

***The Times, They Are a-Changin'***

**Gough Whitlam**

Gough Whitlam was a turning point in the history of Australia, bringing an end to Labor's twenty-three year oppositional role and going on to implement legislative, party and cultural change, a feat still remembered today. However, continuous Senate obstruction and mistakes on the Government's part led to one of the most memorable and contested moments in Australian politics. Whitlam was an exponent of change, more often than not the changes proved to have a positive impact, however sometimes the benefits were not always explicit. The varying interpretations of the Government's affect on Australia, as well as the inevitable political deadlock between Whitlam's Government and the Opposition, eventually led then Governor General of Australia Sir John Kerr to do what had never been attempted in the nation's history and, in November 1975, the Prime Minister of Australia was dismissed. The memory of the Whitlam Government is now celebrated among some; however, in the perspective of history the 11<sup>th</sup> of November 1975 gave Remembrance Day a new meaning to politics, but especially to the man that was hitherto commonly believed to be the most powerful man in Australia.

Gough Whitlam proved to be a breath of fresh air to the Labor Party as it stood in 1945, the year Whitlam joined the party, providing a new discourse of diversity, equality and, primarily, change. Whitlam recognised the challenge when he joined the Australian Labor Party (ALP) as a well educated man, differing to most ALP members, who were mainly of working class descent; he saw the Party was unfit for rule and needed a new belief system. A biographical quote from Whitlam in Hocking supports this, with Whitlam stating, "the ALP was racist before it was radical" (Whitlam, G. in Hocking, J. (2008) pp. 205). When Whitlam was voted in as leader of the Opposition in 1967, succeeding Arthur Calwell, there is still evidence supporting the view that Labor, and indeed policy, needed to change. Corroborating the continuity of this belief are nationalism supporters Alomes, S. and Jones, C., which quote a 1972 political speech, wherein Whitlam said, "we cannot afford to limp along with men whose attitudes are rooted in the slogans of the 1950's – the slogans of fear and hate" (Whitlam, G. in Alomes, S. and Jones, C. (1991) pp. 352). After the victory of the Labor Government in the 1972 election change occurred almost instantaneously, with the formation of a duumvirate between Whitlam and his Deputy Lance Barnard. During this time, approximately forty significant decisions were made, including the release of conscientious objectors to the Vietnam War from prison, the withdrawal of remaining forces from Vietnam and the recognition of a communist People's Republic of China. Whitlam brought about swift change, providing a new sense of reform for Australia, and went on to produce some major legislative change, some of which with unprecedented historical value.

Three of the major reforms of the Whitlam Government were the introduction of the 'needs principle,' the initiation of various policies regarding Indigenous Australians and the assumption of full Federal responsibility for tertiary education. The needs principle ended the sectarian debate on State and Federal funding of private schools. Until Gough Whitlam came into power, the Federal Government used a uniform system of per capita grants to private schools, a practice former Education Minister Malcolm Fraser championed. Whitlam abolished this policy, introducing a system that would give funding to both public and private schools based on need; in order to determine this need, the Australian School's Commission was created. Whitlam foresaw these changes as far back as the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 1951, the date on which Gough Whitlam spoke in the House of Representatives

