places that Australians fought during WWI need only be identified, this content elaboration recommends engagement with sources to investigate Gallipoli.²⁴ The relevance of Anzac is carried through to Year 10, where it is suggested students learn “the significance of Kokoda as the battle that halted the Japanese advance on Port Moresby and helped foster the Anzac legend.”²⁵ In this way, the curriculum recognises the contestation and debates about the significance of the Anzacs at Gallipoli, but emphasises them all the same.

The inclusion of Asia in the *Australian Curriculum: History*, however, takes a broader view of this particular topic area. In Year 8, a required depth study must focus on the ‘Asia-Pacific World’ with a selection from the Angkor/Khmer Empire, Shogunate Japan, or Polynesian expansion across the Pacific.²⁶ Unlike curricula of previous decades which framed Asia’s history around colonial connections and warfare, each of these studies focus on Asian nations independently (unrelated to Australia or other European nations). That is not to say that Asia’s connections to Australia are overlooked. Year 9 for example requires a study of ‘Australia and Asia’ as the second (of three) depth studies for the year. However, this requires the choice between “students investigat[ing] the history of an Asian society OR Australia in the period 1750 – 1918 in depth.”²⁷ The two available options for this depth study present a problematic choice for teachers.

²² Ibid., 46.

²³ Ibid., 45.

²⁴ Education Services Australia, “History: Year 9; Historical Knowledge and Understanding,” <http://www.scootle.edu.au/ec/search?accContentId=ACDSEH095>. To further demonstrate the extent to which this unit emphasises learning about Anzacs at Gallipoli, the website version of the curriculum has a direct link from this content elaboration through to Scootle (an online digital resource repository designed to support the curriculum). Following this link will bring up a page of listed resources, where the top three results are: ‘Founders and survivors storylines: lifelines’; ‘Forgotten heroes’; and ‘Off to War: Australia answers the call’.

²⁵ ACARA, “Australian Curriculum,” 53.

²⁶ Ibid., 31.

²⁷ Ibid., 43.

They must choose to either teach the history of any Asian nation between 1750 and 1918, or teach the ‘making’ of the Australian nation. Presented in this way, it is likely the choice is obvious for many teachers: to choose the study of Asian society would come at the detriment of students learning about Australia’s settlement, Federation, and foray into WWI. This is likely considering there are no other opportunities for a study of this historical period throughout the 7-10 History curriculum.

The *Australian Curriculum* therefore demonstrates many interesting tensions; whilst it makes some attempts to negotiate historical narratives of the Anzac legend and to incorporate studies of Asia, it also undermines its own attempts. This is indicative of the multiple stakeholders in the *Australian Curriculum*. As a result, the content is pulled in many directions and functions incoherently if selections are made. As a national curriculum, this is a function of its burden to apply unequivocally across Australia. Whilst changes can be made to shift some of these tensions, the curriculum will always remain ‘unfinished’.

Conclusion

Overall, the current *Australian Curriculum: History* demonstrates a perpetuation of the tensions and negotiations of previous Queensland History curricula between 1970 and 2000. Although this is not surprising considering the position of curricula as ‘unresolvable,’ the process of the negotiation and Mentioning of these tensions has resulted in a top-heavy balancing act. In battling the swathe of conflicting state priorities and goals to create a national curriculum, the *Australian Curriculum* has produced History that carefully maintains a simplistic and generalised view that neatly creates a path to the present. The ‘Official Knowledge’ of the curriculum is very much the same as before—celebratory and Eurocentric—but demonstrates a heightened level of conflict and negotiation with rival histories that remain unresolved despite a formulaic approach. The formulaic repetition of unit topics alongside overarching priority frameworks make it clear that the *Australian Curriculum* has not resolved previous decades’ recurrent tensions within History curricula.

Inevitably, discussion and debate about the History curriculum—at both state and national level—will continue. However, this is significant as it points out the ways in which these discussions and debates do not exist in a vacuum; rather, historicising the curriculum shows that issues of balance and bias are only perpetuated through the

conversation of successive curricula. It is important to make visible curricula's fundamental 'unresolvability.'

Conclusion

Certain trends are apparent when surveying the negotiation of tensions in Queensland's History curricula between 1970 and 2000. Whilst the 1970s were characterised by the gradual transition from Old History to New History, which saw History education become inquiry-based and thematic, this shift opened History to accusations of being partial, biased, and problematic. Queensland's History education landscape was quite unique in this era, largely because of the idiosyncratic leadership of the highly conservative Bjelke-Petersen government who were in power from 1968 to 1987.

Strong public reproach of New History and vehement opposition to Queensland's History curricula demonstrated that a shift away from traditional and conservative values within curriculum would not go uncontested. This was apparent in the *Man, A Course of Study* (MACOS) and *Social Education Materials Project* (SEMP) debate that set the foundation for ongoing and heightened political intervention in Queensland History education during the 1980s. A contradictory and confusing mess of History curriculum was the result and remained pervasive during this decade. This was the product of the Bjelke-Petersen government's placation of high-level community interest groups.

