

We are the stories we tell about ourselves: child welfare records and the construction of identity among Australians who, as children, experienced out-of-home ‘care’

Shurlee Swain* and Nell Musgrove

Shurlee Swain is a Professor in the School of Arts and Sciences (Vic), Australian Catholic University, who has researched and published in the area of Australian child welfare history. She is the Chief Investigator in charge of the history strand of the ARC-funded ‘Who Am I?’ project and will take responsibility for the history content of the national Find and Connect web resource.

Nell Musgrove is a Lecturer in the School of Arts and Sciences (Vic), Australian Catholic University, and a Research Associate on the ‘Who Am I?’ project. She has experience in historical research based on child welfare records and in 2009 completed a PhD which examined the history of children in institutional ‘care’ in Victoria from 1850 to 1954.

Recent parliamentary inquiries in Australia and elsewhere have highlighted the importance of records access in the process of identity construction among survivors of out-of-home ‘care’, many of whom go through their lives without the tangible links to the past and to identity, which most people take for granted. Changes in legislation to facilitate access to personal records can only partially remedy this deficiency, as significant restrictions remain. In addition official records are frequently sketchy and disjointed, providing at best only partial, and often quite damaging answers to such questions as: ‘why was I put into “care”’ ‘what happened to me while I was there’, and ‘why did “care” providers treat me in that way?’ This paper argues that archivists and historians have to move beyond their traditional roles, to work constructively with ‘care’-leavers to provide the contextual information needed to identify, access and understand the records that document their lives.

Keywords: child welfare history; care leavers; records access; institutional abuse

Over the past fifteen years three national inquiries into historical aspects of children’s out-of home ‘care’¹ have been undertaken in Australia. The first investigated the systematic removal of Indigenous children over more than a century, the second the experiences of child migrants sent from Malta and the United Kingdom, predominantly in the post–World War II era, and the third, the experiences of local children removed by state authorities or placed privately by guardians and relatives.² One of the first acts of the Federal Labor Government elected in 2007 was to offer an apology to Indigenous survivors, followed two years later by a similar apology to members of the two other groups.³ In each of the inquiries primacy was given to survivor testimony taken both in written submissions and at public hearings held across the nation.⁴ The power of such testimony challenges the expert position too often assumed by both historians and archivists.⁵ It also unsettles the assumption that the past is past, for in this area as in many

*Corresponding author. Email: shurlee.swain@acu.edu.au

others where personal testimony comes into play, the two are, sometimes uncomfortably, intertwined.⁶ The aim of this paper is to articulate a place for historians and archivists in interpreting the history of child welfare in the post-apology age. While the Australian Government has offered no financial recompense in any of the redress packages developed as part of the apology process, it has provided funding for the commissioning of oral history projects, museum displays and archives access workshops, and the introduction of new information and support services for 'care'-leavers.⁷

The work of the 'Who Am I?' project (detailed elsewhere in this issue) which draws on the knowledge of scholars from a collection of disciplines, as well as other people outside the academy, has been recognised as having a particular relevance to the last of these responses. The project is concerned with issues around child welfare records, including how access to existing records might be improved, what people need to know in order to make sense of their records, and how to best structure current record-keeping practices in order to support people who will seek access to their files in the future with questions about their identity. Over the course of the project it has become clear that historians, social workers and archivists alike had a connection to child welfare records at all points in their existence, and indeed that some 'care'-leavers who had conducted searches for their own records had already come to understand their records as documents with connections to both historical and present-day events. Historians have tended to conceptualise archived documents as static artefacts, but adult survivors of out-of-home 'care' have proven the falsity of this view by demonstrating the connection of such records to personal identity and the new meanings they acquire in different contexts.⁸ Further, they have challenged the sanctity of the 'unchanging record' by suggesting that people should be able to add notes to their own records in order to have a right of reply to comments made about them and their families.

