Sharing our Story: An Archaeology of Archival Thought[1]

Joanna Sassoon

Joanna Sassoon has managed photograph collections, taught in cultural heritage and in archives and records management. Her PhD was in Australian history, she publishes widely on photography and digitisation theory and in Australian and environmental history. She is Senior Archivist at State Records Office of Western Australia, seconded to work on the Stolen Wages project for the WA Government, and is an adjunct Senior Lecturer at Edith Cowan University. She is the Convenor of the Fourth International Conference on the History of Records and Archives (ICHORA4).

***

This paper is an exploratory dig through some contemporary issues in archival science. Rather than seeing archival practice as the 'lone shag on the rock', this paper will look at ways in which archival thought can be placed at the centre of interdisciplinary thinking, and ways in which archival thought has drawn on other disciplines. This paper argues that by expanding our own archival minds, and embedding our expanding archival world view in places which matter, there is still hope for our own profession, and our planet's future.

The theme of the Australian Society of Archivists' 2007 conference: *Initiatives, ideas and interactions, Sharing our story,* raises some important questions. For example, with whom do we share our story? How do we shape the stories we want to share? Whose stories get told and whose do not?

Milan Kundera, in his oft quoted phrase, writes: 'The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting'.[2] Writers about archives use this phrase because archivists are central to this power struggle. Archivists have the power to shape memory, to shape how a community remembers and how a community forgets.[3]

Because archivists work with materials of memory daily, it is hard for them to imagine what it is like to be in a world without memories.[4] Jeannette Bastian discusses the role that archival institutions and archival materials play in shaping how communities remember. She also makes the important point that it is not only history that is written by the winners, but also that the archives are written by the winners.[5] But what if we turned this around and said that it is because the archives are written by the winners, that history reflects the winner's story? This way, archives can be seen at the centre of shaping how history can be written.

Should we simply accept that archives are written by the winners? How can we acknowledge the holders of the knowledge in archives, who in so many Australian colonial and historical contexts are Indigenous people? How do we acknowledge our agency as professional archivists in shaping this understanding that history is written by the winners?

How we *think* underpins what we do *to* and *with* archives, so what we need to do is to excavate our thinking.

What constitutes an archive?

What do archivists as a profession see constitutes an archive? *ISO15489 Records Management* states that records (which become archives) are 'information created, received and maintained as evidence and information by an organisation or persons in pursuance of legal obligations or in the transaction of business'.[6] And we think of this information as being contained in a range of formats including paper, audio, visual, textual, cartographic and electronic.

Archivists are becoming more aware that these formats exclude non-literate, dispossessed, and mobile cultures apart from our own. There is an awareness that most standard archival formats contain representations *about* others, rather than others being in control of how they are represented. In an attempt to ameliorate these biases some archivists have been collecting 'against the grain', to right/write the

wrongs in the records and provide a more complex understanding of the stories of Australia's past.

But let us think for a moment about what could constitute an archive. In the book *Prisoner in the Garden,* the Mandela archive presents us with an expansive model. The authors suggest that:

> While a conventional archive has a single location and a finite number of documents, the Mandela archive is an infinite one, located in innumerable places, it is also not confined to documents, but includes sites, landscapes, material objects, performances, photographs, artworks, stories and the memories of individuals.[7]

From this perspective, the Mandela archive contains a dispersed and infinite number of related objects in a wide range of tangible and intangible formats, and it paints a broad canvas of a cultural product called 'an archive'. The archival glue cementing the relationships between formats in this context, and what is documented is somehow connected to Nelson Mandela.

Given this approach is already being implemented, can the Mandela archive lead us, to use the title of his autobiography, on our own *Long walk to freedom,*[8] to work towards an expansive model of what constitutes archival materials? Can the Mandela archive assist us to release our intellectual shackles and to expand our idea about the formats we embrace within our archival mind? How can we as archivists shift our thinking to a 'Mandela Model' and see archives as part of a broader cultural landscape?

The idea of bringing archives, landscape and memory together is powerful. While *Landscape and memory* are forever linked with the title of Simon Schama's famous book, is it possible to bring archives into a fold with landscape and memory?[9] To answer this I will pursue two questions. Firstly, does the mind which thinks about cultural landscapes think archivally? Secondly, can we train the archival mind to think that cultural landscapes or other formats are archival?

Does the mind which looks at cultural landscapes think archivally?

