

The Universal Language of Photography?

UNESCO's *Human Rights Exhibition* in Australia, 1951

Jane Lydon

Although I had presented war in all its grimness in three exhibitions, I had failed to accomplish my mission. I had not incited people into taking open and united action against war itself . . . What was wrong? I came to the conclusion that I had been working from a negative approach, that what was needed was a positive statement on what a wonderful thing life was, how marvelous people were, and, above all, how alike people were in all parts of the world.

(Steichen 13)

Visual images have been used to define, contest, or argue on behalf of human rights. In our own time, images constitute an ever-more important means of witnessing, sharing ideas, proving arguments, and mobilizing audiences. Historically, images have created relations between far-distant peoples, and prompted emotions such as compassion and empathy, providing the basis for arguments about who counts as human, and whom one should feel for or with. Conversely, visual culture can define boundaries between people, supporting perceived hierarchies of race, gender, and culture, and justifying arguments for conquest and oppression. Some have argued for the primacy of atrocity imagery as a visual strategy for revealing the violation of rights. Yet at the end of WWII a new apparatus of human rights was articulated through a range of visual narratives that sought to create a sense of a universal humanity and a shared global culture through picturing 'unity in diversity'. Roland Barthes' famous attack on the 1955 photographic exhibition *The Family of Man* foreshadowed subsequent criticism of attempts to visualize universalism—also integral to the *United Nations Declaration of Human Rights* and its culture committee's work—on the grounds of effacing difference and asserting a Western-centric model of liberalism and identity. Instead of this humanist visual genre, the global visual culture that developed after WWII was characterized by the growing value attached to atrocity imagery, which has remained the principal modern media strategy of arousing empathy and arguing for rights.

The Australian reception of UNESCO's 1951 *Human Rights Exhibition* reveals how this new apparatus was applied to local circumstances, as local adherents argued in broad terms for rights and the individual, expressed through photos of both the family and Nazi atrocity. However the glaring absence at the heart of the Australian exhibition was the nation's Indigenous people: echoing UNESCO's Western-centric narrative of progress and humanity, new domestic visions of assimilation required Aboriginal people to surrender culture and identity, ultimately blending into mainstream society. Ironically, the official assimilation booklets produced by the Australian government, structured by a visual conversion narrative, became the target of attack by the nation's Soviet critics, arguing for Australia's betrayal of its Indigenous people.

A Universal Language of Human Rights?

Atrocity imagery has become the principal modern media strategy of arousing empathy and arguing for rights—indeed, recent histories of human rights argue that rights are only visible in their violation (e.g. Hunt; Linfield). Yet at the end of WWII a new apparatus of human rights was articulated through a range of visual narratives that sought to create a sense of a universal humanity and a shared global culture through picturing 'unity in diversity'. This utopian historical moment saw the emergence of a new visual strategy of struggle alongside this vision of harmony, centred on the family. Article 1 of UNESCO's Constitution stated that it would collaborate in the "work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image" ("Constitution" 8.) Between 1945 to 1950 a cosmopolitan view of the future of internationalism dominated intellectual and political visions of an anticipated new world order circulating around the creation of UNESCO. However, Glenda Sluga has traced continuities between the interwar liberal idealism of the League of Nation's mandate system and its notions of imperial trusteeship, and post-war international efforts. The League's aim to create world citizenship through education, symbolised by its slogan, 'One World in the things of the mind and spirit', also underpinned the UN and UNESCO's faith in the 'universal power of knowledge' ("Constitution" 1). For figures such as Julian Huxley, UNESCO's first director-general and an adherent of Darwinism, the aim was "unity-in-variety of the world's art and

culture” (Sluga 395). This was to be achieved through a policy of miscegenation and education of the ‘darker races’ and the less privileged, in what some term a “great utopian moment” (Winter 99-121). Although explicitly opposed to racism and Nazism, nonetheless UNESCO’s political thinking in this immediate post-war period saw the “development” of the world’s colonies as a new source of imperial legitimacy (Cooper and Packard; Cooper; Louis 104).

