

History Australia: A Historical Snapshot

Like most journal encounters, my first scan of *History Australia* was a hopeful research expedition in the library stacks. Part-way through a PhD on history education, I was looking for interdisciplinary periodicals that straddled the curious gap between historical studies and history teaching. The *AHA Bulletin* – the predecessor to *History Australia* – had actively pursued topics on history pedagogy and education policy,¹ but I remember being struck by its successor’s ongoing interest in that disciplinary space beyond academic historical research. The Australian Historical Association’s new journal would continue engaging with pedagogy, practice and public history, Marian Quartly outlined in her opening 2003 editorial, alongside refereed empirical scholarship.² Having spent the first year of my PhD basically holed up in the education library, but as a disciplinary outsider, *History Australia* felt like the sort of place where my work might have a ‘home’ of sorts.

When the current editors got in touch about the possibility of writing a review essay to celebrate the journal’s first twenty years, I was chuffed to be invited. Chuffed because I was grateful to the journal for helping me place my own research in its earliest days, and because it was a chance to reflect on that terrain in a deliberate, sustained fashion. More than simply looking up an article or perusing the latest quarterly collection of historical research and argument, here was an opportunity to consider the place of *History Australia* in an ever-increasing chorus of Australian historiography.

• • •

¹ See, for example: AHA Working Party, ‘AHA Submission to the National Inquiry into School History’, *AHA Bulletin* 90 (2000): 49-51; Jan Bishop, ‘A Teacher’s Reply to “Developing a Strategy to ‘Save’ History”’, *AHA Bulletin* 88 (1999): 39-42; Kate Cameron, ‘School History in NSW: A Response to Alan Ryan’, *AHA Bulletin* 88 (1999): 18-21; Ann Curthoys, ‘Thinking About History’, *AHA Bulletin*, no. 83 (1996): 14-28; Nick Ewbank, ‘An ACT Senior Secondary View’, *AHA Bulletin* 88 (1999): 14-16.

² Marian Quartly, ‘From the Editor’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): vi-vii.

History journals are disciplinary time capsules. Like textbooks and syllabuses, their usefulness extends beyond the currency of their content—they're also records of History's life-story. Taken together, their volumes reveal radical breaks, methodological challenges, and changing historical focus across generations of historians. They also expose the inheritance of disciplinary values over time, showing how certain methods and practice endure as others are augmented.

Following the professionalisation of the discipline in the late nineteenth century, university historians gained increasing status as the interlocutors of historical knowledge and practice: qualifications were standardised, archives and libraries were reified as the cornerstone of empirical research, education was systematised in expanding university systems, and historical associations were established that formalised and often nascent historical interests (such as the Royal Historical Society in 1868, the American Historical Association in 1884, and the Australian Historical Society in 1901—although they each represented varying degrees of disciplinary expertise). Meanwhile, historians published the latest works of archival research and source criticism in the pages of specialist academic journals such as *Historisches Zeitschrift* (established in 1859), *Revue Historique* (1876), the *English Historical Review* (1886) and the *American Historical Review* (1895).³ Like other disciplines, History became a whole 'social system', as Greg Dening has explained, with its own set of norms and values, its own mythology as well as methodology. And it developed its own rituals to reinforce that system—like scholarly peer review.⁴

Given their longevity, the backlists of these journals provide insight into decades of historical thought and practice, as well as the questions that guided both. In the 1986 centennial edition of the *English Historical Review*, for example, an Editorial Note explained how the

³ John Burrow, *A History of History* (London: Penguin, 2007), 455–56.

⁴ G. M. Dening, 'History as a Social System', *Historical Studies* 15, no. 61 (1973): 674.

journal had become a historical archive in its own right. Its volumes revealed ‘the ways in which several generations of historians have responded to great and cumulative changes in historical ideas, interests and methods, to the impact of other disciplines on the study of history and to an immeasurable expansion in our knowledge of the past’.⁵ In his memorable 1995 ethnographic essay celebrating one hundred years of the *American Historical Review* (AHR), Dening similarly described the commanding view enabled by looking back over a discipline, with a nod to Foucault: ‘In any archaeology of knowledge, the wrong place to be is on the basement floor. In this sort of archaeology, the only place to be is on top of the deposit. The view is better, for one thing; but, more important, one knows that one is so high only because of all that is beneath.’⁶ Could there be a better way to pick through the ‘sedimentary strata’ of a historiographical genealogy than an archaeological journal dig?⁷ (Or a more qualified person than Dening to do it?) His review is a wonderful study of the discipline’s form—its gestures, omissions, and assumptions—as well as its content. In it, History’s practice also becomes a vital historical source.

Like a good ethnographer, Dening noted significant shifts in the ways AHR answered not only the question, ‘what is history?’ but also, ‘who is a historian?’ While amateur historians were still influential towards the end of the nineteenth century in the US, over the course of the twentieth century they were increasingly excluded from scholarly historical research—with its professional training, qualifications and methodologies.⁸ The experience was similar in

⁵ ‘Editorial Note’, *The English Historical Review* CI, no. CCCXCVIII (1986): 1.

⁶ Greg Dening, “‘P 905 .A512 x 100’: An Ethnographic Essay”, *The American Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (1995): 863.

⁷ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), 5.

⁸ Ian Tyrrell, *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890-1970* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 210. See also: Tom Griffiths, *Hunters and Collectors: The Antiquarian Imagination in Australia* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Brian H. Fletcher, ‘The Royal Australian Historical Society and the Writing of Australian History’, in *Much Writing, Many Opinions: The Making of the Royal Australian Historical Society, 1901-2001*, ed. Alfred James (Sydney: The Royal Australian Historical Society, 2001), 1–6.

Australia, where professional and academic historians enjoyed increasing prominence in the *Journal of the Australian Historical Society*, for example, and also with the establishment of academic journals such as *Historical Studies*, first published in 1940 by the Department of History at the University of Melbourne.⁹

Today, another twenty-five years after Denning's centenary review, disciplinary understandings about 'what is history' and 'who is a historian' continue to evolve. Compare the introductory article in the AHR's 1895 first edition, a defence of Scientific History's democratic principles by William Sloane,¹⁰ with a 2018 editorial note that committed to decolonise the same journal and acknowledged how historical studies had reinforced forms of inequality and authority in the name of 'truth', 'objectivity' and scientific 'rigour'. 'Rather than simply apologize and move on,' wrote Alex Lichtenstein, 'I have come to believe that the AHR should take the risk of confronting its own potential complicity in the inability of the profession to divest itself fully of its past lack of openness to scholars and scholarship due to race, color, creed, gender, sexuality, nationality, and a host of other assigned characteristics.'¹¹

Similar intergenerational change can be seen in Australian History journals. Links between historical studies and the nation around federation and white Australia are clear in the Australian Historical Society's *Journal and Proceedings* in the early twentieth century,¹² as is the research evolution of women's history into feminist and gender history in key Australian

⁹ Fletcher, 'The Royal Australian Historical Society and the Writing of Australian History'; Brian H. Fletcher, 'Australia's Oldest Historical Journal', *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* 80, no. 1 & 2 (1994): 1–23; 'Fifty Years in the Making of *Australian Historical Studies*', *Australian Historical Studies* 24, no. 95 (1990): 171–73. (*Historical Studies* became *Australian Historical Studies* in 1988.)

