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Before Ann McGrath’s *Born in the Cattle* (1987), discussion of the Aboriginal situation in the cattle industry focused on ‘how badly Aboriginal labour was treated by white pastoralists’. The first major publication on the topic was Frank Stevens’ *Aborigines in the Northern Territory Cattle Industry* (1974). Stevens’ major concern was the condition of Aboriginal stock workers, particularly the wage inequality between black and white stockmen. The anthropologists Ronald and Catherine Berndt, as advisers to the Australian Investment Agency (Vestey’s), researched the Aboriginal situation in the Northern Territory cattle industry in the mid 1940s — about twenty years prior to Steven’s fieldwork — but their report, *Native Labour and Welfare in the Northern Territory* (1946), was not published for an unusual reason. According to the Berndts, A P Elkin ‘was reluctant to have it published for general distribution because he felt it would have more influence on the Australian Investment Agency and on government opinion if it were treated privately’.

A short version was distributed among institutions such as the University of Sydney in 1948 under the title *A Northern Territory Problem: Aboriginal Labour in a Pastoral Area*. C D Rowley’s *Destruction of Aboriginal Society* (1970), as well as the Gurindji’s land claim book by Patrick McConvell and Rod Hargen (1981), used this short version of the report as a primary source to describe the poor living conditions of Aboriginal people in the northern pastoral industry. Today, we still have no way of accessing the full version of the original report. The original manuscript cannot be found in any public institution. If the Berndts’ report had been published and widely distributed in the 1950s, public attention to the Aboriginal situation in the cattle industry may have been gained much earlier than it was. The Gurindji people at Wave Hill Station were looking for outside supporters to realise their project of the return of their country since the 1950s, but the situation of Aboriginal people not recognised by the general public until the mid 1960s.

The Berndts’ report was revised and finally published in 1987 under the title *End of an Era* — more than forty years after their primary fieldwork. The Berndts were primarily concerned about Aboriginal material and health conditions such as malnutrition, diseases, the high infant mortality rate, and the unsanitary conditions of Aboriginal camps than they were about industrial relations, though their work also showed how badly pastoralists treated Aboriginal cattle labourers. They later wrote that the poor living conditions of Aboriginal people in the area at the time ‘are almost unbelievable today. Yet, without a doubt they did exist’.

It may be a remarkable coincidence that McGrath’s controversial work *Born in the Cattle* was published in the same year as the Berndts’ *End of an Era*. McGrath’s oral historical accounts seem to frequently contradict the Berndts’ research results. For example, while the Berndts describe the miserable conditions
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of Aboriginal people during the mid 1940s, McGrath emphasises that Aboriginal people regard the period 1910-1940 as the ‘golden age’ in cattle stations. How could a time requiring such ‘tolerance, fortitude, and patience’ be the golden age? Is this because the Berndts’ research had been done during and after the second world war? Did the war and the introduction of small wages suddenly and completely change the Aboriginal view of cattle station life within five years? It is difficult to see how this could be the case. The poor living conditions of Aboriginal people reported by the Berndts obviously contradict McGrath’s view of the golden age, so is one of these views simply wrong?

Tim Rowse explores these questions in two articles published in 1988. By contrasting the Berndts’ and McGrath’s works, he begins by stating that ‘there could hardly be a better illustration of the complexity of historical judgement than to consider these works side by side’. Rowse suggests that the Berndts’ best argument was demographic. Malnutrition, disease and high infant mortality all meant to the Berndts that Aboriginal ‘physical extinction was at hand’. Bain Attwood supports Rowse by saying the Berndts’ picture of ‘dispossessed and exploited [Aboriginal] workers suffering from disease and malnutrition ... is completely convincing’.

