

# From Archaeologist to Archivist

## Exploring the Research Potential, Content, and Management of a Moving Image Archive

Kelly Wiltshire

Whether one is researching the history of a site or region or reviewing the history of the archaeological discipline more broadly, archives provide a key source of information. Once considered a passive repository of knowledge extraction, archives are today approached as a source of knowledge production

“where constraints and motivations of ideological or political order can transpire and be apprehended” (Schlanger and Nordbladh 2008:3). This is particularly the case for “archaeological archives”—archives that derive from archaeological research and practice and include unpublished correspondence, reports,

### ABSTRACT

Moving image archives—like many other archives—are considered a passive repository of knowledge extraction, rather than an active site of knowledge production. Following the premise that archives are indeed a source of knowledge production, this article explores how moving image archives have the potential to produce new and alternative knowledges by bringing to light factors that may have influenced archaeological practice, factors captured within a moving image archive but obscured or marginalized within linear accounts of this practice. While such an archive may exist unevenly, the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) has been historically positioned to develop a moving image archive that features a number of well-known archaeological investigations. Yet this archive and similar moving image archives remain overlooked and underutilized resources. In order to address this, emphasis is placed on producing detailed, searchable, and retrievable content description for moving image archives. In doing so, this article maintains that the knowledge and experience brought to the management of this archive following the author’s transition “from archaeologist to archivist,” is key to promoting the discoverability and accessibility of this archive with potential clients in the archaeological, academic, and broader community.

Los archivos de imágenes en movimiento—como muchos otros archivos—se consideran repositorios pasivos de extracción de conocimiento más que sitios activos de producción de conocimiento. Siguiendo la premisa que los archivos son realmente una fuente de producción de conocimiento, este artículo explora el potencial que tienen los archivos de imágenes en movimiento para producir conocimientos nuevos y alternativos, poniendo en evidencia factores que pueden haber influido en la práctica arqueológica—factores capturados dentro de un archivo de imágenes en movimiento pero oscurecidos o marginados dentro de las explicaciones lineales de esta práctica—. Aunque tal archivo puede existir de manera desigual, el Instituto Australiano de Estudios Aborígenes e Isleños del Estrecho de Torres (AIATSIS por sus siglas en inglés) ha tenido el rol histórico de desarrollar un archivo de imágenes en movimiento que cuenta con una serie de conocidas investigaciones arqueológicas. Sin embargo, este archivo y otros parecidos siguen siendo recursos demasiado vistos pero poco utilizados. Con el fin de abordar este problema, se hace hincapié en la producción de descripciones de contenido detalladas, consultables y recuperables para archivos de imágenes en movimiento. Este artículo afirma que el conocimiento y la experiencia aportados a la gestión de este archivo después de la transición del autor “de arqueólogo a archivista” son clave para promover la detección y accesibilidad de este archivo a potenciales clientes en el ámbito arqueológico, académico y en la comunidad en general.

*Advances in Archaeological Practice* 5(3), 2017, pp. 289–296  
 Copyright 2017 © Society for American Archaeology  
 DOI:10.1017/aap.2017.14

field notebooks, diagrams, and photographs held in numerous libraries, institutions, and private collections. Importantly, archaeological archives provide a toponymy that can be used to better understand the complexity of archaeological practice; complexities that may become obscured within the archaeological documentation that create the basis of published accounts.

Indeed, a tenet of objectivity still remains a dominant ideology within the archaeological discipline, influencing the documentation of archaeological practice despite the emergence of post-processual critiques of such. As Marciniak (2003:210) points out:

Despite the development of archaeological theory, site reports remain written within a rationalist and objectivist framework. This is where requirements of culture-historical analysis are preserved, even when a person with a different theoretical orientation excavates the site.

Thus, published accounts of archaeological practice can obscure some of the more subjective factors that influence archaeological practice. Such factors may include the broader social context of archaeological practice, whereby participants who either directly or indirectly contributed to archaeological practice remain invisible and marginalized (cf. Lucas 2012:239). As Lucas (2001:13) points out, "archaeology is a practice we do with others, perhaps in fieldwork particularly, and there is a violence which accompanies this when people are silenced in the name of . . . the production of knowledge."

