

DRO

Deakin University's Research Repository

Pinto, Sarah 2015, Unsettling the revival: Australian historical film as national critique. In Macfie, Alexander L. (ed), *The fiction of history*, Routledge, Abingdon, United Kingdom, pp.118-129.

This is the published version.

©2015, Sarah Pinto

Reproduced with the kind permission of the publisher, Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141801.2015.1053689>

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30076893>

Unsettling the Revival

Australian historical films as national critique

Sarah Pinto

More than 20 years ago, the film historian Robert Rosenstone reflected on the problems and possibilities of history on film. Musing on the direction of the discipline of history itself – at the time deeply enmeshed in the methodological questions and frameworks of the cultural turn – Rosenstone posited film as ‘the great temptation’ for historians. He characterised the medium as offering not only the tantalising possibility of history-making for large audiences, but also the opportunity to tell ‘stories that matter’ to people beyond the academy (1988, 1175). Although Rosenstone didn’t say as much, for me the phrase ‘the great temptation’ has always suggested a kind of danger in doing history on film, as well as possibility. And, indeed, the depiction of the past on screen is a risky undertaking.

The danger of historical filmmaking stems in part from the limitations inherent in the medium of film, particularly when compared with written history, and especially when compared with proper, scholarly historical writing. Most obviously, history told on film rarely does so with the benefit of footnotes or bibliographies, the absence of which can often leave historians uneasy. This is not just because historians are obsessed with minutiae – though in fact most of us are – but also because what is lost is significant. References in historical work are not only a method of pointing towards sources, but also a way of engaging with wider conversations between historians about differing understandings of the past. Without them, acknowledging the interpretive nature of historical work is made much more difficult. This kind of acknowledgement is made even more difficult by the enticing realism of history on film. Historical films are rarely explicitly positioned by filmmakers as a representation or interpretation of the past created by particular individuals for particular purposes. Instead, historical films position their audiences as eyewitnesses to the past, and the visual and aural onslaught of cinema discourages critical and distant observation of what are always interpretations.

Most dangerously of all, however, historical films never simply reflect, interpret or represent the past; they must also fictionalise. Filmmakers might laboriously and lovingly recreate the look and feel of a particular time and place, getting characters, backgrounds, speech, dress and events ‘right’, but they must still turn to invention, supposition and imagination to fill their frames.

Instead of the promise of Rosenstone's 'great temptation', then, we are more often than not left with a kind of history that is worse than no history at all: bad history. At its best, written, non-fictional history offers rigorous and critical investigation and insight into the events, ideas and people of the past based on archival and other documented sources. At its worst, filmic fictional history offers a version of the past that is mythologised, romanticised, and presentist, with little to say about that past and a questionable relationship to historical reality.¹

This is precisely how the group of historical films produced during the Revival of the Australian film industry in the 1970s and early 1980s have been understood. As Ian Craven (1999) noted, there is general agreement on the history of Australian cinema in and since the Revival (1). Much of this agreement centres around the characterisation of the period's historical films, which are usually considered to be blindly nationalistic portrayals of unchallenging and mythologised pasts. Graeme Turner called them 'beautiful, untroubling films' (1989, 104), and they were critiqued by others for lacking both historical and contemporary relevance for their audiences. Individually and collectively, the historical films of this period have often been accused of depicting the past with a cloying sentimentality, choosing nostalgia over history. Jonathan Rayner suggested that the historical films of the Revival 'exploited a briefly popular nostalgia for unchallenging cinema, expressing and encouraging pride in a constructed, communal past' (2000, 63).