Although the Queensland government maintained a firm attentiveness to the state of its History curriculum following the 1980s, this gave way to centralised decision-making processes. In combination with growing federal pressures for comparability and accountability amongst the states during the 1990s, the State, Territory, and Commonwealth governments produced a series of national statements on educational goals. This included the 1989 *Hobart Declaration*, the 1991 National Report on Schooling in Australia, the 1999 *Adelaide Declaration*, and in 2000 *The Future of the Past*. The century ended with the 2000 *Studies of Society and Environment* (SOSE) curriculum that energised nationalistic sentiments.

The initial 2011 *Australian Curriculum* represented a political foray into what can be designated as the post-liberal education era.¹ Its subsequent version 8.3

¹ Sirkka Ahonen, "The Lure of Grand Narratives: A Dilemma for History Teachers," in *International Perspectives on Teaching Rival Histories: Pedagogical Responses to Contested Narratives and the History*

demonstrated attempts at balancing utilitarian federal agendas, state agendas, and broad public concerns for History education. However, it resulted in a History curriculum where historical narratives were painted with broad brush strokes, amounting to a white-washing of History. The tenuous position of the curriculum's balancing act became obvious through analysis of its formulaic approach to depth studies, its presumption of national heritage in a multicultural society, and its inherent bias with regards to Western influence in the development of Australian history. The *Australian Curriculum: History* demonstrated a continuation—and in fact, a greater complication—of earlier decades' tensions surrounding the History curriculum.

This thesis has shown that through the process of Mentioning, the History curriculum has consistently shaped a grand narrative of Australian history. In dealing with historical narratives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders as well as Asia,—both of which have fundamentally share Australian history and identity—the curriculum includes their perspectives only insofar as they reinforce Australian identity. Through this measure of 'relevance', these groups are only Mentioned where they directly encounter the Australian narrative of 'Britishness' and Western modernity. As a result, the perspectives and histories of these diverse groups are caged within Australia's grand historical narrative and stripped of their complexity. The caging of Indigenous and Asian perspectives in the curriculum is carried through to the *Australian Curriculum* with the use of the Cross-Curriculum Priorities, 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and cultures' and 'Asia and Australia's Engagement with Asia' which function ambiguously and superficially.

Tensions regarding the issue of SOSE, the positioning and emphasis of Australian history, and the inclusion of Asia in Queensland History curricula are indicative of a consistent political battle between Left and Right, and between critical and celebratory narratives. More importantly, the History curriculum in Queensland has existed in an interesting space whereby it has been consistently shaped through negotiation between conservative-leaning governments, apparently Leftist History teacher associations and leftist educationists. Each of these stakeholders are concerned dually with the central purpose and relevance of History and the image of the student as receptor of past

Wars, ed. Henrik Åström Elmersjö, Anna Clark, and Monika Vinterek (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2017), 42.

knowledge in present times, for use in the building of Australia's future. As a battleground for national identity, the curriculum has maintained a grand narrative of Australian history by negotiating key tension points that attempt to subvert the Official narrative. It continues to Mention other historical events and actors, allowing them to inhabit such a space so long as they maintain, rather than subvert, the national narrative.

It is plain then, that the History curriculum is characterised by its 'unresolvable' nature. As a result, past decades' precedence of using History education as a political football will continue. Decisions regarding the historical significance of individuals and events must continuously be made, whilst negotiations of narratives that challenge accepted interpretations of History will also continue. It is apparent that although the curriculum is unresolvable and negotiations of its content and structure are inevitable, this thesis points to the importance of making such negotiations visible. Despite its seemingly authoritative and apolitical tone, the History curriculum is anything but this.

This thesis has also touched on several threads that may serve as areas of additional research. This includes the role of History in relation to citizenship, including different variants of citizenship, —national and global— as well as its role in civics education. Other tensions include the curriculum's negotiation of other important intersections of Australian identity including gender and multiculturalism.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- AEC Curriculum and Assessment Committee. "A National Curriculum." *The History Teacher* 30, no. 4 (1993): 5-24.
- Asian Studies Council. "A National Strategy for the Study of Asia in Australia." Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1988.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. "The Australian Curriculum: 7-10 History." Sydney, 2016.
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. "National History Curriculum: Framing Paper." Sydney, 2009.
- Australian Education Council. "National Report on Schooling in Australia." 182. Carlton, 1991.
- Australian Government. "Australia in the Asian Century: White Paper." 2012.
- Australian Government. "Review of the Australian Curriculum: Final Report." Canberra: Australian Government, 2014.
- Australian Government. "Review of the Australian Curriculum: Supplementary Material." Canberra: Australian Government, 2014.
- Australian History Curriculum Reference Group. "Guide to the Teaching of Australian History in Years 9 and 10." Canberra: Australian Government, 2007.
- Bell, Dorothy L. "The School Curriculum and History." *Agora* 11, no. 5 (1977): 7-10.
- Blainey, Geoffrey. "Drawing up a Balance Sheet of Our History." *Quadrant* 37, no. 7 (1993): 10.
- Clarke, Eddie. "Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools, 1983-1990." Brisbane: Department of Education, Queensland, 1990.
- Clarke, Eddie. "Assessment in Queensland Secondary Schools: Two Decades of Change, 1964-1983." In *Historical Perspectives on Contemporary Issues in Queensland Education No. 4: Policy and Information Services Branch*
- Commonwealth Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs. "The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling the Twenty-First Century." *Journal of the HEIA* 7, no. 1 (2000): 40-42.
- Cowie, Russell. "Editorial." *The History Teacher* October (1973): 1-5.
- Cowie, Russell. "History in Schools: 'The Wisdom of the Ages' or a Response to the Needs of a Society Today?" *The Australian History Teacher*, no. 5 (1978): 2-8.