As an archaeology student, I was taught to ask questions such as: why was Stonehenge created, what function was it created to serve, and how

does it relate to other parts of the cultural landscape? Another set of questions arose from the materiality of archaeological objects - using what items are made from, and their condition - as evidence.[10] These questions included: what does the distribution of bluestone hand-axes teach us about Neolithic trade routes? Another set of questions arose pertinent to Australia: what does the rock on which the rock art is etched tell us about the history of the earth? And what does the condition of the rock on which the art is etched tell us about environmental change since the art was created? Why was the art created, and what messages was it designed to communicate?

If one sees landscape in its entire constituent and interrelated parts as an archive, and memory is a function of archives, disciplines such as archaeology and geology bring landscape and memory together. While they deal with different time scales and different source materials, these disciplines ask: why were objects created, what purpose were they created to serve, what message were they designed to communicate, and how have they been used? Is it no surprise that these questions sound familiar to us as archivists, because the mind that looks at archaeological, geological and cultural landscapes, *thinks* archivally.

Can the archival mind be trained to consider that landscapes or other formats also constitute archives?

A second question which arises out of the link between landscape and memory is whether the archival mind can be trained to think about landscapes or other 'non-traditional' formats as archival.

The 'Mandela Model' demonstrates that there are archival relationships between a range of diverse formats. If our thinking is common to other disciplines which look at landscape, can we expand our mind to see that landscapes and other formats are also part of a broader way of understanding what constitutes an archive? Can we share our archival story with other disciplines?

But are these questions about whether we can bring a new range of formats together and claim their archival qualities, really another way of my raising the issue of convergence?

Convergence

Convergence - the bringing together of the collections sector - archives, galleries, libraries and museums - is a hot topic in Australia, and most particularly for archives and archivists.[11] The current Australian version of convergence is based on two perceptions. Firstly that all cultural institutions hold *collections* of stuff. Secondly convergence is based on the premise that what we do is similar across the sector. The emerging convergence of the Tasmanian Archives and Library[12] and the prior formation of Libraries and Archives Canada, can be seen as marriages of convenience, or perhaps even as *An Inconvenient truth.*[13]

One consequence of these naïve understandings about the collections sector is that technology is being used as the driver for convergence - to bring what we all *hold* under one digital umbrella. So, the current thinking underpinning discussions about convergence in Australia is based on what *we hold* and what *we do,* rather than *how we think.* Our challenge as archivists is translating how we *think* about our material into the digital world.[14]

In Australia, convergence of institutions has a history. Archives have spent decades trying to get out from under the skirts of libraries, and in this sense, archival institutional history has been about divergence from other sectors to create their own separate identity.[15] For example, in the 1920s in Western Australia, draft legislation proposed bringing together the administration of documents and buildings.[16] This idea failed because of the depression, and because of dispute between the administrative empires of two public servants. But fundamentally it failed because it was an administrative solution to bring two bureaucracies together rather than a solution underpinned by solid thinking about the material forms that were being merged.

Like the discussions in Western Australia in the 1920s, the contemporary discussion about the collections sector is suffused with the wrong kind of thinking. But the example of failed convergence between documents and buildings in WA in the 1920s raises important questions. How should we *think* about convergence, who should we choose as partners for a sustainable relationship, and with whom should we share our bedtime stories?

The 'Mandela Model' shows us a new way of thinking about convergence. Underpinned by an archival mind, the 'Mandela Model' is based on

understanding that the constituent parts of a cultural and physical landscape are part of a broader system. This broader system is a network of related entities interacting together with their non-living (physical, geographical and administrative) environment.[17]

What is interesting in the 'Mandela Model' is that it is based on the definition of an ecosystem. This suggests that the 'Mandela Model' of convergence has recognised that the *thinking* about an ecosystem is remarkably similar to how archivists *think* about archival relationships between records and their administrative environment. The 'Mandela Model' uses this common thinking to generate their expansive idea of what constitutes an archive.

The 'Mandela Model' has harnessed technology to reconstitute lost contexts and relationships between multiple formats across cultural landscapes, and to reconstruct the ecosystem centred around Mandela. In this model, Mandela's mother's grinding stone is part of his archive, as is the quarry where the grinding stone was extracted. Without the context linking the grinding stone to Mandela, it is simply another piece of detritus littering the landscape.