Contrasting with published accounts of archaeological practice, archaeological archives may "allow [for] the excavation of the voices (sometimes names) of subaltern and otherwise suppressed others from the archive" (Zeitlyn 2012:461). Specifically, the study of such archives may illuminate the agency of marginalized individuals, including indigenous peoples, women, and broader members of the community. Notably, archaeological archives have the potential for the agency of marginalized individuals to be better understood, especially during periods of archaeological practice when their contribution was not standard practice and neither valued nor acknowledged. Nevertheless, such individuals will have not contributed to all instances of archaeological practice, so seeking evidence of their agency within the archives may still prove fruitless. Despite this, as a source of knowledge production, archaeological archives have the potential to revisit, revise, and perhaps challenge the "Great Men" or "Forefathers" narrative that dominate the history of archaeology's formative years. Indeed, Baird and McFadyen (2014:15) consider archaeological archives as a site of translation, where the production of archaeological knowledge can be negotiated to produce new and alternative archaeological interpretations and histories. Following from this, Baird and McFadyen (2014:15) argue:

The form of the archaeological archive, we believe, is related directly to the form of archaeological knowledge. The recognition of this relationship is key to working with "legacy" data (existing data from previous excavations),

and to developing a more critical approach to the history of archaeology.

Despite this potential to reach into the "substrate" of archaeology (Schlanger and Nordbladh 2008:3), archaeological archives still run the risk of reflecting dominant ideologies where "certain stories are privileged and others marginalized" (Schwartz and Cook 2002:1). Simply put, archaeology operates within a dominant, positivist paradigm where archaeological practice is understood as a linear and logical process based on objective observations (Chadwick 2003:104; Hodder 1999:x; Lucas 2001:15–16, Lucas 2012:1). Therefore, the way in which archaeological practice is documented and represented within the archaeological archive is likely to reflect these positivist assumptions. As a result, archaeological archives run the risk of perpetuating a positivist representation of archaeological practice, which only tells part of the story of what undertaking archaeological practice really entails. Therefore, archaeological archives may not accurately represent—or even obscure—the true nature of archaeological practice or its disciplinary history.

Alternatively, moving image archives of archaeological practice provide an opportunity to move beyond this positivist representation of archaeological research and practice. Specifically, moving image archives provide an opportunity to ethnographically study archaeological practice at the "trowel's edge" (Hodder 1997:694), leading to insights that can be critiqued to better understand the true nature archaeological practice (Hodder 1999:191; Pillow 2003:178–179). In doing so, moving image archives provide an opportunity to enhance our understanding of archaeological practice prior to or during the documentation process that creates the basis for the archaeological archive, including a more sophisticated understanding of the broader social and political context of archaeological practice; bypassing the potential misrepresentation and marginalization contained within this archive.

That being said, moving image archives are rarely utilized by those situated beyond the boundaries film studies. As Andreano (2007:82) points out:

Throughout history, scholarly interest in moving image archives has rarely extended beyond academics involved in film studies, leaving a wealth of human experience captured on film and video hidden from the more general scholarly community.

Admittedly, many archaeologists would not be naturally inclined to draw on a moving image archive in the process of researching the history of a site or the discipline's history despite the important role other forms of visual representation such as photography and illustration play in archaeological practice. Simply put, there seems to be a "low scholarly expectation" of moving image archives, which are considered an "unconventional" source of information (Andreano 2007:82–84). For the most part, moving image archives remain an underutilized resource due to their perceived lack of academic credibility, discoverability, and accessibility.

With reference to the moving image archive at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS) and its close association with archaeological practice, this



**FIGURE 1.** The Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS), Canberra.

article discusses how the management of this collection is promoting the discoverability and accessibility of this archive with potential clients in the archaeological, academic, and broader community. Specifically, a key component of this management is the production of detailed, searchable, and retrievable content description, informed by knowledge and experience that accompanied my transition “from archaeologist to archivist.” In short, this article demonstrates the importance of cross-disciplinary knowledge and experience within archive management, in order for moving image archives to reach their full research potential.

## AIATSIS, ARCHAEOLOGY, AND THE MOVING IMAGE ARCHIVE

AIATSIS is a research institute located in Canberra, with an extensive audio-visual archive that comprises photographic, sound, and moving image collections (Figure 1). As the world’s most extensive collection of materials relating to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the AIATSIS collections are a major keeping place for information about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, culture, and history. Despite a complex history, AIATSIS continues to preserve and manage these collections, providing accessibility to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and other clients within the broader community. As a result, the AIATSIS collections are today used by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples for family history research, including members of the stolen generations seeking to trace and reconnect with their family, identity, and culture. The collection is also a highly regarded resource for anthropologists, linguists, historians, and filmmakers.

