The book is divided into twelve chapters with each chapter covering a particular aspect. Starting with an honest examination of Australia's love-hate relationship with adoption, the text flows easily into a chapter on adoption legislation in the context of the 'child's best interest' philosophy. The stories of birth mothers and birth fathers follow in separate chapters. The chapter on birth fathers is aptly titled 'the Shadowy Fathers', as thus far little has been written about or heard from them. Separate chapters are also assigned to the stories of adoptive parents and adoptive families, each giving some insight into how the change in emphasis in portrayal of adoption, from child saving to child stealing, can have a negative effect on the sense of worth and wellbeing of adoptive parents and families. The story of adopted persons, their experience of being adopted and reconnecting with the birth family are covered in the last chapters. Although the authors present the book as being mainly about the adoption of Caucasian infants by approved Caucasian couples with the consent of the birth parents, a quarter of the chapters deals with other children, namely those of Australian indigenous descent, those with special needs and those born outside Australia. The adoption of children with special needs and intercountry adoption are developments of the last few decades. Both these chapters show in a positive way how the growing acceptance of the view that all children have the right to grow up in a safe and secure family environment has led to significant increases in these types of adoptions.

My only disappointment with the book is the chapter on Indigenous Adoptions, where in my opinion the lines between adoption and fostering become blurred. The authors correctly state that it is unknown how many children of indigenous descent in Australia were adopted, but fail to point out that the overwhelming majority of the thousands of children of indigenous descent in the substitute care system were placed in segregated camps, institutions, bonded labour and foster care, not in adoptive families. The authors' apparent failure to closely examine original indigenous adoption research material also make them repeat a misleading 95% adoption breakdown rate, thus perpetuating the myth that adoption of children of indigenous descent by non-indigenous parents was (and is) doomed to fail.\*

Not only does this myth affect children of indigenous descent, it also continues to feed the anti-transethnic and intercountry adoption lobby and to provide cultural apologists with an excuse for the drift in care of children for whom an ethnic consistent placement cannot readily be found. How can the authors reconcile this position with their seemingly positive

attitudes towards transethnic placements expressed in the chapter on intercountry adoption? I can only conclude that on the extremely sensitive topic of indigenous adoptions, the authors decided to bow to political correctness, in what is otherwise a fine piece of adoption literature.

The authors offer a glimmer of hope in the final part of the chapter where they critically examine the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle, quoting Justice Chisholm's statement that:

...the underlying error was to use children as an instrument of policy, ... we risk making the same error if we use children as instruments of a different policy. On this view, it would be a mistake to move from a policy of removing children (regardless of the impact on children) to a policy of keeping them with their families (regardless of the impact on children) (p. 170).

My hope, that the book would offer enough weight to encourage the adoption pendulum back to the middle, was largely met with the authors' call for adoption to be seen as a viable permanent care option for those children who could not grow up with their birth parents. They encapsulated it well with their final words:

If ... we want to make the lot of children brighter and better, then in the struggle to obtain those optimum placements for children in need of families, we cannot just discard from the choices such a tried and proven alternative as adoption (p.256).

\* The statistic is based on a clinical sample of 55 subjects, which include children and birthparents who, over a period of 8 years, had contacted the South Australian Aboriginal Child Care Agency in regard to placement in non-indigenous families. '... 52 (of the subjects) were experiencing or had experienced severe emotional stress and disturbance' (Ashkam, 1985, 'Aboriginal health issues, our children and the bureaucracy', Second National Women's Health Conference, Adelaide, pp. 30-35). Reportedly, only 3 cases of this sample involved actual adoption (Pers. Com. de Souza, 1991). Unpublished adoption research in Western Australia by S. Peterson (1998) did not find supporting evidence for the purported nationwide 95% failure rate.

