

Nature Writers Need Big Ears: The Bilby, the Rabbit, and Eco-Colonialism in Australia

Liana Joy Christensen

ABSTRACT

Fifteen years of experience as a nature writer has taught me the advantage of having big ears. You need them to listen in to the complex babble of nature/culture conversations. To illustrate this point, I will tell the story of Australia's big-eared marsupial, the bilby, and its tragi-comic struggles with the introduced rabbit. It has elements of epic—a fence more than three thousand kilometres long built to keep rabbits out; and of farce—scientists squabbling over the most suitable candidate for an Australian fertility icon. This story draws on most of our major cultural shapers: mythology, imperialism, marketing, money, semiotics and science.

I like to listen to all these competing voices, partly for the simple pleasure of story. It is vital, however, to remember that these discourses do not simply exist in the printed page or cyberspace or virtual reality. How we write and think about things has real consequences in a real world. To be truly ecological, discourse needs to be like ecology: multiple, interdependent and diverse. It also needs to be aware of its limitations. Ecological discourse can connect us with the world, but it must not be mistaken for the world. That is the second, more serious, meaning to my title. Nature writers need big ears, we need bilbies, we need the scorching sun of the Western Desert, the red pindan earth, the sharp spinifex. We need nature. And it is part of our job to make meanings that celebrate and fight for its diversity.

KEY WORDS

nature writing
rabbit
ecology
indigenous

bilby
ecofeminism
rabbit-proof fence



Introduction

In 1997, I wrote an essay for *Australasian GEO* on the subject of the bilby—Australia's long eared marsupial—and the European rabbit, its shadow sister. The story is fascinating enough in its own right, yet my purpose here is more than simply re-telling that story. Rather, I wish to look more closely at the confluence of discourses that flow through the story. These powerful discourses of mythology, religion, imperialism, marketing, money, history, semiotics and science reveal much about human interactions with the more-than-human natural world. An examination of the complex conversations among these discourses can help us shape and understand some of the purposes and practices of nature writing.

Accordingly, this paper begins by sketching the outlines of the bilby and rabbit story. The interplay of different discourses is then looked at more deeply, revealing some of the cultural conundrums inherent in the story. Distinctions are made between non-indigenous discourses that create positive results and those that do not. The prospect is raised of learning something from indigenous discourses about animals, without either romanticising or appropriating those stories. Ultimately, there are two principal reasons for looking more deeply into these discourses. The first is the serious consequences they can have in the world, for good or ill; the second is the overdue development of non-indigenous Australians' capacities to understand discourses that originate outside human languages. Writers work with human language, understanding something of its power and its limitations. Nature writers are perhaps more than most sharply aware

of our utter interdependence with the rest of the world. Nature writers, then, must honour both history and imagination in learning how to understand and celebrate the discourses of nature.

From Eternity to Here

Ninu, Dalgyte, Marrura, and Walpatjirri are names the animal had before it was ever known as the bilby (Johnson 187). Aboriginal people from various desert groups were on very familiar terms with this animal. It was undoubtedly a good source of food, but not for everybody. Traditionally, all members of a group would acknowledge the animal's origin and place in the creation matrix, usually rendered into English as "the Dreaming." The Dreaming is simultaneously long ago and now-always. Some members of the group may have a special connection with a specific animal group, again loosely translated as "totemic." They would have particular responsibilities in connection with the animal, and generally it would not be acceptable food for them.

The bilby made its western scientific debut in 1837, when it was described by Reid. It is classified scientifically as order PERAMELEMORPHIA, family Peramelidae, subfamily Thylacomyinae, genus *Macrotis* (hare-eared) species *lagotis* (long-ear) (Johnson 186). The standard scientific accounts (for example, Johnson; Southgate) agree that the bilby was once widespread throughout much of the continent—over an area greater than three million square kilometers. In recent geological times (but before colonization), its range was reduced to a still fairly substantial area of eastern and central Australia, south of latitude 18° south, with a few outlying populations in the western deserts. In the early days of the Australian colonies the animals would have been common throughout most of this territory.

Richard Southgate is one of Australia's foremost bilby researchers. He explains (293–302) that bilbies are nocturnal, like most of the smaller Australian marsupials, and they live in burrows. Although the species was no doubt familiar to observant country people, he elaborates, bilbies were easily overlooked by early

European arrivals, most of whom tended to cling to the coastal fringe. By the early 1900s, there was a dramatic fall in population, with the likely culprits being nominated as rabbits and foxes, particularly in the southern parts of the range. From three million square kilometers, the bilbies' range has shrunk to several pockets of a few hundred square kilometers or less. The remnant populations are now confined to the western and central deserts, with a small group hanging on north of Birdsville in Queensland. The bilby's current status is rare and scattered (Johnson 187).