The records continuum theory, first established in Australian archival practice through the work of Ian Maclean in the 1950s and 1960s, was further adapted to the modern environment by authors such as Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, and is now well-known among Australian archivists.⁹ It has proven a useful tool in the work of the 'Who Am I?' team because it helped the archival, historical and social work researchers to conceptualise the different purposes a child welfare record must serve at various points in time, as well as how and why a variety of people have a vested interest in those records. By using the continuum model the team was able to articulate the intersections of interest groups and purposes to research partners, who performed a range of current practice, policy development, administrative and archival roles in the government and non-government child welfare agencies from which they were drawn. The use of this model was particularly important in conveying the team's ideas and goals to the people responsible for maintaining Victoria's child welfare records, many of whom are not trained archivists, or are operating in relative isolation from developments in archival theory and scholarship.

This article is primarily concerned with the outer, or 'fourth', dimension of the records continuum, the space where records are positioned in such a way that they 'are able to be reviewed, accessed and analysed ... for the multiple external accountability ... for as long as they are required'.¹⁰ Attempting to consider records' operation in any one dimension is potentially problematic because, as Barbara Reed has noted, a 'record exists at the same time in all dimensions, but in our day to day working lives we tend to focus on specific views suited to our particular circumstances of employment'.¹¹ Thus any records work must be done with an eye on all parts of the continuum, precisely because it is a continuum and, as Frank Upward argues, all of its dimensions

are inextricable from one another.¹² Based on the work of the ‘Who Am I?’ project, as well as more than 500 written submissions presented to the third of the official inquiries, this article sets out to expand existing understandings of the responsibilities of historians and archivists in facilitating access to personal records.¹³

Why are records important to ‘care’-leavers?

Narratives developed within families give children a sense of continuity, of belonging to a longer story which reaches back into the past.¹⁴ For children who grow up within families, this narrative is preserved in oral history, photograph albums and family memorabilia, and reinforced at birthdays, anniversaries, christenings and other family occasions.¹⁵ As Christine Horrocks and Jim Goddard have argued, such oft-repeated family stories

have a psychological function, in that they bring order to our lives. They enable us to integrate and gain clearer understandings of our experiences, thus fostering an understanding of the self and who we understand ourselves to be.¹⁶

Of course, people do not always like the ways in which their families reinforce their identity. In dysfunctional or crisis-stricken families, transmission and affirmation of belonging and self may be less than robust. Nevertheless, even unstable familial relationships provide people with an anchoring point for constructing their own life stories.

When children are taken into ‘care’, they too often lose those connections, and with them a core component of identity.¹⁷ Many are left ‘not knowing anyone who belonged to [them]’, denied access to family stories.¹⁸ Social identities are constructed through narrative, but ‘care’-leavers lack the key components needed for such a task.¹⁹ Survivor narratives, Suellen Murray has argued, constitute ‘narratives of lost origins’ attempting to make sense of both a childhood and contemporary self in the absence of ‘reliable markers about what happened, and why’.²⁰ In the construction of such narratives, ‘care’-leavers often access institutional records in the hope that they will be able to replace family as the repository of personal histories.

While there are parallels here with searches conducted by genealogists and family historians, identity construction is more complex where the original link with family has been severed. Adoptees and people conceived through donor insemination provide a closer comparison.²¹ Donor offspring have articulated how crucial the truth about their conception is to their identity formation, and how discovery of their true paternity can throw their established life narratives into question – the parallel with adoptees is apparent.²² Similarly, without a knowledge of family histories, ‘care’-leavers have struggled to understand ‘who I was or where I belonged’.²³ As Leonie Sheedy, co-founder of the Care Leavers Australia Network (CLAN), argues:

Being a parentless person is a most difficult thing. I feel like a second class member of the community. I feel different, I have no sense of belonging to a long line of extended relatives, no parents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, second cousins. My loss is also my children’s loss as they have no extended relatives on their mother’s side either. I feel that I have no past, that my life only began at 3 yrs old. The documents and family photos of a normal family life are missing.²⁴