A major means of furthering UNESCO’s goals to overcome barriers of nation, language and illiteracy was photography, the basis of new forms of mass communication that emerged during the 1940s, in the form of photo-books, exhibitions, magazines and other ephemera. As Tom Allbeson has argued, post-war conceptions of photography as a universal language, and of cultural diplomacy as a means to achieve mutual understanding, generated a standardized visual language that underpinned a shift from nationalist to internationalist conceptions of identity (Allbeson). The most famous of the visual projects mounted at this time was the 1955 photographic exhibition *The Family of Man*, curated by Edward Steichen at New York’s Museum of Modern Art. It contained 503 photos from 68 countries, and toured the world, showing the seemingly eternal dimensions of human life—birth, play, work, marriage, death. Steichen explained that *Family of Man* aimed to illustrate the “essential oneness of mankind throughout the world,” mirroring mankind back to himself (4). It was tremendously popular, and by 1960 had been seen by around seven million people in 28 countries, Steichen noted, arguing that photography “gave visual communication its most simple, direct, universal language” (Steichen 107). However, the *Family of Man* exhibition is now remembered in terms of Roland Barthes’ anti-humanist critique of its simultaneously exoticising and incorporative effects—emphasizing difference only to assert a transcendent sense of shared humanity, an essence that effaces cultural and historical differences, and naturalises the status quo. Barthes’ famous attack on the exhibition set out the primary anti-humanist objection to such attempts to visualize universalism—also integral to the UNDHR and its culture committee’s work—on the grounds of effacing difference and history, arguing that,

This myth of the human ‘condition’ rests on a very old mystification, which always consists in placing Nature at the bottom of History. Any classic humanism postulates that in scratching the history of men a little, the relativity of their institutions or the superficial diversity of their skins (but why not ask the parents of Emmet Till, the young negro assassinated by the Whites what they think of The

Great Family of Man?), one very quickly reaches the solid rock of a universal human nature. Progressive humanism, on the contrary, must always remember to reverse the terms of this very old imposture, constantly to scour nature, its 'laws' and its 'limits' in order to discover History there, and at last to establish Nature itself as historical. (100-102)

Others have examined the *Family of Man*'s complicity with American cold war liberalism and its benign view of an American world order stabilised by the rule of international law. Sekula termed *Family of Man* as "the epitome of American cold war liberalism ...promoting a benign view of an American world order stabilized by the rule of international law" (19). Louis Kaplan argues that its conception of global community echoed American liberal foreign policy, with all its exclusions, excisions and suppressions. Despite the positive intent of Steichen's assertion that "[t]he family unit is the root of the family of man, and we are all alike," as Kaplan points out, in echo of Barthes, "the utopian inclusiveness of the ambiguous myth of human community demands a series of exclusions that mask inequalities and cultural hierarchies" (74-75).

More concrete attacks were also mounted at the time of the exhibition: in 1959, for example, Nigerian Theophilus Neokonkwo tore down several images because he objected to the representation of Africans as primitive and unclothed. The exhibition's hosts in Russia objected to an image of a Chinese beggar on the grounds that it undermined a new communist ally (Kaplan 76). The Japanese sponsors insisted on including a large mural depicting the victims of the atomic bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Other scholars have pointed to the exhibition's telling exclusions and blind spots, such as the absence of the Shoa as the invisible centre of the exhibition (Schmidt-Linsenhoff; see also Berlier), or its registration of American trauma (Solomon-Godeau). These protests expressed national sensitivities concerning implied civilisation and racial status as well as national trauma, challenging the visual rhetoric of inclusivity and equality.