The Swift Rise of the Easter Bilby

At the beginning of the final decade of last century, the bilby was no doubt mourned by the traditional desert people whose absence mirrored the bilby's own decline. It was also significant to the handful of researchers cognisant of the disappearance of the "critical weight range" mammals, first noted by Burbidge and McKenzie. For the majority of urban Australians, however, the bilby did not exist. By 2004, however, the bilby occupied a secure niche in popular culture: there have been several television appearances by the "Bilby Brothers" of Queensland (see, for example, Stevens, Online); and the children of environmentally conscious parents are presented with chocolate bilbies at Easter time.

How did this change happen? Well, to hear Flannery (16–17) tell the tale, it seems that the old English goddess Eastre fell down a rabbit hole and ended up in the southern hemisphere, a disheveled market parody of her former glory. Flannery's account takes us back to AD 601 when Christianity was in the early years of its long ascendancy in Britain, aided by Pope Gregory's *Realpolitik* decision to incorporate rather than suppress the more popular native festivals, particularly the spring equinox rites celebrating Eastre's renewal of fertility and light. The Christian graft took exceedingly well, and Easter is permanently established, even in the secular calendar. The religiously inclined may well bemoan the commercialisation of an essentially religious festival, but only folk historians are likely to understand the seemingly

incongruous symbols of eggs and rabbits. These fertility symbols bear witness to the older, largely eclipsed religion. And they are also remarkably suitable for mass manufacture of chocolate confections and, in the case of the rabbits, soft toys.

How Much Is That Bilby in the Window?

Soft toys might sell in the millions, but—for good reason—real rabbits are not popular in Australia. So, in the mid-1970s, naturalist Malcolm Turner had an inspiration (Flannery 16–17). Why not use a native animal, the long-eared bilby, to celebrate Easter? It took a while, but eventually this idea caught the public imagination, as well as the attention of marketers. The Anti-Rabbit Research Foundation of Australia (ARRFA) contracted with small manufacturers such as Haigh's Chocolates to make and distribute Easter bilbies and return a percentage of the profits to anti-rabbit research. Sensing a profitable niche market, the Chocolate Manufacturers of Australia (CMA) sought to register a trademark. Legal disputes followed. Nonetheless, throughout the 1990s, the buying public became used to Easter bilbies—and, by default, the existence of the actual animal and its threatened status.

In a rear guard action, certain scientists have advanced—with varying degrees of seriousness—better contenders for the crown of indigenous Easter animal. Flannery (16) facetiously notes that Australia's most fertile animal is the plague rat, but holds no real hope for its widespread adoption. John Wamsley, founder of Earth Sanctuaries, is rather more earnest in his insistence that the boodie, or burrowing bettong, is a better biological match for the bunny (Earth Sanctuaries, pers. com.). This somewhat misses the point. The bilby has long ears. It is very cute. It is commonly known as the rabbit-eared bandicoot. These are better qualifications for a P.R. sleight of hand than any biologically based facts. This is a good example of one discourse culture—that of science—being incommensurable with another—that of marketing.

Shifting the Colonial Gaze

The dominant discourse Europeans use in their relationship to the bilby is scientific. In the first phase this mainly took the form of collecting/appropriating for the great museums of Europe. Later the scientists, like the painters and writers, started to become engaged with the intrinsic fascination of local landscapes, local wildlife, local habitat. H. H. Finlayson, an explorer and scientist, wrote of the bilby in 1935: “[It carries] a number of structural peculiarities to gross lengths, yet manages to reconcile them all in a surprisingly harmonious and even beautiful whole” (qtd. in Johnson 186).

The compliment is ambivalent. (Poignant, too, if one takes account of the fact that Finlayson had been badly disfigured in a gas explosion.) Still, his observation represents a shift from Europeans’ original inability to see or hear or respond to the new country except by reference to the old. It is well representative of the second phase of adaptation non-indigenous Australians experienced in coming to terms with a radically new landscape inhabited by radically different wildlife. The somewhat surprised admiration so evident in Finlayson’s words shows the shift in favour of the colony, as opposed to the empire. The place had begun to work its own, slow magic.