‘When and how do you start telling your own children your childhood life stories?’ asks Deborah Findlay. ‘My children need to know my story and others who lived in

state care so they can understand why they are a little different from other families.²⁵ In what he categorises as the ‘age of testimony’, historian Bain Attwood has argued, the telling of such stories

is no longer simply the *acquisition of historical knowledge* about pasts poorly known ... instead it has become much more ... the *transmission of pasts* to future generations in a way that creates a sense of a strong transgenerational link between the faces and voices of witnesses and those who listen to them.²⁶

The archival records that document ‘care’-leavers’ lives have a deeply personal element, which is often missing in more conventional historical research. The case record that historians find so fascinating is for the ‘care’-leaver, a rare surviving fragment of their earlier self. The reaction to receiving such information varies. Melissa found the process of accessing her files deeply satisfying: ‘As an adult I like finding out the person I am now, as I was as a child, and where I was from.’²⁷ Others were buoyed, and at times angered, to discover that far from being unwanted or rejected as they had repeatedly been told, they had parents, or former foster parents, who had struggled in vain to retain or regain contact.²⁸ Recovered files also contained information about parents and siblings previously believed dead or denied, reinstating individuals as members of real rather than imagined families, even if contact were unable to be established.²⁹ However, for others, such discoveries only intensified their anger. Having been informed by a records access clerk that the brother she had been told was dead was still alive, and that she had another brother whom she had never met, Carol Ann May recalled only devastation and agony.³⁰ Her story is only one of many documenting the emotions and unmet expectations involved in records access. While Jody Ann Smith was excited to receive the ‘present of my childhood’, she found that she had ‘forgotten how unbearable’ that childhood had been.³¹ ‘When I started the search’, Lorna Manning wrote, ‘I thought the ache in the corner of my heart would be erased only to find it has got larger.’³² ‘We are left with a sense of BEWILDERMENT to make sense of it all’, observed Caron, ‘and are forced to study the history and sociology of this era to understand our context.’³³

‘In traumatic memory’, Dominick Capra has argued, ‘the past is not simply history as over and done with. It lives on experientially and haunts and possesses the self or the community.’³⁴ It is part of the role of both historians and archivists to work alongside survivors as they navigate their way through records likely to revive or elicit such traumatic memories. ‘Memories,’ ‘care’-leaver, Regina Stratti observes, ‘are part of our surviving; with knowledge we try and understand how to walk forward. We have survived in a world of judgment with little margin for error’.³⁵ To strengthen the sense of self, ‘care’-leavers must reconcile their newly accessed records with their memories and with the larger public narratives which have been developed through the activities of survivor support groups and the public inquiries.³⁶ This is a complex task. Having grown up with what Caron describes as ‘only a pseudo and fragile sense of self’, many ‘care’-leavers struggle to reconcile a hoped for past with the reality they find in the files, and to make sense of the decisions by both authorities and family members which determined the shape of their childhood lives.³⁷

Files were not designed to meet such needs. They were compiled for bureaucratic reasons and preserve the forms and documents necessary to ensure the efficient operation of an organisation without making any attempt to tell the story of a life.³⁸ The files

encode the views of the 'care'-giver and the language is often alienating, leaving no space for the voice of the child to be heard. 'As a state ward I had no rights', one 'care'-leaver recalled:

When I got access to my files I noticed everything written about me was done by other people, I was never asked a question or allowed to say what was happening to me ... I live with the memories of the treatment, I received, no matter what I do or how hard I try it never leaves me it's always just under the surface.³⁹

Kimm Moore considers herself lucky to have found material that was 'really positive and affirming'.⁴⁰ More commonly what was recorded was negative incident reports, punishment logs and justifications for decisions which disrupted the child's life. A negative impression once formed is often repeated 'over and over, like a broken record or perhaps copied from the page before'.⁴¹ Particularly upsetting are the letters from family seeking to maintain some form of contact. For Linda Eldridge, 'the lack of compassion in the system was abundantly clear when my grandmother's heartfelt request for even a photo was denied'.⁴²

What does this mean for archivists?

