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Abstract

This is a study of the History curricula at the University of Sydney and the University of Melbourne. Until about 1950 the parameters of the History curricula at these two universities were determined by their respective professors of History. The curricula so determined and implemented reflected English and German historiographical and pedagogical traditions. The aim of this thesis is to analyse, compare and contrast the nature and derivation of the History curricula taught by Professors Wood and Roberts at the University of Sydney and Professors Scott and Crawford at the University of Melbourne from about 1910 to 1950.

There have already been some attempts to portray a distinctive 'School of History' at each university. This concept of a distinctive 'School of History' has been most pronounced at Melbourne where many students and staff have written, with pride, of the superior attributes of the History department there. The same has not yet occurred to the same extent for the History department at the University of Sydney nor has an explicit comparison been made between the History curricula at these two universities. What has been written of the History curricula at these universities has only been done within the limited confines of the Australian context and has failed to put these curricula in the perspective of their English and German historiographical and pedagogical antecedents.

These traditions originated as separate entities but by the turn of the nineteenth century had begun to be synthesised by historians. In England the writing of historical work had developed as a form of literature while its subject matter centred upon the development of liberty throughout English history. This so-called 'Whig' interpretation dominated English historiography for about 100 years from the 1820's and helped to legitimise contemporary
political reform. In Germany the main aim of historical study was to ascertain the truth of what happened in the past by an impartial analysis of primary sources. Partisanship was to be avoided. This contrast in historiography was reflected in pedagogy at English and German universities. In those of England, the study of History was seen as a literary adjunct to other disciplines. In German universities, History was established as a subject in its own right with its own 'scientific' methodology. From the German tradition developed the concept of the 'professional' historian who combined research and teaching at a university.

By the 1870's, especially through the work of William Stubbs at Oxford, the German tradition was having an impact on that of England with greater emphasis on the use of primary sources although Whig ideology still predominated. The first Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney, George Arnold Wood, was educated at Oxford. This was reflected in both his historiographical stance and in his pedagogy which included a limited use of the Oxford tutorial system. His synthesis of the Liberal, Literary and Scientific traditions in historical study pre-dated George Macaulay Trevelyan's noted essay on this subject, "Clio - A Muse". The values Wood taught in his History curriculum also reflected his Nonconformist and Liberal upbringing.

Wood's contemporary at Melbourne from 1914, Ernest Scott, had not had formal training in historical study but had been 'self-taught' through his own research. He was a strict adherent of the German Scientific tradition as enunciated by the British historians, Acton and Bury. This 'scientific' methodology with its emphasis on analysis of primary sources was characteristic of his History curricula at the University of Melbourne. Although openly avowing impartiality, he unconsciously viewed Australian history, about which he wrote, largely from a Whig perspective with an emphasis on the concept of political 'progress'.
Wood's successor at the University of Sydney was Stephen Roberts who had been a student of Scott at Melbourne. He succeeded Wood in 1929 and implemented a History curriculum which was closely modelled on that of his mentor, Scott. However Roberts gradually divested his curricula of a Whig outlook. He replaced it with an emphasis on the study of the current world situation and an understanding of how it had been derived. This reflected the dramatic course of events in international relations in the 1930's. For Honours students, Roberts continued to stress Scientific methodology with its inherent research aspect. In this way he sought to help professionalise the study of History in Australia. He also introduced the German-based seminar system for his Honours students.

In the late 1920's a reaction had occurred in England against Whig methodology. This rejection of the Whig interpretation of History was reflected in Australian historiography in the History curricula of Professor Max Crawford at the University of Melbourne. Crawford's curricula showed his eclecticism in that he borrowed from other sources and added these ideas to his own. As successor to Scott, he retained his emphasis on primary sources. However, in common with Wood, he was interested in the study of moral questions and liberty in past circumstances. Like his contemporary Roberts, Crawford saw the study of History as a means of understanding the present. He himself openly rejected the Whig interpretation of History and sought to purge it from the History curricula at Melbourne. He replaced it with his own Synoptic view of History. He also initiated classes in the Theory and Method of History. In so doing, he required History students to consider the aims and methodology of their study and so helped to professionalise the study of History in Australia. Crawford also introduced the widespread use of tutorials at the University of Melbourne.

The curricula of these four professors, therefore, reflected English and
German historiographical and pedagogical traditions. The concept of a distinctive School of History with a continuous nature at each of the universities of Sydney and Melbourne is invalid in that each professor implemented curricula which reflected his own personal and historiographical upbringing. Similarly, the often stated concept of Crawford taking 'the Wood tradition' to Melbourne is invalid. Any similarity in outlook was a result of similarities in their upbringing rather than Crawford simply borrowing from Wood. Roberts's dependence on Scott is usually overlooked by students of historiography and yet this concept is the more valid. Overall, the History curricula at the universities of Sydney and Melbourne from 1910 to 1950 were a result of each professor's individual adoption, modification or rejection of English and German historiographical and pedagogical traditions in an Australian context.
Introduction

The aim of this work is to analyse, compare and contrast the nature and derivation of the History curricula taught by Professors Wood and Roberts at the University of Sydney and Professors Scott and Crawford at the University of Melbourne from about 1910 to 1950.

That such an exercise is warranted was noted as far back as 1940 when Professor Crawford stated in the first issue of Historical Studies, "As a student under Wood in Sydney, and as successor to Scott in Melbourne, I have thought it fitting to undertake in a later issue of Historical Studies a discussion of the historical work, both in investigation and in teaching, of these two men". While this present work does not purport to handle this topic in the same manner as Crawford would have done, it does seek to analyse both the historical methodology and pedagogy of these two professors as well as the other two mentioned - Crawford himself has been included in the survey.

Wood was Professor of History from 1891 to 1928 while Crawford was Professor from 1937 to 1970, covering a total of eight decades. However, the emphasis of this work is on the four decades from 1910 to 1950 as it was during this period that all of the four professors under consideration held office at some time - Wood 1891 to 1928 and Roberts 1929 to 1947 at Sydney, and Scott 1914 to 1936 and Crawford 1937 to 1970 at Melbourne. Despite the concentration on these four decades, reference is made to relevant aspects of the periods before and after them.

The university curricula to be examined are those for undergraduate students (both Pass and Honours) as sufficient information is available on them to make an adequate analysis. In university calendars and handbooks information on postgraduate courses is scant in comparison with that on
undergraduate courses. As well, postgraduate courses were designed mainly for those who wished to adopt History as a specialist study probably as an aid to their careers whereas undergraduate courses were designed for much larger numbers of students and had a variety of aims which in turn reflected the aims and ideologies of the professors themselves.

The term 'curriculum' is sometimes defined in such a broad way as to be virtually useless. In this thesis it is used to incorporate such matters as the aims, content, method and assessment involved in teaching. The term 'curriculum' is also used to denote two precise concepts - firstly, a sequence of courses for study in one subject i.e. History, and secondly, a collection of courses which constitute one year's study in a given subject e.g. "History IV". The term, 'course', is used to denote one year of study on a specific topic e.g. "Contemporary World History since 1914".

The term, 'aims', encompasses such matters as knowledge, attitudes and skills objectives and these reflect the attributes that a History professor might wish a person to have as a result of studying his subject. By examining these aims as well as methods of teaching and assessment within a given curriculum, one can determine the nature of that curriculum. The so-called 'hidden curriculum' referring to such matters as the teacher's ideological and historiographical stances can also be deduced by such examination. As a result of this analysis of each professor's curriculum (or curricula over time) one is then able to compare and contrast the nature of these professors' curricula.

In the period under consideration in this work, 1910 to 1950, each professor was dominant in his department and was ultimately responsible for the nature of the curricula therein. While there may have been some variation in emphasis when one lecturer replaced another in the teaching of the same course, this only amounted to such variation within the framework
prescribed or permitted by the head of the department. This thesis is primarily an analysis of the implementation of the historiographical and pedagogical ideas of these professors themselves rather than a minute analysis of how individual lecturers may have adapted the professors' overall curricula to their individual bents.

From 1891 to 1915 Wood was the sole member of his History department and from 1916 to 1928 had only James Bruce on the permanent staff to assist him. By 1947, under Roberts, the total number of staff had still only risen to five. The staff at Melbourne in 1914, the year of Scott taking up duties as professor, was composed of Scott and Jessie Webb - the latter taught Ancient History courses and the former taught Medieval and Modern History courses. By 1936 the number of staff had risen to three full-time and four part-time members. During Crawford's professorship there was a massive increase in the numerical size of the department so that by 1950 there were twenty full-time members of whom eleven held the position of Lecturer or above. There were also two part-time lecturers. Until 1950 the History departments at Sydney and Melbourne were each controlled by one professor although in subsequent years, as these departments grew, extra professorships were created.

An exception to professorial dominance was Ancient History. The status of Ancient History within History departments is an interesting point and has helped to determine the parameters of the content of this thesis. At the University of Sydney the teaching of Ancient History was not the province of the History department until after December 1938 when Dr. McDonald was specially appointed to teach it. Until that time courses in Ancient History had formed part of the Classics curriculum. However from 1939, despite the fact that they were within the jurisdiction of Professor Roberts, it was Dr. McDonald, not Roberts, who determined the content of
Ancient History courses\(^2\) and supervised Honours students in Ancient History\(^3\).

Similarly at the University of Melbourne while the Professor of History had formal jurisdiction over Ancient History he left its management to a lecturer specialising in that field. There is substantial primary source evidence to verify this. In 1913 Ernest Scott wrote to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, "I learn that Miss Webb has had charge of ancient and medieval history recently and there is general testimony as to the excellence of her work"\(^4\). In the following year Scott, as in 1913, requested that Jessie Webb continue as the lecturer in Ancient History because, as he stated, "No human being can hope to keep up to date in ancient as well as in modern history"\(^5\).

Webb continued as the lecturer in Ancient History throughout Scott's professorship and into that of Crawford until her death in 1944. Kathleen Fitzpatrick, a student of Scott in the 1920's and a member of staff under Professor Crawford, has referred to Ancient History as Jessie Webb's "province" on at least two occasions - her 1966 W.E. Hearn Historical Lecture as reprinted in the *Melbourne Historical Journal*\(^6\), and in her autobiographical work, *Solid Bluestone Foundations*\(^7\). The autonomy of Webb within the History department was explicitly stated by Crawford in 1941 when he wrote, "The position in the Department of History is the more difficult because it is really a composite department of both Ancient and Modern History. The work of the present Senior Lecturer, Miss Webb, is entirely in Ancient History, and I leave its problems entirely to her"\(^8\). Crawford confirmed this autonomy of Jessie Webb in her formulation and teaching of Ancient History courses when he wrote in July 1985:
I did not invite George Paul to lecture to Ancient History classes which I regarded as Jessie Webb's province. It was a field in which I had had little training and I would not have thought of interfering in her arrangements which I respected - except in asking her to try out tutorial classes (with the result that she became an enthusiastic supporter of the system). (9)

Crawford directed and administered the Modern History courses in the department. He urged the appointment of a Senior Lecturer to help him in this task as "the one Senior Lecturer is a specialist in Ancient History."10 In a Memorandum on Examinations of about the same time, Crawford stated,

All question papers except those in Ancient History are approved by me before being sent to the printer. In Ancient History they are set by the Senior Lecturer, Miss Webb, in consultation with Mr. Harper who assists in the Ancient History work, and go immediately to the printer without reference to me. (11)

Thus in setting both the Ancient History courses and examinations thereon, Jessie Webb acted independently and although under the ultimate jurisdiction of the Professor of History, neither Scott nor Crawford appear to have interfered in her management of them. After Webb's death in 1944, Crawford invited John L. O'Brien to replace her. According to a student and later colleague of O'Brien, D.J. Mulvaney,

In retrospect, Crawford was a crucial factor in the success of Ancient History Parts I and II during the 1940's. As head of department, he took no action whatever in relation to the control of Ancient History, and thereby conveyed to O'Brien his complete confidence in his courses. Virtually, O'Brien was free to teach what, when and where he wished, and this wise trust was something that he valued tremendously. In his turn, O'Brien encouraged initiative in his students, and in fact, often went to 'have a talk with Max' about matters. (12)

Thus while Roberts, Scott and Crawford as heads of departments each had courses in Ancient History within their jurisdiction, none sought to dominate the teaching of these courses. At both the universities of Sydney and Melbourne the nature of the Ancient History courses was left at the
discretion of lecturers who had specialised in that field. All of the four professors under consideration in this thesis had studied aspects of Modern History before their appointment and did not have the background to authoritatively dictate the nature of Ancient History courses. Consequently these courses did not directly bear the imprint of their historiographical stances in the same way as Medieval and Modern History courses did. For this reason, analysis of Ancient History courses has mostly been omitted from this thesis as it would tend to be irrelevant. The main matters to be considered are the overall structure of each professor's curriculum as a whole and the influence of his historiographical stance on the courses the nature of which he determined therein.

Comparative analysis of university History curricula does not just entail study of separate curricula and their European historiographical and pedagogical derivation. It also requires an evaluation of the concept of a 'Sydney School' and a 'Melbourne School' in the study and teaching of History. That such a distinction can be made between aspects of intellectual life in these two cities has been noted by Donald Horne in 1964 and John Docker in 1974. Horne described "two main strands" in intellectual activity:

At Melbourne University: a feeling that the English Puritan Revolution is still being fought (if in social terms), a continuing concern with moral affirmation and sincerity of motives, and a belief in the implementation of eternal righteousness. At Sydney University: an avoidance of 'illusion' and 'confusion', a destructive analysis of practically everything, and the consolation of feeling oneself one of the elect. For the one, Professor Max Crawford: for the other Professor John Anderson. (13)

In 1985 Crawford affirmed this distinction between the two universities14. While Docker in 1974 did not refer to Crawford or any of the other professors dealt with in this thesis, his main argument was that "Australian culture has for too long been seen as unified and monolithic, whereas it contains alternative and varied traditions, which are versions in
Australia of major European cultural arguments ..."15. This thesis is an attempt to examine the concept of different intellectual traditions in Sydney and Melbourne (although not Docker's specific thesis) in relation to the teaching of History at the universities of these two cities to about 1950.

Intellectual traditions have to be seen in the context of usage within History departments in the first half of the twentieth century. At this time there were increasing numbers of students taking History (in absolute terms) and increasing importance given to the task of research vis-a-vis teaching by members of staff. Honours students also shared in the increasing importance attached to primary source research. In 1892 Wood taught more than eighty History students16 out of the total of 372 students (day and evening) in the Faculty of Arts and 598 in the whole university17. This was at a time when History was available only to Second and Third Year students. By 1910, when History was available to students of all Years, there were 399 students (including postgraduate students) in the Faculty of Arts and 1342 in the whole university; by 1927 these numbers were 828 and 2410 respectively. Although student numbers more than doubled from 1892 to 192718, the number of full-time staff in the History department merely rose from one to two. It is therefore little wonder that Wood had hardly any time for research. His first book, The Discovery of Australia, did not appear until 1922 and that was based upon a lecture course he had given in 1917 on Australian history.

Similarly with Wood's successor, Stephen Roberts, few books were written by him after he took up his duties as professor. As with Wood, and perhaps even moreso, Roberts experienced an increase in the number of students. Whereas student numbers in the Faculty of Arts rose from 399 in 1910 to 828 in 1927, they rose from 880 in 1929 to 2413 in 1947! This high enrolment was due to the cessation of World War II and many former
members of the services resuming or commencing their studies. Despite this large post-war increase, the number of members of the History department rose only from four in 1944 to five in 1947. However Roberts did have time to make commentaries (mostly in newspapers and on radio) on current affairs in the 1930's and 1940's. He also continued to stress the research function of scholars in his Honours students and through them helped to develop the emerging concept in Australia of the 'professional' historian.

The History department at Melbourne has been better endowed, in terms of the number of staff members, than has that at Sydney. In 1914, Scott's first year as professor, there was a total of 1324 students at the University of Melbourne while by 1936 there were 3752. With this threefold increase in total student numbers, the History department's staff was increased from two full-time members to three full-time members and four part-time members. Similarly from 1937, Crawford's first year as professor, to 1949 there was an increase in the total number of students at the university from 3861 to 9254 of whom 2304 were in the Faculty of Arts. In October 1941 Crawford reported to the Vice-Chancellor, "This department is very large, teaching ten (from next year, eleven) subjects to over 450 students (counting as a unit one student taking one subject)." In 1941 there were 4623 students at the University of Melbourne. A peak of 9506 occurred in 1948 as a result of the enrolment of those returning from participation in World War II. During this period of a two and a half times increase in student numbers from 1937 to 1949 the number of full-time members of the History department increased sevenfold! Of these twenty-one full-time staff members, eight were classed as "Temporary (Post-war) Senior Tutors". This large number of tutors would be attributable to Crawford's emphasis on the tutorial system in his pedagogy.

The Second World War not only brought about an influx of students at its cessation but also changed the role of universities in regard to research
for its duration and thereafter. While this research was primarily of the nature of 'applied science' in the fields of physics, chemistry, engineering and medicine, "the role and performance of the universities during the war demonstrated the potential of university research in Australian life"\(^{21}\). This was in contrast to the pre-war period when, according to Geoffrey Serle, "The universities continued to operate on a pinchpenny basis; it was common for a professor to teach half a dozen courses with the help of one or two lamentably paid junior assistants. Research was a luxury, not reasonably to be expected"\(^{22}\). Serle did admit that some research occurred in university History departments in the inter-war years.

In the period under consideration, 1910 to 1950, there was therefore great strain put upon the Sydney and Melbourne History departments due to the increasing numbers of students and the need to match this with increases in staff. This was exacerbated by the increasing emphasis on primary source research which required time which would otherwise have been spent in teaching. This emphasis on research can be traced back to the Scientific historiographical tradition although it could not make much impact in Australia until the resources were available for it to be implemented. The opening of government archives, the publication of historical records and the establishment of primary source repositories such as the Mitchell Library in Sydney facilitated this implementation. When it did occur, it was usually in the area of Australian or Pacific history and this was illustrated by the research and pedagogy of the four professors under consideration in this thesis. The increasing importance attached to research in university life was reflected in the second half of the 1940's when both universities established the degree of Doctor of Philosophy which was awarded on the basis of full-time research done by the candidate. The University of Melbourne introduced the degree into Australia in 1945 and Sydney followed suit in 1948.
A major theme in this thesis is therefore the impact of English and German historiographical and pedagogical traditions on the History curricula in practice at the universities of Sydney and Melbourne from about 1910 to 1950. To do this, the historical training of the four professors of history pertinent to this period - Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford - will be examined and analyses made to see how they were influenced or reacted to these traditions in the curricula that they implemented at their respective universities. Another theme will be that of comparing and contrasting the nature of these curricula.

These four professors are presented in chronological order of their taking office - Wood 1891, Scott 1914, Roberts 1929 and Crawford 1937. This method, apart from the convenience of historical sequence, allows for comparisons and contrasts between the historiographical traditions to which these four professors belonged. Wood was mainly representative of the English Liberal (with Whig methodology) and Literary traditions although his historiographical stance also reflected the synthesising of these with the German Scientific tradition. Scott was mainly representative of the latter in his methodology although ideologically he supported the English Liberal tradition. Roberts, a student of Scott, saw himself as being in the Scientific tradition. Crawford denounced Whig methodology as being too narrow in scope and in its stead sought to implement a Synoptic approach by taking into account the interaction of all aspects of an historical situation.

To some extent Crawford followed in the Liberal tradition in that he was interested in the concept of liberty or freedom in history but he was not a supporter of the Whig historians who portrayed the history of mankind as the story of social and political progress with a concomitant enlargement of freedom, especially in regard to British history. He was an adherent of the Literary tradition in two respects. Firstly, he regarded literary evidence as
a legitimate source for historical investigation and secondly, he believed that style and clarity of expression were important in the writing of historical works. He pursued Scientific methodology to the point that in the 1940's he attempted for a while to find some regularity in human behaviour in the same way as natural scientists do in their field, almost to the point of determining laws. Crawford's historiographical stance can be seen as combining certain aspects of the Liberal, Literary and Scientific historiographical traditions and yet also reacting against other aspects of them culminating in attempts to reformulate the aims and methodology of historical study.

It is obviously difficult to simply classify historians practising in the first half of the twentieth century as belonging to one historiographical group or another. Historians held some views in common but also differed on other aspects of the study and teaching of History. It is more therefore a matter of emphasis rather than placing historians into dichotomously opposing camps so as to gain some neat classification system. It is wrong to impose artificial classification systems upon them. By placing each professor's historical methodology and pedagogy in relation to their respective historiographical traditions, one can understand their nature and how they were organically derived. By putting these professors' curricula into such historical perspective in relation to their English and German origins, one can gain a much greater understanding of them and this is what most published studies have so far failed to do (see chapter 1 of this thesis).

Professor F.L. Wood hinted at this technique of putting Australian historiography in relation to its British ancestry when he stated of his father, George Arnold Wood, that "His case represents the migration to a new country not only of men but of ideas; in becoming an Australian he represents both the continuity of the old and the adaptation to the new of a lively and sensitive intelligence."
One flaw in historical study is that terms are often used without precise definitions of them being determined. The term, 'historiography', can be used in two ways both of which are used in this thesis. Firstly, it can mean the study of the works of those who have written about the past and is usually applied to secondary sources (the works of Clarendon may be an exception). Secondly, it can refer to the works themselves with their intrinsic ideas that are characteristic of a group or school of historians e.g. 'Whig historiography'. The term, 'historiographical stance', refers to the ideology (values, beliefs and attitudes), aims and methodology of a particular historian.

The two pedagogical terms, 'seminar' and 'tutorial', also need clarifying. According to G.R. Elton, a 'tutorial' consists of a discussion on a particular topic between a teacher and one student (perhaps two students at the most) whereas a 'seminar' is conducted by a group of students and their teacher on a topic which is of common historical interest to all. The tutorial was characteristic of pedagogy in English universities based on the collegiate system from the mid-nineteenth century whereas the seminar was characteristic of pedagogy in German universities. In Australia the two terms appear to have become rather confused. Both Wood and Scott occasionally met their Honours students individually to discuss their essays with them although these one-to-one discussions did not assume the prominence that the tutorial system did in English universities. At times Scott also held seminars. Roberts introduced seminars for his Honours students at Sydney while Crawford did so on a permanent basis for all students, both Pass and Honours, at Melbourne. Crawford however referred to these seminars as 'tutorials'. He had experienced the latter, in the English sense, during his time at Oxford and supported the discursive methodology inherent in them. He was keen to implement this system at
Melbourne. While, technically, Crawford used the seminar method (with groups of students), his own terminology will be used in this thesis.

Another term which has been loosely defined is that of 'Whig' historiography. While no-one appears to have actually and specifically defined what is meant by the 'Whig' interpretation of history, there appears to be agreement on some of its characteristics. Using these generally acknowledged characteristics, the 'Whig' interpretation of history can be taken to be a methodology in historical study and writing which views past events and themes from the perspective of the present and in so doing simplifies the course of history by emphasising those factors which have culminated in the status quo. By doing this, 'Whig' historians have given a false sense of inevitable progress to the course of history and narrowed the scope of historical writing by omitting factors which appear peripheral or irrelevant to this march of progress. Certain people or groups have been classed as supporters or opponents of this 'progress'.

The 'Whig' interpretation of History appears to some to be synonymous with the 'Liberal' historiographical tradition although they are quite distinct. However in certain works they can be seen as working in unison. Historians in nineteenth century Britain often used (both consciously and unconsciously) Whig methodology in describing British political history to that time and this reflected an ideological basis for this methodology. By emphasising the development and implementation of political liberalism in British history, the scope of historical writing was often limited to the story of political progress and sometimes was aimed at justifying a current political stance. This was also applied to the development of political liberalism in British colonies.

Historians of the Liberal historiographical tradition were interested in the concept of liberty, or freedom, and its practice. Both Whig and
anti-Whig historians (such as Professor Crawford) have been interested in this concept which forms part of the content of university curricula. Whether the methodology of its study is 'Whiggish' is another matter.

Whig methodology can be applied not only to political history but also to other forms of history such as cultural, educational, military etc. It is especially characteristic of an age when the people living therein perceive themselves as being at or on the path to the zenith of whatever is being studied. This was the case of British historians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when Great Britain, taken overall as a nation, was prosperous, powerful and politically 'progressive'. Liberal historiography therefore applies to the study of the concept of liberalism, liberty or freedom i.e. curriculum content, whereas Whig historiography refers to how this content is historically portrayed i.e. methodology.

This thesis is composed of seven chapters divided into four sections. Before analysing, comparing and contrasting the nature and derivation of the History curricula taught by the four professors under consideration, a survey is made of what has been published on them so far. Having shown the need for the exercise undertaken, English and German historiographical and pedagogical traditions are then outlined so as to place the curricula in their historical context. The educational background of each professor, especially that which exposed him to these traditions, is examined before an analysis is made of the History curricula implemented under him at university. The work concludes with an evaluation of the concept of Schools of History the nature of which are peculiar to Sydney or Melbourne.
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Chapter 1

Historiography of Australian Historiography:

Published Studies of Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford

Despite the lapse of fifteen years since the retirement of Max Crawford as Professor of History at the University of Melbourne and the passing of longer periods since the retirement of the other three professors, few major works have been written on their lives and their work. None has been written comparing the impact of their historiographical stances on the curriculum that they taught at their respective universities. Although there is a lack of secondary sources analysing the historiographical traditions and related pedagogical techniques of these four professors, many published primary sources do exist although heavily weighted (both in terms of number and judgement) in favour of the Melbourne School of History.

Ironically, the only major work devoted entirely to any one of these four professors is that on the Sydney professor Wood but written by the Melbourne professor Crawford. The reason for Crawford undertaking this task was stated by him in the Preface to his work:

The History which Arnold Wood taught in the University of Sydney from 1891 to 1928 has become in many respects unfashionable. But fashion is not a test of validity and it is my belief that his ideas and practice have a present relevance. (1)

Although this book, entitled 'A Bit of a Rebel': the life and work of George Arnold Wood, was not published until 1975 it had been planned since the late 1940's. In the University of Melbourne's 1948 "Research Report" for History it was stated that Crawford and Miss Margaret Kiddle were working on "a study of the first Challis Professor of History in the University, his life, his influence as a teacher, and his importance in Australia as a representative of
the English Non-Conformist Liberal tradition\(^2\). It was planned to finish writing the book in 1948.

This classification of Wood as a Nonconformist Liberal was also adopted by Wood's son, Professor F.L. Wood of Victoria University College (Wellington, New Zealand) in his "George Arnold Wood Memorial Lecture", *The Historian in the Modern Community*, of 1949 which was published in 1950.

In 1962 Crawford read a paper entitled "The Antipodean Pilgrimage of Arnold Wood: a Manchester Liberal and the Boer War" to the Royal Australian Historical Society and in the following year it was published in the Society's *Journal*. In this paper Crawford examined Wood's Nonconformist and Liberal upbringing and its relation to his opposition to Britain's role in the Boer War. The tradition of Nonconformist Liberalism was again noted in *A Bit of a Rebel* and it was this that gave Wood's History curriculum its distinctive flavour.

Although Crawford was taught by Wood for one year (1925) at the University of Sydney, this book can be classified as a secondary source due to its coverage of Wood's life from birth to death and therefore, of necessity, Crawford consulted sources other than his own personal recollections of Wood\(^3\).

Crawford's theme of Wood as a Nonconformist Liberal was shared by Manning Clark in his article (published in 1955), "Arnold Wood - and His View of History". According to Clark, what Wood did in Sydney was "to argue that material progress and liberty were the fruits of British political institutions and the Protestant religion"\(^4\).

Although not explicitly stated by either Crawford or Clark, this description would classify Wood as a proponent of what is known as the 'Whig interpretation of History'. While this term is usually applied to British
historiography, it can also be applied to a certain degree to that of Australia. In an article, "Challenges to Australian Identity", published in 1978, Professor Michael Roe divided Australian historians into Whigs and counter-Whigs. According to Roe, Australian Whig historians have emphasised three aspects of Australia's history - Progress, Unity and Democracy. 'Progress' is seen in terms of political and economic development, especially ever-broadening liberty and pastoral wealth. This concern with 'Progress' leads to the underplaying of aborigines and convicts in Australia's history. The concept of 'Unity' "encourages the Whig to enhance the homogeneity of Australian history" and "to exaggerate the distinctiveness of Australian experience". Concerning 'Democracy', "Australian Whigs see the needs and will of the common man as being the great dynamic force in our history". In general, the Whig interpretation of Australian history is "genial, congratulatory, and optimistic. Further characteristics of Whiggism and of this dominant version of Australian history, are emphasis upon the material, secular aspects of life, and lack of concern for minorities and failures".

Roe did not refer to Wood, Scott or Roberts but did refer to Crawford and his School of History which he described as "the powerhouse of Australian academic history" in the 1940's and 1950's and in which Whiggism was "especially strong". However Roe later stated that Crawford, in his 1960 An Australian Perspective, was a 'modifier' of the Whig interpretation but he did not really explain this apparent change:

One of the modifiers is R.M. Crawford, who for a generation from 1937 led the Melbourne History Department, said much earlier in this paper to have been a powerhouse of Whiggery: such are the paradoxes that arise when abstract patterns are imposed on real people. (9)

Crawford himself had repudiated the Whig interpretation of History in the
1930's and this puts some doubt on Roe's initial classification of Crawford as a Whig. An obvious difficulty is variations in historians' own understandings of what constitutes Whig historiography and what exactly it is.

In the early 1960's Professor John M. Ward wrote in his chapter in The Pattern of Australian Culture that,

The "Whig" interpretation is not "Whig" at all; the name derives from a fancied resemblance to the Whig version of British history. No one book embodies it completely. Russel Ward's The Australian Legend (1958) and R.A. Gollan's Radical and Working Class Politics: A Study of Eastern Australia. 1850-1910 (1960) do, however, if read together, come near to presenting the "Whig" view as understood by some of their contemporaries. (10)

Ward summarised what has been described as a Whig interpretation of Australian history:

There were two bites at democracy in Australia, one in the fifties and another in the eighties and later. The first is supposed to have been accomplished by middle-class liberals and radicals who took power from the former oligarchy of pastoralists and officials in the early years of responsible government. The second bite at democracy is attributed to an increasingly articulate working class. The trade-unions, inspired sometimes by radical collectivist ideas from overseas and enlivened by the social ideals of the indigenous rural proletariat (Dr. Ward's bush workers), were the motive power behind the later move toward political democracy and social reform. Labor, in other words, provided the architects of Australian democracy that was at once egalitarian and national. (11)

Ten years later, in 1973, Ward stated,

In Australian history there are still no significant schools of interpretation, apart from the discordant and fragmentary efforts of the Left, new and old, and Manning Clark's understanding of our past, that is not yet fully worked out. There are no charismatic teachers, to command a following among scholars willing to explore the resources of an idea or of a method of enquiry. (12)

John M. Ward, third Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney, therefore believed that the term 'Whig' could not validly be applied to Australian historiography and that there were "no significant schools of interpretation".
Another method of classifying Australian historians has been put forward by Donald Horne who divided them into the "rough" and the "smooth". In his 1976 review of Frank Crowley's *A New History of Australia*, Horne wrote,

On one side are rough democracy, as portrayed in Russel Ward's *The Australian Legend* and elsewhere, a general emphasis on the labour movement, the crudity of Cyril Pearl's *The Wild Men of Sydney*. On the other side is the story of the long craving for respectability, the ideal that we might all of us become good, wise, prosperous, responsible, as expressed in works such as Michael Roe's brilliantly conceived and appallingly written *Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia 1835-1851*. Each painting could then be reproduced on dust-jackets for one of the two general views of Australian history, the rough view and the smooth. (13)

The reference to paintings was a literary device used by Horne to commence his review. They were to depict Governor-General Kerr and opposing demonstrators whom Horne saw as representative of the 'smooth' and 'rough' respectively in Australian history.

In his 1979 book, *The Manufacture of Australian History*, Rob Pascoe noted these and Stuart Macintyre's 'bourgeois' and 'radical' classifications of Australian historians but stated that, "None of these pairs of labels does justice to the complexity of Australian historiography and, more importantly, tends to reduce the difficult task of critically evaluating history-writing to a conflict between opposing camps". Instead he devised a classification system based upon that in Stephen Pepper's 1942 book, *Worlds Hypotheses: a study in evidence*. In applying Pepper's classification system to Australian historians, Pascoe included Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford in the category of "Liberal Patriots" who "were concerned to understand how English practices were transplanted into a new environment so that a genuinely Australian civilization was created: this was the broad context of events and ideas". While such categorization may be partially satisfactory
when painting a broad canvas encompassing about fifty historians as Pascoe did, it is unsatisfactory to the extent that it ignored differences between historians that he put into the one group.

Apart from minor references elsewhere, Pascoe, a graduate of Melbourne, took just one page of the 168 pages of text in his book to describe the contributions of Wood, Scott and Roberts to Australian historiography! Of Wood, he wrote,

> Attempting to work out his liberal principles in the antipodes - most significantly over his opposition to the Boer War - Wood found that 'free speech' was not tolerated in the colonies, and incurred the displeasure of the university senate. It may have been such collisions with intolerance that shaped the approach of later liberal patriots, notably in their careful division of 'fact' and 'value'. (17)

In regard to Scott, Pascoe quoted La Nauze's observation that Scott "did not encourage (bringing) to history a point of view". Pascoe himself noted that Scott "initiated the first full-length course in Australian history in 1927: Wood had usually taught the subject as a segment of imperial history." He then quoted Macintyre to show the impact Scott had on the teaching of history in Australia by listing his three students who became professors of History at Australian universities - Roberts, Hancock and Alexander.

The brevity with which Pascoe dealt with Roberts results in a damning judgement of that professor. Without referring to any of Roberts's works or to his students who have occupied chairs at Australian universities, Pascoe merely repeated Gollan's statement that Roberts "presided over one of the dullest history schools in Australia". Although Gollan, as a History student at the University of Sydney in the mid-1930's, can be regarded as a primary source, the view stated here is obviously a partial one (in both senses of the term) and gives no idea of the overall picture.

Pascoe spent about five pages of his book on Crawford whom he
described as "the real master of Australian history during this period" i.e. from the late 1930's to the late 1950's. In his study of Crawford's historiographical stance, Pascoe outlined Crawford's 'Synoptic' view of History and his later move "from the positivism of Hempel to the linguistic philosophy of Wittgenstein". Throughout his account, Pascoe stated that Crawford's historiographical stance was based upon that of Hancock, especially as reflected in the latter's 1930 book, *Australia*. Although he referred to Wood as Crawford's "mentor", Pascoe gave no information to justify the use of this term nor of other influences on Crawford.

The closest that Pascoe came to noting some difference between the Sydney and Melbourne Schools of History was in the statement,

> Although Melbourne was the focus of historical research in the 1940's and 1950's in Australia, producing an almost missionary orthodoxy exemplified by Crawford and other liberal patriots, the shape of historical inquiry at the University of Sydney under professors S.H. Roberts and J.M. Ward was somewhat different in important respects.

Pascoe went on to describe Ward's historiographical stance but he made no further mention of that of Roberts and hence did not elaborate on the differences at which he had hinted. Pascoe's analysis of the historiography and pedagogy of Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford therefore lacks detail and balance and, apart from his study of Crawford, was largely based on the opinions of other historians. But for a brief reference to Crawford's Theory and Method classes, no reference is made to the pedagogical techniques used by the professors in the teaching of their respective views of History.

A more detailed study of these Australian History professors can be found in Stuart Macintyre's article, "Radical History and Bourgeois Hegemony". Macintyre portrayed Wood's curriculum at the University of Sydney as the best illustration of the type of History curriculum taught at Australian universities on the eve of World War I:
The curriculum was a weak imitation of the English mother-culture through which the undergraduate came to appreciate the inevitability and rightness of the English way of doing things. No university taught Australian history. History in the colonies was at its best only loosely related to the lived past; it was predominantly a course of moral instruction based on established texts. (25)

Scott's contribution to Australian historiography and pedagogy was that he "introduced a wholly new emphasis upon research and document study." Scott emphasised the study of facts which could be ascertained from the study of documents. The availability of Australian historical documents encouraged Scott and other scholars, especially in the 1920's, to research and write on aspects of Australian history.

These two factors - the availability of primary sources and the work of pioneers such as Scott and Wood - had been noted in 1943 by Herbert Heaton in his article, "The Progress of Historical Studies in Australia". Heaton saw these factors (along with the establishment of 'workers' education') as the reasons for the increase in Australian historical scholarship in the inter-war years. Scott was deemed by Heaton to be "especially influential and successful" in this process. Roberts was only noted in that he was a student of Scott and wrote *History of Australian Land Settlement, 1788-1920* which work was seen as a result of Scott's inspiring professional leadership. Heaton saw Crawford's importance in Australian historiography as being in his increasing interest in Australia's place in Pacific affairs not just those of Europe as evidenced by his being editor of *Ourselves and the Pacific* which Heaton described as "a highly worth-while effort at a new approach".

In his 1959 study of university research in History, Professor Crawford himself emphasised the difficulties under which pre-World War II university research had been carried out. Professor Wood and to a lesser extent Professor Scott had little help in their lecturing duties and hence could not give much time to historical research - their first duty was as teachers. Nevertheless, according to Crawford,
they and their immediate successors transformed the state of original historical writing in Australia. They increased the facilities for scholarly research, left the universities dominant in it, and, indeed, may be said to have prepared the way for the replacement of the amateur by the professional in Australian historical writing. (29)

Scott was described by Crawford as "the doyen of Australian historians". Stephen Roberts's 1924 History of Australian Land Settlement was seen by Crawford as an example of the fruits of "the encouragement of good graduates with research grants".

In the 1966 publication, The Historiography of the British Empire-Commonwealth, Kenneth MacKirdy was also concerned with the availability of primary sources in Australia and the role of universities as centres of research and consequent publication thereof. He judged Scott as "the first significant figure in the development of professional Australian history" while Wood's importance was seen mainly as a teacher. Of Professor Roberts, MacKirdy wrote,

Stephen H. Roberts' History of Australian Land Settlement (1788-1920) (1924) and his The Squatting Age in Australia, 1835-1847 (1935), are other early publications which had noteworthy effects on Australian scholarship. Later investigators, dealing with more restricted periods, have demonstrated so many errors in the first of Roberts' books that it should now be used with caution. The Squatting Age, with its description of the pastoral society which dominated the eastern mainland before the discovery of gold, has survived the scrutiny of later researchers better.

Wood's primary role as a teacher and Roberts's emphasis on research had also been noted in 1952 by Professor P.H. Partridge in his lecture which was one of a series commemorating the centenary of the University. Partridge did not mention research done by Wood but summarised his teaching of History as "first and foremost an earnest, sympathetic, passionate introduction to some of the most important moral and intellectual movements that have entered into the progress of European culture".
According to Partridge, changes occurred in the character of the Sydney History School after Wood's death in 1928. Changes initiated by Roberts were firstly, an increasing interest in the political and economic development of the Great Powers during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and secondly, an increasing emphasis on Australian and Pacific history. Roberts also encouraged research by the staff and by M.A. and honours students in these fields. Partridge appears to have been one of the few historical commentators who really sought to understand the nature of Roberts's School of History and not merely dismissed it as of little consequence.

In his article, "Radical History and Bourgeois Hegemony", Macintyre ignored Professor Roberts altogether and, like Pascoe, put the emphasis in his work on Crawford\(^{35}\). According to Macintyre,

> Crawford maintained the liberal moral concern of his predecessors and set it on a refurbished philosophical basis (but one which still fell far short of the methodology of Hempel). Moral judgement now proceeded from the freedom of will which derived from the ability to understand a situation historically. (36)

In the teaching of History, "Crawford built the Melbourne department (and its journal Historical Studies) into the leading Australian history department and a source of staff recruitment for other departments for two decades"\(^{37}\).

Professor Roberts fared better in G.C. Bolton's 1969 article, "Australian Historians in Quest of a Theme". Bolton expressed admiration for Roberts's books published in the 1920's and 1930's but foreshadowed Pascoe's pessimistic view of the Sydney School of History under Roberts: "Yet despite Roberts' early brilliance, despite the individual records of some of those whom he taught, it is difficult to see the department of history which he chaired as a seminal influence in Australian historiography"\(^{38}\). Of Scott and Wood, Bolton stated that they "made their most important contributions to the future of Australian history through their graduate
students. For his appraisal of Crawford, Bolton listed three important contributions that Crawford made to Australian historical teaching:

He showed that home-bred Australians might hope to achieve excellence in periods and countries outside their own, concentrating especially on the Italian Renaissance and the English Civil War. He kindled an interest, hitherto somewhat lacking, in intellectual and social history. And he inculcated in many of his students a concern for issues of social conscience.

Both Bolton and Pascoe refer to Wood as the "mentor" of Crawford but the use of this term, which means an "experienced and trusted adviser", is misapplied in this case. Crawford was only taught by Wood in the second year (1925) of his Bachelor of Arts degree and for most of the remainder of the 1920's Crawford was overseas. While the term may accurately be applied to Scott's relationship with Roberts, it is too simplistic (and erroneous) to apply it to Wood and Crawford - many other influences helped to determine Crawford's historiographical stance and pedagogical technique. Neither Bolton nor Pascoe note the special relationship between Scott and Roberts.

This thesis is a means of rectifying this situation by showing Scott's immense impact on Roberts as an historian and conversely by showing that Wood's impact on Crawford was not as great as is commonly assumed. The thesis is also a means of filling a gap in Australian historiography by examining Roberts's development as an historian, the nature of his History curriculum at the University of Sydney and the rationale of this curriculum. No attempt appears to have been made to understand it and judgements have been made of it without adequate substantiating evidence.

In summary, the only 'secondary source' books to date devoted entirely to Australian historiography have been those of Crawford on Wood (1975) and of Pascoe on Australian historians in general (1979). Other works have either been monographs, articles, or chapters in books dealing with other
(non-historiographical) matters as well. The main themes in these works have been firstly, the problem of classification of Australian historians; secondly, the historical research undertaken at Australian universities; and thirdly, the relative importance of various Australian historians in the development of historical studies in Australia.

In respect of the first of these, various terms have been used - 'Rough' and 'Smooth' by Horne (1976), 'Whig' and 'counter-Whig' by Roe (1978 but largely based on an unpublished 1962 A.N.Z.A.A.S. paper by A.W. Martin), 'Liberal Patriots', 'Old Left', Manning Clark, 'Empiricist Conservatives', 'Syncretic Conservatives', 'Feminists', 'Sociological Historians', and 'New Left' by Pascoe (1979). John M. Ward has opposed the use of the term 'Whig' when applied to Australian historiography and in fact denies that there are any "significant schools of interpretation" in Australian history at all!

The second theme, research undertaken at Australian universities, has been looked at by Heaton (1943), Partridge (1952), Crawford (1959), MacKirdy (1966) and Macintyre (1972). In each of these works, leading into the third theme, Professor Scott is seen as a pioneer and especially important in the development of historical studies in Australia. Ironically, despite the fact that Stephen Roberts regarded Scott as his mentor and acknowledged him as the source of his methodology, in contrast to Scott, he has received quite a 'bad press' from most commentators on Australian historiography. Wood has been portrayed as an historian in the English Nonconformist Liberal tradition and rather conservative in his aims and methodology. In the studies so far published, Crawford has emerged as the 'star in the historical firmament'.

While secondary sources in Australian historiography therefore appear to be weighted, both numerically and judgementally, in favour of the
Melbourne School of History and especially of the professorship of Crawford, so too do the primary sources so far published. The only student of Wood to have written about his university teacher appears to have been Max Crawford and his account was more in the realm of a secondary rather than a primary source. Roberts has fared little better with only one student, John M. Ward, writing of the Sydney School of History under Roberts. Ward was a History student at the University of Sydney from 1936 to 1938 and a member of the History staff from 1944. In 1971, upon the death of Roberts, The University of Sydney News published a generally favourable article by Ward entitled, "Sir Stephen as Historian". In this article Ward noted Roberts's publications, the nature of his School of History, graduates who themselves became professors of History, Scott's influence on Roberts, and Roberts's contribution to Australian historiography. Ward stated that, "As a teacher he was stimulating to nearly everybody and utterly rigorous with his best people".

Four years later in the journal of the History Teachers' Association of New South Wales, Teaching History, Ward recorded some reminiscences of his time as a student in the 1930's. In this he stressed the "high intellectual standards" expected of History students by Roberts. Ward was taught by Crawford in 1936 and then by Roberts after his return from overseas. In comparing the two, Ward wrote,

Whereas Crawford, while in charge of the History Department, had breathed the spirit of liberal nineteenth century Oxford, as communicated to him by George Arnold Wood, his old teacher, who had been Challis Professor from 1891 to 1928, and of the Oxford that he had experienced for himself after graduation, Roberts was the most devoted of the students of Ernest Scott of Melbourne, who had been a very plain, self-taught documentary historian. (45)

Note here Ward's observation that Crawford's liberal outlook was a result not just of his being taught by Wood but also of his own experiences at
Oxford in the 1920's. In contrast to Ward's generally favourable comments on Roberts in 1971 and 1975, in the latter year Robin Gollan (with whom Ward had shared the University Medal in History) stated in his review of John Docker's book, *Australian Cultural Elites*, that Roberts "presided over one of the dullest history schools in Australia". This latter view is the one that has been unilaterally adopted by Pascoe.

However Gollan's statement, while not complimentary to the Sydney School of History under Roberts, could, by implication, be just as unfavourable to the Melbourne History School under Scott when put into its context. According to Gollan,

> In the reviews the point has been made that people central to the culture of Sydney or Melbourne are not native to them.... It could be added that Max Crawford, the architect of the first really important school of history in this country, was a migrant from Sydney, and that S.H. Roberts, who presided over one of the dullest history schools in Australia, was a product of Melbourne. The question is, could Crawford have built the kind of school that he did if he had remained in Sydney?... Of course there can be no definitive answer to such counter-questions, but they are relevant to the study of cultural history. (47)

Ward had noted that, "Roberts was the most devoted of the students of Ernest Scott of Melbourne, who had been a very plain, self-taught documentary historian". Perhaps what should be open to criticism is not Roberts personally or as an historian but rather the historiographical tradition to which he belonged with its 'scientific' emphasis and all that entailed.

Members and graduates of the Melbourne School of History have been more forthright in espousing the virtues of their School in general and of Professors Scott and Crawford in particular. In his 1954 autobiographical work, *Country and Calling*, Keith Hancock described the impact of Professors Scott and Harrison Moore, and Jessie Webb on his understanding of History.
As a general comment, Hancock stated, "All in all, I should find it hard to design a course of study better suited to a young man of my type than the course offered to me at Melbourne." Apart from praise such as this for the curriculum itself, another attribute of 'primary source' writers of the Melbourne School of History is their feeling of personal attachment to the History department as an institution and to the personalities in it. Of Scott's impact on him, Hancock write, "I made the exhilarating discovery that study, when it is pursued with ardour and discipline, becomes creation. I made, rather more slowly, another exciting discovery - that my master was also my friend."