¹⁰ William M. Sloane, 'History and Democracy', *The American Historical Review* 1, no. 1 (1895): 1–23.

¹¹ Alex Lichtenstein, 'Decolonizing the AHR', *American Historical Review* 123, no. 1 (2018): xv.

¹² Charles Daley, 'The Growth of a Historic Sense in Australia', *Royal Australian Historical Society: Journal and Proceedings* 25, no. 3 (1939): 226–34; K. R. Cramp, 'The Australian Historical Society—The Story of Its Foundation', *Australian Historical Society: Journal and Proceedings* 4, no. 1 (1917): 1–14; Hugh Wright, 'National Archives—Their Meaning and Preservation', *Royal Australian Historical Society: Journal and Proceedings* 4, no. 8 (1918): 425–42; Frank Walker, 'The Beginnings of History—An Evening with Australian Pioneers', *Australian Historical Society: Journal and Proceedings* 1, no. 9 (1904): 173–77. (The Australian Historical Society became the 'Royal Australian Historical Society' in 1918.)

journals several generations later.¹³ The belated recognition of Indigenous histories and forms of history-making by the discipline from the 1970s is also rendered in sustained reviews of *Australian Historical Studies*, *Labour History*, and *Australian Feminist Studies*, as well as the foundation of *Aboriginal History*, first published in 1977.

Take the first issue of *Australian Historical Studies* in 1940, published in the heat of WWII with a foreword that committed the discipline to the principles of Scientific History: ‘there is a positive need in such times to keep alive the standards of objective truth, and, more generally, to contribute in this way to the preservation of civilized values’.¹⁴ Eighty years later, in the first issue of 2020, Lisa Ford and David Roberts’ editorial revealed how some of those values had shifted markedly. While commitment to History’s ethical and democratic potential remained a feature of this academic scholarship, critical new readings of the discipline revealed shifts that implicitly interrogated historical concepts such as ‘objectivity’ and ‘civilized values’, as well as method and form. Outlining their special issue on ‘Aboriginal mobilities’, the editors described how Indigenous knowledges were controlled and parsed in the Australian settler-colonies, and how its archives selectively curated the past.¹⁵ Placed alongside one another, these journal bookends not only reflect changing historical interests and trends over eighty years, but the changing questions successive generations of historians have asked.

¹³ For example: Karin Sellberg, ‘The History of British Women’s Writing, 1970–Present’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 33, no. 95 (2018): 164–66; Zora Simic, ‘What Can Feminist Historians Do With Intersectionality?’, *Lilith: A Feminist History Journal*, no. 24 (2018): 16–25; Jane Carey, ‘Intersecting Currents: Lilith and the Development of Feminist History in Australia’, *Lilith: A Feminist History Journal*, no. 24 (2018): 4–15; Ann McGrath, ‘The Loneliness of the Feminist Historian’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 29, no. 80 (2014): 204–14; Joy Damousi, ‘Does Feminist History Have a Future?’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 29, no. 80 (2014): 189–203; Ann Curthoys, ‘Towards a Feminist Labour History’, *Labour History*, no. 29 (1975): 88–95; Ann Curthoys, ‘Historiography and Women’s Liberation’, *Arena*, no. 22 (1970): 35–40; Martha Bruton Macintyre, ‘Recent Australian Feminist Historiography’, *History Workshop Journal* 5, no. 1 (1978): 98–110; Jill Matthews, ‘Feminist History’, *Labour History*, no. 50 (1986): 147–53; Jill Julius Matthews, ‘Writing Women’s History’, *Refractory Girl: A Women’s Studies Journal*, no. 44–45 (1993): 47–60; Margaret Allen, ‘Feminist History in the Mainstream — an American Conference’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 1, no. 2 (1986): 59–62; Marilyn Lake, ‘Women, Gender and History’, *Australian Feminist Studies* 3, no. 7–8 (1988): 1–9.

¹⁴ ‘Foreword’, *Historical Studies: Australia and New Zealand* 1, no. 1 (1940): 1–2.

¹⁵ David A. Roberts and Lisa Ford, ‘Editorial’, *Australian Historical Studies* 51, no. 1 (2020): 1–3.

All this is to say that studying the genealogy of a journal facilitates a sort of disciplinary self-awareness. As artefacts in their own right, History journals demonstrate that, like the past they study, the discipline itself also changes over time. the discipline is subject to vagaries and trends, is captured by ideals as well as advancing idealism, and it is populated, researched and taught by people *of their time and place*. Until the mid-twentieth century, for example, many Australian histories were ambivalent about the nation's penal origins, and families also famously hid their connections to the convict system. Now, 'the convicts' are a foundational moment in Australian historiography, and the focus of major scholarly journals,¹⁶ as well as being a popular genealogical connection for many Australian. Meanwhile, many colonial histories described in explicit detail the horrors of Australian frontier violence until the late nineteenth century, when those accounts were increasingly replaced with euphemism and vagueness by historians about the 'disappearing race' that endured until the second half of the twentieth century. Tom Griffiths describes these episodes of historical 'silence' in an important article in *Australian Cultural History* in 1987, in which he notes how such historiographical curations change over time.¹⁷ You can see I'm a fan of journal reviews, although I've only attempted one before. In 1999, in my second year History Honours subject at Sydney University, we each had to write a journal review. I chose *Quadrant*—Robert Manne's then recent resignation as editor had attracted significant media interest and I was curious about the politics of Australian history. I have a copy of it still, with thoughtful, critical encouragement from Stephen Garton, the HSTY 2902 coordinator. (Perhaps the fact that I chose to hang onto it as an unconscious act of archiving might be seen as an early indicator of where I was heading professionally?)

¹⁶ See, for example, the *Journal of Australian Colonial History*.

¹⁷ Tom Griffiths, "Past Silences: Aborigines and Convicts in Our History-Making," *Australian Cultural History*, no. 6 (1987): 18–32.

Reading over the essay for this review I can't believe it's only a thousand words long. In my memory it was career-defining: I can still see myself sitting in the stacks of Fisher Library, hunched on a footstool, a volume pressed into my lap as I scanned it for author, article, and audience. I remember enthusiastically discussing the review with my tutors, Catherine Kevin and Zora Simic (who also had stints as Editor and Reviews Editor of *History Australia* years later), feeling like this was what I wanted to be doing. I was struck by *Quadrant's* radical swing across what felt like very political and politicised terrain—from Robert Manne and Raymond Gaita's insistence on the ethical imperative of reconciliation, to a rigid disdain of that endeavour by the new editor, P.P. McGuinness after Manne's resignation.¹⁸ The journal has since retreated even further towards a hard-line stance on Indigenous history—confirmed by recent reviews of the University of Newcastle's digital 'Massacre Map', led by Lyndall Ryan, and Henry Reynolds' book *Truth-Telling: History, Sovereignty and the Uluru Statement*.¹⁹

Reading Denning's AHR ethnography of 1995 brought it all back: the feeling of sitting quietly among long shelves of books and periodicals, lights flickering off with an assertive, final buzz after their allotted time, poring over cloth-bound volumes of a powerful cultural voice in Australia, and seeing the journal becoming increasingly reactionary and partisan over time. I felt like I was witnessing history. Now, I can also see how that exercise gave me context and coverage. It taught me that historians could disagree in the moment, and that historical interpretation changed over time.

