

The Warrigal Creek Massacre - a Reply to Wayne Caldw

P.D. Gardner



The Author at Warrigal Creek 2016. Still from the Warrigal Creek Documentary produced by Swinburne University

Introduction

On 30 December 2020 Quadrant published an article entitled “The Warrigal Creek Massacre: True Story or Apocryphal?” by Wayne Caldw¹, which was a general attack on my work and in particular on the Warrigal Creek massacre. I suppose one should feel pleased that this attack adorns the Quadrant pages – a journal that promoted the discredited Windschuttle thesis and lambasted the ‘black armband historians’, a group of which I have been described as a minor member. Apparently Keith Windschuttle is the editor of Quadrant which explains a lot. Coincidentally the same month the Victorian Historical Journal published my essay on Bruce Pascoe’s use of the McMillan photo in *Dark Emu*. One is left to wonder which journal has the political agenda and which essay has gone through the editorial review process.

This is not the first time Caldw has attacked my work. In a letter to Gippsland Times (24.6.20) he described the ‘Gippslander’s’ 1925 Gap article as “anonymous, unattributed and generic” to which I later replied that this was ‘all untrue’ and that the details ‘Gippslander’ provided ‘were quite specific and by no measure can be classified as ‘generic’.²

The illustration at the head of the Caldw article is the photo of McMillan between two Aborigines taken from the centenary commemorative brochure, including the original caption, with the implication that McMillan was always a friend of the Kurnai. As noted

above the story behind the photo is far more complicated than that and that Caldwell's piece and mine coincidentally appeared at the same time.³

Caldow selectively quotes from my work on numerous occasions and in his polemic 'cherry picks' what suits his argument and ignores any contrary statements I have made. This is difficult to respond to, as with a career of writing spanning nearly 50 years, my views on some matters have changed considerably over time with the discovery of new evidence. An example of this is originally I discounted the idea that Red Hill was connected with Warrigal Creek to later accepting that it was probably a repository for the bones of the massacre. I admit freely to using provocative titles and indulging in occasional hyperbole such as in "outrageous and brutal occurrences" used in the opening quote by Caldwell. Perhaps not that much different from the newspaper reports he frequently quotes. I have justified this elsewhere.⁴

The Essay and My Responses

What follows are notes, corrections, criticism and a general reply to Caldwell's assertions and statements made in his article. All his quotes are in italics.

"The current awareness of the Warrigal Creek massacre stems largely from the writing of the self-published historian Peter Gardner..." My publishing career spans five decades. From 1973 to 1984 my articles were published in various outlets including the Victorian Historical Journal, the Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society and the Historian. Most of these essays were later included as chapters in *Gippsland Massacres* first published by the Warragul Education Centre, Warragul in 1984. The second volume of my Kurnai 'trilogy' *Through Foreign Eyes* was first published by the Centre for Gippsland Studies in 1988. In the same year I self-published *Our Founding Murdering Father* when it seemed most unlikely that any publisher would accept it. This volume later became the first in my publishing venture Ngarak Press. All of my Kurnai 'trilogy' were republished (or self-published?) by the Press. Since then I have occasionally submitted articles to prestigious publications including one on the Tambo Crossing affair in the Gippsland Heritage Journal⁵ and another in the Victorian Historical Journal. As well since 2012 I have added 23 essays on the Kurnai on the publications page of my website with many, but not all, on the subject of massacres. It should be noted that almost all my original research on this matter was done before 1988.

"His work has indeed permeated academic and public discourse, but it contains many unproven assertions that undermine his main premise, that McMillan was responsible for the massacre." The assertion that "McMillan was responsible for the massacre" was my 'main premise' is false. Is this a 'straw man' argument? Whilst I did assert that he led the 'Highland Brigade' in my 1980 RAHS essay (which was republished in *Gippsland Massacres*) eight years later in *Our Founding Murdering Father* I noted that it was not clear who led the 'Brigade' and that it could have been one of the Macalisters.⁶ Both these publications, paradoxically, have been used by critics to argue that McMillan did not lead the massacre at

Warrigal Creek. Has Caldow registered that the ‘permeation of my work’ in the ‘academic and public discourse’ may have something to do with the argument and the evidence which I have attempted to outline with logic and objectivity? My concern is not with the matter of leadership. My main premise (in the 1970s at least) was to establish that these events actually occurred, gather as much evidence (often conflicting) for them as I could and to locate them as best possible. In other words trying to answer as many of the where, when, who, why and how, questions on these events. Perhaps other than in the bunker of Quadrant the ‘black war and massacres’ in Gippsland is generally accepted?

“McMillan is not implicated in any of the material cited as evidence against him.” Again the leadership of the ‘Highland Brigade’ is not, and has never been, my priority. *Our Founding Murdering Father* of 108 pages including notes, clearly states the case against McMillan, including the exploration debate, frontier conflict and his later years. There are one or two minor factual errors in this account and Caldow’s is the first criticism of a small part of the thesis. In the ‘Gippslander’s’ 1925 Gap article on Warrigal Creek, McMillan is the only European mentioned. I look into this in some detail elsewhere.⁷ Again bordering on the Windschuttle demand for primary evidence.

“The aim of this article is to examine Gardner’s interpretation of the Warrigal Creek massacre story and his accusations against McMillan”. Is this a ‘straw man’ argument again - that Gardner claims this, which is not backed by evidence, therefore all his claims are false? I make a number of claims against McMillan in *Our Founding Murdering Father* and the claim of ‘possible’ leadership of the ‘Highland Brigade’ at Warrigal Creek, which Caldow concentrates on, is just one of many. Caldow, paradoxically, appears to be arguing against McMillan’s leadership of the Brigade at Warrigal Creek – an event he also implies did not occur. Later he claims the event took place at Bruthen Creek and again paradoxically, adds a new piece of evidence that supports the Warrigal Creek location (see below).

“First though, it is necessary to establish the circumstances that led to the European settlement of Gippsland and the resulting conflict with the indigenous Kurnai people, which is the root of the massacre story.” This has been told in detail by others before and gives an academic aura to his essay. Very little of it is new.

“This provides a contrast to Gardner’s analysis, which is based largely on a story from a schoolchildren’s magazine from 1925.” This is misleading. My work is not largely based on ‘Gippslander’ alone but his account is an important one within a range of sources, including other secondary accounts, local topography, folk accounts, bone finds and other circumstantial evidence. This attack on The Gap magazine is also condescending, implying that because of the source the material is not worth considering. There have been two series of The Gap magazines - in the 1920s and 1960s, the latter ably edited by Lynette Treasure, and published by the Bairnsdale Inspectorate of the Education Department. Both series carry a wide range of articles by both students and adults and are generally recognised as a valuable resource by local historians. More on this below.