In 1962 the *Melbourne Historical Journal* (the journal of the Melbourne University Historical Society) published two articles on the Melbourne School of History - one by Crawford himself and the other by a well-known graduate, Manning Clark. In the former, entitled "The School of Prudence or Inaccuracy and Incoherence in Describing Chaos", Crawford outlined his study and teaching of History since his Oxford days in the late 1920's with emphasis on his time as Professor of History at Melbourne. The twin themes of pride in the Melbourne School of History and personal attachment to its members and graduates are evident in the opening paragraph:

One is all too aware of opportunities for original work missed, of work confidently planned that remains undone, of false trails followed. It is of course true that often enough the opportunities had to be missed, since they could be taken only at the cost of neglecting the demands of a large and growing school. The rewards, on the other hand, have been great, in the loyalty and friendship of one's colleagues and students, and in the knowledge of their achievements.

Clark combined both themes in one sentence when writing of Crawford:

This, then was the man who enthused a whole generation of students by carrying on the Melbourne tradition - who excited them by posing the questions of the day: such as - if bad conditions have made men evil, will good
conditions make them good? or - is it possible to bring culture to the masses without a loss of standards? or - is it possible to have greater economic and social equality without loss of liberty? (51)

According to Clark, Crawford was "a great teacher" in that he was "a man who addressed himself to the great intellectual questions of the day, who communicated to us the excitement of the chase, and presented the memorable pictures". In 1966 Kathleen Fitzpatrick, a History student at the University of Melbourne in the 1920's and a member of staff from 1939, delivered a lecture on "Ernest Scott and the Melbourne School of History". Although part could be regarded as a secondary source, most of what she said was based upon personal experience. In 1968 this lecture was printed in the Melbourne Historical Journal. Apart from describing the virtues of Scott's School of History, Fitzpatrick repeated the feeling of friendship between teacher and student at Melbourne evident in the writings of Hancock, Crawford and Clark - "His interest and encouragement of students was in part policy, but only in part. Although he was severe with us he really liked us". Although this may appear rather saccharine, it does reflect a distinguishing feature between what has been published on the Sydney and Melbourne Schools of History. The little that has been written about Roberts gives one the impression of him being distant, pragmatic and aloof.

A good illustration of the contrast between what has been published on both Schools of History is the appreciation showered on Crawford upon his retirement as professor in 1970. In that year the Melbourne Historical Journal published an article by A.G. Serle entitled, "R.M. Crawford and his School". In the concluding paragraph, Serle, a graduate of 1946 and a lecturer in the History department from 1951 to 1960, stated,
Crawford carries with him, on his retirement, the gratitude and affection of a diverse tribe of teachers of all degrees, theologians, diplomats and other civil servants, economists, political scientists, art historians, anthropologists, lawyers, journalists - even a few politicians and businessmen - and of his academic colleagues in many fields all over Australia and internationally, and especially in this University. He has borne the heat and burden of the day and, in no small way, has raised the quality of intellectual life in this country. (54)

This eulogising continued in 1971 when the journal founded by Crawford and others in the History department in 1940, Historical Studies, devoted a special issue to him. In the Preface to this issue, the Chairman of the Editorial Board, J.R. Poynter, wrote,

This dedication is not merely an act of private and local piety. Historical Studies has always sought to serve the broadest community of historical scholarship; so too Crawford's work in 33 years at Melbourne has been of major significance in an important area of Australian intellectual development. (55)

The twin themes mentioned earlier are evident here. Articles under the collective title of "R.M. Crawford: Some Reminiscences" were contributed by five former students and colleagues - Manning Clark, Arthur Burns, Hugh Stretton, John Mulvaney and Jack Gregory.

No similar enterprise of such magnitude occurred upon the resignation of Roberts as Professor of History in 1947 or as Vice-Chancellor in 1967. A three-page "Appreciation" of Roberts was published in The University of Sydney News upon his death in 1971. However the Sydney School of History has not attempted to analyse its nature, development or contribution to Australian historiography. This is possibly partly due to the fact that the Sydney School has not developed the means in the form of a journal such as that of Melbourne's Historical Studies or Melbourne Historical Journal.

However members of the Melbourne School have continued espousing the virtues of their School in avenues apart from these two journals. Kathleen Fitzpatrick wrote a chapter for the 1982 book, The Half Open Door,
in which sixteen Australian women described their careers and achievements. While the central theme of this chapter was Fitzpatrick's own career, the Melbourne School of History, by necessity, was also analysed. Fitzpatrick described the University of Melbourne as "the place so congenial that the happiest years of my life were spent there, at first as a student and later as a member of the academic staff in all the grades from part-time tutor to associate professor." In relation to the School of History under Crawford, Fitzpatrick wrote,

The History Department of the University of Melbourne was an exciting place to work, especially during the earlier part of my time there, when the then young Professor R.M. Crawford, enthusiastic and creative, was raising a great school of learning on the solid foundations laid by his predecessor. New subjects were introduced and new staff assumed to teach them and studies became more specialised and profound. The quality of both staff and students was extremely high as the department was a magnet for gifted people. (57)

Fitzpatrick included further analysis of the Melbourne School of History in her 1983 book, Solid Bluestone Foundations. In this, the twin themes of praise for the Melbourne School of History and personal affection for its members recurred. However a new element appeared in a comment on Stephen Roberts, reminiscent of that of Gollan in 1975:

As a teacher of History, at least in my student days, his attitude was strictly practical; he did not seek to interest us in History or to develop our minds but simply dictated dull but informative notes, designed to enable us to get good marks in examinations, just as he had done. (58)

The process of analysis of the Melbourne School of History by its members and graduates has continued into 1985 with the publication of the book, Making History. In this book Max Crawford, Manning Clark and Geoffrey Blainey gave their accounts of their own study of History and of historiography at Melbourne. Stuart Macintyre, in his Introduction to this book, noted the plethora of praise written of the Melbourne School by its
members and graduates:

The Melbourne School has always had a weakness for self-congratulation and it is hard to decide whether the intended comparisons with Sydney are more offensive than the unintended assumption that history departments elsewhere in Australia in the early post-war years simply did not matter, at least until they too became part of the Melbourne diaspora. While the influence of Melbourne-trained historians has been great, its sons and daughters have celebrated its achievements so fondly and so often that one hesitates to do so again. (59)

So far no analysis has been published comparing the Sydney and Melbourne Schools of History. As Macintyre has stated, praise for the Melbourne School implies comparison with that of Sydney in which the latter comes out second-best. This thesis is not a means of seeking to prove the superiority or equality of Sydney or even to justify the curriculum of any of the professors. Part of its function is to explain the nature of the curricula taught by Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford and the reasons for this nature by examination of the background of each of these four professors. In doing this, these curricula will be related to their historiographical and pedagogical origins. If the study of History is a means of gaining understanding of the past, such examination and explanation should allay unsubstantiated and partial judgements passed in secondary sources on these professors' Schools of History.
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Chapter 2

The English Liberal and Literary, and
German Scientific Historiographical Traditions

The various natures of the History curricula taught by Professors Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford at Australian universities in the twentieth century owe their origins to British and German historiographical practices in the nineteenth century. The two main historiographical traditions were the English Liberal and Literary one and the German Scientific tradition. Along with these historiographical traditions both England and Germany had their respective pedagogical traditions.

Although the origins of the English and German traditions were distinct in themselves, historians hybridised them so that the 'History' taught at Australian universities was an amalgam of them the main points of difference between university curricula being degrees of emphasis rather than dichotomous contrasts. The practices which gave rise to these traditions can be analysed according to historians' aims, ideology, content specialization, research methodology, and presentation of content.

One of the earliest and foremost English Liberal and Literary historians was Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-59). According to Macaulay,

The perfect historian is he whose work the character and spirit of an age is exhibited in miniature. He relates no fact, he attributes no expression to his characters, which is not authenticated by sufficient testimony. But, by judicious selection, rejection, and arrangement, he gives to truth those attractions which have been usurped by fiction. In his narrative a due subordination is observed: some transactions are prominent; others retire. But the scale on which he represents them is increased or diminished, not according to the dignity of the persons concerned in them, but according to the degree in which they elucidate the condition of society and the nature of man. (1)
Macaulay was concerned with presenting an overall account of which he was writing rather than becoming entangled in detail - "No picture ... and no history, can present us with the whole truth: but those are the best pictures and the best histories which exhibit such parts of the truth as most nearly produce the effect of the whole".

Macaulay's reputation was established, according to Pieter Geyl, in 1825 when his essay on Milton's role as a politician opposed to the Stuarts was published in the *Edinburgh Review*, "the leading organ of the Whigs". Macaulay was a 'Whig historian' in both senses of the term. He was a member of the Whig faction in British political circles and supported the 1832 Reform Bill. He also wrote historical works using the values, perspective and methods of Whig historians as identified by Herbert Butterfield in 1931. According to the latter,

> The total result of this method is to impose a certain form upon the whole historical story, and to produce a scheme of general history which is bound to converge beautifully upon the present - all demonstrating throughout the ages the workings of an obvious principle of progress, of which the Protestants and Whigs have been the perennial allies while Catholics and tories have perpetually formed obstruction. (4)

Edward H. Carr noted in 1961, "The English Whig historians of the nineteenth century attributed the rise of British power and prosperity to the development of political institutions embodying the principles of constitutional liberty". Paralleling this and in a broader sense, in the first chapter of his *History of England*, Macaulay himself had stated, "For the history of our country during the last hundred and sixty years is eminently the history of physical, of moral, and of intellectual improvement". The period about which Macaulay was writing was that from the overthrow of the absolutist and Catholic James II, in the so-called "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, to the mid-nineteenth century. Whig historians used the year '1688' as
an historical watershed which marked the beginning of the era of liberal parliamentary and 'progressive' government. Professor Ernest Scott showed his awareness of the historiographical importance of this 'Glorious Revolution' when he wrote, "Macaulay wrote the history of the Whig revolution of 1688-9 as a politician for whom that great event was the initiation of a Whiggish golden age"7.

As with other Whig historians, Macaulay wrote history from the viewpoint of the present and gave an overall picture of progress achieved to that time. In so doing, according to Butterfield, Whig historians gave "an oversimplification of the historical process"8. Progress and improvement in the course of English history was seen as being synonymous with the triumph of the exponents of Whig ideology over adversaries. As an example of this,

Macaulay believed that the prosperity, liberty and political freedom of his own time were the result of those seventeenth-century struggles between King and Parliament, between Church and Puritan, and between Tory and Whig. Prosperity and imperial greatness marched with liberty, toleration and Whig doctrine. (9)

Ideologically, then, Macaulay's writing of history was undertaken from a Whig perspective. This subjectivity was in contrast to the attempted objectivity of contemporary German 'scientific' historians. Macaulay was a Whig/Liberal member of Parliament from 1830 to 1834 and again from 1839 to 1847 and used History as a means to justify Liberal Party policies. According to Marwick, Macaulay's Whig bias was a "great failing"10 in his capacity as an historian. Another fault was that, "In his search after effect he sometimes cheated, his rendering of the past was less 'truthful' than, given the resources available to him, it could have been"11. However it is generally recognised that, despite his faults, his works are masterpieces of literary skill12.
In 1827, two years after Macaulay's essay on Milton appeared in the Edinburgh Review, Henry Hallam's Constitutional History of England from the Accession of Henry VII to the Death of George II was published. This is deemed to be the first major work by a Whig historian. In this book Hallam, in defining "the distinctive principles of Whigs and Tories" during the reigns of Anne, George I and George II (i.e. 1702-60), stated,

Of the Tory and Whig factions, Hallam continued, "The former was generally hostile to the liberty of the press, and to freedom of inquiry, especially in religion; the latter their friend". The importance of Hallam's work in Whig historiography was that,

All shared with Hallam a spoken or unspoken assumption that the central theme in English history was the development of liberal institutions; thus in the study of remote ages they greatly exaggerated the importance of 'parliaments' or of bodies, real or imagined, that they thought were parliaments; and they tended to interpret all political struggles in terms of the parliamentary situation in Britain in the nineteenth century, in terms that is, of Whig reformers fighting the good fight against Tory defenders of the status quo. **(16)**

Although Hallam may have formalised the Whig interpretation as a School of historical thought in the nineteenth century, its opinions were not new to the nineteenth century. Professor R.M. Crawford saw Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, as a 'proto-Whig' in Clarendon's History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England begun in the year 1641. Crawford noted
Clarendon's emphasis on political history which was a distinctive feature of Whig historiography: "The Civil War is explained almost entirely by the acts and omissions of the chief actors on the political stage at the time"\(^{18}\). When writing of Clarendon and his work, Leopold von Ranke stated, "Clarendon belongs to those who have essentially fixed the circle of ideas for the English nation"\(^{19}\). To some extent Clarendon can be considered as a 'primary source' in that he was describing events in which he himself had been involved. Hallam, on the other hand, was writing in the early nineteenth century and was interpreting the overall course of events from 1485 to 1760 from a distant viewpoint and hence may be seen legitimately as an historian writing with a Whig bias.

Whig historians therefore attempted to legitimise the role of the Whig faction (and later the Liberal Party) in British politics by portraying it as a force for improvement and the enlargement of liberty. They imposed the values of the nineteenth century onto the history of preceding centuries with their own time being part of the process of the development of liberty and liberalism. Whig historians because of the nature of their aim and ideology, emphasised political history and used narrative as the means of presenting their evaluation of English history. While they used primary sources as part of the research for their publications, the emphasis was not on this methodology per se (as it was in Germany) but on conveying their Whig ideology. While Hallam referred to both primary and secondary sources in his footnotes, there is no bibliography and in his Preface he stated,

I have ... on a revision of the present work, availed myself of the valuable labours of recent authors, especially Lingard and Brodie; and in several of my notes I have sometimes supported myself by their authority, sometimes taken the liberty to express my dissent ... (20)

He therefore used other secondary sources to reinforce his own opinions. Archival research had not yet begun. Macaulay referred to primary and
secondary sources to a lesser extent but hoped to sway his readers by the literary skill of his narrative.

Another historian who was representative of both the Literary and Liberal traditions was Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881). While Carlyle is chiefly remembered for his depiction of 'heroic' types such as Oliver Cromwell and Frederick the Great, his works are seen as pieces of literature in their depth of feeling. Of his French Revolution, G.P. Gooch wrote,

"In the first place, it is a piece of great literature. In a generation accustomed to the dissertations of Hallam and Alison and to the metallic brilliancy of Macaulay, a book brimful of passion and poetry came as a revelation. By a supreme achievement of creative imagination he succeeded in rendering the vision as real to his readers as to himself." (21)

In the first half of the nineteenth century, then, with historians such as Hallam, Macaulay and Carlyle dominant in historical writing, 'History' was generally perceived as a form of literature illustrating the 'glories' of English history and emphasising personalities. Likewise, History as a study at universities was seen as a branch of literature and was only studied for a utilitarian, vocation-oriented purpose. According to Marwick,

"History in Britain, much later than history in Germany and France, remained a branch of literature, or a study to be pursued purely for its more obvious utility to soldiers, statesmen and lawyers. Only against strong resistance was history established as an autonomous academic discipline, and even then the literary and the utilitarian traditions proved very enduring." (22)

History had been taught at Oxford since at least the late sixteenth century when the Camden Chair in Roman history had been established and this was reinforced in 1724 when George I had established Regius Chairs of Modern History at both Oxford and Cambridge. However, according to Marwick, "The early incumbents of the chairs were completely without distinction in historical studies" while according to Woodward, "The purpose
of these foundations was to assist in the training of civil servants and diplomatists. These professorships soon degenerated into sinecures. In the eighteenth century some professors did not lecture at all.

Thus by the mid-nineteenth century the study of History was seen as a means to a 'non-historical' end. For Whig politicians it helped to legitimise their reformist and parliament-oriented policies by putting them into historical perspective and for prospective soldiers, statesmen and lawyers it would enhance potential for achievement in one's vocation. The study of History catered for the needs of those in power while the 'History' that was studied was literary in emphasis rather than a systemic and objective analysis of past events and their protagonists.

It was the Germans who provided the latter. In 1811-12 Barthold Georg Niebuhr's two volume History of Rome was published. In the preface to the first edition, Niebuhr (1776-1831) wrote concerning early nineteenth century historians and their use of the works of the ancient historian Livy, "We must try to eliminate fiction and forgery and to strain our vision in order to recognize the features of truth beneath all these incrustations. The search for 'truth' became a basic tenet of later 'scientific' historians using empiricist methods. In contrast to the English Literary tradition (as reflected in Macaulay) with its emphasis on the quality of prose at times to the detriment of historical accuracy, Niebuhr wrote of the historian,

If he omits from his work those investigations which he thought had led him to evoke the spirits of times past, then he must either renounce the use of these results or run the risk of appearing as if he wanted to give out, arrogantly and insolently, as historic truth a mere hypothesis or a questionable possibility - a heavy price to pay for greater elegance in composition. (28)

Niebuhr also used the concept of History as a science:
Neither in my earlier studies nor during the course of my lectures did I use the more recent works on Roman history. Thus I was not tempted to engage in controversies which would have been inappropriate to this work and which in any case are of little benefit to science; they should be replaced by as complete an analysis as possible. (29)

While the use of the term "science" in this context may simply mean "systematic and formulated knowledge"\textsuperscript{30}, it is also implicit that History is part of such knowledge and hence its study can be regarded as scientific. Niebuhr stressed his use of primary sources as the methodology involved in the scientific study of history.

In direct contrast to the English Literary tradition, Niebuhr admitted that his prose might not be of the greatest quality: "A book which claims to be a work of science rather than a work of art can plead for a gentle judgment of its diction and presentation"\textsuperscript{31}. He also requested impartial judgement of his work: "An author, conscious of having sought the truth, of having written without partisanship or polemical intention, can demand attentive and disinterested examination and judgment of his work"\textsuperscript{32}.

Niebuhr's ideas show several overt contrasts between the English Literary and Liberal tradition and what was to develop into the German Scientific tradition. The English valued readability while the Germans tolerated poor expression as long as historical accuracy was achieved. The English viewed History as an aspect of Literature whereas the Germans viewed it as a part of Science. The English wrote History from the perspective of and as a rationale for the present e.g. the Whig historians, whereas the Germans wrote History "without partisanship or polemical intention". The English tolerated (and perhaps even supported) subjectivity (especially when it came to showing Britain's rise to pre-eminence in the nineteenth century), the Germans demanded objectivity.
In preparation for his book Niebuhr did not "use the more recent works on Roman history" and this indicated an important aspect of the German Scientific approach - the study of primary sources. In 1824 Leopold von Ranke (1795-1886) explicitly stated both the aim and methodology of Scientific History in the preface to his Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494-1514:

To history has been assigned the office of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future ages. To such high office this work does not aspire: It wants only to show what actually happened.

But whence the sources for such a new investigation? The basis of the present work, the sources of its material, are memoirs, diaries, letters, diplomatic reports, and original narratives of eyewitnesses; other writings were used only if they were immediately derived from the above mentioned or seemed to equal them because of some original information. (33)

In contrast to the English Literary tradition, Ranke stated,

Aim and subject mould the form of a book. The writing of history cannot be expected to possess the same free development of its subject which, in theory at least, is expected in a work of literature; I am not sure it was correct to ascribe this quality to the works of the great Greek and Roman masters.

The strict presentation of the facts, contingent and unattractive though they may be, is undoubtedly the supreme law. After this, it seems to me, comes the exposition of the unity and progress of events. (34)

The ideas of Niebuhr and Ranke encapsulate the concepts inherent in the German Scientific tradition which, although contemporary with such English Literary historians as Macaulay and Carlyle, was not a direct reaction to them but rather a reaction to the writings of ancient historians such as Livy and also to Renaissance writers describing contemporary events, the accuracy of whose writings was in question.

This new 'scientific' historical methodology was accompanied by new pedagogical techniques at German universities. In 1824 Ranke was appointed Professor of History at the University of Berlin and there, according to
Stern, "he originated the historical seminar, which instructed advanced students in Quellenkritik, the critical study of the sources"\(^\text{36}\). However according to Butterfield the first historical seminar was held at the University of Gottingen and "many of the things that we have attributed to Ranke ought to be traced back to the influence of the Gottingen school"\(^\text{37}\). As to which German or German institution held the very first seminar is probably superfluous, suffice to say it was a German pedagogical device. In contrast to the German seminar in which a group of students discussed a set topic in the presence of a professor, in England the tutorial system where one student met his college tutor once a week was developed from the 1840's when Benjamin Jowett introduced it into Balliol College, Oxford.

Thus by the mid-nineteenth century England and Germany had experienced two distinct types of historical writing and teaching. English historians had put great stress on the literary worth of their work in which was emphasised the development of liberty in England while German historians had laid great stress on historical accuracy and an objective presentation of the past without reference to the present. In England the study of History at universities was viewed as a useful adjunct to training in government or the law while in Germany the concept of the 'professional' historian with an ability to critically analyse primary source material developed. As Marwick has noted, "The attitudes of the great English historical writers of the early nineteenth century were amply reflected in the absence of any efficient provision for the systemic teaching of history at the university level"\(^\text{38}\). Pedagogically, the English employed the tutorial system which centred on the residential colleges while the Germans employed the seminar which was conducted within the university itself with the university professor not the college tutor as the supervising agent.

However from the mid-nineteenth century the German historiographical
tradition began to have an impact on that of England. In 1850 History "was first given status as a subject suitable for academic study at Oxford" although only as a part of the combined school of Law and History; in 1852 Cambridge did likewise. The occupants of chairs of History at both Oxford and Cambridge before this time had been political appointees installed for motives other than researching and teaching historical subjects. Oxford led the way in England in changing the nature of historical study and teaching. In 1871 an independent 'School of Modern History' was established at Oxford and in 1873 a separate Historical Tripos was established at Cambridge.

In 1866 William Stubbs had been appointed Regius Professor of History at Oxford and retained that office until 1884 when he became Bishop of Chester. He adopted Ranke's methodology and emphasised the use of primary sources. In 1857 the Rolls Series, a compilation of Medieval primary sources, had been commenced by Lord Romilly, Master of the Rolls. From 1867 to 1883 Stubbs edited fifteen volumes of this but a far more pedagogically important collection of primary sources was arranged and edited by him under the title, Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History which was published in 1870. This book was a collection of primary sources in either Latin, English or French dating from Julius Caesar's description of Germanic tribes to writs issued by Edward I in the early fourteenth century. Each document was preceded by one or more paragraphs (in English) in which Stubbs commented on the authenticity and historical context of the relevant document. In the second edition (1874) Stubbs included other documents such as the 1628 Petition of Right, 1679 Habeas Corpus Act, 1689 Bill of Rights and 1700 Act of Settlement. According to Stubbs, "This book is intended to be primarily a treasure of reference; an easily handled repertory of the Origines of English
Constitutional History; and, secondarily, a manual for teachers and scholars. In 1874 this collection of primary sources was complemented by the publication of Volume I of Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England*. In 1875 and 1878 respectively volumes II and III were published. These three volumes extended the time-span of that of the original edition of Stubbs's *Selected Charters* to the death of Richard III in 1485. Stubbs concluded the first chapter of his *Constitutional History* by stating:

> The German element is the paternal element in our system, natural and political. Analogy, however, is not proof, but illustration: the chain of proof is to be found in the progressive persistent development of English constitutional history from the primeval polity of the common fatherland. (42)

This concept of "progressive persistent development" is reflective of Whig ideology and, with the abundant footnotes in the text to primary sources, illustrative of Stubbs's combining the English Liberal and German Scientific traditions. In the Preface to this work, Stubbs also referred to the 'illuminating' aspect of the study of History, specifically the "History of Institutions":

> It presents, in every branch, a regularly developed series of causes and consequences, and abounds in examples of that continuity of life, the realisation of which is necessary to give the reader a personal hold on the past and a right judgment of the present. For the roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present comes to be what it is. (43)

Stubbs's *Selected Charters* and *Constitutional History of England* had a great impact in both the study and teaching of History. According to J.G. Edwards, "In the nineteenth century there were probably few if any learned books that became more influential in any field of academic study than Stubbs's *Selected Charters* and *Constitutional History* in the historical
field. Both books were recommended in English universities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Stubbs's works as well as the formation in 1870 of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, whose task it was to catalogue documents in private collections, helped to put the study of History in England on a more 'scientific' basis and provided a boost to the academic study of History. The 1870's proved to be the decade when the study of History at universities was put on an independent footing.

During the second half of the nineteenth century History was to many synonymous with the study of politics. Stubbs's successor at Oxford, Edward Augustus Freeman (professor from 1884 to 1892) stated, "History is past politics, and politics is present history." Stubbs's and Freeman's contemporary at Cambridge, John R. Seeley (professor from 1869 to 1895), stated, "Politics are vulgar when they are not liberalised by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relation to practical politics."

However this view was not held unanimously - John R. Green championed the writing of social history as evidenced in his book, *A Short History of the English People* (1874). Although Green did not denigrate constitutional or political histories, he maintained that social history was equally important but often neglected:

In England, more than elsewhere, constitutional progress has been the result of social development. In a brief summary of our history such as the present, it was impossible to dwell as I could have wished to dwell on every phase of this development; but I have endeavoured to point out, at great crises, such as those of the Peasant Revolt or the Rise of the New Monarchy, how much of our political history is the outcome of social changes; and throughout I have drawn greater attention to the religious, intellectual, and industrial progress of the nation itself than has, so far as I remember, ever been done in any previous history of the same extent. (47)

But despite this difference in emphasis on content, Stubbs, Freeman, Seeley and Green all viewed History from a Whig standpoint in that they perceived
English history as one of progressive development.

Scientific history with its empiricism and objectivity was firmly implanted in England at Cambridge University during the Regius Professorships of Lord Acton (1895-1902) and John B. Bury (1902-27). Echoing Niebuhr's ideas expressed in 1811-12, Acton stated in his 1895 Inaugural Lecture,

> For our purpose, the main thing to learn is not the art of accumulating material, but the sublimer art of investigating it, of discerning truth from falsehood and certainty from doubt. It is by solidity of criticism more than by the plenitude of erudition, that the study of history strengthens and straightens, and extends the mind. (48)

Acton then went on to outline how the historian undertakes his task of critical examination of his sources. Criticism of sources was but one of three things which, according to Acton, "constitute the amended order" in historical study; the other two were the availability of archival material ("Every country in succession has now been allowed the exploration of its records, and there is more fear of drowning than of drought" 49) and "the dogma of impartiality" 50.

In his Inaugural Lecture, Acton expressed his admiration for Leopold von Ranke:

> Ranke is the representative of an age which instituted the modern study of History. He taught it to be critical, to be colourless, and to be new. We meet him at every step, and he has done more for us than any other man. There are stronger books than any one of his, and some may have surpassed him in political, religious, philosophic insight, in vividness of the creative imagination, in originality, elevation, and depth of thought; but by the extent of important work well executed, by his influence on able men, and by the amount of knowledge which mankind receives and employs with the stamp of his mind upon it, he stands without a rival. (51)

In planning *The Cambridge Modern History*, Acton showed the influence of Ranke's ideas on his own historiographical stance. Where Ranke had
wanted "only to show what actually happened", the object of Acton's work was "the increase of accurate knowledge". Ranke's emphasis on primary sources was repeated in Acton's statement that,

In order to authenticate the text and to assist further research, it is proposed that a selected list of original and auxiliary authorities shall be supplied in each volume, for every chapter or group of chapters dealing with one subject. (53)

Acton emphasised the study of primary sources in preference to secondary sources:

The production of material has so far exceeded the use of it in literature that very much more is known to students than can be found in historians, and no compilation at second hand from the best works would meet the scientific demand for completeness and certainty. (54)

Ranke's idea, stated in 1824, that "Aim and subject mould the form of a book" was repeated in the "Introductory Note" to The Cambridge Modern History: "It is better to allow the subject-matter to supply its own unifying principle than to create one which is inadequate or of mere temporary value".

The impact of scientific historical methodology on English historians, as enunciated by Niebuhr and Ranke, was explicitly shown in Bury's 1902 Inaugural Lecture entitled "The Science of History". In this lecture, Bury showed an admiration for Ranke similar to that held by Acton: "Erudition has now been supplemented by scientific method, and we owe the change to Germany. Among those who brought it about, the names of Niebuhr and Ranke are pre-eminent". In contradiction of the English Literary tradition, Bury stated, "I may remind you that history is not a branch of literature". In concluding his lecture he stated that history "though she may supply material for literary art of philosophical speculation, she is herself simply a science, no less and no more".
In the same year as the 'scientific' historian, Lord Acton, took office as Regius Professor of History at Cambridge, the London School of Economics was opened. This had been possible due to Henry Hutchinson, who died in 1894, leaving instructions in his will that the residue of his estate (amounting to nearly £10,000) be used by Sidney Webb and four other trustees for "socially progressive purposes". Part of this estate was used to establish the London School of Economics the aim of which "was to contribute to the improvement of society by promoting the impartial study of its problems and the training of those who were to translate policy into action".

The first Director of the School, W.A.S. Hewins, "was greatly influenced by the German historical school". The methodological emphasis of the School was on research: "the School was from the beginning designed to provide, not a general course for young beginners, but an introduction to independent research work for mature people with some knowledge of the world". For this purpose a Research Library was opened in 1896 and this, to a great extent, became the centre of the School's activities. In 1900 the London School of Economics and Political Science became part of the restructured University of London and a Bachelor of Science (Economics) degree was created.

The nature of the School's curriculum was therefore 'scientific' with an emphasis on research and impartiality typical of German historical methodology. The empiricism inherent in this approach was reflected in a statement by Sir William Beveridge, Director of the School from 1920 to 1937, when writing of the founders of the School:

They wanted to base economics, politics and all the other social sciences on collection and examination of facts rather than on analysis of concepts; they wanted, in effect, to see applied to the study of human society the methods by which natural scientists had won their many triumphs in discovering the secrets of nature. (63)
During Beveridge's own directorship, "Great developments of research took place, and led naturally to making the results of research known by more and more publications of books and of learned periodicals"64. It was in this ambience that Stephen Roberts, future Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney, was to study in the mid-1920's.

However the Literary tradition continued in the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth century. Freeman's successor as Regius Professor at Oxford was James Anthony Froude who held the professorship from 1892 to 1894. Recalling Froude's Inaugural Lecture, Sir Charles Oman wrote,

He asserted that history was all the better for being written as literature, that it is the historian's duty to present it in a form that will attract as many intelligent readers as possible, and that arid narrative and technical verbiage scare away many who might have profited greatly by historical study. He pleaded that the influence of the personality of the historian cannot possibly be eliminated: he must state the case as it appears to him, not as it might appear to some ideal person destitute of all bias, convictions or prejudices. (65)

As well, there was a reaction to those who held an extremist Scientific stance. The reaction was formalised in 1903 - the year after Bury's Inaugural Lecture - when George Macaulay Trevelyan, the grand-nephew of that epitome of Literary historians, T.B. Macaulay, had an essay entitled "Clio, a Muse" published in the Independent Review. Trevelyan appealed to his readers to hark back to the Literary tradition:

We ought to look to the free, popular, literary traditions of history in our own land. Until quite recent times, from the days of Clarendon down through Gibbon, Carlyle and Macaulay to Green and Lecky, historical writing was not merely the mutual conversation of scholars with one another, but was the means of spreading far and wide throughout all the reading classes a love and knowledge of history, an elevated and critical patriotism and certain qualities of mind and heart. But all that has been stopped, and an attempt has been made to drill us into so many Potsdam Guards of learning. (66)
Trevelyan maintained that the study of History was not scientific for two reasons - it had "no practical utility like physical science" and secondly, it "cannot, like physical science, deduce causal laws of general application". He argued that one's empathy with an historical period and its characters, rather than the 'scientific' collection of facts about them, was what was necessary for "the best interpretation". Consequently, according to Trevelyan, "the value of history is not scientific. Its true value is educational. It can educate the minds of men by causing them to reflect on the past". The study of History was educational in that it could also "train the mind of the citizen into a state in which he is capable of taking a just view of political problems"; it could present "ideals and heroes from other ages"; it could "enable the reader to comprehend the historical aspect of literature proper" and the "value and pleasure of travel, whether at home or abroad, is doubled by a knowledge of history".

Trevelyan did not entirely denounce the concept of History as being a science - "In this vexed question whether history is an art or a science, let us call it both or call it neither. For it has an element of both". In making a statement such as this, Trevelyan reflected the synthesising of the Literary and Scientific traditions that was occurring at the turn of the century. In his 1891 Inaugural Lecture, Professor G.A. Wood of the University of Sydney stated that an historian must be both scientific in his methodology and empathetic with the people about whom he is writing. History was to have the qualities of both a science and an art (both in depth of feeling and in quality of prose). In a 1927 lecture Wood described Trevelyan as the "greatest modern historian".

While the English Literary tradition had been challenged and later synthesised with the German Scientific tradition in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, so too the English Whig interpretation of History
was challenged in the 1920's and 1930's. The first major challenge occurred in 1929 with the publication of Lewis Namier's *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III*. Namier was an emigrant from Galicia and took British citizenship in 1913. By nature he was conservative and due to his youth not being spent in England, his historiographical outlook had not been immersed in the Whig tradition.

In his 1929 publication (in two volumes), Namier analysed politics in England in the mid-eighteenth century but he deviated from the Whig tradition in two important respects. Firstly, unlike Hallam who claimed that Whig politicians "loved to descant on liberty and the rights of mankind" while Tories had "an aversion" to political improvement, Namier claimed that men wanted to be in the House of Commons "'to make a figure', and no more dreamt of a seat in the House in order to benefit humanity than a child dreams of a birthday cake that others may eat it; which is perfectly normal and in no way reprehensible". Namier disputed that the terms 'Whigs' and 'Tories' legitimately applied to political groupings at all in 1761! 'Country' and 'Court' were more suitable names to classify contemporary political groupings. Secondly, unlike those of the Liberal and Literary tradition, Namier's book was not a narrative of events but an analysis of the status quo at a given place and time.

With implicit reference to the Whig interpretation of History, Namier wrote of eighteenth century politics,

> Between them and the politics of the present day there is more resemblance in outer forms and denominations than in underlying realities; so that misconception is very easy. There were no proper party organisations about 1760, though party names and cant were current; the names and the cant have since supplied the materials for an imaginary superstructure. (78)

Namier thereby denounced the historiographical practice to that time of applying the nomenclature of contemporary political parties to political
groupings of the eighteenth century. He also opposed superficiality in writing History and stated that "one has to steep oneself in the political life of a period before one can safely speak, or be sure of understanding, its language".

Namier's theme of historians imposing the values and institutions of the present upon those of the past and hence giving a false and superficial interpretation of the past was reinforced by Herbert Butterfield in his 1931 book, *The Whig Interpretation of History*. According to Butterfield, the thesis of his book was "that when we organise our general history by reference to the present we are producing what is really a gigantic optical illusion" and that "the Protestant and whig interpretation of history is the result of something much more subtle than actual Protestant or party bias". The Whig interpretation of History was "the result of the practice of abstracting things from their historical context and judging them apart from their context - estimating them and organising the historical story by a system of direct reference to the present".

Reminiscent of Hallam's and Macaulay's 'Whig' interpretations, Butterfield wrote,

> If we can exclude certain things on the ground that they have no direct bearing on the present, we have removed the most troublesome elements in the complexity and the crooked is made straight. There is no doubt that the application of this principle must produce in history a bias in favour of the whigs and must fall unfavourably on Catholics and tories. Whig history in other words is not a genuine abridgment, for it is really based upon what is an implicit principle of selection. The adoption of this principle and this method commits us to a certain organisation of the whole historical story.

Butterfield further on in his book stated that the Whig historian, is apt to imagine the British constitution as coming down to us by virtue of the work of long generations of whigs and in spite of the obstructions of a long line of tyrants and tories. In reality it is the result of the continual interplay and perpetual collision of the two. It is the very embodiment of all the balances and compromises and adjustments that were necessitated by this interplay.
It was the simplification inherent in Whig historiography that Professor Crawford of the University of Melbourne attacked in his 1939 book, *The Study of History*. Crawford stressed the complexity of historical situations and to the study of them he applied the concepts of "necessity" and "freedom" - in any given situation, an individual's freedom to choose from a range of potential courses of action is inhibited by the constraints already bearing upon that individual. Crawford therefore denounced purely political history (as exemplified in Whig historiography) because it ignored the economic, social and other factors which affected political actions.

These attacks, in both Britain and Australia, on the Whig interpretation of History had important repercussions on historiography. According to Gareth Stedman Jones,

> The demolition of Victorian historical assumptions left history without a centre. Political and constitutional history had provided the main vertebra upon which the ambition of a universal history had depended. After the First World War, what had been a solid marble block became a honeycomb. To political history was added economic history, administrative history, ecclesiastical history, army history, navy history, local history, entrepreneurial history, or agricultural history. No attempt was made to fuse this aggregate of specialist routines into a meaningful historical totality. That was left to the academic demi-monde of Toynbee and H.G. Wells. (85)

In the mid-1930's Toynbee, in particular, had a great influence on the development of Crawford's historiographical stance through his concept of 'challenge and response'.

In 1939 Crawford attempted to mould the diverse aspects of historiography into what he called the 'Synoptic' view of History. This Synoptic view emphasised complexity in historical causation and this concept was reflected in Crawford paraphrasing, on the title page of his book, a statement of Maitland: "All history is but a seamless web; and he who
endeavours to tell but a piece of it must feel that his first sentence tears the fabric". Maitland's actual statement, which formed the opening sentence of his (and Pollock's) *The History of English Law* (1895) was, "Such is the unity of all history that any one who endeavours to tell a piece of it must feel that his first sentence tears a seamless web". By this both Maitland and Crawford perceived that any history, whether it be Maitland's legal history or the political history typical of the content of Whig historiography, could not validly be studied as an entity in itself but had to be related to both its antecedents and its context.

Maitland also helped in the process of 'professionalizing' History - "Maitland was a true professional, meticulous in his use of sources, preoccupied above all with the problems of analysis, and, though a brilliant stylist, not at all interested in the writing of historical narrative". Namier's 1929 work therefore had predecessors in the writing of analysis rather than narrative but Namier's analysis helped to break the monopoly of the Whig interpretation of History whereas Maitland's work remained in the Whig mould.

The professionalization of History began in the nineteenth century and continued into the 1900's. One aspect of this process was the application of the critical method to the use and evaluation of sources which had been encouraged by Niebuhr and Ranke. Both had emphasised the critical use of primary sources in the study of history and

> It became an axiom that historical writing must be based on research, and that presupposed knowledge of original sources and of methods for the critical evaluation of sources. Political interest or literary talent was no longer enough for the writing of history; it required specialized training. (89)

The 'professional' historian therefore tended more to the German Scientific rather than to the English Literary historiographical tradition.
Specialized training of historians was a second aspect of the professionalization process. In 1824 Ranke had been appointed Professor of History at the University of Berlin. Here he could both research and teach History. According to Gilbert, "The most decisive innovation in the nineteenth century was the establishment of a close connection between research in history and the teaching of history in universities". To facilitate research into primary sources, government archives and private collections of documents were made available to researchers. Periodicals such as the German Historische Zeitschrift, the French Revue Historique, and the English Historical Review were begun to be published in 1859, 1876 and 1886 respectively so as to publicise the results of this research.

The appointment of independent professors of History (unattached in their duties to other studies such as law) led to another aspect of the professionalization process - a hierarchical structure. At the apex were the professors themselves and in the strata below were directors of archives, archivists, research associates and assistants at universities, and high school teachers.

The specific training of students as historians was an important step in the professionalization of History. In his essay, "Clio, a Muse", which was largely observations on historiographical trends, Trevelyan also noted the pedagogical changes that had been occurring in Britain:

Whereas fifty years ago history had no standing in higher education, and even twenty years ago but little, to-day Clio is driving the classical Athene out of the field, as the popular Arts course in our Universities. The good results attained by University historical teaching, when brought to bear on the raw product of our public schools, is a great fact in modern education. But it means very hard work for the History Dons, who, in the time they can spare from these heavy educational tasks, must write the modern history books. Fifty years ago there were no such people; to-day they are a most important but sadly overworked class of men. (91)
The first 'independent' professors of History at the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne - George Arnold Wood and Ernest Scott respectively - had not been professionally trained as historians. Wood was a product of the Oxford School of History the undergraduate curriculum of which was aimed at the general education of 'gentlemen' and as an aid to them in their future careers in church or state. The training of historians per se only occurred at the post-graduate level which Wood failed to complete at Oxford due to his taking up his appointment as professor at Sydney. Wood's History curriculum at Sydney aimed at the general education of his students (and the inculcation of Liberal ideals) rather than mainly training them in the expertise of an historian. Scott had had no professional university training at all and was without a university degree upon his appointment as Professor of History at Melbourne. His strength lay in his adoption and implementation of Rankean methodology in his research into primary sources pertaining to Australian history and the publication of this work. As professor he sought to inculcate this Rankean methodology into his students and thus can be seen as more of a 'straight-line' professional than was Wood.

Wood's successor, Stephen Roberts, and Scott's successor, Max Crawford, can be seen as examples of the result of the professionalization of History in Australia in the first half of the twentieth century. Both took Bachelor's degrees, majoring in History, at Australian universities and then went on for further study at English universities. Both saw research as being as important as teaching at universities and Crawford established the periodical Historical Studies which can be judged as the Australian equivalent of British and European historical journals. Both saw a major part of their task as being the training of their own students in the skills of historical methodology, especially those students who attempted an Honours degree. These students would, in turn, carry on the skills of a professional historian.
The establishment of Sydney and Melbourne universities in the 1850's was fortunate for the teaching of History in Australia as it coincided with the transformation of historical study and the teaching of History which occurred in Great Britain from the mid-nineteenth century. The development of this subject as an academic discipline in Australia to a large extent reflected historiographical and pedagogical changes overseas.

To fully appreciate the History curricula of Wood, Scott, Roberts and Crawford, one therefore really has to view them in the perspective of the British and European context of the historiographical and pedagogical traditions to which they belong. To do otherwise is to assess them in a vacuum the result of this being to miss the determining factors and significance of their curricula in the development of historiography.
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Chapter 3

Wood: Educational background and development as an historian

George Arnold Wood's perception of the purpose and methodology of the study of History during his time as Professor of History at the University of Sydney from 1891 to 1928 dates back to his earliest years at Manchester and to his five years at Oxford University.

Arnold Wood was born on June 7, 1865 into a middle-class family at Salford adjoining Manchester which was a centre of industry in the English Midlands as a result of the Industrial Revolution over the preceding one hundred years. In 1868 the Wood family moved to Bowdon, a village nine miles to the south of the city, for the sake of his mother's health. In the mid-nineteenth century Manchester was a centre of Nonconformity and Liberalism - "Success in business brought urban nonconformists into a social prominence which they matched with political energy. In Arnold Wood's Manchester, above all, Nonconformity and Liberty Party politics became almost synonymous". Although during the nineteenth century Nonconformists were gradually being re-admitted to take part fully in English intellectual and political life as the restraints placed upon them through the Clarendon Code shortly after the Restoration of 1660 were lifted, there was still a conscious realization by Nonconformists of their distinctive heritage.

Arnold Wood's own family was the epitome of this 'respectable' middle-class Nonconformism with its Liberal political philosophy. His father, George Stanley Wood, was a cotton merchant as had been his father, a trustee of the Lancashire Independent College from 1864, and a member of the Manchester Reform Club from 1860 - "The policies he supported as a
campaigner in elections were those which in Gladstone's time saw the establishment of a system of national education, the legalizing of trade unions, the abolition of the remaining religious tests, the introduction of vote by ballot, and the giving of the vote to agricultural labourers." Arnold's mother's family had included Nonconformist ministers for at least three generations before 1865 and Arnold grew up with the atmosphere and ideas of Puritan Nonconformity to mould his own ideas and character.

Having learned the educational rudiments at a school conducted by a Mrs. Hunt, he entered Mr. Theophilus Dwight Hall's School, Bowdon College, as a day pupil in 1875. Theophilus Hall was a graduate of the non-denominational University of London and in May 1856 had been appointed Professor of Classics at the Nonconformist Lancashire Independent College. In 1867 he established his own college at Bowdon and subsequently became a member of the Bowdon Downs Chapel of which Arnold Wood's father, Stanley, was also a member - "A scholar and teacher of sound reputation and a member of chapel, he naturally attracted the support of fellow Independents. It was a foregone conclusion that Arnold would be sent to his school". During this period Arnold Wood was immersed in the doctrines and practices of Nonconformity by attendance at Chapel, Sunday School and family devotions at home. It was during this period also that Wood's life-long interest in the study of History had its genesis although not at school:

while I found the study of History at school very uninteresting, I was at the same time finding in my reading at home that the study of History was to me the most interesting of all studies. When I was about thirteen my father advised me to read Scott's Ivanhoe. I did not read the book, I swallowed it, I swallowed as if it had been a chocolate cream. And in the course of about a year I had swallowed very nearly every one of Scott's thirty novels. It was a bad plan, for it made me very ill. But it also gave me the passionate interest in History that has made it the study of my life. (7)
In 1882 Arnold Wood enrolled at the non-residential Owens College of the Victoria University which, being set in Manchester, "could not fail to share the religious and political liberalism of Manchester's citizens, nor their concern with precise - and, for preference, practical - knowledge". In this Nonconformist milieu Wood excelled in the study of History in which, along with English Literature, Greek and Latin, he gained first-class Honours in his first examinations in December 1882; he also achieved first place in both History and English Literature. In the ensuing two years he continued to gain first-class Honours in both English Literature and History as well as achieving first place in the latter. In 1884, his final year at Owens, he won both the Shuttleworth Historical Essay Prize (for an essay on Erasmus) and the Bradford Historical Scholarship.

After graduating with Honours in History at Manchester in June 1885, he went on later in the year to Balliol College, Oxford, to sit for the Preliminary Examinations in September and October. Wood matriculated in October 1885 and although he failed to win a Brackenbury Scholarship for which he sat in November, his tuition fees were paid for by the College itself due, to a large degree, to the confidence that Balliol's History Fellow, Arthur L. Smith, had in him as a scholar. In his biography of Wood, Emeritus Professor Max Crawford described the contrast that Wood would have found in the transition from Owens College, Manchester to Balliol College, Oxford:

(Owens College) was set in the heart of an industrial city and at the end of a daily and grimy train journey. His companions there, the sons of Manchester's merchants, industrialists and professional men, might be the salt of the earth; at least one suspects that such a belief was never far below his skin, and he made good friends amongst them. But they could not offer the rich variety of interest which he was to find in that company of bright spirits brought together in Jowett's Balliol. And it is probable that the teaching at Owens, though learned and formally impressive, was less exciting to a young man of
questioning imagination than that which he found in Oxford, for it lacked the informal companionship in enquiry which Oxford would give him. It could not easily be otherwise. In Oxford, he would live in College together with his teachers and his fellow undergraduates; but Owens was a non-residential university college, its dust shaken from the feet when lectures were over! The exploration of new worlds of thought which at Oxford continued in all sorts of informal and unplanned ways, was here curtailed by the daily dispersion. (10)

Benjamin Jowett was a tutor at Balliol College from 1842 to 1870 when he became Master of Balliol (until 1893). He was notable in the pedagogical aspect of Oxford life in that he promoted the Oxford tutorial system i.e. the practice of each student writing one essay per week and subsequently reading and discussing it with his tutor during a weekly one-hour tutorial.