How far can this 'Mandela Model' for convergence based on the idea of an ecosystem be taken in Australia? The idea of heritage relates to the things we value enough to keep, to pass from one generation to another.[18] So, following the 'Mandela Model', what if archivists converged with the whole heritage sector? Far from being an *Inconvenient truth,* could this be a true marriage of minds? What if we recognised the common archival thinking which underpins studies of landscapes, archaeological materials, the built environment and geological evidence and see our natural partners as the heritage sector - rather than being simply hitchhikers on the technological superhighway, could this be our *Long walk to freedom?*

As archivists, we need to expand our idea of what constitutes an archive, and think about the suitability of converging with the heritage sector. This approach is sustainable because archives are part of a broader cultural system in which heritage is seen as the umbrella. And while heritage looks at one level at the *things* we value, the heritage sector is suffused with a mind which thinks archivally.

It is important that archivists look outwards, to expand their archival horizons beyond the collections sector to the heritage sector, and

understand that the way archivists think is also the way that other related disciplines think. We as archivists also need to look more at our own professional thinking. We need to firstly acknowledge our own agency in shaping a general understanding that history and archives are written by the winners, and then think about how we deal with this.

Thinking archivally

Let us go back to the foundations of our archival principles and how our thinking and practice relate. Sir Hilary Jenkinson's seminal roar is that the primary duty of the archivist is the moral defence of archives.[19] Practices of arrangement and description are one way archivists defend the ability of the records to retain their evidential value.

But how diligent have archivists been in our moral defence of the archives? Have archivists accepted a single story of the creator of the archives, have they been passively reflecting the ideology of the administrator, and that archives tend to be written by the winners? If archivists take a user's understanding that there is no single truth, only multiple stories, how have they been reflecting this in documentation practices? With the moral defence of the archives in mind, let us turn to current thinking about three areas of archival theory - provenance, continuum and format.

Provenance

Provenance is a dynamic concept. We have moved beyond simply identifying who created the body of records through nominating the single person or corporate body as creator, to understanding that relationships between the creator and the records need to be documented.[20] But does provenance only happen once, is it exclusive, and what other ways are there of thinking about provenance?

Tom Nesmith takes a cross-cultural approach and encourages thinking about the provenance of winners' sources. Where, he asks, does our traditional idea of provenance leave the Indigenous archives of knowledge which are at the core of the archives of colonial Europeans? How can we think about documenting archives written *by* the winners but *containing* the knowledge of Indigenous people?[21]

These questions require us to shift our ideas about provenance to be more inclusive of the complexity of the creation of archival sources and

the multiple stories they contain. Within the 'Mandela Model', the social causes and frameworks which influence the records creation are part of the societal provenance - for example, the systems of justice, politics and resistance. So if we *think* that we should document societal provenance in the moral defence of the record, then how do we go about *doing* this?[22]

Chris Hurley's parallel provenance provides another way of thinking. Hurley sees provenance as more than simple relationships between units which tell stories of context and structure.[23] Hurley writes that, 'Parallel provenance is neither a partial, nor a compromised, nor a winner's view. It recognises wholeness, contestation and ambiguity'.[24] Thinking through why this kind of approach is important, Hurley writes that 'different perspectives on the past ... provide ... the whole contextual meaning, as well as enriched discovery pathways'.[25]

The 'Mandela Model' builds on the idea that provenance can be more than what Mandela himself created. It looks to the complex web of interrelated systems in which records *about* Mandela were created. Interrelated parts of this system include the dominant culture at particular moments itself, judicial systems, and systems of social resistance, and Truth and Reconciliation.

Our thinking about cross-cultural, multiple and parallel provenances, within a model which acknowledges relationships akin to an ecosystem, challenges us to devise documentation practices which acknowledge the original and multiple sources of knowledge in our archives. This thinking may well lead us towards a more sustainable moral defence of the archives.

Continuum

The saying that archaeology is rubbish resonates with archival theory, though both archaeologists and archivists have moved beyond the idea that they simply rummage through the dustbin of history.[26] Archaeologists now look beyond what the object is, to the social and cultural biography of the objects, how their meanings change over time and according to context, how each layer of meaning enriches the overall understanding of the object itself, and that the materiality of the object also contributes to its meaning. They have also started to look at how the histories of objects unfold in the present, and extend into the past and into the future.[27]

In this context, an exhibition at Hyde Park Barracks challenges how we think about rats. Are they pests or archaeologists, can our thinking about them change over time?[28] Excavating rat holes showed the shifting meanings of objects over time and context - what was once thought to be rubbish to humans, is valuable to rats, and eventually to curators. In being moved across contexts, these objects accrued multiple meanings in different contexts and have over their lives been afforded different cultural values.