• • •

But what happens when a journal review is more snapshot than *longue durée*? Twenty years of *History Australia* isn't several generations. It might only be one. Launched in 2003, thirty years

¹⁸ Raimond Gaita, 'Mabo (Part One)', *Quadrant* 37, no. 9 (1993): 36–39; Raimond Gaita, 'Mabo (Part Two)', *Quadrant* 37, no. 10 (1993): 44–48; Robert Manne, 'The Coalition and the Aborigines', *Quadrant* 40, no. 329 (1996): 3–4; Robert Manne, 'Why I Have Resigned', *Quadrant* 41, no. 12 (1997): 3–4; Padraic McGuinness, 'The Future for Quadrant', *Quadrant* 42, no. 1–2 (1998): 11–14.

¹⁹ Michael Connor, 'The Shoddy Research Behind the Massacre Maps', *Quadrant* 64, no. 10 (2020): 52–55; Michael Connor, 'Resentment History and Cook's Last Secret', *Quadrant* 65, no. 10 (2021): 46–49.

after the establishment of the Australian Historical Association, the journal inherited an institutional legacy from the *AHA Bulletin* (published since 1974). While building on the *Bulletin*'s tradition of publishing relevant news and debates from the profession, *History Australia* also attempted to carve out a new scholarly space for historical research and method.

In the two decades since, it has remained committed to those original aims articulated by Quartly in that opening editorial. *History Australia* aimed 'to reflect the interests, to publish the research product, and to increase the professional self-awareness of all those historians currently making and applying history in the nation and the community'.²⁰ Since then, the journal has continued to publish and review the latest historical research in Australia, as well as consciously engage with forms of public history, practice and pedagogy, and commission reports into the state of the discipline. It has produced an impressive archive of published research, commentary and policy advocacy. If anything, then, I wonder if this review covers a historiographical moment, rather than a succession of them. But in that moment, we're also given insight into what Al Thomson might call a 'social generation' of the History profession.²¹ This cohort of scholars is versed in the fields of labour history, gender history, transnational histories and subaltern studies; it's aware of the selective curation and attendant limitations of the 'official record', as well as the ethical imperative to register and work with environmental, oral, creative and material cultural archives; it recognises that Indigenous forms of history-making extend into this continent's deep history; and it's increasingly interested in questions of decolonisation, as well as the challenges posed by Indigenous knowledges to the History discipline in a settler-colonial state.²²

²⁰ Quartly, 'From the Editor', *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): vi.

²¹ Alistair Thomson, 'Australian Generations? Transformative Events, Memory and Generational Identity', in *Conflicted Pasts and National Identities: Narratives of War and Conflict*, ed. Michael Böss (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2014), 55.

²² For example: Billy Griffiths, *Deep Time Dreaming: Uncovering Ancient Australia* (Carlton, Vic.: Black Inc., 2018); Grace Karskens, *People of the River: Lost Worlds of Early Australia* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2020); Kate Fullagar, *The Warrior, the Voyager, and the Artist: Three Lives in an Age of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020); Tracey Banivanua Mar, *Decolonisation and the Pacific: Indigenous Globalisation and the Ends of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up to*

It's a cohort represented in twenty years of *History Australia*.²³ In contemplating this review, I'm reminded of Leigh Boucher's terrific essay about being among the generation of historians trained *after* the cultural turn, where our historical lens explicitly includes a film of gender, postcolonial and class analysis. Despite the potential for genealogical narrowness, he acknowledges, reading across cohorts of historians offers important insight into the historiographical moment: 'While thinking about the writing of history in generational terms might seem needlessly exclusionary, it also gestures towards the complex processes through which dispositions towards the world are shaped by cultural and political context.'²⁴

That's not to say using the concept of 'generation' here is without problem. For one thing, I'm aware that ascribing a historiographical generation to the last twenty years is a generous generalisation. It has a tendency to smooth over granular differences between historians (for example, those at the end of their careers and those just starting out, those who have been trained and practice in different fields of history, such as oral, environmental, and transnational history, or those who came to feminism from Marxism rather than studies of intersectionality).

Like 'social generations', historiographical cohorts are more complex and nuanced than the term might account for. It's also a reading that might smooth over distinctive changes and

the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism (St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland Press, 2000); Ann Curthoys and John Docker, *Is History Fiction?* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Frank Bongiorno, 'Australian Labour History: Contexts, Trends and Influences', *Labour History*, no. 100 (2011): 1–18.

²³ See, for example: Lorina Barker, "'Hangin' Out" and "Yarnin'": Reflecting on the Experience of Collecting Oral Histories', *History Australia* 5, no. 1 (2008): 09.1-09.1; Melissa J. Bellanta, 'Australian Masculinities and Popular Song: The Songs of Sentimental Blokes 1900–1930s', *Australian Historical Studies* 43, no. 3 (2012): 412–28; Sarah Brown et al., 'Can Environmental History Save the World?', *History Australia* 5, no. 1 (2008): 03.1-03.24; Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'Communing with Magpies', *History Australia* 11, no. 3 (2014): 194–206; A. James Hammerton, 'Oral Testimony and History's "Fabrication"', *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 110–13; Lynette Russell, "'A New Holland Half-Caste": Sealer and Whaler Tommy Chaseland', *History Australia* 5, no. 1 (2008): 08.1-08.15; Zora Simic, 'Butter Not Bombs: A Short History of the Union of Australian Women', *History Australia* 4, no. 1 (2007): 07.1-07.15; Kiera Lindsey et al., "'Creative Histories" and the Australian Context', *History Australia* 19, no. 2 (2022): 325–46; Laura Rademaker, 'A History of Deep Time: Indigenous Knowledges and Deep Pasts in Settler-Colonial Presents', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 658–75.

²⁴ Leigh Boucher, 'New Cultural History and Australia's Colonial Past', in *Australian History Now*, ed. Anna Clark and Paul Ashton (Sydney: New South, 2013), 291.

feel of *History Australia* across generations of editorial collectives. Marian Quartly's initial tenure of the journal (2003-2008) defined its remit. From 2009-2013, History Australia was edited by Penny Russell and Richard White at the University of Sydney, followed by Tomoko Akami, Frank Bongiorno & Alex Cook at the Australian National University (2013-16), Matthew Fitzpatrick, Catherine Kevin and Melanie Oppenheimer at Flinders University (2016-18), Michelle Arrow, Leigh Boucher and Kate Fullagar from Macquarie University (2019-2021), and the current editorial team, which began with volume nineteen in 2022—Kate Fullagar, Jessica Lake, Benjamin Mountford & Ellen Warne from the Australian Catholic University.

Each editorial cohort came with particular emphases and included new features (such as archival reviews, for example, publication statistics, or commissioned autobiographies by notable historians). Each team responded to particular events and policies during their tenure, such as inquiries and government intervention (the 2006 History Summit covered in 4.1), as well as publishing special issues on emerging fields of research—into Aboriginal history (5.2), histories of the senses and emotions (6.2), forms of popular history (8.1) and histories of displaced peoples (12.2).