regarding education for the first time. During this speech he said that, “the Commonwealth will gradually be obliged to take over that function from the States” (Whitlam, G. in ED Hocking, J. and Lewis, C. (2003) pp. 244). This policy reduced the fiscal difficulties of the State’s education budget, which, during the 1970’s, absorbed 40% of State Government recurrent spending (Marginson, S. in ED Hocking, J. and Lewis, C. (2003) pp. 247). The second of Whitlam’s most definitive policies, Aboriginal welfare, was also promptly introduced. After one week of office Whitlam ordered Royal Commissioner Justice Woodward to report on arrangements for granting land to Indigenous groups and procedures for examining Aboriginal claims in the Northern Territory; by 19 December 1972 the Department of Aboriginal Affairs was established, in which all states except Queensland gave the Federal Government responsibility for Aboriginal welfare. This wasn’t the first step towards Federal responsibility of Indigenous people, however it was the most significant; the 1967 Referendum may have granted enfranchisement and the Government concurrent powers regarding Aboriginal affairs, nevertheless, it did not stop backward policy making from a conservative Menzies. Law lecturer Tony Buti wrote in 1999 that, “it was [in 1967] that the official policy shifted from assimilation to integration...however, it is difficult to ascertain exactly what the difference is and what ‘integration’ was intended to mean” (Buti, T. (2005) online). After Whitlam’s centralisation of Aboriginal welfare, however, policy became that of self-determination, marking a change in Australia’s history – the idea of an Aboriginal self-identity became a reality. Whitlam treasured this as his most prominent achievement; in one of his autobiographical memoirs he expresses his satisfaction, saying, “...if there is one cause for which future historians will salute us, it is this: that the Government I lead removed a stain from our national honour and brought back justice and equality to the Aboriginal people” (Whitlam, G. (1985) pp. 468). The third decision in Whitlam’s Prime Ministerial career that is deemed memorable is the full Federal funding of tertiary education. This program, the precursor to HECS, enabled lower-income families the same opportunities as those with higher-incomes, equalising the education system so that it would focus on academic merits rather than on financial status. These changes brought new life to the Australian Labor Party, with the reform implemented during the Whitlam era making its mark on history by institutionalising equality and diversity in Australian society; an achievement worth celebrating.

Methods used by Whitlam in order to successfully implement change, however, have been criticised by some; this criticism, though, has remained marginal. The main ideology behind Whitlam’s time in Government was ‘crash through or crash;’ Whitlam defends this abrupt style in his autobiography, published on the tenth anniversary of the dismissal, writing, “...in politics nothing is inevitable, least of all change” (Whitlam, G. (1985) pp. 1). Also supporting Whitlam is Kelly, who holds the opinion that Whitlam had to push as much legislation through while the public still undoubtedly supported him. In Kelly’s 1995 book he quotes his 1976 work, in which he wrote, “once a compromise was made, once the spirit and pace of reform slackened, it was quite likely lost forever” (Kelly, P. 1976 in Kelly, P. (1995) pp. 7). Whitlam’s philosophy on reform originated from his government’s plan for Australia, dubbed the ‘Program,’ which laid out everything the Government hoped to accomplish. This could be viewed as determination on behalf of Whitlam; however, Whitlam’s refusal to stray from the Program also resulted in the view that it was narrow-mindedness. In support of this view is former Prime Minister of the Coalition Government, Robert Menzies, who said on that Whitlam believed, “in which to be logical is to be right and to be right is its own justification” (Menzies, R. in Kelly, P. (1995) pp. 7). This negativity casts doubt onto whether or not Whitlam’s policies were very well thought out. This viewpoint, however, is largely ignored by orthodox sources, as evidenced in

the National Museum of Australia website, which says that, “the legislative program of the Whitlam Government was groundbreaking and frenetic. A whole raft of legislation covering existing and new areas of government activity was passed” (National Museum of Australia (2007) online). Being an orthodox source, this demonstrates that there is more praise than there is criticism of the Government’s ‘Program’ and the way in which Whitlam went about implementing it. The crash through or crash method adopted by the Government was successful, albeit uncouth according to critics; nonetheless any criticism has remained marginalised in the dominant discourse, indicating that the history and memories of Whitlam have celebrated change rather than rejected it.