Although the most famous of these post-war visual projects, the *Family of Man* was by no means unique. A year after the United Nations proclaimed the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) in 1948, it mounted an exhibition displaying photographs, as well as photographs of images, documents and objects, in mural collages designed "to convey a compelling visual history of human rights" and disseminate the abstract contents of the UDHR (Bregengaard and Prag, 1). After the Paris exhibition

ended, 12,000 copies of a portable photograph album were sent out to the fifty member states, as the basis for local exhibitions.

Australia and the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

Twenty copies were sent to Australia. Australians had already been involved in the process of drafting, proclaiming and disseminating the UDHR, then underway at the United Nations. Australia was one of the 51 founding member states of the UN and one of eight nations who drafted the *Universal Declaration*, largely due to the influential leadership of Dr Herbert Vere Evatt, the head of Australia's delegation to the UN. In 1948, Evatt became President of the UN General Assembly, and oversaw the adoption of the *Universal Declaration* (Australian Human Rights Commission). However, Australia's engagement with the *Declaration* was shaped by specific political and administrative circumstances, as well as restrictive attitudes toward the rights of immigrants and Indigenous people.

The UN's travelling exhibition opened first in Brisbane in July 1951, and was perceived as a form of visual history and education. The images were roughly divided into fourteen themes, each covering a historical struggle for a set of rights. The first 24 images reviewed the long span across prehistory to the post-war period, with architecture representing its high point, as widely different cultures enfolded into a narrative of progress to illustrate the introductory text which stated that "the illustrations mark the stages along the road leading from the cave-man ... to the free citizen of a modern democracy" ("Short History"). Key documents of rights were featured, with the notable exclusion of the Russian Declaration of the Rights of the Toiling and Exploited People (1918), and as Tom Allbeson points out, "[t]he Soviet Union is, in a sense, the exhibition's unconscious; while not explicitly referenced, the threat of nuclear war animated much of post-war visual culture" (15). While much of the exhibition represents the harmonious, familial imagery of the *Family of Man* in its depiction of a shared way of life, a counter-narrative of atrocity is introduced through images of Nazism in a discourse of atrocity and the violation of human rights.

In November the UNESCO travelling exhibition opened in Adelaide, South Australia, at the Public Library lecture room. It was launched by the chairman of the UNESCO Australian National committee for education, with Walter Duncan, a professor of political science and history at Adelaide University, and a local UNESCO State committee member. The exhibition's purpose was "to show man successively as a physical organism, a moral personality, a worker, an intelligent being, and a member of the community." The pictures, "reproduced in photogravure from ancient manuscripts, sculptures, paintings, mosaics, engravings, and contemporary photography," depict the "dramatic struggle of man, from earliest times, to assert his birthright to free citizenship" and included the topics of the abolition of slavery, freedom of movement, protection against arbitrary arrest, freedom of the press, emancipation of women, right to education, freedom of religion, and the dignity of labour ("Human Rights in Pictures" 10).

Duncan was a champion of adult education, who was impressed by the Soviet regime, and was a hostile critic of capitalism, imperialism and religion (Stretton). In his opening speech, Duncan argued that "People still had to be awakened to the significance and implications of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which their Governments had agreed" ("Awakening Needed" 2). He pointed out that "Not all of the rights in the declaration are recognised in every country," ("Awakening Needed" 2) and suggested that South Australians

might examine the declaration and see how many are recognised here. Some comparatively recent rights included the right to work, to rest and leisure, to form trade unions, to equal pay for equal work, to education and to participation in culture. ... The right to form trade unions was only recently acknowledged in the US. ... In South Australia, the right to equal pay for equal work seems to have aroused some controversy recently ("Awakening Needed" 2).

Women in South Australia had successfully campaigned for the franchise in 1894 (Magarey 67), so this concept met with a receptive audience. Duncan also argued that the declaration represented 'the ends for which the State and governments existed', and concluded that '[i]t can never be sufficiently emphasised that the end of all State action Is the development of individual personality. That is, respect for the dignity and rights of the individual' ('Awakening Needed' 2). However, this view of the declaration as a means to challenge the status quo was contradicted by media responses.