- Department of Education and Training. "Embedding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Perspectives in Schools (EATSIPS)." Brisbane: Queensland Government, 2011.
- Department of Education Queensland. "Syllabus in History: Grades 8, 9 and 10." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1966.
- Department of Education Queensland. "Syllabus in Social Studies for Primary Schools: Book 3; Grades 6 and 7." Private Collection, 1978.
- Education Services Australia. "History: Year 9; Historical Knowledge and Understanding."
<http://www.scootle.edu.au/ec/search?accContentId=ACDSEH095>.
- Finch, Louise. "Historian Heal Thyself? [Response to Alan Ryan]." *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 88 (1999): 26-29.
- Gibson, Margaret, and Alan Bennett. "Discussion Paper on Assessment in History." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1984.
- Gray, Ian. "The History of What!?" *Agora* 17, no. 5 (1983): 15-17.
- History Teachers' Association of Victoria. "What Is the Use of History? The Place of History in the School Curriculum." *The History Teacher* 21, no. 3 (1983): 14-18.
- Hoepper, Brian, and Max Quanchi. "History in Years 1 to 10: Studies of Society and Environment Key Learning Area." Queensland School Curriculum Council, 2000.
- Hughes, Phillip. "Managing Curriculum Development in Queensland." edited by Queensland Department of Education. Cairns Main Collection, James Cook University Library, Cairns, 1991.
- Karmel, Peter. "Quality of Education in Australia: Report of the Review Committee, April 1985 (Karmel Report)." Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, 1985.
- Macintyre, Stuart. "The Genie and the Bottle: Putting History Back into the School Curriculum." In *Queensland History Teachers' Association Conference*, 1996.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. "Melbourne Declaration: On Educational Goals for Young Australians." 2008.
http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs. "The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century." 1999. <http://www.scseec.edu.au/archive/Publications/Publications-archive/The-Adelaide-Declaration.aspx>.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs. "The Hobart Declaration on Schooling (1989)." 1989.

<http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/EC-Publications/EC-Publications-archive/EC-The-Hobart-Declaration-on-Schooling-1989.aspx>.

- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Junior Syllabus in History: Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1986.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Science." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Junior Syllabus in Social Studies." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1981.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Junior Syllabus in Study of Society." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1981.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit I Nationalism and Internationalism in the Twentieth Century; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit II Nationalism and Internationalism: Origins and Development; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit III Nationalism and Internationalism; New Perspectives; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit IV Economic Trends in the Twentieth Century; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit IX Imperialism and Racial Conflicts and Compromises; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit V Asia and Australia in World Affairs; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit VI: Transformation in Modern East Asia." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit VII; Colonialism and Independence in South and South-East Asia." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit VIII Modern Australia; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.

- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Draft Senior Syllabus in Modern History: Unit X: The Historical Background to Contemporary Society; Second Draft." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Junior Syllabus in History: January 1988." Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 1988.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Senior Modern History." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1987.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Support Materials for Modern History (1995 Syllabus)." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1995.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Syllabus Evaluation Report: Final Report on the Evaluation of the Pilot of the Syllabus in Modern History; Years 11-12." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1982.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Syllabus Evaluation Report: Final Report on the Evaluation of the Syllabus in Modern History, Years 11-12; Unit Viii; Modern Australia." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1983.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Syllabus in History: Grades 9-10; September, 1974." Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane, 1974.
- Queensland Board of Secondary School Studies. "Syllabus: Modern History; Years 11 & 12." Library Services Collection, Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority, Brisbane, 1976.
- Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies. "Modern History: Senior Syllabus." Private Collection, 1995.
- Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies. "Statistics Bulletin." John Oxley Collection, John Oxley Library, Brisbane, 1993.
- Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority. "Australian Curriculum Implementation Strategy." 2017. <https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/p-10/aciq/implementing-aciq/implementation-strategy>.
- Queensland History Teachers' Association. "New Syllabuses." *The History Teacher* May (1973): 53-55.
- Queensland School Curriculum Council. "Anzac Cove to Anzac Day: Australian International Relations." 2000. https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/p_10/kla_ose_sbm_505.pdf.

Queensland School Curriculum Council. "Program Planning: Courses of Study; History." Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 2001.

Queensland School Curriculum Council. "Studies of Society and Environment: Years 1 to 10 Syllabus." Townsville Reference Collection, Eddie Koiki Mabo Library, James Cook University, Townsville, 2000.