The negative interpretations of Whitlam’s actions in Government, however marginalised, as well as the inevitable political deadlock between the Government and the Opposition, were the main factors in Whitlam’s demise as leader. Whitlam believed that nothing like the events of the dismissal could ever occur; he believed, up until 1975, that the Governor General would never act in an autonomous manner. This belief is substantiated in Whitlam’s autobiographical memoir published shortly after the dismissal in 1979, wherein he wrote, “...the governor-general will act on the advice of his Australian ministers...as the Queen does on the advice of hers” (Whitlam, G. (1979) pp. 29). Even though avidly republican after the dismissal, while in office Whitlam sought to please the country’s voters by displaying acceptance of the Queen’s technical rule by maintaining ties with the Monarchy, contradicting his eventual rejection; during the Queen’s visit in 1974 the Sydney Morning Herald editorialised that, “it was most appropriate...that Mr. Whitlam was able to consult the Queen personally about her new representative while she is in Canberra” (Sydney Morning Herald, 1974 in Whitlam, G. (1979) pp. 30). According to Kerr, Whitlam’s rejection of the Monarchy was always clear, and Kerr felt as though there was a constant threat against his job, seen in a secondary quote in Kelly in which Kerr recalls “[Whitlam saying]...with a brilliant smile, ‘it could be a question of whether I get to the Queen first for your recall or you get in first with my dismissal!’” (Kerr, J. in Kelly, P. (1995) pp. 131). This leads to the inference that Kerr dismissed Whitlam not only because of the deadlock, but out of fear for his own job. However, Kerr rebuts this or any other possibly misgivings to his decision in a quote taken from the primary source of his statement delivered on the 11 November 1975, wherein he attempted to reason his actions, saying, “...both here and in the United Kingdom the duty of the Prime Minister is the same in the most important respect – if he cannot get supply he must resign or advise an election” (Kerr, J. 1975 in Kelly, P. (1976) pp. 362). Contradicting this belief is the corroboratory assertion between Labor political speechwriter, Graham Freudenberg, and the National Archives of Australia website, that both say Whitlam was set to win the political deadlock. This, and the evidence aforementioned, clearly substantiates the inference that Kerr acted more out of fear than he did out of actual democratic duty, making the most contentious political decision in Australia’s history primarily for his own benefit.

Kerr is not the only one to blame, though, as the Opposition government, with control of the Senate, was doing exactly the same thing; from the beginning of Whitlam’s rule, continuing right to the end of it, the Opposition always had the goal of forcing Whitlam out of office. Evidence of this dates back to the 8<sup>th</sup> of March 1973, the day on which Opposition leader in the Senate Reginald Withers told the Senate that, “because of the temporary electoral insanity...the Senate may well be called upon to protect the national interest by exercising its undoubted constitutional rights and powers” (Withers, R. in Freudenberg, G. (1977) pp. 266). The Opposition refused to accept defeat, and continued to do so after the 1974 elections; Opposition Leader Billy Snedden stated that, “we were not defeated. We just didn’t win enough seats to form a government” (Snedden, B. in Nolan, S. ED (2005) pp. 8). More

evidence to corroborate the continuous Senate obstruction is the fact that from the period of August 1974 to November 1975 a total of 44 Bills were passed by the House of Representatives and negated or otherwise not passed by the Senate (Pettifer, J. A. in Whitlam, G. (2005) pp. 270 – 272). The opposition, naturally, refutes these statements. Senior adviser and speechwriter to Fraser at the time of the dismissal, and a former Howard Government minister, David Kemp, said that, “Mr. Whitlam had been reported as saying that he would continue to govern without the budget. Malcolm Fraser was deeply concerned by this remark...for no government can legitimately raise and spend money without the authorisation of parliament...Fraser foresaw the impending illegality” (Kemp, D. in Nolan, S. ED (2005) pp. 41). Another reason given is the ‘Loans Affair;’ the National Archives of Australia website, a Government source, states that, “...the Loans Affair enabled new Liberal Party leader Malcolm Fraser to justify refusing to vote on the budget Bills in the Senate...” the source, however, also corroborates Fraser’s intentions, going on to say that, “...The aim was to force the government to an election while its electoral fortunes were in decline” (National Archives of Australia (2009) online). Again corroborating this is Whitlam himself, who said that, “the events of October-November...had everything to do with the Withers political strategy of 1973” (Whitlam, G. (1979) pp. 63). Based on the overwhelming evidence it is clear that the Opposition was selfishly acting for the benefit of their party and not of the country, supporting their farce with over exaggerated mistakes of the Government. In the end they chose to fear change instead of celebrate it, which meant that, unfortunately for Whitlam, fear-based politics succeeded over reform; in this case, however, the historical significance of this event was not to be celebrated.