Two images from the exhibition were reproduced in Adelaide newspapers over following days: a portrait of a Maori mother and child, and another of Nazi book-burning,

neatly encapsulating the twin themes of familial humanism and atrocity that were to become emblematic of the modern visual discourse of human rights. The exhibition did not spark confrontation (figures 1 and 2). The *Adelaide News* reproduced the familial image, with the caption “Security of Family Life,” and commented that

A section of the exhibition is devoted to social security, family, and property. In present days, there is nothing revolutionary in the stipulation that men and women, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and found a family. But the rights of women, within the family itself, are only a recent achievement. (“Security of Family Life” 3)

This very mild statement suggested only that women had a right to marry and participate in a family, a circumscribed role even at the time. As Sekula pointed out of the later *Family of Man*, such imagery “universalizes the bourgeois nuclear family, suggesting a globalized, utopian family album, a family romance imposed upon every corner of the earth. The family serves as a metaphor also for a system of international discipline and harmony” (19). Australia had opposed ‘equal pay’ clauses in the drafting of the UNDHR, given entrenched disparities in domestic wages between men and women, and continued to oppose such moves into the 1950s on the grounds of “community sentiment” against women working outside the home (Devereaux 135-6). Another significant gap was the total absence of Australian Aboriginal people in the exhibition, reflecting continuing community prejudice despite official commitment to a system of human rights.

Figure 1. Maori mother and child, UNESCO Album, 1951.

Human Rights and Struggle

Of particular interest is the exhibition’s innovative narrative of struggle, adumbrating a now-dominant visual language of human rights defined through their violation. Through images showing the Nazi regime, the UN exhibition can be seen to draw upon a new genre of atrocity imagery—photographic evidence for distant suffering that has now come to assume a predominant place in global visual culture (Lydon, *Visualising* 5-7). The shocking photographs emanating from the liberation of the camps in the wake of WWII gave photographs of atrocity a new documentary power (Brink 148–149). In the immediate aftermath of the war, as Fay Anderson argues, Australian press coverage of the Holocaust obscured local understanding of the Jewish genocide by editorial practices

that reported events in isolation rather than as a deliberate Nazi program (Anderson 148-151). Nonetheless over following years a growing sense of outrage framed these images, inaugurating the principal modern media strategy of arousing empathy and arguing for rights.

The second image from the exhibition reproduced by the *Adelaide News* was a seventeenth-century engraving headlined “Books Burnt Publicly” to illustrate the freedom of thought and opinion. It argued that “Rulers have checked the progress of civilisation by silencing reformers, persecuting scientists and philosophers, and burning libraries, as pictured above. ... The freedom of thought and opinion is illustrated in a large section of the exhibition” (“Security of Family Life” 3). By picturing the history of human rights as a struggle against repression, the exhibition became intelligible as a linear narrative, as one by one, specific types of freedom were fought for and won. This modernist faith in progress was for many disrupted by growing understanding/recognition of trauma of what is now termed the Holocaust in the aftermath of the war, prompting scepticism toward grand narratives of progress, universality and equality.

Figure 2. ‘Books Burnt Publicly’, UNESCO Album. 1951.

Aboriginal Rights

But what of Australia’s Indigenous people? After World War Two, a profound shift in the status of Indigenous Australians began, as new notions of rights and the evils of racism began to circulate, and as Aboriginal activists demanded better conditions and claimed equality (Rowley 337–8; de Costa 75). At just this time, campaigners such as the Victorian Council for Aboriginal Rights were making arguments for including Aboriginal people. In June 1951, for example, medical doctor and activist Charles Duguid appealed to the Federal Government to include Australian natives in the UN declaration of human rights and in Australia’s own Constitution. Duguid declared that “[t]here will be no justice for the aborigines until they get full education, the same as whites, work instead of the dole, and decent wages” (“Human Rights Plea” 3). At the same time, the intensified role for photographic evidence in reporting distant atrocity after the war intersected with new understandings of race, and it became increasingly common for observers to draw an analogy between Jewish and Aboriginal experiences of displacement and oppression.