Importantly, however, these successive editorial periods re-emphasised the remit of the journal, as much as they marked out each editorial periods with distinction: incoming teams re-committed *History Australia* to exploring historical practice and pedagogy, as well as reflecting the diversity of historical research in Australia. In particular, each explicitly grappled with the challenge of remaining committed to showcasing research into Australian history, while also publishing transnational, comparative and international historical research produced in this country. Compare this editorial from the new Flinders University team (Fitzpatrick, Kevin and Oppenheimer), where they emphasised 'The journal's commitment to research into the history of Australia', as well as its obligations to cover global historical research: 'given the discipline

's increasing awareness of the need for transnational and trans-imperial perspectives in the writing of history and the interconnectedness of Australian history with the history of other places, the journal supports the work undertaken by our predecessors and the Australian Historical Association to actively seek out work by historians dealing with histories beyond those of Australia.'²⁵ Three years later, the message from incoming team at Macquarie University (comprising Arrow, Boucher and Fullagar) was just as clear. 'We maintain a strong commitment to publishing the most outstanding research into the history of Australia', they insisted. 'However, the growth in transnational, Imperial and cross-cultural histories means that we will continue the work of our predecessors in publishing historical research that reaches beyond Australia, and to publish research by Australian historians working in other fields.'²⁶

As well as articulating a sense of distinctiveness and direction, the opening editorial from the current team also reflects what we might read as an attempt to define an enduring 'sense' of *History Australia*, reiterating the journal's legacy and committing to publish emerging research. 'Our primary mission is to uphold the quality that previous editors have established', they announced. 'We remind readers that our remit is to publish 'high-quality and innovative scholarship in any field of history''. Our pages reflect the concerns of historians making, teaching, and applying history in both Australia and its region.'²⁷ In other words, the fundamental scope of the journal has remained remarkably secure, which I suggest *invites* a generational reading (while also being mindful of the limitations that approach also presents).

²⁵ Melanie Oppenheimer, Matthew P. Fitzpatrick & Catherine Kevin, 'From the Editors', *History Australia* 13, no. 2 (2016): 193.

²⁶ Kate Fullagar, Jessica Lake, Benjamin Mountford & Ellen Warne, 'From the Editors', *History Australia* 19, no. 1 (2022): 1-2. See also the opening editorials from issues: 1.1, 8.3, 10.2, and 13.2.

²⁷ (2022) 19.1

Maybe that's the value in taking a disciplinary snapshot like this? Ethnographic journal reviews such as Dening's give us a model here: histories produced over the last twenty years reflect diverse and diffuse questions and concerns that reflect our profession's present. And, on reading the entire *History Australia* journal list, I was quickly attuned to the fact that, despite the potential narrowness of a twenty-year journal survey, this period has seen a boom in Australian historical output. For this review alone, I was sent 741 articles (excluding reviews). And as I read over the collection, it became clear that the question wasn't going to be whether twenty years would be 'enough' to mark disciplinary time, but how to discern historiographical patterns in such a diverse and diffuse collection.

How do you find trends amid such a proliferation of research, and gauge the significance of a discrete disciplinary moment? Taking just one issue randomly—Vol. 13, No. 4, 2016—there are articles on the South Australian Premier Don Dunstan's legacy, the oral history of Anangu migration in the 1950s, Alfred Deakin's 1907 defence statement, Industrial Arbitration, the environmental history of the Brisbane River, an 1850s goldfields journalist, Janet Mitchell and Australian internationalism, and food industry print media from 1930-60, as well as a study of tertiary history teaching.²⁸

Finding patterns in such breadth and juxtaposition is a challenge. By way of answer, my method has been part close reading, part sweeping survey. It is qualitative and quantitative,

²⁸ Andrew Junor, 'The Meat and Veg Complex: Food and National Progress in Australian Print Media, 1930–1965', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 474–89; Shannyn Palmer, 'Exodus? Rethinking Histories of Movement and Migration in the Western Desert and Central Australia from an Anangu Perspective', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 490–507; Mark Hearn, "'Compelled by the Circumstance of Our Time and Situation": Alfred Deakin's 1907 Defence Statement as Narrative of *Fin de Siècle* Acceleration', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 508–24; Angela Woollacott, 'The Making of a Reformer: Don Dunstan before the 'Dunstan Decade'', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 462–73; Ian Tregenza, 'Law, Evolution and the Organic State: Intellectual Sources of Industrial Arbitration in Australia', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 525–39; Margaret Cook, 'Damming the 'Flood Evil' on the Brisbane River', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 540–56; Brendan Dalton et al., 'Identifying Another Goldfields Reporter: Frederick Dalton (1815–80)', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 557–74; Fiona Paisley, 'The Spoils of Opportunity: Janet Mitchell and Australian Internationalism in the Interwar Pacific', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 575–91; Leigh Boucher and Michelle Arrow, "'Studying Modern History Gives Me the Chance to Say What I Think": Learning and Teaching History in the Age of Student-Centred Learning', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 592–607.

employing deep discursive readings of key texts along with numerical analysis of larger samples. In short, it employs what might be best described as ‘mixed methods historiography’. I skimmed the entire corpus of articles across twenty years and closely read what I thought to be *History Australia*’s key articles, especially those that pertained to the journal (such as all the editorials and reports from successive AHA Presidents), articles about the state of the discipline (such as teaching and learning, methodology, research, and historiography), and articles about historians’ professional lives (including obituaries, notes, debates, and reflections on practice/career).

Since I received the articles in PDF, I also wondered if some quantitative analysis would add to this initial reading. An online data visualisation tool that generated word clouds and computed key terms might reveal and/or clarify any standout ideas or themes across the journal’s twenty years. To aggregate *History Australia* content, I used the open-access digital analysis program *Voyant*, uploading a selection of issues and articles. I took a both a slice and longitudinal approach to the data analysis. I pushed through whole issues at five-year intervals (volumes 1.1, 5.1, 10.1 and 15.1), as well as 19.1 (since 20.1 wasn’t yet published). I also copied all fifty-eight editorials from 1993-2022 and put them through the *Voyant* PDF reader.²⁹ This process enabled me to complement and contrast my own deep reading of individual articles and see to what extent that corresponded with the most cited key ideas, concepts and terms in this historiographical ‘moment’.

It’s likely that others would have produced different style of review of *History Australia*’s first twenty years. This isn’t a chronological narrative or exhaustive empirical analysis—but I do hope it helps tells the journal’s story in the context of the discipline more broadly. While this intervention might be seen as slightly off-beat, its intentions are serious.

²⁹ <https://voyant-tools.org/> (accessed 30 June 2022). My thanks to Alana Piper for her advice in working with this software.

What follows is my reading of *History Australia* from 2003-2022, prompted by the granular quantitative term lists generated by *Voyant*, and contextualised by several weeks of quiet reading.

'war': 135 mentions

'War' was the highest-ranked historical topic across all 58 editorials, coming above mentions of 'world' (88), 'colonial' (75), 'time' (67) and 'national' (66). At first glance, this is hardly surprising: *History Australia* was launched amid fervent public and professional discussion about the Australia's Anzac legacy. Anzac memorialisation had become increasingly prominent in framing Australia's national narrative and collective memory by successive governments since the 1990s. They have poured literally billions of dollars into the narrative by funding Anzac-related teaching resources and prizes, museum exhibits and war memorials, especially in the lead-up to the centenary of WWI.³⁰ Meanwhile, prominent historians were speaking out about the valorisation of Australia's military history.³¹ As the centenary drew near, both discourses (of academic scholarship and celebratory 'Anzackery',³² to use Honest History's apt term) only accelerated.