“To implicate McMillan, Gardner imputed words and meaning into this story that are simply not there, rendering his narrative both perplexing and questionable. This raises the inevitable question of whether the massacre story, based on Gardner’s interpretation, should be seen as historical fact or an apocryphal tale.” Caldow is questioning the existence of Warrigal Creek massacre. Is this pure Windschuttle? This is the ‘Straw Man’ fallacy again as outlined above. Since his original premise is wrong the rest is nonsense.

“there is an implicit assumption in Gardner’s work that the Kurnai were passive victims of European violence, but this does not do them justice.” This implicit assumption is purely imaginary on Caldow’s part. My thesis is that there was something like a ‘war’ of equals for a very short time before European firepower, mobility and tactics asserted their dominance which then gave way to protracted guerrilla war. Spearings and murders of Europeans were, as far as we can establish, followed by retaliatory massacres. This is basically my, fairly obvious, ‘murder/retaliation’ theory.⁸ This rough pattern occurred at different times at different places in the region throughout the 1840s. Some academic critics object to the use of the term ‘massacre’. Others such as Richard Broome have argued that my work tended to ‘victimology’. About 15 years ago when replying to this criticism I wrote:

“One wonders what the term ‘victimology’ means. If it means the concentration or placing undue stress on the victims of the 'black war' I would argue that my works have been concerned with establishing firstly that these events did occur beyond any doubt and secondly that these events were of extreme importance in the context of Australian history. Much of my work was written in at best an unsympathetic, and at worst, hostile environment. In all my works I outline and test aspects of Rowley's "guerrilla war" thesis. Part of the problem is that the 'guerrilla war' in terms of victims was so one sided. If it is the study of the victims then one is left to ponder how they can be ignored when considering such serious events as these. Further what is actually known about the victims of these events is, in my opinion, miniscule.”⁹

“The men were easy prey for the Kurnai and by mid-1843, four had been murdered. One man was killed with thirteen spears, his body was mutilated, and his arms and legs were removed—the Kurnai were cannibals.” This is shallow treatment of the situation shepherds faced when, isolated on the runs in ones and twos, they were obvious targets in the ‘guerrilla war’ and probably five or more were killed in the early years. However these accounts were often grossly exaggerated in the press. The numbers killed are not in dispute. With regards ‘cannibalism’ Howitt noted that the Kurnai practiced it only with their native enemies and that certain parts of the body were favoured. Since the Kurnai were relatively isolated (as Caldow admits) and external raids into enemy territory unusual, the statement and inclusion of the quote by Caldow is misleading. Was cannibalism practised? Yes. But was it common? Definitely not. Was it ever practised on Europeans? There is no evidence whatsoever to support this implication from Caldow.

“In March 1840, twenty Bunurong men from Westernport escaped the supervision of Assistant Protector William Thomas to undertake a raid into Gippsland. They returned in triumph with flesh from the Kurnai they had killed.” This account is not in dispute. I have

written about this in some detail elsewhere outlining the problem of inter-tribal conflict in both post and pre European situations.¹⁰ More below.

“In October that year, ninety-seven Kurnai warriors made a revenge raid into Bunurong territory. They did not find any Bunurong so they ransacked a squatter’s station instead.” This is an interesting and intriguing account of a Kurnai intrusion to Westernport by William Thomas that I have not used as there were no casualties from this event. A European woman was held captive for a short time during the retreat but later released. Quite possibly this was a response to the earlier intrusion by the Melbourne group.

“Just before European settlement, the Kurnai raided as far as Brighton and Arthur’s Seat on Port Phillip Bay—a distance of at least 120 kilometres as the crow flies—and they are believed to have wiped out about half of the Bunurong. This was the cause of great enmity among the surviving Bunurong.” There is no doubt about the enmity between the Kurnai and all the surrounding tribes but I doubt this report as the evidence is so slim. Howitt notes the general belief that death was caused by an ‘enemy’¹¹ and by ‘evil magic’.¹² Massola stated that the “Aborigines believed that no man died of natural causes, and always attributed any death to the evil machinations of their enemies’ – and that death had to be avenged.¹³ William Thomas gives an account of a killing epidemic ‘many years ago’ and thought that it was “cholera” and that it occurred “about the time it raged in Europe.”¹⁴ It is more likely that the event that Caldow cites was a large death toll in the Bunurong by some unexplained cause (small pox?) that the survivors ‘believed’ was caused by their enemies the “Twofold Bay blacks” – that is the Kurnai.

“Gardner regards tribal warfare as a myth.” This is a distortion. One assumes Caldow is quoting the title of an essay which I called ‘The Myth of Tribal Warfare’ then completely ignoring what I actually said. The thesis of this essay is that most of what we know of tribal conflict has been exaggerated, that European influence greatly distorted these events post settlement, and that whilst raids and clashes did occur pre-settlement the evidence to support them is slim. Contrary to his assertion Caldow partially accepts this thesis when he states the *“arrival of the Europeans changed the dynamics of this conflict with the introduction of firearms and the formation of the Native Police”*. Another problem for the ‘Windschuttle school’ is that, according to their narrow definition, none of the evidence of pre-European tribal conflict is ‘primary evidence’.

“The Murder of Ranald Macalister” This is not only not in dispute but central to the narrative of the massacre. The murder/retaliation scenario again. Caldow offers various accounts of the murder including some wildly exaggerated newspaper accounts like that in the Geelong Advertiser “they set upon him with their waddies, and despatched him under circumstances of the utmost barbarity.” Also in Lachlan Macalister’s correspondence his nephew “was dragged off his horse, and cruelly murdered, on the township of Alberton, his head being so totally disfigured that his countenance could not be recognised among even his most intimate friends, by these harmless, innocent denizens of the wild of Gipps Land ...”¹⁵ This conflicts with George Robinson’s account who wrote “Reginald McAllister was the gentleman killed by natives: they are supposed to have killed him with sticks; there was no

spear wounds no person saw it done or saw natives; hence there is no direct proof”¹⁶ that he was killed by the Kurnai. Much of the material quoted in this section of Caldwell’s article supports the general ‘black war’ thesis.