It is Susan Dermody and Elizabeth Jacka's (1988) critique of these films that is still the most incisive. Dermody and Jacka called the historical films of the Revival the 'AFC genre', named after the funding body the Australian Film Commission. The AFC was established in 1970 (as the Australian Film Development Corporation) to encourage film production in Australia, and it rapidly increased the number of films made locally. Between 1970 and 1985, almost 400 Australian feature films were made, more than the entire number of films produced in Australia prior to 1970 (McFarlane 1987, 36). The AFC in particular - along with government funding and subsidies more generally - are usually considered to have had a dramatic impact on the tone and content of the films released during this period. Dermody and Jacka argue that the AFC genre is characterised by picturesque and nostalgic 'quality' films dominated by 'morally inoffensive and bland' characters and a troubling engagement with the past (32-33). 'The AFC genre', they write, 'engages "history" as a way of marketing a safe product, inviting gentle nostalgia for a moment seen passing harmlessly under glass' (34). These films thus have little interest in critical history-making, and are instead in the business of settlement:

audiences were to be wooed, reassured, invited to a safe place where no demands would be made beyond feeling with the character, and feeling proudly at home in the setting.

When I first began watching and researching these films, I found myself strenuously agreeing with this characterisation. The historical films of the Revival seemed awash with nostalgic, sentimental and old-fashioned narratives of national foundation and achievement that were more in the realm of myth than history. The past really did appear to exist in these films as background; they seemed to offer history merely as an aesthetic rather than as subject matter. Many of these films also felt strangely disinterested in Australia's past, divorced from both the upheavals of 1970s – and 1980s – Australia and historical scholarship on the times and places in which they were set. Viewed collectively they demonstrated all too clearly the dangers of doing history on film.

This is particularly true of two of the most successful and popular historical films of the Revival, *The Man From Snowy River* (George Miller, 1981) and *Gallipoli* (Peter Weir, 1981). In one sense, these two films are very different. Drawing on a well-known poem by A.B. (Banjo) Patterson, *Snowy River* is set in rural Australia in 1880 and narrates Jim Craig's (Tom Burlinson) attempts to earn the right to live in the mountainous high country in north-eastern Victoria by taming a pack of wild brumbies, along with a 'wild' woman (Jessica, Sigrid Thornton). In contrast, *Gallipoli* depicts the experiences of two young men, Archy Hamilton (Mark Lee) and Frank Dunne (Mel Gibson), who enlist in the Australian Imperial Force during the First World War. These two films are, however, remarkably similar in their storytelling: both are masculine coming-of-age stories that are also clearly commentaries on the apparent coming-of-age of the Australian nation. Perhaps not surprisingly, they are also both intensely nationalist films.

Graeme Turner called *Snowy River* a 'vividly nationalist film' (1989, 41), and it's difficult to read the film's story of Jim Craig 'becoming a man' and earning the right to live in the high country as anything other than a deeply patriotic rendering of the bush legend. *Gallipoli's* story of Hamilton and Dunne's coming-of-age in the glory and tragedy of the First World War is similarly an intensely parochial version of the Anzac legend. As Amanda Lohrey argues, Weir's film is thematically preoccupied with innocence as a way of depicting a 'fashionable and sentimental nationalism' (1982, 29). That these two films, like many of the historical films of the Revival, are interested in the making of the Australian nation is unsurprising; Australian popular culture in the 1970s and 1980s was deeply engaged with the reevaluation of Australian identity that characterised the period (Arrow 2009, 108–84). At a time when Australia's national identity was being reimagined by some around pluralist ideas of multiculturalism, however, *Snowy River* and *Gallipoli* turned to mythologised and triumphalist stories of the making of the (white man's) settler nation to depict Australianness.² True to the reputations of the historical films of the Revival, they are stories about the past that naively affirm and celebrate the Australian settler nation's foundation and achievements (Sheckels 1998, 29).

Snowy River and *Gallipoli*, then, can be positioned as paradigmatic examples of the dangers inherent in the making of historical film. Both draw very heavily on mythologised notions of Australian national identity. Their narratives are

sentimental and romanticised, and their characters highly stereotypical. Although both are set in the past, neither could be called critical historical accounts of the times and places they purport to depict, drawing on myth rather than written histories or archival material to construct their narratives. They have little in common with the new kinds of scholarly history-making that surrounded them in Australia in the 1970s and 1980s as radical changes engulfed the discipline and histories of women, gender, everyday life, and Indigenous peoples became increasingly important.