Archivists cannot change what is contained within the files, but they can think about their practice taking into account the perceptions and sensitivities of 'care'-leavers. As Tom Nesmith notes, much of the scholarship around the records continuum has focused on developing strategies for capturing and describing records more effectively and there is still much scope for extending discussions about what the continuum model might suggest about improving access to existing collections.⁴³ In 1994 Helen Nosworthy contended that there were still many archivists who saw themselves as the last line of defence between the archived records and the public.⁴⁴ Since then the post-custodial view of archival management has received more attention in scholarly literature, and this view offers some opportunities for reimagining the relationships between archivists, creators of documents, the records themselves and the people about whom the records contain information.⁴⁵

The revitalisation of debate around archival practice stimulated by the changing ways in which people are accessing archives has produced some fruitful discussions. Many archivists have reconceptualised their professional relationships with the increasing number, and types, of people who are requesting access to collections, often as part of their journeys of identity construction. This has provoked an array of responses ranging from reconceptualising the delivery of services within archival reading rooms (particularly in response to the flow of genealogical researchers), through reconsidering access conditions to certain records (a leading example being adoption records), to changing the ways archival series and collections are described to account for the range of cultural backgrounds of the people now seeking out this material (examples include guides produced to help Indigenous people locate records about themselves, and the redevelopment of online catalogues to explain materials to people who may not be seasoned researchers).⁴⁶

Even within scholarly works, however, some authors have continued to frame their studies of the post-custodial archival environment in terms of the archivist's responsibility to the records themselves.⁴⁷ The experiences of 'care'-leavers searching for their files also suggest that the 'gatekeeper' mentality is still very much present among some in the field. Despite recent legislative and procedural changes designed to improve

access to personal records, issues around archiving practice, privacy and what one 'care'-leaver described as bureaucratic self-preservation continue to frustrate those who seek their files in order to construct a coherent version of their lives.⁴⁸ The fact that many of the people responsible for releasing files to 'care'-leavers in Victoria are not trained archivists certainly plays a role in this. Although their intentions are good, they are often drawn into risk-averse interpretations of privacy legislation. This has engendered suspicion among many 'care'-leavers that both government departments and community sector organisations refuse to release certain records, or obscure their existence, in order to prevent the release of evidence of neglect and abuse. Discussions held during the course of the 'Who am I?' project with people undertaking records release roles suggest that this is not how they explain the rationale behind their decisions.

Participants in 'Who am I?' workshops have cited examples of situations in which they believed that information in the files had the potential to cause psychological damage to the 'care'-leaver making the request. Workers for government offices are bound by Victorian privacy legislation which prohibits release of such information, but people releasing non-government records have expressed their ethical concerns about revealing information which they consider extremely distressing. This situation may look quite different from the perspective of the 'care'-leaver. Mary Brownlee found access to her records blocked by an official who assured her that she 'would not like to see what had been written in my records, but don't say that I told you that'.⁴⁹ The intention of refusing to release such information was surely motivated by the desire to prevent psychological harm, but it is difficult to balance the risk of potential harm with the inevitable trauma that is the legacy of gaping holes in people's life stories. One positive response has been the supported release of records, meaning that psychologists, social workers or others with relevant experience are present when applicants first read their files.

Another reason cited for blocking access to files, or at least to some information contained within them, is the protection of third parties identified in the records. After initially being surprised by the detailed files documenting his childhood, Frank Golding was

staggered to find Departmental officials reluctant to give back all that was surely mine, the story of my life in their care. Having preserved the files of events going back fifty years, why continue to decide what we could and could not read?⁵⁰

Information which those releasing records may identify as exposing a third party to a breach of privacy may, for the 'care'-leaver constitute a crucial part of their family story, because the third party that is being protected is a family member. In recordkeeping systems in which all information about siblings was concentrated on the oldest, or youngest, child's files, third party information is often part of the individual story of other family members. This should encourage us to reflect on Reed's comment that recordkeeping 'does not occur in a cultural or political void' and question the extent to which we can create flexible practices that are responsive to broader, and potentially fluctuating, social needs.⁵¹