During the Middle Ages both the universities of Oxford and Cambridge had developed the collegiate system i.e. the colleges provided board, lodging and tuition for the students who then sat for examinations set by the university itself. In 1800 the Oxford examination system was reformed by an Examination Statute which stipulated that the university was to appoint six public examiners who would replace the previous examiners (the Regent Masters) and instituted an optional examination, other than the Pass examination, in the results of which the students' names would be placed in order of merit - this was the basis of the later Honours degree concept. In the early nineteenth century a student attempting these examinations would attend lectures given to large classes by college tutors but if he was attempting an Honours examination he would usually find his own private tutor, usually outside the college. From the 1840's Jowett changed this system by developing the concept of the weekly discussion of a student's essay on a one-to-one basis with a college tutor and it was this system that Wood encountered in the mid-1880's. In his 1899 history of Balliol College, H.W.C. Davis wrote of the relationship between Jowett and the other tutors
of Balliol: "In his own department each was unrivalled; but Jowett was the guiding spirit of all, and though his influence was exposed to checks of many kinds, he was on the whole successful in subordinating every department of tuition to the object which he had in view" 11.

One of Wood's tutors at Balliol was Arthur L. Smith who later described him as "the tall youth from Manchester who came 'dyed in the wool' with Puritan Nonconformity, Cobdenism, Gladstonian Liberalism, the humanitarian ideals of John Bright and the political philosophy of John Morley" 12. Both Richard Cobden and John Bright were English radicals who led the Free Trade Anti-Corn Law League with its headquarters in Manchester. Bright was the Liberal M.P. for Manchester from 1847 to 1857 while Cobden was M.P. for Stockport at times in the mid-nineteenth century. Both politicians believed in independent action based on conscience regardless of party policy and opposed Britain's involvement in the Crimean War. This latter situation was to be repeated in 1899 when Arnold Wood (when Professor of History) opposed Britain's involvement in the Boer War.

At one of his earliest Balliol tutorials, Wood was asked by Arthur Smith which book had most influenced him so far and he replied, "Morley on Compromise" 13 while of Gladstone, Wood stated in 1915:

"The foremost among the nations," said Gladstone, "will be that one which, by its conduct, shall gradually engender in the minds of others a fixed belief that it is just." The words were to Gladstone not mere words; they were a passionate conviction that guided his life, and did very much to guide British statesmanship for half a century. He so lived and so wrought, someone finally said, "that he kept the soul of England alive." The result of Gladstone's life was that the spiritual standard of British statesmanship was permanently raised. (14)

This adherence to the values of Gladstonian Liberalism was noted in a 1928 editorial in the Sydney Morning Herald, "He was a Gladstonian Liberal, and while politics were excluded from his discourses he had a breadth of outlook,
a toleration, and a capacity for understanding motives that made him an inspiring teacher." Wood regarded liberalism as a faith founded on strong thought, deep-rooted in fervent emotion, the permanent compelling faith of a People. It became the religion of the nineteenth century. All men, said the new gospel, which was the old gospel, all men are able, by virtue of common human nature, to be happy and good. By nature man is free so to be. But by the State - the State controlled by King, Lords, and Church - he has been enchained. He must throw off the chains. The State must become the instrument, not of the tyranny of person, of caste, of superstition, but of the common will of the people. Force must yield to humanity. All men must help all men to live the good life. And, when mankind has accepted the new-old religion of the service of man, war will end in sense of brotherhood. This faith, with British interpretations, has been the inspiration of British Liberalism. And in its light and strength British statesmen, in unbroken succession, from Charles James Fox to David Lloyd George, have fought for the rights of human souls. (16)

In this way Wood himself followed in his family's tradition of support for Liberal policies.

For Nonconformist Arnold Wood, Jowett's liberalism in theological and ecclesiastical matters would have been an inducement to enrol at Balliol. Following the downfall of Puritan government and the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662 which resulted in non-Anglicans being excluded from Oxford so that, despite some pedagogical change, even by 1830 'the basic structure of post-Restoration Oxford as the 'nursery of the Church' remained untouched'. However at about this time bourgeois liberals working through the Whigs were beginning to have some effect upon the upholders of the status quo - the land-owning aristocracy and the Tories. This feeling of liberalism which had been suppressed during the Napoleonic Wars for fear of too drastic change was now effective in bringing about not only political change as in the First Reform Act of 1832 but also change in relation to one's status despite one's religion. The Anglican monopoly in parliament was challenged by the repeal
of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828 and by the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829. The spirit of liberalism finally had its effect on Oxford in 1854 when the Oxford University Act abolished religious tests for undergraduates and Bachelors except for theological degrees and government of the University and of the colleges remained open only to Anglicans. In 1871 the University Tests Act abolished all religious tests except for theological degrees and professorships. When Arnold Wood decided to enter Balliol, Nonconformists had only been permitted to do so for the past thirty years but this did not deter Nonconformists such as Wood from taking a full part in university life.

During his time at Oxford Wood maintained his Nonconformist beliefs and practices by attending meetings of "the Society for Religious Union" (the former "Nonconformist Union"), the foundation breakfast of the Oxford branch of the London Missionary Society, and also Chapel; on 30 September, 1885 he even had breakfast with Jowett and discussed disestablishment. In his study of History, Wood read the works of Macaulay, Bright, Stubbs, Freeman, Gardiner, Bryce, Carlyle, Kemble, Green, Hallam and Stanhope.

In November 1886 Wood sat again for the Brackenbury history scholarship which, this time, he won. During his course he formally came into contact with the ideas of the Rankean William Stubbs through two of his books. Stubbs had been the Regius Professor of History at Oxford from 1866 until his retirement in 1884 to become Bishop of Chester. According to Wood,

The real founder of the Oxford History School was Bishop Stubbs. The fundamental text books in use are his two invaluable works, 'The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development' (to the year 1485), and 'Select Charters and other Illustrations of English Constitutional History from the Earliest Times to the Reign of Edward I'. An examiner in the History School told me two years ago that the only thing that saved the School from contempt was Stubbs's 'Select Charters.'
Now what is the character of Stubbs's books? They deal with the earliest and obscurest period of our History - the period before 1485. They deal with one aspect only of the history of that period; they trace the origin and development of institutions. With infinite industry constitutional documents are collected, examined, arranged, and when possible, explained. With infinite care the worth of evidence is tested, and distinction made between what is certain, what is probable, what is possible, what is impossible. So step by step some sort of path is made, over ground, the uncertain character of which becomes more and more evident. Bit by bit we gain some notion of the little that is knowable and of the much that is unknowable about the early history of English institutions. That is the invaluable work that has been done by Stubbs, and the School of Stubbs. (22)

Stubbs's Select Charters had been published in 1870 and his three volume Constitutional History of England between 1874 and 1878 - the former "long remained a basic source book in constitutional history classes." Stubbs's successor as Regius Professor of History was Edward Freeman who believed that "History is past politics, and politics is present history." According to Arthur Marwick, this was typical of the Oxford attitude to historical study and Wood appears to have adopted this view - "he agreed with Freeman and Seeley that it was desirable to associate the study of History with the study of Politics." However with his concern for moral issues and the concept of liberty, there was more to Wood's study of History than simply studying politics.

Wood admired the work of John R. Green whose book, A Short History of the English People, had been published in 1874 and in which not only was the political emphasis in historical studies challenged but the development of liberty was seen as being synonymous with the course of English history itself:

In England the history of the town and of the country are one. The privilege of the burgher has speedily widened into the liberty of the people at large. The municipal charter has merged into the great charter of the realm. All the little struggles over toll and tax, all the little claims of 'custom' and franchise, have told on
the general advance of liberty and law. The townmotes of the Norman reigns tided free discussion and self-government over from the Witanagemot of the old England to the Parliament of the new. The husting court, with its resolute assertion of justice by one's peers, gave us the whole fabric of our judicial legislation. The Continental town lost its individuality by sinking to the servile level of the land from which it had isolated itself. The English town lost its individuality by lifting the country at large to its own level of freedom and law. (27)

This display of the Whig concept of the development of liberty largely coincided with Wood's own views.

Wood also admired Green as a teacher of History. According to Crawford,

Of all the historians of his time whom he admired, men who ranged from the dispassionate Gardiner to the passionate Green, it was J.R. Green who came nearest to his own ideal of the historian as teacher, Green who was its main inspiration, with a strong blending of the ideals of Morley's On Compromise, the social ideals of Arnold Toynbee, and the critical spirit of Freeman, Gardiner and Stubbs. He respected but did not exaggerate Green's historical scholarship but it was as a teacher that he most admired him. (28)

Samuel Gardiner was "an Oxford historian in the style of Ranke and Stubbs, who was for a time Professor of History at King's College, London" while Arnold Toynbee (the elder) in his 1884 work, Lectures on the Industrial Revolution, discussed the social evils that arose as a result of the Industrial Revolution.

During this period the aim of the undergraduate History course at Oxford was "to educate gentlemen destined to lead in church and state". Training to become an historian did not occur until one had reached the postgraduate stage and began to work with other historians in the investigation of primary sources. Of the undergraduate course, Wells wrote in 1892,
In history for example, a student is taught to balance the evidence for opposing views, and he has to read the great authorities with care and intelligence but it is not at all required of him that he should know how to read a manuscript, or to decipher an inscription, or to go back along any one of the numerous ways by which printed history is reached. (31)

While Stubbs's works were collections of and commentaries on primary sources, they were 'pre-digested' from the students' standpoint and did not give practice in research and collation. According to Crawford,

'Stubbs's Charters' was the Oxford undergraduate's introduction to the historical methods of von Ranke and the Germans, to the laborious task of uncovering the past just as it was; and it went no further than sifting documents already selected for him. He might, particularly if he were spurred on by preparation for one of the prize essays, go further and dig out original sources for himself, as Arnold Wood did for his Stanhope Prize essays, learning something more thereby of the slow task of discovering, authenticating and using the traces of the past. (32)

Thus at Balliol, Arnold Wood came into contact with both the Rankean research concept of study of primary sources (although in a limited sense) through the study of Stubbs and with Jowett's pedagogic concept of the weekly tutorial on a one-to-one basis. To this methodology Wood applied his moral concept of the purpose of the study (and teaching) of History.

In Wood's final year at Balliol, 1888, he obtained First Class Honours in History and decided to use this academic qualification for the benefit of his religion. In October 1888 he was granted a theological scholarship to Mansfield College, a non-residential Nonconformist college which had been established in Oxford only two years earlier for the purpose of teaching theology to graduates and acting as a religious centre for Nonconformist students living in other Oxford colleges. Wood did not intend becoming a minister but an academic who through his work would have a moral impact on others.

During his first term at Mansfield College Wood also began writing a
section of a History book being organised by the historian York Powell.

According to Crawford,

York Powell's invitation was a recognition of his promise as an historian, and gave him a useful apprenticeship in historical work with an older scholar. He was now a graduate student and as such he turned increasingly to the original sources - the chronicles of 'Hoveden, Wendover, Matthew of Paris, Walter of Hemingburgh, etc.', as well as the established secondary sources. (33)

This use of primary sources had beneficial results in mid-1889 when he won the University's Stanhope Essay Prize with an essay on Wallenstein largely based on primary sources - "his work for this essay was a useful training in source-criticism. He was still confined to printed sources, but they were extensive, and he dealt with their puzzles with acuteness and good sense, confronting words with deeds and shrewdly estimating the character and bias of the observer".34

However his study of primary sources as a scholastic method led to an unexpected development - doubts about his continuing to study theology at Mansfield:

He had now finished a year of theological study and clearly he was beset by doubts on points of doctrine and particularly about some of the gospel narratives. These doubts had been stirred, it seems, less by study of the philosophical arguments for and against a belief in God than by his study of the applications of source criticism to the Scriptures, treating them as historical sources to be considered in relation to their dates, authorship and local circumstances. Such study could lead, he would argue in time, to a truer understanding of the Scriptures; but meanwhile there was the question of conscience: could he continue to hold his scholarship and stay at Mansfield? (35)

Both Dr. Fairbairn, the Principal of Mansfield College, and Dr. MacKennal, Wood's pastor at Bowdon, encouraged him to stay and so in October 1889 he began his second year of studies at Mansfield.
Almost contemporaneously (in September 1889) the University of Sydney became entitled to the estate of John Henry Challis who had died in 1880 and had bequeathed his residuary real and personal estate to the university "to be applied for the benefit of that Institution in such manner as the governing body thereof shall direct". In 1885 the Senate of the University had resolved "that the Challis Fund should be applied as a permanent provision of income for educational uses" and subsequently it was decided that the income arising from the bequest should be used to maintain the Chairs of Engineering (established in 1884) and Modern Literature (1887) and to establish and maintain professorships in Anatomy, Biology, History, Law, and Logic and Mental Philosophy, as well as four lectureships in Law and a lectureship in Military Science.

In 1890 the University Senate made appointments to fill all the Challis Chairs except that for History for which it had offered a lower salary than the others and for which it could not find a suitably qualified applicant. The Senate then increased the salary for the Chair from £800 to £900 per annum (on a par with the other Challis professorships) and re-advertised the Chair. The Selection Committee consulted Arthur L. Smith, Wood's former tutor, as 'History expert' who then informed Wood of the vacancy and later recommended Wood in these terms, "He is a man of first-rate ability, with a remarkable power of vigorous expression; his judgment is clear and his knowledge great, and he would be sure to succeed in initiating and developing the study of history in Sydney University." According to Crawford, Wood was faced with a dilemma - "a choice between a professorship, a good salary and security in the antipodes on the one hand, and on the other the insecurity of an uncertain dependence on hack-work while waiting for a prize in a lottery in which the prizes were few." In 1891, without completing his course at Mansfield College, Wood was appointed the first
By 1891 therefore Wood's perception of the purpose and methodology of the study of History was a combination of a number of factors. Firstly, his early years in Manchester and more especially his Puritan Nonconformist family background gave him a concern for moral issues. His reading of Sir Walter Scott's novels in which were drawn "splendid men and women doing splendid deeds"\(^{41}\) inspired him to perceive the purpose of the teaching of History as placing before students historical characters whose ideals and actions they should emulate. Secondly, his family was of a liberal persuasion both in a broad and in the narrow Party sense - he grew up to believe, in common with 'Whig' historians such as J.R. Green and J. Morley, that "the central theme in English history was the development of liberal institutions"\(^{42}\). To this ideological framework was added both the 'scientific' historical methodology of Stubbs with its emphasis on primary sources and the pedagogy of Jowett with its emphasis on the weekly one-to-one tutor-student tutorial. These four aspects of Wood's perception of the study and teaching of History were implemented during his thirty-eight years as Challis Professor of History.
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Wood's History Curriculum

at the University of Sydney

George Arnold Wood was only twenty-five years of age when he took up his duties as first Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney but his views as to the purpose and methodology of the study of History were well formed.

Wood arrived in Sydney in February 1891, began his duties in March and gave his Inaugural Lecture, in which he outlined his perception of the purpose and methodology of the study of History, in May. According to Wood,

The purpose of the study of history is to enable the student in his turn to make history, and history which it will be worth the while of future generations to study. That the only possible motive for the study of the history is its present usefulness to men of to-day is a saying which only needs to be understood to be accepted. (1)

While this concept is not the same as that propounded by his successor in the Challis Chair, Stephen Roberts, or by one of his pupils, Max Crawford, that History can be used to better understand, or illuminate, the present, it is a concept that applies the study of History to the present. History is useful to those living today in that one can use knowledge of past people, ideas and events to guide one's own actions. According to Wood, the process is reciprocal:

The historian must bring an educated mind to the study of the past: and then in the study of the past he will find a lesson for the present. Periods vary enormously in interest and in importance, and to deny it is the purest pedantry. There are some periods that are dead: there are other periods that live. Now, the business of the historian is to study the past that lives in the present. The study of the dead past belongs not to the historian, but to the antiquarian and the pedant. (2)
This concept of studying "the past that lives in the present" is in direct contrast to Samuel Gardiner's idea, "He who studies the society of the past will be of the greater service to the society of the present in proportion as he leaves it out of account". Both Wood and Gardiner saw History as being useful to contemporary society but each approached it from a different angle - Wood studied (and taught) History with the present in mind while Gardiner attempted to disregard it. But while these two historians differed in their approach to their subject, they both employed 'scientific' methodology. According to Wood in his Inaugural Lecture,

the method pursued by the student of history must be the scientific method. His primary work is to ascertain facts, and to learn the relations of facts. He adopts the same method of work as the student of science, though his results may never have the same completeness nor the same certainty. Where the student of science discovers facts and laws the student of history has often to be content with probabilities and tendencies. But though he may fall short of absolute certainty both in premises and in conclusions, it is certainty which he aims at, and which increasing knowledge and experience are always enabling him more nearly to reach. The first business of the historian, then, is to discover and test facts, to sift the evidence, to distinguish facts from fictions, to show the relations between facts and facts. All this is the work of historical criticism. I am not saying that this is the whole duty of the historian, but it is a very important part of his duty. The work of criticism must come before the work of construction.

This concept of the task of the historian "to discover and test facts, to sift the evidence, to distinguish facts from fictions, to show the relations between facts and facts" was a direct result of Wood's time at Oxford studying the works of Stubbs. However, according to Wood, the best historical writing was not only scientific in method but also sympathetic in spirit and utilitarian in motive. In relation to the former, Wood stated,

The gift which is most essential to the making of a great historian is the gift of sympathy. Before you can hope to explain rightly a man's conduct you must be able to think yourself into his position; you must understand his
thoughts and his beliefs; you must know all the circumstances of his life; you must be able to imagine that you placed in his position might possibly have acted as he did act. As the first part of the historian's work, then, is to get to know the facts, the second part of his work is to get to know the men who made the facts. He gets to know the men of the past in very much the same way that he gets to know the men of the present. In the first place, he listens to what they have to say for themselves; and in the second place, he listens to what other men have to say of them. (5)

In combining his concepts of scientific method and sympathetic spirit, Wood stated, "And while the scientific method of history will teach the student to think clearly, its sympathetic spirit will teach him what is perhaps still more important for the happiness of himself and of the world - to feel strongly, and to feel rightly."

Wood's third concept, 'utilitarian in motive', in general refers back to why History is studied at all i.e. its purpose, although he did make specific reference to its use to 'the politician' and 'the man of business' by whom Wood meant "a man who works, and whose work is characterised by its present usefulness". For the former, "The study of history will at least enable the politician to understand the general drift of events in his time" while for the latter, "The study of history claims the attention of the man of business because it helps him to understand what his work in the world is, and to do that work well."

These ideas expressed in his Inaugural Lecture were to be found in the first curriculum by which Wood taught in 1891 when History was only offered for the Second and Third Years of the Bachelor of Arts course. The curriculum comprised:

Second Year course: Pass - The History of the English People.  
Honours - The Growth of the English Constitution.

Third Year course: Pass - A Period of European History. Period for 1892, "the Middle Ages".
Honours - A special historical subject to be carefully studied with reference to the original authorities. Subject for 1892, "The Chronicles of the Crusades". (10)

Thus the course was divided equally into English and European sections. Its scientific nature was reflected in the use of primary sources for Honours students - Stubbs's Select Charters was set for Second Year Honours and a direct reference was made to "original authorities" for the Third Year Honours course. The 'utilitarian' nature of the Second Year course was evident in the use of C. Ransome's A Short History of England which traced English history from pre-Roman to contemporary times and Green's A Short History of the English People which dealt with the period from 449 (the English conquest of Britain) to 1874 (the commencement of the second Disraeli Ministry) and thereby put the present into its historical context. For Second year Pass, the Twelve English Statesmen series which dealt with such personalities as Cromwell, William III, Walpole and Pitt and which was edited by Viscount Morley showed Wood's use of biography and the use of personalities to reflect ideals and actions for application to one's own life. The concept of 'sympathetic spirit' was not directly reflected in the curriculum (as stated in the 1891 Sydney University Calendar) but would have been a product of Wood's own pedagogy and the students' responses.

By 1910 History could be taken over three years although only two courses were still offered - Course II changed annually for students majoring in History. For those studying History for only two years, Course I could be taken in either First or Second Year while Course II would be taken in Second or Third Year. In 1910 Course I comprised "The discovery, conquest, and settlement of America" while Course II comprised "The history of the English Colonies in America". For each Course Froude's English Seamen, Corbett's Drake and Hakluyt's Voyages were recommended texts along with
other sources. The selection of these three for both Courses reflects Wood's use of primary sources i.e. Hakluyt's Voyages (in the vein but not content of Stubbs's Select Charters) and his emphasis on things English. The latter was especially reflected in his 1911 curriculum in which the Pass component for Course I was "English History, 449-1558". The reading list for this Course included J.R. Green's A Short History of the English People of which Wood had said in 1891, "If one book be chosen to represent the history of the present generation, as Gibbon represents the history of the last century, that book is undoubtedly 'Green's Short History of the English People'".  

The context in which Wood made this statement was in reference to History from "the social point of view. History has ceased to be the history of classes, and has become the history of societies". While this may appear to be a rejection of Whig history with its emphasis on politics, Wood maintained the concept of progress and improvement typical of Whig historians although not in a narrowly political sense. Other books in the reading list for the 1911 Course I included English History from Original Sources, B.C.54 - A.D. 1154 and the same title but dealing with the period from 1216 to 1485 thereby reflecting the scientific methodological approach with its emphasis on primary sources.

The Pass component of Course II of the 1911 curriculum continued this emphasis on English history, the title of the course being "The History of the British Empire, and especially of England, from 1685-1845". In the reading list for this course there was an emphasis on books on personalities, for example Morley's Walpole, Harrison's Chatham, Morley's Burke, Rosebery's Pitt, Wakeman's Fox, Trevelyan's Early Life of C.J. Fox, Hammond's Fox, and Morley's Cobden. As well, Burke's Thoughts on the Present Discontents and Speeches on America were included as primary source material. In all, ten out of seventeen books dealt directly with personalities rather than being
of a more general nature. The emphasis on individuals was a noteworthy feature of Wood's curriculum.

This selection of and stress on personalities was noted by the author of the editorial of the University of Sydney undergraduate magazine, Hermes, in 1928: "As he led one through his portrait gallery of heroes - mostly Englishmen: Bede, St. Francis, the Milton of 'Areopagitica,' Bunyan, Wesley, Gladstone - one saw in his selection the incarnation of those qualities of high endeavour which supply the standards of our civilization." This concept of using historical personages as exempla of ideals was also noted in The Magazine of St. Andrew's College:

By his own life he held up a mirror to the lives of the heroes whom he worshipped, for Professor Wood was a hero-worshipper, and his heroes were the embodiment of his most cherished ideals. With these he would walk hand in hand, back through countless ages, in the dim vistas of the past. With Cromwell at Huntingdon he loved to tread the path of Freedom and Democracy; with Milton in his blindness he sought the light of soul Liberty; with Bunyan the Tinker he made humble pilgrimage. (16)

That Wood "was essentially a hero-worshipper" was also noted by his contemporary, Professor Sir Edgeworth David, in his obituary on Wood in 1928. Indeed in 1904, for the University Extension Board, Wood had given a series of lectures entitled "Saints and Heroes" and dealing with St. Francis of Assisi, Jeanne d'Arc, Sir Thomas More, Oliver Cromwell, John Milton and John Bunyan.

The ideals that Wood displayed for imitation were those associated with his Nonconformist and Liberal upbringing. This is explicitly seen in his selection of personalities to be studied in 1911 - Walpole, Chatham, Pitt the younger, Burke, Fox and Cobden - and the authors who wrote about them - Morley, Harrison, Rosebery, Wakeman, Trevelyan and Hammond.

While Course II dealt with a new topic each year, the Pass component of Course I only underwent four changes of topic in the eighteen years from
1911 to 1928 inclusive. The phases through which this Course went were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>English History, 449-1558</td>
<td>Professor Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-22</td>
<td>English History, 449-1509</td>
<td>James Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923-26</td>
<td>English History, 449-1558</td>
<td>Wood (1923 &amp; 1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>English History to A.D. 1485</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>English History, 449-1485</td>
<td>Wood (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all phases (but for 1927) the course began at 449 A.D. (the English conquest of Britain) although the 'end-year' varied from 1485 - the Battle of Bosworth Field and the accession of the first Tudor monarch, Henry VII, to the English throne, 1509 - the death of Henry VII and the accession of Henry VIII, to 1558 - the accession of Elizabeth I. It remained however a course which dealt with English history from early English to Tudor times. The change in time-span is attributable to the change in lecturer with Wood favouring 1558 as the end-year and Bruce, who began duties as a lecturer in 1916, favouring 1509.

Despite changes in lecturer and in 'end-year', J.R. Green's A Short History of the English People remained a text-book for Course I throughout the period from 1911 to 1928 inclusive thereby reflecting the historiographical and ideological basis of this part of the curriculum. In 1902 Wood had reviewed a published collection of J.R. Green's letters. In this review Wood showed his admiration for Green as well as their ideological similarities. Wood described Green as "the greatest historical teacher of his century" and stated that Green was a supporter of Gladstone and his ideals. Of the historical methodology in Green's Short History, Wood commented, "The essence of the new method was the selection of those facts which are, or which ought to be, of interest to us, because they help to
make life happier or better or noble:-. These facts he strives to make vivid and alive. Wood therefore would have seen in Green's Short History an illustration of his attempt to set before students people whose ideals and actions they should emulate. The retention of Green's book as a basic text until 1928 reflects a certain historiographical and ideological conservatism by Wood.

From 1911 to 1915 Wood also stipulated as "Books to be bought" Wakeman's Church of England, Gibbins's Industry in England and two collections of primary sources - English History from Original Sources, B.C. 54-A.D. 1154 and English History from Original Sources, 1216-1485. In 1915 Wood replaced the last two with English History Source Books (Bell) which, despite changes in lecturer and the introduction of other books, remained in use until 1928 for the study of primary sources. While Wood therefore put before his students the Whig interpretation of history with an emphasis on Liberty, he also attempted to acquaint them with scientific methodology in the study of primary sources.

This was reflected in compulsory questions on documents in examination papers. In December 1911 (History I, Pass and Honours) examinees were to write "short notes" on nine, mostly Medieval, primary sources. In December 1920 (History I, Pass and Honours) examinees were required to "write a note of explanation" on a selection of Medieval primary sources as well as a statement of Stubbs that "Britain was easy to be conquered in proportion as it was Romanized". Similar compulsory questions requiring "an explanatory note" on primary sources also occurred in other examination papers such as, for example, those for History I Distinction in 1922 and History I (Pass and Distinction) in December 1925.

The continuing influence of Stubbs and his ideas that Wood had encountered during his studies at Balliol in the 1880's endured into the 1920's.
In December 1911 the History I Honours paper contained the question, "'The chief element in our nation is Germanic.' What is the evidence for this statement?" which was a concept found in Stubbs's *Constitutional History*. In 1919 a History I (Pass and Honours) question directed, "Sketch the development of the English people from despotism towards constitutional government during the thirteenth century" while a similar question occurred in the 1920 History I (Pass and Honours) paper, "Sketch the development of parliamentary government in England during the thirteenth century". In December 1922 the concept of 'freedom' was explicitly included in this 'Stubbsian' question - "Trace the principal stages in the evolution of political freedom in England from the date of the Battle of Bouvines (1214), until the death of Edward I." As late as December 1926 questions still appeared on this Liberal theme, with its Whig overtones, of constitutional development -

"Each step in our growth has been the natural consequence of some earlier step; each change in our law and constitution has been, not the bringing in of anything wholly new, but the development of something that was already old."

Illustrate this statement for the period 1066 to 1307.

Thus Course I of the curriculum for Pass students reflected several aspects of Wood's historical methodology. Firstly, it reflected his ethnocentricity in that he only taught English history in this part of the curriculum. Secondly, the constant use of Green's *A Short History of the English People* reflected both his idea that the study of History was not simply the study of politics but also of people, and that (as Green himself believed) the history of England was the story of the development of liberty. Fourthly, in the Rankean tradition via Stubbs, Wood as a scientific historian did not rely solely on secondary sources but went back to primary sources and taught his students to do likewise.

Course II of his curriculum for Pass students gave further examples of
these four aspects of Wood's historical methodology. Unlike those for Course I, the topics for Course II do not fall into distinct phases - however some themes do emerge both in content and methodology. Firstly, there was still an emphasis on English and British history both in themselves and in their impact overseas. Examples of this theme were "The history of the English Colonies in America" (taught in 1910 and 1912), "The History of the British Empire, and especially of England, from 1685-1845" (1911), "The History of England from 1603 to 1793" (1914), "The History of England from 1603 to 1763" (1919 and 1922), "Aspects of British History, 1760-1867" (1920), "Aspects of British History after 1760" (1923), and "British History from 1603" (1927). In courses such as that of 1915, "British History from 1763 to 1845, with special reference to the political and social history of England, the War of American Independence, the influence of the French Revolution, the history of Ireland, and the Industrial Revolution"^23, Wood widened the 'geographical span' of his curriculum by including European and Irish history.

In 1913 Wood had conducted a Pass course, "The discoveries, conquests and settlements of European nations in the East Indies and in America from 1492 to 1606". In 1918 and 1921 he taught a Pass course "European History from 1774 to the present time" and this trend to teach European history was emphasised by James Bruce in the 1920's. While Bruce only taught Course I, which was solely English history, from his appointment until 1922 and then went on leave in 1923, he initiated a course on the Renaissance when he was Acting Professor in 1924 during Wood's Sabbatical leave. This course, which was repeated in 1926, was entitled "Some Aspects of the Renaissance" and described in 1924 as "an examination of the development of civilisation in Italy from the death of Dante (1321) until the Sack of Rome (1527), and its diffusion especially in England"^24 while in 1926 it was
an examination of the development of civilisation in Italy from the Jubilee of 1300 until the Siege of Florence (1530), and - as far as time permits - of its diffusion in Europe, especially in England. Note that even in a course such as this which was essentially European-oriented, there was reference to England. This was probably a reflection of a contemporary cultural value which saw England as 'the mother country', the centre of the Empire and world affairs, and hence an essential element of one's historical knowledge.

Max Crawford, later Professor of History at the University of Melbourne, was a student at the University of Sydney from 1924 to 1926 and attended Bruce's course on the Renaissance in 1926. According to Crawford,

... many a student was to remember Bruce's lectures on 'The Renaissance in Italy', not for their verbal frills, but for their sheer driving enthusiasm for creative achievement in all fields of art from sculpture to statecraft. When Bruce forgot his notes to talk about these things, the conscious word-play fell away, to be replaced by that easier felicity of phrase that comes to a master of words when he talks of something which really interests him more than the words themselves. (26)

The phrase here "from sculpture to statecraft" gives a hint of Crawford's later interest in and development of the Synoptic view of History. In 1928 Bruce introduced a course entitled "Europe since 1870" and described it as:

discussion of the most important phases of European history since the unification of Germany and Italy. It will be concerned chiefly with the external relations between those States which issued in the War of 1914-1918, and with the subsequent readjustment of those relations. Only those aspects of the internal development of the various States which have importantly affected the common interests of Europe will be considered. It is hoped that time will be found to examine the revolutionary movement in Russia till 1927, the origin and activities of the League of Nations, and the Fascist movement in Italy. The later phase of the period - i.e., since 1900 - will be discussed more fully than the earlier phase. No attempt will be made to examine the military history of the War of 1914-1918. (27)

This course was an innovative one in that it was the first to largely deal with
'contemporary history' - Wood's "European History" courses of 1918 and 1921 had dealt with "the present time" but had begun in 1774. In dealing with so short a time-span, Bruce's course was a forerunner of those of Stephen Roberts, the second Challis Professor of History, who specialised in such courses.

Another trend away from English history in Wood's History curriculum was the study of Australian history. In 1917 he had taught a Pass course entitled "The Age of Discovery, with special reference to the discovery of America and Australia" and in 1925 he taught "The Discovery of Australia; The Foundation of New South Wales; English History, 1603 to 1756". Unlike Professor Ernest Scott who introduced a 'full' course in Australian history on a permanent basis at the University of Melbourne in 1927, Wood kept his occasional teaching of Australian history within the confines of its European context. This European orientation of Wood's Australian history courses was reflected in the 1917 examination questions for this course (History II, Pass and Honours):

Q.11. Write a short account of the exploration of Australia by the Dutch before the voyage of Tasman.
Q.12. Explain the interest of the voyages of Dampier in the story of the exploration of Australia.
Q.13. What did Cook and Banks think about Australia?
Q.14. Write an account of the discovery of the coast of Victoria and South Australia.

Each of these questions put this aspect of Australian history into its role as a part of general European history.

For his 1925 course Wood prescribed Trevelyan's England under the Stuarts and his own Discovery of Australia. This latter book had been first published in 1922 and, as Wood stated in the Preface, was composed of the lectures that he had given at the University in 1917. As in 1917, questions were set on European exploration of Australia but Wood also ventured into
Australian history per se, not simply as an adjunct to European history. Four questions from the History II (Pass and Distinction, paper II) examination illustrating this venture were:

Q.1. Sketch the character of Governor Phillip, and estimate the value of his services to New South Wales.
Q.2. Describe the exploration of New South Wales during the Governorship of Phillip. What estimates were formed of the value of the country?
Q.4. Discuss the causes of the deposition of Governor Bligh.

Questions on 'character' were reasonably common in examination papers set by Wood and were also applied to British and European personalities. This is shown in questions such as, "'A man of the very highest intellectual gifts, but whose moral nature was infinitely inferior to them.' Discuss this description of Raleigh's personality" (History II, Honours, December 1910), "Describe the character of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham. What were his great merits, and what were his defects, as a politician?" and "Discuss the character and opinions of Charles James Fox" (History II, Pass and Honours, December 1920), "Discuss the character and the statesmanship of Peel" and "Discuss the character and statesmanship of Queen Victoria" (History II, Honours, March 1922), and "Discuss the character and statesmanship of Wolsey" (History I, Pass and Distinction, December 1923).

This concept of the study of character was also used by Wood's Associate-Professor, James Bruce, in his Renaissance history courses such as in his December 1926 History II (Pass and Distinction) paper - "Describe the character and career of Lorenzo de' Medici (Il Magnifico), and indicate the nature of his influence in contemporary Italy" and "Explain the contrast presented by the character and ideas of Savonarola and Machiavelli respectively". The study of character and personality was an important
aspect of Wood's curriculum and reflected his interest in the study of values. In its most extreme form, it extended to a form of hero-worship. This study also echoed Wood's statement in his Inaugural Lecture that the study of history should teach a student "to feel strongly, and to feel rightly" by an understanding of historical figures and their deeds.

Overall in the Pass components of both Courses I and II there was, despite some study of America, Australia and Europe, and especially in Wood's own courses, an emphasis on English history. This gave him the geographical context for discussion of social history (as distinct from purely political history) and his concept of the development of 'liberty'. To illustrate this in Course I he relied upon Green's *A Short History of the English People* as a text every year from 1911 to 1928 but in the case of Course II, due to a variety of topics, he used a variety of texts. Notable amongst the authors read was John Morley whose books on either Walpole or Burke were used every year in which there was a course purely on British history. It was of Morley that Wood had said to Arthur L. Smith at Balliol that it was his book, *On Compromise*, that had most influenced him to that time and this book was described by Crawford as "one of the text-books of liberals".28

Other authors that were read for at least half these 'British' courses were Rosebery's *Pitt*, Harrison's *Chatham* and *Cromwell*, Carlyle's *Past and Present*, Trevelyan's *England under the Stuarts* and *British History in the Nineteenth Century*, as well as the primary source material in Burke's *Thoughts on the Present Discontents* and *American Speeches and Letters*. To a lesser extent other authors read for Course II were Green's *A Short History of the English People*, the elder Toynbee's *Industrial Revolution*, Gardiner's *Puritan Revolution*, Traill's *Strafford*, and Ruskin's *Unto This Last*. These books, as a representative sample, indicate the views that Wood
wished to be read, the people and events about which he thought students should know ("the past that lives in the present" as he said in 1891), and indeed his own historiographical stance.

Both Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) and George Macaulay Trevelyan (1876-1962) wrote 'literary' history. Carlyle's works "are literature, prophecy even: in that they are full of lessons and morals for his times, in that they were very widely read, they demonstrate clearly the social affiliations of historical writing" while Trevelyan's works "are mostly literary, narrative histories with a marked bent for social history." According to Trevelyan himself, Green and Morley et al. "carried on the tradition that history was related to literature." All of these 'literary' historians were recommended for study by Wood in his university curriculum and Wood himself in his Inaugural Lecture had stated his support for literary history - "The writing of history, like all other forms of literature, has had a history of its own." In this statement, Wood harked back to the great literary historians such as Macaulay and pre-dated Trevelyan's 1903 essay, Clio: A Muse, in which he denounced narrow 'scientific' history and supported 'literary' history.

Carlyle, Wood and Trevelyan all saw History as having a social educative function. "History, said Trevelyan, provides a basic training in citizenship. . . . History should not only remove prejudice, it should provide the ideals which inspire the life of the ordinary citizen." In 1891 Wood had stated, "The great end and object of education are not the training of learned students, but the making of good men and good citizens. And it is in this work of education that I claim for history a share." 

Carlyle and Wood also saw History, to a large extent, as the study of 'great men' or, as it has been applied to Wood, "heroes". Carlyle's Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (1888) "made an important contribution to
historical interpretation: for two centuries the Puritan dictator had been described as one of the most evil villains of English history; thanks to Carlyle he now began to take his place as one of the 'great men' of English history.\(^36\) Of Cromwell, Carlyle wrote that he was the soul of the Puritan Revolt, without whom it had never been a revolt transcendentally memorable, and an Epoch in the World's History; that in fact he, more than is common in such cases, does deserve to give his name to the Period in question, and have the Puritan Revolt considered as a Cromwelliad, which issue is already very visible for it.\(^37\)

Not only did Carlyle see Cromwell in an heroic light but he viewed Puritanism in a similar manner - "One wishes there were a History of English Puritanism, the last of all our Heroisms; but sees small prospect of such a thing at present.\(^38\) These sentiments would no doubt have pleased Wood with his Puritan upbringing and admiration for this Puritan leader.

Wood's support for literary and social history in the vein of Green, Carlyle and Trevelyan did not mean that he held a dichotomous opposing position to scientific history, indeed he usually included collections of primary sources in his various courses. However he did not adopt the extreme scientific empiricist approach which sought the determination of the truth by the impartial study of primary sources - this empiricist approach was the historical methodology adopted by Wood's counterpart in Melbourne, Ernest Scott, and his successor as second Challis Professor, Stephen Roberts who was a student of Scott. According to Wood,

People sometimes seem to think that were the historian only sufficiently impartial he would be able to get at the absolute and final truth of the history with the precision with which a machine separates the ore from the dross. The truth is that the 'impartial historian' in this sense is as pure a fiction as the 'economic man'. \(^39\)

Wood sought to combine a moral purpose of History with scientific methodology. According to Garnet Vere Portus, a student of Wood and later
Professor of History at the University of Adelaide from 1935 to 1954,

I owe a great deal to your husband, I think a great many men were turned towards a liberal outlook by him and by Francis Anderson. Their lectures were complementary. Professor Wood's great worth to the undergraduate community was his moral enthusiasm. I shudder at the thought of History being taught by a cynic. It's all right for older folk, but it's disastrous for these youngsters we get up here. And Professor Wood showed us that it is possible to be scientific, to hate shams and to be ruthlessly logical, and at the same time to be warm-hearted and enthusiastic and human. This is a rare combination of gifts. (40)

Wood's personality and teaching had a great impact on his students and those he met. According to Sister M. Henrietta, a Dominican nun,

My work brought me for some time into close touch with the Professor and gave me a special opportunity of knowing the kindliness, tolerance and high-souled humanity, for which his name will ever be synonymous in the minds of his students. (41)

Valerie Payne-Scott, a teacher at Mudgee High School, wrote in October 1928,

In common I think with all graduates who have had the supreme privilege of following his lectures, I mourn the passing of our Professor who showed us so much of the height and depth and inner meaning of History, and who in friendly sympathy spared no pains to help us in our difficulties.
The charity and faith in mankind that infused all his lectures was at one with the practical kindness that I never knew to fail.
My own personal debt to his teaching and guidance is beyond measure. (42)

A Presbyterian minister, the Reverend W.G. Sharpe, wrote of Wood, "I will never forget his lectures on St. Francis of Assisi, Savanarola, Cromwell, Latimer and the Puritan Revolution. He was essentially a hero worshipper, and was able to inspire the students with something of his spirit."

In the Pass curriculum Wood attempted to apply the Nonconformist and Liberal ideals of his youth to the study of History in Australia through
mostly English-centred content emphasising 'great men' as the embodiment of his ideals and their impact on society in general within an overall Whig framework of the development of liberty. To do this he chose authors such as Green, Morley, Carlyle and Trevelyan for his students to read and historical personalities such as Cromwell, Walpole, Chatham, Burke, Fox and Cobden for his students to read about. Within this ideological framework Wood encouraged students to experience 'scientific' methods through their reading of primary sources such as Burke's *American Speeches and Letters* or the more general collections such as the series *English History from Original Sources* and *English History Source Books*.

For the Honours (or Distinction) curriculum there was greater diversity of topics but nonetheless the themes of Nonconformity, Liberty (and Liberalism), 'great men' or 'heroes', and 'scientific' methodology through the study of primary sources evident in the Pass curriculum were repeated. From what can be ascertained from the University Calendars it appears that Wood (and later Bruce) never set the same topic for essays and rarely did so for examinations more than once although there were exceptions. The topic, "The History of Europe, 800-1250", was set for the Course I examination for Honours students in most, if not all, years from 1911 to 1928 inclusive. In 1911 the texts for this Honours course were Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, Tout's *The Empire and the Papacy*, and Kingsford and Archer's *The Crusades*. By 1928 the reading list had been expanded to also include as well as these three, Robinson's *Readings in European History, Volume I* (a collection of primary sources), Milman's *Latin Christianity*, Davis's *Charlemagne*, Morison's *St. Bernard*, Sabatier's *St. Francis*, and Davis's *Medieval Europe*.

Another examination topic which was set more than once (in 1920, 1923, 1926 and 1928) was "English History from 1637 to 1660" for which the recommended texts in 1920 were Clarendon's *The Great Rebellion*, Ludlow's
Memoirs, Hutchinson’s Memoirs, Carlyle’s Cromwell, Firth’s Cromwell, Morley’s Cromwell, Gardiner’s Constitutional Documents, The Great Civil War, and The Commonwealth and Protectorate, Firth’s Protectorate, and Masson’s Life and Times of Milton. By 1928 these works had been supplemented by Gardiner’s Cromwell, Firth’s Last Years of the Protectorate and Cromwell’s Army, and Carlyle’s Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches while Carlyle’s Cromwell, Firth’s Protectorate and Masson’s Life and Times of Milton had been deleted. Despite a change in works, authors such as Clarendon, Carlyle, Firth, Morley and Gardiner were all represented as were Wood’s Puritan heroes in Cromwell and, in 1920, Milton. The ‘scientific’ study of primary sources was practised through such publications as the Memoirs of both Ludlow and Hutchinson, Gardiner’s Constitutional Documents and Carlyle’s Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches.

The theme of Nonconformity was implemented in the essay topics "The History of Nonconformity in England to 1643" (set in 1914) and "The Teaching and the Influence of Methodism in the 18th Century" (1919) while that of Liberalism was implemented in the essay topics "Lord Durham’s Report" (1911) and "The cause of Democracy and Liberty in England from 1789 to 1832" (1915). The setting of essays on 'great men' was also a means by which students were to study these ideologies of Nonconformism and Liberalism. Representative of the former were "The Pilgrim Fathers and their colony" (1912), "John Wesley" (1914), "The political economy of John Ruskin" (1915), "Was Milton a Puritan?" (1919), "The Teaching of Bunyan" (1919), and "Ruskin as a Social Reformer" (1920). Wood’s concern with values and Puritanism was reflected in the 1919 (History II, Honours) question on a quotation by Milton:

"He who holds himself in reverence and due esteem, both for the dignity of God's image upon him, and for the price of his redemption, which, he thinks, is visibly marked upon
his forehead, accounts himself a fit person to do the noblest and godliest deeds." (Milton)
Discuss the influence of this idea in Puritan England.

The quest in the past for liberty (and liberalism) was studied in essays on "St. Francis of Assisi" (1911), "The character and opinions of Sir Thomas More" (1912), "Thomas Becket" (1913), and "Hildebrand" (1915). The concept of liberty was also used in examination questions - "'Liberty is Order, Liberty is Strength.' Explain Fox's maxim, and show how he applied it to the political questions of his time" (History II, Honours, December 1911), "'This fierce spirit of liberty is stronger in the English colonies than in any other people of the earth.' Illustrate the presence of this spirit of liberty in the colonies before 1763" (History II, Pass and Distinction, December 1923), and "Explain and illustrate the conception of political liberty which prevailed in Italy between the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries" (History II, Pass and Distinction, December 1926).

Wood's interest in other than political history, in the vein of J.R. Green, is shown in his setting of essays on "Monastic Life in England" (1912), "Social and Economic troubles in England in the first half of the 16th Century" (1913), "Agrarian changes in England in the 18th and 19th centuries" (1915), and "The Decay of the Yeomanry" (1920).

Similarly, an interest in colonial and imperial history was shown in essays on "The character of the French nation as illustrated by the early history of Canada" (1912), "Spanish character as illustrated by the story of the discovery, conquest and settlement of America" (1913), "The relations of the English Government and the Colonies to the outbreak of the War of American Independence" (1915) and examinations on "The History of the English Colonies in America to 1756" (1915) and "British Colonial Policy from 1783 to the present time" (1921 and 1924).

Apparently in response to World War I, Wood set essay questions in 1915
on "The importance of the principle of nationality in the 19th century", "1848", and "Bismarck" and an examination in 1916 on "The History of Europe from 1789 to 1878". This incursion by Wood into modern European history (since 1789) was unique with his Honours curriculum which emphasised British history using the themes of Nonconformity and Liberty. Perhaps this is an instance of Wood using the study of History to illuminate contemporary problems viz. the so-called 'Great War' in which the European powers and their allies, dependencies and colonies were then involved. This concept of illuminating the present was to be a major one used by Wood's successor, Stephen Roberts, in the framing of his own History curriculum.

Wood had set essays on European history but not with this 'current affairs' emphasis - "The Crusades" (1912), "The conception of the Holy Roman Empire in the Middle Ages" (1913), "The decadence of Spain" (1913), and "The controversy of the Empire and the Papacy during the Middle Ages" (1915); examinations had been set on "The History of England, Spain and the Netherlands from 1558 to 1609" (1914) and "The Conflict between England and Spain in the reign of Elizabeth" (1918).