Queensland Studies Authority. "History: Learning Area." 2009.
https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/senior/yr10_guide_learning_areas_history.pdf.

Queensland Studies Authority. "Queensland Response to Draft K(P)-10 Australian Curriculum." 2010. https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/approach2/aus_curriculum_qld_response.pdf.

Queensland Studies Authority. "Queensland Response to the Draft Senior Secondary Australian Curriculum." 2010. https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/approach2/aus_curriculum_qld_response_snr_secondary.pdf.

Queensland Studies Authority. "Review of the Australian Curriculum: Queensland Response." 2014. https://www.qcaa.qld.edu.au/downloads/approach2/ac_qld_response_review.pdf.

Rudd, Kevin. "Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future." Brisbane: National Asian Languages & Cultures Working Group, 1994.

Ryan, Alan. "Developing a Strategy to 'Save' History." *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 87 (1998): 39-49.

Young, Carmel. "Historical Revivalism [Response to Alan Ryan]." *Bulletin (Australian Historical Association)* 88 (1999): 23-25.

Secondary Sources

Ahonen, Sirkka. "The Lure of Grand Narratives: A Dilemma for History Teachers." In *International Perspectives on Teaching Rival Histories: Pedagogical Responses to Contested Narratives and the History Wars*, edited by Henrik Åström Elmersjö, Anna Clark and Monika Vinterek, 41-62. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2017.

Allen, William J. R. "An Analysis of Curriculum Policy for Upper Secondary School History in Western Australia from 1983 to 2000." University of Western Australia, 2004.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. Revised ed. London: Verso, 1991.

- Andrews, Rhys, Catherine McGlynn, and Andrew Mycock. "Students' Attitudes Towards History: Does Self-Identity Matter?" *Educational Research* 51, no. 3 (2009): 365-77.
- Apple, Michael W. *Ideology and Curriculum*. Third ed. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Apple, Michael W. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. Second ed. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Apple, Michael W. "The Politics of Official Knowledge: Does a National Curriculum Make Sense?" *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 14, no. 1 (1993): 1-16.
- Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies. "AIATSIS Map of Indigenous Australia." 2017. <https://aiatsis.gov.au/explore/articles/aiatsis-map-indigenous-australia>.
- Barcan, Alan. "The Curriculum as Social Studies." *The Australian Quarterly* 60, no. 4 (1988): 448-60.
- Barcan, Alan. "History in a Pluralist Culture: Response to Stuart Macintyre." *Australian Journal of Education* 41, no. 2 (1997): 199-212.
- Barcan, Alan. "The Nineteen Eighties: Prelude to Curricular Reform." *Melbourne Studies in Education* 42, no. 1 (2001): 45-78.
- Barcan, Alan. "The Struggle for Curriculum Reform in Australia, 1987-1993." *Education Research and Perspectives* 30, no. 2 (2003): 108-39.
- Barcan, Alan. "Why Political Intervention in Education Has Increased." *Australia and World Affairs* 33, no. Winter (1997): 30-39.
- Barcan, Alan. "Writing About Education, 1950-1988." *Quadrant* 31, no. 12 (1987): 24-32.
- Bell, Derrick A. "Brown V. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma." *Harvard Law Review* 93, no. 3 (1980): 518-33.
- Bishop, Kay. "The National Scene." *The History Teacher* 30, no. 1 (1992): 7-9.
- Bonnell, Andrew, and Martin Crotty. "Australia's History under Howard, 1996-2007." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 617, no. 1 (2008): 149-65.
- Brennan, Marie. "National Curriculum: A Political-Educational Triangle." *Australian Journal of Education* 55, no. 259 (2011): 259-80.
- Broinowski, Alison. *The Yellow Lady: Australian Impressions of Asia*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1992.

- Butler, Kathy. "Overcoming Terra Nullius: Aboriginal Perspectives in Schools as a Site of Philosophical Struggle." *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 32, no. 1 (2000): 93-101.
- Carroll, John. "C.E.W. Bean and 1988." *Quadrant* 32, no. 6 (1988): 47-49.
- Clark, Anna. *Australian History Now*. Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2013.
- Clark, Anna. "Coalition of the Uncertain: Classroom Responses to Debates About History Teaching." *History Australia* 4, no. 1 (2007): 1-12.
- Clark, Anna. "A Comparative Study of History Teaching in Australia and Canada: Final Report." Monash University, 2008.
- Clark, Anna. "'Getting Back to the Facts': When Politics Meets Pedagogy in History Education." *The History Teacher* December (2002): 20-25.
- Clark, Anna. "History in Black and White: A Critical Analysis of the Black Armband Debate." *Journal of Australian Studies* 26, no. 75 (2002): 1-11.
- Clark, Anna. "History Teaching, Historiography, and the Politics of Pedagogy in Australia." *Theory & Research in Social Education* 32, no. 3 (2004): 379-96.
- Clark, Anna. *History's Children: History Wars in the Classroom*. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2008.
- Clark, Anna. "Inheriting the Past: Exploring Historical Consciousness across Generations." *Historical Encounters* 1, no. 1 (2014): 88-102.
- Clark, Anna. "Politicians Using History." *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 56, no. 1 (2010): 120-31.
- Clark, Anna. *Private Lives, Public History*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2016.
- Clark, Anna. *Teaching the Nation: Politics and Pedagogy in Australian History*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2006.
- Clark, Anna. "Teaching the Nation's Story: Comparing Public Debates and Classroom Perspectives on History Education in Australia and Canada." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 41, no. 6 (2009): 745-62.
- Clark, Anna. "Whose History? Teaching Australia's Contested Past." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 36, no. 5 (2004): 533-41.
- Clarkson, Chris, Zenobia Jacobs, Ben Marwick, Richard Fullagar, Lynley Wallis, Mike Smith, Richard G. Roberts, *et al.* "Human Occupation of Northern Australia by 65,000 Years Ago." *Nature* 547, no. 7663 (2017): 306-10.
- Collins, Jenny, and Tim Allender. "Knowledge Transfer, Educational Change and the History of Education." *History of Education Review* 42, no. 2 (2013): 112-18.