AIATSIS was established by the Australian government in 1964, during the formative years of Australian archaeology, and has had a long association with archaeology and archaeologists. In particular, former principals and chairs of the institute include well-known archaeologists Fred McCarthy, Peter Ucko, and John

Mulvaney. As a result of these strong associations, AIATSIS has both supported and influenced archaeological practice in Australia (Taylor and Ward 1999). Specifically, for many years AIATSIS operated one of the main sources of funding for archaeological research in Australia, particularly toward the study and protection of rock art (see Ward 2011). In addition, AIATSIS either published or assisted with publication of results from archaeological research (Du Cros 2002:22–23). As a result, the products of this research were donated to the institute, resulting in numerous collections that derive from archaeological practice. The founding principal of AIATSIS, archaeologist and anthropologist Fred McCarthy, was—like his contemporaries Charles Mountford and Norman Tindale—a strong advocate for ethnographic filmmaking and supported the development of the institute’s Film Unit in 1961; in fact, ethnographic filmmaking was seen as an important aspect in the formative years of AIATSIS (Bryson 2002:9–16; Leigh 2016). Specifically, McCarthy saw filmmaking as a means to create a scientific record that would complement ethnographic fieldwork and set about producing large amounts of unedited, archival footage for future use by researchers. McCarthy had a particular interest in rock art, and this is reflected in one of the institute’s earliest recordings of archaeology. He partnered with a young Rhys Jones to document the recording of engravings in Tasmania (see AIAS 1969); Jones himself would later go on to contribute to and produce significant moving image collection items for the institute (see AIAS 1983, 1984; Meehan and Jones 1971–1980).

For the most part, however, McCarthy’s approach to filmmaking was conservative and in stark contrast to that of his successor, archaeologist Peter Ucko. Prior to becoming principal, Ucko was chair of the Film Committee of the Royal Anthropological Institute in London and had a keen interest in ethnographic filmmaking. Following McCarthy’s reign, Ucko set about restructuring the film unit and shifting its focus by employing filmmakers who produced edited films for release and general distribution (Bryson 2002:36). Most importantly, under Ucko’s reign the Film Unit commenced the participation and employment of Aboriginal people.

Subsequently, the AIAS Film Unit—as it was formally known—was active between 1961 and 1991, archiving filmed material and producing some 30 original ethnographic films for public release. As a result, AIATSIS became instrumental in the establishment of ethnographic filmmaking in Australia (Leigh 2016), producing “one of the largest assembly of ethnographic films created in the world” during that time (AIATSIS 2016b). Materials produced by the AIAS Film Unit are estimated to comprise about 70 percent by volume of the whole moving image archive (AIATSIS 2016b).

As a result of this long association with archaeology and emphasis on ethnographic filmmaking, AIATSIS has been uniquely positioned as the recipient of numerous archive items relating to archaeological practice; items that may have otherwise been dispersed among numerous archives, libraries, and personal collections. In addition to being a recipient of this content, the AIAS film unit also produced content that document archaeological practice. Overall, the moving image archive at AIATSIS contains at least 20 moving image archive collections documenting archaeological practice, a number of which are referenced herein; however, due to the extent of this archive—and the evolving nature of archives in general (Schwartz and Cook 2002:1)—more collections will likely come to light through its ongoing management.

## SCOPE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE MOVING IMAGE ARCHIVE

The AIATSIS moving image archive comprises more than 5,000 video titles and 6.5 million feet of film, which, if placed end to end, would stretch from the top to the bottom of Australia (AIATSIS 2016b). More specifically, the archive contains original and unique film, analogue video, and born digital items, including ethnographic films, documentaries, and footage recording Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, ceremonies, oral history, and historic events. Reflecting changes in the use of the AIATSIS collections in recent decades, the moving image archive is now a resource for numerous Aboriginal filmmakers. In particular, Arrernte and Kalkadoon filmmaker and AIATSIS Council member Rachel Perkins—daughter of well-known Aboriginal activist Charlie Perkins—has drawn on AIAS Film Unit collections in some of her film productions (Leigh 2016). Perkins also has donated extensive collections from her filmmaking career to AIATSIS, such as rehearsal footage, original costume sketches, and props. Of particular note are over 500 hours of interview footage from her highly acclaimed TV series *First Australians*, which are described in a recent significance assessment as “likely to be the most significant addition to the AIATSIS collection of the past decade” (O’Donnell 2014:40).