As my research reminded me, however, *Gallipoli* and *Snowy River* are not the only historical films that were released in Australia during the Revival, and they cannot stand in for the genre. There are numerous other historical films released during this period – both critically acclaimed and disdained, popular and unpopular – that do not engage in such explicitly triumphalist national storytelling. There are histories of women, of violence, and of Indigenous dispossession to be found within these films, all of which function in some way as national critiques. *My Brilliant Career* (Gillian Armstrong, 1979) and *For Love Alone* (Stephen Wallace, 1986), for example, tell stories of women and the emotional life of the past. Based on the semi-autobiographical novel by Miles Franklin (1901), *My Brilliant Career* is the story of Sybylla (Judy Davis), a young woman aspiring to a life beyond the domestic – and a career as a writer – in rural Australia in the 1890s. Also based on a semi-autobiographical novel (by Christina Stead, 1945), *For Love Alone* is set in Sydney and London in the 1930s and narrates the romantic life of Teresa (Helen Buday). Where Sybylla chooses her career over romantic love and domesticity, Teresa chases grand and true love. Both *My Brilliant Career* and *For Love Alone* can be understood as feminist films, as two sides of the same feminist coin: one insists on women's right to live outside the constraints of love and marriage, the other on women's right to love and desire where they choose. Both also make implicit claims for the importance of women's lives as an object of historical study that are very much in keeping with the growing importance of women's and gender history in academic scholarship at the time.

The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith (Fred Schepesi, 1978), *Manganinnie* (John Honey, 1980) and *The Naked Country* (Tim Burstall, 1985) are historical films concerned with the disruption and violence of settler colonialism in Australia, and particularly with the impact of dispossession on Australia's Indigenous peoples. *Manganinnie* is a small but critically acclaimed film set during the Black Wars in Van Diemen's Land (present-day Tasmania) in 1830 and based on the historical novel by Beth Roberts (1979). Mawuyul Yathalawuy plays Manganinnie, who has lost her land and her husband as a result of the Black Line. The film depicts the impact of European colonisation on Van Diemen's Land's Indigenous peoples, and follows Manganinnie as she travels the island with a lost young settler (Joanna, Anna Ralph) in a fruitless search for her lost people. *The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith* is an adaptation of Tom Keneally's historical novel (1972) tracing the Governor murders (Blacksmith in the film and novel) in New South Wales in 1900. *Jimmie Blacksmith* follows its

protagonist's (Tommy Lewis) doomed attempt to move from – or perhaps between – Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australia at the turn of the twentieth century, and is a story of racism, conflict and violence. Tim Burstall's *The Naked Country* is set in northern Queensland in 1955 and is loosely based on Morris West's potboiler novel of the same name (1960). The film charts conflict between a 'landowner', Lance Dillon (John Stanton), and the dispossessed Mundaru (Tommy Lewis), ending in death and destruction on both sides. Neither *Jimmie Blacksmith* nor *The Naked Country* were particularly successful films, although *Jimmie Blacksmith* has sometimes been reclaimed as more deserving of attention and acclaim than it received at the time of its release (Wilson 2007). There are also significant problems with the ways in which each of these films portray Indigenous peoples. But all three trace histories of dispossession, conflict and violence; their portraits of the nation's past are a long way from those of the triumphalist *Gallipoli* or *Snowy River*.