- Cowie, Russell. "History as a 'Relevant' Subject." *The History Teacher* QHTA State Conference (1996): 39-40.
- Creighton, Ian. "A History of Curriculum Development in Queensland." In *Report of the Review of the Queensland School Curriculum 1994: Shaping the Future*, 76-133. Brisbane: The State of Queensland, 1993.
- Davidson, Rebecca. "History Should Not Be a Thing of the Past!" *The History Teacher* 25, no. 2 (1987): 33-34.
- Davison, Graeme. *The Use and Abuse of Australian History*. St. Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 2000.
- Ditchburn, Geraldine. "The Australian Curriculum: History – the Challenges of a Thin Curriculum?" *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 36, no. 1 (2015): 27-41.
- Ditchburn, Geraldine. "A National Australian Curriculum: In Whose Interests?" *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 32, no. 3 (2012): 259-69.
- Doherty, Catherine. "Forging the Heteroglossic Citizen: Articulating Local, National, Regional and Global Horizons in the Australian Curriculum." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 35, no. 2 (2012): 177-89.
- Down, Barry. "From Patriotism to Critical Democracy: Shifting Discourses of Citizenship Education in Social Studies." *History of Education Review* 33, no. 1 (2004).
- Duhs, L. A. . "MACOS/SEMP Debate in Queensland, 1978: Some Central Issues." *The Australian Journal of Education* 23, no. 3 (1979): 270-83.
- Emmett, Geoff, and Lois Kennedy. "New Times Old Questions: Towards a Clearer View on What Students Learn." In *Australian Association for Research in Education Conference*. Brisbane, 1997.
- Everingham, Christine, Deborah Stevenson, and Penny Warner-Smith. "Things Are Getting Better All the Time?" *Sociology* 41, no. 3 (2007): 419-37.
- Fraser, Lisa, and Lisa Uusimaki. "Making Sense of the Controversy Surrounding the Queensland Studies of Societies & Environment (SOSE) Syllabus." *The History Teacher* 39, no. 1 (2001): 22-41.
- Gilbert, Rob. "Can History Succeed at School? Problems of Knowledge in the Australian History Curriculum." *Australian Journal of Education* 55, no. 3 (2011): 245-58.
- Gilbert, Rob. "Citizenship, Education and Postmodernity." *British Journal of Sociology and Education* 13, no. 1 (1992): 51-68.
- Gilbert, Rob. "Commentary: Social Science Education; Perennial Challenges, Emerging Issues and Curriculum Change." *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 48, no. 2 (2013).

- Gilbert, Rob. "Social Education and the Challenge of Change: A Reply to Dr Cowie." *Queensland History Teachers' Association Newsletter*, 1990, 26-28.
- Gilbert, Rob. "Teaching Australian Society: A Critical Approach." *Social Alternatives* 4, no. 2 (1984).
- Gough, Noel. "No Country for Young People? Anxieties in Australian Society and Education." *The Australian Educational Researcher* 36, no. 2 (2009): 1-19.
- Gray, Ian. "The Decline of Senior History: What Can Be Done?" *The History Teacher* 33, no. 1 (1995): 28-30.
- Gray, Ian. "Government Censorship and History Teaching in Queensland." *The History Teacher* 24, no. 4 (1987): 9-10.
- Gray, Ian. "History Is Not a Social Science: The Latest on Social Education." *The History Teacher* 30, no. 2 (1992): 5-6.
- Gray, Ian. "Is It Really Worth Creating Lists of Important Facts? A Reply to Graham Shipstone." *The History Teacher* 32, no. 4 (1995): 20-22.
- Gray, Ian. "Should We Re-Write History?" *The History Teacher* 32, no. 1 (1994): 14-15.
- Gray, Ian. "Teaching Ethics, History and SOSE." Queensland School Curriculum Council, 2000.
- Gray, Ian. "Teaching SOSE through History and Promoting Chronological Perspectives." *The History Teacher* 38, no. 4 (2001): 27-29.
- Gray, Ian, and Reg Burns. "Legislative Change to Education in Queensland." *The History Teacher* 25, no. 2 (1987): 10-11.
- Griffiths, Tom. *The Art of Time Travel: Historians and Their Craft*. Carlton: Black Inc. Books, 2016.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. "History: Searching for Identity." *The History Teacher* QHTA State Conference (1996): 3-10.
- Grimshaw, Patricia, Marilyn Lake, Ann McGrath, and Marian Quartly. *Creating a Nation, 1788-1990*. Melbourne: McPhee Gribble, 1994.
- Halse, Christine, ed. *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Halse, Christine. "Introduction: (Re)Thinking Asia Literacy." In *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, edited by Christine Halse. Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia, 1-10. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Halse, Christine. "What Makes Asia Literacy a 'Wicked Policy Problem'?" In *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, edited by Christine Halse. Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia, 13-28. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.