In addition to this, the collection includes items from Central Australian Aboriginal Media Association (CAAMA) and *Imparja TV*, media created and produced by and for Aboriginal people. AIATSIS also supports an Indigenous Remote Archival Fellowship to assist Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander organizations archive and preserve their own audiovisual heritage (AIATSIS 2016d). In short, the AIATSIS moving image archive reflects changes that have played out within the Australian social and political landscape in recent decades, helping Aboriginal peoples gain a

greater degree of self-determination in controlling the representation of their identity, culture, and history.

It was in this context that I began working as an archivist within the moving image archive in 2015, following a decade working as archaeologist for numerous organizations of the Ngarrindjeri nation. While working as an archaeologist, I developed an interest in and knowledge of the history of the discipline, no doubt influenced by a period of self-reflection within Australian archaeology that preceded this role (see Du Cros 2002:35–40). As a result, I have often drawn on this disciplinary knowledge in my research as well as presentations (see Wiltshire 2006, 2011, 2015, 2016, 2017; Wiltshire and Wallis 2008), and it informs my current role as an archivist. Specifically, being an archivist within collection development and management involves coordinating, supervising, advising, and undertaking various collection management activities, including the assessment, accessioning, and cataloguing of moving image items to current professional standards. My role as an archivist also affords the opportunity to undertake research into moving image collections in order to provide high-level content description that in turn facilitates client discoverability and accessibility. Therefore, having developed prior knowledge of the association between archaeology and AIATSIS as a result of my disciplinary knowledge, I commenced researching items within the moving image archive that are the product of this association, while considering their research potential for archaeological practice and its disciplinary history.

A broader literature review undertaken revealed few if any published accounts of archaeological practice or its disciplinary history drawing on this moving image archive; however, Jones and White (1988) provide one of the few exceptions with reference the AIAS Film Unit title *The Spear in the Stone*. Specifically, this publication reports on the technical process of stone artifact production, which is a key feature of this title. In doing so, Jones and White (1988:65–66) describe the use of this moving image archive by stating, “Diltjima was filmed both preparing his core and also detaching flakes from it. No questions were asked of him, nor did we solicit demonstrations of technique or posed photographs. This sequence constituted Roll 15 of the field films.” From this quote, one can assume that the moving image archive was later accessed in order to study this stone knapping in detail for interpretation purposes, which later created the basis for Jones and White’s (1988) published account. In drawing on this moving archive, Jones and White (1988:87) point out, “Original uncut film rolls for *The Spear in the Stone* . . . held in the film archives of the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra . . . are available for study at the Institute to any *bona fide* researcher.” With the exception of this published account, it seems that such a *bona fide* researcher is yet to take up Jones and White’s (1988:87) suggestion. Consequently, the AIATSIS moving image archive remains, to date, an underutilized resource within the broader archaeological community. Thus, the following discussion seeks to understand the underutilized nature of this archive with reference to its discoverability and accessibility.

### Discoverability

The level of discoverability of any moving image archive stems from the level of metadata available via an accessible catalogue system. In fact, quality metadata is an important interface to the

establishment of a discoverable and therefore successful archive (Schaffner 2015). Notably, in his article on improving scholarly accessibility to moving image archives, Andreano (2007:82) argues that “accessible catalogs with comprehensive content descriptions are the key to establishing a link between scholars and moving image archives.”

In order to produce the metadata that creates the basis for such content description, an archivist undertakes a process of “analysis, translation and representation” (La Barre and Novaris Cordeiro 2012:235). In other words, the moving image item is analyzed; this may involve reviewing the content of the item, but time and labor constraints often limit this ability. In most cases, an archivist analyzes documentation accompanying the item in order to develop an understanding of the nature of its content, which is then translated and represented as metadata within a cataloguing system. While a moving image item might be accompanied by ample documentation in order to undertake this task, more often than not the level of accompanying documentation is minimal. This results in a poorly documented moving image archive that in turn decreases a moving image archive’s discoverability (Edmondson 2004:40). Therefore, understanding the nature of a moving image item is vital to increasing its discoverability.