Some essays and examinations had been set on British history which could serve an 'illuminating' function - "The aims and methods of English Trade Unions at the present time" (1911 essay), "British History from 1832 to the present time" (1922 exam) and "British Colonial Policy from 1783 to the present time" (1921 and 1924 examinations). While the study of these courses could 'illuminate' the present, their prime function was not to do this but appears (from an analysis of the reading lists for them) to have been to provide a study of Wood's theme of Liberty. For the 1911 Trade Union essay, Webb's Industrial Democracy was "to be bought", for the 1922 "British History from 1832" examination Morley's Gladstone, Trevelyan's Bright, and Moneypenny and Buckle's Disraeli were recommended while for
the "British Colonial Policy from 1783" examinations Bernard Holland's *Imperium et Libertas* set the tone. According to Holland in relation to the British Empire,

> The primary motive of our constitution has always been local liberty with share in national council. On the larger scale this principle is working itself out in the modern imperial system, so far as concerns the white part of the Empire, although the process is as yet far from complete. But to know the principle is to have a signpost of the general direction of the road. (45)

Despite changes in content, it was usual to include both primary and secondary sources for study in the writing of essays although some essays appear to have been set purely as exercises in the scientific methodology (as learnt in Stubbs's Oxford History School) which, as Wood put it in his Inaugural Lecture, was "to discover and test facts, to sift the evidence, to distinguish facts from fictions, to show the relations between facts and facts." Examples of these exercises in scientific methodology were essays on "Speculation and knowledge as to the Geography of America" (1913) and "Conceptions of the Character of Cromwell" (1920). While these topics are of a specific nature, their titles indicate an approach by the student requiring scientific methodology.

Wood's colleague, James Bruce, in his courses on the Renaissance continued his professor's emphasis on British history as can be seen in the topic for both his 1925 and 1927 Honours examination papers - "Erasmus, Sir Thomas More and the first phase of the Renaissance in England". Like the Pass curriculum, the Honours curriculum was predominantly concerned with British and European history but, unlike the Pass curriculum, Australian history was at no time included. This was due to the lack of primary sources that had been published. In a 1914 letter to the Chairman of the Parliamentary Library Committee about the publication of the Historical Records of Australia, Wood wrote, "I am very anxious to introduce the study
of Australian History into our University. But nothing can be done till we get out material into print!"  

Wood had encouraged post-graduate students to research the original sources in Australian history but could not allow these valuable and irreplaceable documents to be handled by numerous undergraduates. In April 1915 Wood wrote, "At the present time several of my graduate students are working, under my direction, at the early history of N.S.W. Last year we studied the period of the first three governors. This year we proceed to the period of Bligh and Macquarie."  

When Wood instituted the undergraduate Pass course "The Age of Discovery, with special reference to the discovery of America and Australia" in 1917 he used the secondary sources Russell's Dampier and Kitson's Cook as texts for the Australian part of the course while for his 1925 course which included "The Discovery of Australia" and "The Foundation of New South Wales" Wood used his own book The Discovery of Australia which had been published in 1922. However the study of Australian history only played a minor role in Wood's History curriculum.  

The critical study of primary sources (although not necessarily Australian ones) and of historiography itself was occasionally included in examination papers, for example, "Write a critical account of the original sources of information for Drake's voyage round the world" (History II, Honours, December 1910), "'The hope of the unbending Tories.' Discuss Macaulay's description of Gladstone" (History II, Honours, March 1922), and "Discuss the characteristics, as historians, of Gardiner, or of Macaulay, or of Lecky, or of all of these writers" (History II, Honours, December 1922).  

Wood's main aim, however, was the portrayal of ideals through the study of personalities in his curriculum and in occasional lectures to other groups such as school teachers. This was stated explicitly by J.H. Smail in 1928:
There was not a teacher in the High Schools but had the greatest respect, I might even say affection, for Professor Wood. He was so kind to them; so stimulating in his lectures. Again and again round our various common-room tables I have heard the teachers calling to mind some of his fine lectures and his readings, - particularly one from his favourite St. Francis - the dialogue with Brother Leo about 'Perfect Joy'.

I have often told the Professor of the grateful affection in which he was held by us teachers. He gave us ideals. (49)

That this instruction was mostly done within an English context was referred to by F.G. Phillips, a teacher at Sydney Grammar School:

It is nearly thirty years since I first attended History lectures at the University, and quickly learned for our teacher a respect and admiration which time has magnified. I was impressed by the scholarship of Professor Wood, but even more by the fact that I was privileged to meet a man who brought with him the traditions and ideals associated with an English University gentleman.

I look back with pleasure to my meeting with him at Terrigal some few years ago, and rejoiced to hear him say that as he grew older he became more and more 'fanatically English'. And in this young country the implanting of English ideals in national life was a necessity which we are realising to-day. His students treasure and honour his memory, and I am proud to be included among those who received from him an abiding inspiration. (50)

During his professorship, then, there are quite discernible themes in Wood's History curriculum - Nonconformity, Liberty, 'great men' or 'heroes', and scientific methodology all directed to encouraging a 'good' moral stance. These were a reflection of his own upbringing and education as well as of his synthesising of the British Liberal (and Literary) historiographical tradition and the Scientific tradition in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This was in contrast to his Melbourne counterpart, Ernest Scott, whose main aim was the inculcation of 'impartial' scientific method into his students' study of History.
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Chapter 4

Scott: Educational Background and Development as an Historian

Like Arnold Wood, Ernest Scott was born in England but his upbringing was much different and he represented a different tradition in historiography while Wood represented the 'liberal' tradition of Oxford, Scott represented the 'scientific' tradition of the German universities.

Ernest Scott was born in the south Midland town of Northampton on June 21, 1867 and, in contrast to Wood's Nonconformist schooling, was educated at Northampton's St. Katherine's Church of England School. He became a pupil-teacher at the same school "but finding difficulty in reconciling some of his opinions with those of the Church that he was required to teach, he abandoned teaching and became a journalist"1. He worked on the staff of "The Globe" and other London newspapers and in 1892, at the age of 23, due to his wife's ill-health migrated to Melbourne where he joined the staff of "The Herald" then under the direction of Mr. S.V. Winter.

In 1895 Scott became a member of the Victorian Hansard staff and in 1897 attended the Federal Convention in Adelaide his "brilliant sketches" of which won him "wide recognition"2. In 1901, the year of Australian Federation, he joined the Commonwealth Hansard staff with whom he stayed until he became Professor of History at the University of Melbourne in 1914. During this time as a journalist, Scott became a friend of Alfred Deakin3 and his son-in-law, Herbert Brookes, and it was they who, according to The Bulletin, suggested Scott in 1913 as a candidate for the Chair of History at the University of Melbourne4. In contrast to this, Kathleen Fitzpatrick has
stated that the invitation originated from the University Council itself: "The Council decided to re-advertise the Chair and gave permission to the Selection Committee to approach, as the record says" - 'a person living in Melbourne, not an applicant,' and to suggest that he become one."\(^5\) This is substantiated by a letter by Professor W.A. Osborne to Lady Scott in 1939:

> When we were disappointed at the mediocre quality of the applicants for our chair of history the late Sir Harrison Moore sounded me whether it would be wise to offer the chair to our friend and 'fellow boobook Ernest Scott'. I welcomed the suggestion with enthusiasm. I do not imagine for a moment that my support counted much but it added to the general acclaim. (6)

During most of the forty-five years of his life to 1913 Scott had indulged his interest in History by researching and lecturing on the subject and according to him in his application for the Chair,

> I can claim to have been a diligent student of historical literature for nearly thirty years, and have an intimate acquaintance with the best English and French work. I have also read the 'English Historical Review' and the 'American Historical Review' from the beginning of their publication, and the 'Revue Historique' for ten years; and by these means am familiar with the main lines and principal developments of modern research. At various times I have studied particular periods and phases of history for my own pleasure and satisfaction; especially (1) the Elizabethan age, with its literature and published State Papers; (2) the French Revolution, Consulate, and Empire; (3) American history; (4) British and other Colonial history; (5) Australian history. During the last five years I have worked steadily at the last two subjects because I saw that there was fresh work to do in them, which could be done with the material available in this country. (7)

Scott's special interest in the study of primary sources is reflected in his statement that he was "familiar with the main lines and principal developments of modern research" and his references to the "literature and published State Papers" of the Elizabethan age and "the material available in this country" (Australia). Scott had never enrolled as a student at a university and hence had no formal training in the study of History but
despite this was well aware of the Rankean revolution that had occurred in the study of History in the 19th century. An important aspect of Ranke's historical methodology was the emphasis on the study of primary sources and in the preface to his 1824 work, Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494 to 1514, he wrote, "The basis of the present work, the sources of its material, are memoirs, diaries, letters, diplomatic reports, and original narratives of eyewitnesses; other writings were used only if they were immediately derived from the above mentioned or seemed to equal them because of some original information".

Lord Acton, the Regius Professor of History at Cambridge from 1895 to 1902, had been influenced by the Rankean methodology as is evidenced in part by a letter sent to the contributors to the Cambridge Modern History:

> The production of material has so far exceeded the use of it in literature that very much more is known to students than can be found in historians, and no compilation at second hand from the best works would meet the scientific demand for completeness and certainty. (9)

Acton himself wrote the first article for The English Historical Review (referred to by Scott in his 1913 letter) and significantly it dealt with "German Schools of History". In this article Acton's aim was "to show neither their infirmity nor their strength, but the ways in which they break new ground and add to the notion and the work of history". The empiricist approach of this journal itself is shown in the Prefatory Note, "The object of history is to discover and set forth facts..." while the search for 'truth' is shown in the statement that the journal "invites the co-operation of all who love historic truth and are striving to find it". The concept of 'impartiality' in the study of History (and the journal's printing of articles) is reflected in the statement, "Some topics it will be safer to eschew altogether. In others fairness may be shown by allowing both sides an equal
hearing. But our main reliance will be on the scientific spirit which we shall expect from contributors likely to address us. This "scientific spirit" in the study of History was referred to again later in the statement.

We believe that history, in an even greater degree than its votaries have as yet generally recognised, is the central study among human studies, capable of illuminating and enriching all the rest. And this is one of the reasons why we desire, while pursuing it for its own sake in a calm and scientific spirit, to make this Review so far as possible a means of interesting thinking men in historical study, of accustoming them to its methods of inquiry, and of showing them how to appropriate its large results. (14)

These concepts of empiricism, impartiality, the search for truth, and the overall scientific method are found in Scott's writings. According to Kathleen Fitzpatrick, Scott chose this scientific tradition that was espoused by von Ranke and Acton:

Scott was free to look around and choose for himself and he chose the Cambridge school, founded by Lord Acton, who had been educated in Germany and soaked in the methodology of Leopold von Ranke. The essence of the new method of studying history was the importance attached to primary sources, documents contemporary with the historical events in question, in preference to the later reflections of historians on those events. History was to cease to be the historian's individual view and to become 'history without the historian', the record, free from subjective influences or interpretation, of what actually happened. (15)

Scott explicitly stated his admiration for Ranke and his historical methodology:

Much of the material of history consists of partisan writings, things written to deceive, to put a gloss upon truth, to suppress inconvenient facts; and it is the business of historical criticism to probe, compare, sift truth from falsehood. Honest partisanship is never so difficult to deal with as the subtler kind that twists the truth, suppresses half of it while stressing the remainder, and tints the whole presentation with sophisticated dye. But the wholly admirable historian is neither a Macaulay with his Whig bias, nor a Froude with his passionate hatred of Romanism, but one who, like Ranke, represses 'the poet, the patriot, the religious or political partisan, to sustain no cause and write nothing that would gratify his own feelings or disclose his private convictions.' (16)
These concepts of the importance of the study of primary sources and objectivity in historical writing continued to play a major influence on Scott's ideas during his time as professor. In a memorandum of July 1917, Scott wrote,

History is founded upon evidence, much of which is to be found in collections of State Papers, documents, memoirs, letters, and original narratives written by those who witnessed or participated in historical occurrences. Honours students at important English American and foreign universities, are directed to go to this material, and work out for themselves historical problems, which are formulated by their tutors or professors. Thus, the University of Edinburgh possesses a complete set of British Parliamentary papers, and has published work founded upon them. Advanced historical teaching cannot be done without easy access to ample material of this kind. (17)

Fitzpatrick's reference to History "free from subjective influences or interpretation" was reflected in Scott's 1925 book *History and Historical Problems* in which he wrote,

The writer of honest intent will take care that no piece of evidence known to him, or accessible to him, is neglected. He will be prompt to rectify a conclusion in the light of freshly discovered facts. He will state points of view even when he does not approve of the conduct which they explain. He will endeavour to present a case as it was seen by those who were concerned in it, so that their motives, as far as discoverable, shall be fairly disclosed. He will base his judgments upon verified facts, and will not prejudice an issue by suppressions, by twisting truth in the manner of unfair controversialists, by failing to give the 'other side' when there is another side which ought to be heard. It is this good faith which makes sound history, not the dehumanising of the historian by making him deciduous in respect to opinions, feelings, sympathies and aversions. (18)

Scott's impartiality related to the presentation of evidence but this did not preclude him from passing judgement on historical figures in the vein of Acton who in his 1895 Inaugural Lecture advised students of History "to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong". Scott followed in Acton's path in the
concept of impartiality in the writing of History - not impartiality in passing judgement on historical figures but impartiality in presenting evidence so that the reader can be aware of all factors in a given situation. This concept of impartiality was reflected in Acton's creation *The Cambridge Modern History* and was followed by Scott in his role as 'Adviser' for the Australian volume of *The Cambridge History of the British Empire* published in 1933. According to Acton in his letter to the contributors to the *Cambridge Modern History*:

> Our scheme requires that nothing shall reveal the country, the religion, or the party to which the writers belong. It is essential not only on the ground that impartiality is the character of legitimate history, but because the work is carried on by men acting together for no other object than the increase of accurate knowledge. The disclosure of personal views would lead to such confusion that all unity of design would disappear. (20)

In continuance of this concept, Acton went on to write,

> ... our Waterloo must be one that satisfies French and English, Germans and Dutch alike; that nobody can tell, without examining the list of authors, where the Bishop of Oxford laid down the pen, and whether Fairbairn or Gasquet, Liebermann or Harrison took it up. (21)

This concept of uniformity of approach was echoed by Scott in 1927 when he wrote to Serle explaining why he could not give a lecture to the Shakespearean Society:

> There are 16 contributors of chapters to the Australasian volume of the Cambridge History of the British Empire, which I am looking after; and that job is a burden of much weight. They all have different points of view as to how things should be done, and it is necessary to adopt only one way, the handling of them is in itself a tricky business. I fear I must not undertake anything else this year. (22)

These are examples of what was perceived as 'scientific' history - the by-passing of historians' interpretative works back to the original sources, the comprehensive selection and presentation of evidence from these sources
to give a complete picture of what actually happened (von Ranke's phrase "wie es eigentlich gewesen"
23) and, by the giving of a complete picture, eliminating bias. Scott himself explicitly stated that the writing of History was both an art and a science:

To the extent, then, that history presents evidence, and reasoning upon evidence, that is, criticism of evidence, and to the extent that it is partially-unified knowledge, it is science. But there is other history that presents pictures of the past, analyses character, probes motives, and is distinguishable by skill in narrative. To the extent that it consists of these qualities, it is art. (24)

While Scott acknowledged the virtue of the latter he stressed the importance for History of the former:

The scientific age has affected historical studies chiefly in two ways: by imparting the scientific spirit to historical investigation, and through the influence of certain lines of scientific thought on the work of historians. There is no one absolutely right way of writing history. There is room for historians who are not much influenced by the scientific spirit. But most assuredly there is also room for the historians who aim at being scientific, and much work of high value and interest for them to do. The testing of evidence, in the same way as a man of science tests his materials and checks his experiments, the criticism of authorities, synthesis, analysis, are processes which need to be performed in the spirit in which the physicist or the biologist works. (25)

Stephen Roberts, a student of Scott from 1919 to 1922 and the Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney from 1929 to 1947, acknowledged the 'scientific' aspect of Scott's historical methodology; "When he came to Australia, history meant a memorizing of unrelated facts or a tendentious culling of past happenings to support a present thesis. Ernest Scott got rid of all this, and, while humanizing history, made its methods scientific"26.

Until 1913, the year of his application for the History Chair, Scott had not only kept up to date with the contemporary trends in historical research but he also lectured "to societies on literary and historical subjects" although
he conceded that this was "different in aim and kind from teaching students. My experience in this direction is mentioned chiefly because by means of it a certain facility of expression and of method has been attained."

Scott also used his research as a basis for the writing of both books and articles for historical journals. In 1911 his article, "The Resistance to Convict Transportation to Victoria", was published in the Victorian Historical Magazine and in 1912 so too was his "English and French Navigators on the Victorian Coast" in the same magazine. In 1913 his "Baudin's Voyage of Exploration to Australia" appeared in the English Historical Review.

However his major contribution to Australian historiography to 1913 was the writing of three books on English and French navigators who had visited Australia. The first of these books was published in 1910 and was entitled Terre Napoleon - the name given by the French at the beginning of the nineteenth century to the stretch of southern Australian coastline "from Wilson's Promontory to Cape Adieu in the Bight". According to Scott, in a typically empiricist mode, "The main object of this book is to exhibit the facts relative to the expedition despatched to Australia by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1800-4, and to consider certain opinions which have been for many years current regarding its purpose."

Scott hoped to revise the opinions of historians concerning "the expedition commanded by Captain Nicolas Baudin on the coasts which were labelled Terra Napoleon" by going back to the primary sources. According to Scott, "It is to be feared that in the writing of Australian, as of much other history, there has been on the part of authors a considerable amount of 'taking in each other's washing' and consequently recourse to the original sources was the only way of ascertaining what actually happened. Scott summarised the themes of this book and his conclusions as:
The main two points which the book handles are: (1) whether Napoleon's object was to acquire territory in Australia and to found 'a second fatherland' for the French there; and (2) whether it is true, as so often asserted, that the French plagiarised Flinders' charts for the purpose of constructing their own. On both these points conclusions are reached which are at variance with those commonly presented; but the evidence is placed before the reader with sufficient amplitude to enable him to arrive at a fair opinion on the facts, which, the author believes, are faithfully stated. (32)

The last sentence in this quotation both reflects the Actonian concept of 'impartiality' in the writing of History so that the reader can be aware of all factors in a given situation and is precursive of Scott's 1925 assertion that in an historian "The test of dependableness, indeed, is not absence of bias, but the presence of good faith. The writer of honest intent will take care that no piece of evidence known to him, or accessible to him, is neglected". Although Scott's own conclusions were at variance with those held by other historians in 1910, he was able to state "of Terre Napoleon three years later that it was "a book which has passed into a second edition, and the main conclusions of which, fresh at the time when they were put forward, are now, I believe, generally accepted".

As well as the study of primary sources and the implementation of the concept of impartiality, Scott also used other techniques which were symptomatic of the 'scientific' approach to History. Firstly, the compilation of a 5½ page "Comparative Chronology" which, according to Scott, is designed to enable the reader to see at a glance the dates of the occurrences described in the book, side by side with those of important events in the world at large. It is always an advantage, when studying a particular piece of history, to have in mind other happenings of real consequence pertaining to the period under review. Such a table should remind us of what Freeman spoke of as the 'unity and indivisibility of history,' if it does no more. (35)

The historical concept of 'chronology' was held by Scott to be "a fundamentally important thing in history" and according to him, "It is by
means of chronology that we preserve that sense of perspective which saves us from regarding human things in the flat."

Secondly, an extensive bibliography of over one hundred items and containing both primary and secondary sources is found on pages 282 to 290 although, in contrast to the Actonian tradition as reflected in the Cambridge Modern History, footnotes are used - mostly referring to primary sources.

Thirdly, primary sources themselves such as maps and written documents are reproduced. Apart from portraits of General Charles Decaen, Captain Nicolas Baudin and Francois Peron and illustrations of the French ships Le Geographe and Le Naturaliste, Scott's book contains maps of New Holland and Terre Napoleon as projected in Freycinet's Atlas of 1807, the track chart of Le Geographe from Freycinet's Atlas of 1812, and an Admiralty Chart of the entrance to Port Phillip. On pages 65 to 66 of his book, Scott has had reproduced in the original French two passages from the official history of Baudin's expedition written by Peron and Freycinet which, according to Scott, is factually incorrect. Scott opens Chapter III of his book with a summary of the chapter's content:

Conflict of evidence between Baudin, Peron, and Freycinet as to whether the French ships had sighted Port Phillip - Baudin's statement, corroborated by documents - Examination of Freycinet's statement - The impossibility of doing what Peron and Freycinet asserted was done. (38)

The first footnote to the actual text of Chapter III reflects Scott's acquaintance with secondary sources on this subject and also his opinion of their inadequacy, especially regarding this conflict of evidence in the primary sources:

the conflict of evidence to be pointed out seems to have escaped the notice of writers on Australian history. The contradictions are not observed in Bonwick's Port Phillip Settlement, in Rusden's Discovery, Survey, and Settlement of Port Phillip, in Shillinglaw's Historical Records of Port Phillip, in Labilliere's Early History of Victoria, in Mr. Gyles Turner's History of the Colony of Victoria, nor in any other work with which the author is acquainted. (39)
Having outlined this conflict of evidence, Scott explicitly stated his purpose - "Here, at all events, is a sharp conflict of evidence. We must endeavour to elicit the truth." This fourth aspect of Scott's writing - the search for 'truth' - coincided with the concept of 'impartiality'. It was also strongly empiricist in that rather than attempting to make the facts fit into and support some theory, he hoped to ascertain the truth (what actually happened) from examination of the primary sources. He explicitly stated this in the Preface to *Terre Napoleon* when he wrote, "the book has not been written to prove a conclusion formulated a priori, but with a sincere desire that the truth about the matter should be known." This search for truth was a basic component in Scott's perception of the purpose of the study of History:

> It is the principal object of history to ascertain the truth and tell it, and this it can do in the full confidence that no good cause will ever be weakened by the setting forth of the truth about it, and is not, in fact, a good cause to the extent that truth can damage it. But the effect, good or ill, is not the business of history; truth-telling is its business, first and foremost. (42)

In 1912 Scott continued the theme of his work on French navigators with the publication of a book on the Comte de Laperouse who, in command of two ships, had entered Botany Bay in January 1788. While this book was not of the same scale as that of *Terre Napoleon* it nonetheless featured some of the characteristics of its larger counterpart and consequently some of the characteristics of the 'scientific' method in historiography. Scott quoted extensively from primary sources in his narrative and, although he gave no footnotes or bibliography at the end of the book, he listed his sources at the end of Chapter VII, "Botany Bay", wherein he wrote, "It may be well to cite, as a note to this chapter, the books in which contemporary accounts of the visit of Laperouse and his ships to Botany Bay are to be found. Some readers may thereby be tempted to look into the original
Scott appears to have been well acquainted with both the primary and secondary sources relevant to this subject for in 1913 he wrote that this book, *Laperouse*, was "an attempt to show the true significance of the voyage of this navigator to Australia. (The general view, which I believe to be erroneous, is put, for instance, in Jenks's 'History of the Australasian Colonies' pp.29-30)."

As with his earlier book, *Terre Napoleon*, Scott was aware of and sought to revise the ('incorrect' as he perceived them) opinions of historians who had already published on this period - Scott sought a revision of the views expressed in these secondary sources by a re-investigation of the primary sources and thus arrive at the 'truth' of the matter. This reflected the aim of 'scientific' historians to dispose of the unsubstantiable aspects of historians' opinions and, by close scrutiny of primary sources, find out what actually happened in an impartial and honest way without bias of any kind.

As with *Terre Napoleon*, Scott included in his 1912 book maps showing "Australia as Known at the Time of Laperouse's Visit", "Chart of Laperouse's Voyage in the Pacific", and "Map of Vanikoro. Laperouse's Ships were lost on the Reef Shewn in the Left-hand Corner". Implicit in this array of primary source material and evidence to substantiate Scott's opinions is the concept of empiricism whereby 'concrete' facts are needed to verify a point of view.

In 1914 Scott's third book related to the exploration of Australia's coastline was published - *The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders, R.N.* - and in it he continued his 'scientific' methodology established in his first book, *Terre Napoleon*. In 1913 when applying for the Chair of History at the University of Melbourne, Scott wrote of his book on Flinders, "It is a work of about 130,000 words, founded upon a very large quantity of entirely fresh manuscript material, and it presents both facts and conclusions which are
new to history. Here Scott stated explicitly his use of primary sources as a means of obtaining facts from which he could deduce conclusions i.e. the empiricist method. Facts were not to be used to support a theory already held but rather opinions were to be formed based upon the facts.

Scott used the bulk of the Preface of his The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders, R.N. to outline where he obtained primary source material - "the grand-nephew of that Comte de Fleurieu who largely inspired three famous French voyages to Australia - those of Laperouse, Dentrecasteaux and Baudin", the Flinders papers in the Melbourne Public Library, manuscripts in the Mitchell Library in Sydney, and copies of documents from Paris and Caen. The Bibliography towards the end of the book is in four parts - Manuscript Sources, Printed Documents, Works by Flinders, and Other Printed Books - while the footnotes are references to primary source material, explanatory comments on the text or references to other secondary sources.

In common with other concepts found in his 1910 book, Scott's 1914 publication contained a 1½ page Chronology of Flinders's Life, illustrations of the chief protagonists and ten maps including Flinders's Voyages in Bass Strait; Bass's Eye-sketch of Westernport; Port Dalrymple discovered in the Norfolk, 1798; Flinders's Chart of Spencer's Gulf, St. Vincent's Gulf, and Encounter Bay; Flinders's Map of Port Phillip and Westernport; Flinders's Chart of Torres Strait, also showing Cook's and Bligh's Tracks, etc. As well, the book contains seven reproductions of original manuscript material such as Facsimile of letter to Sir Joseph Banks, 1794; Page from Flinders's MS. Narrative of the Voyage of the Francis, 1798; Page from Bass's MS. Account of the Voyage of the Norfolk; Page from MS. of Flinders's Abridged Narrative, etc. While these reproductions of original maps and documents are of intrinsic interest they, probably more importantly, reflect Scott's
empiricist and scientific methodology in that they stress the importance that Scott himself placed on basing one's opinions upon concrete, factual evidence. To supplement this evidence, Scott also added two appendices to the text - Baudin's Account of Encounter Bay, 1802, and Peron's Report on Port Jackson, 1802 - while a third appendix listed "Names given by Flinders to Important Australian Coastal Features".

Of all his writings to date Scott stated in 1913 that they "were undertaken because I had something fresh to say on the subjects with which they deal and all do, I believe, clear up obscure or misunderstood points in history". The 'scientific' historian's aim of arriving impartially at the truth is implicit here and although Scott's writings in general exhibit other characteristics of 'scientific' historiography they also reflect some of Scott's cultural values and other historiographical characteristics not essentially 'scientific'. The last paragraph of his *Terre Napoleon* (1910) shows not only his empiricist methodology but also his adherence to the concept, held by many in the first half of the twentieth century, that Australia owed much of its economic, social and political well-being to Great Britain as part of the Empire:

The facts set forth in the preceding pages are sufficient to show that the people of no portion of the British Empire have greater reason to be grateful for the benefits conferred by the naval strength maintained by the mother country, during the past one hundred years, than have those who occupy Australia. Their country has indeed been, in a special degree, the nursling of sea power. By naval predominance, and that alone, the way has been kept clear for the unimpeded development, on British constitutional lines, of a group of flourishing states forming 'one continent-isle', whose bounds are 'the girdling seas alone'. (53)

The last paragraph of the Preface to his *The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders*, R.N. shows a similar Anglophilia:

It is hoped that these pages will enable the reader to know Matthew Flinders the man, as well as the navigator; for the study of the manuscript and printed material about him has convinced the author that he was not only
remarkable for what he did and endured, but for his own sake as an Englishman of the very best type. (54)

This Anglophilia was again shown in 1916 when Scott's book, A Short History of Australia, was first published for university and secondary school History courses. Scott was aware of the dangers of nationalistic bias in the writing of History but with true scientific impartiality in search of the truth he stated,

\[ \text{History should be wholly patriotic in its uplift; but it is bad history that sets patriotism before truth, and bad patriotism that desires such a disservice. History serves patriotism most fully when it discharges its function fairly, and leaves the truth to do its own work.} \ (56) \]

This scientific historical concept of seeking after the truth was again shown in Scott's application for the Chair of History in 1913 when he wrote of his three books and various articles for periodicals.

It was on the strength of Scott's original works that he applied for the Chair of History in 1913 - all had been published by 1913 except for The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders, R.N. which was then "in the printer's hands". When the University of Melbourne first advertised the vacancy there were twenty-three applicants ranging in age from 24 to 44 years. A Committee for Selection composed of Professor J.B. Bury, Dr. G.W. Prothero and Professor T.F. Tout, having examined the applications, narrowed the field down to two candidates - Mr. Arthur Jones and Mr. John Elder. Amongst the criteria used for selection the Committee "laid great stress on the publication of work showing a capacity for original historical research, such as is required from candidates for Professorships in the British Universities, as well as on character, experience and knowledge". Jones had done research into Welsh History while Elder that of Scotland in the 17th century.

However there was some doubt within the University of Melbourne as
to whether either man was suitable for the Chair and so the position was re-advertised in Australia and New Zealand in May 1913 - it was overtly as a response to this advertisement that Scott applied. In his letter of application Scott outlined his original research and publications, his keeping up-to-date with current historical thinking, the historical areas which had especially interested him, and his experience in lecturing to societies on literary and historical topics. Towards the end of his eight-page letter, Scott noted his lack of a university education:

I have the disadvantage of having lacked the opportunity, in my youth, of receiving an University training, and, if this application meets with favour, should have to acquire a knowledge of methods of work to fit myself for the satisfactory performance of the duties of the chair. But I can profess an enthusiasm for the subject, and can, I believe, impart a living interest in it to students. (59)

Scott was not immediately appointed to the Chair and according to Sir James Barrett who was on the Council of the University in 1913, "the Council hesitated to appoint him because, while his work in Australian history was profoundly appreciated, some members of the council questioned whether anyone whose work had been limited to Australia could develop the wide range necessary". However some academics were supportive of Scott's candidature. T. Fink in a letter to Scott congratulating him on his being knighted in 1939 described Professor Masson's and Dr. Leeper's support of Scott in 1913:

Many years later I had the good fortune to be on the University Council, and one of the three appointed to consider the reports on the candidates for the then vacant Chair of History. There were Professor Masson, Dr. Leeper and myself. That fine scientist and scholar Masson was emphatic that in addition to your knowledge of history and teaching ability, the original work you had already done (Flinders, La Perouse etc.) was an earnest of future original research and work which would add lustre to the University. Dr. Leeper warmly supported this. (61)

Scott was appointed to the Chair and over the ensuing twenty-three
years lectured on both British and European History. His interest in Australian history was reflected in his introduction of courses on this topic and in so doing led the way in this matter in Australian universities - this and his scientific methodology became important features of the History School's curriculum under his direction.

From 1914 when Scott took office as Professor of History at the University of Melbourne he had the opportunity, for which he had hoped, of imparting "a living interest" in History to his students. Writing to Alfred Deakin in August 1913, Scott stated, "I have some tough work ahead, but shall face it with a firm belief that if well done it will bear good fruit and be of genuine public service". 
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Scott's History Curriculum at the University of Melbourne

In 1853, three years after a similar event in Sydney, an Act was passed in the local colonial legislature to establish a university in Melbourne which had only been established as a town eighteen years before. In 1854 the foundation stone of the University building was laid (the present-day Law Building) and in the following year the first four professors arrived - Henry Rowe, Professor of Classics; William Wilson, Professor of Mathematics; Frederick McCoy, Professor of Natural Science, and William Hearn, Professor of Modern History and Literature, Political Economy and Logic.

As in the case of Oxford, there was no department of History as a separate entity but rather History was combined with other subjects to form a 'composite' department. In 1879, with the appointment of John Simeon Elkington as professor, History and Political Economy became a separate department. Elkington had been born in England but, having migrated to Victoria with his parents, was educated at Melbourne Church of England Grammar School. In 1866 he graduated from the University of Melbourne with first-class honours in History and Political Economy. He obtained a Bachelor of Laws degree in 1884. Elkington lectured in Ancient History, British constitutional and imperial history, and Political Economy. He wrote no books during his professorship but did have some articles published on constitutional history (his main teaching subject). During his professorship the study and teaching of History at the University of Melbourne stagnated largely due to his interests outside the university and his tendency to disreputable behaviour. Upon his retirement in 1912, the subjects of History and Political Economy each became a separate department. In 1914 Ernest Scott took up his duties of Professor of History.
In a letter to the Vice-Chancellor and Council of the University aimed at maintaining the employment of Jessie Webb as the Ancient History lecturer, Scott outlined the nature of the curriculum he was implementing in 1914:

The lines upon which I have been working entail the expenditure of a very large amount of time. In the three branches of which I have been in charge, I have encouraged students to undertake essay-work from original historical material - state papers, memoirs, letters, collections of documents, etc. Work of this kind is of very great value. It trains the intelligence in piecing together fragments of information from various sources into a readable narrative, it exercises the judgment in elucidating contradictions, examining evidence, and so forth. I have found that students do this work with keen enjoyment, the subjects suggested having been chosen to awaken their curiosity, and to afford opportunities for writing which active minds would be likely to appreciate. I have tried to increase the profitableness of the work by individual criticism, and by discussing the essays in class. (4)

It is perhaps easier to appreciate the importance of the nature of Scott's History curriculum by contrasting it with that of his predecessor, Elkington. In the years 1910 to 1912 there were four History courses offered - Ancient History, History of the British Empire Part I, History of the British Empire Part II, and European History. The content and recommended books for the 'non-Ancient' courses as outlined in the 1912 Calendar of the University were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## European History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plus four other books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gardiner - The Thirty Years' War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bryce - Holy Roman Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodge - Close of the Middle Ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Acton - Lectures on Modern History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Cambridge Modern History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plus two other books.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the History curriculum in the last phase of Elkington's professorship dealt with Ancient Greece and Rome (taught by Jessie Webb), the history of Britain and its empire to the nineteenth century, and the history of the European continent from the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century. The courses were of a general nature (this concept being explicitly stated in both 'British' courses) with no detailed study of a specific period or of primary sources. The only variables in the curriculum were the alternation every year of "Medieval History" and "Modern History" within the European history course and the additional work for Honours students within the course "History of the British Empire - Part I". This Honours course dealt with different periods in English political history - in 1910 the period from 1216 to 1485 was studied, in 1911 that from 1603 to 1702, and in 1912 that from 1547 to 1603. However these Honours courses were not based on the study of primary sources but on that of secondary sources, specifically the Longmans series on the political history of England written by authors such as Tout and Oman (for the 1910 course), Montague and Lodge (1911) and Pollard (1912).
Primary sources were also not studied in the general courses for which books recommended for study were all secondary sources. Books for study in the course "History of the British Empire" (Parts I and II) were distinctly in the Whig tradition with authors such as Green, Macaulay, Hallam and Seeley being represented. Typical of the Whig interpretation of history, emphasis was put on the study of the political, constitutional and imperial history of Great Britain.

The Rankean concept of 'scientific' history (as distinct from Macaulay's 'literary' history) was represented in the European History course by the works of Gardiner and Acton as well as by The Cambridge Modern History itself. 'Scientific' history was also represented in the Honours course for which books by Tout (a pupil of Stubbs) and Pollard were recommended. Despite this reading of the works of 'scientific' historians, Elkington does not appear to have attempted to encourage 'scientific' practices in his students through such activities as the study of primary sources.

In 1910 candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts at the University of Melbourne were required to pass examinations during a three-year course. No History courses were offered for the First Year Examination but were offered (although at no time were compulsory) for the Second and Third Year Examinations. In Second Year, Pass and Honour Examinations were held in Ancient History and History of the British Empire, Part I, either or both of which could be chosen; evening lectures were also held in these Second Year subjects. In Third Year the 'History' group of subjects for the Pass Examination was composed of History of the British Empire, Part II, European History, and Political Economy any or all of which could be chosen. The Final Honour Examination in History was held in the first term of 1911 (this was the normal practice for Final Honour Examinations as well as for examinations for scholarships and most higher degrees). The course and
recommended books for the History subjects (as distinct from Political Economy) were mostly the same for this final examination as for the general course although a "subject for special study" was added - in 1911 this special study was "the generation after Waterloo" and in 1912 was "The War of the Succession in Spain". The History component of the 1911 and 1912 examinations for a Master of Arts degree in the School of History (which included Political Economy) was "The History of France" for which the recommended books for study were Lectures on the History of France by Stephen and France by Bodley - both secondary sources.

Thus some observations can be made on the History curriculum at the University of Melbourne during the final phase of the professorship of Elkington. Firstly, the courses for the 'basic' Bachelor of Arts degree were of a general nature and some specialization only occurred if a student attempted Honours. Secondly, students (even those attempting Honours or a Master of Arts degree) appear to have made no study of primary sources and 'learnt their history' from other historians' interpretations i.e. secondary sources. No attempt appears to have been made to train 'professional' historians by exposing students to the study of the 'raw materials' themselves. Thirdly, the content of the courses was extremely European centred - Greece, Rome, Britain and her empire, and Europe. As well as this geographic narrowness, the curriculum was narrow in scope as it concentrated on political, constitutional and imperial history. An overriding factor in this narrow scope was the Whig interpretation which was represented in Elkington's curriculum by books written by some of its major exponents.

In 1912 Elkington retired from his professorship and until the appointment of his successor the department was conducted by Miss Jessie Webb, Mr. E.C.W. Kelly and Mr. T. Clyne. Jessie Stobo Watson Webb
entered the University of Melbourne as a student in 1898 and gained first-class Final Honours and the exhibition in History and Political Economy in February 1901. She shared the Wyselaskie Scholarship in English Constitutional History and was awarded the Cobden Club Medal. She graduated as a Bachelor of Arts in 1902 and obtained her Master of Arts degree in 1904. In the following year she completed the work of a second Arts Honour School taking first-class Honours with first place in Logic and Philosophy. In 1908 she was appointed an evening lecturer in History and in 1913 the lecturer in Ancient History, her main interest being in Greek and pre-Greek Mediterranean history.

During the interregnum between the resignation of Elkington in 1912 and Scott taking up his duties in March 1914, the History curriculum followed the overall pattern established by Elkington but for the 1914 academic year some changes did occur. Greek history was introduced into the additional Honours work for Ancient History (no doubt due to the interest in Greek history of Jessie Webb) and the nature of the additional Honours work for History of the British Empire, Part I, was also changed. Whereas under Elkington the additional Honours work was the study of a specified period in the political history of England based on the Longmans series on this theme, in 1914 under Scott the recommended texts were The Domesday Inquest by Ballard and Factors in Modern History by Pollard.

In 1914 the general course "History of the British Empire, Part I" was extended in its time-span from 1685 to 1688 (a notable year in the Whig interpretation of history) and Green's History of the English People was supplemented by Hodgkin's Political History - Scott was not anti-Whig in his perception of history. The list of recommended books for "History of the British Empire, Part II" remained much as it had been under Elkington with its concentration upon political, constitutional and imperial history although
Edward Jenks's *History of the Australasian Colonies* replaced his *The Government of Victoria* - this was a sign of things to come in that Scott was concerned with the history of Australia as a whole rather than seeing the colony of Victoria's government as a derivative of the Westminster Model initiated by the 'mother country', Great Britain. The European History course (subtitled "Modern History" in 1914) now began with the Thirty Years' War and consequently Lodge's book *Close of the Middle Ages* was deleted from the list; Alison Philips's *Modern Europe* and Macaulay's *Historical Essays* were added. Gardiner, Acton and The Cambridge Modern History kept their place.

Changes to the conditions under which a student could qualify for the aware of the degree of Bachelor of Arts also came into force in 1914. Rather than subjects being arranged into three separate yearly groups (First Year, Second Year, Third Year) they were arranged into four groups viz. Language and Literature, History and Political Science, Philosophy and Pure Mathematics, and Science. "Group 2" was composed of British History Part I, British History Part II, European History, Ancient History, Political Economy, Constitutional History and Law Part I, and Public International Law. Subjects could be passed in any order as long as, in the case of History courses, candidates passed in the lower grade of a subject before proceeding to a higher grade. To obtain the B.A. degree a candidate had also to pass in all subjects constituting Major Subjects - in the case of Group 2, this amounted to any three subjects. As well, three of the four History subjects - Ancient, British Part I and European - could now be taken in a candidate's first year for his degree whereas to 1913 all History subjects were to be taken in Second or Third Year. Similarly, subjects for which evening lectures were given were not divided into First Year or Second Year but graded as in the general B.A. course. There was therefore greater flexibility in these new arrangements.
Thus by 1914 there was not only this greater flexibility in a student's choice of subjects but the nature of the History courses within this range of subjects had also begun to change. From 1914, students of History were to face a different state of affairs to those preceding 1914. In 1915 three major changes occurred to the History curriculum. Firstly, there was an increasing component of Australian history in "History of the British Empire, Part II" with the addition of Rogers's *Australasia* (in Lucas's *A Historical Geography of the British Colonies*, Vol. VI, Part I), Jose's *Australasia* and Gyles Turner's *History of Victoria*; the 1910 to 1914 recommended books of Lecky, Hallam, Seeley, May and Hunter were deleted. Secondly, Honours courses were instituted for "History of the British Empire, Part II" and "European History" - the Special Study for the former was "The Reign of George III" and for the latter "The Napoleonic Empire"; works by Holland Rose were recommended for both Honours courses. Thirdly, Elkington's alternation of Medieval and Modern History courses was abandoned and the "European History" course was now a Modern European history course emphasising the nineteenth century as can be seen from the recommended reading list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study (for Honours)</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European History</td>
<td>Modern History</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marvin - <em>The Living Past.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acton - <em>Lectures on Modern History.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E. Payne - <em>European Colonies.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MacMasters - <em>History of the American People.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawkesworth - <em>The Last Century in Europe.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisher - <em>Napoleon.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Napoleonic Empire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fournier - <em>Napoleon I.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holland Rose - <em>The Personality of Napoleon.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 1914 recommended reading list, only Acton's *Lectures on Modern History* remained. In 1915 changes were also made to the curriculum for the degree of Master of Arts in which a new course "British Colonial Policy" was added to the existing course, "The History of France".

Further changes were made for the 1916 academic year so that, despite retention of the names of the courses, their content was somewhat different to those offered in 1912, Elkington's final year as professor. Collections of primary sources were introduced into the recommended reading lists for the additional work for Honours and this innovation also proved a sign of things to come during Scott's professorship. The Honours course "The English Colonies to 1688" for History of the British Empire, Part I, included a study of Hart's *American History told by Contemporaries, Vol. I; Era of Colonization, 1492-1689* while the Honours course "The Reign of George III" for History of the British Empire, Part II, included a study of Grant Robertson's *Select Statutes, Cases and Documents*. The inclusion of these collections of primary sources was in contrast to Elkington's lists of recommended books which were all secondary sources. This innovation by Scott can be seen as a reflection of his perception of the purpose for which students studied History. That purpose was to approach History in a 'professional' and 'scientific' sense by being capable of analysing the raw materials of history, assessing and interpreting them and then being able to communicate one's findings and conclusions in a coherent manner. According to Emeritus Professor Max Crawford, "Scott rescued, the Melbourne School from the abyss into which it had fallen under Elkington's rule". Excluding Ancient History, the structure of the History curriculum in 1916 was:
### Name of Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study (for Honours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The General History to 1688; The History of the British Colonies to 1688.</td>
<td>The English Colonies to 1688.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General History continued.</td>
<td>The Reign of George III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general history of Europe since 1492; History of European colonies; History of America in so far as it touches the general history e.g., the Monroe Doctrine etc.</td>
<td>The Napoleonic Empire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of the use of primary sources was reinforced in 1917 when Robinson and Beard's *Readings in Modern European History* was added to the recommended reading list for the European History course and this concept was again reinforced in 1918 when Gardiner's *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution* was included, to be read in conjunction with Trevelyan's *England under the Stuarts*, as part of the recommended reading list for the study of the Stuart period, 1603-1688, within the course "History of the British Empire, Part I". In 1917 also Scott's own *A Short History of Australia* appeared on the recommended reading list for History of the British Empire, Part II - this book was to be later used as a text for History courses in both high schools and universities in New South Wales and Victoria.

Thus by the fifth year (1918) of Scott's professorship, two important trends (apart from revision of content and reading lists per se) were becoming apparent - the increasing importance of Australian history and the introduction of the study of primary sources initially for Honours students.
and then for others. Sir Keith Hancock, a History student at the University of Melbourne from 1917 to 1919, recalled the importance of the latter in two of his own works - Country and Calling and Professing History. In the former he wrote of Scott,

The reading he demanded of us and the lectures he gave us had the quality of span. They may sometimes have lacked depth; but he made up for this by sending us to original sources for the long essays he required us to write every term. Thereby I learnt to assemble and to handle the materials of my craft. I made the exhilarating discovery that study, when it is pursued with ardour and discipline, becomes creation. (19)

By "span" Hancock refers to the fact that Scott's lectures covered all British history and European history from the sixteenth century onwards. In another reference to the use of primary sources, Hancock stated,

As one of his honours students, I studied and published writings of John Winthrop, Ann Hutchinson and other leading lights of Puritan New England. In writing long essays for him about these people I began to understand the original and the still continuing meaning of history as a process of search and discovery. (21)

But despite changes of content, reading lists and methodology some aspects of Elkington's History courses remained in 1918. Although apparently of a superficial nature at first sight, the nomenclature of the courses had not changed - History of the British Empire Parts I and II, and European History. This observation of names is important in that it shows that Scott had retained the European centredness of Elkington's curriculum - he did not initiate a quick revolution in this aspect of the History curriculum at the University of Melbourne. Secondly, the curriculum still concentrated upon political, constitutional and imperial history, and thirdly, some specific books were retained - Macaulay's History of England, Marriott's English Political Institutions and Acton's Lectures on Modern History. By retaining both Macaulay and Acton as authors whose work was deemed worthy enough to be read, Scott revealed his own approach to the study and writing of
History - Whig in outlook (ideology) and scientific in technique (methodology).

These two aspects of Scott the historian are reflected in his book *A Short History of Australia*, first published in 1916. As with the English Whig historians who emphasised the development of parliament in their country from medieval times, Scott saw the development of liberal and, later, democratic institutions as an important theme in Australian history. He traced this development back to the governorship of Macquarie (1810-21) during which time (in 1812) the House of Commons Committee on Transportation proposed that a council should be formed to advise him. According to Scott,

Macquarie was, indeed, the last of the purely arbitrary Governors. He finished his own eleven years' course of benevolent autocracy beyond the effective reach of criticism except from Downing Street; but the demand made after 1812 bore fruit when the next Governor was appointed, and was the real beginning of the movement towards popular government in Australia.

In common with the English Whig historians who held events in certain years to be historical watersheds (1688, 1832, 1867, 1884, 1911 etc.), so too Scott saw certain events as landmarks on the path to liberal democratic government in Australia. In 1819 J.T. Bigge arrived in Sydney "to examine the laws, regulations and usages of the settlement, the mode of government, the treatment of the convicts, and every other matter connected with the transportation system." According to Scott, "The most important consequence of Bigge's mission was the institution of the beginnings of constitutional government in Australia" and this was manifested in the 1823 New South Wales Judicature Act which established a Legislative Council. Although only an advisory body, Scott regarded its institution as "a step forward. It went far to destroy the arbitrariness of the Governor's powers." In this idea of progress Scott clearly associated himself with the Whig interpretation of history and its concept of the reduction of arbitrary
government and promotion of liberal institutions as being beneficial.