- Harrison, Neil. "Country Teaches: The Significance of the Local in the Australian History Curriculum." *Australian Journal of Education* 57, no. 3 (2013): 214-24.
- Haywood, Ben. "Keeping a Date with History." *The Age*, 2006.
- Henderson, Deborah. "The Apology, the Aboriginal Dimension of Australian History and a National History Curriculum: Beginning a New Chapter?" *QHistory* December (2008): 8-22.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Engaging Students in Historical Thinking: Implementing the Australian Curriculum: History." *Primary and Middle Years Educator* 10, no. 1 (2012): 3-11.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Future Directions: Incorporating Studies of Asia." *Discovering Democracy InSite Newsletter*, 2003, 1-2.
- Henderson, Deborah. "History in the Australian Curriculum F-10: Providing Answers without Asking Questions." *Curriculum Perspectives* 31, no. 3 (2011): 57-63.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Introduction to Point and Counterpoint: What Does the Review of the Australian Curriculum Mean for History?". *Curriculum Perspectives* 35, no. 1 (2015): 49-51.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Robert Parkes (2011) Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum after 'the End of History'". *Curriculum Perspectives* 32, no. 1 (2012): 73-4.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Shaping Australia's Future." *AEF News* 11, no. 2 (2002): 22-23.
- Henderson, Deborah. "What Is Education For? Situating History, Cultural Understandings and Studies of Society and Environment against Neo-Conservative Critiques of Curriculum Reform." *Australian Journal of Education* 49, no. 3 (2005): 306-19.
- Henderson, Deborah. "Why Studies of Asia Deserves a Place in Australia's History Curriculum." *EQ Australia, Talking History* Winter, no. 2 (2004): 21-22.
- Henderson, Deborah, Kerry M Mallan, and Cherie Allan. "Desperately Seeking Asia through China: Reading 'China' in the Australian Curriculum: History through Children's Literature." *Curriculum and Teaching* 28, no. 1 (2013): 7-27.
- Henderson, Deborah, and Libby Tudball. "Contested Notions of Civics and Citizenship Education as National Education in the Australian Curriculum." *Curriculum and Teaching* 29, no. 2 (2014): 5-24.
- Henderson, Deborah, and Joseph Zajda. "What Does the Review of the Australian Curriculum Mean for Senior Modern History?" *Curriculum Perspectives* 35, no. 1 (2015): 64-8.

- Herbert, Jeannie. "Ceaselessly Circling the Centre': Historical Contextualisation of Indigenous Education within Australia." *History of Education Review* 41, no. 2 (2012): 91-103.
- Hirst, John. "Our Schools Neglect History at Our Cost." *The History Teacher* 37, no. 2 (1999): 63-65.
- Hoepper, Brian. "Who Says You Can't Change History?" *EQ Australia*, 2004, 13-15.
- Hoepper, Brian, Deborah Henderson, John Fien, Cheryl Sim, Don Alexander, and Peter Bond. "Perspectives: Rigour for Life." *The Courier Mail*, 16 September 2000.
- Hollingworth, Jacqueline. "The Yellow Peril: Race, National Identity and the Chinese in Australia." *Agora* 37, no. 3 (2002).
- Hughes, Colin A. *Images and Issues: The Queensland State Elections of 1963 and 1966*. Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1969.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: The Free Press, 1996.
- Johnston, Ross W. "Why Study History?". *The History Teacher* 33, no. 1 (1995): 25-27.
- Ker, Peter. "Howard Rewrites History Curriculum." *The Age*, 2007.
- Kilmister, Michael, James Bennett, Margot Ford, and Jennifer Debenham. "Treading on Sacred Ground? Confronting the Anzac Myth in Higher Education." *History Compass* 15, no. 8 (2017).
- Korkatzis, Ros. "Sose in the News! Is It Only Paranoia or Are They Really out to Get Us?". *The History Teacher* 38, no. 2 (2000): 38-39.
- Korkatzis, Ros. "Sose: The Continuing Saga." *The History Teacher* 38, no. 3 (2000): 28-32.
- Kühnel, Reinhard. "Beyond the National: Transnational History in Australian Schools 1978-2007." University of Western Australia, 2012.
- Lake, Marilyn, Henry Reynolds, Mark McKenna, and Joy Damousi. *What's Wrong with Anzac?* Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd., 2010.
- Lemke, Jay, L. *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 1995.
- Logan, Greg, and Eddie Clarke. "State Education in Queensland: A Brief History." edited by Department of Education, 25. Brisbane: Policy and Information Services Branch, 1984.
- Macintyre, Stuart. "The Fight for History." *The History Teacher* 36, no. 2 (1998): 13.
- Macintyre, Stuart. "Our Past Need Not Be Written Off as History." *The Age*, 2013.