In order to address the knowledge gap that can arise within the archival process, it makes sense that an archaeologist should be involved with producing metadata for moving image archives that are the product of archaeologists and archaeological practice. Indeed, Andreano (2007:82) argues, “to establish a link to the scholars, [archives] may need to look outside of their own cataloging departments for help in capturing content information.” Accordingly, I draw on my knowledge of archaeological practice and its disciplinary history to improve the existing metadata of the moving image archive at AIATSIS and increase its discoverability.

This content description seeks to document key and searchable metadata that encompass the content of the moving image item, including the names of archaeologists featured, location and/or site of archaeological practice, date or span of archaeological practice, and the type of practice featured: content specific metadata that is preferred when seeking such a resource (Schaffner 2015:87–88). Given that the AIATSIS collections are used daily by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples for family history research, it is important to privilege these needs while also recognizing the needs of potential clients within the broader archaeological community. Therefore, the metadata and content description must foremost document and include—where available—the names of Aboriginal people featured, their cultural/language group affiliation, and culturally appropriate thesauri headings; information that will not only allow their discoverability with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients, but may be valuable in assisting with family history research (see AIATSIS 2016c; Hitch 2016). This content description also observes the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library, Information and Resource Network (ATSILIRN) Inc. Protocols, in order to avoid “the use of outdated, inaccurate or value laden terms [that] actually obstructs access” with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander clients (ATSILIRN 2012).

In addition to this, the content description should ideally make reference to the broader context of the moving image item, in

order to accurately “analyze, translate and represent” (La Barre and Novaris Cordeiro 2012:235) its significance. For example, the content description and subject terms contained within the catalogue for the *Tasmanian Film Project* (1984) includes reference to the shifting dynamics between archaeologists and Aboriginal people emerging within Australian archaeology at the time. In doing so, the broader social and political context filmmaker Kim McKenzie (1983) aimed to capture in this film is captured within the content description. In some cases, key publications arising from the archaeological practice featured are also included within the content description; for example, the content description for the *Anbarra Field Tapes* (1972–1980) produced by Betty Meehan and Rhys Jones includes reference to Meehan’s (1982) *Shell Bed to Shell Midden*—an important and internationally regarded resource for midden studies. Far from being a static repository, contributing and improving content description in this manner also demonstrates the dynamic potential of archives and how content description can and should be refined in order to remain relevant and engage new audiences.

In addition to this, my role as an archivist involves drawing on and creating new connections within the archaeological community, as a means to engage with those individuals associated with creating these archives to address knowledge gaps that exist. Far from the common stereotype of an omniscient archivist quietly laboring away in a dark and dusty basement, actively engaging with the archaeological community is an important step in creating and improving content description as a means to improve discoverability. Thus, my transition from archaeologist to archivist has provided an opportunity to expand on traditional archiving processes in order to facilitate a collaborative approach to archiving, further ensuring this archive remains discoverable into the future. While content description is vital to increasing the discoverability of a moving image archive, such archives—particularly those featuring archaeological practice—may exist unevenly and be dispersed among numerous archives, libraries, and personal collections (cf. Johnston and Withers 2008; Kurtz 2001). As a result, such archives may suffer from a lack of representativeness. Coupled with the “low scholarly expectation” of moving image archives (Andreano 2007:82–84), such archives may be considered obscure, fragmentary, and ultimately difficult to locate. As Andreano (2007:86) argues:

Owing to the traditional lack of scholarly involvement with moving image archives, it can be very difficult for an uninitiated researcher to know where to begin looking for relevant audiovisual materials. Before this researcher can even begin navigating an institution’s catalog or inventory, he or she must first be able to locate and identify an archive holding appropriate material. This can be a very difficult and frustrating task.

While AIATSIS has been uniquely positioned to develop a moving image archive featuring numerous items relating to archaeological practice, it is vital this archive is searchable and discoverable via an accessible catalogue system; without such, this archive will remain obscure, overlooked, and underutilized.