Visual campaigns to improve Indigenous living conditions during the 1950s drew on photographic evidence that was frequently explicitly compared with concentration camp imagery (Lydon *Flash*, 175-79). In 1955, for example, Murray River camp settlements were described as “shocking” because they were “second-class concentration camps” (Courtney 37).

In Perth, Western Australia, the local division of the Australian Association for the United Nations met in 1953 to commemorate Human Rights Day, and singled out the status of Indigenous Australians as a pressing concern. The meeting suggested that the UDHR’s “influence is almost worldwide” and was “being used increasingly as a source of law,” although qualified this argument by suggesting that it was “unwise as well as impracticable to apply all the articles of the declaration at one stroke and to all peoples” (Green 2). In January 1950 the anthropologists Catherine Berndt and Ronald Berndt also argued for both “the establishment of the basic human rights of the aborigine” as well as their “integration and assimilation” within the Australian nation (5). These arguments expressed a relativist understanding of Indigenous and white cultures but concluded that Aboriginal people would eventually be absorbed into the mainstream population.

Despite strongly supporting the UDHR during drafting, Australia changed its position to distinctly qualified acceptance of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Australia abstained on clauses covering the prohibition of slavery, freedom of movement and a right to equality, for example, and voted against clauses on prohibiting racial hatred, a right to self-determination and specific plans for compulsory, universal and free primary education. On Australia’s treatment of its Indigenous peoples, Australian government departments were aware that several policies were vulnerable to criticism, including the prohibition of arbitrary interference and the removal of half-caste children. The Department of the Interior thought the international law deficient because it argued that rights were not intended to apply to “natives who have not yet reached a state of civilization where they can fend for themselves and protect their own interests” (Devereux 273).

Mirroring the UNESCO rhetoric of unity and inclusivity, an Australian policy of assimilation was implemented in 1951 that aimed to raise the status of Aboriginal people so that they could qualify for full citizenship, by merging them into the mainstream population—although it was an agenda contested then and now (Rowse). Official visions

of an Indigenous future relied upon an imagined modernity and equality, contrasted with a primitive past, in a conversion narrative as old as colonisation. Newspapers and magazines such as the *Australian Women's Weekly* promoted assimilation by reproducing the logic of transformation, “from *this* to **THIS!**” demonstrated by individual “success stories.” (Lydon, *Flash* 179-180) What was new was the sight of Aboriginal people taking their place as equals in a modern society, becoming ideal suburban middle-class families. Assimilation took strength from a widely shared vision of a modern, unified nation (Haebich; McGregor). However, despite the rhetoric of equality, some pointed out the hypocrisy of providing inferior dwellings and resources through housing schemes; they were often implemented as a means of instructing Aboriginal people, rather than simply as a right.

The Australian government produced glossy official publications filled with high-quality photographs in visual conversion narratives that documented new building programs, but also revealed substandard living conditions. Amid increasing international interest in Australia's treatment of its Indigenous people, communists used this imagery to challenge Australia's international standing on human rights, pointing to photographic evidence to deflect Western criticism and to undermine Australian policy. Soviet criticism in the United Nations and other international forums became a powerful form of external scrutiny, as photographs of Aboriginal prisoners and ‘fringe-dwellers’ transcended barriers of language and culture to become effective ammunition against Australia's international reputation. The issue was taken up overseas by the British Anti-Slavery Society and the Soviet government, and the Polish delegate to the United Nations, Jan Drohojowski, launched a sustained attack on Australia's human rights record, asking:

Who is coming to the rescue of alleged violations of human rights in Hungary? From the antipodes comes Australia, a country whose original immigrants have almost entirely exterminated the aborigines. As a matter of fact, Australia seems to consider the remaining aborigines as zoological specimens. (Lydon, *Flash* 191)