Nonetheless, throughout this time, and for a long time afterwards, the only languages non-indigenous Australians had for the bilby were those of science: initially biological and more recently ecological. Thus, we talk in terms of “classification,” “genus,” “species,” and subsequently “range,” “distribution,” and “status.” This broadening discourse is, in itself, symptomatic of a desirable expansion from a more narrowly-based, objectified, modernist science to a more contextualised animal-together-with-environment approach. Along the way the species also acquired a small collection of common names, including “Greater bilby [as distinct from the Lesser bilby which has been considered extinct since the 1960s], rabbit-eared Bandicoot, rabbit Bandicoot [and] Pinkie” (Johnson 187).

The Rabbit Problem

It is appropriate to acknowledge that non-indigenous Australians have gradually deepened and broadened their relationship with their new environment. Nonetheless, the connection remains precarious. The predominance of utilitarian motives inevitably creates unequal power relations. And any reduction in poor attitudes towards local species is not matched by an equivalent sensitivity when dealing with the complexities of the rabbit problem. The sorry history of rabbits in Australia is deeply symptomatic of the underlying structural issues that need to be dealt with before we can achieve any shift towards a more ecocentric worldview.

The original and best account of how rabbits and other feral animals came to Australia is Eric Rolls' classic text *They All Ran Wild*. It is a story of stupidity, cupidity and outright scandal. In his opening chapter, Rolls informs us that five domestic rabbits arrived with Governor Phillip on the first fleet, and it was common practice for ships' captains to carry rabbits on board and release them at various ports of call in order to create a food supply as insurance against future shipwrecks. These animals were largely domestic breeds and hybrids. The real problems started, however, with repeated attempts to import rabbits and foxes in order to ape the British upper class practice of hunting for sport. It was the English subspecies of the European rabbit (*Oryctolagus cuniculus cuniculus*) that was to prove so spectacularly and destructively adaptable to its new environment.

Initially, rabbits were highly desirable in Australia. They represented an opportunity to transform both the place and the people of the fledgling colony, to populate it with familiar figures from the British cultural and natural landscapes: the hunter and the hunted. It sounds extraordinary to contemporary Australian ears, but rabbits were even used as a selling point for rural real estate. Rolls quotes an advertisement from the *Argus*, 8th June 1861: "rabbit warren. It is situated in Western Port Bay, contains about 200 acres and it is estimated that there are now between 4000 and 5000 rabbits on it; a

new cottage and other improvements" (31–32). But the rabbit was not a fertility symbol for nothing. Soon the animals bred in overwhelming numbers, and quickly became a threat to European agricultural systems. (At this early stage, the damage to indigenous animals and ecosystems was not a priority for most non-indigenous Australians. In fact, quite a range of indigenous species was either classed with the rabbit as a pest. Others died in the rabbit wars as "collateral damage.")

So, the good bunny becomes the bad bunny, but who is really responsible here? Certainly not the animal itself, which did not arrive on the continent of its own accord, and once here set about behaving exactly according to its nature. Absolutely bereft of ironic self-reflection, Europeans experienced a mounting terror of this invading species that threatened to overrun the continent. Indisputably, the number of rabbits, the swiftness of their spread and the extent of rabbit-induced damage were major problems. Yet the measures taken to counter the threat are also a fair picture of the degree of unconsciousness Europeans had about their own status as invaders. Trapping, poisoning, fumigation, and burrow-ripping are part of the standard anti-rabbit armaments, but here I will look only at two: physical barriers and disease.

First, there is the fence. The rabbit proof fence has epic qualities, in the individualistic tradition of the hero. It does not, of course, compare with China's great wall. Nonetheless, in a nation of so few people and so much open space, it is an extraordinary achievement to construct a series of fences stretching more than 3,000 km from north to south of a whole continent. Mad, but remarkable. From any other than an anthropocentric and heroic perspective, however, such an undertaking could at best be described as farcical, and, above all, as singularly useless in the long run. But it is not random. Like the symptoms of individual psychosis, cultural psychosis is deeply symbolic. We actually believe it is possible to control and fence off the natural world; we actually believe it is possible to fence off the knowledge of our own destructive colonising. Once again, this is a singularly useless undertaking in the long run.