The AIATSIS collections including the moving image archive are discoverable via Mura®, the AIATSIS catalogue system that has been available online to the public since 1998 and named after the Ngunnawal word for “pathway” (AIATSIS 2013:3, 2016e). In

In addition to this, many items within the AIATSIS collections are also discoverable via [Trove](#), an online search engine that harvests metadata of over 90 million items from over 1,000 libraries, museums, archives, and other institutions across Australia (Holley 2010). For many researchers, academics, students, and members of the broader community, Trove is considered a “one-stop shop” for searching and locating relevant resources. Thus, the inclusion of the AIATSIS collections on Trove is especially beneficial for client discoverability. As Wood and Gray (2016) maintain:

One of our aims is to ensure our collection is accessible and valued. As many of our clients live in some of the most remote parts of Australia, delivering information using the latest technology is essential. Trove is an important tool for us to achieve this goal . . . providing a new discovery avenue to our collection to people all across Australia, and especially to those in remote communities.

In total, there are currently just under 90,000 AIATSIS collection items discoverable on Trove—including 3,000 moving image items—with collection items added on a daily basis (AIATSIS 2013; NLA 2016; Wood and Gray 2016). Most importantly, Trove encourages clients to interact with, recommend, and contribute content as a core feature (Holley 2010). Thus, Trove provides a mechanism to receive and incorporate information from clients into content descriptions for AIATSIS collections, which in turn increases their discoverability.

### Accessibility

One of the key strategic priorities of AIATSIS is to ensure the collections are accessible (AIATSIS 2016a:3). While catalogue records remain the most efficient way to allow discoverability of these collections, client accessibility can remain obscure—particularly for moving image archives. In most cases, items from the moving image archive need to be viewed on AIATSIS premises; however, many of our clients are located remotely. While clients can order copies of some moving image items, this is accompanied by a standard waiting period and associated fees that can pose a practical deterrent to clients seeking to utilize this resource. In addition to this, the inability to browse a moving image item the way “one can browse a book or set of manuscripts” (Edmondson 2004:40) also provides a practical deterrent in accessing and utilizing such archives.

While a number of our collections are digitized and [available online](#) as a means to increase their accessibility, placing the entire AIATSIS collections online is not an immediate reality due to their extent, ongoing digitization work, and cultural restrictions that prevent online access. In lieu of placing collections online, emphasis is placed on the creation of shot logs, audition sheets, or [finding aids](#). Specifically, these documents provide detail and timed content descriptions of moving image items. These documents are linked to the catalogue record and can be downloaded remotely by clients. Thus, these documents provide a detailed and in-depth description that can be browsed by clients and allow them to ascertain the nature and potential usability of the content without having to access the moving image item. AIATSIS (2013:14) recognizes the value and importance of these documents to potential clients, as outlined:

AIATSIS holds a significant number of individual historical items which are of inestimable value for research. However, without detailed descriptions of the materials to make relevant materials accessible to both Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers, clients would remain unaware that the material they seek is in the Collection.

This is further demonstrated by Blackburn (2016) in her discussion on AIATSIS finding aids and discoverability:

Without them, discovering the content of the archives would rely on catalogue records, which broadly describe subject matter. . . . Each researcher would have to have the time to trawl through all of a collection to first get a sense of what it contains and then identify (and remember or note) the individual parts relevant to their study . . . to develop their own finding aid, effectively.

While finding aids assist in the accessibility of moving image archives, the creation of such documents is time and labor intensive. As a result, many moving image archives are yet to be fully documented and described in this manner (Edmondson 2004:40).

## CONCLUSION

As a source of knowledge production, archaeological archives—particularly moving image archives—have the potential to produce new and alternative knowledges about archaeological practice and research. Specifically, moving image archives provide an opportunity to move beyond the linear and positivist accounts that may characterize other types of archaeological archives, in order to better understand other, potentially obscured factors that may have influenced archaeological research and practice. Managing this archive and creating connections with the broader archaeological community provides the opportunity to undertake a different kind of excavation, one that seeks to better understand the social context of archaeology more broadly.

The moving image archive at AIATSIS features some of the key archaeological investigations in Australia and avoids the unevenness and voids similar archives may suffer; however, it is by no means representative of archaeological practice and research in Australia on a broader scale. This raises the question of whether we are failing to document and archive the history of archaeology in a way that will allow future scholars to ask such questions. Only time will tell how seriously this might affect our understanding of how archaeological knowledge is produced.

### Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Moving Image Manager Lara McLellan and Deputy Director of Collection Development and Management Jonathan Wraith, for their support in producing this article. I would also like to thank my Moving Image colleagues for their valued feedback and suggestions. I would also like to thank the reviewers for their feedback on this article. No permits were required for this work.

## Data Availability Statement

All moving image archive items referenced herein are managed by Collection Development and Management archivists at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS). All inquiries regarding access to these archives should be directed to AIATSIS Access and Client Services. Contact information is available at <http://aiatsis.gov.au/collections/using-collection>.

## REFERENCES CITED

- Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Library, Information and Resource Network (ATSILIRN)  
2012 Description and classification. Electronic document, <http://atsilirn.aiatsis.gov.au/protocols.php>, accessed October 25, 2016.
- Andreano, Kevin  
2007 The Missing Link: Content Indexing, User-Created Metadata, and Improving Scholarly Access to Moving Image Archives. *Moving Image* 7(2):82–99.
- Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies (AIAS)  
1969 *Tasmanian Engravers*. Film. Produced by AIAS. Canberra.  
1983 *The Spear in the Stone*. Film. Directed and produced by Kim McKenzie. Canberra.  
1984 *Tasmanian Film Project*. Film rushes. Produced by Kim McKenzie. Canberra.
- Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies (AIATSIS)  
2013 AIATSIS Collections Cataloguing Policy 2013–2016. Canberra.  
2016a AIATSIS Corporate Plan 2016–2020. Canberra.  
2016b Film. Electronic document, <http://aiatsis.gov.au/collections/about-collections/film>, accessed October 5, 2016.  
2016c Introducing the Family History Unit. Electronic document, <http://aiatsis.gov.au/news-and-events/blog/introducing-family-history-unit>, accessed February 20, 2017.  
2016d PY Media wins 2016 Indigenous Remote Archival Fellowship. Electronic document, <http://aiatsis.gov.au/news-and-events/news/py-media-wins-2016-indigenous-remote-archival-fellowship>, accessed October 13, 2016.  
2016e Search the Collection. Electronic document, <http://aiatsis.gov.au/collections/using-collection/search-collection>, accessed October 7, 2016.
- Baird, Jennifer A., and Lesley McFadyen  
2014 Towards an Archaeology of Archaeological Archives. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 29(2):14–32.
- Blackburn, Fiona  
2016 Archival Finding Aids and Discoverability. Electronic document, <http://aiatsis.gov.au/news-and-events/blog/archival-finding-aids-and-discoverability>, accessed October 25, 2016.
- Bryson, Ian  
2002 *Bringing to Light: A History of Ethnographic Filmmaking at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies*. Aboriginal Studies Press, Canberra.
- Chadwick, Adrian  
2003 Post-Processualism, Professionalization, and Archaeological Methodologies. *Archaeological Dialogues* 10:97–117.
- Du Cros, Hilary  
2002 *Much More Than Stones and Bones: Australian archaeology in the Late Twentieth Century*. Melbourne University Publishing, Melbourne.
- Edmondson, Ray  
2004 *Audiovisual Archiving: Philosophy and Principles*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Hitch, Georgia  
2016 Young Indigenous People Discover Lost Ancestral History in Canberra. Electronic document, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-07-20/indigenous-people-discover-lost-ancestral-history-in-canberra/7645902>, accessed February 20, 2017.
- Hodder, Ian  
1997 “Always Momentary, Fluid and Flexible”: Towards a Reflexive Excavation Methodology. *Antiquity* 71(273):691–700.  
1999 *The Archaeological Process: An Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- Holley, Rose  
2010 Trove: More Than a Treasure? How Finding Information Just Became Faster. Electronic document, <http://www-prod.nla.gov.au/content/trove-more-than-a-treasure-how-finding-information-just-became-easier>, accessed February 20, 2017.
- Johnston, Ron, and Charles W. J. Withers  
2008 Knowing Our Own History? Geography Department Archives in the UK. *Area* 40(1):3–11.
- Jones, Rhys, and Neville White  
1988 Point Blank: Stone Tool Manufacture at the Ngilipitji Quarry, Arnhem Land, 1981. In *Archaeology with Ethnography: An Australian Perspective*, edited by Betty Meehan and Rhys Jones, pp. 51–87. Australian National University, Canberra.
- Kurtz, Matthew  
2001 Situating Practices: The Archive and the File Cabinet. *Historical Geography* 29:26–37.
- La Barre, Kathryn, and Rosa Inês Novaris Cordeiro  
2012 That Obscure Object of Desire: Facets for Film Access and Discoverability. In *Indexing and Retrieval of Non-Text Information*, edited by Diane Rassmussen Neal, pp. 234–262. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Leigh, Michael  
2016 Australian Ethnographic Film. Electronic document, <http://aso.gov.au/titles/collections/ethnographic-film-in-Australia/>, accessed October 5, 2016.
- Lucas, Gavin  
2001 *Critical Approaches to Fieldwork: Contemporary and Historical Archaeological Practice*. Routledge, London.  
2012 *Understanding the Archaeological Record*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- McKenzie, Kim  
1983 Film Proposal. Canberra.
- Marciniak, Arkadiusz  
2003 Review of *Archaeological Theory and Scientific Practice*, by Andrew Jones. *European Journal of Archaeology* 6(2):208–211.
- Meehan, Betty  
1982 *Shell Bed to Shell Midden*. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra.
- Meehan, Betty, and Rhys Jones  
1971–1980 Blyth River, Arnhem Land, Northern Territory. Film rushes. Produced by Betty Meehan and Rhys Jones. Canberra.
- National Library of Australia (NLA)  
2016 Current work counts by contributor. Electronic document, <http://trove.nla.gov.au/system/counts>, accessed November 5, 2016.
- O'Donnell, Vincent  
2014 Moving Image. In Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies: Significance Assessment Report, Significance International Pty Ltd, pp. 33–40, Canberra.
- Pillow, Wanda  
2003 Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16:175–196.
- Schaffner, Jennifer  
2015 The Metadata Is the Interface: Better Description for Better Discovery of Archives and Special Collections, Synthesized from User Studies. In *Making Archival and Special Collections More Accessible*, pp. 85–97. OCLC Research, Dublin, Ohio.
- Schlanger, Nathan, and Jarl Nordbladh  
2008 General Introduction: Archaeology in the Light of Its Histories. In *Archives, Ancestor, Practices: Archaeology in the Light of its History*, edited by Nathan Schlanger and Jarl Nordbladh, pp. 1–5. Berghahn Books, New York.