To a more local, Northern Territory example, the Borroloola Library is thought to have come originally from America, possibly from the Carnegie Foundation. There is no surviving tangible evidence of the library, yet the Borroloola Library has left its mark in the literature, in folklore and in the memories of the community. Nicholas Jose, whose grandfather is central to the Borroloola Library story, muses on the termite mounds of the Northern Territory landscape:[29]

> I like to think that some small part of that has come from the ants or the termites that have eaten the Borroloola library and totally digested it and made it into something else, which is these ant mounds. Apparently when white ants eat a bit of newspaper ... you will find traces of that newspaper inside the tunnels in the ant bed, so it may well be that a few pages of Henry James or whoever ended up in some ant bed at Borroloola.[30]

These two stories begin to demonstrate the possibilities for looking at archives through a material cultural eye. They show that we could think about the multiple provenances of archival materials and somehow pests as co-creators of meaning. This is all good continuum theory - that from the idea of creation, to the actions and transactions of creators, collectors, and curators, what each agent does *with* and *to* archival materials is part of the ongoing making of meaning.

But how do we document the multiple histories and ongoing lives of archival materials within our own conceptual framework? How do we document the lives of estrays and their history of recovery? How do we document how rats and white ants add new dimensions to the lives of archives? How do we document the contexts in which we salvage the records, as well as the contexts in which they were created? These are some of our professional challenges as archivists.

Format

If we accept that archival thinking underpins thought processes across the heritage sector, how can we expand what formats we as archivists consider archival? While Terry Cook has noted our obsession with electronic records,[31] has the advent of digital records led us to rethink our ways and theories?[32]

Continuum thinking has brought archivists forward to the point of creation of good and sustainable records, but can the continuum turn anticlockwise? Can we rewind this thinking about electronic records to look at older formats in our care? Does the essence of a record differ in each format? How best can this be preserved in the digital and original and also the digital translation?

Debates about electronic records will hopefully rid the profession of the pestilence of the idea that we are format-neutral.[33] Why a pestilence? We as archivists see ourselves as format neutral, yet we privilege one format, electronic, above all others. We also think that what we do to textual sources can be overlain onto other formats. However our *thinking* about electronic records can assist us to recognise the commonalities and complexities of each format, and then expand our idea of format so we can start to debate with whom we want to converge. This may be our *Long walk to freedom* but we have the 'Mandela Model' as our guide.

So far in this excavation of archival thought, this article has argued that we need to expand our idea of what constitutes an archive, consider converging with other disciplines who think archivally, and think about how we can get our practice up-to-date with some of the theory so as to improve our moral defence of the records. There is yet one more point about where we see ourselves as archivists, and where we place ourselves more broadly in society.

Previously discussed was the role of archives in shaping memory, but we need to move from thinking about archives only in relation to the past, to bringing archives much more centrally into contemporary culture.

Pluralising the archival paradigm

This article aims to expand our ideas about what could be seen as archival. But one great conceptual challenge is, (and to steal a title from an

international archival project),[34] that we need to *pluralise our archival paradigm.*

Along with native title claims, three key national reports in Australia have been produced in the last few years which demonstrate that 'archives are fundamental to understanding who we are'.[35] These reports are the *Bringing them home* report,[36] *the Lost Innocents: righting the record - report on child migration,*[37] and *Unfinished business: Indigenous stolen wages.*[38] These three reports demonstrate the powerful role that archives play in ameliorating individual and collective pain of the past, how archives are used to rebuild a sense of individual, community and national identity, and how archives build bridges between the past and help chart a national future.

However, we have been missing one signpost on our *Long walk to freedom* so far, which demonstrates the central role for archives and our future.

Climate change is sending a tsunami of uncertainty about our very existence through the world, and it is now on the lips of many powerful and influential individuals. As archivists, we know that without archives there would be no debate about climate change, but we have not yet exploited the extraordinary number of times Al Gore said, 'from the record', in *An Inconvenient Truth* to let people know of the role of archives in bringing context to contemporary national debate.