- Macintyre, Stuart. "The Poor Relation: Establishing the Social Sciences in Australia, 1940-1970." *Australian Historical Studies* 40, no. 1 (2009): 47-62.
- Macintyre, Stuart. "The Rebirth of Political History." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 56, no. 1 (2010): 1-5.
- Macintyre, Stuart, and Anna Clark. *The History Wars*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2003.
- Martin, Bridget. "Debating History in the Australian Curriculum: A Clash of Paradigms?" *Agora* 51, no. 1 (2016): 4-12.
- McAllister, Stewart. "SOSE and Modernity: A Work in Progress." *The History Teacher* December (2002): 26-28.
- Nayler, Jenny. "Inquiry Approaches in Secondary Studies of Society and Environment Key Learning Area." Queensland School Curriculum Council, 2000.
- Pan, Chengxin. "Australia's Self-Identity and Three Modes of Imagining Asia: A Critical Perspective on 'Asia Literacy'." In *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, edited by Christine Halse. Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia, 197-210. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Parkes, Robert J. *Interrupting History: Rethinking History Curriculum after 'the End of History'*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Parkes, Robert J. "Reading History Curriculum as Postcolonial Text: Towards a Curricular Response to the History Wars in Australia and Beyond." *Curriculum Inquiry* 37, no. 4 (2007): 383-400.
- Parkes, Robert J. "School History as Postcolonial Text: The on-Going Struggle for Histories in the New South Wales Curriculum." In *Second World Curriculum Studies Conference*. Tampere, Finland, 2006.
- Parkes, Robert J., and Heather Sharp. "Nietzschean Perspectives on Representations of National History in Australian School Textbooks: What Should We Do with Gallipoli?" *ENSAYOS. Revista de la Facultad de Educación de Albacete* 29, no. 1 (2014): 159-81.
- Peterson, Andrew. "Different Battlegrounds, Similar Concerns? The 'History Wars' and the Teaching of History in Australia and England." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 46, no. 6 (2016): 861-81.
- Phillips, Robert. "Contesting the Past, Constructing the Future: History, Identity and Politics in Schools." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 46, no. 1 (1998): 40-53.
- Quanchi, Max. "Teaching History: Comments from Queensland." *Bulletin (Australian Historical Association)*, no. 89 (1999): 4-10.
- Queensland History Teachers' Association Executive. "Education 2000: QHTA Responds." *The History Teacher* 23, no. 2 (1985): 11-13.

- Queensland Studies Authority. "Modern History: Senior Syllabus 2004." edited by The State of Queensland. Brisbane, 2004.
- Reynolds, Henry. *Why Weren't We Told?* Melbourne: Penguin, 1999.
- Rizvi, Fazal. "Beyond the East-West Divide: Education and the Dynamics of Australia-Asia Relations." *The Australian Educational Researcher* 24, no. 1 (1997): 13-26.
- Rizvi, Fazal. "Learning Asia: In Search of a New Narrative." In *Asia Literate Schooling in the Asian Century*, edited by Christine Halse. Routledge Series on Schools and Schooling in Asia, 56-69. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.
- Roberts, Philip. "A Curriculum for the Country: The Absence of the Rural in a National Curriculum." *Curriculum Perspectives* 34, no. 1 (2014): 51-60.
- Rundall, Kathleen. "Workshop: Past, Present, Future: The Curriculum Dynamic." *The History Teacher* 33, no. 3 (1995): 20-22.
- Rushbrook, Peter. "Introduction to the History of Education Review Special Issue: Centre and Periphery in Histories of Education." *History of Education Review* 41, no. 2 (2012).
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 2003.
- Said, Edward. "Orientalism." In *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, edited by Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan, 873-86. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.
- Salter, Peta. "Defining 'Asia': Refashioning of the Australian Curriculum." In *AARE Annual Conference*. Canberra, 2009.
- Salter, Peta. "Local History; Going, Going...Gone?" *QHistory* (2015): 42-46.
- Salter, Peta. "The Problem in Policy: Representations of Asia Literacy in Australian Education for the Asian Century." *Asian Studies Review* 37, no. 1 (2013): 3-23.
- Salter, Peta, and Jacinta Maxwell. "The Inherent Vulnerability of the Australian Curriculum's Cross-Curriculum Priorities." *Critical Studies in Education* (2016): 1-17.
- Salter, Peta. "Navigating the 'Inter' in Intercultural Education." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* (2016): 1-16.
- Scott, Ann. "The Ahern Committee and the Education Policy-Making Process in Queensland." The University of Queensland, 1984.
- Scott, Ann. "Chapter 8: Education." In *The Bjelke-Petersen Premiership 1968-1983: Issues in Public Policy*, edited by Allan Patience, 131-44. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1985.
- Scott, Ann, and Roger Scott. *Reform and Reaction in the Deep North: Education and Policy-Making in Queensland*. Parkville: University of Melbourne, 1980.