I don't want to suggest in this chapter that the historical films of the Revival are without problems; my aim is not to resuscitate the genre as an example of historical filmmaking as uniquely or even particularly engaged in critical history-making. Rather, I want to suggest that these films, like historical film more broadly, are not as dangerous as they may at first appear. As a group, these films narrate many different versions of the Australian nation and its pasts, often confounding their triumphalist nation-making reputations. Certainly, the historical films of the Revival are, at times, nostalgic, sentimental and triumphalist stories of the (settler) Australian nation and its pasts. But they also, at times, offer a critique of the legitimacy of that nation, most particularly by asking questions about settler belonging. One of the ways these films engage in this project is by suggesting an uneasiness in the relationship between non-Indigenous settlers and the land of their 'settlements'. This uneasiness is sometimes depicted in direct contrast to the comfortable and assured nature of Indigenous ownership of the land, but more often than not this contrast is implied rather than explicitly-drawn.

An uneasiness in the depiction of settler ownership and connection to land is particularly noteworthy given the longstanding centrality of land in articulations of Australian identity and character (White 1981; Elder 2007; Darian-Smith *et al.* 1996; Read 2000; Trigger and Griffiths 2003). Within Australian nationalist discourses, land has often been viewed as both what defines – and is the source of – an 'inexhaustible and ineffable Australianness', to use Ross Gibson's phrase (1994, 51). As Catriona Elder argues, ideas about Australian identity 'have been and continue to be organised around a desire for the land, a fear of others who may claim the land and, as a result of this, a deep ambivalence about belonging to this space' (2007, 6). In the historical films of the Revival, settler Australians are not as often depicted in ambivalence as they are shown to be alienated from a threatening and dangerous Australian environment.

The land of the historical films of the Revival and beyond is frequently a menacing presence. In many of these films, the Australian landscape is not

merely a picturesque background to the main events. Instead, as Ross Gibson argues, land is a central figure, as significant and manipulated as character, plot or narrative (1983, 49). It is perhaps not surprising, then, that almost all of these historical films are set in rural Australia, at least in part, and most begin with widescreen shots of their landscape settings. The Australian landscape's filmic persona, however, is often a threatening one; the terms of this threat might differ between the films, but the threat remains. In many, the threat is suggested by cinematography. In *Jimmie Blacksmith*, for example, 'discomforting close-ups of reptiles and insects testify to the land's menace and alienness', according to Jonathan Rayner (2000, 82). In *Silver City* (1984), Sophia Turkiewicz's story of postwar migration to Australia, Nina's (Gosia Dobrowolska) first glimpse of the Australian bush on her way to a migrant camp is a night-time vision of a forest of gumtrees rendered as blue, stark and threatening: 'they're like trees from another planet', Nina says.

In other films, though, it is plot that suggests threat: the dry, drought-ridden land of Sybylla's family home in *My Brilliant Career* threatens to entrap her in a life of femininity and domesticity, stifling her creative ambitions. In *We of the Never Never* (Igor Auzins, 1982), the narrative centres around Jeannie's (Angela Punch McGregor) move from Melbourne to an outback station in the Northern Territory with her new husband Aeneas (Arthur Dignam) in 1902. *Never Never* is an adaptation of the semi-autobiographical novel by Jeannie Gunn published in 1907. In both novel and film the land is a significant character in the story, but it is also a source of significant danger: Jeannie's move to the outback is depicted at the film's outset as a threat to her femininity and in particular her health, and the film ends with Aeneas' death from sickness. In Tim Burstall's *Kangaroo* (1987), 1920s Australia is an apparent refuge from Europe's old-world woes for Richard and Harriet Somers (Colin Friels and Judy Davis). Based on D H Lawrence's semi-autobiographical novel (1922), *Kangaroo* is in some ways in opposition to the land-obsessed historical films of the Revival, dominated by interior shots and rarely venturing beyond Sydney as setting. When Richard and Harriet leave the city, however, they encounter a threatening and unsettling landscape: walking into the bush, Richard is confronted by armed men, blindfolded, and taken back to the camp of a proto-fascist group led by Kangaroo (Hugh Keays-Byrne), who tries to convert him to their revolutionary cause.