Gough Whitlam is a man to be remembered, being responsible either wholly, or in part, for the end of the twenty-three years in opposition and being the man responsible for the most ambitious and historically groundbreaking implementation of change in the history of Australia, with some aspects of his reform still evident today. Had it not been for continuous Senate interference and some mistakes on Whitlam’s behalf, the extent of change and historical influence could have been much vaster. Most of Whitlam’s policies went on to have a positive impact on the people and country. However, some are critical as to the methods used by Whitlam in order to achieve the passage of these reforms. These critics are responsible for the most controversial political upheaval in the ever carried out in politics, with the Opposition leader Malcolm Fraser using flimsy argument and reasoning in order to block supply, consequently creating a political deadlock that John Kerr decided to ironically, and supposedly democratically, solve by dismissing the Prime Minister. The dismissal of Gough Whitlam is an important milestone in politics, the history of which is still contested; however, not contested is what people remember. On November 11, people remember such things as the hanging of Ned Kelly and the end of World War One; after 1975 it is now the day on which people remember the dismissal of Gough Whitlam.

## **Annotated Bibliography**

Alomes, S. and Jones, C. (1991) *Australian Nationalism*, Harper Collins Publishing, Australia

This book is a secondary source that details the various milestones in Australia, with focus on their relation to nationalism, the Australian national identity and the various social issues surrounding these two topics. With regards to Gough Whitlam, there is only a small amount of detail on his political story, however this is the case with most topics in this book, and because it only gives such general information the accuracy of its information is correct but consequently only marginally useful. The information that is mainly to do with Whitlam's changing of the social attitude of the previous government. This discourse relating to change is supported by a primary source quote from Whitlam, taken from one of his policy speeches from 1972. The social change Gough Whitlam was trying to achieve is corroborated by Whitlam himself, in his 1985 political biography. Both of these points add to the reliability of the source. The book source doesn't contain a bibliography or notes page though, which makes it less reliable for any uncorroborated opinions, which may be little in number but are still there. The explicit message that is produced by the source is one that promotes nationalism, but doesn't promote or support the exploitation if it, which segues into an implicit message of disdain towards the negative impacts of exploitation and nationalism itself. Because of this, the reader is positioned most of the time to view nationalism as something that is good, and because Alomes and Jones position Gough Whitlam as a symbol of nationalism, they also position him as something that is good. This makes the values of the authors quite clear and it is obvious that they support positive nationalism and have the motive to try and promote it. Even though the book was published in 1991 it still retains its relevance today in the post-9/11 world, and so the source, even if the information is only slightly useful, is still accurate, making this a reliable source.

Australian History (2006) *Australian History: Edward Gough Whitlam* [online] Available: [www.australianhistory.org/edward-whitlam.php](http://www.australianhistory.org/edward-whitlam.php) [2009, February 19]

This internet source details briefly the early and political life of Gough Whitlam. It provides little insight other than facts about Whitlam's career and offers no quotes or a bibliography. The source tends to value the progress that Labor made during the time, which positions the reader to feel supportive of the former Prime Minister. Gaps and silences help to confirm this bias of the author; the source notes the little economic success of the Fraser government, however it doesn't mention any failings of the Whitlam government with regards to the economy, which a critical historian would have done. This leads to the conclusion that the source is orthodox. On the other hand, because the source was only used for its facts, which corroborate with Hocking, it is still a fairly reliable source, but only for its facts.