Rowse addresses three main aspects of McGrath’s new approach: the complex power structure and open-ended concept of ‘culture’; a female perspective; and the use of oral accounts as primary historical evidence. First of all, Rowse acknowledges, and mostly agrees with, McGrath’s analysis of the complex colonial power structure that contradicts the Berndts’ ‘zero-sum’ concept of power. While the Berndts presented Aboriginal exploited workers as people with no choice but to be obedient to pastoralists, McGrath pointed out that Aboriginal people in fact enjoyed stock work (‘no shame job’) as well as being in the bush. The Aboriginal culture that was on ‘both sides of the frontier’ (station and bush) accommodated the settlers’ pastoralism. Aboriginal people adopted aspects of European society and incorporated these into their own cultural system. Aboriginal people were not just ‘victims’ but ‘active agents’ in Australian colonial history. McGrath controversially concludes that Aboriginal people ‘were never truly colonised’. Rowse suggests that McGrath provided a flexible, open-ended notion of ‘culture’, which contrasts with the Berndts’ relatively hidebound concept of culture that could not accept stock work as part of Aboriginal culture. To some extent, McGrath’s perspective is followed by Dawn May’s work, which also emphasises the huge contribution of Aboriginal labour to the cattle industry in Australia. May describes Aboriginal people not just as victims but also as active agents but also adopts an economic historical perspective and is dubious about McGrath’s ‘golden age’.

McGrath makes it clear that Aboriginal men and women have different views about sexual relations between white men and Aboriginal women. While earlier works described such relations as nothing but exploitation, McGrath argued that Aboriginal women often enjoyed the exchange and were in a better position than Aboriginal men to receive gifts from whites. Although McGrath does not deny their memories of some cruel experiences, she emphasises the complexity of race relations in colonial history. Rowse argues that ‘to the extent that there was a redistribution of power away from men and towards women within colonised
Aboriginal society, it is McGrath’s rather than Berndts’ framework that makes the phenomenon intelligible. Reference to Lyn Riddett’s Kine, Kin and Country (1990), which follows and develops a female perspective of the racial history of the cattle station, would enable a more detailed analysis of these gendered relations.

Rowse becomes more critical of McGrath’s work. More than Attwood, he is suspicious of the way McGrath used oral accounts. While McGrath admitted the possibility of romanticising the ‘nostalgic’ past by Aboriginal survivors, Attwood points out that she ‘fails to reassure us that she has adopted a critical approach to her sources’. Both Rowse and Attwood compare her work with Howard and Frances Morphy’s article discussing the Aboriginal ‘nostalgic’ view of their pasts. The Morphys treated Aboriginal oral accounts of the golden age as their present view of the past: as nostalgia. They argue that the golden age was possible ‘through the transformation from the “wild” black into the “civilised” station black’, which means ‘whites had come and initiated the process of destruction of the “wild blacks”, and thus survival was possible only because they had participated in the process’. Aboriginal oral accounts were treated as the ‘present view of the past’, but not as historical evidence.

Attwood argues that McGrath ‘tends to provide an ideal model or model picture drawn out of a patchwork quilt of evidence, using examples from a range of places to support her argument’. While acknowledging that Born in the Cattle is ‘the first academic monograph to rely heavily on oral sources, as distinct from those who have merely used them to complement other data’, and that it ‘bring[s] to the foreground Aborigines’ subjective relationship with colonial authority’, Attwood and Rowse conclude that McGrath’s work was the product of an nostalgic Aboriginal view of the past: that it is more concerned with myths and memory than history.

Since Deborah B Rose’s Hidden Histories (1991), one cannot as easily accept Rowse’s and Attwood’s critique of McGrath’s study. This is not because Rose approves of McGrath’s argument, but because she clearly takes a position against it. Although Rose uses as many oral sources as McGrath, she provides quite a different picture of Aboriginal history in cattle stations. As Rose says in the introduction to Hidden Histories, many Aboriginal stories of their pasts ‘are distressing. They tell of intense cruelty perpetrated by human being [settlers] against human being [indigenous people]’. Rose also writes that ‘people who worked for [Victoria River Downs (VRD)] and Wave Hill, for the most part regard the decades of work for others as a time of horrendous hardship, deprivation, and oppression’. The Aboriginal accounts in Rose’s interviews are not nostalgic at all.