The related concept of this shift from autocracy to democracy as a process occurring over an extended time-span was reflected in Scott's account of Chief Justice Forbes's refusal to condone Governor Darling's anti-liberal policies; according to Scott,

Chief Justice Forbes, who continued to hold office till 1836, proved a stout friend to the liberalizing process which was now at work in New South Wales when he refused to sanction the newspaper licensing measure; and his sympathies throughout were with Wentworth in his campaign for the introduction of free institutions. (27)

The 'landmark' technique of Whig historians was used by Scott when he wrote:

The limitation of the power of the Governor by setting up a Council to work with him, the institution of trial by jury, and the prevention of official control of the Press, were the three first important steps in the direction of constitutional liberty. (28)

In chapter XVIII of A Short History of Australia Scott went on to state, "The next important step in the constitutional history of Australia was the passing, in 1842, of the Act for the Government of New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, which introduced the elective principle" 29.

Scott related his Australian constitutional history to British liberalism:

The whole process of change, to be understood in its historical relations, must be considered in connexion with the Parliamentary Reform movement in England, the Chartist movement, the general liberalizing tendencies of the times, and the altered attitude of the Imperial Government towards colonies and dependencies. (30)

However Scott did concede that the British Liberal Party itself was loath to grant responsible government to the colonies in Australia but (as if in their defence and using a paternalistic image) Scott wrote of Lord John Russell:

The idea did not occur to Lord John that no great harm would accrue if the Imperial Government and the Colonial Governors did no longer give orders; that the giving of
such orders was not necessarily the expression of perfect wisdom; and that, indeed, the colonies would be better without them. But the self-governing principle was soon seen to be the inevitable one to adopt; and in 1850 it was Lord John Russell's Government that applied it to Australia. (31)

Note also in this statement the concept of the inevitability of the 'progress' of liberalism - the same concept applied by English Whig historians to English liberalism. Scott saw 1850 as an historical watershed and described the Australian Colonies Government Act of that year as a "measure which inaugurated the new era". The "new era" was marked by the power given to the colonial legislatures "to clothe themselves with just such constitutional garments as would fit them best" and this was followed in the mid-1850's by the colonial legislatures instituting responsible government within their respective jurisdictions. The New South Wales constitution was, according to Scott, "as far as possible a copy of the British constitution" and in reference to the constitution of a united Australia in 1901, Scott noted that "The main problem was to engraft a federal system upon responsible government after the familiar British pattern ...".

Thus in his study of Australian constitutional history Scott adopted three devices typical of Whig historians - the concept of the inevitability of the progress of liberalism, the use of certain years as historical watersheds and as stepping stones along this path of progress which itself occurred over an extended time-span, and thirdly, he directly associated Australia's constitutional progress with developments in Britain - the parliamentary reform movement, the Chartist movement and "the general liberalizing tendencies of the times" and of course the systems of government adopted in the Australian colonies and later for the Commonwealth were modelled on the Westminster System. Scott implicitly paralleled the progress of liberalism in Great Britain and Australia and in so doing gave shape to Australian political history according to the Whig interpretation.
However unlike other Whig historians, for example Macaulay, Scott was scientific (in the Rankean sense) in his historical methodology. His 'scientific' approach can be seen in his compilation of a chronology of events from 1486 to 1927 relevant to Australian history (pages xvi to xxiii), of lists of governors and premiers of all six colonies/states as well as the governor-general and prime ministers of the Commonwealth (pages xxiv to xxviii) and of "Bibliographical Notes" (pages 369 to 376). As well, Scott emphasised the use of primary sources - an important part of the changes, as noted earlier, that he made to the curriculum of the University of Melbourne's School of History. In chapter I, entitled "The Dawn of Discovery", he mentioned the importance of the use of primary sources to the historian:

Not until 1606 do we reach certain ground. In that year both Dutch and Spanish vessels were voyaging within sight of the Australian coast; and here at last we get in touch with people whom we know by name, and with first-hand contemporary documentary evidence which we can read and analyse. (36)

Later in chapter XXXI, "Imperial Relations and the Australian Spirit", he repeated the importance of primary sources:

Marcus Clarke, drawing his basic facts from authentic sources, produced the classic novel of the convict days in his grim and powerful For the Term of His Natural Life (1874). 'Rolf Boldrewood' (T.A. Browne) knew intimately the life which he described in his tales, Robbery Under Arms (1888), The Miner's Right (1890), Nevermore (1892), The Squatter's Dream (1892), and others; and their fidelity will give them endurance, though some readers may grow impatient with the author's slipshod style. (37)

In the latter case the books were important because of the author's intimate knowledge of his subjects and his faithful accounts of them despite his literary style.

However Scott acknowledged that primary sources should not be taken on face value but should be analysed to test their validity. The importance of this is illustrated in his discussion of a document supposedly given to Lord
John Russell in 1853, when Foreign Secretary, concerning a possible invasion of Victoria by the French during the reign of Napoleon III. Scott examined this document on two levels - whether it itself was genuine and whether its contents were accurate. Concerning the former, Scott stated, "A curious document exists which, if genuine, shows that the Emperor Napoleon III at one time gave thought to the possibility of making an attack on Australia". According to Scott, "The paper itself purports to reveal a series of questions 'upon the English colonies in Australia'" and in his judgement upon the validity of the document as a primary source Scott stated:

The spelling of Port Phillip as 'Port Philippe' suggests that the person who supplied Lord John Russell with the information was a Frenchman; but the document is not in French, though it professed to be copied from an original written by Napoleon III. The copyist said, 'want of time, or rather the danger of discovery, did not allow of a complete copy being taken.' Russell's informant was therefore, clearly, a spy, and was probably paid for the information he supplied.

Scott then contested the accuracy of the contents of the document:

Whether in this instance he was supplying correct information is doubtful. Two of the questions do not indicate an intelligent knowledge of Australian geography. (1) The sensational gold discoveries at Mount Alexander in 1851-2 gave prominence to that place in the newspapers, but it is not easy to believe that Napoleon III considered that inland hill, near Castlemaine, a suitable position for fortification. (2) another question referred to 'the colonies of Victoria and Sydney'.

In his summation of his analysis of the document, Scott stated,

Although Lord John Russell thought the document 'important' in 1853, we should not now consider it as more than interesting. There is certainly nothing to corroborate the assertion of the spy that Napoleon III thought of attacking Australia.

This two-fold procedure was characteristic of Rankean methodology. Barnes described scientific historical method as,
first, the rise of those auxiliary sciences - such as diplomatic, chronology, paleography, epigraphy and lexicography - which would enable the historian to ascertain the genuineness of a document; and, second, the growth of internal or interpretative criticism, which passes beyond the mere establishment of the authenticity of a document and examines the credibility of its author as a witness of historical facts. (43)

In line with his scientific approach to researching and writing history and its concomitant precision, Scott also used direct quotations of statements (written or oral) made by protagonists in his history of Australia. In dealing with the first crossing of the Blue Mountains in 1813, Scott allowed Wentworth to express for himself his emotions on finding that the mountains had been crossed:

... it was with the pen of one who knew the joy of discovery that Wentworth, three years later, in competing for a Cambridge prize for poetry, described how -

As a meteor shoots athwart the night

The boundless champaign burst upon our sight,

Till, nearer seen, the beauteous landscape grew,

Opening like Canaan on rapt Israel's view. (44)

Similarly he quoted Wentworth when writing of the latter's role in the 'liberalizing' of the government of New South Wales:

'The colony is, I believe,' wrote Wentworth, 'the only one of the British possessions inhabited by Englishmen in which there is not at least the shadow of free government.' (45)

Records of oral statements were also used, for example when dealing with the first Colonial Conference in 1887 Scott quoted Deakin:

'There was a time perhaps,' said Deakin, one of the Victorian representatives, at the first day's sitting, 'when an invitation to a conference such as this would not have been sent from the mother-country; but there has never been a time when such an invitation would not have been cordially responded to by the Australian colonies.' (46)

While Scott made extensive use of quotations throughout his book it is interesting to note that rarely did he acknowledge the source of the quotation through the use of footnotes. This was in keeping with another
'scientific' historian, Lord Acton who edited the Cambridge Modern History and in which, due to its supposed objectivity, there were no footnotes—this being based on the premise that the writer's interpretation was the only (objective) one. Occasionally Scott did use what may be called 'quasi-footnotes' by inserting a bibliographical reference with page number in brackets near the quotation, for example when discussing the varying railway gauges used in the Australian colonies, Scott wrote,

The Scotch engineer won his way, the 1852 Act was repealed in 1855, and 'the most lamentable engineering disaster in Australia was an accomplished fact.' (Professor W.C. Kernot, in Proceedings of Victorian Institute of Engineers, vol. vii, p. 73.) (48)

Even when not actually quoting a statement but merely referring to what was written, Scott used these quasi-footnotes, for example when discussing the South Australian Land Transfer Act which brought into use what is commonly referred to as 'Torrens Title':

The other Australian colonies very rapidly adopted the Torrens system, and it was likewise applied in the French colonies. Indeed, Leroy-Beaulieu, in his great treatise on Colonization among Modern Peoples, states that such a system of land transfer is essential to the success of a colony. He claims (vol. ii, p. 25) that the idea had a Frenchman for its 'inventor' thirty or forty years before it was worked out by Torrens in South Australia. It may be so; but Torrens certainly derived his idea from his experience among shipping, as explained above, not from any book or outside suggestion. (49)

Why Scott should use these quasi-footnotes for some quotations but not most is neither stated explicitly nor implied.

Scott encouraged the reader to do primary source research for himself to fill in the gaps not covered by him:

In Australian history there are large spaces which need closer study than has yet been accorded to them. It is hoped that the bibliographical notes at the end of the volume, brief though they be, will assist the reader, whose thirst is not assuaged by what is to be found within these covers, to go to the wells and draw for himself. (50)
A specific reference to further research was made in chapter XXVII when dealing with the constitution for the Commonwealth of Australia, "Very learned men were engaged in this work of constitution building, and the student who examines the reports of the debates will see that every example of federation known to history had been studied by them". It should be noted that this further research was encouraged so that the reader could fill in the gaps in Scott's account or to further illustrate Scott's account but not to study the primary sources so as to re-interpret and revise what Scott had written.

Scott's Whig ideology and scientific methodology influenced the nature of the curriculum that he taught at the University and although he kept Elkington's nomenclature for courses, he began to change their content (as explained earlier). Not only were the History courses changed but so too was the structure of the Bachelor of Arts course as a whole. In 1919 new regulations came into effect which separated candidates taking a Bachelor of Arts degree into those taking the Ordinary (Pass) Degree and those taking the Honours Degree. According to the Chancellor, J. MacFarland, in his Annual Report of 1917-18,

The course for the former class has been left unchanged, the amendments being made for the purpose of instituting the latter. Candidates for the Honour Degree will be required to take rather fewer subjects than other candidates, but they will be required to declare themselves at an early stage of their course, and to study the subjects they do take at a higher level throughout. (52)

The subjects of the course for the Ordinary Degree were divided into four groups - Language and Literature, History and Political Science, Philosophy and Pure Mathematics, and Science. Group 2 (History and Political Science) comprised British History Parts I and II, European History,
Ancient History, Political Economy, Modern Political Institutions, and Sociology. Subjects of the course for the Honour Degree were divided into seven Schools - Classical Philology, History and Political Science, Philosophy, Mathematics, English, French Language and Literature, and Germanic Languages. Students could attempt Combined Honours Courses by studying selected subjects from two Honours Schools which together made the equivalent of a single Honours School course. In 1919 sample Combined Courses incorporating History were History and English, History and Philosophy, History and French, and History and German.

In the School of History and Political Science itself, the subjects for the Degree with Honours consisted of Ancient History, British History Parts I and II, European History, Political Science, and Modern Political Institutions. Honours students were required to do both the Pass and Honours courses as well as complete courses in two other subjects outside the School of History and Political Science so as to fulfil the university's requirement of passing eight subjects.

For each of the Ordinary and Honour Degrees Scott taught two courses in British History and one in European History. The content and recommended texts for the Honours courses were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History, Part I</td>
<td>The English Colonies to 1688.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History, Part II</td>
<td>The British Colonies from 1688; the American Revolution; British India; the Dominions and Crown Colonies in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History</td>
<td>(a) The middle ages in general outline, and especially the era of Charles the Great; (b) The European Colonies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were certain similarities between the courses for the Ordinary and Honours Degrees. Firstly, both the Ordinary "History of the British
Empire, Part I" and Honours "History of the British Empire, Part I" finished at 1688 - a watershed for Whig historians. Secondly, both had primary source materials in their recommended reading lists - Gardiner's Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution for the Ordinary course and Hart's American History told by Contemporaries, Vol. I; Era of Colonization, 1492-1689 for the Honours course. Scott believed that primary sources should be studied by all students, not just those attempting Honours. However the content of each course was different - the Ordinary course dealt with British domestic and colonial history with special regard to the Stuart period from 1603 to 1688 while the Honours course was a more specialized course dealing solely with English colonial history to 1688.

A third similarity was that both the Ordinary "History of the British Empire, Part II" and the Honours "History of the British Empire, Part II" covered the period from 1688 to the present day (1919). The reading list for the Honours course was drawn from that for the Ordinary course although the Ordinary course dealt with British domestic and imperial history (with special regard to the period from 1688 to 1714) while the Honours course dealt solely with British imperial history. Thus Scott's aim was to have Honours students study one aspect e.g. colonial history, of the Ordinary course in more depth.

A fourth point of similarity was that a "European History" course was available to both Ordinary and Honours students although for the former the course entailed "The general history of Europe from 1492, with special regard to the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire, 1789-1815" while Honours students studied the Middle Ages, especially the era of Charles the Great, and European colonial history.

Thus in overall terms two observations can be made on these courses. Firstly, they reflected Scott's ethnocentricity in that of the three History
subjects that he taught, two dealt with the history of Britain and her colonies while the third dealt with Europe. No courses were offered on histories of other parts of the world unless they were related to the British or European courses, an example of this being a section of the Ordinary course "European History" in which is stated "History of America in so far as it touches the general history e.g. the Monroe Doctrine, etc.". This should not be seen as a fault in his curriculum as it was probably largely due to contemporary cultural mores and the availability of primary sources from other times and places. Secondly, the study of primary sources was available to all students, both Ordinary and Honours, and not just to those who may have been preparing to be 'professional' historians or teaching in academe.

In 1918 "a selection of Essays on Historical Subjects written by students of the School of History, University of Melbourne, during 1917" was published under the title of Historical Studies. Scott's emphasis on the study of primary sources was reflected in the Foreword to this publication:

> It does not represent the whole of the ground covered in research essays; but it is hoped in future years to publish annually a larger volume, which will exhibit a wider range of subjects and treatment. The scope of work of this kind precludes the exhaustive treatment of large historical subjects; but the study of History is something more than the learning of facts: it entails the pursuit of a sound method of enquiry, the weighing of evidence, the exercise of judgment, and the construction of a readable narrative from the diverse material used. These Essays have been written after the study of such original letters, memoirs, State papers, etc., as were available to the authors. It is hoped that they may be of some value to other students, and also prove interesting to the public generally. (59)"

The 1920 Ordinary courses were the same as those in 1919 except that the special periods of study were changed. For "History of the British Empire, Part I" the special period of study was "the period from the commencement to 1066" while in 1919 it had been "the Stuart period 1603-1688". In keeping with this change in special period, Gardiner's
Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution was replaced with "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England (Everyman's Library)". For "History of the British Empire, Part II" the special period of study in 1920 was "the period from 1784 to 1815" while in 1919 it had been "the period from 1688 to 1714" - in each case, the primary sources for study were the relevant sections of Grant Robertson's Select Statutes and Cases. Despite a change of name to "British History" (still Parts I and II), the 1921 courses were the same as those for 1919.

As in 1919, the 1920 European History course covered the period from 1492 with reference to European colonies and America although in 1919 the period for special study was "the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire, 1789-1815" while in 1920 it was "the period from 1815 to 1914". For the former the primary sources were contained in Robinson and Beard's Readings in Modern European History while for the latter, Mowat's Select Treaties and Documents illustrating the European States System was used. In the 1921 European History course emphasis was put on the Middle Ages from 326 to 1453 showing an extension of the time-span covered in this subject.

Thus in 1919, the first year of the course for the Ordinary Degree under the new regulations, Scott introduced into all three History courses the concept of a course with 'span' (as Hancock would describe it) with a period for special study within it. This concept had first been tried in the 1918 course "History of the British Empire, Part I" in which the period for special study was "the Stuart period 1603-1688" - it was now applied to both British History courses and the one European History course. Each period for special study had its supporting primary sources for students to analyse.

In 1922 Scott introduced a nomenclature that would remain until his retirement in 1936 - the use of the letters A, B, C and D as suffixes to label the different British and European History courses. While this
may seem of superficial consequence in itself, it did help to formalise the content of Scott’s courses and allow the alternation of courses from one year to another without the apparently piecemeal changes that had occurred before 1919. The new system of courses in 1922 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course</th>
<th>Special Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History A</td>
<td>The general History to 1688</td>
<td>The period to 1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History B</td>
<td>The general History to 1688</td>
<td>The period from 1603 to 1688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History C</td>
<td>The general History from 1688 to 1901</td>
<td>The period from 1688 to 1714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History D</td>
<td>The general History from 1688 to 1901</td>
<td>The History of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History A</td>
<td>The History of the Middle Ages, 326 to 1453, and modern European History in general outline.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History B</td>
<td>Modern European History from 1453 to 1914</td>
<td>The period from 1789 to 1815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History C</td>
<td>Modern European History from 1453 to 1914</td>
<td>The period from 1815 to 1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are seven noteworthy elements of these courses. Firstly, the year 1688 was still the 'watershed' year dividing the British History courses - British History A and B dealt with the period to 1688 while C and D covered the period from 1688 to 1901 and thereby the Whig influence was still strong. Secondly, of the four periods for special study in the British History courses, half of them dealt with the Stuart period which is emphasised by Whig historians as the epoch when the liberal forces of Parliament overthrew the autocratic forces of the King and in so doing legitimised the former in their role in the government of England (the British History B special study covered the period from 1603 to 1688 while that for British History C continued this from 1688 to 1714). Thirdly, Australian history was introduced as a period for special study in British History D - while books on Australian
history had been included on the recommended reading list for "History of the British Empire, Part II" for at least ten years, no course had emphasised Australian history to the extent that this one did in 1922. Fourthly, the end-year for British History C and D was 1901 which was a notable year in both British and Australian history - during this year Queen Victoria died and the Commonwealth of Australia was born. While the importance of the former may have been more symbolic than real for the fortunes of Britain, of the latter the reverse was true in relation to Australia.

Fifthly, in the European History courses, 'watershed' years were also used to demarcate the time-span of courses. The years and events of 326 - the beginning of Constantine's absolute rule of the Roman Empire (having quashed all opposition), 1453 - the capture of Constantinople by the Turks signifying the fall of the eastern Roman Empire, 1789 - the start of the French Revolutionary period, 1815 - the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo and the subsequent reactionary attempt to restore the pre-Revolutionary status quo in Europe, and 1914 - the outbreak of World War I, were used by Scott to mark significant historical periods. These years relate to international relations and politics and therefore by implication determined the essentially political nature of the courses themselves.

Penultimately, all courses included the study of primary sources ranging from the Medieval Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation through Gardiner's Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution and Grant Robertson's Select Statutes and Cases to Legg's Select Documents of the French Revolution and Mowat's Select Treaties and Documents. Lastly, for European History B and C Scott introduced his own book Men and Thought in Modern Histbry onto the recommended reading list and thereby, together with his A Short History of Australia, helped moreso to put his personal mark on university courses.
In overall terms, the content of the Honours courses on British History remained much the same in 1922 as it had been when introduced in 1919 although "British History, Part I" was renamed "British History B" and "British History, Part II" was renamed "British History D". These Honours courses, British History B and D, were not the same as the Ordinary courses of the same name although in both 'D' courses Australian history was introduced as a significant segment. The 1922 Honours European History course omitted the Medieval segment leaving European colonial and imperial history as the sole component.

Kathleen Fitzpatrick (nee Pitt), who later became an Associate Professor in History at Melbourne, was a student of Scott in the early 1920's and has written of the History School of that time. According to her, Scott's lectures "were all so much better than any other lectures I attended that I would not have dreamed of missing one. All had the value of being based on primary sources". In delivering these lectures,

His voice was strong and even those in the back row could hear him without strain, but he could not sound the letter 'r' and it was a measure of the force of his personality that even when he had to pronounce in succession several words containing 'r' there was never any tittering. Scott took great pains with the structure of his lectures. Every one of the hundreds he delivered each year was self-contained, with a beginning, a middle and an end, so that he never had to start with a dreary - 'As I was saying at the end of the last lecture'. Attention was gained by the announcement of a new theme and held by its coherent development. Scott gave the same care to the construction of each sentence as to the architecture of the lecture as a whole, because in learning through the spoken word the student has one chance only of grasping what is said and each sentence should therefore be short, crystalline and without subordinate clauses, and a judicious measure of repetition should be used in linking sentence to sentence, both to carry the argument of the lecture forward and to dilute the intensity of the strain of attention.

To provide some 'rest pauses' in his lectures, Scott often used to intersperse his lectures with "picturesque quotations, anecdotes, jokes and
vivid expressions'. However this technique did not meet with the approval of all students as can be evidenced by Henry Minogue's criticism of Scott in The Melbourne University Magazine of May 1917:

Three forces are at work in creating the Historical method now in vogue at our University: firstly, the tendency to miss the point of history by stressing the less important material side at the expense of "imponderabilia"; secondly, the tendency to make history "interesting" with questionable anecdote; thirdly (and this is a corollary of the second), the habit of playing to the gallery. Such method is permitted by the obtuse mind and ovine passivity of the undergraduate who fails to perceive how these things touch him. (67)

Scott's practice of "playing to the gallery" as well as his inability to pronounce the letter 'r' were satirised in 1927 in The Melbourne University Magazine with the verse:

Waggling a finger, his eye on the woof,
With an air of detachment - a manner aloof,
With a keen, thorough-going dislike for all mystewy,
Prof. Scott puts the spice in the hell-bwoth of History. (68)

The "imponderabilia" referred to by Minogue in 1917 was Scott's apparent inability to grasp "anything beyond externals" such as the influence of religious belief on people's actions. In this case, Minogue was writing in complaint of Scott referring to "the flagellant monks of the Middle Ages as fanatics who went around scourging themselves and anyone else who was foolish enough to let them". According to Minogue, "Such a glib phrase, careless as it may be, suggests a mind that has never grasped anything beyond externals and has failed, not only in appreciation, but even in comprehension of the medievals" and he later stated,

From this loss of perspective and this degraded apercu, religion is that which will suffer most, and it behoves those of us to whom religion is the great fact of life rather than a mere lifeless creed to challenge a historical method which counts as mere evanescent fanaticism some of the most potent forces that have ever stirred the soul of human kind. (72)
Fitzpatrick also noted this apparent inability of Scott to quantify motivation in groups or individuals:

Scott was also constitutionally unable to enter into certain types of mind, those of mystics, for example, who seemed to him merely mentally deranged people. This defect of the imagination made it impossible for him to understand that even if one is not religious oneself, one simply must accept the abundant evidence available that there are many people, as intelligent as oneself or more so, to whom religion is a fact of experience. Religious belief was 'wot' in Scott's view, and his rather crude remarks on this subject sometimes gave offence. This blind spot made it impossible for him to understand and therefore to render intelligible some of the people he lectured about, such as the Puritans of the seventeenth century who, when deprived of the religious faith and fire within them, are hard to understand. (73)

As well as lecturing in all History subjects but for Ancient History, Scott set all the essays (which he allocated according to one's place alphabetically in the list of students) and heard every Honours student read their essay aloud and discussed it with them. In her autobiographical work, Solid Bluestone Foundations, Fitzpatrick relates one of her experiences in reading an essay to Scott:

Reading essays aloud to Professor Scott was something of an ordeal. He simply could not stand poor, scamped work, and was wont to say that 'histowy should be studied sewiously'. It was unnerving, as you stood in the corridor outside the Professor's study, waiting your turn to read your essay, to see some weeping girl or angry, white-faced young man emerge from the room you were about to enter. I was far too interested and hardworking to incur reproof for inadequate preparation but my composition sometimes failed to please. Once I was the first reader for the morning and found Professor Scott opening and reading his mail, which he continued to do after I had begun to read. I thought this rather a good arrangement, as he did not appear to be attending, but suddenly he snapped at me 'We-wead that last sentence'. I re-read it, with some trepidation as it was a reflection which, at the time of writing, I had thought quite profound but as to which I now had misgivings. 'As I thought', Professor Scott observed, 'meaningless, quite meaningless. Continue'. (75)
While this one-to-one pedagogical technique was indicative of the Oxford tutorial system and was also practised by Wood at Sydney for his Honours students, Scott also had seminars operating by 1927. In a letter to Wood on this topic, Scott wrote,

I allot to the tutors in History a definite period, which they are to handle in their tutorial classes, not by lecturing, but by questions and discussions in small groups of five or six students at a time. It works excellently. A student is set to write a short essay on a given topic, for discussion. The tutor is expected to prod the rest of the class with questions upon the set topic. I don't know that I can tell you any more about the system, but I shall be glad to answer any definite questions. (76)

Scott did not indicate whether all students, both Pass and Honours, took part in the tutorials, how often they were held or for how many years this practice endured but this letter does show that Scott did make use of the German pedagogical technique of the seminar. Scott's successor, Max Crawford, used the seminar as a pedagogical basis for his curriculum and greatly expanded its use although he referred to it by the Oxford term, 'tutorial'.

In examinations Scott's emphasis on the use of primary sources was extended to allowing students to bring and use collections of primary sources into the examination room itself - for example, the annual examination in November 1936 for European History C for the Pass degree had the note "Robinson and Beard's Readings in Modern European History, Volume II, may be used by students in the examination room". Other examination papers had similar advice while Honours students were also advised that "Candidates may make use of books and memoranda". According to Fitzpatrick and Emeritus Professor N. Harper (also once a student of Scott), some students brought whole suitcases of books, lecture notes and other papers into the examination room. This was not a means of making the examination less arduous for the students but rather "what was being tested was not our
memories but our capacity to make good use of our sources". In this way Scott's Rankean methodology was put into practice in his university courses - his methods in teaching History at the University were as noteworthy as his revision of the content component of the curriculum.

The content of all courses remained intact (except for a slight variation to that of European History A in 1923) until 1926 when a major development occurred with the introduction of a course solely devoted to "Australasian History" in both the Ordinary and Honours courses. Scott had planned such a course as early as 1913 as evidenced by part of a letter he wrote to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts asking for the continuation of employment of Jessie Webb as a History lecturer. In this request he outlined his own work-load and stated his intentions for the department - "I desire to institute a separate course of general Colonial and Australian history". It probably took over ten years for this desire to be implemented due to Scott's heavy work-load and the need to accommodate other changes in the History curriculum. Although the course itself was not taught until 1927, notice of it and its alternation with British History D in the Ordinary course was given in the 1926 University Calendar. It was described in the 1927 Calendar as:

The History of the discovery of Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific, political development, imperial and foreign relations, with special regard to the History of Victoria.

Books recommended:

Wood - The Discovery of Australia.
Scott - Short History of Australia.
Mills - The Colonization of Victoria.
Price - The Foundation and Settlement of South Australia.
Turner - History of the Colony of Victoria.
Battye - Western Australia: A History.
Roberts - History of Australian Land Settlement.
Sweetman - Australian Constitutional Development.
Willard - White Australia Policy.
Reeves - The Long White Cloud.
Scholefield - The Pacific: Its Past and Future. (82)

The other History courses for the Ordinary Degree remained much as
they had been in 1922 except that the period for special study in British History A was "the Norman Conquest to the accession of Edward I" in 1927 whereas it had been "the period to 1066" in 1922, for British History D the special study became "the period from 1815 to 1914" rather than "the History of Australia" which had now become a separate course, and for European History A the special study was now "the Frankish Kingdom and Empire, 481-987". The 1927 Honours courses remained almost exactly as they had been in 1922 except for the introduction of "Australasian History" which was described thus:

In addition to the work prescribed for the pass course, a closer study of Imperial relations in respect to Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific.

Books to be consulted:-
Keith - Responsible Government in the Dominions.
Keith - Imperial Unity and the Dominions.
Duncan Hall - The British Commonwealth of Nations.
Egerton - British Colonial Policy in the Twentieth Century.
Other Works to be mentioned in lectures. (83)

The introduction of Australian History as a separate subject was the culmination of a trend evident since the earliest stages of Scott's professoriate. In 1915 Scott added books on Australian history to that of Jenks in the recommended reading list for the course "History of the British Empire, Part II". In 1917 Scott placed his own book A Short History of Australia on the reading list for this course. In 1922 Australian history was introduced as a special study within the course "British History D" and finally in 1927 it became a separate course in its own right although it was only offered every alternate year. The emphasis on political and imperial history was retained.

The 1927 Honours course remained unchanged until Scott's retirement in 1936 and, despite further minor changes, the pattern for the Ordinary course was also established by this time. British History A and C and European History C were dealt with in evening lectures, Australasian History
and European History A were given in 'odd' numbered years e.g. 1927, and alternated respectively with British History D and European History B which were given in 'even' numbered years e.g. 1928. These alternating courses plus British History B were among those compulsory (with the Honours course subjects) for students attempting the Honour degree.

Some of the changes that did occur between 1927 and 1936 were the substitution by 1929 of 1660 (the year of the 'Restoration') for 1688 (the year of the 'Glorious Revolution') as the year of demarcation between the courses British History A/B and C/D - the latter pair were also extended in time-span from 1901 to 1914 (the outbreak of World War I). The years 1702 (the death of William III) and 1871 (the year of the proclamation of the German Empire after the Franco-Prussian War) were introduced as end-years for periods of special study in British History D and European History C respectively. The 1929 courses remained intact until Scott's retirement in 1936 except for the substitution in 1935 of the "History of Middle Ages, 326-1453, with special regard to the Medieval Empire" for the "Frankish Kingdom and Empire" in European History A.

By 1936, therefore, after twenty three years of Scott as professor, the History courses at the University of Melbourne had been dramatically changed from those offered during the professoriate of Elkington - although there were some elements of continuity. Both Elkington and Scott reflected their ethnocentric outlook by offering courses on the domestic and colonial histories of Britain and Europe - the histories of America and Asia were only studied in relation to British or European history. As well, both professors were ideologically Whig as can be seen in their selection of recommended books to be read for their courses (this of course may be more a reflection of the nature of the books available at the time).

However there had been some notable developments. Firstly, Scott
offered a greater array of courses than did Elkington. By 1929 there were eight distinct History courses (apart from Jessie Webb's Ancient History) - British History A, B, C and D, Australasian History, and European History A, B and C in contrast to Elkington's three - History of the British Empire I and II, and European History. Secondly, Scott had implanted the concept of periods for special study within each course - this allowed for more detailed research with the consequent practice in the skills of an historian. Thirdly, rather than relying upon secondary sources as Elkington had done, Scott introduced the study of primary sources which further emphasised the role of the History student as a practising historian. In describing this use of primary sources in Scott's History School, Kathleen Fitzpatrick has noted,

It was a school committed to the method of learning by investigation, in which all students were required to learn their craft by experimentation, to discover how history is written by trying to write some. It was a school in which great emphasis was placed on the value of original documents, and this method of study was not reserved for an elite but required also of Pass students. . . . (84)

A fourth development under Scott was that he introduced Australian history as a separate subject into the Melbourne History curriculum and was in fact the first to do so in any Australian university. Lastly, in response to the University's change in regulations for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, Scott established an Honours School of History - an innovation the importance of which would be made more apparent during the professoriate of Scott's successor, Max Crawford. Overall, Scott put the study and teaching of History in Australia on a more 'scientific' basis and in so doing laid firm foundations for subsequent developments.

Three graduates of Scott's Honours School of History became professors of History at other Australian universities - Stephen Roberts at Sydney, Keith Hancock at Adelaide and Fred Alexander at Perth. That Scott was proud of this achievement was reflected in part of a letter he wrote to Sir
John MacFarland, Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, in 1932. Having mentioned the publication of books by both him and those who had been his students, Scott stated, "I derive some satisfaction from this record, as well as from the fact that in three Universities the History Departments are in charge of former students of mine - Roberts in Sydney, Hancock in Adelaide, and F. Alexander in Perth, all of whom have published books".

The importance attached by the 'professional' historian to research and publication of work is implicit here.

Scott's impact on Professor Hancock in his teaching at Adelaide was noted by Hancock in his autobiographical work, *Country and Calling*:

I did in fact meet each student as an individual two or three times a year, when I discussed the essays that I had required from them after the example of my first master, Ernest Scott - gentle exercises in the use of original sources, which enabled me to identify the writers who had in them the stuff of honours work. (86)

Kathleen Fitzpatrick also adopted Scott's primary source methodology when teaching at Melbourne while Roberts based his first curriculum at Sydney directly on one that Scott had implemented.

In conclusion, probably Scott's two main achievements (despite his physical and intellectual drawbacks) were that he introduced into the curriculum of the University of Melbourne's School of History the study of primary sources and of Australian history - the former 'elevated' historical study onto a 'scientific' level while the latter legitimised the study of Australian history at the tertiary level. Although the study of Historical theory per se was lacking, students were acquainted with the technique of historical study and with Scott's enthusiasm for the study of History.
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Chapter 5

Roberts: Educational background and development as an historian

Although the concept is somewhat simplistic, Stephen Roberts himself attributed his academic upbringing as an historian solely to Professor Ernest Scott of the University of Melbourne.

Stephen Henry Roberts was born on February 15, 1901 in the central Victorian country town of Maldon which had been established only about forty-five years earlier as a result of the gold-rushes to the area. In this rural atmosphere, Roberts attended the Maldon State School for his primary education and then, having won a junior scholarship in 1913, went on for his secondary education at Castlemaine High School. In 1915 he passed the Junior Public Examination with seven distinctions and in the following year passed the Senior Public Examination winning, in the process, a Senior Scholarship. He served for a year as junior teacher at Maldon State School whilst studying unassisted for the Senior Public Honour examinations in English and History - he obtained first-class Honours in each.

In 1918 he began a three-year teacher training course at the Melbourne Teachers' College and Melbourne University. Despite the fact that History was to become the basis of his later career, Roberts read no History subjects during his first year at university but rather studied English, Pure Mathematics, Mixed Mathematics, Psychology, Logic and Ethics. In 1919 Roberts studied Professor Scott's courses of British History Parts I and II and European History obtaining first-class Honours in each at the annual (December) examinations as well as the Dwight's Prize in British History Part II and European History.
Honours candidates, such as Roberts, studied both the Pass and Honours courses within their chosen subject. The content of the Pass courses that Roberts did would have been the general history of Great Britain to the early twentieth century with emphasis on the periods 1603 to 1688 and 1688 to 1714, and the general history of Europe and European colonization from 1492 with special regard for the period 1789 to 1815\(^1\). The Honours courses that he attempted would have comprised British colonial history from its beginning to the early twentieth century, further study of European colonial history, and Europe during the Middle Ages with emphasis on the era of Charlemagne. The importance of the content of these courses is that it largely formed the basis of the curriculum that Roberts introduced into the University of Sydney after his appointment as Challis Professor of History in 1929.

Roberts completed his degree by gaining first-class Honours in Ancient History and Political Economy in December 1920 and first-class Honours in the School of History and Political Science at the Final Examination for the degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honours in March 1921. In the year of his graduation as a Bachelor of Arts (1921), Roberts embarked upon his academic career as a university teacher. This was facilitated by his former lecturer, Professor Scott, who in March 1921 advised him,

> The Registrar tells me that this year there are sufficient applicants for night lectures in Brit. Hist. II, to justify the appointment of a night Lecturer. This is the first year in which there have been enough applications for night lectures in that subject. I should like to nominate you for the work. It will be well for you to make a beginning with lecturing work as soon as you get an opportunity. (2)

British History II (renamed British History C in 1922) dealt with "The General History from 1688 to the present time, with special regard to the period from 1688 to 1714\(^3\). From 1921 also, Roberts was a tutor in British History as well as an examiner in History for the Intermediate and Leaving
Certificate public examinations. In 1922 Roberts also began lecturing in British History A - "The general History to 1688, with special regard to the period to 1066". Kathleen Fitzpatrick was a History student at the University of Melbourne during this time and has written of Roberts,

As a teacher of History, at least in my student days, his attitude was strictly practical; he did not seek to interest us in History or to develop our minds but simply dictated dull but informative notes, designed to enable us to get good marks in examinations, just as he had done. (5)

The students' nickname for Roberts was "Swatty (sic.) Roberts" thereby alluding, albeit in a derogatory sense, to Roberts's capacity for work. In 1923 Roberts graduated as a Master of Arts.

Roberts concluded the first phase of his teaching career at the end of 1924 because for the following year he was awarded the Fred Knight Research Scholarship which allowed him to go overseas to research French colonial policy. Roberts's mentor, Professor Scott, had written in support of Roberts's application for this scholarship, "The best evidence of his qualification to enter upon such work is afforded by his book, The History of Australian Land Settlement, which deals with an extraordinarily complex subject in a thoroughly sound and interesting style. . . . He is, I believe, quite an exceptional man." 7

Roberts's History of Australian Land Settlement (1788-1920) was first published in 1924 and forms an interesting case-study of Roberts as an historian. The impact of Roberts's rural upbringing in central Victoria is stated explicitly by him in the Preface to this work:

As far back as memory goes, nothing has ever gripped me more than the romance of Australia's squatters - the conquest of an unknown land by a body of adventurers, who spread over hundreds of miles, and who occupied principalities in the face of the Government, the natives, and all manner of natural difficulties. I set out with the intention of explaining that period and showing how it really sums up Australia's story. (8)
Professor Scott noted the importance of rural Australia as an influence in the writing of the book: "only a country-bred boy could have written this book as he has done it. Another scholar might have done good work in another manner on the same theme, no doubt, but this book has the stamp of the country upon it. I have said in another connexion that the scent of eucalypts pervades the pages, and that metaphor is true." 

As Roberts did research for the book his original concept of its nature changed from one of a romanticised picture of outback life to a more academic and complete study of land settlement. Writing of his original aim, Roberts stated,

Chiefly I desired to recapture the atmosphere of the time - the struggle and the glamor, the camaraderie and the fights against uneven odds, the romance of overlanding and mustering, the dirt and droughts and disease, the cattle-duffing and the boundary fights, the heroism of unrecorded deeds - in short, to show the nature of the squattting occupation which was more complete and more spontaneous than in any other country. (10)

However he was forced by circumstance to change this original nature of his work:

As I tapped source after source of new manuscript material (especially on such matters as the Northern Territory and the great Companies), I conceived the idea of surveying the whole field of land settlement. I desired, not to make a mere list of regulations, but to sum up within one volume the effect of each from an evolutionary point of view. In so doing, I had perforce to sacrifice the more obvious interest of my first topic to the utility and completeness of the second. Not that the tale is the less romantic; it is merely that the romance of irrigation and closer settlement and the poison lands is less perceptible than that of the large runs. And, moreover, the enlargement of aim necessitated the withdrawal of any matter, however interesting, which would have spoiled the symmetry of the whole. (11)

As well as aiming to survey "the whole field of land settlement", Roberts revealed in this work his later emphasis, both in his popularist writings and in his university and secondary school curricula, on using the
study of History as a means to illuminate, or better understand, the present. While he did not explicitly state this aim within this book, it is apparent in that the final Part of the book covers the period from 1884 to 1920 - virtually the contemporary scene. Within this Part of the book the final chapter is entitled "Trends" and in this Roberts comments on the status quo, its deficiencies and how improvements could be facilitated. In this way he gave a historical perspective to the present and outlined possible future courses of action. He does explicitly refer to this historiographical concept of 'perspective' - "The book aims at giving the proper perspective to any particular phase or policy; an intensive study of scores of points must be made to fill in this general analysis."

Aspects of Roberts's historical methodology are also reflected in the Preface to this work. An important characteristic of Scott's pedagogy was the study of primary sources by both Pass and Honours students and Roberts's adoption of this aspect of scientific historical methodology was stated explicitly by him both in the Preface and in the book's bibliography. In a letter to Professor Wood of Sydney, Scott commented on Roberts's research into primary sources:

My young man, Roberts, whose very fine book on Australian Land Settlement I hope you have seen, also spent a good deal of time in Hobart, and explored the papers rather thoroughly for his own particular subject; and it is clear from what he tells me that the papers of real importance dealing with exploration and land policy alone, are of enormous extent, and very great value. (13)

The opening phrase of this paragraph also shows Scott's rather paternalistic attitude to Roberts which would partly explain Scott's sponsorship of Roberts on so many occasions and Roberts's obvious feeling of respect and gratitude to Scott as shown in his writings.

Reminiscent of Scott's 1916 advice to any reader of his *A Short History of Australia* "to go to the wells and draw for himself" and consequently his
inclusion of over seven pages of "Bibliographical Notes" towards the end of his book, Roberts in 1924 included detailed footnotes on almost every page along with a twenty-page bibliography after the text because, according to him, "my primary motif was to afford a starting point for more specialised research". Roberts concluded his Preface by acknowledging, as he so often did, his 'debt' to his teacher, Professor Scott: "Finally, this book, as does all my work, owes its inspiration to Professor Ernest Scott, who did much to make it possible, and to whom my debt is far greater than he will realise".

Scott, in fact, wrote the "Introduction" to Roberts's book and stated of the subject of the book, "It is the fundamental subject in Australian history. There is nothing quite like it in the history of any other country". Having discussed the traditional, romanticised image given to explorers of Australia, Scott stated that there were concrete reasons for journeys of exploration being undertaken - "Perhaps this view may seem to some to rub the bloom of romance off many a fine tale; but veracity is preferable to fiction". This last clause reflects the impartial search for truth indicative of 'scientific' historians and Scott's own perception of the purpose of the study of History.

Some of these concepts concerning aims and methodology are also found in Roberts's next book, Population Problems of the Pacific, published in 1927. Firstly, the aim of illumination of the present, implicit in his 1924 book, was explicitly stated in his 1927 work: "This book is meant to give an account of the problems of the South Sea islands, both a history of their development and an analysis of their present form". However, as in 1924, he did not offer actual solutions to contemporary problems but rather described the status quo and put it into its general context:

The aim has been presentation rather than solution, - not so much to solve the various problems (even if this were possible) as simply to explain how they have arisen, how similar problems have been treated elsewhere, what are the fundamentals of the existing dilemmas, and what principles may be useful in dealing with them. Beyond
Phases in the development of Australian Land Settlement

The emphasis and impartiality which were characteristic features of Prof. Robert's approach to his subject, and his concern in which he put the topic of his book in that historical perspective, and went on in Chapter Two to examine the Pre-European System.

In the first chapter of his book, Roberts discussed "The Peoples of the Status quo" into perspectives, both from historical and geopolitical points of view. A second aim in his 1927 book was to put past events and the present that nothing has been said, where principles are discussed.
The study of race was an important feature of Roberts's book, Population Problems of the Pacific, in which he wrote, "Racial and social problems are especially stressed, and the economic and administrative background explained throughout." As evidence of the importance he placed on racial factors, the final sentence of the first chapter states:

Race wanderings into the Pacific zone had meant cultural change and racial health: the cessation of those migrations, while allowing the various cultures to become stereotyped, and while not altogether exhausting the possibilities of physical combination, meant racial decay - decay merging into death even when the first Europeans came. (26)

Roberts went on in later chapters to examine the effects of immigration to the Pacific Islands from the Asian mainland, Japan and the Philippines. Scott had a similar interest in the concept of race and difficulties arising therefrom as evidenced in his Foreword to J.S. Lyng's book, Non-Britishers in Australia - this was indicative of the investigation of racial questions in a 'scientific' manner in the early twentieth century.

Both the book, Population Problems of the Pacific, and his next one, History of French Colonial Policy (1870-1925), were results of the time he had spent mainly in Great Britain and France doing research at the University of London for a Doctor of Science (Economics) degree on account of the Fred Knight Research Scholarship which he had won for 1925 and 1926. In the Preface to these publications Roberts acknowledged the guidance of Professor Lilian Knowles, of the University of London, who supervised his work for Population Problems of the Pacific and of Professor Harold Laski, of the same university, who was his supervisor for History of French Colonial Policy.

Both Roberts and Max Crawford, his Melbourne contemporary as Professor of History from 1937 to 1947, were born in Australia and both studied for a further degree overseas although the institutions at which these
degrees were taken reflected both their academic training in Australia and later influenced the nature of the curriculum that they instituted after being appointed professor at their respective universities. Roberts was a student of Ernest Scott who is regarded as a 'practical' historian. This outlook was reflected in the 'practicality' of Roberts's History writing in that a major aim of his work and later in his university curriculum was the illumination of the present and its problems. Roberts also adopted Scott's empiricism and impartiality in historical methodology and sent his postgraduate students to the London School of Economics. The impact of Scott's methodology on Roberts was reflected in the latter's comments on the former after Scott's death in December 1939:

Affectation or insincerity he loathed, especially in the approach towards history. His devotion to truth was a religion with him; and he followed his facts. Those of us who took his lectures during the last War realized that; and he never tired of scorning the men who made history a vehicle for 'slick' moralising or for pandering to some fashionable interest of the moment. That is why, quite apart from the charm of his writing, his work will live. It will live because of what he has written; it will live the more because he placed historical studies in Australia on a scientific basis and because he inspired his students to apply those methods to the study of historical problems as far apart as modern Italy and abstract political science.

In contrast to this, Crawford was a student of George Arnold Wood who was interested in the inculcation of values through the study of History and who was a graduate of Balliol College, Oxford. Crawford similarly was interested in the study of values, although not in the inculcation of a specific set, and was also a student at Balliol to which he later sent his own post-graduate students. Roberts was a graduate of Scott's History school at Melbourne and of the London School of Economics both of which attempted to put historical studies on a 'scientific' basis with an emphasis on research. Roberts's History curriculum at the University of Sydney followed in this
Thus a distinction can be made, albeit not unconditionally, between Scott/Roberts, the London School of Economics, and the concept of History as a practical science and Wood/Crawford, Balliol College, and the concept of History as largely a study of values and ideas.