The fence debate has entered a new dimension in the last two

decades, as both government departments and private organisations attempt to save endangered species such as the bilby by building small, fenced reserves. I can certainly understand the sense of urgency that underlies these projects, but I'm inclined to share Glen Albrecht's view. He calls it the "Noah Syndrome" and comments:

Well, the focus on individual species may be laudable in one sense, but by putting one species into an enclosure, removing predators, removing the large animals that would have roamed in and out of that ecosystem, you're creating in effect a kind of monocultural zoo for bilbies. And I'm not sure that's going to be in the best interest of bilbies, or indeed of those ecosystems that are now being modified to enclose them. (Online)

Whether they are used to keep some animals in, or other animals out, fences will ultimately fail. In the meantime, however, we are quite capable of escalating the violence required to defend ourselves against self-knowledge by projecting it onto an "evil other." We resorted to biological warfare against the rabbit. Myxomatosis is an ugly disease, yet history continually shows us that it is possible to talk of such things in a detached and clinical manner:

When the Myxoma virus originally infected unexposed European rabbits it produced an acute illness that resulted in 100% mortality. After infection, skin lesions appeared on the 3rd day and had spread every where by the 4th day. The skin lesions are typically swelling of the genitals and of the head, especially the eyelids which results in blindness. The rabbit's appetite remains normal until shortly before death which is on average 13 days after infection.

In time rabbits developed some immunity to the myxoma virus and the disease process changed in some cases to produce chronic form of Myxomatosis. (Isabelle Vets, Online)

And:

Even the introduction of the rabbit virus myxomatosis by the CSIRO in the 1950s failed to provide *a final solution*, although it was devastatingly effective in the short term. Initially the disease had a 99 per cent kill rate (99 out of a hundred infected rabbits died) but with time, the virus declined in strength and the surviving rabbits have again multiplied to the point that they've become a major problem. (*Biotechnology Australia*, Online, italics added)

Myxomatosis did not work. The graphic and painful nature of death by myxomatosis even gave a few people pause for thought. Our next strategy—the premature release of Rabbit Calicivirus Disease from a government laboratory—was described in all public accounts as an accident. It is a less painful, more humane death. Other than that, it follows exactly the same pattern—major, but not total, population crash. The remaining rabbits had no trouble re-populating. In August 2002, James Randerson reported in the *New Scientist* that “in some areas of the outback, there are as many as 3,000 rabbits per square kilometer” (13). Total estimates vary between 300 and 400 million. Rabbits continue to thrive; human attempts to control rabbits continue to fail. Have we learned anything?

Not a lot. Although, in all fairness, current concerns about the rabbit plague more often spring from ecological as well as agricultural motives—and there is genuine cause for concern. Unquestionably, rabbits have radically damaged habitat and out-competed local species, driving many animals to extinction. The bilby clings on in very marginal habitat these days. It is one thing to say that human interactions with the rabbit in Australia are very revealing of our imperfect repression of our own colonising, alienated impulses. To deny that rabbits are a major environmental problem in Australia, however, would be plainly ignorant. My argument is otherwise. It does not question the damage done, nor the desire and necessity to do something about it. Rather, I contend that applying more of the same alienated and alienating controls that underpinned the creation of the problem in the first place is futile. If we are to have any chance of achieving a new ecological balance, we require a far more radical shift.

What Signifies?

These various stories about two animals from the Australian continent reveal much about the discourse communities that co-create the animals' identities. Is the bilby a totem? An icon? Is it a meal? Flesh—or chocolate? Is it the subject of research? The animal object for a nation's grief about the ecological devastation wrought in the last 200 years? What about the rabbit? Is it a living link to the mother country, the final seal of social approval for aspirant "gentlemen"? Is it the tragic, blinded victim of human callousness? The demonic face of relentless invasion? The animal object for a nation's fury about the ecological devastation wrought in the last 200 years? The rabbit is certainly a threat to the Australian environment, but is the degree of hatred felt for the rabbit justly proportioned? Is it really more of a threat to the environment than the relentlessly invading humans who introduced it in the first place?

Looking more closely at this process of co-creation of animal identities can teach us a lot about human nature, and human relations with the rest of the more-than-human natural world. I believe that humans have the ability—and therefore the responsibility—to get better at creating room in our own discourses for the interdependent and partial agencies of humans together with the more-than-human natural world. In this respect, I think indigenous discourses have much to offer the world, although western science and literature also have key roles to play.