The missing pieces in individual case records are not always the result of information being withheld. People look to the records of their time in 'care' for self validation, but the surviving records are frequently sketchy and disjointed, providing at best only partial, and often quite damaging answers to such questions as: 'why was I put into "care"?'; 'what happened to me while I was there', and; 'why did "care" providers treat me in that way?'⁵² Often the traces of people's lives are scattered across many different

files, meaning that the request for a particular file is just the beginning of a trail that will lead through many archives. In the struggle to navigate around such barriers in order ‘to fill in the gaps’ in personal histories, to find the ‘(Me) who I truly never quite knew as a whole person because I was missing the most important years of my life’, survivors are forced to become ‘historians of the self’.⁵³ The need to fill the gaps was particularly important for Linda Eldridge who moved frequently during her time in ‘care’:

With each new family came a new name, new friends and it was if [sic] the old ones did not exist. Years later I visited every home where I lived and took photos so that I could validate to myself that ‘yes, this place really does exist’ and I remembered what my life was like when I lived there.⁵⁴

Coherence is central to identity development, but it is a need that surviving files are ill-equipped to meet.⁵⁵ As Caron observed, ‘hidden ... from society, removed and stripped of all being, many of these older ex-wards have no records of their lives in these institutions other than three sole lines: name, date of birth and parents.’⁵⁶ Kerry Blake’s file contained ‘no photos, nor anecdotes, just a slim green file, with a sentence devoted to Kerry, who was “a good girl” and the information ‘that at four years of age I was 2’6” tall, and weighted 2 stone 11 pounds’.⁵⁷ At many non-government institutions record-keeping was minimal, ‘no memory, no photos, no medical, school reports nothing’, whole childhoods contained within one or two sheets of paper.⁵⁸

Preparing people for the gaps that may be in their records helps. Archivists should ensure that the extent and nature of available records are clearly identified. Given the (probably) hundreds of repositories holding child welfare records in Australia, and considering the under-resourcing and under-valuing of these files over many decades, this is a massive undertaking. The ‘Who am I?’ archivists have worked with the project’s partner organisations to make a start in Victoria, creating a centralised and publicly accessible listing of the organisations which currently hold records relating to specific institutions and out-of-home ‘care’ programs, though some agencies are not yet in a position to itemise their holdings in detail.

Gaps in files may also be easier for ‘care’-leavers to accept if it is possible to explain the reasons for the missing pieces. It is at this point that historians and archivists, working together, have a particular role to play. Archivists are particularly adept at identifying systemic flaws which have led to the destruction or misplacement of files. However, ‘care’-leavers often find that some of the information they expect to find in their records was never documented. The ‘Who am I?’ historians have been able to shed some light on the processes through which child welfare records were created, and to decode some of the language that can be both mystifying and distressing to the people reading their own files. Working with archivists, historians also possess the tools to identify and contextualise additional materials that can provide explanations in response to many of the questions that personal files fail to answer. Locating, and where possible making publicly available, such sources has been one of the key achievements of the ‘Who am I?’ archival and historical teams. This collaborative approach drew on the model established by Peter Read and Anna Haebich, whose research was central to the inquiry into Indigenous child removal.⁵⁹

The major output of this intellectual exchange has been the Pathways web resource which in turn provides a model for the national Find and Connect web resource which is to be developed over the next three years.⁶⁰ Pathways is a public knowledge space,

drawing on materials that are already in the public domain. While it cannot, and would not, provide people with access to information about their families, it contains information about the institutions and organisations that were acting *in loco parentis*, and listings of the contents and location of their archival holdings. Individual interlinked pages document the institutions, charities, government departments, key figures and key concepts in the history of child welfare in Victoria. Such historical information, augmented by entries charting changing laws, policies and attitudes relating to child welfare, is intended to help 'care'-leavers to answer some of the 'Why' questions that arise from a reading of their individual records. By removing barriers to accessing information, it aims to present information in a way that is 'user friendly', raising public awareness of a long-silenced history, and providing people with materials to help them make sense of the past and to help them tell their own stories.