Buti, T. (2005) *The Systematic Removal of Indigenous Children from their Families in Australia and Canada: The History – Similarities and Differences* [online] Available: <http://www.newcastle.edu.au/centre/cispr/conferences/land/butipaper.pdf> [2009, March 3]

This is a secondary internet source that compares and contrasts the Indigenous policies of Australia and Canada that resulted in the removal of children from their Indigenous families; the author looks also looks at the implementation of the policies and legislation. The source includes a vast number of footnotes, and, while not containing a bibliography, the author makes note of the bibliographical details of his sources in those footnotes. Compounding this reliability is the fact that the author uses

primary sources as well as secondary; however the primary sources in this source weren't used, nor were they corroborated. This source was, instead, only used for a secondary quote on the Aboriginal policies under the Menzies Government. Buti received a fellowship in Aboriginal legal issues and public policy, which indicates that the author is fairly knowledgeable in this area of the law, which increases the reliability of this source. Such high knowledge is also indicative of a passion for these issues, which is evident in the bias of the text. Although not an explicit bias, there is a tendency to support the Aboriginal people of both countries. There is also the implicit message within the source that the Indigenous people deserve some form of reparations. The explicit message of the text is that there was severe abuse, in both Australian and Canada, of the children taken from their families. This source was written prior to the apology of the Rudd Government in Australia for the wrongs of previous governments with regards to the 'stolen generation,' leading to the assumption that the Buti may perhaps have the motive to promote some form of recognition on the issue, which the Howard Government infamously refused to give. This also makes this source revisionist at the time of publication due to the fact that the Howard Government refuted many of the Indigenous people's claims; however, today, in a post-apology society, the source would be orthodox. This motive, combined with the bias of the text, positions the reader to feel supportive towards the Indigenous calls for reparations by making the reader feel sympathetic towards the children. Ultimately, though, because the bias is so implicit and the information and facts are all referenced in footnotes the source is, overall, reliable.

Freudenberg, G. (1977) *A Certain Grandeur*, The Macmillan Company of Australia, Australia

This secondary book source presents an orthodox Labor Party view on Gough Whitlam's political life. It is a secondary source; however it contains some primary source evidence in the form of speeches and news articles from the time. Even though Freudenberg doesn't corroborate his own findings, some of this primary source evidence is found elsewhere, such as in Kelly, Sexton and Hocking. Freudenberg does however have a notes and sources section; this combined with the corroboration increase the reliability of this text's information. The motive of writing this book would be to try and restore some perception of stability to Labor after their defeat to Fraser in the 1976 elections, as it is sometimes hard to do this in opposition with such little opportunity. Because of this motive the reader is therefore positioned to feel both sympathetic and gratuitous towards Whitlam, a position agreeing with Freudenberg's bias of support towards Whitlam. Demonstrating this bias is the language used by Freudenberg, who, for example, describes the dismissal as an "ambush." There is also a justification for nearly all decisions made by Whitlam's government, an emerging trend within Labor supporting sources. The source contains no photographs however does contain some secondary quotes. There is also some corroboration between this source and others; the allegation that the Liberal Party aimed to use the Senate to force an election from the very beginning of Whitlam's election is corroborated in Whitlam, Nolan and the National Archives of Australia website. A primary source quote is also used in this source to support this allegation. Overall the accuracy of the source is hard to question, as most facts are well known, however only the corroborated opinions of Freudenberg can be used otherwise bias would undermine the information.

Hocking, J. (2008) *Gough Whitlam: A Moment in History Volume 1*, Melbourne university Publishing Ltd, Australia

This secondary book source provides a highly detailed biography of the life of Gough Whitlam from his birth right up until his most noted political speech at the Blacktown Civic Centre in 1972. The source is a very reliable source, containing a complete bibliography and completely referenced notes. It also contains primary source photographs; however the photographs are not located in other sources as the other sources only really detail the life of Whitlam after 1972, during his time in office. The only real corroboration is the primary source Blacktown Civic Centre speech, which is also present in Alomes and Jones. However the author's experience in writing political biographies, having written two major biographies previously, really dispels any doubts on the source due to the lack of corroboration. Even though this is a biography, and the author's opinions really shouldn't be noticeable, there is an implicit sense of support for Whitlam present in the text; the photos also give this implicit sense. For example, in one photo Gough Whitlam is relaxing at home with his daughter Catherine after the 1969 election. The relaxed demeanour of this photo matches the demeanour of nearly every other photo present, which positions the audience to believe that Whitlam was very good at his job to be relaxed all the time. This reveals a slight bias of support towards Whitlam, which is explicitly supported by the aforementioned photo, in which the paper that Whitlam is reading with his daughter has on the front cover the headline 'Strong Swing for Labor.' Even though Hocking didn't take the photo, she is still responsible for choosing them, and the choice to use photos that nearly always depict Gough Whitlam as relaxed and in control is in direct opposition of the situation in 1975, which leads to the inference that the author may be attempting to soften the depiction of Whitlam in 1975 in the second volume of the biography. Overall, though, the source is still reliable for its accuracy of fact and the implicitness of its bias.