- Schwartz, Joan M., and Terry Cook  
2002 Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory. *Archival Science* 2(1):1–19.
- Taylor, Russell C., and Graeme Ward  
1999 Archaeology and Indigenous Australia. Paper presented at the Fourth World Archaeological Congress, Cape Town.
- Ward, Graeme  
2011 The Role of AIATSIS in Research and Protection of Australian Rock Art. *Rock Art Research* 28(1):7–16.
- Wiltshire, Kelly  
2006 Unfinished Business: The Lower Murray Lakes Archaeological within an Historical and Legislative Context. Honours dissertation, Department of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide.  
2011 Changes in Mindset: The Development of a Collaborative Research Methodology. *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 26(2):31–43.  
2015 Archaeology of Aboriginal Society in Australia. Presentation in Indigenous History and Identity, University of Canberra, Canberra.  
2016 From Archaeologist to Archivist: Exploring the Archaeological Research Potential of Moving Image Collection Items at AIATSIS. Presentation at the World Archaeological Congress (WAC) Conference, Kyoto, Japan.
- 2017 All Things Are Connected: Disassembling Archaeological Practice for the Future of Ngarrindjeri Ruwe/Ruwar. PhD dissertation, Department of Archaeology, Flinders University, Adelaide.
- Wiltshire, Kelly D., and Lynley Wallis  
2008 A History of Aboriginal Heritage Protection Legislation in South Australia. *Environmental and Planning Law Journal* 25(2):98–114.
- Wood, Jenny, and Bryce Gray  
2016 AIATSIS on Trove: Discovering Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander records on Trove. Electronic document, <https://www.nla.gov.au/blogs/trove/2016/01/19/aiatsis-on-trove>, accessed October 25, 2016.
- Zeitlyn, David  
2012 Anthropology in and of the Archives: Possible Futures and Contingent Pasts. Archives as Anthropological Surrogates. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41:461–480.

## AUTHOR INFORMATION

**Kelly Wiltshire** ■ Collection Development and Management—Moving Image, Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia ([kelly.wiltshire@aiatsis.gov.au](mailto:kelly.wiltshire@aiatsis.gov.au))