While McGrath’s research was done in the north western part of the Northern Territory and the east Kimberley in the late 1970s, Rose’s fieldwork was conducted in the early 1980s mainly in the Yarralin community, where she interviewed people who used to live and work on VRD, Wave Hill and Humbert River Stations. Even though their research areas are not identical, their research method (oral history) and research period are almost the same compared to the Berndts’.
Rose suggests that McGrath’s interviewees were mostly from west of VRD, where many people now live in town and used to work mainly on family-owned stations like the Durack’s. Their experiences and memories would differ from those of people who worked for company-owned stations such as Wave Hill and VRD. She argues that ‘apparently [McGrath’s interviewees] had no deep and long-term sense of exploitation, and their retrospective view of station life includes considerable pleasure’. Rose concludes that *Born in the Cattle* ‘underscores the advisability of treating generalisations with caution’. The logic of this comment is similar to McGrath’s critique of *End of an Era*. McGrath argues that the Berndts’ data was collected exclusively from Vesteys’ stations, which were owned by an ‘extremely stingy company’. Here, it seems that both McGrath and Rose agree with the diversity of Aboriginal experience ‘according to region’, yet disagree about the ‘general view’ of the Aboriginal history of the northern Australian pastoral area. McGrath suggests that even though there is regional diversity, Aboriginal people in cattle stations generally had lives of pride and accommodation; and Rose argues that even though there is regional diversity, Aboriginal people in cattle stations generally had lives of terror and oppression.

The reality in most pastoral areas was somewhere in between these views, so why do McGrath and Rose not come to this conclusion? Is it, as Attwood suggests, because they both tend ‘to provide an ideal model or model picture drawn out of a patchwork quilt of evidence, using examples from a range of places to support [their] argument’? By reassessing the contributions of McGrath and Rose, it becomes apparent that the problem is not as simple as Attwood indicates. In *Contested Ground* (1995) McGrath wrote a review chapter on Aboriginal historiography. In this chapter, she mistyped a subtitle of her own book. *Born in the Cattle*’s subtitle is ‘Aborigines in Cattle Country’, but here she wrote ‘Aborigines in [the] Cattle Industry’. This mistake is symbolic to those who have read *Born in the Cattle* as the Aboriginal history of industrial relations between pastoralists and Aboriginal people, and McGrath may bear some responsibility for this confusion.

In terms of race (industrial) relations, McGrath was very careful not to exaggerate the situation. For example, she wrote that Aboriginal people ‘maintained self-esteem on a typically racist frontier’, and ‘although Aborigines accepted many of its contingencies for their own reasons, they were not blind to the contradictions and injustices of the system’. The reality was that ‘on some stations, the manager was under strong pressure to spend as little money on Aborigines as possible’, and ‘the cattle industry was an oppressive institution ... crucial to the overall colonial takeover of the north’. McGrath admits that cattle stations in northern Australia were part of ‘a typically racist frontier’ which inevitably created ‘contradictions and injustices of the system’ through ‘oppressive institutions’. In addition, as McGrath responds to Rowse’s review article (particularly chapter five: ‘Tame Blacks?’: Paternalism and Control), life on the cattle stations ‘presents the many inherent tensions in the master/servant relationship, with its frequent collapse and explosions into violence’. On the issue of health conditions and the problems of Aboriginal depopulation, McGrath’s arguments were not so different from those of the Berndts: ‘Aborigines were facing a health crisis during this period. Diet, clothing, lifestyle
changes and low immunity to western diseases caused harmful effects’, 48 ‘employers continued to neglect their employees’ health, and to avoid the expense of transporting them to hospitals’, 49 and ‘the Aboriginal population was decreasing rapidly from 1900 to 1940’. 50