Kelly, P. (1976) *The Dismissal: Australia's Most Sensational Power Struggle – The Dramatic Fall of Gough Whitlam*, Angus and Robertson Publishers, Australia

This is the first book written by Paul Kelly on the topic of Whitlam's dismissal. The book is less of a revisionist than Kelly's 1996 work for the simple fact that the history was still being written, as is evidenced in the autobiographies of Whitlam, the first of which wasn't published until 1979. The source is therefore of an orthodox nature to the opinions of people opposed to the dismissal. It is also secondary source like the 1996 book, however contains a slightly different positioning than his later work. In this book the reader is positioned to have more sympathy for Gough Whitlam, with the blame not really focusing on Whitlam at all; unsurprising considering the book was published in 1976, only one year after the dismissal, as there would have only been a very early understanding of the events. The motive the author could have for this would be for beneficiary purposes. The book states on the front cover that it is now a major television drama series, and so the book would most likely have to fit accordingly with the drama of the television show so that the book sells; this could have an adverse effect on the reliability of the information. Only facts were really taken from this source and so the facts corroborate with most sources such as Sexton and Freudenberg. This source is a reliable source and was useful for its facts, and its publishing date so close to the dismissal is almost irrelevant considering the same author published a second book on the same issue years later.

Damian Staveley

Kelly, P. (1995) *November 1975*, Allen and Unwin, Australia

The book source by Kelly is a complete account of the events that occurred in the lead up, during and after the dismissal. It is a secondary source, and contains accurate information as it corroborates its information with events and other sources that the author has used as research. The source also contains notes pages as well as appendices to support its theories. This book, written in 1995, is more reliable than the book that Kelly wrote in 1976, as it contains new interviews that weren't conducted at the time of his 1976 book. The values and motives of the author are still the same, though, as the author (a journalist) has continued to work for traditionally left wing newspapers. From 1981 to 1984 he worked at the Sydney Morning Herald and from 1991 to 1996 he was Editor in Chief at The Australian. However, even with these values and beliefs the author maintains a critical viewpoint that gives way to the positioning of the audience to view Whitlam as determined but arrogant and Sir John Kerr is depicted as being not as innocent as he may try to seem as a willing executioner and not a reluctant victim of the crisis. This makes this source a combination of both revisionist and critical history. The source is very much a reliable source because of the author's ability to corroborate his own facts as well as present critical viewpoints regardless of what bias he might maintain.

Marginson, S. in (ed) Hocking, J. and Lewis, C. (2003) *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Melbourne Publishing Group, Australia

This book source presents a mostly celebratory depiction of Gough Whitlam and Labor, with only some critical elements to the text. The source details the beginnings of many of Whitlam's policies and the end of some of them; research was only taken on Whitlam's education policies, the section being written by Marginson, as can be seen above. The accuracy of this source is at a sufficient level, with many of the book's opinions based on facts and figures, not by coincidence all supporting Whitlam in some way. There is also a completely referenced notes and sources page. Marginson has a background in education, which reveals her bias towards supporting growth and change in the education area, in turn explaining her motive to support Whitlam, as education was one of his key legislative goals. The implicit message that is present in the text is one of disdain towards private schools for being favoured after Whitlam, which of course reveals the explicit disapproval of the successive Liberal governments. The values of the author and the positioning of the reader this influences can be seen through the gaps and silence of the text. One of the main gaps in the text is the post-Whitlam reform to education, which is entirely left out, leaving the reader only with the Whitlam supporting facts, figures and arguments, positioning them accordingly. The motive for doing this could be the social context of the book. The book was published in 2003, during a Coalition Government, and so any praise from the author would have to be limited in case she accidentally positioned a reader to support the Liberals, which a Labor supporter would not want to do. Overall the source is reliable for its facts, as they are mostly indisputable; however the bias surrounding the author's opinion make the rest of the text questionable.