As well as acknowledging the guidance of Professors Knowles and Laski of the University of London, Roberts not only acknowledged the help of Professor Scott in his Population Problems of the Pacific but dedicated his History of French Colonial Policy to him. In the former book, Roberts made a direct reference to Scott’s training of him in historical methodology: “and especially to Professor Ernest Scott of the University of Melbourne, for criticising the original plan of the work and for the training in method engendered by a working contact with him” while in the latter book he thanked Scott for his “initial interest” in the topic. Roberts elaborated on this in a letter that he wrote to Scott on August 10, 1929:

I trust that my dedication has not offended you. Quite simply, the position was that I wished to dedicate it to you, because the original idea had come from your Tuesday-afternoon classes, and because the basic principles had come from you, too. Knowing that you would probably refuse, I didn’t ask you in advance. (33)

Roberts’s book, History of French Colonial Policy, was based on the thesis for which he was awarded the degree of Doctor of Science (Economics) at the University of London in June 1927. In it, his aims and methodology which had been shown in his two earlier books once again came to the fore. Firstly, his practice of using his historical research as a means to illuminate the present is shown in the fact that in the penultimate chapter, entitled "The French Empire since 1914", statistics are given relating to 1927, two years before the publication of the book, and indeed throughout the two-volume work many other references are made to events of the 1920's. Secondly, his aim of breaking new ground in the area of historical
research is shown in the opening statement, "This book is an attempt to cover an obvious gap in modern European history. It is strange that, despite the importance of the subject, nothing exists on it in English, even in the slightest form."34

Methodologically, his empiricist, impartial and geopolitical stance is apparent in several statements in the Preface to his book, especially:

The author ... accompanies his conclusions with the proviso that most of them are tentative, and may be changed. All that can be said is that there is not the slightest conscious bias, either of approach or treatment: the writer had no preconceived ideas to warp his facts. Actually, there were constant changes. The analysis of Algeria was approached with much admiration for the French effort there, but the pressure of facts gradually forced the writer into a distinctly opposite position: and this happened frequently. It may be said that this particular conclusion is controversial, but the writer holds that it is a legitimate deduction from the facts, with no attempts to with-hold or distort relevant matter. (35)

Roberts's geopolitical stance (as well as his use of primary sources) is reflected in his statement, "The raw material is contained within a regional survey, which takes each colony in turn and gives the full details of its particular history and position."36 As with his other two books and in keeping with other 'scientific' historians, Roberts included many footnotes and an extensive bibliography with an emphasis on primary sources. In his review of the book, Scott noted, "Anyone who glances over his 50 pages of bibliography, printed as an appendix at the end of his second volume, will appreciate the immense extent of the documentary and printed material which had to be mastered by a writer who ventured into this field."37 This use of primary sources places Roberts's methodology in the Rankean tradition. As well, Roberts acknowledged that other historians, having read the same evidence, could arrive at conclusions different from his own and in relation to his own conclusions he wrote:
The writer asks for a more elastic acceptance of these critical chapters, because, being interpretative, they are open to conflicting conclusions. They are more constructive, less fixed, more suggestive; and nothing like finality or dogmatism is claimed for them—far less, indeed, than for the regional survey, and even there, the writer is conscious of the fluidity of his conclusions. As a whole, therefore, the book resolves itself into an academic and supposedly impartial presentation of the facts of fifty years of French colonization, and a discussion, avowedly influenced by the personality of the critic, of those facts and the theories behind them. One part is thus fixed, the other more elastic: and the reception of each should be tempered by a consideration of the different approach in each case. (38)

By 1929 the characteristic aims and methodology of Roberts's writing of History had become apparent and their nature was largely based upon that of the work of his mentor, Professor Ernest Scott, which Roberts continued to acknowledge. In each of his three books in the 1920's Roberts sought to put past and present events into their historical perspective and in so doing help people to better understand the present including contemporary problems. This emphasis on recent events was stated explicitly by Roberts in 1937 when he wrote, "Most of my work for the last twenty years has been concerned with contemporary history"39. This interest in contemporary history was to be strongly influential in the university (and secondary school) History curricula that he was to determine during his nineteen years as Challis' Professor of History.

In his historical methodology there are certain persistent characteristics. Firstly, he extensively used primary sources with which method he would have become acquainted in 1919 when he studied the courses British History Parts I and II, and European History under Scott and which would have been reinforced by Jessie Webb in 1920 when Roberts studied Ancient History. Secondly, Roberts's methodology was strongly empiricist in that when researching and writing History he worked 'from the roots up' i.e. he gathered and analysed the facts relevant to his current subject and then,
having examined them, came to his own conclusions pertaining to that subject (rather than trying to make the facts 'fit' some theory already held or some a priori conclusion).

This use of primary sources and empiricist approach were consistent with the 'scientific' study of History practised by Roberts's mentor, Scott. Further to these and concomitant with them, a third characteristic was the concept of impartiality. This did not preclude Roberts from forming his own opinions on the subject he was examining but he perceived his own task as presenting and examining all the relevant information (facts) to the exclusion of none so that his final opinions (or interpretation) would not be prejudiced. He was not conscious, apparently, of the idea that 'facts' are only deemed to be of importance because of the theoretical framework within which one is working. Professor Wood had noted as far back as his Inaugural Lecture in 1891 that complete objectivity was unattainable. Roberts's use of the concept of impartiality was reiterated in 1937 in his book, The House that Hitler Built:

My main aim was to sum up the New Germany without any prejudice (except that my general approach was that of a democratic individualist), and to contrast the state of affairs to-day with that I knew in Germany at the end of the inflationary period, then at the height of the Weimar Republic's temporary success, and lastly immediately prior to Hitler's accession to power. I may have gained - or suffered - from the detachment of view which is natural to one living in a distant Dominion. (41)

In keeping with the need for a complete presentation of 'the facts' and from whence they could be obtained, Roberts included both detailed footnotes and an extensive bibliography in most of his books so that other scholars could re-examine the sources and perhaps arrive at different conclusions. This practice was possibly not done in the case of his 1937 book, The House that Hitler Built, because it was written, not for other scholars, but, as Roberts himself stated, "for the man-in-the-street who
wishes to have some idea of the German experiment. Concomitant with this concept of other scholars re-examining the sources and coming to other conclusions, Roberts usually in his works asserted that his own interpretation was neither dogmatic nor final. In 1927 he stated, in regard to his *Population Problems of the Pacific*: "These conclusions are not put forward dogmatically. They are simply an interpretation of the facts, but the facts stand, in some cases, for other interpretations..." In regard to his *History of French Colonial Policy*, he wrote, "The conclusions given are thus only tentative and relevant: that is all that is claimed for them" while in 1937 he wrote of his *The House that Hitler Built*, "I claim no finality or completeness". These five characteristics of Roberts's historical methodology - his use of primary sources, his empiricism, his impartiality, the use of extensive footnotes and bibliographies, and his willingness for other scholars to re-interpret the facts - along with his stress on contemporary history and the geopolitical nature of the subjects about which he chose to write give the parameters of Roberts's historiography.

In October 1928 the incumbent Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney, George Arnold Wood, died. The vacant Chair was advertised throughout Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand in January 1929. There were nineteen applicants for the position including the historian, Arthur Jose, the later Professor of History at the University of Western Australia, A.F. Alexander, and F.L. Wood, the son of the deceased Challis Professor. Stephen Roberts had as his referees Sir John MacFarland, the Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, Professor H. Laski of the University of London, Dr. J. Macmillan Brown, the Chancellor of the University of New Zealand, and Professor Scott.

In October 1928, at Roberts's instigation, Scott had written to R.S. Wallace, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, in support of his
student's application for the Chair. In reference to Roberts's forthcoming book, History of French Colonial Policy, Scott wrote,

It strikes me as being an extraordinarily able piece of work, truly learned in the technical sense, independent in its judgements, and based upon a thorough exploration of sources - the latter kind of material having been furnished to him by the French Col. Office. I doubt whether there is an historical student in the English-speaking world who will have to his credit, at Roberts's age, so much solid work as he will have when this book is added to the two previous works which he had written, that on Austln. land sett., and that on PPP. (47)

Scott then described his perception of Roberts's personal qualities and role in future research:

Roberts has always wanted to do things. His fertility in ideas is one of his best qualities. He is a very hard worker: I have never known anyone to equal him in the vigour which he puts into his work, and his powers of intense application. There is still a large field of research available in general Colonial and in Austln. history. Indeed, not much really original work is to be done in this part of the world except in that field, because the material is not available for research in problems of medieval history, or modern European history, or British history at large. . . . He is a very good public speaker, takes great pains with his preparation, and has a peculiarly forceful style. He could not be pale and timid in anything he did. His nature is exploratory, emphatic, constructive. With these characteristics, he is very easy to work with, friendly, a good students' man, and alert not only to do but to help in doing. . . . From his early student days I felt that he was a man likely to win high distinction, and I have felt that still more strongly since he has had English and European contacts. (48)

The Committee of Advice appointed by the Senate of the University to select a suitable person to fill the Chair interviewed five of the applicants - P.H. Box, F.W. Brooks, A.C.V. Melbourne, S.H. Roberts and F.L. Wood - in February 1929 and "after discussion and careful deliberation" recommended Roberts as the most suitable candidate. In their report of February 12, the Committee gave their reasons for their choice:
Mr. Roberts has impressed them greatly by the quantity of first-rate historical literary work which he has produced, though he has only reached the age of 27. His speciality is Australian history, and Modern Australian political and economic problems. He has also studied the colonial endeavours of other States - more especially France. He appears also to be a competent teacher. (51)

The next two most highly-placed candidates in order of precedence were F.L. Wood and J.F. Bruce - the former having graduated as a Bachelor of Arts with First Class Honours from Balliol College, Oxford, and the latter being the current Associate-Professor and Acting Professor of History at the University of Sydney. However neither, in contrast to Roberts, had produced any significant literary works and according to the Committee, "The status of a study in the University depends very largely on the merit of the work produced by the head of the department, and his reputation in the academic world"52. This statement reflected the increasing importance of the concept of the 'professional' historian. This concept encompassed research and critical analysis of primary sources, publication of the results of research projects, and the specialized training of historians per se. This formal historical training which helped Roberts obtain the Chair of History had not been as important in the appointment of Wood and Scott to their respective Chairs although, of course, they had studied historical topics.

The Committee's recommendation was unanimously adopted by the Senate of the University. In 1929 Stephen Roberts, who had begun his studies at a State school in rural Victoria and who at seventeen years of age had begun a teacher-training course in Melbourne, now became the second Challis Professor of History at the University of Sydney - the oldest university in the land.
Endnotes:

1. See University of Melbourne, Calendar. 1919; 430-431.


3. University of Melbourne, Calendar. 1921; 505 and see University of Melbourne, Calendar. 1922; 517.

4. University of Melbourne, Calendar. 1922; 516.


6. Ibid., 160. According to Max Crawford (Interview, August 1983), another version was the alliterative "Swotty Steve".

7. Scott, E., "Memorandum to the University of London", 15 September 1924 (S.U. P16).


9. Scott, E. quoted in Education Gazette, 16 September 1924; 298.


11. Ibid., xiii-xiv.

12. Ibid., xiv.

13. Scott, E. to Wood, G., 19/20 August 1924. (N.L. MS 2490)


16. Ibid., xv.


18. Ibid., x-xi.


20. Ibid., xvii.

21. Ibid., xix.


26. Ibid., 16.

27. See Ibid., 102.

28. See, for example, Fitzpatrick, K., Bluestone, 168.


33. Roberts, S. to Scott, E., 10 August 1929 (Baillieu).

34. Roberts, S., French Colonial, v.

35. Ibid., vi-vii.

36. Ibid., v.


38. Roberts, S., French Colonial, vi.


42. Ibid., v.


44. Roberts, S., French Colonial, vii.


46. For a copy of the advertisement, see The Times, 15 January 1929.


49. The Committee of Advice was composed of George W. Fuller, Charles W. Oman, A.F. Pollard, Basil Williams, and J.T. Wilson. (S.U. P16)

50. Fuller, G.W. to the Vice-Chancellor, University of Sydney, 19 February 1929 (S.U. P16).


52. Ibid.
Professor S.H. Roberts, c.1928. Photograph courtesy of the University of Sydney Archives.
Stephen Henry Roberts was Challis Professor of History from 1929 to 1947. During that time he changed the History curriculum from one aimed at inculcating moral values in the English Liberal tradition as taught by Wood to one giving a broader historical perspective and emphasising the 'illuminating' aim of the study of History. In so doing he broadened the curriculum content to be studied but with greater emphasis being placed on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

When Roberts took up his studies as Professor in 1929 the other members of the History department were Associate Professor James Bruce who had risen to that position during the professorship of G. Arnold Wood, and Acting Lecturer Kathleen Pitt, B.A. (Melb. and Oxon.), who had also joined the department in 1929. By the close of the 1920's there was therefore a total staff of three - the Professor, an Associate Professor and an Acting Lecturer. These three were involved in the teaching of two undergraduate courses each with Pass and Honours (Distinction) components while the Professor supervised the post-graduate students.

The 1929 History curriculum for undergraduate students was a continuation of that in existence during the professorship of Wood. The Pass component for "Course I" was entitled "English History to 1485" while the Honours component dealt with "The History of Europe from 800 to 1250". The "Course II" components were "Some Aspects of the Renaissance in Italy" for Pass students, and "Erasmus, Sir Thomas More, and the early phase of the Renaissance in England" for Distinction and final Honours students. All four courses were available to both day and evening students. For post-graduate students a Master of Arts course in History was offered.
Other courses such as Oriental History, Military History and Science, Jurisprudence, Legal History and the Elements of Political Science, and Economic History were also offered for consecutive History courses. According to Chapter X, Section 6a of the University's By-Laws, "Any course in Law taken in the third year may count as Course III of History..." while according to Section 6d,

The course in Economic History, or the course in Oriental History, or the course in Military History and Science, may count as Course II of Modern History, and the course in Economic History may also count as Course III of Modern History. (2)

However the curricula for these 'History' courses did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Challis Professor of History.

In his first year as professor, Roberts faced two main difficulties - a hostile Associate Professor and the need to reorganize a curriculum part of which had been in operation since 1911. Each of these difficulties was resolved by the close of 1930.

Associate Professor Bruce had applied for the Chair of History when it was advertised in January 1929 and appears to have been rejected because, as stated by the Advisory Committee, "He has not as yet produced any literary work of importance". In contrast, "Mr. Roberts has impressed them greatly by the quantity of first-rate historical literary work which he has produced...". Bruce appears to have been resentful at his being passed over in favour of Roberts and in a very interesting letter to Scott, Roberts described his relations with Bruce in mid-1929:

By now, however, I am a past master in the art of passive (and indeed, open) obstruction in case I should ever have to hand over this Department to somebody. Resolved to meet Bruce as far as I could (on the ground that, if everybody were against him, there must be something right with him), I soon found my concessions viewed as weakness and abused. I have never met anybody quite as ingenious and troublesome. From the first, I have kept my arrangements with him entirely in writing, but statements that seem to me quite plain and dogmatic receive
the strangest interpretations. It is really very difficult, when my smallest statements are turned inside out, but fortunately, Wallace and the administration quite understand. (5)

This open hostility between the History Professor and his Associate was not a situation conducive to the harmonious running of the department. That Roberts had absolute power and the final say within his department is evident from the next paragraph of his letter to Scott:

In a way, it has been easy for me, because the authorities are entirely for my side of the question. Having taken the major step of appointing me, they are prepared to support my re-organisation. Wallace has been very apologetic about it all, and about giving me an Associate who refuses to co-operate. He has given me an absolute assurance of his support in any of my plans to build up the Department, and expects a shaking-up of the whole course. "If there is any question about a matter in the History Department, or if any member of the History staff complains", he has said in a broad accent more than once, "I shall refer him to the final authority in that Department, viz. the Professor of History!" This really solves one's difficulties in advance. He insists on vigour and a good History School, and wants no details. I was a little uncertain at first, because, after all, one cannot treat an Associate-Professor like a tutor, but Wallace disposed of this reticence of mine by himself explaining away the Associate-ship as "an historical accident". So that there has been no doubt as to what powers I have in the Department. (6)

This shows that curriculum change in the History department was at the discretion of Roberts and that he was ultimately responsible for it. Marjorie Jacobs, a member of Roberts's staff from 1938 to 1943 and again from 1945, has stated that Roberts never held staff meetings to determine the curriculum although he did consult staff members on an individual basis. Roberts determined the basic, overall structure of the curriculum and allocated staff members to certain courses but allowed them latitude in the actual teaching of these courses. As a result of this, variations in emphasis between courses with the same title but taught in different years may have occurred as in the 1930's when there was a fair turnover of Roberts's staff.
F. Wood (1930-34), Ashburner (1933), Crawford (1935-36), Shepherd (1936-37), Henderson (1937-44), Greenwood (1937 and from 1942), Hentze (1938-39), Jacobs (1938-43 and from 1945), and McDonald (from 1939). However, despite these changes in emphasis due to a change in lecturer, the overall structure and content of the curriculum depended upon Roberts. In 1930 Associate Professor James Bruce was on leave from the University and later became Professor of History at the University of the Punjab, Lahore, in India—coincidental with his departure, the course on the Renaissance which he had introduced in 1924 was terminated.

The second problem faced by Roberts was the need to reorganise the curriculum and, concomitantly, the staff. He alluded to this in his letter to Scott of August 10, 1929 when he stated that Wallace, the Vice-Chancellor, "expects a shaking-up of the whole course" and "insists on vigour and a good History School". In this letter to Scott, Roberts outlined the staff deficiencies in the department and how he intended to rectify the situation:

My first complaint was about staff. With only two persons, and one of them openly recalcitrant and coming up to the University only for six hours a week, it was practically a one-man Dept. In view of this, Wallace has given me a permanent lecturer from January 1st, so that this person and myself will have all the second and third year people. Bruce fought to have the modern period and the advanced students, but that was impossible. I insisted on having my own special periods and on managing the honours people. He wanted our work to alternate every two years, as he and Wood had done: but I wouldn't consider this. The only possible solution was to rope him off in some branch of the Dept. where he could do the least harm: and I told Wallace that I must resign if I couldn't do this and keep my own special periods. His reply was to say that I had only to tell Bruce what he had to do, and that was all there was to it!

My plan is practically worked out now. Bruce will take Part I (perhaps I will have the Honour people for one lecture a week, to get in touch with them from the first) while I will have the other two subjects. The lecturer will be entirely at my disposal and will have nothing to do with Bruce, except to correct a few of his essays, because his Part I numbers are so great. I very much want Kathleen Pitt, and she, I think, is anxious to stay. The salary starts at £350 and rises, £50 a year, to £500. The
first engagement is for four years, in case we strike a "dud", but the arrangement is that a really good person shall stay on, although we do not commit ourselves. Miss Pitt has shaped very well, - I would much rather have her than a mediocre man. (8)

However Kathleen Pitt returned to Melbourne and in 1930 Fred Wood (the son of Professor G. Arnold Wood) was appointed Lecturer in her place. With James Bruce on leave in 1930 (and later resigning) this left only Roberts and Wood to give lectures. In that year the basic structure of Roberts's new curriculum was published in the University Calendar with courses in British History I and II and European History I and II⁹. The British History courses were introduced in 1930¹⁰, European History I in 1931¹¹ and European History II in 1932¹². In tabular form, Roberts's completed new curriculum by 1932 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History I</td>
<td>General History of Great Britain to 1688 (45 lectures on period to 1603)</td>
<td>Stuart period (45 lectures)</td>
<td>F.L. Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History II</td>
<td>General History of Great Britain from 1688 to 1914 (45 lectures)</td>
<td>Australia (45 lectures)</td>
<td>S.H. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History I</td>
<td>European History from 1492</td>
<td>Development of France since 1789</td>
<td>S.H. Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History II</td>
<td>The Expansion of Europe from 1492</td>
<td>Comparative colonial policies since 1815. The opening of America, Africa, and the Orient.</td>
<td>S.H. Roberts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Honours (Distinction) Curriculum:

British History I: The Colonies and the Colonial Policy of England to 1688.
The economic background of colonisation in England and Europe.

British History II: The general colonial policy of Great Britain from 1688.

European History I: Social, economic and political movements in France and Germany since 1815.

European History II: The Opening of Asia and the Pacific. (13)

In essence, the curriculum was a study of British and European history with reference to other areas, including Australia. Overall, the British history course dealt with British domestic and colonial development to 1914 with the year 1688 providing the division between the courses "British History I" and "British History II". Candidates for the Pass degree studied British domestic development plus some Australian history while Honours candidates studied British colonial development. There is a striking similarity between the division of content for this curriculum and that of the British component of the History curriculum under Scott in Melbourne in 1919 when separate courses were instituted for Pass and Honours candidates and when Roberts himself was a student at the University of Melbourne.

In Melbourne there were two courses labelled "British History Part I" and "British History Part II",14 which had the same basic division of content as Roberts's 'new' curriculum of 1932. In both the Melbourne and Sydney courses "British History I" for Pass candidates was a study of the "general history" of Britain to 1688 with a special study of the Stuart period15. Roberts recommended books which were immersed in the Whig tradition - Trevelyan's History of England, Pollard's The Evolution of Parliament, Montague's and Lodge's volumes in Longmans series Political History of England and Maitland's Constitutional History of England. Both Scott and Roberts included Trevelyan's England under the Stuarts and Gardiner's
Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution in their respective reading lists - Roberts adopted Scott's Whig ideology and use of primary sources for this course.

In both Sydney and Melbourne the "British History I" courses for Honours candidates dealt with English colonial policy to 1688. Although Roberts adopted two of Scott's recommended texts - Tyler's *England in America* and Andrews's *Colonial Self-Government, 1652-1689* - he did not include any primary source material, as Scott had done in his selection of Hart's *American History told by Contemporaries, Volume I*. All Roberts's recommended texts for this course were secondary sources although he did recommend the reading of primary sources for the writing of essays.

The "British History II" courses in Melbourne in 1919 and Sydney in 1932 also reveal similarities. Both courses for Pass candidates dealt with the "general history" of Great Britain from 1688 to the twentieth century and each course had recommended books in common - Grant Robertson's *England under the Hanoverians*, Marriott's *England since Waterloo*, and Grant Robertson's *Select Statutes and Cases*. Both courses had a 'special study' and although there was a difference in content, the Sydney course was still related to that in Melbourne. In his 1919 course, Scott had the period "from 1688 to 1714" as the period for special study but when he reorganised the History curriculum for 1922 (during which year Roberts was a lecturer in British History at the University of Melbourne) he introduced a course that had the 'outer limits' of the 1919 course, i.e. 1688 to the twentieth century, but had as its special study the history of Australia. It was this latter course that Roberts had in his 1932 curriculum. As well as his own books, *History of Australian Land Settlement* and *The Squatting Age in Australia*, Roberts included Scott's *Short History of Australia* and some primary source material, Wakefield's *Art of Colonisation* and *Letter from Sydney*, on the recommended reading list for his 1932 course.
The "British History II" courses for Honours candidates at Melbourne in 1919 and Sydney in 1932 both dealt with British colonial policy from 1688 although the recommended reading list was slightly more extensive for Roberts's course than what it had been for that of Scott in 1919.

Thus when Roberts launched his new History curriculum at the University of Sydney in 1930 the four courses on British history (two for Pass candidates and two for Honours) were virtually a transplant of the courses that had been offered at the University of Melbourne during the time that Roberts had been there firstly as a History student (1919-20) and then as a lecturer (1921-24). Professor J.M. Ward has noted Scott's influence on Roberts's History curriculum:

> Scott not only aroused his enthusiasm for history and for a decade or more set the pattern of his scholarship; he also established in Roberts's mind the principles of teaching that he followed throughout the period of his professorship. (16)

The structure of the British history courses for Pass candidates at Sydney was conceptually identical with that of those offered at Melbourne with each course having a relatively long time-span for its outer limits and incorporating a smaller period for special study. Not only was the structure of the courses at the two universities identical but the content was also basically the same. Despite the lapse of a decade, many of the recommended texts were also the same for both the 1919 Melbourne courses and those at Sydney in 1930/32. Thus, although the History curriculum introduced to the University of Sydney in 1930 was new to Sydney, it was basically a copy of one that had been introduced into the University of Melbourne about ten years earlier but which had been revised during the 1920's. In 1927 a major innovation occurred in Melbourne when Scott began teaching his "Australasian History" course but no such course was introduced by Roberts between 1930 and 1932 nor at any time during his term as Professor of History.
As well as the striking resemblance between the 1919 Melbourne British history courses and those of Sydney in 1930/32, there was also a similarity in the European history courses offered. Although in Melbourne only one European history course was offered for the Ordinary (Pass) degree in 1919 while in Sydney there were two in 1932, the content of courses at each university was almost the same. In Melbourne, Scott's course comprised,

The general history of Europe from 1492, with special regard to the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Empire, 1789-1815.
History of European Colonies.
History of America in so far as it touches the general history e.g. the Monroe Doctrine, etc. (17)

In Sydney, Roberts's "European History I" comprised "European History from 1492, with special study of the development of France since 1789"18 and his "European History II" dealt with "The Expansion of Europe from 1492 (90 lectures), with special study of comparative colonial policies since 1815. The opening of America, Africa, and the Orient"19. Roberts had divided Scott's course in two - its domestic and colonial components - and made a separate course of each. Both Scott's and Roberts's treatment of European history began at 1492 and included a special study of French history from 1789.

Scott's European history course for Honours candidates and Roberts's European history courses for Distinction was the one area in which Roberts did not copy his mentor. Scott's course comprised "The middle ages in general outline, and especially the era of Charles the Great" and "The European Colonies"20. The Distinction course of Roberts for "European History I" was "social, economic, and political movements in France and Germany since 1815"21 and for "European History II" was "The Opening of Asia and the Pacific"22. In 1932 Roberts had no collections of primary sources on the recommended reading lists for the Distinction component of his European History courses in contrast to Scott who prescribed the study of
primary sources for both Pass and Honours students.

However while there is some difference in the detail of these latter courses, it is obvious that Roberts had adopted Scott's ethnocentric perception of world history in that neither studied non-European history from the point of view of non-Europeans but rather from the point of view of Europeans themselves. Roberts's use of the phrase "The opening of America, Africa, and the Orient" when describing the content of his European History II course for Pass candidates and the similar "The Opening of Asia and the Pacific" for the Distinction component of European History II, both emphasise his point of perception.

Although the History department under Roberts only offered courses in British and European history, a course in "Oriental History" was available under Professor Sadler and this course could "be taken as a consecutive second year course to History I". The Oriental History course comprised "Lectures on Japanese History with special reference to the Period of European Intercourse and Foundation of the Tokugawa Shogunate, 1530-1700".

The 1932 "Economic History" course emphasised 'Western' civilization (Greece, Rome, England, Australia) while the Legal subjects allowable for consecutive courses in History had a similar emphasis. Ancient History was not taught as a separate subject (unlike at the University of Melbourne) but only as a segment of the Classics curriculum.

Although Roberts's 'new' curriculum that was phased in from 1930 to 1932 remained virtually intact until the whole History curriculum was restructured for the 1940 academic year, some minor variations in the Pass curriculum did occur. In 1933 the 'span' of British History I was limited to the period from 1485 to 1688 and lectures on Australian history replaced the special study of the Stuart period. In the same year the special study for European History I was limited from "comparative colonial policies since
1815" to "French colonial policy since 1815" on part of which topic Roberts had written his book published in 1929. In 1936, with the arrival of Max Crawford, the British History I course reverted to what it had been in 1930-32 with the Stuart period restored as the special study probably due to the expertise of the lecturer. In 1936 also, Australian history as the special study for British History II was limited to the period to 1855 while in 1938 Pacific History was introduced as an alternative special study for this course with the Research Professor, George C. Henderson, as the lecturer. This study of Pacific History was last given in 1944 because of Henderson's death and replaced by lectures on "Dominion and Colonial History" in the "Modern British History" course of a revised curriculum. The appointment of a 'Research Professor' was indicative of Roberts's pedagogical emphasis. In August 1944 Roberts wrote, "The position of Research Professor in History has lapsed with Professor Henderson's death, but the experiment fully justified itself and opens a fresh avenue of contact between Sydney and other Universities". The importance of research was a significant theme in both Roberts's educational background and his career as an historian.

In the Distinction curriculum the only change occurred in 1936 when "the Pacific" was deleted from the European History II course leaving "The Opening of Asia". Apart from these variations, there were no changes in the content of the History curriculum from 1933 to 1939 inclusive and, despite these changes, the nature of the curriculum remained as it had been when introduced in 1930/32 - the content arranged with each course being composed of a 'survey' of the period with a special study within it and ethnocentric from the perspective of Great Britain and Europe.

For almost the first decade of Roberts's professorship, Pass students were taught solely by means of lectures. As a result of this, no discussion of historical issues for Pass students occurred - this was in contrast to the
Melbourne History School where Crawford, from his first year as professor, planned tutorials as an integral part of courses for both Pass and Honours students. In 1938 Marjorie Jacobs, then an Assistant Lecturer, was asked by Roberts to begin tutorials for groups of six or seven students on matters such as writing essays and the use of primary sources. It was not however until the late 1950's that funding was available (as a result of the Murray Report) for tutorials for Pass students to be established on a permanent basis.

However, for Honours students, Roberts introduced the seminar method to the University of Sydney. The seminar method had not been used at the University of Melbourne on a regular basis by Scott, Roberts's mentor, but it was a pedagogical device which had originated in Germany and as such was in line with the German Scientific tradition that both Scott and Roberts espoused. These seminars consisted of a student reading a 'major paper' for about twenty minutes and perhaps another student reading a 'minor paper' for eight to ten minutes. Roberts would then ask for questions but usually little discussion ensued. During the seminar Roberts took notes and then, for the conclusion, summed up the matter under discussion and gave further references for research on it. According to J.M. Ward, Roberts's seminars were sometimes "conducted impatiently".

In 1936, during Roberts's absence overseas to attend the fourth Anglo-American Conference of Historians held in London in July 1936 and also to do research which resulted in his book, The House that Hitler Built, proposed new regulations were discussed concerning the Arts curriculum. In 1936 Max Crawford was Acting Head of the Department and advised the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Professor Todd, of what he perceived as Roberts's ideas on this subject along with his own. In 1937 the By-Laws of the Faculty of Arts were amended to provide, inter alia, for the establishment of Honours
Schools and the award of an Honours Bachelor of Arts degree (Honours Schools and degrees had been introduced into the University of Melbourne in 1919). As a result of this, the History curriculum was restructured.

In the 1939 University of Sydney Calendar the new, restructured curriculum that took effect from that year was outlined. Instead of the previous four courses - British History I and II, and European History I and II each with their Pass and Distinction components - the new curriculum was divided into four years (History I, II, III, and IV). While History IV was listed it was not to be given until 1941 and it was in this latter year that the new curriculum was to be fully operational. In tabular form, the curriculum outlined in the 1940 Calendar for 1941 was as follows:

### Pass Curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History I:</td>
<td>Ancient and Medieval World History, including Prehistory, the Near East, Greece and Rome, the Middle Ages to 1453 A.D.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History II and III:</td>
<td>(1) European History</td>
<td>European History from 1492.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) The Expansion of Europe</td>
<td>The expansion of Europe from the earliest times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Modern British History</td>
<td>The general history of Great Britain from 1688.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honours Curriculum:

| History I | Medieval Life and Thought | None |
| History II and III: | (1) European History | Social, economic and political movements in France and Germany since 1815. | None |

| (2) The Expansion of Europe | Development of France since 1789. |
| (3) Modern British History | French colonial policy since 1815. The opening of America, Africa, and the Orient. |
| (4) Australia or Pacific History to 1855. | None |
The Expansion of Europe

The Opening of Asia.

Modern British History
The general colonial policy of Great Britain from 1688.

History IV:

1. A course on Historical Methodology and the Science of History.
2. A course on Contemporary World History, since 1914 - seminars by Professor Roberts.
3. Such special courses of lectures, as may be decided upon when each student interviews Professor Roberts. For 1941, such courses will normally be either Economic History or Oriental History or the course within the History Department which the students did not take in their first three years.
4. A thesis on some aspect of Ancient, Medieval or Modern History. (39)

Pass History students studied from one to three courses (one course per year) while Honours students studied four consecutive courses over four years. The two major innovations in this 1939/41 curriculum were the introduction of a course on Ancient and Medieval World History and the History IV Honours course. The former course was "compulsory for all First-year students taking History as one of their qualifying courses for the B.A. degree" and was taught by Alexander McDonald who was appointed Reader in Ancient World History in December 1938. McDonald had a Master of Arts degree in Latin and Greek from the University College at Auckland, New Zealand, and in 1938 the University of Cambridge granted him the Ph.D. degree for his work on the sources of Livy XXX-XLV. McDonald took up his duties in 1939. As at the University of Melbourne, the Ancient History lecturer was virtually autonomous within the History department - McDonald determined his own course content. It was generally on the basis of a student's performance at the Credit examination for History I ("Medieval Life and Thought") that one was admitted to the Honours class. In special cases the Faculty permitted admission to the Honours School without the student having done the Honours course in First Year. After Roberts's
departure as head of the department, the History I Honours course was abandoned and the requirement for admittance to the Honours School was the gaining of a Credit or above in the History I examination.

Students taking the Honours curriculum were "under the immediate individual supervision of Professor Roberts" although those undertaking research work on Ancient or Medieval History were supervised by McDonald. The Methodology section of the History IV Honours curriculum was, as with many aspects of the 1930/32 curriculum, new to Sydney but had already been taught at the University of Melbourne - Crawford had introduced such a course by 1938. There was, however, a difference in emphasis between Roberts's and Crawford's Methodology courses in that Roberts's course dealt with the history of historical writing whereas Crawford's course dealt more with nineteenth and twentieth century historical scholarship.

Roberts himself took no part in the Methodology course which was conducted by other members of his staff - Professor Ward has stated that this was due to Roberts being too busy. The pedagogy of the course itself was an equal division of lectures and seminars. In First Term of the course McDonald dealt with Greek and Roman historians. In Second and Third Terms Jacobs dealt with prominent figures in historiography from the Renaissance to Modern Times such as Machiavelli and Italian historians, the eighteenth century British historians Gibbon and Robertson, Marx, and French and German scholarship. The concept of 'historical laws' as part of the 'scientific' aspect of History was also discussed as were the problems of historical writing.

The "Contemporary World History" section of the History IV curriculum reflected Roberts's interest in current affairs. According to John M. Ward, speaking of the History curriculum as a whole, Roberts wanted students to take an historical view of world affairs. As a result of this aim, his courses
dealt with long time-spans so that long-term trends would become evident. According to Bruce Mansfield, a History student who knew Roberts as a seminar teacher in the mid-1940's, Roberts wanted students to understand the contemporary world and relations between the Great Powers in a broad way with emphases on demographic and economic development. With the collapse of the 'Old Order' and a new configuration of power emerging in the mid-1940's this made the curriculum cater to both the needs and interests of the students.

However Roberts's activities were not limited to the University as he used the mass media to inform the public at large of world affairs. In 1936 Roberts explicitly stated to Professor Scott his emphasis on this aspect of his work. Referring to Max Crawford, then on Roberts's staff, Roberts wrote, "I see from the Press that he has been keeping up the aspect of my work I have always stressed - informing the public about foreign affairs." In the following year Roberts's book, _The House that Hitler Built_, was published and in the Preface, Roberts wrote,

> This book is written primarily for the man-in-the-street who wishes to have some idea of the German experiment. It may best be explained by a personal note. Most of my work for the last twenty years has been concerned with contemporary history, and I spent most of the study-leave which the University of Sydney granted me (November 1935 to March 1937) in Germany and neighbouring countries.

Roberts also made radio broadcasts and contributed articles to newspapers on current affairs. As examples of these, in 1934 he wrote ten articles on "Japan at the crossroads" and forty-three articles on "World affairs in the balance" for the _Sydney Mail_. In 1937 this newspaper serialised his book, _The House that Hitler Built_, and in the same year Roberts went on a public lecture tour, including country towns, speaking on Nazi Germany and other matters of topical importance. His radio broadcasts
included such themes as commentaries on World War II and "Notes on News" (1946) - these were broadcast over 2BL or 2FC (or both). He had great knowledge of military history and during World War II he wrote a series of articles for the Sydney Morning Herald attributed to "Our Military Correspondent" although he was teaching on a full-time basis at the University.

Roberts, therefore, was deeply involved in activities outside the University as well as in the History department. According to a student of the mid-1940's, Douglas McCallum,

In 1945 and 1946 Roberts conducted seminars by sitting at his desk in his study behind a great wall of books on the desk and with the students in a semicircle of chairs. We sometimes got the impression that while the paper was being read by the selected student Roberts was writing an "S.M.H." article, though he may have been making notes on the paper as it was being delivered. He conducted the seminars very badly. He never seemed to have engaged in any special preparation, arbitrarily asked his favourite to lead the discussion... or equally arbitrarily picked on the women forcing them to say something in turn. (52)

Bruce Mansfield has also noted that Roberts "pushed students into discussion". It is probable that during the seminars Roberts was noting his assessment of students as he did not read a student's seminar paper but only judged the student on what was said during the seminar itself.

Roberts appears to have had a rather flexible method of assessing and grading students. Pass candidates had to achieve satisfactory results in essays done during the year as well as in the end-of-year examination although one could compensate for the other if the results were in doubt. The University administration only required to know if a student obtained a 'Pass' or 'Fail'. For Honours candidates, examinations counted for less than fifty per cent of the total assessment - seminar results and essays were of greater value. In History IV, the thesis based upon original research was of great importance. For this purpose the resources of the Mitchell Library
and the Public Library, of which Roberts was a Trustee, were used. These theses were usually on some aspect of Australian or Pacific history unless overseas sources were available.\(^5\)

Roberts expected a high standard from his Honours students although rarely gave much help except for ruthless criticism - it was a matter of "sink or swim".\(^6\) According to J.M. Ward, Honours students, especially the good ones, were set to work on difficult, exacting subjects with little direct assistance apart from the full force of trenchant criticism when he believed that their labours, their reasoning or their presentation fell short of what they ought to have attained. He conducted a hard Honours school that produced a relatively high proportion of men and women actively engaged in scholarship and teaching.\(^7\)

This view of Roberts's Honours school is also held by Gordon Greenwood,

Roberts consciously decided that at all costs he was going to maintain standards of quality in his Honours school. This he undoubtedly did. It was widely known that Honours under Roberts was one of the toughest courses in Sydney and required total effort to succeed even if one had the ability.\(^8\)

Although the History I and History IV courses of the 1939/41 curriculum were real innovations at the University of Sydney, the courses for History II and III were not - they were simply courses already offered but given a new guise. "European History" (both its Pass and Distinction components) had been originally offered in 1931 as "European History I". The "Expansion of Europe" course had been originally offered in 1933 as "European History II" but with the starting point being 1492 rather than "from the earliest times" as in 1940.\(^9\) Similarly, "Modern British History" (both its Pass and Distinction components) had been introduced in the 1937 Calendar as "British History II" although this course had had its genesis in 1930 when it was described as "The general history of Great Britain from 1688 to 1914, with special study of Australia".\(^10\) The Distinction component of this course can
itself be traced back to a course given by Professor Scott at Melbourne University in 1919! Scott's 1919 course was described as "The British Colonies from 1688; the American Revolution; British India; the Dominions and Crown Colonies in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries" while Roberts's course was described in 1940 as "the general colonial policy of Great Britain from 1688". As Roberts was a Distinction student of Scott he appears to have simply transferred this course he did as a student at Melbourne in 1919 to one he offered as a Professor of History at Sydney in 1940.

Not only had the content of some courses not been changed for many years but neither had the reading lists been substantially revised. Apart from the replacement of Acton's _Lectures in Modern History_ by C.J. Hayes's _Political and Social History of Modern Europe_, the other nine recommended books for the 1940 "European History" course were the same as they had been for the "European History I" course of 1931; the three books for the Distinction component of the course were unchanged. All the sixteen recommended books for the 1940 course, "The Expansion of Europe", were the same as for its 1933 predecessor, "European History II".

The same situation applied for the seventeen books for the 1940 course, "Modern British History", and its 1937 predecessor, "British History II". In fact, the original course in this 'British' series had the same reading list in 1930 as there was in 1940 with only three exceptions - Reeve's _The Long White Cloud_ had been deleted from the list while Turberville's _Johnson's England_, Volumes I-II, and Namier's _Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III_ had been added. The Distinction courses in both 1930 and 1940 had the same reading lists. Thus the three 'new' courses for History II and III outlined in the 1940 Calendar were not new at all in terms of either content, structure or reading matter but simply 'old wine in new bottles'.

From the implementation of the 1939/41 curriculum to Roberts's retirement in 1947 to become Vice-Chancellor of the University, no changes were made to the courses History I or History IV. The History II and III courses remained very much as they were until 1944 when the "European History" course began at 1789, not 1492, and the period for special study was from 1914, not 1789; in 1947 this period for special study was from 1919. These changes in 1944 coincided with John M. Ward joining the History department and these courses were taught by him. Within the course, "The Expansion of Europe", a course of lectures on American history taught by distinguished visitors was introduced.

The course, "Modern British History", now began at 1815 rather than 1688 but Australia remained the special study within the course and the period of Australian history to be studied began earlier than 1815. In all three courses for History II and III, the Distinction component remained unchanged. Thus, in overall terms, the curriculum was 'updated' in that the starting-point for each course was brought nearer to the present-day and secondly, the special course of lectures on American history reflected the development of a trend away from courses which emphasised Great Britain, Europe and their overseas colonies.

The introduction of these courses on American history was a reflection of the closer ties between Australia and the United States of America as a result of their co-operation in World War II against a common enemy. American scholars were encouraged and enabled to come to Australia to give lectures on American history. These scholars included Professors Ralph Gabriel of Yale (1946), Avery Craven of Chicago, Nevins, and Dixon Wector. John M. Ward carried on the teaching of American history as part of the "Expansion of Europe" course once the visiting Americans had left.62 Whereas the University of Melbourne introduced a separate course on
American history in 1948, the Sydney History School retained it in the late 1940's within a European context. Despite some innovatory curriculum development such as these courses, the basic structure and nature of the curriculum as a whole remained static with its European perspective.

By 1947 the History curriculum at the University of Sydney was composed of courses divided amongst three years of study for Pass students who majored in History and four years for Honours students. History I was compulsory for all History students and dealt with the Ancient civilizations of the Near East, Greece and Rome, and the European Middle Ages to 1453. This course omitted the study of ancient Asian civilizations such as those of India and China and dealt solely with those in which were seen the roots of twentieth century European civilization.

The three Pass courses for History II and III in 1947 dealt with the histories of Great Britain and Europe and their impact on the rest of the world especially from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Pass students who majored in History therefore followed a curriculum that was solely concerned with the history of European civilization and its impact on other parts of the globe. No attempt appears to have been made to study non-European civilizations from a non-European perspective and even the special course of lectures on American history was included in the course, "The Expansion of Europe". The history of Australia itself was not given as a separate course as had been done in Melbourne but was relegated to a "special study" within the course, "Modern British History".

The 1947 Credit/Distinction curriculum was of a similar nature. "For Pass with Credit", in History I a course was given on "Medieval Life and Thought" while the three Distinction courses offered in History II and III dealt with the histories of Germany and France since 1815, British colonial policy from 1688, and "The Opening of Asia" respectively. The name of the
latter course clearly indicates Roberts's ideological stance towards European contact with Asia and the overall history of the latter.

The History IV curriculum for Honours students was wider in scope than any of its preceding courses but nonetheless had much in common with them. Roberts's seminar course on "Contemporary World History, since 1914" reflected his interest in international relations in the twentieth century - this interest was also shown in the 'updating' of the Pass courses in 1944 and 1947. Final year Honours students were also to take one of the courses not already studied in History II or III but they also had the option to study Economic or Oriental History if they so wished. While the Economic History course was also European oriented, the two Oriental History courses available were not. They dealt with Japan from 1530 to 1650 and with "the main formative elements in Indian, Chinese and Japanese culture". Through these, Professor Sadler therefore presented some foil to Roberts's European oriented curriculum. Probably the most significant innovation was the third part of the History IV Honours course - "Historical Methodology and the Science of History". Although Roberts never taught this theoretically-natured course, its nomenclature may reflect the 'scientific' approach to the study of History in which he had been trained by Scott.

For the eighteen years during which Roberts was Challis Professor of History, the History curriculum that he had inherited from Wood remained ethnographically Anglo-European but with different emphases in other respects. With the departure of Associate Professor Bruce in 1930 the courses on Renaissance history ceased although these were replaced by courses on European history covering a much wider time-span (from 1492 to the twentieth century). European history continued to be taught to 1947 although as the years proceeded the time-span covered by each course diminished with their emphasis contracting to within two hundred years of
the twentieth century. The only course that dealt solely with history before this period was the general survey of Ancient and Medieval History in "History I" and this was under the immediate direction, not of Roberts, but of Professor A.H. McDonald. Similarly British history continued to be taught although rather than being "to 1485" as it was under Wood, in 1947 it was "from 1815". In the closing phase of both Wood's and Roberts's professorships, courses in Medieval History were available to Credit/Distinction students.

The innovatory aspects of Roberts's curriculum compared to that of Wood were his introduction of courses in Ancient History in 1939, Anglo-European colonial history in 1930/32, Historical Methodology and the Science of History, and Contemporary World History both in 1941, and American history in the mid-1940's. However even these 'innovatory' courses were taught within the ethnographic Anglo-European paradigm and most had been taught earlier by Scott or Crawford in Melbourne.

The extent to which Roberts followed the initiatives of Scott and Crawford in design of the History curriculum is a matter of dispute. The sequence of events certainly indicates that, except for the "Contemporary World History" course, most innovations in the History curriculum occurred firstly at Melbourne and then at Sydney although the exact cause and effect relationship is difficult to determine. According to Douglas McCallum (although not a member of staff but a student in the 1940's), "after Wood any initiatives in curriculum change came from Scott and Crawford". However according to Marjorie Jacobs (a member of Roberts's staff from 1938 to 1943 and again from 1945), curriculum change in Melbourne was not taken into account when designing the History curriculum at Sydney. John M. Ward (a member of Roberts's staff from 1944) maintains that the initiatives in curriculum change came from Sydney.
Despite this controversy, it is clear that in the early years of designing his curriculum Roberts relied heavily upon the ideas of his mentor, Scott. Later his geopolitical outlook and his concern for using History as a means of 'illuminating' the present helped give shape to his curriculum. In keeping with the Scientific historiographical tradition that he experienced under Scott and then at the London School of Economics, Roberts encouraged original research, especially by his Honours students. The published works of Margot Hentze, Jack Shepherd, John Ward and Gordon Greenwood testify to this. This emphasis on research was also extended to staff. According to Roberts in 1944,

I should like to have the tenure of every member of my staff dependent upon research-work, because I think that the History School in this University has an important role to play in this matter. A variant of this proposal would be to allow me to reduce the lecturing and routine work of lecturers whom I know to be actively engaged in research-projects. (67)

Roberts represented the 'new' professional historian who made a career of combining research and teaching at a university. He, however, was not elitist and was keen to use university facilities for the benefit of the public at large. He did this through his publications and radio broadcasts. His perception of 'professionalism' (perhaps reinforced by his own personality) made him a personally distant figure who sought high academic standards but who apparently failed to engender the rapport with colleagues and students that Crawford appears to have done at Melbourne. It is ironic, considering his emphasis on research, that Roberts did not establish an historical journal in Sydney similar to Crawford’s Historical Studies. Despite the introduction of two courses new to Sydney in 1939-41, Roberts’s History curriculum remained basically conservative in nature for the (almost) two decades during which he was professor.
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Chapter 6

Crawford: Educational background and development as an historian

At the age of thirty, Raymond Maxwell Crawford was appointed Professor of History at the University of Melbourne in succession to Ernest Scott. Unlike Scott who had had no university experience before his appointment, Crawford had graduated from the Universities of Sydney and Oxford and had lectured in History at both institutions.

Although born in the mid-western New South Wales country town of Grenfell in 1906, Crawford was brought up from 1912 in the southern Sydney suburb of Bexley which at that time was a rapidly 'developing' semi-rural area in which lived members of occupational groups ranging from unskilled labourers through the middle classes to members of the 'professions'. Crawford, one of a family with eleven children, was the son of a station-master. A "mild Presbyterian" upbringing had the same effect on Crawford as Nonformist (Puritan) ideas had had on Arnold Wood in that both became interested in the study of 'values' and their relation to peoples' behaviour - this was later to be reflected in both men's teaching of History.