History Australia anticipated the significance of this anniversary, with an editorial in 2013 that nudged at the circus of Anzac commemoration, as well as the scholarly prompt such public history would generate. 'The approach of the centenary of the First World War promises

³⁰ Carolyn Holbrook, *Anzac: The Unauthorised Biography* (Sydney: New South, 2014).

³¹ Chilla Bulbeck, 'Aborigines, Memorials and the History of the Frontier', *Australian Historical Studies* 24, no. 96 (1991): 168–78; K. S. Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001); Ann Curthoys, 'Expulsion, Exodus and Exile in White Australian Historical Mythology', *Journal of Australian Studies* 23, no. 61 (1999): 1–19; Joy Damousi, 'Private Loss, Public Mourning: Motherhood, Memory and Grief in Australia during the Inter-War Years', *Women's History Review* 8, no. 2 (1999): 365–78; Bruce Scates, 'In Gallipoli's Shadow: Pilgrimage, Memory, Mourning and the Great War', *Australian Historical Studies* 119 (2002): 1–21; Graeme Davison, 'The Habit of Commemoration and the Revival of Anzac Day', *Australian Cultural History*, no. 22 (2003): 73–82; Graham Seal, *Inventing Anzac: The Digger and National Mythology* (St Lucia, QLD: University of Queensland Press, 2004).

³² David Stephens and Alison Broinowski, eds., *The Honest History Book* (Sydney: NewSouth Publishing, 2017); <https://honesthistory.net.au/wp/anzackery-definition-included-in-the-new-edition-of-the-australian-concise-oxford-dictionary/> (accessed 1 August 2022).

to generate a vast number of historical publications on Anzac, Australian military history, war and society and associated subjects’, Tomoko Akami, Frank Bongiorno, and Alexander Cook wrote presciently. ‘*History Australia* will, we feel sure, play a significant role as a forum for the publication of original research and historically-informed debate on these matters.’³³

By 2015, the centenary of the Gallipoli landing, *History Australia*’s analysis and critique were in full swing. Marilyn Lake’s significant 2014 AHA Presidential Address, ‘1914: Death of a Nation’, was published in 12.1, and built on the work of *What’s Wrong with Anzac?*—a collaboration with Henry Reynolds, Joy Damousi and Mark McKenna.³⁴ Lake argued that World War I had replaced Australia’s social-democratic nation-building narrative with a much narrower Anzac story, and warned that the nation was once again facing a choice ‘between militarism and equality’.³⁵ A suite of articles by leading historians also provided critical re-readings of the war experience internationally.³⁶ Two years later, a special issue on ‘Peace and Patriotism in Twentieth-Century Australia’ (edited by Kyle Harvey and Nick Irving) included a memorable contribution by John Maynard tracing diverse Aboriginal experiences of the Great War.³⁷

Closer reading of the journal also revealed another interesting topic was pushing up ‘war’ in my *Voyant* terms list: the ‘History Wars’. The very first issue of the journal was dedicated to the topic, and after twenty years of sustained public debate about the past now reads like a bit of an omen. Since that opening salvo, *History Australia* has provided significant

³³ Tomoko Akami, Frank Bongiorno, and Alexander Cook, ‘From the Editors’, *History Australia* 10, no. 3 (2013): 5.

³⁴ Marilyn Lake et al., *What’s Wrong With Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History* (Sydney: New South, 2010).

³⁵ Marilyn Lake, “‘1914: Death of a Nation’: Presidential Address Australian Historical Association Annual Conference, Brisbane, 2014’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 23.

³⁶ M. Mehdi Ilhan, ‘Special Feature: Remembering Gallipoli in a Global Context: Turkey’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 25–35; Joan Beaumont, ‘Australia’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 36–42; Peter Stanley, ‘India’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 43–48; Kynan Gentry, ‘New Zealand’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 49–55; Matthew Graves, ‘France and Senegal’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 56–63; Jenny Macleod, ‘Britain and Ireland’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 64–68.

³⁷ John Maynard, ‘Missing Voices: Aboriginal Experiences in the Great War’, *History Australia* 14, no. 2 (2017): 237–49.

space for historiographical analysis dissecting the nature of historical contest and dispute.³⁸ It has featured articles on specific outbreaks of the history wars—in school curricula, museum exhibits and public commemorations, as well as recent transnational discussions of the Black Lives Matter movement and the Statue Wars.³⁹

Perhaps unusually, it also reveals a level of discomfort expressed by historians about becoming embroiled in the debate, as well as uncertainty about how to respond. That the most frequently cited figure in that first issue of the journal was ‘Windschuttle’ (mentioned 60 times), gives an indication of that complex professional interest.⁴⁰ In his President’s Report in volume 1.1, David Carment was strategic in his advice, while noting anxiety and wariness within the AHA: ‘Difficult as it is going to be, historians need to think about and develop some new strategies that take advantage of the widespread community interest in history yet allow for better informed media coverage of historians’ findings and views.’⁴¹

That professional unease remained evident in the journal over the following twenty years. Government vetoes of ARC grants (including several for historians), criticism by the

³⁸ Shayne Breen, ‘Fabrication, Genocide and Denial: The History Crusaders and Australia’s Past’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 73–84; Mathew Trinca, ‘Museums and the History Wars’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 85–97; Chris McConville, ‘Writing Australian History: Fact or Fabrication?’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 98–104; Lyndall Ryan, ‘Reflections by a Target of a Media Witch Hunt’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 105–9; Hammerton, ‘Oral Testimony and History’s “Fabrication”.’

³⁹ Tony Taylor, ‘Neoconservative Progressivism, Knowledgeable Ignorance and the Origins of the Next History War’, *History Australia* 10, no. 2 (2013): 227–40; Anna Clark, ‘Coalition of the Uncertain: Classroom Responses to Debates about History Teaching’, *History Australia* 4, no. 1 (2007): 12.1-12.12; Jenny Gregory, ‘At the Australian History Summit’, *History Australia* 4, no. 1 (2007): 10.1-10.5; Guy Hansen, ‘Telling the Australian Story at the National Museum of Australia: “Once upon a Time...”’, *History Australia* 2, no. 3 (2005): 90.1-90.9; Alessandro Antonello, ‘Monumental Geo-Politics: Ocean, Land and Captain Cook in Interwar Australia’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 753–67; Sean Scalmer, ‘The Movement and Its Monument: Victorian Labour’s Tribute to the Eight-Hour Day’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 768–81; Nancy Cushing, ‘#CoalMustFall: Revisiting Newcastle’s Coal Monument in the Anthropocene’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 782–800; Penelope Edmonds, ‘Monuments on Trial: #BlackLivesMatter, ‘Travelling Memory’ and the Transcultural Afterlives of Empire’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 801–22; Nathan Sentance, ‘Remembering, Re-Storying, Returning’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 823–29; Stephen Gapps, ‘Keep Them, Counter Them or Tear Them down? Statues, Monuments and the Smoothing over of Historical Injustices’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 830–36.

⁴⁰ Keith Windschuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Vol. 1, Van Diemen’s Land 1803-1847*, vol. 1 (Paddington, NSW: Macleay, 2002); Robert Manne, *Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle’s Fabrication of Aboriginal History* (Melbourne: Black Inc., 2003); Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars* (Carlton: Melbourne University Press, 2003).