National Archives of Australia (2009) *Gough Whitlam – In Office* [online] Available: <http://www.primeministers.naa.gov.au/primeministers/whitlam/in-office.aspx> [2010, February 20]

This online source is from the National Archives of Australia. It is mainly represented as a public knowledge resource, and presents information that seeks to inform the reader about Gough Whitlam's time in office. The source gives an orthodox version of history of Gough Whitlam, as it

makes the claim that Gough Whitlam was a valued Prime Minister who brought about a staggering amount of change and that Fraser's motivation for the deadlock was the loan's affair, a claim corroborated by the National Museum of Australia website. This is contrary to the more corroborated belief that the opposition government had the plan all along to get Labor to call an election unwillingly by blocking supply. This type of history reveals a motive that aims to promote government in Australia, doing this by largely ignoring most of the negatives of the Whitlam government, and a bias towards supporting Whitlam and the government, positioning the reader to feel sympathetic towards the former Prime Minister; this positioning is similar to the one in nearly all of the sources in this bibliography. Also like most sources in this bibliography, this source is secondary, giving primary and secondary source evidence to support the information given. This source proved useful in giving an example of the orthodox positioning of Whitlam and the government's strive for pleasant history and is, overall, a reliable source as it is mostly just fact, and the only real opinion in the source is corroborated by the National Museum of Australia.

National Museum of Australia (2009) *Gough Whitlam* [online] Available: [http://www.nma.gov.au/education/school\\_resources/websites\\_and\\_interactives/primeministers/gough\\_whitlam/#row\\_2](http://www.nma.gov.au/education/school_resources/websites_and_interactives/primeministers/gough_whitlam/#row_2) [2010, February 20]

This internet source briefly details the facts of Gough Whitlam's life. Even though it is just facts about Whitlam's life, the fact that it's a government site means that they are facts which the government has chosen to put there, which helps to shape the official orthodox story of Whitlam. There is also an element of celebratory history telling, as most government websites will try not to criticise the government, no matter who's in office at the time. This is evident in how the website only mentions the 1975 crisis in one paragraph, paying little attention to it so as to provide a more pleasant history. Also, the accuracy of this source is greatly increased due to the fact that it is, in its basic form, nothing more than a fact sheet. A implicit bias of support is also still present even though it's only a fact sheet; this is evident in how the website lists all the successes of the government and only marginally lists the failures. The explicit message of the text is that the government was successful in most of its endeavours; however the government would have the motive to emphasise this to promote itself. The source is also partially revisionist with respect as to what caused the deadlock; in other sources it is thought that the Liberals had a plan from the start to have Labor kicked out of office and an election called, however this source maintains that it was the loans affair that sparked the deadlock and caused Fraser to call for an election. This version of history is corroborated in the other government source used, the National Archives of Australia website. Overall, this source is only useful for its facts as there is little to no corroborated opinion or insight given.

Nolan, S. (ed) (2005) *The Dismissal*, Melbourne University Press, Australia

This secondary book is a collection of stories from different people about where they were on November 11, 1975 and their opinions on the matter; it is therefore mainly a revisionist depiction of what is, in this book, contested history. The opinions present from the various people are based mainly on already known facts, however some facts need corroboration; this makes the source somewhat reliable for its information. With regards to its referencing, there is a small one page bibliography; however it depends on the writer which sources are given, making the bibliography practically useless. The same lack of evidence applies to notes; because not all writers referenced

the notes page is very unreliable. However the varying authors was interesting, as there were some who were supportive of Whitlam (Hocking) and some that were very anti-Whitlam (Kemp). Respectively, the contributors have the bias to support and condemn Whitlam. One piece of corroborated evidence is the claim that it was the opposition's plan from the beginning to force out the government using the Senate; this is corroborated with the National Archives of Australia website, Hocking and Whitlam. This source is, as a whole, only a somewhat reliable source, and is only really good for facts and to get a sense of the varying opinions.