- Sharp, Heather. "Historical Representation of Gallipoli in the Australian Curriculum: What Does a Critical Analysis of Textbooks Reveal About the Gallipoli Campaign?" *Agora* 49, no. 2 (2014): 14-23.
- Sharp, Heather. "What We Teach Our Children: A Comparative Analysis of Indigenous Australians in Social Studies Curriculum, from the 1960s to the 1980s." *Social and Education History* 2, no. 2 (2013): 176-204.
- Shipstone, Graham. "Historical Knowledge and Cultural Literacy." *The History Teacher* 32, no. 2 (1994): 5-12.
- Shipstone, Graham. "The Importance of Content in the Study of History." *The History Teacher* 33, no. 1 (1995): 20-24.
- Smith, Claire, and Rodney Sullivan. "Internationalising the Curriculum: A Case Study in Citizenship Education." *The History Teacher* QHTA State Conference (1996): 69-85.
- Smith, Richard A., and John Knight. "Macos in Queensland: The Politics of Educational Knowledge." *The Australian Journal of Education* 22, no. 3 (1978): 225-48.
- Smith, Richard, and John Knight. "Political Censorship in the Teaching of Social Sciences: Queensland Scenarios." *The Australian Journal of Education* 25, no. 1 (1981): 3-23.
- Stanner, W. E. H. "The Great Australian Silence: After the Dreaming." In *Highlights of the Boyer Lectures 1959-2000*, edited by Donald McDonald. The Boyer Collection, 112-23. Sydney: ABC Books, 2001.
- Stearns, Peter N., Peter Sexias, and Sam Wineburg. "Introduction." In *Knowing Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, edited by Peter N. Stearns, Peter Sexias and Sam Wineburg, 1-13. New York: New York University Press, 2000.
- Stephens, David. "Anzac and Anzackery: Useful Future or Sentimental Dream?" In *The Honest History Book*, edited by David Stephens and Alison Broinowski, 120-33. Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2017.
- Stephens, David, and Alison Broinowski. "Introduction." In *The Honest History Book*, edited by David Stephens and Alison Broinowski, 1-13. Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2017.
- Stockley, David. "Empathetic Reconstruction in History and History Teaching." *History and Theory* 22, no. 4 (1983): 50-65.
- Taylor, Tony. "The Future of the Past: Final Report of the Report of the National Inquiry into School History." Canberra: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 2000.
- Taylor, Tony. "Under Siege from Right and Left: A Tale of the Australian School History Wars." In *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*, edited by Tony

- Taylor and Robert Guyver. *Studies in the History of Education*, 25-50. United States of America: Information Age Publishing, 2012.
- Taylor, Tony, and Carmel Young. "Making History: A Guide for the Teaching and Learning of History in Australian Schools." edited by Lan Wang. Carlton: Curriculum Corporation, 2003.
- Tripcony, Penny. "Would the Real Aborigine Please Stand Up: Changing Perceptions of Indigenous Australians." *The History Teacher*, no. December (1996): 86-88.
- Walker, David. *Anxious Nation: Australia and the Rise of Asia, 1850-1939*. Second ed. New Delhi: SSS Publications, 1999.
- Walker, David, and Agnieszka Sobocinska. "Introduction: Australia's Asia." In *Australia's Asia: From Yellow Peril to Asian Century*, edited by David Walker and Agnieszka Sobocinska, 1-23. Crawley: UWA Publishing, 2012.
- Wertsch, James V. *Voices of Collective Remembering*. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Williamson-Fien, Jane, and Max Quanchi. "Teaching About Asia: Will the Phoenix Rise Again?". *The History Teacher* 29, no. 3 (1991): 6-10.
- Wilson, Bruce. "Against the Postmodern Curriculum." *The History Teacher* 32, no. 2 (1994): 13-16.
- Wiltshire, Kenneth, Marilyn Mcmeniman, and Tom Tolhurst. "Shaping the Future: Review of the Queensland School Curriculum." Brisbane: The State of Queensland, 1994.
- Yates, Lyn. "Revisiting Curriculum, the Numbers Game and the Inequality Problem." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 45, no. 1 (2013): 39-51.
- Yates, Lyn. "What Can Schools Do? Knowledge, Social Identities and the Changing World." Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 2005.
- Yates, Lyn, and Cherry Collins. "Australian Curriculum 1975-2005: What Has Been Happening to Knowledge?" In *Australian Curriculum Inquiry as 'Really Useful' Educational Research: A Symposium*. Brisbane 2008.