The methodology employed builds upon the concept of shared authority, first expounded by Michael Frisch in relation to the practice of oral history.⁶¹ It is not a top down or benevolent model, but rather one of ceding authority in order to stand alongside and learn from each other, recognising complementary skills and knowledge sets.⁶² Survivor support groups have been critical in helping us find the language in which to share our knowledge, while policy makers and practitioners contribute an understanding of contemporary recordkeeping and access provisions. The site does not claim to offer an objective or authoritative version of the past; rather each entry aims to present a range of viewpoints linking wherever possible to primary sources that access 'care'-leavers' voices and complicate the received history of out of home 'care'.

'Care'-leavers using the site have shown a decided preference for the visual material. Given the absence of such materials in most surviving case records, it would seem that illustrations of buildings, residents and staff on Pathways are already beginning to function as a 'family album' for those who have none. 'Care'-leavers who access records in order to gain some power over what Mary Brownlee describes as 'a profoundly sad part of my life' already testify to the importance of doing so within a peer support group who, in the absence of family, constitute the one group of people who understand their lives.⁶³ The national Find and Connect web resource will have the potential to extend this sense of a shared consciousness into a virtual space not only for 'care'-leavers engaged in the process of identity construction but also for their partners and children, and all others in the community wanting to understand their lived experience.

Many archivists work with collections that contain records that could provide contextual information to 'care'-leavers. This paper has argued for the importance of archivists working collaboratively with historians and representatives of 'care'-leaver organisations to establish which records might be of the most value and to develop procedures through which they can be made accessible. Establishing this kind of practice takes time, and potentially adds time to the release of information. The archivist's primary responsibility will always be to the preservation of the record. However, the testimony of 'care'-leavers has highlighted the importance of developing an approach to archival work that incorporates a direct responsibility to people, community and society as well.

Endnotes

1. Care is a term which has been adopted by providers of programs for children who needed to be accommodated apart from their parents. In principle it is useful as an umbrella because it describes the intention of protecting children without establishing unnecessary distinctions