⁴¹ David Carment, ‘From the President’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): iv.

Institute for Public Affairs on the teaching of History, and the introduction of funding mechanisms and policies that penalise humanities students, all contributed to a sense of a discipline under attack. Questions about how to strategically respond to those attacks—how to ‘war-game’ the history wars—in turn prompted a fascinating series of responses and sentiment from the profession over twenty years of *History Australia* about the role and function of History in Australia.⁴² Several pieces map out a disciplinary defense for History that reach beyond the narrow political dimension of the history wars. A 2013 article by the History educationist Tony Taylor explored the epistemological aspects of the school history wars. While primarily framed as political disputes, he notes how these historical debates are as much a contest over the civic purpose of History, as they are partisan-political.⁴³ A roundtable published in 2021 (18.4) on the ‘Statue Wars’ also highlighted the complex temporal and geographical interconnectedness of this contested historical moment beyond the simplistic left-right politics that characterises their public manifestation. It’s a collision between local and global, in Penny Edmonds’ analysis, where #BlackLivesMatter and anti-slavery intersect with #ChangeTheDate and Australian truth-telling.⁴⁴

‘New’: 165 mentions

That ‘new’ was cited more than ‘university’ (141), ‘editor’ (127), ‘historians’ (122) and ‘research’ (109), instantly piqued my interest. What exactly is ‘new’ in *History Australia*? Some clues were obvious: as a settler-colony, the apparent *newness* of this continent can be

⁴² Angela Woollacott, ‘From the President’, *History Australia* 12, no. 1 (2015): 1–2; Melanie Oppenheimer, Matthew P. Fitzpatrick, and Catherine Kevin, ‘From the Editors’, *History Australia* 14, no. 1 (2017): 3–5; Joy Damousi, ‘From the President’, *History Australia* 16, no. 1 (2019): 1–2; Paul Sendziuk and Martin Crotty, “‘Fragmented, Parochial, and Specialised’?: The History Curriculum in Australian and New Zealand Universities”, *History Australia* 16, no. 2 (2019): 239–65.

⁴³ Tony Taylor, ‘Neoconservative Progressivism, Knowledgeable Ignorance and the Origins of the Next History War’, *History Australia* 10, no. 2 (2013): 227–240.

⁴⁴ Penelope Edmonds, ‘Monuments on trial: #BlackLivesMatter, “travelling memory” and the transcultural afterlives of empire’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 801–822

found in all manner of topics. There were certainly a lot of references to New Zealand and New South Wales—hardly surprising in a History journal based in Australia. But the very label is instructive, nonetheless, reminding us how the continent was once imagined and positioned in relation to the ‘old world’.

Closer reading of the *Voyant* data, along with re-reading my journal notes, also picked up nuances and emphases in *History Australia*’s reference to the ‘new’. In particular, it highlighted how the journal consistently pointed to ‘new research’, as well as associated concepts, such as ‘fresh interpretations’ and ‘new readings’ of the past, along with ‘new directions’ in method and approach. In doing so, it also revealed a curious relationship between newness and reiteration in historical research. A symposium organised by David Lowe and Sharon Crozier-De Rosa on new ‘Nationalism and Transnationalism in Australian Historical Writing’ locates the field within longstanding research into colonial historiography, histories of empire and comparative history), while also recognising the distinctiveness of transnational readings—of imperialism, empire and even nationalism.⁴⁵

The journal’s role in publishing new work is also worth mentioning here, given its commitment to publishing special issues and roundtables on the emerging fields of environmental history, histories of disability and health, and histories of the senses.⁴⁶ Articles on new ways of archiving (including digital histories),⁴⁷ as well as new forms of pedagogy and new methods of research (such as Indigenous knowledges and approaches) also provide thoughtful interventions to disciplinary practice.⁴⁸ Meanwhile, research into Deep History offers a distinct reimagination of Australia’s settler-colonies: ‘The New World has become

⁴⁵ Sharon Crozier-De Rosa & David Lowe, ‘Introduction’, *History Australia* 10, no 3 (2013): 7-11.

⁴⁶ Brown et al., ‘Can Environmental History Save the World?’; Catharine Coleborne and James Dunk, ‘From the Margins: Madness and History in Australia’, *History Australia* 19, no. 1 (2022): 3–12; Penny Russell and Richard White, ‘From the Editors’, *History Australia* 6, no. 2 (2009): 34.1-34.1.

⁴⁷ Tomoko Akami, Frank Bongiorno, and Alexander Cook, ‘From the Editors’, *History Australia* 11, no. 3 (2014): 4–8.

⁴⁸ Barker, “‘Hangin’ Out” and “Yarnin’”.

Old', Billy Griffiths cogently observed in his history of Australian archaeology.⁴⁹ Research into Australian history's *durée*, has been one of the newest research directions explored in the pages of *History Australia*.⁵⁰

Action: 294 mentions

This was another interesting one. On first glance, 'action' was embedded in several URLs relating to the publisher, Taylor and Francis, and the article cache. It's a non-term, really. But drilling down through the editorial corpus led me to 'action' initiated by the AHA and the editors. In fact, what shines through in this collection is a strong sense of disciplinary citizenship from the AHA, which repeatedly calls for action and takes action: the Association produced several major reports into the state of tertiary teaching and postgraduate studies during this twenty-year period, as well as making submissions to government inquiries and policies (such as the 2005 National History Summit, the 2019 Tune Review of the National Archives of Australia, the 2021 Review by ACARA of the Australian Curriculum and the 2022 National Cultural Policy).⁵¹ This represents just a fraction of the Association's advocacy work, much of which is shared in the pages of *History Australia*.

In addition to this professional support and representation is the increasing presence of historical activism in the journal, which is also a distinct type of action. In the wake of catastrophic fires in the summer of 2019-20, floods in 2020-21, and violent university

⁴⁹ Griffiths, *Deep Time Dreaming: Uncovering Ancient Australia*, 2.

⁵⁰ Rademaker, 'A History of Deep Time: Indigenous Knowledges and Deep Pasts in Settler-Colonial Presents'; Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 14, no. 1 (2017): 1-2; Katie Holmes, Andrea Gaynor, and Ruth Morgan, 'Doing Environmental History in Urgent Times', *History Australia* 17, no. 2 (2020): 230-51; Joy Damousi, 'From the President', *History Australia* 15, no. 4 (2018): 633-34.

⁵¹ <https://theaha.org.au/about-the-aha/advocacy/> (accessed 1 August 2022). See also: Sendziuk and Crotty, "'Fragmented, Parochial, and Specialised'"; Adele Nye et al., 'Historical Thinking in Higher Education: Staff and Student Perceptions of the Nature Of Historical Thinking', *History Australia* 6, no. 3 (2009): 73.1-73.16; Millar Carly and Mark Peel, 'Canons Old and New? The Undergraduate History Curriculum in 2004', *History Australia* 2, no. 1 (2005): 14.1-14-13; Carly Millar and Mark Peel, 'Vocational Ventures and Robust Independence: A Review of Honours and Postgraduate Programs in History', *History Australia* 4, no. 2 (2007): 45.1-45.12.

restructuring during the Covid pandemic, questions of how historians might comprehend and respond were prominent. Rolling crises prompted critical interventions from the profession.