For his primary education, Crawford attended the local Bexley Public School from 1913 to 1918 and from there he went on to Sydney High School for his secondary education from 1919 to 1923. At school he was much more interested in English literature than in History although "exposure to printed documents in the Leaving Certificate year may have stirred a glimmering of historical interest".

In 1924 Crawford began his studies for a Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Sydney and was here lectured in History by both the Challis
Professor, George Arnold Wood, and his Associate Professor, James Bruce. It is held by some that as Roberts was a product of Scott's teaching at the University of Melbourne so too was Crawford a product of Wood's teaching at the University of Sydney. As a corollary to this, the concept of Roberts taking Scott's ideas to Sydney and Crawford taking Wood's to Melbourne thereby causing a kind of academic cross-acculturation has been stated. However this view is too simplistic and is one to which Crawford himself does not subscribe. While Wood and Crawford do have much in common it is more because of certain parallels in their upbringing than one being strongly influenced by the other.

In his three years studying for his Arts degree Crawford was lectured by Wood for only one year (1925) and by Bruce for two years. The courses taken by Crawford were "English History, 449-1558" in 1924, "The Discovery of Australia; The Foundation of New South Wales; English History, 1603 to 1756" in 1925, and "Some Aspects of the Renaissance" in 1926. While Wood confirmed Crawford's concern for the concept of the study of values in History, Bruce extended Crawford's range of interests by acquainting him with the Renaissance, an historical period which has been of major interest to Crawford ever since. Crawford graduated in 1927 with First Class Honours in Modern History and obtained the Frazer History Scholarship (re-awarded in 1928 and 1929) and the Woolley Travelling Scholarship. With the aid of the former and upon the advice of Wood, Crawford went to Oxford University.

At this most ancient of English universities Crawford attended Balliol College and here he came under similar influences to those that Arnold Wood had experienced about forty years earlier - especially the ideas of Thomas H. Green and Arnold Toynbee the elder. Both Green and Toynbee had been interested in moral questions and according to Sir Charles Oman, Chichele
Professor of Modern History at Oxford from 1905 to 1946, interest in this 'moral' aspect of the study of History was shared by the Regius Professor of History from 1925 to 1928, H.W. Davis:

He repudiated the idea that history was an exact science, and that topics were to be studied from a detached impersonal point of view, and not presented to the world showing any trace of personal bias or scale of moral values appertaining to the historian. (11)

This 'moral' aspect of the study of History at Oxford reinforced Crawford's existing interest in the study of values in History. However according to Crawford, "I was most influenced by my tutors in Balliol - Sumner for his fastidious scholarship, C.G. Stone for his richness of mind, Kenneth Bell for his invigorating energy of mind" 12. Thus while Crawford's ideas were influenced by the general intellectual ambience of the Oxford History School, it was the tutors at Balliol College in particular who had the most important impact on him.

As well, Crawford's literary bent was expressed in his increasing interest in History of Ideas - according to Crawford himself, "I had moved, somewhat reluctantly, from literary to historical studies, and in my Oxford days I had expressed this literary bent by devoting most of my time to History of Ideas". 13. This interest developed into a concern for 'situation' a problem which he tackled many times over the ensuing years both in his writings and teaching. Regarding this development of interest in 'situation', Crawford wrote,

But ideas do not exist in a vacuum and I was inevitably concerned with understanding the situation about which ideas were thought. Perhaps also, I had carried with me, not very consciously, what one might describe as a novelist's interest in the spectacle of individuals caught in a situation not of their own devising but with which they had to cope. At any rate, I found myself growing more and more interested in the early thirties in the analysis of 'situation' in the broadest sense. (14)
At Oxford Crawford, with W.E. Muir, formed the Synoptic Club\textsuperscript{15} which was a reaction to the narrow scope of some other Oxford clubs. Crawford was later to use the term, 'Synoptic', to designate the view of History that he put forward in a 1939 A.N.Z.A.A.S. address as a reaction to the limited Whig interpretation of History. The latter was being challenged by historians such as Lewis Namier in his \textit{The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III} (published in 1929) and Herbert Butterfield in his \textit{The Whig Interpretation of History} (1931). When a lecturer at the University of Sydney in 1936, Crawford used Namier's ideas in his curriculum\textsuperscript{16}.

Crawford opposed the Whig concept in historical methodology that History was "the story of the political activity of persons eminent in government, almost that History is what these persons choose to make it"\textsuperscript{17}. Exponents of the Synoptic view of History attempted to put political decisions in their social, economic, intellectual and cultural context - as Crawford asked in 1939, "Can the historian treat political activity satisfactorily without a lively sense of the context within which it takes place?"\textsuperscript{18}. When lecturing at the University of Sydney in 1936 Crawford attempted to implement this Synoptic view of History by using the pedagogic concept of combining various threads of a broad tapestry into a series of lectures on 18th century England. According to Crawford,

\ldots I tried to practise what I was already preaching by offering a course on 18th Century England in which I attempted to weave threads as diverse as banking history and architectural fashion into a coherent cloth. Tentative first effort though this was, the response of my students to it strengthened my conviction that the subject of study must be the whole cloth and not merely its political strands. (19)

Note here the implied reference to Maitland's concept of History as "a seamless web".

This idea of analysing and writing on non-political topics was not novel as can be seen in John R. Green's wish in his \textit{A Short History of the English
People of 1874 "to pass lightly and briefly over the details of foreign wars and diplomacies, the personal adventures of kings and nobles, the pomp of courts, or the intrigues of favourites, and to dwell at length on the incidents of that constitutional, intellectual, and social advance in which we read the history of the nation itself." However Crawford did not wish "to pass lightly" over political history but rather to integrate it into the history of its context. He recognized that previous historians had included non-political history in their work but, according to Crawford, only as extraneous matter to the central political theme:

Very often, even in histories which recognize that prominent political action is not the whole of history, chapters on economics and social conditions, on Kulturgeschichte, are additions, digressions, at most a background. Hume, in the appendix to his account of the reign of James I, uses the significant turn of words, 'It may not be improper, at this period, to make a pause; and take a survey of the state of the kingdom with regard to government, manners, finances, arms, trade, learning.' I shall argue that it is not merely covering a wider range of material that is necessary to History as such, but also attempting to see how the various forms of activity affect each other. (21)

Crawford not only developed his ideas on historical methodology at Oxford but he also experienced the Oxford tutorial system instigated by Benjamin Jowett, tutor from 1842 and then Master of Balliol from 1870 to 1893. Crawford saw that this tutorial system inspired scholarship and he was later to implement this pedagogical technique at the University of Melbourne.

During his time at Oxford, Crawford was awarded the Kingston Oliphant Prize, a Balliol prize for an essay on an historical subject, and in 1930 was placed in the First Class in the Honours School of Modern History. Returning to Sydney in 1930 he taught at Petersham Intermediate High School and then at Sydney Grammar School where he was dismayed to find that the History library consisted of one book - a single volume of the
Cambridge Modern History. During this period he also acted from time to time as an examiner in English and History for the University of Sydney. In 1932 Crawford returned to England to fill the position, temporarily, of Kenneth Bell, the senior tutor in History at Balliol College during Michaelmas term. From there he went on to teach at Christ's Hospital and then Bradfield College, Berkshire, where he had charge of the specialist work in English and History.

The Western world in the early 1930's was experiencing much social and political instability and occasional upheaval due to the Great Depression. As a result of this, according to Crawford, "the pleasing art of historical narration was at times elbowed out by the insistent demand that the past must somehow illuminate the present, that history must find answers to the problems that beset and bewildered us." Crawford's time as a secondary school teacher during this period reinforced two important concepts in his study (and teaching) of History - that History can help us to better understand the present (i.e. an aim of History) and that its study should not be limited to political events (methodology). According to Crawford, "The demand that History should illuminate was probably reinforced in my own case by some reaction against the narrowness and aridity of the political and military narrative which I had found to pass for History in my school-mastering days both in Australia and England." At this time (1934) Arnold Toynbee's first three volumes of A Study of History were published and Crawford found the 'challenge and response' concept contained therein "stimulating" - "I found these volumes immensely stimulating for their sweep and for their suggestive use of myth and scripture."

At the beginning of 1935 Crawford was appointed lecturer in History at the University of Sydney to which he returned in May of that year (during the professorship of Stephen Roberts). This appointment finally confirmed
History rather than English as the discipline in which Crawford's academic career would be based. Until that time he "would have jumped at the opportunity" of joining the English department in which, he was later told, a place would have been made available to him. Crawford's former English teacher and valued friend, Professor John Le Gay Brereton, was disappointed at this course of events. This is evidenced in part of a letter from Professor Todd, Dean of the Faculty of Arts at Sydney in 1936, to Raymond Priestley, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, congratulating him on Crawford being chosen for the Chair of History:

Dear old Brereton used to say that he had had no better student of English, and was downcast when Crawford, compelled to choose, finally threw in his lot with the historians. He doesn't encourage the fashionable divorce of history from letters, and he has a fastidious regard for the King's English. (28)

Crawford's literary bent continued to have a strong influence on him.

Crawford took the place of Fred Wood (the son of Arnold Wood) who had resigned as lecturer in December 1934 upon his appointment to the Chair of History at Victoria University College, Wellington, New Zealand. Both Wood and Crawford lectured in British History I and II which dealt with the "general history of Great Britain" with 1688 as the year dividing the two courses. Owing to Roberts's departure for Britain and Europe on study leave, Crawford was given charge of the History department from November 1935. In 1936 the present Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, John Manning Ward, was a first-year student at the University and had Crawford as a lecturer. According to Ward,

Crawford was without doubt the most inspiring teacher of my first year. He was teaching us a subject he knew remarkably well, Tudor and Stuart England, and he did so with that verve, intellectual excitement and strong moral conviction, that were later to make him justly famous at Melbourne. He was decidedly a lecturer with presence, learning, love of history and humanity. He was also much more. I have never ceased to recall with gratitude how he
received me when I called on him to point out that there was considerable discrepancy between the mark awarded my first essay and my previous work in history. He reread the essay, raised the mark and warned me that, if I wanted to do unusual things that were beyond a first year student, I should hand my next essay to him personally. At that time Crawford was responsible for one of the largest departments in the Faculty of Arts, had only one man to help him, was preparing for his own departure to Melbourne and had a host of other cares and responsibilities. His kindnesses to me were matched in his dealings with many other students. (30)

During his two years (1935 and 1936) at Sydney, Crawford also had opportunity to read in greater depth into his historical interests such as situation; the work of R.H. Tawney especially interested him:

All this reading was an exploration of what I have termed 'situation'. Tawney was most apt to my purpose because, while fully alive to the influence of economics on attitudes, he saw situation, not only in material terms, but also in terms of beliefs and attitudes which can impose as stubborn restraints on individual freedom of action as any economic or physical difficulty. (31)

In 1936 the University of Sydney devised a general scheme for the establishment of Honours Schools and the award of an Honours Bachelor of Arts degree - the new By-Laws implementing this and other changes applied only to students entering the Faculty in 1938 and after.32 According to Crawford in October 1936, "As Acting Head of the Department of History I have taken part in both Committee and Faculty discussions of this matter, and, in common with the Heads of other Departments, I drew up, as contribution to the discussion, a proposal for an Honours School in my subject"33.

Crawford proposed that candidates for an Honours degree in History should take eight courses of which half were to be British History I and II and European History I and II and the other half were to be chosen from Groups I, II, III and IV b.8 (i.e. Geography only in Group IV) of the subjects available for study for a B.A. degree.34 In reference to these latter
subjects, Crawford wrote, "One of these subjects must be studied for at least two consecutive courses" and he went on to recommend that "Candidates for final Honours must show an ability to read historical writing in French, German, or Italian". In his proposal, Crawford incorporated what he perceived as Roberts's ideas for a History Honours School - "I know that he feels that an Honours School in History should have a nucleus of purely historical subjects, and, for the rest, sufficient flexibility to allow the student to follow his individual bent towards an economic, social, philosophical, or literary emphasis in his historical study". Crawford preferred a wide range of choice in the non-historical subjects whereas he felt that Roberts might prefer to limit this range.

As part of the final agreement for the Honours curriculum as stated in the University's By-Laws, candidates were to do eight courses including the Honours subject for four years and gain at least a Credit in this each Year. They were also to at least pass three consecutive courses of another subject or two consecutive courses in each of two other subjects - at least one of these non-historical subjects was to be a language other than English (this last provision, which was a Faculty requirement for all subjects, was repealed in February 1940). Thus in the case of History, half the Honours course would be made up of History subjects and the other half of other subjects (some taken consecutively) of which one would be a foreign language - this scheme was quite close to that proposed by Crawford. This experience at Sydney enabled him to formalise his ideas on constructing Honours curricula and he implemented some of these ideas soon after his arrival at Melbourne.

As well as teaching at secondary and tertiary levels, from 1934 to 1936 Crawford was also interested in contemporary affairs in Spain which had become a republic in 1931 and was the scene of much socio-political conflict.
Crawford used this interest as a means to examine the concept of using History to better understand the present - "I was trying to understand the present by seeing how it had developed out of its own past. My specific question might have been phrased this way, 'Could Spain move peacefully, if somewhat belatedly, into the twentieth century?'". This study of Spanish affairs also reinforced his Synoptic view of History which had developed at Oxford and in reference to his Spanish studies, Crawford wrote:

This work was, I believe, the main determinant of that view of history which I put forward in a paper given to the A.N.Z.A.A.S. meeting in Canberra in 1939, called The Study of History. A synoptic View. Certainly it was a study which carried me into fields seemingly remote from each other. I taught myself to read Spanish, and, at the same time as I was exploring the material conditions of miners in Galicia or of peasants in Badajoz, and the struggle for power within the complex of political, clerical, and industrial groupings, I was also trying to get some sense of attitudes and temper from reading modern Spanish literature. For the historical student who wishes to understand how foreign or past peoples think, and by what values they appear to be moved, can find no better pointer than the idiom in which they express their thoughts and aspirations.

Note Crawford's continuing concern for the literary aspects of historical study and for the study of values in people's behaviour. In a direct reference to his Synoptic view of History, Crawford stated, "The relevance of this study to my theme is that in order to understand a political question, I had been driven into studies ranging widely from geography and economics to literature.".

Thus by 1936 Max Crawford had come into contact with various influences which were helping to shape his views on the aims and methods of the study and teaching of History. His domestic Presbyterian upbringing and his contact with Arnold Wood at the University of Sydney had given him a concern for the study of human values and their relation to human behaviour. Unlike Wood he did not see his role as a 'crusader' exhibiting models of
'good' behaviour for others to emulate but rather he was interested in the study (as if from a distance) of how individuals acted in relation to their espoused values in a given situation. The problem with which Crawford was concerned was "How can you observe principles in political life?". He was interested in the moral implications of power, for example how does one reconcile power with justice?

Professor Wood's reinforcement of Crawford's interest in the study of values dovetailed with Associate Professor Bruce's lectures on the Renaissance and the hybrid of these two factors resulted in Crawford's long-lasting interest in that great figure of the Renaissance and the epitome of what is perceived as the unscrupulous use of power - Machiavelli. At the University of Sydney also, Crawford studied both History and English. The influence of the latter remained evident in his concern for what he termed the "novelist's interest in the spectacle of individuals caught in a situation not of their own devising" and in his "fastidious regard for the King's English".

At the University of Oxford these themes of interest in moral values and of 'situation' culminated in Crawford's espousal of a synoptic view of History which was reinforced during his time as a secondary school teacher and which he implemented as a lecturer at the University of Sydney in 1936.

In the mid-1930's Crawford, through his interest in contemporary events in Spain, continued his literary and synoptic historical methodology and also developed the concept of the aim of the study of History as being a means to better understand the present. This complexity of factors that influenced Crawford's Historical outlook should put into some doubt the theory that his Historical ideas were simply a product of him being a student of Professor Arnold Wood.

The year '1936' was a period of flux at both the Universities of Sydney
and Melbourne and events occurred which were to greatly affect Crawford's career. At Melbourne the Professor of History, Ernest Scott, gave notice in January of his intention to retire at the end of the year and so during 1936 the University authorities sought a replacement. At Sydney the Professor of History, Stephen Roberts, was on study leave in Europe and Crawford became the Acting Head of his department and consequently played a part in formulating the new Honours curriculum. In March the Registrar of the University of Melbourne (J.P. Bainbridge) outlined the professorial duties as part of a circular on the "Conditions of Appointment to the Chair of History and information with regard to the work":

The Professor will be a full-time officer of the University and will be required
1. To teach, to conduct examinations, and to exercise supervision over the work in his department in accordance with the Statutes and Regulations of the University and the direction of the Council.
2. To carry out research work and to organise and generally stimulate research work amongst the staff and post graduate students. (46)

Initially the University's Council invited W. Keith Hancock to accept the Chair and was even willing to hold the vacancy open until 1938 should he be unable to accept the position immediately. However Hancock was unable to accept the invitation at all due to two commitments - his work at the University of Birmingham at which he had been appointed the Professor of History in 1931 and, secondly, his preparation of a two-volume work "Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs 1918-36" for the Royal Institute of International Affairs which he envisaged might take another four years to complete. Hancock concluded his letter of inability to accept by stating,

If I now accepted the Council's offer I should have to face immediately two desperately hurried and anxious years, with the certainty at the end of them of leaving behind me an obligation only half performed and a piece of work spoilt by superficialty and haste. Under these circumstances I should have to begin my work in Melbourne with a bad conscience and without the confidence and undivided energy which its importance demands.
I am deeply disappointed that this should be so. I still hope -- though the hope may seem an unreasonable and unlikely one -- that a similar opportunity may someday recur. All that I can do now is to turn to the work which I have in hand and to express once more my sincere appreciation of the very great kindness which the Council has shown in honouring me with this invitation. (48)

In accordance with a previous decision of the University's Council the Chair was then advertised in both Australia and Great Britain - there were eighteen applicants. On October 15, 1936 Max Crawford applied for the Chair setting out his curriculum vitae and towards the end stating the proposed development of his interests:

In the meantime I have been planning work to which I hope to give most of my time in the future, on the development of Australian society. Should I be appointed to the Chair, I would be disposed to encourage research along such lines. (51)

In the same month Dr. C.H. Currey of the Teachers' College, Sydney, wrote (unsolicited by Crawford) to the Acting Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne for the information of members of the Chair of History Committee in which he stated:

I say nothing about his academic record. That speaks for itself. Nor have I read anything from his pen save occasional articles. He has been too preoccupied with teaching up to date, and is too steeped in the Oxford tradition to have been able to publish anything that he would regard as worthy of publication.

But I have found him very interested in the study and teaching of history. He is, I gather, a very good teacher and is a stimulus to the most able of his students. I have been associated with him in the public examinations and have been struck by the kindness of his judgment and the thoroughness with which he does the job in hand.

As a man he seems to be highly regarded by his University colleagues, and their esteem is easily understood. Personally I'll be sorry to see him leave this University, but, when consulted by him, urged him to apply for the post because I think him eminently Chair-worthy. (52)

In November Professor Roberts wrote from London to Professor Scott regarding Crawford's personal and work-related attributes. According to Roberts:
He is energetic, loyal to a degree, has very diverse interests, represents the combination of literature and history at its best, is a good mixer, takes a part in all student activities, is an excellent lecturer, has many ideas, and, most important in my eyes, has been through the mill of adversity in the years when he was getting experience in English public schools. (53)

The Chair of History Committee interviewed Crawford (who had come down from Sydney) on December 22 and unanimously recommended his appointment to the Chair. In their report, the members of the Committee stated:

Mr. Crawford has deeply impressed the chiefs with whom he has worked, both at Oxford and Sydney. Mr. Kenneth Bell, of Balliol, one of the most experienced of History tutors in Oxford, has written of him that "he has the teaching instinct tingling in him, and he made a tremendous impression upon the lads here when he was doing my work." Professor Roberts wrote of him that he is an excellent lecturer, a man of ideas, energetic, and interested in students' activities. The Sydney History School would regret his leaving though all who knew him there would be glad that he had earned promotion. (54)

The University's Registrar wrote to Crawford on January 9, 1937 informing him of the Committee's choice - he consequently resigned from his lectureship at Sydney. In 1936 Kenneth Bell of Balliol College had written of Crawford,

He is a real Australian: he is fond of England and has some devoted friends here, but he is not a hankerer after flesh pots. His pupils love him: he's got the teacher's touch.

(55)

Over the ensuing thirty four years as Professor of History at the University of Melbourne Crawford had much opportunity to display his pedagogic (and administrative) skills.
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Max Crawford was Professor of History at the University of Melbourne from 1937 to 1970 but it is generally agreed\(^1\) that the heyday of his History School was in the 1940's and 1950's. The period from 1937 to 1950 was the period during which Crawford fully implemented his ideas on the study and teaching of History and by the mid-century mark the nature of his History School was firmly established.

In March 1936, in his circular for applicants for the Chair of History, the Registrar of the University of Melbourne outlined the current courses conducted by the History department as well as the membership of the History staff and subjects available to History students:

The lecturing work of the department in recent years has included the following subjects -

(i) Ancient History (in charge of a lecturer).

(ii) British History from the earliest times to 1660 (taken by a lecturer).

(iii) British History to 1660 with special regard to the period from 1603 to 1660.

(iv) British History from 1660 to 1914 (taken by a lecturer for evening students).

(v) British History with special regard to the period from 1660 to 1702.

(iv) Australasian History.

(v) European History - the Middle Ages.

(via) European History from the Renascence to 1914.

(vib) European History from 1453 (taken by a lecturer for evening students).

Australasian History (iv) and British History from 1660 (iii) are taken in alternate years.

The History of the Middle Ages (v) and European History from the Renascence to 1914 (via) are also taken in alternate years.

The establishment of the department at present is the Professor, a whole time Senior Lecturer, two Evening Lecturers and two Tutors.
The particular lecture courses which the Professor will deliver will be a matter of arrangement between the Professor and the Council. The work of the department is open to revision.

The subjects Economic History, Economics Part I, History of Economic Theory, Modern Political Institutions, Political Philosophy, and International Relations may be taken by students of the History School as alternatives. (2)

The content emphasis for the Medieval and Modern History courses was therefore on British, European and Australasian history all of which were under the control of the Professor of History - the Ancient History course remained under the complete control of Jessie Webb until her death in 1944 after which J.L. O'Brien accepted Crawford's invitation to transfer from the Department of Classics to that of History. O'Brien's first complete lecture course was given in 1945 and he retained the independence in the teaching of Ancient History that Jessie Webb had enjoyed. In tabular form, the courses of which Professor Scott was in charge in 1936 were organised thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History A</td>
<td>England from the earliest times to 1660.</td>
<td>From the Norman Conquest to the accession of Edward I (1066-1272).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History B</td>
<td>The general history to 1660.</td>
<td>1603-60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History C</td>
<td>The general history from 1660 to 1914.</td>
<td>1815-1914.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History D</td>
<td>The general history from 1660 to 1914.</td>
<td>1660-1702.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasian History</td>
<td>Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific.</td>
<td>History of Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History A</td>
<td>The Middle Ages, 326 to 1453.</td>
<td>The Medieval Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History B</td>
<td>Modern European History, 1453 to 1914 i.e. from the Renascence.</td>
<td>1789-1815.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European History C</td>
<td>Modern European History, 1453 to 1914.</td>
<td>1815-71.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During Crawford's first year as professor, 1937, the curriculum remained as it had been in 1936 but changes were planned to take effect from 1938. In a letter to the Vice-Chancellor in May 1937 Crawford outlined his plans for the development of the History curriculum and department. Concerning the curriculum for the Pass degree he proposed to decrease the number of options offered in British and European history and to delete the Australasian History course altogether:

**The Pass Courses.**

I propose to provide four Pass courses as follows:-

- Ancient History Part I (Grade 1 and 2)
- British History Part I (Grade 1)
- British History Part II (Grade 2 and 3)
- Modern History (Grade 2 and 3)

'Modern History' - an analysis of the making of the modern world - will replace the present European Pass courses, and is designed to serve the needs both of History pass students and of the projected School of Politics. For the latter, a special Honours Class in Modern History will be provided in addition to the pass lectures.

These four courses will be available to evening students, but for them Modern History and British History Part II will be given in alternate years.

I am anxious to strengthen these courses by a greater degree of tutorial work than is at present provided - or possible to provide. (3)

The last paragraph reveals Crawford's early attempt to implement the tutorial system which he had encountered and admired at Oxford. The importance of the influence of historical training at Oxford to Crawford again came to the fore in 1941 when Crawford wrote to the Vice-Chancellor requesting that the position of Kathleen Fitzpatrick be raised from that of Lecturer to that of Senior Lecturer and as justification for this request he stated,

Most important for the development of our work in history is the fact that she most fully understands what I am trying to achieve in the School. This is partly because she had much the same training as I had in the School of History at Oxford. But it arises also from the fact that her interest in history is probably wider and more varied than that of the other Lecturers. (4)
Fitzpatrick became a Senior Lecturer in 1942.

Despite the deletion of Australian History as a separate course from 1938 (which Crawford regarded as a temporary measure), it was included in one of the British History courses thereby reverting to Scott's curriculum concept before 1927 of including Australian history as part of a course on British history. According to Crawford in 1937, "I propose to include some Australian History in British History Part II, approaching the foundation and settlement of the Australian Colonies in the light of the British setting of the late 18th and early 19th Centuries". In a "Memorandum on Reconstruction in Department of History" he gave three reasons for this deletion of Australasian History as a separate course:

1. only fifteen students took this subject in 1937. I considered that the provision of teaching in a pass subject taken by such small numbers was a luxury which this department could not at present afford.
2. while the subject is taken as part of British History D a larger number of students will gain at least an elementary knowledge of their own history.
3. the comparative paucity of first class writing on this subject makes it, at present, of less general educational value than other branches of history.

In the 1941 Calendar, notice was given of a separate "Australasian History" course but with the proviso that this would not be available until 1942 - as events turned out, a separate course on Australian history was not given until 1945.

Also in 1937, despite the substitution of a Modern History course for those on European History, Crawford did not intend making the deletion of the Medieval component of the European History courses permanent but instead proposed "to preface the Modern History courses with some lectures on the Mediaeval roots of Modern Europe. I hope that the Modern History course may prove not only a valuable part of a History Major or Sub-Major, but also a useful background course for those students emphasising the study
of Modern Languages, Philosophy, or Politics". The concept of using the study of Modern History as "a useful background" for "the study of Modern Languages, Philosophy, or Politics" is typical of Crawford's synoptic outlook i.e. relating the dominant theme of one's study to its context so that all parts make a whole or as Maitland would have it "a seamless web" - Crawford himself had used this pedagogical technique at Sydney for his lectures on 18th century England. In 1937 he made a direct reference to the synoptic nature of historical study in relation to the creation of a separate School of Politics:

A danger that might have existed was a sharp delimitation of the two schools which would be disastrous to a study so essentially synoptic as History. I have planned on the assumption that there will be such a School of Politics, but that there need be no sharp delimitation of the spheres of the two schools. (8)

Another two reasons for the change in name for Scott's three European history courses were recently outlined by Crawford:

The use of 'Modern H.' in place of 'Modern European History' had two purposes:
1. to enable me to include British History with European where relevant.
2. to cut short the legislative procedures in case of change of syllabus. Any change involving a change of title had to go through Faculty, Professorial Board and Council to the Committee of Convocation and back again. So one chose general terms e.g. 'General History', which would allow changes of content more simply; so-called 'Details of Subjects' had to be approved by Faculty and were generally accepted as a formality by Prof. Board and Council - I did not have to go onto Convocation, which could add months to the process. (9)

As well as alterations to the Pass curriculum, Crawford also changed the Honours curriculum and indeed appears to have concentrated more on the latter than on the former. In 1936 the content of the purely historical subjects (British History B and D, Australasian History and European History) in the Honours History School curriculum had not been altered since 1927 and
remained as such in 1937. In this last year however Crawford outlined changes to the Honours curriculum the nature of which would be drastically modified and according to his own philosophy of the study and teaching of History.

His modifications were based upon several assumptions which he enunciated in 1937:

**The Honours School.**

In planning the Honours School I have assumed that work in such a school should stimulate mental activity, both sympathetic and critical, encourage an attitude of reasonable discussion, make for cogent argument and clear expression, and, by prompting his reading of good historical writers, stimulate the first class student beyond mere adequacy of expression. These aims are inseparable from work in small tutorial classes.

It is impossible in three years to take the student through all History, and the attempt to do so is incompatible with the necessity of allowing him to think particular things through. In selecting from the field of History I have gone on the assumption that the value of History lies not simply in the mental exercise offered by an academic study, but particularly in its content of individual and social experience, and I have chosen for the Honours School certain nuclei which seem to me to be especially valuable in this respect. These nuclei (Ancient History, European A, B, and C) are planned as a co-ordinated centre around which the School should turn.

In this outline of these underlying assumptions, Crawford's interest in the 'literary' aspects of History is reflected in his statement, "by prompting his reading of good historical writers, stimulate the first class student beyond mere adequacy of expression". This concern for "the King's English" had been noted at Sydney during his time there as a student. Similarly, his reference to the use of "small tutorial classes" harks back to his time as a student at Oxford and is restated in more detail later in this document:

The success of these proposals as a whole will depend particularly upon the ability of the History staff to maintain close touch with the individual Honours students; this we can do only through a greatly extended use of small discussion classes. I propose that the Honours work
of the second and third years will be mainly tutorial work with short lecture courses, generally of a term's duration, on special aspects of the courses. (11)

These tutorial classes would give students practice in thinking quickly and being able to clearly expound their ideas; it would also fit in with Crawford's wishes concerning examinations:

I should like to accompany Finals with an oral examination - a good method only if the student has a background of tutorial work and is accustomed to discussion. (12)

Crawford's interest in people's behaviour which had been shown earlier in his interest in 'values' and 'situation' is reflected in the statement that "the value of History lies not simply in the mental exercise offered by an academic study, but particularly in its content of individual and social experience".

In his reconstruction of the Honours History curriculum, Crawford had four objectives principally in mind:

1. The desirability of bringing the students and staff into closer contact by means of small classes. Formerly the only element of informal teaching provided was that each Honours student read four essays a year to the Professor - for the rest, instruction was given only by means of lectures.

2. The need for a re-valuation of the distribution of work for Honours. The field for work for Honours and Pass was formerly sharply divided - for example, for Pass the student would read general European History and for Honours would make a special study of the Expansion of Europe. There appeared to be a danger that honour students would put in a minimum of work in the possibly more important field of study for Pass, concentrating on the Honours subject.

3. to bring more explicitly into the actual honours course the theory of history, its method and philosophy, by providing a discussion class and a general paper in the Final Examination.

4. to remodel the content of the Course so that it should no longer be designed at catering rather for the minority who will go on to historical research than for the majority. While my principal concern has been to build up an undergraduate school, I have tried to cater
for those who may go on to do valuable research work, by introducing the study of a Special Subject with prescribed documents and by the encouragement of graduate research work. (13)

Crawford's use of tutorial classes as an innovatory pedagogical technique is clearly stated here as is his equally innovative concept of teaching "the theory of history, its method and philosophy". The question can arise here as to which university - Sydney or Melbourne - led the way in introducing classes on Historical theory and methodology for its Honours History students. On the simple basis of which university was the first to actually implement such a course, Melbourne would win the laurels as Crawford had begun his Theory and Method of History classes by 1938\(^\text{14}\) whereas the first course of this nature was not held at Sydney until 1941 (although notice of it was given in the 1940 Calendar).

In contrast, the University of Sydney implemented a fourth year for its Honours students in 1941 whereas this did not occur at Melbourne until 1950 from which year students beginning the Honours degree curriculum were to take four years to complete it. According to Crawford, "When we introduced the 4th Year for B.A. Honours, we were much influenced by the belief that the various departments were cramming too many demands into the 3-years course and in History we really did try (as all Departments were supposed to try) to use the extension to ease the burden"\(^{15}\). This apparent slowness on the part of the University of Melbourne to extend the length of time needed to take an Honours degree was partially due to the fact that "Melbourne students taking Honour Schools normally stayed for a sixth year (Leaving Honours) at school, and came to the University a year later than was the general rule in Sydney, for example"\(^{16}\). The students taken would therefore have been somewhat more mature in their approach to their studies although the problem still remained, until 1950, of cramming much work into the three-year university curriculum.
At Melbourne the responsibility for instituting the classes in theory and methodology in the Honours curriculum clearly lay with Crawford. Whether they would have been instituted earlier at Sydney had Crawford stayed there is doubtful as Roberts himself did not appear to show particular interest in this type of course.

The contrasting historical interests of Crawford and Roberts can be seen in the fact that Crawford himself took the classes on "Theory and Method of History" at Melbourne whereas Sydney's course on "Historical Methodology and the Science of History" was taken by other members of staff - Roberts himself took the "Contemporary World History since 1914" part of the Honours curriculum. These choices of Crawford and Roberts as to what they would teach reflect the former's interest in the History of Ideas which had developed at Oxford and the latter's interest in recent events and how knowledge of them helps one to better understand the present - the 'theoretical' and 'practical' bents of these two professors is here clearly evident. While it is not thoroughly valid to categorise in such 'black-and-white' terms (as Crawford himself was interested in the 'illuminating' facility of History), it does reveal the different interests and pedagogic emphases of these two professors.

It is interesting also to note that Crawford gave his course the rather general title "Theory and Method of History" whereas the Sydney course embodied the underlying assumption that History was a science - "Historical Methodology and the Science of History". This possibly reflects the strong influence of Roberts's teacher, Ernest Scott, and his emphasis on 'scientific' methodology through the strict use of primary sources.

In describing his changes to the Honours curriculum in general, Crawford wrote in June 1937:
(a) I have planned the first year as a preliminary year of four subjects. For this reason, I have prescribed for Honours in British History Part I and Ancient History Part I more intensive study within the pass courses rather than extra study outside the pass courses. I have treated the second and third years as forming a unit; this is one reason for my proposal to do as far as possible without second year examinations in the General History subjects at least. It will be noticed that during his second and third years, the Honours student may choose from one of two alternative combinations of History subjects - either Ancient History Part II, General History Parts I and II; or General History Parts I, II and III. These are planned as Honours courses only, and for the most part the Honours student will part company with the Pass student after the first year. It is essential, in my view, that the more intensive Honours work should be guided in small classes. But for a general survey of the ground covered in the General History subjects, Honours students will be encouraged to attend the pass lectures in Modern History and British History Part II.

(b) I propose to replace the present Final Honours Thesis by a Special Subject, chosen from an approved list of Special Subjects with specified documents and examined in Finals. This would bring into the course an important piece of individual work with source material and would, I think, be more suitable to the undergraduate course than a research thesis. I cannot prepare a list of such subjects until late in the year, and I should like the Faculty's permission to make them public at the end of the year.

In 1939 the Special Subjects from which Honours students could make their choice were:

1. The Governorship of Macquarie.
2. Immigration into Australia, 1830-1850, with special reference to the period 1840-1850.
3. The American Revolution and Federation.
4. English Radicalism towards the end of the eighteenth century.
7. Politics in Athenian Drama.
8. Excavations in Mesopotamia, Greece and the Near East since 1930.
10. German Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century.

As well as these changes, due to the organisation of a separate School of Political Science, Crawford reduced the range of choice of non-historical
subjects such as Modern Political Institutions, Political Philosophy etc. for Honours students. 

As a summary of the structure and nature of the Honours curriculum, Crawford wrote:

The Honours school is planned as a pyramid, having as its base a first year of general study, and culminating in a third year of advanced work of a specialised nature. Certain preliminary work is indispensable as equipment - Philosophy I, as a training in handling and criticising terms and ideas, and Economics I as providing a key to matters otherwise unintelligible to historical students. The School is constructed in such a manner that whether a student approaches history from the literary, historical, legal or political side he should find scope for his peculiar bent. In the last year of the course the work becomes more specialised and advanced; contributory subjects are left behind; only one history subject is formally studied; the student takes his special subject as an individual piece of work, and tries to form some acquaintance with theories of history. (20)

In his first two years as Professor of History, Crawford not only re-organised the curriculum for the Pass and Honours courses but also carried on his teaching duties in accordance with the conditions of his appointment. One of Crawford's students in his first year at Melbourne was Manning Clark, later a lecturer in History at Melbourne and from 1949 Professor of History at the then Canberra University College. In 1937 History lectures were given in the Old Arts Building and Clark attended those in European History A (Pass and Honours):

I will remember the first lecture as long as I live, for quite a trivial reason. At the end of the lecture Professor Crawford, instead of delivering a peroration and sweeping majestically out of the room, not only stayed behind to speak to us, but actually asked whether anyone could lend him a match. Revolutions often begin with just such an incident. The second reason for remembering the lecture is rather more difficult to explain. It had something, but not everything, to do with the language and passion of the lecturer, and that magic given off by the born teacher. (21)
Clark had attended other lectures such as those on Modern Political Institutions by W. Macmahon Ball and tutorials in Constitutional and Legal History conducted by Professor Kenneth Bailey but, according to Clark,

I suspect that what drew us so warmly to Professor Crawford on that blousy north wind Melbourne March morning was that here at long last was a man for whom history was the great passion of his life. Here before us was a man for whom the study of the past helped to make life both intelligible and bearable. Here was a man who conferred on history a lofty role, and treated it with a becoming high seriousness. So that first lecture was like the start of a great journey of discovery. It seems to me now that before the first ten minutes were over, we had been given that feeling of being taken up on to a high mountain, and promised that Clio would help us to see 'all the Kingdoms of the world'. (22)

Crawford's earlier interest in human behaviour and peoples' responses in certain situations was now evident in his teaching: "I remember especially the lectures on Gregory VII and Innocent III mainly because for the first time in my life these men were introduced not as characters in some comic strip, but as men who were wrestling with central problems in the human situation".23

To cater for the curriculum changes, Crawford also obtained revision of the staffing of the History department. In 1938 Kathleen Fitzpatrick (who had left Roberts's History department towards the end of 1929) joined Crawford's History staff as did Lewis Wilcher, Dean of Trinity College, but only on a part-time basis. Both Fitzpatrick and Wilcher were Oxford graduates. Norman Harper, a graduate of Melbourne and already part-time in 1937, became a full-time member of staff in 1939.

In May 1939 Crawford wrote to the Vice-Chancellor requesting that a full-time lecturer be employed in place of two current part-time appointments (the tutor Joseph Mulvany and the lecturer in the now defunct evening course "European History C", Orwell De Ruyter Foenander). This request reflected the importance that Crawford attached to research in his
department. According to Crawford,

Should my proposal be accepted, I should try to get as my new lecturer a person qualified in the technique and organisation of research, who might help to make this Department a lively centre of graduate historical research. If such a person were able to help me to edit the proposed Australian and New Zealand Historical Review, the production of this in Melbourne would contribute to the prestige of the University as a research centre. (24)

Crawford found a suitable candidate in Mr. Gwynydd Francis James who had been appointed to a part-time lectureship at the University of Sydney in 1938. James was a Fellow of St. Andrew's College, Sydney, and a member of the Institute of Historical Research, London. He had spoken on the study of history in Australia and related research difficulties at the Canberra Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science in 1939 - the same one at which Crawford gave the presidential address to Section E (History). According to Crawford in September 1939:

He is a very fine scholar with an extensive and minute bibliographical knowledge and experience in organising research, which would round up the qualifications of my staff... it is essentially because he is a scholar with important experience in the conduct of research that I want him here. (25)

James was appointed on Crawford's recommendation and in April 1940 Crawford was able to write to Professor F. Wood of the University of New Zealand:

With the appointment of James I have been able to fill in the main parts of my general scheme for the Honours School, the essential assumption of which is that the first necessity is a solid training in fields comparatively limited in time, with the small tutorial class as the main method of teaching. Research falls into its place as something to which the student may safely come only if he has had a good under-graduate training, that is why my first emphasis is upon building up the under-graduate school. (26)
By 1940 the staff of the History department comprised the following:

**Full-time Officers:**
- **Professor:** Max Crawford, B.A. (Syd. and Oxon), M.A. (Melb).
- **Senior Lecturer:** Jessie Webb, M.A. (Melb).
- **Lecturers:**
  - Kathleen Fitzpatrick, B.A. (Melb), M.A. (Oxon).
  - Gwynydd Francis James, MA. (Birm.).
- **University Research Fellow:** Brian Fitzpatrick, M.A. (Melb.).

**Part-time Officers:**
- **Lecturers:**
  - Orwell De Ruyter Foenander, LL.M. (Melb.).
  - Lewis Wilcher, B.A. (Adelaide and Oxon.), B. Litt. (Oxon.)

Crawford's overall aim and changes since his arrival were noted in the University's 1937-38 Annual Report: "The general object of the department is to build up a School of Research in Australian History. Since his appointment, Professor Crawford has been largely occupied in rearranging the course of study and staff". Examples of research work already undertaken were studies of the Economic History of Australia by Brian Fitzpatrick, John Franklin in Tasmania by Kathleen Fitzpatrick and The Study of History, a Synoptic View by Max Crawford who had also been working on an occupational analysis of convicts transported to Australia as well as "co-operating in the preparation of a book of documents upon 'Development of Australian Foreign Policy in Recent Years'". As well, the periodical Historical Studies, with James as editor, was launched in 1940 and was "meant to serve both the specialist student and the general reader of history". As well as general historical articles and book reviews, the journal contained articles on Australian archives and lists of accessions of manuscripts by Australian libraries because one of its aims was "to co-ordinate the activities and needs of research students with those of
librarians and archivists, but mainly because we believe that without such assistance in the serious investigation of fact, history which will meet the demands of mature minds cannot be written.\footnote{31}

By 1941 Crawford had extensively revised the History curriculum for both Pass and Honours students. Apart from that for Ancient History, the Pass courses offered were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>General Course Content</th>
<th>Special Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History A</td>
<td>Outline analysis of British History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History B</td>
<td>Great Britain, 1485 to 1689.</td>
<td>1603 to 1689.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History C</td>
<td>Political, social and economic history of Great Britain after 1689.</td>
<td>1815 to 1914.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern History</td>
<td>The growth of the Modern World.</td>
<td>19th and 20th Centuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparing the 1941 History curriculum for Pass students with that of Scott's final year at Melbourne, several points can be made. Firstly, the range of courses offered had been reduced from six to four and indeed to three for students wishing to major in History because British History A was only intended as a generalised 'background' course which could be used by non-History students to place their own studies in their historical context. The reason for this reduction in courses was, as Crawford put it, lack of "equipment".

My opinion at present ... is that the Department's policy in the provision of Pass Courses is more ambitious than its equipment will permit. Some economies have already been made - (Modern History replaces European History A and B, in order to avoid the alternation of subjects, and the taking of Australian History as part of British History D.) My future policy is, in the circumstances, likely to take the form of restricting efforts in this field in the interests of the staff. (33)
Secondly, Crawford responded to the requirements of other University departments\(^{34}\) and in so doing displayed his 'synopticism' by allowing others to use the study of History as a background to their own specialised studies and thereby illustrating the point that he made in 1939 that "political history could not be understood by reference only to political behaviour"\(^{35}\). In 1941 he did this through the course "British History A" which, as stated in the Arts Handbook,

is planned for students who do not intend to make History a main subject of study, and particularly for those who intend to study mainly Law or Political Science. The emphasis is not on institutions in themselves, but rather on the social context in relation to which the growth and modification of institutions may be understood. (36)

Geoffrey Serle, a graduate of 1946 and a lecturer in the department from 1951 to 1960, noted this 'synopticism' - "we were also a 'hub' department which reached out, as no other department attempted, towards other disciplines"\(^{37}\).

Thirdly, Australasian History had disappeared as a separate course from the curriculum! In 1938 Crawford had incorporated it as a component of British History D but in 1939 he had stated to the Vice-Chancellor:

I am anxious to begin, if possible, next year, a new course in Australian History. I suspended the former Australian History Course in 1937 when I was busy instituting new courses in Modern History A and B, and additional courses in General History I, II and III, and was not then able to afford time or staff for a course in Australian History. It is an anomaly for an Australian University to lack a course in Australian History; but this 'course will necessitate additional lectures per week' (2 day, 2 evening). (38)

In the 1941 Calendar notice was given that an Australasian History course would not be available until 1942 although in the latter year Crawford went to the U.S.S.R. as the First Secretary of the first Australian Legation to that country and did not return until February 1944. Following his return, a course in Australasian History was introduced in 1945.
Fourthly, Crawford maintained Scott's pedagogic concept of incorporating a special study within a general course for each of those courses designed for History students. He also retained the study of primary sources which was a major feature of Scott's pedagogy. He continued to use the Hakluyt Society's editions of original narratives of important voyages, travels and expeditions and in 1948 the Council of the Society appointed Crawford as its Australian representative. In British History B, prescribed text books in 1941 included Stephenson and Marcham, Sources of English Constitutional History, and Bland, Brown and Tawney, Select Documents in English Economic History, while Tanner's Constitutional Conflicts of the Seventeenth Century was "Recommended for reference". Stephenson and Marcham were "Recommended for reference" for British History C. Crawford also maintained Scott's practice of students referring to primary sources during examinations. In 1941 papers for both the Pass and Honours examinations in British History A, although a course of only a rather general 'background' nature, had the advice that "Bland, Brown and Tawney - English Economic History, Select Documents may be used in the examination." For British History B, examinees could use Stephenson and Marcham's Sources of English Constitutional History as well as Bland, Brown and Tawney's book - in each of these cases a compulsory question on primary sources formed part of the exam. In some examinations all questions were based on knowledge of primary source material and its context - for example, the first paper in British History for the Final Honours Examination in November 1941. Examination papers for Pass courses were not quite so rigorous as they did not have compulsory questions requiring knowledge of primary sources.

According to Crawford, although his curriculum was different to that devised by his predecessor, he built on the foundations established by Scott and in 1939 he wrote to Mr. Dyason,
You may well have realised at Canberra that Scott and I differ greatly in our approach to our subject. That has not prevented me from realising more and more in the last two years the value of his twenty-three years work here, particularly, the high standards of scholarship, of thoroughness of investigation, which he demanded of his students. I have altered the work here in all sorts of ways, but I have done so the more confidently because of the legacy, the foundation on which I could build in my own way. (42)

This was confirmed by Kathleen Fitzpatrick, a student of Scott in the early 1920's and a member of the University of Melbourne History staff from 1939: "Professor Crawford has always most generously acknowledged the legacy that Ernest Scott left him. He preserved what was worth preserving, made needed reforms and added his own contribution" 43.

Despite this dismantling of much of the curriculum which he had devised, Scott maintained a friendly relationship with Crawford who described it as being "compounded of the most immediate readiness to give help and advice when I have asked him, with the most scrupulous care to allow me every freedom to pull down and rebuild what he was so long and thorough in building" 44.