Even though McGrath provides examples of a harmonious relationship between pastoralists and Aboriginal workers, *Born in the Cattle*’s picture of race relations in the cattle industry remains one of racism, exploitation and oppression. Why, then, does *Born in the Cattle* give readers the impression that Aboriginal people have a positive view of their past? Many of McGrath’s anecdotes show Aboriginal people’s memories of their lives as stock workers. In her introduction, McGrath emphasises Aboriginal people’s adoption of the cattle life: ‘Aborigines now see the work they performed on stations as an important feature of their lives’; 51 ‘Aboriginal excellence and desire for continuing work in the pastoral industry contradicts the popular image of Aborigines as bludgers and misfits’; 52 and ‘we may think the cattle economy swamped Aborigines, but in fact they have incorporated cattle life into their world, consciously adapting and integrating it’. 53

This view repeatedly comes out in her arguments: ‘[d]espite the hard work, most Aborigines have positive memories of their days on horseback’; 54 ‘their use of this work to continue ritual ties with land challenged colonial ownership and the domination of white Australian culture’; 55 ‘the cattle station lifestyle has became incorporated into Aboriginal culture, and many Aborigines today do not want to dispense with it’; 56 and ‘station blacks have a certain empathy with cattle; they do not view them as a symbol of European usurpation of their lands, but are calmly accepting of their presence’. 57

McGrath argues that Aboriginal people had a strong attachment to their country even under the colonial regime: ‘it was not the western work ethic, but rather a unique mixture of ‘cowboy complex’ values and distinctive Aboriginal values — especially land-related — which motivated Aborigines to work with cattle’; 58 ‘the Aborigines viewed the land, animals and other primary resources on the cattle station in a more egalitarian and holistic sense than non-Aborigines’; 59 and ‘they worked not just for tucker, but literally to “hold onto” their land, and keep it alive’. 60 McGrath’s arguments about the Aboriginal attachment to the cattle and the country are significant in that they focus on Aboriginal people’s positive relationship with cattle and the country, but not with the European settlers.

McGrath’s speculation goes too far, however; having established that Aboriginal people had a harmonious relationship with cattle and the country, she goes on to make the unsupported assumption that Aboriginal people must have also had a harmonious relationship with the pastoralists. This is expressed implicitly through other ideas (albeit without sufficient evidence): ‘to protect their country and its people, Aborigines had to teach station whites many things’; 61 ‘Aborigines did not think their living conditions harsh, for they were “soft” by bush standards’; 62 and ‘despite economic exploitation on stations, many Aborigines with cattle station backgrounds are tolerant and friendly towards whites, and express a desire for harmony’. 63 Despite several examples, 64 this view of harmonious race relations contradicts the Berndts’ *End of an Era* and Rose’s *Hidden Histories* and, most importantly, also negates McGrath’s own statements about the ‘contradictions and injustices of the system’ under the ‘oppressive
institutions’ on ‘a typically racist frontier’. It is an obvious contradiction if harmonious race relations are generally established on ‘a typically racist frontier’.

The connection between Rose’s *Hidden Histories* and *Born in the Cattle* becomes more apparent with closer scrutiny. Firstly, while Rose spent about half of her book discussing the period of ‘invasion and the establishment of control’, McGrath spent about only one seventh of her book discussing this same period. Rose justifies this by stating that it was in accordance with the instructions of her primary Aboriginal historian, Hobbles Danayarrri of Yarralin. In contrast, this period was not the major issue in *Born in the Cattle*, since McGrath’s study was more about the period when pastoral lifestyles were already well established — ‘a relatively stable time’. Nevertheless, Rose and McGrath seem to agree with each other that there was violence during the European invasion.