More than any other recent issue, archivists should be able to harness debates about climate change to help expand the idea of what constitutes an archive to include Antarctic and Arctic ice cores, the Thylacine etched on the rocks on the Burrup Peninsula,[39] now extinct animals in the South Australian Museum,[40] dried and living plant specimens in herbaria or all kinds of documented observations in meteorological archives.

Archivists can harness the debate about climate change to encourage the profession to see possibilities for convergence with other disciplines who think like archivists yet deal with other formats. But, could this approach be seen as forming yet another unsustainable relationship? If there are solid foundations of a common thinking - that is, if we can see that lurking in all these other formats is an archival mind, then this kind of convergence could work in the very long term.

But we can do more than simply expand our archival mind to consider new formats as archives in this climate change debate. We can expand

our archival reach under the umbrella of climate change. To enhance the profile of the archival profession, we must find ways to demonstrate the central role that archives play in national debates such as climate change. We must find ways to harness the debate about climate change to bring archives into greater prominence in a national consciousness for one very good reason: statements about *change* are statements which involve archives.

Archivists can turn climate change into an archival advocacy tool, to demonstrate how change over time can only be measured by using archival materials. Immediately, Australian archivists could join with The Association of Canadian Archivists which is building a Climate Change special interest group entitled CRISIS (Climate Records and Information Special Interest Section). However, a slightly different approach chould be encouraged. Imagine a coalition with other archival organisations across the world to make this a global rather than local Special Interest Group. Imagine the reach if archivists could engage Nobel Prizewinner Al Gore (US), Professor David Suzuki (Canada) and Professor Ian Lowe (Australia) as patrons and enrich the messages about climate change by including the central role of archives?

Conclusion

So, in this paper I have excavated the surface scatter of archival thought, and dug deep into the stratigraphy of contemporary archival theory about convergence and our moral defence of the record. My overall message to archivists is that we must turn both inward and outward, and work towards enriched archival relationships so as to pluralise our own archival paradigm.

We must work towards building an expansive *idea* of what constitutes an archive, we must *share* the relevance of our archival way of thinking across the heritage sector and we must expand our *interactions* with other disciplines so as to demonstrate the centrality of archives to national debate and the transformative power of our archival minds.

An archival way of thinking, and archives themselves underpin many national debates about ameliorating the pain of the past and about understanding the shape of our future in the context of unprecedented environmental change. And as both these sets of circumstances demonstrate, it is only with the wise use of archives that we can chart a

way for the nation's future. Placing archives at the centre of national debate and placing our archival thinking in the centre of other disciplines are some of the many exciting challenges we face in our quest to demonstrate the relevance of archives to our nation's past and the planet's future.

Endnotes

[1] This was originally presented as a keynote address to the Australian Society of Archivists conference, Alice Springs, August 2007, and is published here with minor editing. Particular thanks to the State Records Office of Western Australia who sponsored this conference session.

[2] Milan Kundera, *The book of laughter and forgetting,* Middlesex, Penguin, c1980.

[3] See for example Terry Cook and Joan Schwartz, 'Archives, records and power. From (Postmodern) theory to (Archival) performance', *Archival Science,* vol. 2, nos (3-4), 2002, pp. 171-185.

[4] See UNESCO Memory of the World Australian Committee, *Brochure,* 2007, at <www.amw.org.au>.

[5] Jeannette Allis Bastian, 'Reading colonial records through an archival lens: the provenance of place, space and creation', *Archival Science* (online preprint 2006), p. 1.

[6] Standards Australia, *Records Management. Part 1 General,* AS ISO 15489.1-2002 (ISO15489-1), p. 3.

[7] The Nelson Mandela Foundation, *Prisoner in the Garden,* Viking, 2005, p. 35.

[8] Nelson Mandela, *Long Walk to Freedom* [England], Windsor, 1994.

[9] Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory.* HarperCollins, London, 1995.

[10] For a paper which brings material culture to archival science, see also Ala Rekrut. 'Material literacy: reading records as Material Culture', *Archivaria,* no. 60, at

<http://journals.sfu.ca/archivar/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12513>.

[11] There have been other meanings of convergence for archivists and records managers in recent years. For example it was used as the title of the 2001 ASA/RMAA joint conference in Hobart where it referred to the issue of converging technologies.

[12] Government of Tasmania, *Press release,* October 31, 2006.

[13] In reference toAlbert Gore, *An Inconvenient truth: a global warning,* [Australia]: Paramount Home Entertainment (Australasia), 2007, foreshadowing climate change discussions later in this article.