Learning from the Local

As a non-indigenous Australian, I can only observe Aboriginal cultural discourses as an outsider. However, I believe even this degree of knowledge, clearly available in the public domain, reveals something about the possibilities for human relationships with animals. This is not to say that there has always been a perfect and mutually beneficial relationship between Aboriginal Australians and the

indigenous fauna. (There is a great deal of money, no doubt, but little of real value to be gained from idealising indigenous cultures.) For instance, in *The Future Eaters*, Flannery makes a controversial but plausible case from the fossil record that the arrival of Aboriginal people on the continent was one causative factor in the extinction of the megafauna. He goes on to acknowledge, however, that subsequently a new balance was reached that provided for the long-term survival of the remaining diversity of species, including the people.

How was this new balance achieved? In part, simply by the passing of a large amount of time. Over millennia, the people stopped, in Flannery's arresting phrase, "eating their future" and learned to live in a sustainable manner. That is self-evident with even a small knowledge of the pre-European history of Australia. But the passing of time is not a sufficient explanation for the transformation. A "biology 101" explanation would account for it in fairly mechanistic terms including the expansion and contraction of populations in direct ratio to the availability of food sources. But what, exactly, makes the difference between a culture, such as traditional indigenous Australia, that eventually achieved sustainability—and one, such as globalised, modern, industrial culture, that has not?

Perhaps it is not time, *per se*, but the necessity of having sufficient time in a particular place for us to be able to converse with any fluency with our environment. It seems evident to me that the kind of relationship the indigenous Australians developed with the animals of their home place is one that fits well within a framework that Leesa Fawcett calls the "kinship imaginary." Such relationships are conceived of as mutually respectful. They do not necessarily preclude the utilitarian, but they are not reducible to it. The rest of the more-than-human natural world is recognised as having intrinsic value, both in material and non-material terms. Fawcett's concept of the "kinship imaginary" also indicates that human imagination has a role in co-creation, which is the underlying theme of this paper.

The radical shift we need to make is not unprecedented. It is the same shift made by indigenous Australians sometime in the years after the last of the megafauna disappeared. The way of life they eventually

developed here was sustaining of life in the long term. I do not wish to project a misty, romantic image of this achievement. Quite the contrary, in some aspects it is quite a great deal more sharp-edged, hard and clear sighted than that of the urban dweller who fails to connect the McBurger with the abattoir. Nor do I entertain the notion that the Australia's current multicultural population should somehow try to "convert" to Aboriginality. That would not only be a ludicrous proposition, but also a deeply offensive one. But there is a world of difference between the consumerist appropriation of indigenous cultures and the respectful recognition that we have something to learn from them.

Modern, industrial capitalist culture may be unique in the scale of its power and destructiveness, but it is not the only manner of being human. And, as Murphy points out in *Literature, Nature and Other—Ecofeminist Critiques*, non-indigenous peoples are not necessarily doomed to continue in their alienation from the world's immanence (144–45). In the West, this alienation has its roots in the specific historical period of post Enlightenment thought, and is not a given of any human existence. In other words, as Derrick Jensen repeatedly states in *A Language Older than Words*, "It doesn't have to be this way." If we really believe that there are alternatives, then it makes sense to look at the underlying structures of cultures that have achieved relative sustainability. Not in order to reproduce those cultures, which would be impossible anyway, but in order to gain some insight into how we can move from what is not desirable closer to how we would like it to be. In this instance, I am positing the 'we' as people around the world who share a commitment to Donna Haraway's vision:

So I think my problem and 'our' problem is how to have simultaneously an account of radical historical contingency for all knowledge claims and knowing subjects, a critical practice for recognizing our own semiotic technologies for making meanings, and a no-nonsense commitment to faithful accounts of a 'real' world, one that can be partially shared and friendly to earth-wide projects of finite freedom, adequate material abundance, modest

meaning in suffering, and limited happiness. (187)

Nature Writing

Working towards Harraway's earth-wide projects—projects that are inclusive of the more-than-human natural world—will require participation from many different discourse communities, including the indigenous, scientific, political and philosophic. In other words, to be truly ecological, discourse needs to be like a healthy ecology: multiple, interdependent and diverse. This is not a naïve, liberal pluralist approach to discourse; it does not require the erasure of difference, or polite suppression of any knowledge of power differentials. Quite the opposite: it demands active acknowledgement of—and resistance to—univocal power. Of course, “multiple, interdependent and diverse” will not protect against all possible depredations or deaths. A comet or single-celled invader could easily wipe out the most pristine of planetary ecosystems, just as a random accident can kill the most healthy individual. However, it is still both possible and desirable to enhance the chances for health and sustainability in an individual, an ecosystem and a society's discourses.