Again, in October, speaking in the UN Political Committee debate on the violation of human rights in Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary, the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrey Vyshinsky, attacked the Australian government's “total disregard” for the human rights of Aboriginal people (Lydon, *Flash* 192). The External Affairs Minister (Dr Evatt) responded by accusing the Russians of deflecting attention from their own record on religious persecution. Soviet support for the Aboriginal campaign against a Long Range Weapons facility at Woomera was effectively dismissed on the grounds that it was

concerned not so much for the Indigenous occupants as for the limitation of Western technological development (Morton; Davenport et al.; Gorman). Communists continued to attack Australia's Indigenous record, drawing from photographs published in official assimilation pamphlets. While these photo-booklets were intended to serve as propaganda for the success of assimilation, they presented visual evidence that undermined their own claims. Overseas observers were appalled by photos contrasting the poor circumstances of the camps many Indigenous people lived in, representing the past, with modern, hygienic circumstances, standing for their future.

In October 1960, at a United Nations Correspondents lunch in New York, Soviet leader Nikita Krushchev asked why Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies "did ... not tell of the way in which the native population of Australia was treated? Why did he not tell of that shameful fact, that most of the native population of Australia has been virtually wiped out?" (Australian Mission). By 1961 the Department of External Affairs had begun to note that "adverse references now appear regularly in the Soviet and Communist Chinese press and radio," such as when Krushchev was reported in the Moscow press as having "pointed to the eternal shame that rested on the ruling class of Australia for the extermination of the Aborigines" (National Archives of Australia).

Figure 3. *One People*

Source Commonwealth Department of Territories, Government Printer, Canberra, 1961

Despite official Australian rejection, however, the UDHR also provided ammunition for the campaign for constitutional reform that emerged during the late 1950s, arguing for the nation's commitment to the 1948 *United Nations Declaration on Human Rights*. As Joseph Slaughter reminds us, as the UDHR was drafted, much of the world remained under colonial rule, and the global community was much more provincial than it has since become (53). In 1948 what was most notable about human rights, as Samuel Moyn has stressed, was their marginality (113). In 1948, the Third Committee delegates agreed to temper the individualism of the UDHR by declaring that human personality could be developed only in community. Nonetheless, the age of postcolonial state formation and national self-determination still lay ahead.

Conclusion: The Limits of Human Rights in Australia

The UNESCO travelling exhibition of 1950 defined and argued for the new framework of human rights in an innovative, twin discourse of harmony and struggle that presaged more recent debates around humanism and violation. Further, challenging Barthes's classic critique of the *Family of Man*-style vision, many observers have identified the more complex effects of such visual projects upon their viewers. Steichen asserted that he aimed to show "what a wonderful thing life was, how marvelous people were, and, above all, how alike people were in all parts of the world" (Steichen 13). Yet as several theorists argued, we must shift our attention from Steichen and his intentions as author, to consider the exhibition as an "archive containing the visual proxy" of the UN 1948 *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (Azoulay 19; and see Hurm 38-39). Instead of seeing the *Family of Man* as the manifestation of universalism, as Barthes did, Ariella Azoulay emphasises multiplicity and diversity (19). As she suggests, categories such as "Family" "cannot erase the heterogeneity" of the situations they show. In the same way, UNESCO's photographic assemblage provided juxtapositions that showed a spectrum of human experience, from the realisation of rights to their absence and even transgression. The reception of human rights and the UDHR in Australia maps the fluidity of visual meaning, as the selection of specific images could be deployed by official or, conversely, by activist factions. Assertions of familial harmony were undermined by visual evidence for the denial of Indigenous rights. Nonetheless, the application of human rights in Australia as elsewhere has been profoundly shaped by state agendas—even where the ideals and language of human rights has been echoed at a national level and applied to domestic issues.