[14] For further discussion see Joanna Sassoon, *If digitisation is the answer, what on earth is the question?* Paper presented at the Australian Society of Archivists conference, 2006, at <http://www.archivists.org.au/files/Conference_Papers/2006/Sassoon_ASAConference2006.pdf>.

[15] Leigh Hays and Joanna Sassoon, 'Divergence from the Heritage and Cultural Community - An Antipodean Perspective', Association of Canadian Archivists conference, Newfoundland, July 2006.

[16] Joanna Sassoon, 'The Courage of their Convictions. Building Cultural Landscapes in 1930's Western Australia', *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* vol. 12, no. 3, 2006, pp. 255-266.

[17] A range of definitions of ecosystem can be found at <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&client=safari&rls=en&defl=en&q=define:Ecosystem&sa=X&oi=glossary_definition&ct=title>.

[18] National Inquiry into the National Estate, *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the National Estate,* Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1974.

[19] Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration Including the Problems of War Archives and Archive Making,* The Clarendon Press, 2nd ed, 1937, pp. 8-11.

[20] Chris Hurley, *Problems with provenance.* Records Continuum Research Group, 1998 at <http://www.sims.monash.edu.au/research/rcrg/publications/provenance.html>.

[21] Tom Nesmith, 'The concept of societal provenance and records of nineteenth century Aboriginal-European relations in Western Canada - implications for archival theory and practice', *Archival Science,* preprint, 2007.

[22] *ibid.*

[23] Chris Hurley, 'Parallel provenance (2)', *Archives and Manuscripts* vol, 33, no. 2, 2005, p. 79.

[24] *ibid.*, p. 85.

[25] *ibid.*, p. 85.

[26] Holtorf, p. 54.

[27] Igor Kopytoff, 'The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process', in *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective,* Arjun Appadurai (ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986, pp. 64-91; Holtorf, p. 55.

[28] *Ruffians, rodents and rosaries.* Exhibition at Hyde Park Barracks Museum, NSW Historic Houses Trust at <http://www.hht.net.au/museums/hpbm/exhibitionswhats_on#Ruffians>.

[29] Nicholas Jose, *Black Sheep: Journey to Borroloola,* South Yarra, Vic., Hardie Books, 2002.

[30] Nicholas Jose in Jan Wositzky, 'The ants that ate plutarch', 16 February 2002, ABC Radio show 'Books and writing' at <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/arts/bwriting/stories/s576485.htm>.

[31] Terry Cook, 'Byte-ing off what you can chew: electronic records strategies for small archival institutions,' *Archifacts,* April, 2004.

at <http://www.aranz.org.nz/Site/publications/papers_online/terry_cook_paper.aspx>.

[32] Eric Ketelaar, 'Archives in the digital age: new uses for an old science', *Archives and social studies: a journal of interdisciplinary research,* vol. 1, no. 0, 2007, pp. 107-131.

[33] For an expansion of this argument, see Joanna Sassoon, 'Beyond chip monks and paper tigers: towards a new culture of archival format specialists', *Archival Science,* forthcoming.

[34] Anne Gilliland et al, *Pluralizing the Archival Paradigm: A Needs Assessment for Archival Education in Pacific Rim Communities, 2005-2006,* at <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/~pacrim/>.

[35] David Lammy MP, Minister for Culture (UK). *Identity papers - the role of archives in teaching diversity and citizenship.* Archives Awareness Conference (UK) 24 April 2007 at <http://www.davidlammy.co.uk/da/54012>.

[36] Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, *Bringing them home. Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families,* 1997, at <http://www.humanrights.gov.au/social_justice/bth/preliminary.html>.

[37] Senate Community Affairs References Committee, Lost Innocents: Righting the record - report on child migration, 3 August 2001, at

<http://www.aph.gov.au/SENATE/COMMITTEE/clac_ctte/completed_inquiries/1999-02/child_migrat/report/index.htm>.

[38] Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee, *Unfinished business: Indigenous stolen wages* December 2006, at

<http://www.aph.gov.au/Senate/committee/legcon_ctte/stolen_wages/report/index.htm>.

[39] Anna Salleh, *Rock art shows attempts to save Thylacine,* 15 December 2004 at <http://www.abc.net.au/science/news/ancient/AncientRepublish_1265476.htm>.

[40] Dorothy Tunbridge, *Story of the Flinders Ranges mammals,* Kangaroo Press, Adelaide, 1991.