‘What are our responsibilities in the face of cataclysmic change?’, Yves Rees and Ben Huf ask, in the introduction to a special issue on ‘doing History in Urgent Times’.⁵² For a start, they implore, historians are required ‘to provide stories that will furnish the basis of an entirely reimagined political, social and economic order’.⁵³ Archie Thomas, Hannah Forsyth and Andrew Bonnell call on historians to build ‘cultures of solidarity’ in response to increasing precarity in the profession.⁵⁴ Tamson Pietsch and Frances Flanagan urge historians to ‘turn their special focus to the kinds of questions our times demand. The great task—regardless of period or specialism—is to see the ecological, social and political realms as entwined and to draw out the links between knowledge, action, change and its limits.’⁵⁵ There’s clearly a sense here that historians’ *action* has an important role in helping shape a better future.

‘https’: 599 mentions

At one level, this is a simplistic numerical aggregation. In a PDF on which the cover page is a document identifier, with URL and publisher information, of course ‘https’ will appear in a crude quantification of terms. Other digital monikers were similarly high-achievers in my *Voyant* list: ‘tandfonline’ had 549 mentions, topping even ‘Australia’ with 537. Close behind were ‘10.1080’ (376) and ‘doi’ (318).

As well as being pretty rudimentary, measuring these terms fleshes out the historiographical moment of my analysis. The obvious point here is physical: you don’t *sit* in

⁵² Yves Rees and Ben Huf, ‘Doing History in Urgent Times: Forum Introduction’, *History Australia* 17, no. 2 (2020): 226.

⁵³ Yves Rees and Ben Huf, ‘Training Historians in Urgent Times’, *History Australia* 17, no. 2 (2020): 277.

⁵⁴ Archie Thomas, Hannah Forsyth, and Andrew G. Bonnell, “‘The Dice Are Loaded’: History, Solidarity and Precarity in Australian Universities”, *History Australia* 17, no. 1 (2020): 21–39.

⁵⁵ Tamson Pietsch and Frances Flanagan, ‘Here We Stand: Temporal Thinking in Urgent Times’, *History Australia* 17, no. 2 (2020): 269.

the stacks anymore. Just comparing my own two experiences of journal reviewing illustrates the profundity of this change. The first was researched using entirely printed volumes in the library. The other was a compressed Zip file with hundreds of articles—I never even left my desk.

In that digital revolution, research itself has been revolutionised. The convenience is extraordinary, as is the capacity to do quantitative readings of our material (as this review demonstrates). In a talk to the AHA conference in 2004, Marian Quartly pointed to some of the new possibilities of this digital publishing revolution: ‘I imagined a time when readers would access primary and second-ary sources not as footnotes but as complete texts. I spoke of history directly informed by the evidence of image and sound: of research illustrated by video clips; of oral histories where a mouse-click would bring the sound of the subject’s voice.’ When Quartly partnered *History Australia* with Monash University e-Press for its second volume the following year, she described how the the move would ‘bring history in Australia into this new historiographical moment’.⁵⁶

On the other hand, what might we miss by not sitting in libraries, surrounded by the adjacent texts, and researchers, we might stumble upon? We forego the text’s very texture—its changing fonts, and paper, its underlined passages, readers’ annotations and even smell. This vast digitisation, epitomised by ‘https’ in my *Voyant* terms list, has been democratising for research access (especially for those working in international archives, with disabilities, or perhaps carer responsibilities), but it also raises questions about what research might be inadvertently prioritised and promoted.⁵⁷

Such questions are explicitly addressed in the pages of *History Australia*, with articles and editorials that explore some of the challenges of the digital turn, as well as its obvious

⁵⁶ Marian Quartly, ‘From the Editor’, *History Australia* 2, no. 1 (2005): 2-1.

⁵⁷ Mike Jones, ‘The Temple of History: Historians and the Sacralisation of Archival Work’, *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 676–93.

possibilities.⁵⁸ A special section devoted to the National Library of Australia's Trove database in issue 18.4 highlights recent research and new digital methods of analysis, enabling archival searches to populate and expand extant research with additional data, as well as making them more accessible.⁵⁹ 'This digitisation has changed the way many of us do research', Lynette Russell explained in her President's Report in 15.2.⁶⁰ In the subsequent issue, her support was also tempered with advice: 'Over the next years many of us will need not only to be advocates for our discipline but also advocates for the very infrastructure and resources we require to be good historians.'⁶¹

That digital terminology also implicitly gestures towards increasingly quantifiable research markers for academics, however. This is a game of publication points and citation metrics, with the challenge of evaluating quality thrown in for good measure, as Robert Cribb's lengthy discussion of History journal rankings explores.⁶² As well as opening up new possibilities for research, digitisation has also streamlined methods of outputs measurement and scrutiny.

'history': 774 mentions

⁵⁸ Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 457–58; Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 15, no. 2 (2018): 211–13; Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 15, no. 3 (2018): 395–96; Angela Woollacott, 'From the President', *History Australia* 13, no. 3 (2016): 317–18; Akami, Bongiorno, and Cook, 'From the Editors', January 2014.

⁵⁹ Tim Sherratt, 'More than Newspapers', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 837–40; Shurlee Swain et al., 'Trove and the History of Childhood – Combining Microhistory and Big Data', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 840–45; Lyndall Ryan, 'Newspaper Evidence of Colonial Frontier Massacres in Australia', *History Australia*, 18, no. 4 (2021): 845–849; James Keating, 'Say Her Name: Madge Donohoe and the Promise and Problems of Using Trove to Write Australian Suffrage Histories', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 849–52; Paul Kiem, 'Use of Trove in School History Classes', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 853–55; Lauren Pikó and André Brett, 'Trove, Disability, and Researching History: Or, Digital Materialism for Precarious Times', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 855–58; George Bishi et al., 'A Trove for Historians of Africa: Reflections from the International Studies Group and Research Associates', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 858–63; Brett Holman, '@TroveAirRaidBot, a 24/7/365 Research Assistant', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 863–67.

⁶⁰ Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 15, no. 2 (2018): 211.

⁶¹ Russell, 'From the President', 15, no. 3 (2018).

⁶² Robert Cribb, 'Developing a Quality Ranking for History Journals in Australia', *History Australia* 15, no. 3 (2018): 591–611.

In a journal with ‘history’ in the title, it’s no surprise this was the most common term in the editorial corpus. Yet its top position on the terms list is more than just nominal. As a collection, *History Australia*’s articles and editorials provide significant representation of historical research undertaken in Australia since 2003. A quick scan of the journal’s contents pages shows how much Australian history is contained in the journal, as well as enduring editorial conversations about how best to encourage and represent non-Australian research topics.⁶³

As well as publishing recent research in the discipline, *History Australia* has also helped define it. Consideration of the architecture of disciplinary practice—of teaching and learning, access to resources, higher education policy, and the role and function of History—is prominent across the collection, and could sustain a review in its own right, I suspect.