“The newspapers indicate that the murder was not an isolated event and occurred within a wider context of anarchy and violence involving the Kurnai and the convicts. No reason was given for the murder. Lachlan Macalister’s demand of Gipps to provide protection for the settlers gives the impression that the settlers were on the defensive against both the Kurnai and the convicts.” Caldwell is over reliant on exaggerated newspaper accounts. Backed by Macalister’s account he is implying that convicts in the region were an equal source of ‘anarchy and violence’ to that attributed to the ‘black war’. Other than Macalister’s letter, and Robinson’s generalisations I know of little evidence to support this. One is led to speculate whether this was a secondhand report made to Macalister or that he was actually in Gippsland at the time. If so perhaps he did lead the retaliation at Warrigal Creek (not Gammon) as described by Dunderdale.

Charles Tyers. I have a chapter on Tyers in *Through Foreign Eyes* as I have on Henry Meyrick, William Thomas and George Robinson.

Under the heading “*Convicts*” Caldwell makes the case that convicts were responsible for much of the harm inflicted on the Kurnai. He notes that *“Robinson’s comments are significant in that he was revealing that escaped convicts were responsible for mistreating the Kurnai. Convicts under the control of the penal system in the Port Phillip District and elsewhere were notorious for their crimes against the Aborigines. Fawcner blamed them for most of the conflict between the Europeans and the Aborigines. Escapees living outside the law would therefore have posed a dire threat to the Kurnai.”* The last sentence is pure speculation - something Caldwell continually accuses me of doing. An analysis of this paragraph shows that Robinson is mostly repeating information from the Port Phillip district, not Gippsland. Caldwell then notes my criticism of Robinson in *Through Foreign Eyes* when I said he ‘was “incorrect” to blame the convicts’ and that this ““correction” suggests that Gardner entirely overlooked the substance and significance of Robinson’s observations.’ In fact I argued that Robinson had been to a certain extent been ‘gulled’ by some of the squatters with whom he stayed in Gippsland, including McMillan. Robinson travelled through Gippsland but failed to meet or talk to any member of the Kurnai. Nevertheless despite the fact that Robinson gleaned his information on the Kurnai from European sources, his records remain an important primary source. Historians should not be inhibited about analysing and evaluating these valuable resources. Recent material surfacing on the period just before Warrigal Creek¹⁷ indicates that the chain of events that led to the Macalister murder and then the retaliatory massacre may indeed have been initiated by a convict shepherd throwing hot coals on the feet of Aborigines to get rid of them.

Gardner claims his work is “partly political and partly moralistic”; he disdains objectivity and describes his politics as “left”. No. The first quote is taken from an unpublished essay and the “*partly political and partly moralistic*” is nowhere to be found in the reference Caldwell lists or in any of my online published material.¹⁸ (see more on this below). No. I

reject out of hand that I disdain objectivity – another Caldwell falsehood as far as I am concerned. And No! The last of these quotes has been ‘cherry picked’ from one of my online essays on an earlier Quadrant essay by Patrick Morgan.¹⁹ On answering the question of my motivation for writing history I stated “that “the idea of guerrilla warfare ... came from C.D. Rowley’s *Destruction of Aboriginal Society*²⁰ rather than from anything to do with my personal ‘Vietnam experience’. The latter may have had influence in that it possibly made me more responsive to Rowley’s thesis. The ‘Vietnam experience’ referred I suppose to my possible motive and possible (left-wing) bias from my student days and opposition to this war.” Note ‘possible bias’.

How “left” is open to interpretation given that his third book, Our Murdering Founding Father (a diatribe against McMillan), begins with the “property is theft” quote from the nineteenth-century anarchist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. Yes the Proudhon quote on property is famous and is used to open the first chapter rather than the book. The book actually begins with a quote from Herman Hesse’s ‘Journey to the East’ that went as follows:

In order that something like cohesion, something like causality, that some kind of meaning can ensue, and that it can in some way be narrated, the historian must invent units, a hero, a nation, an idea, and he must allowed to happen to that invented unit what in reality has happened to the nameless.

The chapters in turn are introduced by quotes from Proudhon, poet Wilfrid Owen, William Godwin (another anarchist?), another quote from Hesse and Lao Tse. The Proudhon quote helps illustrate the fact that under an imperial façade the land was stolen from its original inhabitants the Kurnai. Rather than a ‘diatribe’ against McMillan the book is a cogently argued case in an unofficial debate with McMillan biographer Kenneth Cox. All of this information is freely available on my website which Caldwell chooses to ignore.²¹

*Gardner’s work has hints of Marxist reductionism, where the Kurnai are portrayed as living in an Arcadian “economy” that was destroyed by the expansionary capitalism of the land-hungry squatters. I emphatically deny the charge of Marxist reductionism and Caldwell makes no effort to support this libel beyond a loose reference to one of my online massacres essays. I have scanned the essay and can find nothing resembling anything that can justify Caldwell’s outrageous statement. If anything the strongest political influence on me by far has been libertarian including from individuals like George Orwell. The ‘Arcadian’ reference may refer to my use of the term ‘noble savage’ in chapters of Strzelecki and John Bulmer in *Through Foreign Eyes*. Otherwise it is just more Caldwell speculation.*

*“Gardner’s method in telling the story is to first present the massacre and McMillan’s involvement as matters of fact.” Caldwell is referring specifically to the first chapter in *Gippsland Massacres* and this is one of the few valid criticisms he has so far made. This book was mainly a compilation of previously published essays and talks. The first chapter was a student Newspaper publication of a talk given to students at the Gippsland Institute of Advanced Education and as such was mostly a summary of the frontier conflict. Thus the claim is misleading.*

Gardner's evidence for Angus McMillan's involvement in the Warrigal Creek massacre consists of a story written for The Gap school magazine in 1925 by William Hoddinott under the pseudonym of Gippslander. Not so. I include Dunderdale as a source, and Meyrick along with a number of other various secondary accounts and folk evidence.²² My argument has always been that the different sources are cumulative, if occasionally contradictory. A conflict between these accounts does not necessarily negate them. Unlike Caldow I have visited the various alternative sites and discussed the massacre with landowners. Included in this is Gammon Creek (see below) favoured by Dunderdale which has no physical creek or waterhole that conforms to the topographical descriptions of the massacre (see below).

McMillan is mentioned once by Gippslander, where he is supposed to have caught Macalister's horse on the road to Sale (which did not exist then). Otherwise, he has no involvement in the story. McMillan is actually mentioned twice and is the only European to be mentioned in the account. Yes Sale, originally Flooding Creek, did not exist in 1843. This error was also missed by The Gap editors. The editors possibly made a number of changes to the Gippslander account to make it more suitable for publication. If so the inclusion of Sale may have been theirs.