The symmetry between the program of universality espoused by the UNESCO and Australian assimilation centred upon the language of unity in diversity and assertions of a shared national culture and history, utilized in a policies that overlooked the rights of minorities. The domestic emphasis on coercive conversion maps the limitations of Australia's deployment of human rights in the immediate post-war period. Despite their utopian intent, in practice, the building of universal rights entailed a process of 'inclusive exclusion', requiring the abandonment or invisibility of certain groups, such as Aboriginal people. On one level, the domestic application of the ideals and language of human rights indicates a tension between principles of universalism and local difference that continues to be central to current analysis of global networks, linked to concepts of

universal human rights and local values. This dilemma is a problem not merely of articulation between different orders of practice, but of how to conceive human subjectivity and difference. The shortcomings of idealising visions of human rights however have provided the basis for critique of social injustice, and measure how far we have left to travel toward their realization.

Works Cited

- Allbeson, Tom. "Photographic Diplomacy in the Postwar World: UNESCO and the Conception of Photography as a Universal Language, 1946-1956." *Modern Intellectual History* vol. 12, no. 2, 2015, pp. 1-33.
- Anderson, Fay. "Never Look Away: Humanitarianism and Australian Newspaper Photographers." *Visualising Human Rights*, edited by Jane Lydon, UWA Publishing, 2018, pp. 141-166.
- Australian Human Rights Commission. Australia and the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/australia-and-universal-declaration-human-rights>
- "Australian Mission to United Nations". Inward Cablegram to Department External Affairs, 7 October 1960, National Archives of Australia. A1838 929/5/3 Part 1.
- "Awakening Needed to Human Rights." *The Advertiser*, 13 Nov. 1951, p. 2.
- Azoulay, Ariella. "'The Family Of Man': A Visual Universal Declaration Of Human Rights." *The Human Snapshot*, edited by Thomas Keenan, et al., Luma Foundation and Sternberg Press, 2013, pp. 19-48.
- Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Hill and Wang, 1971.
- Berlier, Monique. "The Family of Man: Readings of an Exhibition." *Picturing the Past: Media, History, and Photography*, edited by Bonnie Brennan and Hanno Hardt, University of Illinois Press, 1999, pp. 206-41.
- Berndt, Catherine and Berndt, Ronald. "The Black – Through Different Eyes." *Great Southern Herald*, Friday 13 January 1950, p. 5.
- Bregengaard, Katrine, and Eva Prag. *Visualizing Universalism. The Unesco Human Rights Exhibition, 1949-1953*. Columbia University's Institute for the Study of Human Rights, 2014.
- Brink, Cornelia. "Secular icons: Looking at Photographs from Nazi Concentration Camps." *History and Memory*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2000, pp. 135–50.
- Cooper, Frederick, and Randall Packard. *International Development and the Social Sciences*. University of California Press, 1997.
- Cooper, Frederick. "Modernizing Colonialism and the Limits of Empire." *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, edited by Craig Calhoun, et al., New Press, 2006, pp. 63-72.
- de Costa, Ravi. *A higher authority: Indigenous transnationalism and Australia*. UNSW Press, 2006.