In *Hidden Histories*, the Aboriginal historians of Yarralin told stories of terrifying race relations even after the establishment of the cattle industry. Rose states that:

> In analysing station life, Hobbles wanted to explain the continuities between the European strategy of killing Aborigines directly and the strategy of working them (often to death). Both strategies, as I understand him, were based on the relationship he started in discussing Aboriginal trackers: “Me white fellow, you black fellow. You work with me ... You work not for your people...”

Rose elaborates on this by saying that ‘Mass murder declined and was eventually stopped, only to be replaced by life on the station where, in the words of Reverend Woods, people died “in the cruellest and most horribly lingering of ways”’; and that ‘[t]error remained a key feature of European-Aboriginal social relations on VRD, Wave Hill and Humbert River, and the fact that brutality appeared to be officially condoned added a further element of threat’. Rose does not deny the possibility of exceptionally friendly relationships between Aboriginal people and pastoralists, yet she did not hear such happy stories from Aboriginal historians. She explains that ‘[t]he issue is not so much what happened, but what people think is worth telling’. Rose’s arguments about ‘terror’ and ‘total power’ support the Berndts’ zero-sum power structure in race relations.

In *Hidden Histories*, Aboriginal historians express their strong concern for and attachment to their countries, which clearly corresponds with the stories in McGrath’s work. However, although some Aboriginal historians mention the time of ‘walkabout’ as an important period when they were able to ‘look after the land’ in their own way, *Hidden Histories* does not explore how Aboriginal people looked after their countries. This was probably because Rose wanted to concentrate on the issue of race relations in her book and was preparing another, more anthropological book, for the purpose of exploring the Aboriginal relationship with the land. In *Dingo Makes Us Human*, which was published a year after *Hidden Histories*, Rose explains that:

> The one saving grace, for cattle station people, was that work could be effectively carried out only during the dry season. Aborigines are turned off from the stations during the wet... The result was that for part of every year Aborigines in this region were living in their own country, and were using and maintaining the ecological, technological, social, and religious knowledge required for the continued care both of the country and of the relationships between people and country.
In *Hidden Histories*, instead, Rose repeatedly refers to the story by Riley Young of Yarralin: ‘[w]e couldn’t, we didn’t [get] any help behind [there was no one to back us up]. You know, we tried, but sort of frightened for — Aboriginal people [were] too frightened he might get shot ... [they thought] “long as you can look after the land. Keep the place, right thing”’. Rose explains that ‘[a]s long as people chose to remain close to their country and kin, to “look after the land” and “keep the place”, as Riley Young put it, their choices were constrained’; and that ‘[i]ncreasingly, resistance to European invasion was being constructed as staying home and staying alive. “Don’t fight,” people told Riley ... as “long as you can look after the land”’. These arguments make it clear that Aboriginal people’s first priority was to ‘look after the land’ even when facing terrifying oppression.

On the issue of stock work experiences, Rose and Aboriginal historians of Yarralin emphasise how hard Aboriginal people worked for the whitefellas and ‘made them rich’. Even though Rose does not really explore this subject, by reading the stories of Aboriginal historians one cannot deny the Aboriginal people’s pride in being good stock workers. In *Hidden Histories*, Aboriginal historians repeat: ‘[h]ow were we doing a lot of work? We made the numbers [of cattle] for the station ... everything was done good, I tell you’; ‘We did that good job mustering the cattle’; and ‘we did a good job. Because we handled them [well] ... That’s the Aboriginal people handled the beef all in the Territory for this VRD’.