"An avenging party set out under the leadership of Angus McMillan ..." A phrase similar to that first used by F.T. Midlin in an article on McMillan in the 1964 Gap magazine who claimed McMillan led the Highland Brigade ten years before I did.²³ I accept I used some hyperbole, especially in *Gippsland Massacres*, and criticism of some of this is valid. Perhaps I have also unintentionally incorporated some folk history (or local gossip) and more seriously, not acknowledged the source. I have considered this problem recently and may have made a similar error with the evidence of Hatcher (see below). Caldow's end notes are not much better and have a number of errors but one example will suffice - for end note 18 Caldow noted "*Gardner, P D (2005) The Myth of Tribal Warfare On-line essay*" with no link, date of access etc. Perhaps Quadrant did not want their audience to actually read what I had written.

Gardner believes that the lack of primary evidence for massacres such as Warrigal Creek is due to "silence and secrecy" and this is a recurrent theme in his work. Yes. Stating that this is my 'belief' hardly negates the argument, which is both plausible and probable. In *Gippsland Massacres* I state the reasons for this were 'complicated' and that "the killing of European shepherds by Aborigines in what is known as the Faithful massacre at Benalla and the execution of participants in the Myall Creek massacre meant two things – that retaliation was necessary and that secrecy in any retaliation was paramount". The Windschuttle demand for primary evidence.

William Hoddinott A large part of Caldow's attack is on Hoddinott as a source. I have dealt with this on a number of occasions but feel the need to repeat this in some detail. The identity of 'Gippslander' as 'Willy' Hoddinott was first suggested to me in 1976 in an interview with Jack Irving, owner of the Warrigal Creek station.²⁴ But I only put this in print 12 years later in *Our Founding Murdering Father* when it was supported by corroborative evidence. Caldow is critical of my clinical analysis of sources such as Robinson but does exactly the

same with Hoddinott. Willy Hoddinott was born on the Sunville run adjoining the Warrigal Creek run about 15 years after the massacre. Assuming his account to be accurate then his story must have been garnered from both participants and survivors in the affair. But it is not until he was living in Bairnsdale that his story appears in The Gap in 1925. Caldow is critical of the time lag but this is hardly fair. Gippslander, Dunderdale and Bell (see below) all gleaned their stories of Warrigal Creek about the same time – 1860 to 1870. Fifteen years after his 1925 piece Hoddinott, then in his eighties, repeated a similar story under his own name which was published in the Bairnsdale Advertiser. This led me to accept that he was ‘Gippslander’ in *Our Founding Murdering Father*.

*Gardner admonished Hoddinott, stating, “in this account he failed to implicate McMillan as he had done 15 years earlier” ... Caldow has identified the third factual error in *Our Founding Murdering Father* – the sentence should read ‘failed to **mention** McMillan as he had done 15 years earlier.’ A few pages later the book discusses in some detail whether the retribution was led by a Macalister or McMillan, something Caldow fails to mention as it undermines the basis of his essay – the false assertion that I still maintained that McMillan led the massacre. Let me be clear about this I am not ‘catholic’ about who led the Warrigal Creek massacre. However I remain fairly certain that McMillan was there.*

*These passages represent the sum total of Gardner’s evidence against McMillan... No. *Gippsland Massacres* and *Our Founding Murdering Father* represent the sum total of my evidence.*

Gardner accepted Hoddinott’s Gippslander story literally and uncritically, stating that it is “completely reliable” due to its “vividness and detail”. The word colourful may have been more appropriate. The story was written anonymously for a magazine for primary school children eighty-two years after the incident described, without attribution, and by someone who was not there. Gardner claims it is a secondary source but it is, at best, folk history that he has embroidered with his own fiction about McMillan. Caldow’s bitter attack on Hoddinott and The Gap article continues. I have outlined previously as to why Hoddinott chose anonymity – being published at the same time as the ‘McMillan as local hero’ myth was burgeoning – leading to the erection of the cairns across Gippsland in 1927. It is just as possible that the ‘anonymity’ was suggested, or even imposed, by the editor. The closeness of Hoddinott’s early childhood to the Warrigal Creek station and the fact that he was born a relatively short time after the event must have meant that in his childhood he heard various aspects about Warrigal Creek on a number of occasions. The fact that the story only appears 82 years after the incident is irrelevant. Obviously prior to the 1925 publication no one was interested in, or willing to publish, his story. As to attribution the article itself is the source and as far as I am aware articles in this series were unattributed.

William Thomas. Some of Caldow’s criticism under this heading may be valid.

*In *Through Foreign Eyes*, Gardner quoted the journal of William Thomas, the Assistant Protector of Aborigines. Gardner claims—incorrectly—that Thomas “was aware of the circumstances of the Warrigal Creek massacre, as he had recorded the details of it on two*

separate occasions”. Not so. I am fairly certain that Meyrick mentioned ‘Warrigal Creek’ to Thomas on his visit and this would be somewhere in the Thomas papers. I have neither the time, energy nor occasion to check this and leave that to others. But even if I am incorrect on this, the statements of Meyrick and Hatcher still confirm the atrocities of the black war. And Meyrick clearly talked about “the Awful Sacrifice of life after the murder of Mr. Macalister [which] was awfully reckless & merciless”.²⁵ Surely this is primary evidence that Caldwell chooses to ignore?

This was written two years after the murder of Macalister; stating that the slaughter took place after the murder does not necessarily mean that it took place because of the murder. Most importantly, it does not say where—if Hatcher’s account is reliable, he was clearly not speaking about Warrigal Creek. Buntine’s Bruthen Creek run was several miles and several squatting runs to the west of Warrigal Creek. Caldwell’s critique of Meyrick and Hatcher is borderline Windschuttle nonsense and the first sentence is bordering on the absurd. There is no evidence to support Caldwell’s negative assertion that Hatcher was ‘not speaking about Warrigal Creek’ purely because of a distance of ‘several miles’. In fact Warrigal Creek, Gammon Creek and Bruthen Creek are adjacent to each other and at the time the occupants of the various stations were close neighbours.²⁶ Some unattributed references on the internet have Bruthen Creek as the site of a large scale ‘massacre’ but this is unlikely. Caldwell suggests that Hatcher was the original source for this.