The ever-present danger of the land can even be seen in *Snowy River*. Jim Craig's love interest in the film, Jessica, journeys into the high country in search of Jim but instead finds herself lost, wet, without her horse, and stranded on the edge of a precipice. The often-mythologised land of the high country changes so suddenly', Jessica says to Jim once he has rescued her from the edge of the cliff. 'One minute it's like Paradise; the next it's trying to kill you', she says. Graeme Turner describes 'accommodation within this murderous Paradise' as Jim Craig's 'goal' in the film (1983, 41). And, indeed, by film's end Jim has succeeded in this project. Nevertheless, the land of the high country retains an atmosphere of danger for most throughout the film.

For some of the historical films of the Revival, the land is dangerous enough to induce madness. The bush has long been represented in Australian cultural narratives as a place with the potential to cause insanity (Rowley 1996, 140). As Sue Rowley has suggested, the bush environment can be a 'maddening place' (138), and characters who spend too much time there in these films are vulnerable. The eccentricities of the character of Spur (Kirk Douglas) in *Snowy River*, for example, are in part a result of his extended and isolated stay on the land. Similarly, the shearers of Ken Hannam's *Sunday Too Far Away* (1975) are lost men profoundly damaged by the amount of time spent alone in the outback. *Sunday* is set on a sheep station in the Australian outback in 1955, illuminating both the mateship and the loneliness of the life of the shearer. Many of the film's shearers struggle with gambling and alcohol addictions as well as the culture of isolation that characterised the industry; in some ways they are men who have been broken by the outback.

It is Peter Weir's *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, however, that is most emblematic of the land's menacing and maddening presences in the historical films of the Revival. As Kay Schaffer argues, *Picnic* invokes a 'fear that the land might come to absorb its inhabitants' (1987, 54), and in one sense this is an apt description of the film's storyline. *Picnic* presents the clearest example of the depiction of the Australian landscape as a threat to the settler nation. Based on the 1967 novel by Joan Lindsay, Weir's film narrates the disappearance of three students and their teacher on Hanging Rock in Victoria on Valentine's Day in 1900. For the screenplay writer Cliff Green, one of the attractions of Lindsay's novel was its engagement with the problems of introducing European culture into Australia: 'of these Europeans intruding into this timeless environment and being rejected and in some cases destroyed by it' (cited in McFarlane 1987, 45). Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, the Hanging Rock of the film is a dangerous and unsettling place.

Before *Picnic*'s schoolgirls even arrive at Hanging Rock they are warned by their teacher Mrs Appleyard (Rachel Roberts) of the dangers posed by venomous snakes, poisonous ants, and the Rock itself. Ominously, as one of the girls opens the gates to the Rock's picnic grounds, birds flutter away and their horses are uneasy. Once inside, watches stop, characters are overcome by sleep, and the three girls and their teacher disappear onto – or perhaps into – the Rock. At times, the Rock seems to be attacking its intruders. When the four girls who climb it – Miranda (Anne Lambert), Irma (Karen Robson), Marion (Jane Vallis) and Edith (Christine Schuler) – fall asleep at the base of a large rocky outcrop, ants quickly begin to crawl over their feet and a lizard moves nearby. Edith wakes from this sleep feeling 'awful, really awful'. Later, during the search for the three missing girls (Miranda, Irma and Marion) and their teacher Miss McCraw (Vivean Gray), Michael (Dominic Guard) is overcome by tiredness and succumbs to sleep only to wake covered in cuts and dirt; he is found by Albert (John Jarrett) in an almost-catatonic state after a night spent on the Rock. By film's end, Hanging Rock's menacing presence has reached beyond its borders: a student left behind at the school during the picnic (Sara

Margaret Nelson) falls to her death from its roof and Mrs Appleyard's body is later found at the base of the Rock. For Andrew Tudor, 'we are left with a disturbingly unspecific sense of unease' (1985, 212). But to my mind this unease is directly related to the problem of settler belonging.