In relation to the issue of Aboriginal people’s identity as stock workers, Rose provides only a few sentences, yet her statements are clear: ‘to gain the stockman’s skills which by the 1920s, had become an important part of an Aboriginal man’s identity’; and ‘[w]orking stories come close to being happy because it is so evident that people value their skills and the hard work they have done in their lives. In a country which values the ability to do a hard day’s work year after year, these people are workers who know that they deserve recognition’. Rose’s understanding is exactly the same as McGrath’s. In the introduction to *Born in the Cattle* McGrath states that ‘[t]heir identity as station workers does not detract from the strength of their identity as Aborigines’; and that ‘so far he [the Aboriginal stock worker] has been excluded from our national legends because of racism and his position in the story of colonialism ... Aborigines wanted their stories to be told’. The comparison of Rose’s *Hidden Histories* and McGrath’s *Born in the Cattle* reveals some connections between seemingly contradictory works. Both contribute to the Aboriginal history of cattle country. Firstly, the importance of *Born in the Cattle* is not that it describes the ‘complex power structure’ of race relations in the cattle industry. McGrath’s argument about race/industrial relations is confusing rather than complex. Instead, McGrath’s contribution is that she has thrown light, for the first time, on Aboriginal people’s pride as stock workers and their positive memories of their relationship with cattle and country. Many Aboriginal accounts in *Born in the Cattle* are about the Aboriginal view of stock work and their country, not about race relations. It is absolutely correct and appropriate that *Born in the Cattle* is subtitled ‘Aborigines in Cattle Country’. Secondly, the contribution of *Hidden Histories* is to confirm that even when taking an oral historical approach, the race relations in the Australian pastoral frontier...
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still remain a ‘zero-sum power structure’. Rose’s work also shows that Aboriginal people gained a strong identity as stock workers even under the pastoralists’ racist regime. Furthermore, both McGrath’s and Rose’s oral historical approach clearly showed us the Aboriginal people’s continuing strong commitment to their country throughout history.

Throughout most of Born in the Cattle, McGrath provides neither an Aboriginal ‘nostalgic’ view of the past, nor a ‘model picture drawn out of a patchwork quilt of evidence’. Instead, she explores the Aboriginal people’s general affection for cattle and country as well as their identity and pride as good stock workers. McGrath succeeds in disclosing Aboriginal voices that were crying out for wider recognition of the fact that they ‘did a good job’. Aboriginal people’s positive attitude towards cattle and stock work co-existed with their negative view towards the Europeans. The difference between McGrath’s and Rose’s works does not simply come about from regional diversity, because they agree with the Aboriginal people’s strong identification as stock workers in every region. Neither is this because the reality was between two opposite views. Instead, it seems that Aboriginal people generally had two seemingly contradictory experiences at the same time.

One fairly well known story further supports this argument: when the Gurindji people stopped their stock work for Vesteys and walked off from Wave Hill station, one of their concerns at their walk-off camp was the poor situation of the cattle. Since they stopped stock work, no one was looking after the cattle, and the Aboriginal people heard the cattle crying for water. Vincent Lingiari said “[w]e not bin let them cattle die of thirst. Them big Vestey bosses not hear them cattle die; but I bin hear them cattle die’. He decided not to bring pump workers back to their walk-off camp.87 In the middle of their fight for independence from European pastoralism, the Gurindji people were still concerned about the situation of the cattle. They wanted to remove the ‘Vestey mob’, not the cattle, from their land. Furthermore, the aim of the walk-off was not to quit stock work, but to run the cattle station by themselves.88 This episode clearly shows that Aboriginal hatred towards pastoralists and their affection for the cattle and stock work did co-exist.

One of the complex issues in the colonial history of the pastoral frontier in northern Australia is the ambiguous way that Aboriginal people reacted to different aspects of colonisation. Aboriginal people on the pastoral frontier had complex ways of dealing with colonisation even under the zero-sum power structure. Complex relationships were not restricted to race (power) relations, or regional diversity, but were also found between racial and non-racial aspects of colonialism. Although both McGrath’s and Rose’s studies implied this, neither explicitly explored the issue. Each concentrated on one side of it: the zero-sum power structure of race relations (Rose); and Aboriginal identity as stock worker (McGrath). After accepting that two different stories co-exist, what needs to be done next is to ask how and why, and to look into the complex interaction between racial and non-racial aspects of Aboriginal colonial experiences in the cattle country.89
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