In the revised edition of Gippsland Massacres, Gardner reinvented the account, claiming “the bones were carried away from the [Warrigal] Creek by the cartload”. He also claimed this appeared to be part of a cover-up due to the arrival of Tyers or Robinson. This raises two issues: first, this is a fallacious misuse of the material; Hatcher said the bones might be gathered up—his might be transmogrified into Gardner’s were. Second, Hatcher arrived in Gippsland several months after Tyers, so it was just a tad late to be a cover-up. The first sentence is partially correct. I have inadvertently conflated the evidence of Meyrick and Hatcher with local folk history. I made a similar error when filming the Warrigal Creek documentary, was corrected by Peter Crowley, and partly corrected the record here.²⁷ In ‘Recent Notes on Massacres’ I stated “Libby Balderstone whom I had met on two occasions previously then drove us to Red Hill where the bones from the massacre are thought to have been deposited. Here during the interview Peter Crowley noticed that I had mixed my sources attributing the statement ‘cartloads of bones’ to Henry Meyrick instead of Buntine’s brother-in-law. As the team had already filmed much of this primary evidence in the State Library this error had to be corrected and reshot.” As Caldwell has argued the crucial word in Hatcher’s statement was ‘might’ not that they did or were. The story of the bones being carted away from Warrigal Creek to Red Hill was first told to me by Jack Irving in 1976. He was obviously aware of The Gap account as he suggested Willy Hoddinott as Gippslander’s’ identity. But there is no way he had read the papers of William Thomas then located in the Mitchell Library. Nor did he mention Hatcher. Jack also offered Red Hill as a possible massacre site which I then discounted, and still do. A fairly obvious reason for the removal of the bones was the visit of the Aboriginal Protector Robinson in 1844. The removal of the

bones had nothing to do with Hatcher's visit. Perhaps Caldwon can suggest a reason why the bones were removed or is this more fiction on my behalf?

The timing of this record is important because it was made after two of the three searches for a white woman allegedly held captive by the Kurnai. According to Tyers, at least fifty Kurnai were killed by the Native Police and other Aborigines attached to the search parties. Not in dispute and yes, the timing of this is important. The Meyrick letter estimating not less than 450 deaths was written on 30.4.1846. The DeVilliers private expedition was in Gippsland at the end of 1846 and the main killings by the Native Police are supposed to have occurred just before the arrival of the private expedition – that is well after Meyrick's letter had been written. Tyers statement was made in 1858. Was this statement specifically about the Native Police as Caldwon implies or was it a general estimate of deaths during the white woman hunts? Is this another attempt to absolve the squatters of any responsibility for the massacres? The implication here is that I have ignored Tyers, the Native Police and the 'white woman' affair – all untrue.

Meyrick arrived in Gippsland in 1845 so he was not a witness to anything before that date. The Windschuttle thesis again – Meyrick was not present and therefore not a 'primary source'. What Caldwon and many of the 'McMillan' apologists are unable to do is reconcile Meyrick's estimate of not less than 450 Kurnai killed with the location and size of these atrocities – only when at least one large scale event like Warrigal Creek is recognised can this contradiction be resolved.

The murder of Macalister may have marked a turning point in which the Europeans went on the offensive. Another incorrect assertion from Caldwon. The clashes with the Kurnai started almost immediately after the European occupation, with the Kurnai having the initial advantage with their numbers. This advantage was soon overcome with superior weaponry, mobility and tactics²⁷ which led to retaliatory massacres at Boney Point and Butchers Creek and probably Maffra. There is evidence that a small group of Kurnai were communicating with Europeans in the Port Albert region prior to the murder of Macalister. This location was relatively remote from the early massacres in central and east Gippsland and remote in time from these events.

However, Thomas, Hatcher and Meyrick did not mention Warrigal Creek as Gardner claims—and they certainly did not mention McMillan. Incorrect. I claim only that Meyrick via Thomas mentioned Warrigal Creek but I may have been assuming this – possibly after Meyrick talked about the aftermath of the Macalister murder. If a close examination of Thomas papers does not reveal this then I stand corrected. Nor have I stated anywhere that any of them mentioned McMillan.

Gardner claimed in June 2020 that Meyrick gave a death toll of about 150 for Warrigal Creek, which he did not. Wrong again and a deliberate deception. What I said was "He (ie Gippslander) notes that 100 to 150 were killed here and this estimate coincides closely with Meyrick's estimate." The estimate was Gippslanders and Meyrick's estimate was referring to his estimate of not less than 450 killed in Gippsland, which I mentioned in the previous

paragraph. The point being that if Meyrick's estimate is anywhere near the mark the statistics support each other and a large scale massacre helps explain some of his figure. I have gone into these statistics on a number of occasions.

These accounts nonetheless provide evidence of the otherwise unrecorded conflict between the Europeans and the Kurnai at places such as Bruthen Creek. Thank you. I'll accept this as agreement though still maintain Bruthen Creek as a massacre site is most unlikely. But if at some time in the future Caldwell's unlikely claim for Bruthen Creek is established it in no way alters my general thesis.

George Dunderdale. Under the heading *Other Versions of the Massacre Story* Caldwell outlines a number of other sources besides 'Gippslander'. This is misleading as it implies that I have ignored these accounts which, with the one exception below I missed, I have not. The Dunderdale account was mentioned and quoted in my earliest writing. I discounted the site of Gammon Creek for reasons listed above. I also discounted the participation of Lachlan Macalister as there is no evidence that he was in Gippsland as early as 1843. I have written elsewhere on Dunderdale's propensity to change names of places, people and dates.²⁹ The quibble over "Macalister of Nuntin" is not clear. Nuntin was the first run taken up by McMillan on the west side of the Avon near current Stratford. This was abandoned after a short while when the much larger Boisdale run was taken up for the Macalisters. About the same time McMillan took up Bushy Park on his own nearby and it is not clear where the boundaries between the runs were – the initial boundaries being vague although early maps have Bushy Park and Stratford runs to the east of the Avon and Boisdale to the west. This would indicate that the Boisdale run absorbed most or all of Nuntin.

Once again, Gardner "corrected" historical material when it did not agree with his Warrigal Creek narrative. Not so. I accept Dunderdale wholeheartedly as part of the evidence which is certainly corroborative of my thesis along with 'Gippslander' and Meyrick. I was in most of these instances examining source reliability and trying to understand and unravel the variations and conflicts in the different accounts which Caldwell misinterprets as correcting.