Clearly, the characters of Weir's film do not belong in the environment of *Hanging Rock*. The missing schoolgirls and their teacher are devoured by the land of the Rock in what amounts to a warning against the introduction of a settler – and specifically British – culture onto and into the Australian environment. Although the film makes no mention of Australia's history of colonisation, conflict or dispossession, for me the result of these processes is quite clear. In the world created by *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, 'the imposition of foreign (British) institutions upon the Australian natural and social landscape is unwise and unwarranted' (Rayner 2000, 68).

The films I've mentioned above suggest or imply uncertainty in Australian settler belonging by troubling a sense of non-Indigenous ownership over – or even comfort within – the Australian landscape. Other films, however, articulate this uncertainty much more explicitly. In several of the historical films of the Revival, Indigenous characters can be found identifying the alienation of settler Australians from the land they claim to own. In *We of the Never Never*, for example, the film's main Indigenous character, Goggle Eye (Donald Blitner), performs precisely this function. During a discussion of Indigenous land ownership – and the apparent emptiness of the pre-colonial landscape – between Jeannie and Dandy (John Jarratt), Goggle Eye asks: 'If whitefella god made everything, why didn't he make whitefella some bush of their own?' The character of Mundaru makes a similar point in *The Naked Country*, although in much more violent circumstances. From the very beginning of the film, Mundaru understands what Lance cannot: that he will always be alienated from the land he claims to own. 'White man piece of paper says its yours', Mundaru says to Lance, 'but this blackfella country ... You'll never belong to this land – never.' The bushranging film *Robbery Under Arms* (Donald Crombie and Ken Hannam, 1985) includes a scene with a remarkably similar conversation, although under very different circumstances. *Robbery Under Arms* is based on the well-known novel and newspaper serial by Rolf Bolderwood (1888), and follows the adventures of Captain Starlight (Sam Neill) and his bushranging gang in late-nineteenth-century New South Wales. During a conversation between members of the gang about the possibility of leaving the colony for the United States, the Indigenous character Warrigal (Tommy Lewis) is reluctant and incredulous: 'Whitefellas, you got no place of your own. You come here, you go there, not natural ... I belong here. Where do you belong?'

In thinking about these three scenes, I can't help but ask questions of the ways in which, in each case, a film produced by non-Indigenous Australians for an overwhelmingly non-Indigenous audience has Indigenous characters ask questions about the legitimacy of settler belonging and ownership, as if the burden of doing so falls inevitably to Indigenous peoples alone. But, even so, the very fact of this questioning is significant. When placed alongside the

characterisation of the Australian landscape as a place of danger for settler Australians in so many of these films, it troubles the legitimacy of the nation's foundations.

It is little wonder, then, that so many of these films follow characters searching for a place to belong, for a homeland. Ann Curthoys (1999) has written of the pervasive fear of homelessness in contemporary Australian settler culture. It is, according to Curthoys, 'a fear of being cast out, exiled, expelled, made homeless again, after two centuries of securing a new home far away from home' (17). The historical films of the Revival seem characterised not quite by a fear of homelessness so much as the search for home. For the Indigenous characters Manganinnie and Jimmie Blacksmith, for example, their search is for a place to survive and belong in a colonised society, the impossibility of which is demonstrated by the fact both *Manganinnie* and *Jimmie Blacksmith* end with their deaths. In *My Brilliant Career* and *We of the Never Never*, Sybylla and Jeannie seek to define their own place in Australian society, to make their own homelands. Interestingly, it is the historical films set well into the twentieth century that depict characters who are most strongly engaged in the search for home. In *Kangaroo* and *Silver City*, characters migrate to Australia with the intention of creating a new and different home, although some are more successful than others. In *For Love Alone* the reverse is true: Teresa travels back to Britain in her search for belonging.