- between different forms of placements – for example children’s homes, foster care and kinship care. However, many people who grew up in ‘care’ object to this way of describing the placements they experienced because they received very little that was actually *caring* in their daily lives. In recognition of this, the word ‘care’ is denoted in inverted commas.
2. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (HREOC), *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families*, HREOC, Sydney, 1997; Australian Senate Community Affairs References Committee, *Lost Innocents: Righting the Record Report on Child Migration*, Senate Printing Unit, Canberra, 2001; Australian Senate Community Affairs References Committee, *Forgotten Australians: A Report on Australians Who Experienced Institutional or out-of-Home Care as Children*, Senate Printing Unit, Canberra, 2004.
 3. The two apologies can be found at <http://www.dfat.gov.au/indigenous/apology-to-stolen-generations/national_apology.html>, accessed 20 March 2012, and <http://www.fahcsia.gov.au/sa/families/progserv/apology_forgotten_au/Pages/default.aspx>, accessed 20 March 2012.
 4. The submissions are available at <http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate_Committees?url=clac_ctte/completed_inquiries/2004-07/inst_care/submissions/sublist.htm>, accessed 20 March 2012.
 5. Bain Attwood, ‘In the Age of Testimony: The Stolen Generations Narrative, “Distance,” and Public History’, *Public Culture*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2008, pp. 77–8.
 6. *ibid.*, p. 80.
 7. The Australian Government response to the Bringing them Home inquiry is summarised at <<http://www.racismnoway.com.au/teaching-resources/factsheets/52.html>>, accessed 20 March 2012. Responses to the other two inquiries are reported at <http://www.jennymacklin.fahcsia.gov.au/mediareleases/2009/Pages/forgotten_au_revisted_26nov2009.aspx> accessed 20 March 2012.
 8. This shares much with the view of the dynamic nature of records described in: Tom Nesmith, ‘Re-Exploring the Continuum, Rediscovering Archives’, *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 36, no. 2, November 2008, pp. 34–43.
 9. On Maclean’s contribution to the records continuum see: Frank Upward, ‘In Search of the Continuum: Ian Maclean’s “Australian Experience” Essays on Recordkeeping’, in Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott (ed.), *The Records Continuum: Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years*, Ancora Press, Clayton (VIC), 1994, pp. 110–130. For examples of Upward and McKemmish’s work on the continuum see: Frank Upward, ‘Structuring the Records Continuum Part One: Post-Custodial Principles and Properties’, *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 24, no. 2, November 1996, pp. 268–85; and, Sue McKemmish, ‘Are Records Ever Actual?’, in McKemmish and Piggott (ed.), *The Records Continuum*, pp. 187–203.
 10. Barbara Reed, ‘Reading the Records Continuum: Interpretations and Explorations’, *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 1, May 2005, pp. 18–43, p. 21.
 11. *ibid.*
 12. Frank Upward, ‘The Records Continuum and the Concept of an End Product’, *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 32, no. 1, May 2004, pp. 40–62, p. 47.
 13. The primary source for ‘care’-leaver voices in this article is the submissions made to the Forgotten Australians inquiry, available at <http://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate_Committees?url=clac_ctte/completed_inquiries/2004-07/inst_care/submissions/sublist.htm>, accessed 20 March 2012. Recruited through ‘care’-leaver support groups and public advertisement, the voices in this valuable archive include Indigenous and non-Indigenous survivors and former child migrants, providing a powerful counter-narrative to the conventional history of child welfare in Australia. Individuals making submissions to the inquiry could choose whether or not they would be identified on the website.
 14. Suellen Murray, John Murphy, Elizabeth Brannigan and Jenny Malone, *After the Orphanage: Life Beyond the Children’s Home*, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, 2009, pp. 48–52.
 15. Jim Goddard, Julia Feast, and Derek Kirton, ‘Memories, Childhood and Professional Power: Accessing the Care Files of Former Children in Care’, in *Narrative and Memory*, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, 2007, p. 24.
 16. Christine Horrocks and Jim Goddard, ‘Adults Who Grew up in Care: Constructing the Self and Access Care Files’, *Child and Family Social Work*, vol. 11, 2006, pp. 264–72, p. 266
 17. Forgotten Australians submission 360, Alan Sheridan.