Dunderdale's estimate of 60 killed '*was probably an exaggeration.*' This fits neatly into Windschuttle thesis again. Estimates that I have gathered for the major massacre, which I still maintain was most likely at Warrigal Creek, vary from 30 to 500. The problem with the lower estimates is their incompatibility with the Meyrick estimate of 450 killed. If only 60 or less were killed at Gammon Creek/Warrigal Creek/Bruthen Creek, where and when were the other 400 killed? After his attempted demolition of 'Gippslander' perhaps Meyrick is Caldwell's next target?

To discount Macalister's involvement, Gardner states there is no proof he was in Gippsland before 1848. Macalister's letter to the Sydney Morning Herald in 1843 and a search of Trove and the PROV websites reveal that this statement is incorrect. I am happy to accept this if and when definite evidence is produced, which Caldwell does not supply. Is the origin of the letter by Macalister published in the Sydney Morning Herald Camden or Boisdale? If the latter why did Macalister not write to the Melbourne papers? Peter Crowley has gradually

been reducing the date of Macalister's presence in Gippsland but as far as I am aware not as early as 1843. I am happy to accept disinterested advice from Crowley.

R.L. Bell

Gardner cites other versions of the death of Macalister and the massacre to build his narrative, all based on Gippslander or otherwise post-Dunderdale. However, he has not included a much earlier reference to the massacre. In a letter to the Age in August 1874, R.L. Bell stated:

The historic pen of Victorian settlement would paint with truth the horrors of many a scene of Gipps Land life; it was in 1843 ... that the aggressions of the blacks were so frequent. Shepherds worked in pairs, armed, as if in an enemy's country, to resist them; and it was 1843 that ended by wholesale destruction, the massacres at Warrigal Creek and Bundalaguah Swamp, where only one aboriginal was left to tell the story of how they died and the history of his race.[The Age 8 August 1874]

I am delighted that Caldow has brought Bell to my attention which can now be added to the body of evidence on the Warrigal Creek massacre. Note Bell uses both 'Warrigal Creek' and the term 'massacre', which Caldow in his 'hatchet job' on 'Gippslander' has done his best to dismiss. Bell mentions another massacre at Bundalaguah Swamp, which I have not heard of before, unless it is part of a possible massacre at Maffra. Current day Bundalaguah is about half way between the cities of Sale and Maffra. The implication that I somehow failed to include this account is unfair. I certainly missed it and all I can plead is that searching newspapers in the pre Trove days was an exhausting occupation working either on microfilm or with the occasional hard copy. I spent many fruitless days (and nights) in the State Library on this searching for the proverbial 'needle in a haystack'. Caldow also forgets to mention that my last research on frontier conflict was concluded about 1988, well before Trove had made its welcome appearance. In correspondence with historian Linda Barraclough as to whether 'Bundalaguah Swamp' could be the event at Maffra she replied:

"I think there are two Maffra massacres, and both have had other locations suggested - one a bend in the river near the current sugar beet museum, the other the swamp below Powerscourt, which I don't think could be called Bundalaguah. But one out Bundalaguah way would be a better explanation of the remains found at Powerscourt siding."³⁰

The newspapers and Charles Tyers's reports indicate that attacks by the Kurnai continued in 1844 and 1845; they did not end at Warrigal Creek in 1843. The murder of Ranald Macalister may have been the pretext for an attack on the Kurnai at Warrigal Creek or Gammon Creek but this is not borne out by the contemporary historical record. First sentence not in dispute. The false implication from Caldow is all my work is on Warrigal Creek. Nothing could be further from the truth. Windschuttle again. The contemporary historical record is mostly blank. Therefore these events did not occur. Begrudging acceptance that murder of Macalister 'may' have been the precursor to Warrigal Creek.

First, using the information Gardner misinterpreted, rejected or missed in Thomas, Dunderdale and Bell, we must accept the possibility or even the probability that an atrocity

took place somewhere. Establishing the factual basis of this will require in-depth research to uncover any written evidence before Bell's account from 1874, as well as archaeological evidence at locations such as Bruthen Creek and Bundalaguah Swamp. The assertion of "misinterpreted, rejected or missed" by Caldwell is debatable on all accounts. Other than the instances I have listed above, he has offered little evidence of misinterpretation, and as my replies state, the evidence he offers is debatable at best and sometimes wrong. With regards 'rejected' the selection of material is the author's prerogative and dependant on the narrative. Of both Dunderdale and Thomas I deny that I 'rejected' any material. I am familiar with Dunderdale and deny that I missed anything from his account. See my Dunderdale essay in the end notes. With regards 'missed' material I am sure all historians have a yarn to tell on such occasions. I have recently reread some sources such as Robinson and Thomas, now in accessible publications, and found matters of interest I had not noticed before. Caldwell's opinion that I missed Bell is comical. His suggestion of general, as opposed to very specific, localities of Bruthen Creek and Bundalaguah swamp as possible archaeological digs is similar. One site is almost definitely wrong and the other vague in the extreme. In another paper I have suggested digs at Warrigal Creek and Red Hill.³¹ There has already been a dig at Red Hill where a cross section was selected to avoid human remains as much as possible. Caldwell may not be aware of a general reluctance in Aboriginal communities for human remains to be unearthed.

Gardner's narrative is based on the assertion that the massacre and Angus McMillan are synonymous, but he has produced no evidence whatsoever to implicate McMillan. His alleged role in the massacre is a construct entirely of Gardner's own making.... No. The massacre narrative survives regardless of the role of McMillan. However elsewhere I have recently written:

The circumstantial evidence against McMillan as leader of the Warrigal Creek retaliation mounts up. He is in Gippsland at the time and possibly nearby, he is the self-proclaimed leader of the Macalister group and European 'discoverer' of the region, he is a close associate of the dead man, the retaliation vehicle was one of Scottish ethnicity and he is clearly implicated in earlier events of a similar nature. I have stated on a number of occasions it is possible that one of the Macalisters led the retribution but, if so, McMillan was there as well, and on the whole, I favour McMillan as leader.³²

Obviously some of this, such as "the retaliation vehicle was one of Scottish ethnicity" Caldwell will not accept, since it derives from the 'Gippslander' account. Probably the most important of these 'circumstances' is that he is implicated in 'earlier events' – massacres at Butchers Creek, Boney Point and most likely Maffra (at any of those sites suggested by Barraclough above?) – during which time there were only a dozen or so identifiable Europeans in Gippsland proper, including McMillan. This is quite independent of Gippslander's account.