The Revival of the Australian film industry took place at a time of 'ferment about refashioning the national image' (Curran and Ward 2010, 6). In their discussion of this period of so-called new nationalisms, James Curran and Stuart Ward argue it was a new orientation characterised by a 'pervasive *disorientation*' brought about by the difficulties of constructing a post-British version of Australianness (7). Collectively, I wouldn't characterise the historical films of the Revival as disoriented in their narratives of nation. There is, however, an uneasiness to their nation-making storytelling, and, as a genre, they pose questions of the possibility of settler belonging. The historical films of the Revival are films of their time, part of the search for a new nationalism that Curran and Ward argue remains fundamentally unresolved in present-day Australia. They are precursors to the more deliberately critical and questioning historical filmmaking of the post-Mabo era (Collins and Davis 2004) produced within the historical antagonism of the history wars of the 1990s and early 2000s (Macintyre and Clark 2003).

In a very recent contemplation of historical film's ongoing challenge to the discipline of history, Robert Rosenstone asks: 'what do we want from history?' (2013, 82). I might ask instead: what do we want from historical film? I would like to see historical film in the mode of Natalie Zemon Davis' 'thought experiments', with filmmakers and viewers as collective participants in an interpretation and representation of the past (Davis 2000). Unsurprisingly, then, I want to see historical films that have something interesting to say about the past, that offer a thoughtful version of their time and place. But I also want historians to take more notice of historical films, recognising their power and

reach but also engaging with them as pieces of public and popular history-making. Only then do I think we might stop worrying about the dangers of history on film – or, conversely, insisting on the irrelevance of the genre as a whole – and instead take it seriously as one of the many ways that people represent and engage with the past.

Notes

- 1 The discussions of the two previous paragraphs draw on a range of scholarship on historical film including: Davis 2000; Davis 1987; Grindon 1994; Herlihy 1988; Landy 1996; Landy 2001; Rosenstone 1988; Rosenstone 1995; Rosenstone 2006; Sobchak 1997; Toplin 1988; Winter 2001.
- 2 On the rise of multiculturalism in Australia, and its relationship to articulations of national identity, see: Castles *et al.* 1992; Goodman *et al.* 1991; Hage 1998; Hodge and O'Carroll 2006.

References

- Arrow, Me. 2009. *Friday on Our Minds: Popular Culture in Australia Since 1* Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Bolderwood, R. 1888. *Robbery Under Arms*. Melbourne: The Five Mile Press.
- Castles, S., B. Cope, M. Kalantzis and M. Morrissey. 1992. *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, 3rd ed. Sydney: Pluto Press.
- Collins, F. and T. Davis. 2004. *Australian Cinema After Mabo*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Craven, I. 1999. 'Australian Cinema Towards the Millennium'. *Australian Studies*, 14(1–2): 1–14.
- Curran, J. and S. Ward. 2010. *The Unknown Nation: Australia After Empire*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Curthoys, A. 1999. 'Expulsion, Exodus and Exile in White Australian Historical Mythology'. *Journal of Australian Studies* 23(61): 1–18.
- Darian-Smith, K, L. Gunner and S. Nuttall (eds). 1996. *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia*. London: Routledge.
- Davis, N. Z. 1987. "Any Resemblance to Persons Living or Dead": Film and the Challenge of Authenticity'. *The Yale Review* 76(4): 457–82.
- 2000. *Slaves on Screen: Film and Historical Vision*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Dermody, S. and E. Jacka. 1988. *The Screening of Australia Volume 2: Anatomy of a National Cinema*. Sydney: Currency Press.
- Elder, C. 2007. *Being Australian: Narratives of National Identity*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Franklin, M. 1901. *My Brilliant Career*. London: William Blackwood & Sons.
- Gibson, R. 1983. 'Camera Natura: Landscape in Australian Feature Films', *Framework* 22/23: 47–51.
- 1994. 'Formative Landscape'. In Scott Murray (ed.), *Australian Cinema*, 45–60. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Goodman, D., D.J. O'Hearn and C. Wallace-Crabb (eds). 1991. *Multicultural Australia: The Challenges of Change*. Newham: Scribe.