Scholarship on Teaching and Learning, or History SOTL (the acronym makes a few appearances, so I thought it was worth referencing here),⁶⁴ is a recurring and productive topic of analysis in *History Australia*. Mark Peel and Carly Millar explore the history canon in 2.1 (2005) and review honours and postgraduate programs in 4.2 (2007), Martin Crotty and Erik Eklund contemplate History programs in relation to pre-service teaching in 3.2 (2006), while Tyson Retz and Stuart Macintyre reflect on the ‘idea’ of honours in 15.4 (2018).⁶⁵ Adrian Jones contemplates the history of the History essay in 14.1 (2017), and Alison Holland presents a fascinating reflection on teaching Aboriginal history at tertiary level in 15.1 (2018).⁶⁶ Articles

⁶³ See, for example, Quartly, ‘From the Editor’, vii, in which she writes: ‘The articles provide a good cross-section of the best research currently being done in Australia, with one important exception. It proved impossible in the time available to obtain an article dealing with a non-Australian research area. I am keen to publish such material, and would welcome contributions from scholars in non-Australian fields.’ And in: Tomoko Akami, Frank Bongiorno, and Alex Cook, ‘From the Editors’, *History Australia* 10, no. 2 (2013): 3–5.

⁶⁴ Sean Brawley, ‘The Internationalisation of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: The Formation of Historysotl’, *History Australia* 4, no. 2 (2007): 46.1–46.10. See also: Leigh Boucher and Michelle Arrow, ‘“Studying Modern History Gives Me the Chance to Say What I Think”: Learning and Teaching History in the Age of Student-Centred Learning’, *History Australia* 13, no. 4 (2016): 592–607.

⁶⁵ Carly and Peel, ‘Canons Old and New?’; Millar and Peel, ‘Vocational Ventures and Robust Independence’; Martin Crotty and Erik Eklund, ‘History as Service Teaching Possibilities and Pitfalls’, *History Australia* 3, no. 2 (2006): 47.1–47.10; Tyson Retz and Stuart Macintyre, ‘The Honours Conception of History’, *History Australia* 15, no. 4 (2018): 804–22.

⁶⁶ Adrian Jones, ‘A History of the History Essay: Heritages, Habits and Hindrances’, *History Australia* 14, no. 1 (2017): 115–32; Alison Holland and with contributions from Chloe Hayward-Anderson, Jeremy Mayes and

by Kathleen Neal and Kat Ellinghaus on ways of teaching—through sources and object-based-learning—also prompt important questions about the state of the field.⁶⁷ Even the juxtaposition of Adele Nye’s study of historical thinking and Tom Griffiths’ contemplation of the historical imagination in 13.2 demonstrates a constant curiosity and engagement with pedagogy and practice.⁶⁸

It’s worth noting how important this inclusive interest in both historical practice and pedagogy is to the feel and character of *History Australia*, when the two are frequently siloed in universities and scholarship. The journal provides a vital space to observe and discuss our own practice as history educators, public commentators and advocates for the discipline, as well as researchers.

Yet ‘history’ is also more than just a topic in this collection. Even though *History Australia* has only been around for twenty years, there’s a very strong historicity to this journal. Its disciplinary memory is long and deep: articles reach into History’s past and the lives of historians give vital accounts of disciplinary change over time. From Richard Waterhouse’s history of the History department at the University of Sydney, to George Parsons’ colourful reflections on the Macquarie University History Department in the 1970s, there is a real sense of the profession’s changing present.⁶⁹ Even Claire Wright and Simon Ville’s history of the departmental tea-room brings vivid sense of institutional change, and a golden age now long gone.⁷⁰

David Sanders, ‘Teaching and Learning Indigenous History in Comparative and Transnational Frame: Lessons from the Coalface’, *History Australia* 15, no. 1 (2018): 151–72.

⁶⁷ Katherine Ellinghaus et al., ‘Object-Based Learning and History Teaching: The Role of Emotion and Empathy in Engaging Students with the Past’, *History Australia* 18, no. 1 (2021): 130–55; Kathleen B. Neal and Nicholas Ferns, ‘Primary Sources, Pedagogy and the Politics of Tertiary History in Australia’, *History Australia* 19, no. 2 (2022): 363–80.

⁶⁸ Nye et al., ‘Historical Thinking in Higher Education’; Tom Griffiths, ‘History and the Creative Imagination’, *History Australia* 6, no. 3 (2009): 74.1-74.16.

⁶⁹ Richard Waterhouse, ‘History at Sydney’, *History Australia* 1, no. 1 (2003): 140–45; George Parsons, ‘Clio’s Language War: Ancient and Modern Historians at Macquarie University in the 1970s’, *History Australia* 5, no. 3 (2008): 79.1-79.14.

⁷⁰ Claire Wright and Simon Ville, ‘The University Tea Room: Informal Public Spaces as Ideas Incubators’, *History Australia* 15, no. 2 (2018): 236–54.

Life stories further populate that institutional and disciplinary narrative: personal reflection and memoir from Jan Kociumbas, Marian Quartly, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Chips Sowerwine and Wilfred Prest confirm what many of us love about studying and teaching History.⁷¹ They also confer lovely anecdotes of special teachers and texts that propelled these would-be historians into their chosen profession. It's here that we get to the heart of History's pull—how it can be ethical, as well as nurturing. Beyond any simple aggregation of terms, *History Australia* shows that History can be a life's work, as well as 'what happened'. In a wonderful reflective piece, Alan Atkinson puts this sentiment into words: 'Whatever the reasons, the question of conscience is now at the forefront of what I am doing as a historian.'⁷²

Disciplinary life stories are also touchingly remembered in the journal's obituaries. The passing of historians such as Geoffrey Bolton (12.3) and Jill Roe (14.2, 14.4) are marked with sadness and attentiveness, as are Michelle 'Mickey' Dewer (14.3), Beryl Rawson (7.3), Noel McLachlan (4.1), Donald Baker (4.1), John Ritchie (3.2), Alan Macbriar (2.3), and Eleanor Kerr (2.1). Perhaps the one that stood out most for me was Lynette Russell's tribute to Tracey Banivanua-Mar in 2017: 'We have lost one of the brightest stars our profession has known. Tracey was a scholar of singular brilliance. Her work, deeply and profoundly engaged, was like her person—subtle, strong, elegant and generous.'⁷³

Reading these life stories produced a sense of multiple generations, stories and disciplinary identities *beyond* the twenty years of *History Australia*. While the journal might represent just one 'historiographical generation', the collection includes decades of disciplinary genealogy. A powerful sense of Australian History's *history*, as well as its present, emerges in this collection and will no doubt continue to do so.

⁷¹ Jan Kociumbas, 'My Life in History', *History Australia* 18, no. 4 (2021): 737–46; Marian Quartly, 'My Life in History', *History Australia* 10, no. 3 (2013): 252–63; Chakrabarty, 'Communing with Magpies'; Charles Sowerwine, 'The Making of a Historian: Class, Race and the Other', *History Australia* 16, no. 2 (2019): 399–409; Wilfrid Prest, 'Clio and I', *History Australia* 13, no. 1 (2016): 160–69.

⁷² Alan Atkinson, 'The I in the Past', *History Australia* 15, no. 3 (2018): 586.

⁷³ Lynette Russell, 'From the President', *History Australia* 14, no. 4 (2017): 512.

Acknowledgements:

My thanks to Alana Piper for her assistance and advice in working with the data-analytics software. I'm also immensely grateful to Alecia Simmonds for feedback on an early draft, as well as the critically-engaged comments from two anonymous referees.