Third, Gardner's narrative is constructed around a story written for schoolchildren in 1925, a story that could at best be considered as folk history. It beggars belief that it was accepted as a "completely reliable" historical source. Caldwell continues his tirade against 'Gippslander' most of which is answered above. The Gap magazines of the 1920s carried a

range of articles written by students and adults for students and adults. The magazines were annuals both for the Primary and Secondary schools and the wider community and contained a number of essays by well-known historian Charles Daley, who was a prime mover in promoting the idea of cairns along McMillan's discovery route which were unveiled with much fanfare in 1927. The magazines had an editor and an editorial board and they are generally well regarded by local historians. W.F. Wannan was the Bairnsdale High School representative on the board and it is most likely that the 'Gippslander' account was presented by, or through, him.

Conclusion

If anyone has been misrepresented in this essay it has been my work by Caldow. The political bias is mainly his and is closely attuned to his editor and publisher. Caldow's work is 'Windschuttle light'. He chooses to promote themes that may "*be unpalatable, including tribal warfare, the murderous role of the Native Police, and the role of convicts as both slave labour and perpetrators*" as if they are alternatives to the frontier violence and this appears to be a refined Windschuttle thesis. My work includes a number of references to what Caldow calls 'tribal clashes' heavily influenced by Europeans and events like the 'Captive White Woman' episode. Where in fact I have examined tribal warfare I come to a conclusion opposite to Caldow. Further I have included work on atrocities committed by the Native Police and other Kurnai enemies that Caldow ignores.

The publication of my Kurnai trilogy was partly a one man show. *Gippsland Massacres* was published by Warrigal Education Centre and designed for senior students, typeset from a typewritten manuscript, and proof read by yours truly, before the personal computer age. Perhaps the editor might have been more discriminating about some exaggerated phrases and my turn of speech. A number of typos also crept into this first edition. *Gippsland Massacres*, (note the plural) was commentary on five different massacres in Gippsland I had documented, to which I later added another two³³ and in the last chapter mentioned another five possible massacre locations. Warrigal Creek is discussed in two chapters out of twelve and McMillan is 'implicated' by strong circumstantial evidence in three of these massacres.

In the second volume *Through Foreign Eyes* Warrigal Creek gets just five references in the index and McMillan about fifteen. This volume was published by the Centre for Gippsland Studies and ably and rigorously edited by Patrick Morgan. Thanks to this editing it remains the most professional production of the trilogy, but sadly the least popular.

My so called 'diatribe' against McMillan *Our Founding Murdering Father* was, as stated above, the negative case in an unofficial debate with McMillan biographer Kenneth Cox. This was completely a solo venture, written, produced, published and edited by myself. In my impatience to get the book out the first edition was a catalogue of typos, embarrassing spelling mistakes and even missing words. I have elaborated on this elsewhere.³⁴ The second illustrated version was much better, but still with spelling mistakes and the spell checker unmastered. Despite the term 'diatribe' and his dislike of my Proudhon quote Caldow cites

only one error of fact in this book – one of three I had already discovered in the thirty years since publication - to justify his hyperbole. This book had five chapters only one of which was concerned with frontier conflict. As far as I am concerned it is factual, objective, cogently argued and with an accuracy of at least 99.9%. Major research on frontier conflict was terminated in 1988.³⁵

Our Founding Murdering Father became the first publication of Ngarak Press and it and the other parts of the trilogy were later republished or as Caldow would have it self-published. Between 1988 and 2004 the 'Press' published about 25 titles on Gippsland history, place names, some poetry and half a dozen obscure papers by Alfred Howitt. This was part of a business venture – mainly dealing in second hand books with a retail shop front - which supported me financially for 20 years. The best of the publications was a booklet entitled *Names on the Omeo Highway* which eventually had a print run of 8000 copies.³⁶

In 2012 my website was started up almost solely with my preoccupation on global warming. I later added a publications page on which I gradually built up a range of articles of difficult to access, or unpublished material, written over the last 40 years. There are now 23 essays on Aboriginal history on this web page – mostly on Gippsland and about half of them concerned with subjects of this paper – massacres and McMillan. Most of the recent material published here is reactive and reliant on my original research although a number of sources have been reread for other purposes.

Caldow claims my work “*has political motives and a disdain for objectivity, his work should perhaps be seen as a political campaign rather than as history*”. I suggest that these accusations apply more so to Caldow’s own work. His claim of my so called ‘*disdain for objectivity*’ is just that – an unsubstantiated allegation. His flimsy, incorrectly attributed, assertion about my ‘*political motives*’ appears to be based on an introspective analysis of my motivation for writing, which I have never published, and circulated about 15 years ago to a few friends and interested parties. He could have as easily have chosen ‘a Christian upbringing and an abhorrence of violence’ or even a basic ‘search for truth’ as my prime motivation.

Caldow’s essay has all the attributes of a political hit job. It employs many of the deceptive methods of argument used by climate change deniers – ‘false narrative’, ‘cherry picking’ and ‘straw man’.³⁷ It is heavily influenced by Windschuttle and much of it is a refined Windschuttle thesis – a questioning of primary sources like Meyrick, attacking secondary sources and other circumstantial evidence, and offering alternatives as to the violent destruction of the Kurnai. The choice of the essay title says it all ‘True story or Apocryphal’ and fairly obviously Caldow and his publisher have opted for the latter.

Perhaps it is best to leave the last words to ‘Gippslander’ - Caldow’s favourite target. Hoddinott stated that he knew “two blacks, who, though wounded came out of that hole alive”, but must have known European participants as well as he named the “Highland Brigade” and made the estimate of 100 to 150 killed. Hoddinott wrote:

“The brigade coming up to the blacks camped around the waterhole at Warrigal Creek surrounded them and fired on them, killing a great number, some escaped into the scrub, others jumped into the waterhole, and, as fast as they put their heads up for breath, they were shot until the water ran red with blood.”³⁸