- Grindon, L. 1994. *Shadows on the Past: Studies in the Historical Fiction Film*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Gunn, Mrs A. 1907. *We of the Never Never*. London: Heinemann.
- Hage, G. 1998. *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. Annandale: Pluto Press.
- Herlihy, D. 1988. 'Am I a Camera? Other Reflections on Films and History'. *American Historical Review* 93(5): 1186–92.
- Hodge, B. and J. O'Carroll (eds). 2006. *Borderwork in Multicultural Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Keneally, T. 1972. *The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
- Landy, M. 1996. *Cinematic Uses of the Past*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- (ed.). 2001. *The Historical Film: History and Memory in the Media*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Lindsay, J. 1967. *Picnic at Hanging Rock*. Sydney: FW Cheshire.
- Lohrey, A. 1982. 'Gallipoli: Male Innocence as Marketable Commodity'. *Island Magazine* 9/10: 29–34.
- Macintyre, S. and A. Clark. 2003. *The History Wars*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- McFarlane, B. 1987. *Australian Cinema 1970–1985*. Melbourne: William Heinemann.
- Rayner, J. 2000. *Contemporary Australian Cinema*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Read, P. 2000. *Belonging: Australian Place and Aboriginal Ownership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, B. 1979. *Manganinnie*. Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Rosenstone, R.A. 1988. 'History in Images/History in Words: Reflections on the Possibility of Putting History onto Film'. *American Historical Review* 93(5): 1173–85.
- 1995. 'Introduction'. In R.A. Rosenstone (ed.), *Revisioning History: Film and the Construction of a New Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 2006. *History on Film/Film on History*. Harlow: Pearson.
- 2013. 'The History Film as a Mode of Historical Thought'. In R.A. Rosenstone and C. Parvulescu (eds), *A Companion to Historical Film*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rowley, S. 1996. 'Imagination, Madness and Nation in Australian Bush Mythology'. In K. Darian-Smith, L. Gunner, S. Nuttall (eds), *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia*, 131–44. London: Routledge.
- Schaffer, K. 1987. 'Landscape Representation and Australian National Identity'. *Australian Journal of Cultural Studies* 4(2): 47–60.
- Sheckels, T. 1998. "'New Wave" Cinema's Redefinition of Australian Heroism'. *Antipodes* 12(1): 29–36.
- Sobchack, V. 1997. 'The Insistent Fringe: Moving Images and Historical Consciousness'. *History and Theory* 36(4): 4–20.
- Stead, Christina. 1945. *For Love Alone*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
- Toplin, Robert Brent. 1988. 'The Filmmaker as Historian'. *American Historical Review* 93(5), December: 1210–27.
- Trigger, David and Gareth Griffiths, eds. 2003. *Disputed Territories: Land, Culture and Identity in Settler Societies*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Tudor, Andrew. 1985. 'The Aussie Picture Show', in Albert Moran and Tom O'Regan, eds, *An Australian Film Reader*. Sydney: Currency.
- Turner, Graeme. 1983. 'Our "Dubious Legacy": Nationalism and Contemporary Australian Film'. *Overland*, 91, May: 38–43.

- 1989. 'Art Directing History: The Period Film', in Albert Moran and Tom O'Regan, eds, *The Australian Screen*. Melbourne: Penguin.
- West, Morris [East, Michael]. 1960. *The Naked Country*. London: Heinemann.
- White, Richard. 1981. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity, 1688–1980*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Wilson, Janet M. 2007. 'Reconsidering Fred Schepsi's *The Chant of Jimmie Blacksmith* (1978): The Screen Adaptation of Thomas Keneally's Novel (1972)'. *Studies in Australian Cinema*, 1(2): 191–207.
- Winter, Jay. 2001. 'Film and the Matrix of Memory', *American Historical Review*, 106(3), June: 857–64.