Reviewed by:

Trudy Rosenwald Adoption Consultant & Counsellor Mt Helena, WA

## RESPONSE TO REVIEW FROM AUDREY MARSHALL AND MARGARET MCDONALD

Trudy Rosenwald sent a copy of her review to Audrey Marshall and Margaret McDonald and received the following response which, after obtaining permission from the authors, she has submitted for publication with a view to encouraging open and honest dialogue on adoption in Australia.

We are pleased that you consider the book to be 'a fine piece of adoption literature' and of course we are sorry that you were disappointed in the chapter relating to the adoption of indigenous children. Maggie and I have carefully

considered your comments and re-read the chapter with those comments in mind. We would be sorry if your belief that the chapter's recording of unhappy adoption outcomes for indigenous children into non-indigenous families will add to the criticism of trans-ethnic and inter-country adoption and contribute to 'welfare drift' for some trans-ethnic children. Drawing on the material which was available to us, support for the Aboriginal Child Placement Principle is implied. However in the chapter's conclusion we caution against holding to the principle against the interests of the child. We point out (p.197) the very different social circumstances, attitudes and programmes surrounding the two different situations of aboriginal adoption into non-indigenous families and inter-country adoption. It is true that the lines between adoption and fostering of indigenous children may at times be blurred but as some of the problems experienced by indigenous children are common in both forms of alternate care, this may not be inappropriate in the proper context.

The point you make about the SA Aboriginal Child Care Agency's claim re a 95% breakdown rate being based on doubtful evidence is a reasonable one. In the interests of accuracy it would have been better to put this reference in its context. Overall though, when all the material we drew from which reflected unhappy outcomes is considered, would it have made a significant difference? We acknowledge in the book that there has been no systematic research on the subject. In the absence of such research the evidence that was available to us was pretty damning. We did not set out with an established view on this question - we let what evidence we had speak for itself. You mention unpublished research by S. Peterson which did not find supporting evidence for the purported nationwide high failure rate. We were not aware of that study and did not come across any material that gave a more positive view. In the end it was the aboriginal people themselves who were behind the development of the

Aboriginal Child Placement Principle, now firm policy in relation to adoption in all states and territories.

Incidentally, I hear from workers in country areas in NSW that with regard to fostering, the principle gives way to the children's needs for secure placements when no suitable indigenous families can be found and when communities are at times not willing to take on some of the children. We reflected more than once in the book a concern about practice principles that are held too rigidly and which do not put the best interests of the child at the centre when alternate care placements are being planned. We had hoped that quoting Justice Chisholm's reservations about this would raise the issue sufficiently and leave it open to further discussion.

Our focus in the book was adoption and we considered it beyond the scope of the book to go into detail about what happened to all the 'removed' children. However we don't agree that the impression is necessarily given that many children were adopted. That is left open — 'it is impossible to know'. We mention that substitute care of all kinds was arranged for these children and that 'many childhood experiences of removal and institutionalization have had crippling effects', etc.

Maggie and I are advocates of adoption as a viable form of alternate care in appropriate cases and we hope, as you do, that the book 'will encourage the adoption pendulum back to the middle'.

Audrey Marshall

## Children Australia 2001 - Volume 26

(for new subscribers only)

	Standard subscription (inc GS1)						
	Student (full time) subscription (inc GST)				\$44.00 pa		
		Overseas subscription (airmail)			\$75.00 pa		
Name							
If student, aca	ademic institution, c	ourse name & student no	umber:				
Postcode Telephone				Fax			· • • • •
Email					Tax	X INVOICE REQUIRED?	
Cheque/mor	ney order enclosed	d OR Debit Bankcare	d ☐ Visa ☐ Ma	astercard	Expiry date	Amount \$	
	1_1_1_						
				Signature			
PLEASE PRINT CI	LEARLY						
Send to:		tralia, PO Box 702	•		Date		· • • • • • • •
Enquiries:	Larraine Redsh	naw, Tel: 03 9791 542	3 Email: I.redshaw@o	ozchild.com.au			