18. Forgotten Australians submission 153, John Brown.
19. Margaret Somers, 'The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach', *Theory and Society*, vol. 23, 1994, pp. 605–49, p. 605.
20. Murray et al, *After the Orphanage*, p. 53.
21. Judith Etherton, 'The Role of Archives in the Perception of Self', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 27, no. 2, 2006, pp. 227–46; AJ Turner and A Coyle, 'What Does it Mean to be a Donor Offspring? The Identity Experiences of Adults Conceived by Donor Insemination and the Implications for Counselling Therapy', *Human Reproduction*, vol. 15, no. 9, 2000, pp. 2041–51; Carol Cumming Speirs, 'The Destruction of Foster Care Files in Quebec: The Co-opting of a Profession', *Child Welfare*, vol. 74, no. 3, 1995, pp. 763–78.
22. Maggie Kirkman, 'Parents' Contributions, to the Narrative Identity of Offspring of Donor-Assisted Conception', *Social Science and Medicine*, vol. 57, 2003, pp. 2229–42.
23. Forgotten Australians submission 20, Ray Flett.
24. Forgotten Australians submission 33, Leonie Sheedy.
25. Forgotten Australians submission 449, Deborah Findlay.
26. Attwood, 'In the Age of Testimony', p. 86.
27. Forgotten Australians submission 241, Melissa.
28. Forgotten Australians submission 442, Elizabeth B; submission 351, Rosalie Bridgland.
29. Forgotten Australians submission 108, Margaret Bissetts; submission 172, Margaret Peterson.
30. Forgotten Australians submission 344, Carol Ann May.
31. Forgotten Australians submission 504, Jody Anne Smith.
32. Forgotten Australians submission 184, Lorna Manning.
33. Forgotten Australians submission 369, Caron.
34. Dominick LaCapra, *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2004, p. 56.
35. Forgotten Australians submission 314, Regina Stratti.
36. Murray et al, *After the Orphanage*, p. 51; Horrocks and Goddard, 'Adults Who Grew up in Care: Constructing the Self and Access Care Files', p. 266.
37. Forgotten Australians submission 369, Caron; submission 96, Samilya Muller.
38. Forgotten Australians submission 351, Rosalie Bridgland.
39. Forgotten Australians submission 476.
40. Forgotten Australians submission 477, Kimm Moore.
41. Forgotten Australians submission 245; submission 464, Ella Street.
42. Forgotten Australians submission 470, Linda Eldridge.
43. Nesmith, 'Re-Exploring the Continuum', p. 36.
44. Helen Nosworthy, 'Reaching Out: A Core Program for Australian Archives', in McKemmish and Piggott (ed.), *The Records Continuum*, p. 66.
45. See for example: Upward, 'Structuring the Records Continuum Part One', pp. 268–85; Tom Nesmith, 'Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives', *The American Archivist*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2002, pp. 24–41; Alistair Tough, 'The Post-Custodial/Pro-Custodial Argument from a Records Management Perspective', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2004, pp. 19–26.
46. Louise Crave, 'From the Archivist's Cardigan to the Very Dead Sheep: What are Archives? What are Archivists? What do they do?', in Louise Craven (ed.), *What are Archives?: Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: A Reader*, Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot, 2008, pp. 7–30; Hannah Little, 'Archive Fever as Genealogical Fever: Coming Home to Scottish Archives', *Archivaria*, vol. 64, Fall 2007, pp. 89–112; Etherton, 'The Role of Archives in the Perception of Self', pp. 227–46.
47. See for example: Don Boadle, 'Reinventing the Archive in a Virtual Environment: Australians and the Non-Custodial Management of Electronic Records', *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, vol. 35, no. 3, 2004, pp. 242–52; Elizabeth Yakel, 'Knowledge Management: The Archivist's and the Records Manager's Perspective', *Information Management Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2000, pp. 24–30.
48. Forgotten Australians submission 73, Bernard Brady.
49. Forgotten Australians submission 57, Mary Brownlee.
50. Forgotten Australians submission 18, Frank Golding.
51. Reed, 'Reading the Records Continuum', p. 20.

52. Forgotten Australians submission 241, Melissa.
53. Murray et al, *After the Orphanage*, p. 52.
54. Forgotten Australians submission 470, Linda Eldridge.
55. Horrocks and Goddard, 'Adults Who Grew up in Care: Constructing the Self and Access Care Files', p. 268.
56. Forgotten Australians submission 369, Caron.
57. Forgotten Australians submission 418, Kerry Blake.
58. Forgotten Australians submission 314, Regina Stratti; submission 3, Garry Harrison; submission 100, Ian Morwood.
59. Coral Edwards and Peter Read, *The Lost Children: Thirteen Australians Taken from Their Aboriginal Families Tell of the Struggle to Find Their Natural Parents*, Doubleday, Moorebank (NSW), 1989; Anna Haebich, *Broken Circles: Fragmenting Indigenous Families 1800–2000*, Fremantle Arts Centre Press, Fremantle (WA), 2000; Doreen Mellor and Anna Haebich, *Many Voices: Reflections on Experiences of Indigenous Child Separation*, National Library of Australia, Canberra, 2002. Although not directly relevant to this article it is important to note that, as with the works listed above, 'care'-leavers have also been involved in this collaborative practice, participating in workshops and commenting on and contributing to the web resource.
60. Pathways is incorporated into this new resources as Find and Connect Victoria and will continue to be developed for the duration of the project, available at <<http://www.findandconnect.gov.au/vic/>>, accessed 20 March 2012.
61. Michael Frisch, *A Shared Authority Essays on the Craft and Meaning of Oral and Public History*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1990.
62. Katharine T Corbett and Howard S Miller, 'A Shared Inquiry into Shared Inquiry', *The Public Historian*, vol. 28, no. 1, 2006, p. 20.
63. Forgotten Australians submission 57, Mary Brownlee; submission 258, Caroline Carroll.