By 1941 Honours History courses were also quite different to those taught by Scott in 1936. Apart from those for Ancient History, the Honours courses offered were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History B</td>
<td>As for the Ordinary Degree i.e. Great Britain from 1485 to 1689, together with a more advanced treatment of the special period 1603 to 1689, including a detailed study of prescribed texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General History, Part I</td>
<td>The History of Europe (including Great Britain) and of European influence in the period of the Renaissance and Reformation. In addition to the study of Europe in this period, attention will be given to the impact of Europe on the New World and the East, and their influence on Europe; to further study in the more general setting of English religious and constitutional conflicts of the seventeenth century; and to the problems of theocracy and liberty in North America.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General History, Part II
The History of Europe (including Great Britain) and of European influence in the eighteenth century, with some view of the American Revolution in its relation with Europe, and a special study of the French Revolution.

General History, Part III
The economic, social and political history of Europe (including Great Britain) from 1815 to 1914.

In 1936 Scott's courses had comprised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Course</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British History B</td>
<td>In addition to the work prescribed for the Pass course: Early English Voyages of Discovery. The English Colonies to 1688. Early Colonial Policy. The Foundations of British India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British History D</td>
<td>In addition to the work prescribed for the Pass course: The British Colonies from 1688. The American Revolution. British India. The Dominions and Crown Colonies in the 19th and 20th Centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasian History</td>
<td>In addition to the work prescribed for the Pass course: A closer study of Imperial relations in respect to Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite their names being identical, the content of the two 'British History B' courses was quite different - Scott's course dealt with early English colonialism while Crawford's course emphasised Great Britain from 1603 to 1689. Scott's three other courses dealt with the impact of British and European imperialism on areas outside Europe (including Australasia) whereas Crawford's three "General History" courses emphasised the history of Europe from the Renaissance with some additional work on European
influence on areas outside Europe - unlike Scott's course, it was explicitly stated that reciprocal influence was also to be examined and there was no reference to Australasia.

In designing his curriculum, Crawford worked around three focal points - the Renaissance and Reformation, the French Revolution, and nineteenth century European imperialism and industrialization⁴⁷. This concept is reflected in the General History courses. The reason for him using this pedagogical technique of selecting certain focal points for study was outlined by Crawford in the 1985 publication, Making History:

> It seemed to me that the best way to get students to consider what I called fundamental questions - and sometimes, in my philosophical naivete, 'real questions' - was to take certain historical periods when things seemed to come to a head or to crisis, raising the issues more clearly. (48)

The difference in content emphasis between Scott's curriculum which included Australasian History and Crawford's curriculum which included the Renaissance and Reformation to some extent also reflected their experiences before being appointed to their professorships. Scott's primary source research and consequent publications which won him his position at the University of Melbourne were all in Australian history - Terre Napoleon (1910), Laperouse (1912) and The Life of Captain Matthew Flinders (1914), the latter being "in the press when he applied for the chair"⁴⁹. In contrast, Crawford had studied little Australian history but had been deeply impressed as a student by James Bruce's lectures on the Renaissance.

Although this difference in curriculum content is of some interest and revelation, the greatest and possibly most important change Crawford made to the Honours curriculum was the addition of a class, taken for one term in the student's Third (and final) Year, on Theory and Method of History. Crawford had begun these classes by 1938 and the whole concept was quite innovative. According to Crawford,
... we were concerned to discover those paths of historical thinking that might convince us of both their validity and their importance. But ... our approach to all this was simple enough. We read some texts, and discussed them, both histories and general commentaries — among them Acton's Inaugural Lecture, parts of Toynbee, some of Marx's historical work, together with chapters from Clarendon's *History of the Great Rebellion* and from H.A.L. Fisher's *History of Europe*. We looked at both their historical practice and at what they had to say about History in general.

I can do no more than give one illustration of our procedure. We read H.A.L. Fisher's chapter on 'The Great Rebellion in England' carefully, asking whether it succeeded in explaining the occurrence of the English Civil War. We agreed in finding his account inadequate, not only because of its unquestioning acceptance of a Whig interpretation which was at least open to argument, but still more because of what we commonly felt to be its too limited field of observation. If, for example, 'the gentlemen of the House of Commons had now', as he claimed, 'developed a strong and, indeed, passionate interest in many questions of public policy, and notably in religion, in foreign politics as a branch of religion, and in finance, as to which they found themselves placed in the strongest opposition to the Crown', why, we asked, had they developed this strong and passionate interest? We looked for a conflict of interests as well as of ideas and tried to identify the different groups of contestants and to discover what, beyond the particular flags they flew or the professions of principle they proclaimed, might contribute to explaining both their cohesion and their activity. It would not be correct to suppose that we simply substituted for Fisher's Whig interpretation a Marxist Class theory. We were interested in Marxist theories of class conflict as a subject vigorously debated; but such theories were not accepted as a new orthodoxy. It might be more simply put that we agreed on the whole in finding Fisher's explanations superficial and in supposing that any explanation of the great convulsion of the 17th Century would require analysis of some profound transformation of English society with roots reaching both further down and further back than Fisher allowed. (50)

These reflections on Fisher's chapter on "The Great Rebellion in England" illustrate Crawford's reaction to the Whig Interpretation of History and his espousal of a synoptic view of History which he explicitly stated in his presidential address to Section E (History) at the Canberra Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science in early 1939. Crawford began his address by critically examining the work
of the seventeenth century Earl of Clarendon whom he regarded as an archetypal Whig historian. Since his days as a student at Oxford in the late 1920's Crawford had been developing his Synoptic view of History in reaction to the Whig interpretation and now in 1939 he formally propounded his ideas (later published in booklet form). In regard to the writers of political history which had long been regarded as "History as such, History with a capital H," Crawford stated,

the political historian tends to neglect the complex matrix within which political action must take place, both the bearing of their setting on the way politically active people think and act, and the limitations of choice and effectiveness imposed by the material on which they work. This ... amounts to an uncritical assumption of completer freedom of will than in fact exists - uncritical in its neglect or understatement of the limits, both of conditioning and effectiveness, within which decisions are made.

Implicit in this last sentence is Crawford's interest in 'situation' and according to him in the early 1960's "For the central interest of that paper to me was still a pre-occupation with the response of individuals to the challenge of a situation in which they found themselves, a situation to which their own past actions might have contributed but which they had neither wholly made nor deliberately chosen".

In his 1939 paper, Crawford went on to develop the concept of "necessity and freedom" - the former applying to limitations on one's actions due to past events ("in the form of institutions and customary ways of doing things, in the whole air we breathe of traditions, assumptions and attitudes, and in the problems which we inherit") and the latter to one being able to choose between certain courses of action within these limitations. This conflict was the essence of Crawford's concept of 'situation'.

In continuing his criticism on traditional political history Crawford noted that proponents of the Materialist Conception of History not only attacked the Whig interpretation but also, coincidentally, reinforced the
Synoptic view - "the important point for my argument is the eagerness, particularly of Engels in his later letters, to stress the inter-relationship, even reciprocity, of various factors in change". Crawford himself respected but did not fully support the Materialist Conception of History which he regarded as "a hypothesis, not a scientific law" but which, nonetheless, was very useful to the historian. Crawford described his study and use of Marxist ideas as 'Erasmian' - he used them but left out the militancy.

Having examined other interpretations of History, Crawford was led "to a view of complex interaction, with no activity complete and independent in itself. And this interaction is the more complex, the totality of it the more confused and untidy, because of the dualism of necessity and freedom." Writing of his 1939 address, Crawford stated, "But its centre was, I think, this interest in necessity and freedom, which amounted to the belief that the historian's work was most fruitfully a perceptive charting of the situation with which his people had to cope." Crawford thereby stated what he perceived the historian's task to be.

This question of the task or role of the historian was of course one aspect of the curriculum for the Theory and Method of History classes at the University. Both his 1939 address and his Theory and Method classes revealed Crawford's interest in the philosophical aspects of historical study to which he alluded in the final paragraph of his address: "... this is a matter for the philosopher, and, although I have encroached on his mystery with more daring than experience, I am more immediately concerned with the province and the method of History. But this itself, and such is the essence of my argument, cannot be finally and persistently examined without such encroachment."

To facilitate discussion of the philosophical aspects of the study of History, Crawford invited George Paul, a lecturer in Philosophy at the
University of Melbourne, to lecture to the Theory and Method of History class. According to Crawford,

Before Paul's participation in our work, our enquiries had raised many questions of a logical and of a metaphysical nature which none of us had been able to pursue very far. The study of what we did and of what we might do better in our attempts to reconstruct the past now entered a much more professional stage as, under Paul's guidance, we subjected Collingwood to close examination and looked at Hume, John Stuart Mill, and at Carl Hempel's 'The Function of General Laws in History'. (61)

A.L. Burns was a student at Melbourne in the early and mid-1940's and has described the Melbourne History School at that time:

In the forties, Melbourne's History School was reputed to be rather Marxist. Certainly, a majority of students were on the Labor side of politics and a few were members of the Communist Party; nearly all of us approached the materialist interpretation of history with more respect than, for example, I would now accord it. Yet in almost every case our approaches moved through and then away from Marxism: Norman Harper on Imperialism was always, I think, massively critical; Kathleen Fitzpatrick on the French Revolution would call our attention, for example, to the Jacobins' exigencies under the rising cost of living, but never marshalled her revolutionary personages into the obsessive Marxist class divisions. Both she and Max left us with a humane, literary, essentially cultural outlook upon history. Reading again through notes I took in Max's lectures, especially several that I had remembered as particularly inspiring, I find perhaps less detailed information than I had expected, but many vivid expressions and, most notably, phrases that opened out deep if unexplored perspectives, not elaborating but suggesting unasked questions, questions which renewed themselves for me months and sometimes years later. A.C. Jackson remarked on one occasion that Max's lecturing method alternated an easy point, immediately accessible to anybody, with a quite difficult one that set the mind racing to catch it. Such a teaching style, together with an adventurous humility in face of the tragedy and the human comedy he was talking about, were probably what led so many of us to history as a vocation. The stape of the School curriculum, those subjects which even we who took our History mixed with some other School were bound to attempt, still seems to me a classic regimen: first year British History with the Tudors and Stuarts, and in my year Jessie Webb's Ancient History; second year Modern History and General History I (Renaissance and Reformation); third year General History II (Enlightenment and French Revolution) with Theory and
Method and a special subject, later elective. This Europe-centred curriculum was of course much broadened for those taking pure History, in a B.A. course then of three years only, yet even the staple was remarkably satisfying. One began working with first-hand evidence in the linguistically and culturally familiar Tudor and Stuart periods which are yet removed enough from our age to correct one's native parochialism of the present moment. The focus was narrow but deep, with none of the bittiness and pre-digestion apparently favoured elsewhere nowadays.

From 1941 to 1944 the History curriculum remained virtually unchanged - in 1942 a course in Australasian History was listed in the University Calendar but with the footnote, "Owing to war conditions, this subject will not be given in 1942". However with Crawford's return from the U.S.S.R. and also with the end of the war further changes occurred to the curriculum. As with the History curriculum at the University of Sydney, there was greater emphasis on American History no doubt due to the closer relations that developed between Australia and the United States since 1941 in the face of a common danger. The Pass course "British History C" remained "The political, social and economic history of Great Britain after 1689, with special regard to the period from 1815 to 1914" but from 1946 had the addendum "together with a study of the main lines of American development during the period". In 1948 a full course in American History was begun and described as "The social and economic history of the United States from the American Revolution, together with some consideration of American politics in the Pacific".

Also in 1948 a course in "Social History" was introduced and reflected the purpose of the study of History as a means to better understand the present:

This subject will provide a historical introduction to social problems and policies, particularly in English-speaking countries. It will be concerned with the development of social problems and of various policies intended to deal with them, with the process of embodying policy in legislation and administration, and with the effects of that process on the individual members of the community.
This course had been instituted for students in the Department of Social Studies and was not taken by History students except the few who combined History with the Diploma of Social Studies. It was conducted by a History graduate from Melbourne and designed by her. Indirectly it reflected Crawford's earlier reaction, now prevalent in his History School, against purely political history and his view that political decisions, in this case "the process of embodying policy in legislation and administration", should be examined in relation to their wider context. According to A.L. Burns, "... a return during the 1940's to minute political history (except for Australian history) would have seemed to revive the Whig interpretation from which we supposed we had just been unblinker.Ed Crawford's Synoptic approach is clearly seen in the 1948 description of the course "British History A" which was "An outline analysis of British History, with emphasis on the development of British political institutions in relation with their social context."

Courses on Australasian History were finally introduced towards the end of the war. The 1945 Pass course was "The European background of settlement. An analysis of social development in Australia and New Zealand. Their position in the modern world". The emphasis on its European context that had characterized the earlier teaching of Australian history was explicitly stated here but in 1948 the emphasis was put on Australia itself - "The foundation of Australia. The history of Australia from 1787-1939" although the beginning year for the course, 1787, still implied relating Australian history to British origins.

A course on Australasian History was also introduced into the Honours curriculum as "General History Part II" in 1945 and described thus:

The History of Australasia. This subject will follow the main lines of the Pass subject, Australasian History, in so far as it will consist of an examination of the European background of settlement, and an analysis of social development in Australia and New Zealand and of their position in the modern world. But in general students of
this subject will be required to do more advanced work and to do more documentary study, and in particular more attention will be given to the recent history of Australia's and New Zealand's external relations in the Pacific area. (71)

Note here the decreasing emphasis on Australia's European context as well as the continuing emphasis on "documentary study" which was so important in Professor Scott's curriculum. Despite Crawford's changes to Scott's curriculum, these twin themes of emphasising the study of Australian history per se and not as a mere adjunct to the study of European history as well as the study of primary sources can be traced through the curriculum of the University of Melbourne's School of History from the early years of Scott's professoriate.

A drift away from a European-centred curriculum was also evident in General History Part III which from 1944 was "A study of world movements in the 19th and 20th centuries"72 in contrast to that of 1942 which was "The economic, social and political history of Europe (including Great Britain) from 1815-1914"73. This was probably a reflection of the increasingly obvious roles of non-European countries as dominant forces in world affairs during World War II. This object of using History to better understand the present had been an explicit aim of Professor Roberts in his curriculum at the University of Sydney before the outbreak of the Second World War and now became increasingly obvious at Melbourne.

Despite this increasing 'practicality', Crawford maintained his strong concern for the 'theoretical' aspects of historical study. In 1945, for the first time, the format for the Theory and Method course was outlined in the Arts Faculty Handbook:

A weekly, round-table discussion between members of the staff and final year students throughout the Year. Subjects discussed fall into three main groups - techniques of historical study, assumptions and processes of historical explanations, various theories of history. (74)
This emphasis on theory also became evident in the 1948 Pass course on Modern History:

A historical study of the modern world. The purpose of this subject is not to convey a set amount of information about modern history, but rather to examine by historical methods certain major theories and interpretations that have been expounded concerning the development and present problems of the modern world. The lecture course will begin with a discussion of historical method as a means of understanding the present. This will be followed by a statement, illustrated from literary as well as from historical sources, of the main theories concerning the development of modern society, in order to make explicit those assumptions and pre-suppositions, entailed in the theories referred to, which may be tested by historical study. The bulk of the lectures will consist of historical studies in the field of modern history directed to the clarification and empirical testing of the theories examined. A co-ordinating theme will be the changes in the conditions and understanding of the problem of freedom, with particular attention to the question of individual freedom in planned societies. In the course of the lectures, some attempt will be made to illustrate the problems inherent in the concept of history as 'a science of human affairs' (Collingwood). (75)

Several of Crawford's Historical interests are shown in the description of this subject. Firstly, it is stated explicitly that the course would begin "with a discussion of historical methods as a means of understanding the present", a concept which Crawford himself had examined during the Great Depression of the early 1930's and during Spain's socio-political upheavals during that decade; the reference to "literary" sources also harks back to his Spanish studies for which he read modern Spanish literature so as to find out how foreign peoples thought "and by what values they appear to be moved". The reference to "the problem of freedom" harks back to his 1939 lecture The Study of History in which he discussed the concept of "necessity and freedom" - this is reinforced by the phrase "the question of individual freedom in planned societies" and is an example of his concept of situation. Another concept which Crawford intended examining in this course was that of "history as 'a science of human affairs'".
This concept of 'History as a science' was of major concern to Crawford in the mid-1940's and was, in fact, the title of a paper that he delivered to Section E of the A.N.Z.A.A.S. Conference in Adelaide in August 1946. In the second paragraph of his paper, Crawford stated:

Less than seven years ago, R.G. Collingwood, the Oxford historian and philosopher, claimed that the study of history was undergoing a revolution comparable to that which took place in the natural sciences in the time of Bacon and Galileo. He expounded his view in the following passage from his Autobiography:

... the chief business of seventeenth-century philosophy was to reckon with seventeenth-century natural science... The chief business of twentieth-century philosophy is to reckon with twentieth-century history. Until the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, historical studies had been in a condition analogous to that of natural science before Galileo. In Galileo's time something happened to natural science (only a very ignorant or a very learned man would undertake to say briefly what it was) which suddenly and enormously increased the velocity of its progress and the width of its outlook. About the end of the nineteenth century something of the same kind was happening, more gradually and less spectacularly perhaps, but not less certainly, to history. (77)

Crawford explicitly agreed with this concept of historical methodology tending to be more scientific by stating,

... we will agree that there have been great changes in historical studies during the last hundred years. In this audience I may assume a knowledge of their general character, and I shall be content to state my belief that they have been in the direction of making historical studies more scientific. This is not a claim that historical study has become a science, but that on the whole its development has been in that direction. (78)

In attempting to define what warranted the use of the term 'scientific', Crawford stated,

It is the consistency in the behaviour of the subject-matter of your study, whether it is atoms or human beings in their social relations, that matters for scientific description; and not, given the inconceivably large number of permutations and combinations of causes, the exact repetition of events. This uniformity of nature cannot be proved a priori; it is simply a description of experience or an assumption that we make in order to be able to make any progress at all in systematic study of human behaviour. (79)
Crawford's concept of History as a science was different to that held by Scott, his predecessor in the Melbourne Chair, and Roberts, his counterpart at Sydney. Both Scott and his protege, Roberts, perceived History as a science in terms of the empiricist method i.e. the discovery (through the study of primary sources) and interpretation of 'facts' as two distinct and consecutive processes. The 'scientific' historian conducted this method in an impartial manner so as to ascertain the 'truth' concerning a given situation. While Crawford would not have disapproved of Scott's and Roberts's methodological practices, he saw 'scientific' history as more than just an exercise in empiricism. What Crawford was trying to do was to show that the nature of the explanation of phenomena in both history and natural science was similar i.e. the determination of regularities or patterns in the behaviour of the protagonists. Crawford thereby added an inductivist element to Scott's and Roberts's basic empiricism.

However by the end of the decade Crawford had repudiated this concept of History as a science as can be deduced from part of his description of the 1948 Modern History course - "to illustrate the problems inherent in the concept of history as 'a science of human affairs' (Collingwood)". In reference to his 1946 address, in 1962 he wrote,

Nevertheless, it served its purpose. It set going a debate which was to continue for some years and which was marked by the appearance of a series of articles, particularly in Australia and America, which have thrown much light on the nature of historical thinking. And while I would no longer suggest that historians should spend time in trying to formulate and test the statements of law or the generalizations which their explanations so often assume, I still believe that it was reasonable to argue that neither epigram nor metaphor is a satisfactory substitute for serious explanation. Further, I still believe that even those historians who most talk of the uniqueness of historical events do not, and cannot, avoid thinking of classes or kinds of events, and do commonly offer explanations which presuppose regularities in human behaviour.

The purpose of the paper was to point to the inadequacy of forms of explanation often used by historians and to
suggest that explanations in history bore an important similarity to explanations in natural science. (80)

The theme in the 1948 Pass Modern History course of "the changes in the conditions and understanding of the problem of freedom" was again found in the 1948 Honours General History Part I course which also showed Crawford's continuing interest, dating from the mid-1920's, in the Renaissance period:

A study of European civilization in the period of the Renaissance and Reformation... A selection of topics for close study will be made each year from the following or similar topics: The Renaissance State - city state and nation state; Machiavelli and the political thought of the Sixteenth Century; Humanism; Renaissance art; the beginning of European Capitalism; social revolt from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries; the Christian Humanists; the Protestant Revolt; the Catholic Reformation; the Scientific Movement from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries; overseas expansion; international relations and international law. Throughout, attention will be given to the problem of liberty as it was posed and understood in that age. (81)

During the post-war period, also, a simplification and formalisation in the presentation of the format of the Honours curriculum occurred in contrast to its experimental nature in Crawford's initial period as professor. In the 1946 Calendar, having listed the subjects for study, he listed the order in which they were to be taken:

**First Year:**
(a) British History B (Hon.).
(b) Ancient History, Part I (Hon.).
(c) Language other than English (Pass).

**Second Year:**
(a) General History, Part I.
(b) Ancient History, Part II, or General History, Part II.
(c) One of: Political Philosophy, Logic, History of Philosophy, Political Institutions B, Legal History, Economic History, Part I, International Relations.

**Third Year:**
General History, Part II or Part III
Theory and Method of History,
Special Historical Study. (82)
This format reflected his 1936 Sydney proposal to have a nucleus of historical subjects with a wide range of other subjects between which a student could choose "to follow his individual bent towards an economic, social, philosophical, or literary emphasis in his historical study"\(^83\). The inclusion of a foreign language was a Faculty requirement.

By 1950 Crawford had put into effect the ideas on the study and teaching of History that he had been developing up to 1937 during his experiences at Sydney and Oxford. The general content of his curriculum did not differ a great deal from that of Scott in that both offered courses dealing with European and Australian history although Crawford did emphasise different periods and later offered a separate course on American history after World War II. In 1950 Crawford's History School continued to stress the use of primary sources in examinations with Stephenson and Marcham's *Sources of English Constitutional History* and Bland, Brown and Tawney's *Select Documents in English Economic History* continuing to be recommended for British History examinations. Knowledge of primary sources was also applicable in examinations for courses introduced into the curriculum from 1945 - for American History, Birley's *Speeches and Documents in American History* could be used while the advice for Australasian History was that "C.M.H. Clark, *Select Documents in Australian History*, may be used in the examination room". For Final Honours Examinations such as those in British History, General History, and Theory and Method of History, Scott's old dictum "Books and memoranda may be used" still applied\(^84\).

Where Scott and Crawford did differ greatly was in their views on the nature of Historical methodology and pedagogy. Crawford emphasised the synoptic nature of History as well as its literary and scientific aspects - these not only helped Crawford to shape the History curriculum but were
also a source of enquiry and discussion within it. This theoretical aspect of Crawford's curriculum, found initially in Honours and then in Pass courses, was a major innovation which Scott, with his opinion of "the whole concept of a philosophy of history as 'wubbish'"\textsuperscript{85}, would most probably never have introduced.

Crawford's second major innovation was the tutorial system (with about ten students per tutorial) which gave students practice in discussion and expressing themselves. The History School at the University of Melbourne followed strongly in the Oxford tradition both in its emphases on the moral aspects of History and the tutorial system. Melbourne graduates who won travelling scholarships mostly went to Oxford and very largely to Balliol College. Crawford's recommendation was always accepted by Balliol and mostly by other Oxford colleges\textsuperscript{86}. According to Crawford, Oxford was the mecca for Melbourne graduates - although an attempt was made in the early 1950's to cultivate a connection with Cambridge, the latter did not appear to encourage it but rather neglected post-graduate teaching\textsuperscript{87}.

In the first half of the twentieth century at Sydney and Melbourne Universities a professor had absolute power within his department. At Sydney, Wood was the sole member of his department until 1916 when James Bruce joined him, and in 1929 the second Challis Professor, Roberts, was explicitly given total control\textsuperscript{88}. At Melbourne, there were only three full-time members of the History department by 1936 - Professor Scott, a Senior Lecturer and a Tutor. While the Senior Lecturer, Jessie Webb, had virtual autonomy in her field i.e. Ancient History, the ultimate authority lay with the Professor who however lectured in Medieval and Modern History. In Crawford's first year, 1937, an extra tutor was added to the full-time staff and as there were also three part-time lecturers this made a total staff of seven. Crawford's control of the department is reflected in a "Memorandum on Examinations" of about 1939:
(a) The setting of papers.

All examination papers in the various History subjects are set in the first place by the lecturer in the particular subject. If there are two lecturers in one subject they set the papers in consultation. All question papers except those in Ancient History are approved by me before being sent to the printer. In Ancient History they are set by the Senior Lecturer, Miss Webb, in consultation with Mr. Harper who assists in the Ancient History work, and go immediately to the printer without reference to me.

(b) Examining.

In all History subjects there are at least two separate papers. Each is marked by a different examiner, and in some cases, different parts of the same paper are examined by two examiners. If the examiners agree in decisively passing or failing a candidate, his papers are not reconsidered. Papers concerning which examiners are doubtful or in which the results are in conflict are referred to me ... (89)

In 1938 Lewis Wilcher and Kathleen Fitzpatrick (nee Pitt) were added to the staff. Both were graduates of Oxford, Crawford's Alma Mater, and it could reasonably be assumed that both held much the same historiographical and pedagogical stance as Crawford. By 1950 the total staff of the History department had grown to twenty-two although the majority of these were now graduates of Melbourne. While Crawford was head of the department he did not rule 'from above' but believed in decision-making by consensus (although not by vote). He introduced staff meetings and while the overall programme of study was shaped by Crawford himself, the actual implementation of this was left to the lecturer in his/her respective course. According to Kathleen Fitzpatrick,

Much of the success achieved resulted from his skill in selecting staff and the freedom he gave them to be creative. Naturally one discussed any major changes in content or method in a given subject with him but he was a man for persuasion and consensus rather than giving orders. The temper of the department was democratic and a staff meeting, presided over by Prof. C., was held every week and full and frank discussion, in which even the humblest tutor was a welcome participant, was the order of the day. (91)

However Crawford was the guiding figure into the early 1950's and the
History department, according to Geoffrey Serle writing of this period, "was small enough to be homogeneous and in a very real sense personally led" 92.

In the early and mid-1950's one of the main emphases in Crawford's teaching was the concept that the task of the historian was to examine one's own prejudices and pre-suppositions as well as the evidence available. Rebecca West's account in the New Yorker of the Greenville lynching trial reinforced Crawford's ideas at the time because she made the contrast between the prosecution lawyer who described in simple and clear terms what happened whereas the defence lawyer "muddied the waters" so as to cast doubt on his clients' guilt. According to Crawford, historians should follow the example of the former by giving a balanced account of what happened in a certain situation without unnecessary explanation. In this way the causes and effects of events should become obvious 93.

A study of the aims, content, methodology and assessment within a curriculum can show the formal aspects of the curriculum but cannot reflect its efficiency in terms of values, attitudes and the degree of enthusiasm for historical study engendered by that curriculum. Crawford hoped that the value of honesty might be inculcated "by way of habits of accuracy. Correctness about detailed facts; accuracy in statements of points of view; accuracy in inference from facts" 94. However he did not attempt to impose a whole set of values on his students but hoped nonetheless that they themselves would refine their own values. According to Crawford, "The question arises: Should we trust to attempted objectivity in treatment of human experience to achieve the effect of improving values? Or, decide what values we want to inculcate and make our teaching serve that purpose? Given lack of final agreement of values, I prefer the former" 95.

There seems little doubt from opinions expressed by his students in various publications etc. that Crawford engendered an enthusiasm for the
study of History in many students and that he made a profound impression on them. According to Geoffrey Serle in 1970, "His impact on a University which had few teachers deeply involved in current controversy is still remembered with excitement by the students of those days" while according to Manning Clark, "I suspect that Professor Crawford became a great teacher precisely because he was still searching for the answers".

Crawford remained Professor of History throughout the 1950's and 1960's although control of the department became more diffuse with the creation of other History Chairs such as the Ernest Scott Chair of History in 1956. From a peak of about 1500 enrolments in the immediate post-war years (taking one student enrolled for a full year's course as the unit), there was a decline in the 1950's in line with overall university enrolments. Then in the late 1950's and into the 1960's the department doubled in size. However Crawford continued to be of immense influence.

The Melbourne History School as a whole continued to be innovative during this period. In 1957 a new "Modern History" course replaced the former one. However the content of this new course, "A study of the main trends of European history from the French Revolution to 1939" was the same in time span as that of the "European History" course introduced by Roberts at Sydney in 1946 - both courses reflected the increasing emphasis on providing background (illuminating) material to current affairs. In 1960 a course entitled "Far Eastern History" was introduced and had as its content:

The history of China and Japan, mainly in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. China will be studied more closely. After some introductory study of their history and social structure before the nineteenth century, the main theme of the course will be the changing relationship between these two countries and Western powers, and their differing responses to the pressure of Western influences.

This course reflected a shift in perspective from that of previous courses on European contact with Asia in that it examined this contact from the Asian
rather than the European perspective. Crawford had had such a course in mind since 1937. 

In 1970 Serle wrote of Crawford's History School, "His School continued through the 1950's and 1960's to set the standards for the professional training of historians." This emphasis on the "professional training of historians" can be seen as a result of the process of 'professionalization' of the study, writing and teaching of History which had begun in the nineteenth century. It had the effect of the Melbourne History School 'colonizing' elsewhere. Examples of graduates who taught History at other universities were Manning Clark and Barry Smith at the A.N.U., Legge at Monash, Crowley at New South Wales, J.S. Gregory at La Trobe, Robin Moore and Paul Bourke at Flinders, Michael Roe at Tasmania, John O. Ward at Sydney (not to be confused with Professor John M. Ward, a Sydney graduate), and Bill and Dale Kent at Monash and Latrobe universities respectively. The last two graduates have been described as "two of the leading world scholars on Renaissance Florence" - a reflection of Crawford's immense interest and expertise in Renaissance history. "Through this old-boy network the influence of the Melbourne University department of History has undoubtedly made a major contribution to the study of History throughout Australia. 

However only a minority of graduates (then as now) received academic appointments. Hence Crawford's broader aims such as accurate analysis of issues and events, an understanding of the present through a study of the past, and clear communication of one's opinions have had an impact, through graduates of his School, on the community at large. Crawford himself retired as Professor of History in 1970 thus bringing to a close an important phase in both his study of History and the study of History in Australia.
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The four professors under consideration - Wood, Roberts, Scott and Crawford - have been divided neatly by authors as belonging to either the Sydney or Melbourne School of History. This has been most pronounced in the case of Scott and Crawford who have been portrayed as belonging to the one School thereby implying a distinctive historiographical and pedagogical tradition within the History department of the University of Melbourne. However to simply label History departments mainly on the basis of their geographical location is to overlook more subtle differences and similarities both between and within departments over time.

In 1855, when Melbourne University lectures began (in temporary accommodation in William Street), the subject of Modern History was included with English Literature, Political Economy and Logic in the one department under Professor William Hearn. The teaching of Ancient History was a subordinate part of the Classics curriculum and in the care of the Professor of Classics until 1857 when Hearn took charge of it. At the University of Sydney, Modern History was not taught at first and in fact the Act which established the University forbade the University, when History would be introduced, "from requiring any student to study modern history, metaphysics or ethics". According to Professor P.H. Partridge this was because these subjects could be used for social, especially religious, criticism. As in the University of Melbourne from 1855 to 1856, Ancient History was taught as a subordinate part of the Classics curriculum. In 1891 with the creation of a Challis Chair of History at the University of Sydney, the teaching of Modern History commenced and was put on an independent
footing - this independence did not occur at Melbourne until 1914 when Ernest Scott took up his duties as Professor of History. Thus despite a late start in the teaching of History as a separate subject, the University of Sydney was the first of the two universities to establish an independent History department.

The absence of the teaching of History at the University of Sydney for almost the first four decades of its existence was noted by the Vice-Chancellor, Mr. H.C. Russell, in his address of welcome to G. Arnold Wood in 1891. In the course of this address, Russell stated,

It is a difficult task to found a School of History in a country like ours, so much engrossed in the present, and where the study of history has so long been neglected; but we are perfectly assured that Professor Wood will succeed in establishing the school and making us wonder that we rested so long contented without one. (3)

In 1966 Kathleen Fitzpatrick said of Ernest Scott, "He was the effective founder of the Melbourne School of History"4.

These references to a "School of History" beg the question as to what constitutes this concept of a 'School' and how does one differentiate one 'School of History' from another? In a narrow sense, a 'School' can simply refer to a History department within a university. However this definition is not entirely satisfactory in this context as the nature of the History School under Roberts in 1946 was different in many ways from that of Wood in 1891 or 1910. The same can be said of the Melbourne History School under Crawford in 1950 and that of Scott in 1914 or upon Scott's retirement in 1936.

What other connotations are therefore implied by the use of the term, "School of History"? An initial method in discerning what constitutes a School and in differentiating one School from another would be to ascertain both the aims and ideology of each School. These two elements in turn lead
to what was perceived in the School as 'legitimate knowledge' i.e. the content of the curriculum. How this content was taught i.e. pedagogical technique, is a fourth element that can be examined. The methods of assessment of students is a fifth element through the study of which different Schools can be discerned. Thus by comparing and contrasting such elements as the aims, ideology, curriculum content, pedagogy and assessment found in various Schools one can discern what differentiates one School from another and to what extent continuity (or tradition) has existed within a particular 'School'.

The aims of each of Professors Wood, Roberts, Scott and Crawford in their university curricula were quite definite. Wood hoped to make his students into good citizens. In his 1891 Inaugural Lecture, Wood stated of History,

> Its special value, perhaps, is that it has sympathies with every subject and studies man from every side. But by the side of the other studies history, I think, may fairly claim a place, as helping man to be all that he is capable of being, to do all that he is capable of doing; as helping him to think more clearly, to feel more strongly and more rightly, to act more wisely; as helping him to be a better man and a better citizen of a great country. (5)

The main emphasis of Wood's successor, Stephen Roberts, in his curricula for both his Pass and Honours students was to enable them to have a better understanding of contemporary world affairs by placing these in historical perspective. Roberts also attempted to train his Honours students in the skills of 'professional' or 'scientific' historians by having them write theses based on primary source research. Thus at the University of Sydney, the broad aims of the undergraduate History curricula formulated by the first two Challis Professors of History were quite distinct.

At the University of Melbourne there was also a dissimilarity of aims between Professors Scott and Crawford. Unlike Wood and Crawford who saw moral implications in the study of History, Scott saw his task as giving
students practice in impartially analysing primary sources and exercising judgement in examining evidence, especially conflicting evidence. This skill in analysing issues and evidence was primarily aimed at 'elevating' the study of History to a 'scientific' plane although it would also have had an implicit social, but not necessarily moral, function.

Compared to the aims of his predecessor, those of Crawford were relatively broad. Crawford sought to virtually encompass the aims of his predecessors and contemporaries in his own university curriculum. He added his own particular aims as well. Like Wood, Crawford saw a moral aim in the teaching of History although unlike Wood who sought to inculcate his own value-system in his students, Crawford sought an improvement in students' own values through the study of past historical situations. Like Roberts, Crawford saw the study of History as a means of students gaining an understanding of contemporary world affairs. Like Roberts and Scott, Crawford aimed to develop in his students the ability to analyse original evidence and related issues and events. However Crawford went further and actively sought to enable all students (both Pass and Honours) to express themselves orally in a fluent and coherent manner and to further 'professionalise' the study of History by analysing the theoretical aspects of its methodology. While the aims of Wood, Roberts and Scott were therefore reasonably discrete, those of Crawford were eclectic.

To some extent the aims of these four professors reflected personal values and attitudes. Wood had been reared in an environment permeated with the ideals of English Liberalism and Nonconformism. It was the moral values of this environment that he sought to impress on his students. But there was more to Wood's ideological stance than this. He was a product of nineteenth century England and saw English civilization as being synonymous with social and political improvement in general and the development of
freedom in particular. He adhered to the distinctively Whig concept of English history being this story of progress. It was mostly from within this ambit that he drew his historical personalities to be 'studied because they exemplified his cherished ideals. The examination questions that he set on the theme of liberty, sometimes with Whig overtones, and the character of personalities reflected the ideological basis of his curriculum.

On the other hand, both Scott and Roberts sought to free themselves from ideology in their study and teaching of History. Both stressed the importance of impartiality which Wood, in his 1891 Inaugural Lecture, had stated was impracticable. Unlike Wood, Scott did not consciously seek to inculcate moral values in his students and, in fact, was quite unappreciative of religious belief and the concept of ideals motivating human behaviour. Nonetheless his view of History was ideologically based (if unconsciously so) in that he was a proponent of the Whig interpretation of History - his account of Australian political development as outlined in his *Short History of Australia* testifies to this. While reflected in historical methodology, the Whig interpretation of History was ideologically derived. The Whig concept of progress and development was inherent in both Scott's book and his university curricula. The use of the year, 1688, as a watershed year also reflected the Whig basis of his curriculum.

Roberts's 'first' curriculum, i.e. that of 1930/32, being a virtual copy of that of Scott from the period from 1919 to 1924 at Melbourne was also ideologically Whig although, like his mentor, Roberts, espoused objectivity in the study and teaching of History. His 'second' curriculum, i.e. that of 1939/41, while expanding the content covered, retained much of the basic nature of his original curriculum, especially in the Pass courses. Roberts's attempt at objectivity, his reluctance to inculcate a specific set of values or point of view in his students and his acceptance of the still widely-held
Whig orthodoxy are perhaps the reasons for Gollan labelling Roberts's History School as "dull". Of Roberts's History School, Emeritus Professor Gordon Greenwood has written, "His Honours school was certainly the opposite of dull and I would think that Gollan's statement in recollection is based more on the fact that it was not an ideological department".

Ideologically, Crawford had more in common with his Sydney teachers than with his Melbourne predecessor. Like Wood, Crawford had been reared in a Nonconformist family (although in an Australian context) and attended Oxford University. Both professors saw the study of History as having a moral aspect and both emphasised the concept of liberty in their curricula although Wood sought to expound liberal ideas while Crawford examined the nature of liberty in changing historical circumstances. This latter use of the concept of liberty had also been incorporated by James Bruce in his course on the Renaissance which Crawford had attended in 1926. The narrow Whig use of the concept of liberty as an integral part of political development in British and Australian history was rejected by Crawford. In its stead he used his Synoptic view of History which included study of the complex social matrix in which political action occurred. Thus, ideologically, there was a Wood/Bruce-Crawford nexus with the concept of liberty and a moral purpose being the common themes although there was a divergence regarding Whig outlook. Similarly, there was a Scott-Roberts nexus with impartial analysis of issues and events being the common theme although Roberts increasingly rid himself of Scott's Whig outlook.

While all four professors differed ideologically to some degree, they all approached the teaching of History from an ethnocentric standpoint - at least in the initial phase of their professorships. As a consequence of his aim and ideology, Wood chose historical topics from which lessons could be learnt for the present. His curriculum content centred on British (especially
English) and European history from Medieval times and the protagonists therein. His emphasis on English history was reflected in his having a course on English history every year for "Course I" of his curriculum from 1911 to 1928. As well, he taught British and European colonial history especially applying this to America and Australia.

Wood's successor, Stephen Roberts, similarly taught courses based on British and European domestic and colonial history. Even when Roberts included Pacific and American history in the curriculum he included them in British and European courses respectively. Thus at Sydney there was a continuity of ethnocentricity from the British and European standpoints during the professorships of both Wood and Roberts. However Roberts differed from Wood in the time-span of his curriculum. On the one hand, it was more extensive in that it encompassed Ancient History and yet, on the other hand, there was a greater emphasis in the modern history courses on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This was a result of Roberts's perceiving one aim of the study of history as the 'illumination' of the present and greater understanding of current affairs.

In contrast, at Melbourne there was a tendency to establish courses which were freed from this British and European dominance. In 1927 Scott first taught his course on Australasian History. While Roberts at Sydney initially copied parts of Scott's curriculum, he did not implement such an independent Australasian history course as he relied on Scott's pre-1927 curriculum which was still purely in the British-European mould.

Crawford continued Scott's initiative by introducing an independent course on American history in 1948. Crawford also broadened the scope of Scott's curriculum. In his British, European and Australian history courses Scott had emphasised political, constitutional and imperial history which was typical of Whig historiography. In his reaction against this narrowness,
Crawford introduced courses on social history and expanded primarily political courses by giving greater treatment to their social context. He also introduced the novel "Theory and Method of History" course for Honours students by 1938. Despite these changes Crawford's curriculum still had a majority of courses on British and European history and in this respect had a common element with the curricula of the other three professors. All four professors included a study of Stuart Britain in their curricula. A major reason for this common emphasis on British and European history was probably that the most readily available and possibly the best published sources were in that field.

There were also similarities in the pedagogical techniques of the four professors. All used primary sources to some degree. Early in his professorship, Wood used Stubbs's Select Charters and throughout his English history courses e.g. Course I, he used selections of primary sources such as English History from Original Sources and English History Source Books. Scott used primary sources throughout his curricula for both Pass and Honours students but Roberts, his protege, only emphasised the study of primary sources for his Honours students. In contrast to Wood who used published collections of primary sources as Stubbs had done, Roberts urged his Honours students to research the original documents themselves, hence his emphasis on Australian and Pacific history for the thesis in his History IV curriculum. Crawford continued Wood's and Scott's emphasis on the study of primary sources and continued their practice of using published collections of primary sources for both Pass and Honours students.

The importance attached to the study of primary sources by these professors was reflected in the examination papers that they set. Wood and Crawford sometimes set examination papers in which it was compulsory to answer questions based on knowledge of primary sources. Scott permitted
the use of primary sources in his examinations and stressed them in his setting of essays during the year. Roberts does not appear to have put such a stress on the use of primary sources in his examinations but rather stressed the Honours student's ability to use primary sources in the writing of the research thesis. Thus Wood, Scott and Crawford relied mainly on published collections of primary sources for their undergraduate curricula while Roberts emphasised original research by his Honours students. This use of primary sources reflected the impact of German historiographical methodology on Australian pedagogy in the twentieth century.

In 1937 Crawford hoped to accompany the Final Honours Examination with an oral examination. To do this effectively, he maintained that much tutorial work had to be done. This use of tutorials or seminars was a second aspect common, to some degree, to the pedagogical techniques of these four professors. For their Honours students both Wood and Scott held one-to-one meetings in which the student read his essay to the professor for comment and discussion in the manner of an English university tutorial. As well, Scott appears to have held tutorials (or more correctly, 'seminars') for groups of students. However Roberts restricted the use of seminars to his Honours students. Crawford was the only one to use seminars (or 'tutorials' as he called them) on a widespread and permanent basis for both his Pass and Honours students.

Thus Wood and Scott adopted the Oxford concept of a one-to-one discussion for their Honours students while Roberts and Crawford used the German seminar method of groups of students. This catering for groups of students in seminars rather than individual tuition was probably also a reflection of the increased student numbers encountered by Roberts and Crawford in contrast to those encountered by Wood and Scott. As well Crawford may have been able to do this for all students and not just the
Honours students simply because of the practical reason that his department had more members of staff than did that of Roberts. Crawford probably referred to these seminars as 'tutorials' because of his contact with tutorials and their discursive methodology during his time at Oxford and secondly because of the teacher-pupil relationship inherent in discussions between undergraduates and their professor (or lecturer etc.). Thus both English and German pedagogy had an impact on pedagogy in Australian universities in the first half of the twentieth century.

However while both Roberts and Crawford held seminars/tutorials, their relationship with their students appears to have been quite contrasting. Crawford engendered a rapport with his students while Roberts appears to have been perceived as rather distant and clinical. According to Professor John M. Ward who was taught by both Crawford and Roberts at Sydney in the mid-1930's, Crawford possessed and displayed "intellectual and moral excitement that Roberts never felt". Crawford was mainly concerned with ideas and ideologies whereas the emphasis of Roberts's curriculum was on realities and the dynamics of power.

The adoption by all four professors of the study of primary sources and discussion by students was an attempt by them to give students practice in critical analysis of primary sources which would encourage the weighing of evidence, clear and logical thinking, the making of judgements and the writing up of these into coherent reports. The impartial empiricism indicative of German historical methodology was wholeheartedly accepted by Scott and Roberts but treated with scepticism by Wood who recognised the importance of establishing 'facts' in historical study but who treated with contempt the concept of impartial analysis of them. Both Wood and Crawford saw the study of History as being more than just an attempt to ascertain the truth by a supposedly impartial empiricist methodology.
The English Liberal tradition was reflected directly in Wood's curriculum and indirectly in Crawford's analysis of liberty per se in changing historical circumstances. Wood's synthesis of English Liberal and German Scientific historiographical traditions was noted by the University's Professorial Board upon his death in 1928:

As first occupant of the Chair of History, Professor Wood established the School of History here upon lines which combined the accurate and critical study of documents with a truly human and sympathetic interpretation of the records of the past, in a way that made his lectures and teaching in the highest degree contributory to training for enlightened and liberal citizenship. (8)

Both Wood and Crawford also stressed the Literary tradition in historical methodology and regarded the writing of History as a form of literature.

Thus it is invalid to simplistically state that there is a Sydney School of History and a Melbourne School of History. It is also incorrect, as some authors have done, to simply dismiss Roberts's History School as "dull" and of little consequence. All four professors have in their own way contributed to the development of historiography in Australia but the nature of the contribution of each should be clearly seen in relation to its context and British and European antecedents.

It is more correct to identify a particular professor's School of History. The curricula of all the professors under consideration here had certain elements in common while each had elements which set them apart. Scott, his protege Roberts, and his successor Crawford all at various times used the pedagogical concept of a curriculum covering reasonably long time-spans but including a special-study for more intensive treatment. The concept of the professional historian analysing original documents and publishing the results of one's research was also common to both Sydney and Melbourne universities. Both Roberts and Crawford included classes in historical methodology in their curricula (although each had a different emphasis) in
contrast to each of their predecessors who had no such courses.

At the University of Sydney there was a distinct break in continuity of aim, ideology and curriculum content when Roberts succeeded Wood as professor. There were also changed emphases in pedagogy and assessment although the British and European ethnocentricity remained. The teaching of History at the University of Melbourne showed more elements of continuity. Crawford himself and others have stated that he dismantled some of Scott's curriculum but built on the foundations of what remained. The importance of primary sources in examinations and the introduction of non-British and European based courses are prime examples of continuity.

However Crawford expanded the aims and changed the content emphasis and pedagogy of Scott's curriculum from 1937. Ideologically Crawford and Scott were as different as Roberts and Wood. In 1941 Crawford himself recognised this break in continuity from Scott's History School when he wrote,

*I should add, here, that during the first two years of Mrs. Fitzpatrick's appointment as Lecturer in History, Miss Webb's work was interrupted by illness, and Mrs. Fitzpatrick, then the one full-time lecturer, carried an exceptionally heavy share of the work of deciding and carrying out the policy of the new school of History. (9)*

Note here the use of the adjective "new" implying a break with the past. The concept of a Melbourne History School is more a result of rhetoric by members of that School than of the substance. What makes the concept appear 'real' is a result of the apparent earnestness, of its supporters. No attempt has been made at the University of Sydney to emulate Melbourne's example - possibly because it is realized that such a concept is not applicable to the History department under Wood and Roberts viewed as one continuum.

Thus the concept of a distinctive School of History continuous in nature
at either of the universities of Sydney and Melbourne is invalid except in the very narrow sense of a surviving History department. What is discernible is the extent to which British and German historiographical and pedagogical traditions have been implemented, synthesised, rejected or further developed in an Australian context. The History curricula at Sydney and Melbourne universities from 1910 to 1950 varied in nature depending upon the aims, ideology and historiographical background of the professor in charge of the department and as a result of the needs of the students as perceived by that professor.
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