Sexton, M. (2005) *The Great Crash*, Scribe, Australia

This book source by Sexton is a secondary source that details the life and death of the Whitlam government. Sexton has authored several books on law and politics before, which raises the reliability of this source. This opinion is corroborated by the positive reviews by people from both the Australian Book Review and The Age. Also adding to the reliability of this source are the primary source evidence in the form of photos and political speeches, some of which are also found in Hocking. The book, being a revised and updated edition of the original 1979 book, has more updated information than the last; a similar situation to the two Kelly sources. This makes this book slightly revisionist with some information but still mainly maintains a critical viewpoint of Whitlam's history. There is also a select bibliography and notes pages in this source, a positive that continues to increase the reliability of the source, as it shows the author's ability to conduct research correctly, making the information more than likely correct. The author has a bias of overall support for the Labor Party, as he provides explanations for most of Labor's actions. This trend of explanations to everything seems to be in most sources that have a bias of support towards the ALP. The source has an explicit message that Whitlam had a promising vision of Australia's future. The other explicit message was that Labor parties both current and future need to have another promising vision. This second explicit message could provide the motive for re-publishing the book, which is to send a message to the ALP, who was in opposition in 2005. This source is overall reliable for its detail of fact, evidence-based opinion and present but implicit bias.

Whitlam, G. (1979 and 2005) *The Truth of the Matter*, The Dominion Press, Australia

This book source is a straight account of events of the dismissal by Gough Whitlam. As such, there is no bibliography present. There are some quotes present, however they aren't properly referenced. The reason for having two publication dates is because the book was first published in 1979 and re-published for the third time in 2005. The republishing doesn't mean that events were changed, however it could affect the author's shaping of the events, which he would now shape to best suit today's reader. It gives the reader Whitlam's view in a very historically contested manner, as the book was written in response to a book published by the former Governor General, who had published a book detailing his version of events. This provides Whitlam with motive to oppose the Governor General and discredit his story. Even the language used in the book suggests this; the title for example suggests that what the Governor General had written wasn't true. Even though some assumed knowledge has to be given considering Gough Whitlam was there at the time and in 1979 the events should still be fresh in his mind, the bias seems to be unsurprisingly but understandably slightly overwhelming. Due to this, the reader has to be somewhat observant in recognising what is fact and what is rhetoric or over exaggeration. There is an explicit message of justification and an implicit annoyance in the text. Adding to the reliability of the text though is the corroboration

Damian Staveley

between this source and Nolan, Freudenberg and the National Archives of Australia site. Overall, this source is only useful for its facts, as the opinions, unless corroborated, can't be completely trusted due to the noticeable bias of the text.

Whitlam, G. (1985) *The Whitlam Government: 1972 – 1975*, Penguin Books, Australia

This book source was written by Gough Whitlam, making it a primary source. It details the political life of the Whitlam Government from 1972 up until 1975 when they were dismissed. It gives an orthodox ALP view of history, which is one that unsurprisingly supports Labor. There is an explicit message of betrayal and annoyance in the text, which isn't surprising considering he believes he was effectively constitutionally betrayed. Implicitly, the reader is positioned to feel sympathetic towards the former leader and to position them to have a bias that supports Whitlam and in turn hopefully support the ALP, which may be a possible motive for Whitlam's decision to write the book. There could have also been the motive simply to keep the memory of the dismissal fresh, as 1985 was the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the dismissal. The bias of this text can also be brought down to the fact that the chances of Whitlam criticising his own party and time in government is very slim, especially with the supposed arrogance suggested in Kelly; only minor mistakes are ever pointed out. Even with the bias the reliability can still be validated by the fact that this is a political auto-biography. Whitlam was there at the time and so knowledge of the subject has to be assumed. There are also end notes present as well as some appendices. Overall this source is reliable for Whitlam's opinion and shaping of facts, however the bias is sometimes overwhelming and has to be critically looked at.