Notes

1. Like Caldwell in his endnotes, I decline to give a URL link to his online article merely listing the source as an ‘online essay’. Readers can find the original essay with an Internet search. Interestingly Quadrant has taken a still from the Swinburne University documentary with me in the foreground looking down at the Warrigal Creek waterhole. Uncaptioned and unattributed.
2. Gardner, P.D. ‘Notes on Massacres 2020’ <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Notes-on-Massacres-2020.pdf>
3. Gardner, Peter. ‘Bruce Pascoe’s Dark Emu and the McMillan Photograph’ in the Victorian Historical Journal December 2020 <https://www.historyvictoria.org.au/product/victorian-historical-journal-december-2020/>
4. Gardner, Peter. Our Founding Murdering Father Revisited 2016 (online essay) <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Our-Founding-Murdering-Father-Revisited-2016.pdf>
5. Gardner, P.D. ‘Some Notes on Tribal Warfare and an Event at Tambo Crossing’, Gippsland Heritage Journal 1995 Now online at <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/GHJ-No-19-P-D-Gardner-Article.pdf>
6. Gardner, P.D. *Our Founding Murdering Father*, Ngarak Press, 1990 p.41
7. Gardner, P.D. Op. cit. See note 14 in ‘Notes on Massacres 2020’ online essay.
8. Gardner, P.D. *Through Foreign Eyes*, Ngarak Press, 1994 p.106
9. Gardner, P.D. ‘Notes on Massacres (rev. ed)’ collection of online essays <http://petergardner.info/publications/notes-on-massacres-rev-ed/>
10. Gardner, P.D. ‘Myth of Tribal Warfare’ online essay <http://petergardner.info/publications/myth-of-tribal-warfare/>
11. Howitt, A.W. *The Native Tribes of south-east Australia*, 1996 edition p.371
12. Ibid p.466
13. Massola, A. *Aborigines of SE Australia as they were*, Heineman, Melb. 1971 p.139
14. Stephens, M. *The Journal of William Thomas*, Victorian Aboriginal Corporation for Languages, Melbourne, 2014, Vol 2 p.269 (6.10.1847)
15. I have not seen this letter before – the wonders of Trove
16. Clark, Ian D. (ed.) *The Journals of George Augustus Robinson...*vol. 4 p.88
17. Gardner, P.D. ‘Prelude to the Warrigal Creek Massacre’ online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Prelude-to-the-Warrigal-Creek-Massacre.pdf>
18. I suspect, but cannot be certain, that this quote may have appeared in a brief essay that I wrote many years ago analysing my motivations for writing history. This was included in a small photocopied anthology of a dozen essays, with a similar number of copies that I distributed to a small number of friends and close contacts. The essay in particular was about a thousand words and, unlike many of the others in the collection, it remains unpublished. One wonders what Caldwell’s source for this quote was and where he obtained it. If it was from unpublished and private material his use of it is dishonest. It is also misleading in the extreme as, from memory, the essay discussed a range of motivations including abhorrence of violence, a Christian upbringing and a ‘search for truth’. I do not appear to now have a copy of this essay. Another alternative is that it came from something I had written in a ‘Mountain Echoes’ column when I said “Obviously all historians are of one political persuasion or another, and no doubt politics forms part of the complex motivations for anyone to write history.” For a fair analysis of my politics see the Mountain Journal interview by Cam Walker <https://themountainjournal.com/interviews-profiles/peter-gardner/>
19. Gardner, P.D. ‘Notes on Massacres (rev. ed)’ op.cit.
20. Rowley, C.D. *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society* Ringwood, Penguin 1972
21. Gardner, P.D. Our Founding Murdering Father Revisited 2016 op.cit. Caldwell writes as though the anarchists were close to the Marxists whereas in many instances they were diametrically opposed to them. His political analysis is both shallow and simplistic.
22. See my most recent work on Dunderdale here. Gardner, P.D. ‘George Dunderdale and the Kurnai’ online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/George-Dunderdale-and-the-Kurnai.pdf>

23. Midlin F.T. 'Angus McMillan Pathfinder' an article in the 1964 Gap magazine p.6
24. I conducted an interview with Jack Irving owner of Warrigal Creek Station in 1976. The interview went for about 2 hours, during which time I took rough notes. I cannot recall whether these notes still exist (at the East Gippsland Historical Society perhaps?) or have been lost or destroyed. The interview was specifically on the massacre and folk history of it. As a local historian he was familiar with both the Gippslander and Dunderdale accounts. Jack talked about folk history and the fact that the Irving family had held the station since 1896, his belief that the location of Red Hill played a role in the story, either as another massacre site or repository for bones, and offered a very low 'guess' of thirty as the numbers he thought killed. In a second conversation with Jack in Sale in the 1980s (at a history conference?) he had revised this estimate upwards considerably to be more in line with 'Gippslander's'.
25. Gardner, P.D. *Through Foreign Eyes...* p.52
26. According to Billis & Kenyon the Warrigal Creek Station not taken up until 1845
27. Gardner, P.D. 'Recent Notes on Massacres 2017' online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Recent-Notes-on-Massacres-2017-rev.ed.pdf>
28. Gardner, P.D. 'Firearms and Frontier Gippsland' online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Firearms-and-Frontier-Gippsland.pdf>
29. Gardner, P.D. 'George Dunderdale and the Kurnai'...
30. Correspondence with Linda Barraclough 6.1.21 on the RL Bell letter
31. Gardner, P.D. 'The Bones of the Warrigal Creek Massacre' online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Warrigal-Ck-Revisited.rev.ed.pdf> An excavation at Red Hill to recover human bones may be necessary at some indeterminate date in the future due to a rapidly retreating coast and rising sea levels. Such an excavation would require at a minimum Aboriginal support and be conducted by sympathetic parties. If such an excavation failed to find a large deposit of bones it would not negate the massacre thesis, but would make the Red Hill as a repository of the bones thesis most unlikely.
32. Gippsland Times 30.6.2020
33. Gardner P.D. See note 5 and 'Another Gippsland Massacre – Hollands Landing?' online essay <http://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Hollands-Landing-Massacrerev.edpdf.pdf>
34. <https://petergardner.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Our-Founding-Murdering-Father-Revisited-2016.pdf>
35. Work commitments restricted my opportunities for research for the next 20 years. Between 1990-2004 my studies were of the Victorian Coal Miners Association – a sympathetic (left?) union history - and the Coal Capitalists in South Gippsland. From 2004 to 2012 my work was on the Melbourne Land Boom and an extension of my work on the Coal Capitalists - essentially economic history. Since then I have written (and published online) a few essays on the Kurnai and one long one on the Egerton Mine Scandal – again economic history but nothing to do with Gippsland.
36. The title was later changed to *Names on the Great Alpine Road between Bairnsdale and Omeo*.
37. John Timmer, an American journalist, recently wrote "Science isn't a body of facts that should be treated as the final word; it's a collection of conclusions in which we have varying degrees of confidence." History is the same. <https://arstechnica.com/science/2021/01/new-biden-executive-order-makes-science-evidence-central-to-policy/> Accessed 2.2.21
38. 1925 The Gap. A magazine of the Bairnsdale Inspectorate.