- Courtney, Michael. "Give Them A Chance." *Australian Magazine*, 1 March 1955, p. 37.
- Davenport, Sue, Peter Johnson, and Yuwali. *Cleared Out: First Contact In The Western Desert*. Aboriginal Studies Press, 2005.
- Devereux, Annemarie. *Australia and the Birth of the International Bill of Human Rights 1946–1966*. Federation Press, 2005.
- Gorman, Alice. "La Terre et L'espace: Rockets, Prisons, Protests And Heritage In Australia And French Guiana." *Archaeologies: Journal Of The World Archaeological Congress*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2007, pp. 153-168.
- Green, Joseph. "Perth Meeting to Mark Human Rights Day." *The West Australian*, 10 December 1953, p. 2.
- Haebich, Anna. *Spinning the Dream: Assimilation In Australia 1950–1970*. Fremantle Press, 2008.
- Human Rights: Exhibition Album*. UNESCO, 1950.
- "Human rights in pictures." *News*, 7 November 1951, p. 10.
- "Human Rights Plea For Aborigines." *The Advertiser*, 20 June 1951, p 3.
- Hunt, Lynn. "Foreword." *Human Rights in Camera*, by Sharon Sliwinski. Chicago University Press, 2011, pp. ix-xii.
- Hurm, Gerd. "Reassessing Roland Barthes's Myth of *The Family of Man*." *The Family of Man Revisited: Photography in a Global Age*, edited by Gerd Hurm, et al., I.B.Tauris, 2018, pp. 23-45.
- Kaplan, Louis. *American Exposures: Photography and Community in the Twentieth Century*. University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Linfield, Susie. *The Cruel Radiance: Photography and Political Violence*. Chicago University Press, 2011.
- Louis, W. Roger. *Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire*. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Lydon, Jane. *The Flash of Recognition: Photography and the Emergence of Indigenous Rights*. NewSouth Books, 2012.
- . "Visualising Human Rights." *Visualising Human Rights*, edited by Jane Lydon, UWA Publishing, 2018, pp. 1-25.
- Magarey, Susan. "Why Didn't They Want to be Members of Parliament? Suffragists in South Australia." *Suffrage and Beyond: International Feminist Perspectives*, edited by Caroline Daley and Melanie Nolan, Auckland University Press, 1994, pp. 67-88.
- Mcgregor, Russell. *Indifferent Inclusion: Aboriginal People and The Australian Nation*. Aboriginal Studies Press, 2011.
- Morton, Peter. *Fire Across the Desert: Woomera and The Anglo-Australian Joint Project 1946–1980*. Australian Government Publishing Service, 1989.
- Moyn, Samuel. *The Last Utopia*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.
- National Archives of Australia, "United Nations – Human Rights – Discrimination and minorities – convention on racial discrimination, 1964–69", A1838 929/5/6 Part 1.
- "Protest at Chaining Of Natives." *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 October 1949, p. 11.

- Raggatt, T.S. *A report to the Australian Teachers' Federation on the first General Conference of U.N.E.S.C.O. and on education in Great Britain, November, 1947*. The Australian Teachers' Federation, 1947.
- Rowley, Charles. *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society*. Penguin Books Australia, 1972.
- Rowse, Tim, editor. *Contesting Assimilation*. API Network, 2005.
- Schmidt-Linsenhoff, Viktoria. "Trauma and photography." *The Family of Man 1955-2001: Humanism and Postmodernism: A Reappraisal of the Photo Exhibition by Edward Steichen*, edited by Jean Back and Viktoria Schmidt-Linsenhoff, Jonas Verlag, 2004, pp. 80-100.
- "Security of Family Life." *News*, 14 November 1951, p. 3.
- Sekula, Allan. "The Traffic in Photographs." *Art Journal*, vol. 41, no. 1, 1981, pp. 15-25.
- "Short History." *Human Rights: Exhibition Album*, UNESCO, 1950.
- Slaughter, Joseph R. *Human Rights, Inc.: The World Novel, Narrative Form, And International Law*. Fordham University Press, 2007.
- Sluga, Glenda. "UNESCO and the (One) World of Julian Huxley." *Journal of World History*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 393-418.
- Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. *Photography after Photography: Gender, Genre, History*, edited by Sarah Parsons, Duke University Press, 2017.
- Steichen, Edward. "On Photography." *Photographers on Photography*, edited by Nathan Lyons, Englewood Cliffs, 1966, pp.107-08.
- Steichen, Edward. *A Life in Photography*. Doubleday, 1963.
- Stretton, Hugh. "Duncan, Walter George Keith (1903–1987)." *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University. <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/duncan-walter-george-keith-12443/text22375>, published first in hardcopy 2007, accessed online 8 February 2015.
- "Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization." *Basic Texts*, 2014 Edition. UNESCO, 2014. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002269/226924e.pdf>.
- Winter, Jay. *Dreams of Peace and Freedom*. Yale University Press, 2006.