As a nature writer, I am particularly interested in how literary discourse can draw from and contribute to all these conversations across different discourse communities. Nature writers have two responsibilities. The first is a responsibility to memory and history: this requires the sustaining of stories that sustain us, together with the robust commitment to truth-telling that makes resistance to the destructive discourses possible. Nature writers must work constantly with the knowledge that the two worlds—the world of discourse and the material world—are not hermetically sealed from each other: and that communication is not a one-way passage from the cultural to the natural. Human discourses can and do continually result in major impacts on the real world, for good or ill—that is fairly self-evident. What is less often realised is the multiple and independent discourses of the more-than-human natural world. Language has many forms

beyond the verbal. A non-human character in Tess William's ecofeminist novel *Sea as Mirror* asks again and again that we "listen to the world." We have yet to develop an adequate response.

Some of the ways we may be able to make this attempt is through good science and good nature writing. That is why the second responsibility of nature writers is to imagination and hope: this is deep and dangerous work, not to be undertaken lightly. Nature writers must remain sharply aware of the fact that discourses interact with and shape reality. At the same time, due honour must be accorded to the demands of truth. Yet truth is sometimes best served by imagination. In another context, Gilligan captures this concept exactly:

I don't know how to talk about this kind of knowing, since it so readily seems suspect. It is the way animals know. Through vibrations. Something that passes between people. We pore over novels and poems because this is what writers put into words. Truths that have until recently escaped the nets put out by science. Speaking truth only, in Emerson's phrase; knowing what rings true. (164–65)

The shift back into reciprocity—into a more sustainable culture—requires a deeply imagined connection with the rest of the more-than-human natural world. This aspect of nature writing shares much with the ancient craft of mythmaking, with a lower case "m." It is the avowed enemy of capital "M" mythmaking, of propaganda, PR, spin and all the related discourses devoted to convincing the populace that "all is for the best in the best of all possible worlds." Without imaginative leaps in both science and nature writing, it will be impossible to start to understand the other non-human discourses that surround us. Certainly, as with all translation (*Tradurre è tradire*) there is room for error, but that is reason for caution, not reason to abandon the project altogether. Nature writers have a vital role in celebrating and re-creating "kinship imaginaries."

To enjoy the bilby story for its entertainment value, or the chocolate bilby for its taste, is well enough—but little more than most

other forms of consumerism. Without an empathic understanding of the bilby's right to independent existence, and our own responsibility in the matter—materially, spiritually and politically—it is woefully inadequate. Nature writers need “Big Ears” so that we can “listen to the world.” It is important—but insufficient—for us to be fluent in the human discourses of science and poetry. We need to learn a great deal more about the non-verbal discourses of the more-than-human natural world. The more we develop this kind of literacy, the more we will recognise what the world says to us. It is very much a matter of time scale. On the one hand, the bilbies are in desperate and immediate need of our current efforts to ensure their survival—that much is obvious. On the other hand, in terms of deep time, the latest mass extinction event, along with its agent—human beings—will only register as a small chapter in the much larger volume of life.

There is another truth, though. A truth that is local, on a different time scale, and the only one that offers us the opportunity of agency. It is the key to living sustainably in the window of time that is ours, however tiny that may be in the broader picture. This truth is the long ago and now-always interconnectedness of all life and the geophysical systems that support that life. To write ecologically is to write from this place. It requires the recognition of reciprocity inherent in the “kinship imaginary.” As much as bilbies need us, we need bilbies. We need the scorching sun of the Western Desert, the red pindan earth, the sharp spinifex. We need nature. And it is part of our job to make meanings that celebrate and fight for its diversity.

Works Cited

- Albrecht, Glen. Radio National Transcripts: *Earthbeat*, Saturday 10th May 2003. 12th May 2003. <<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/science/earth/stories/s851133.htm>.>
- Biotechnology Australia. “Biotechnology Online: Environmental Applications: Control of pest species: Case Study, the European rabbit in Australia.” 25 April 2003. <<http://www.biotechnology.gov.au/biotechnologyOnline/PDF/environment.pdf>.>

- Burbidge, Andrew, and McKenzie, Norm. "Patterns in the modern decline of western Australia's vertebrate fauna: causes and conservation implications." *Biological Conservation* 50.1–4 (1989): 143–198.
- Christensen, Liana. "The ears have it for the Easter bilby." *Australasian GEO*, March–April 1997. 18–28.
- Earth Sanctuaries, Mylor, South Australia. (1997) Personal communication.
- Fawcett, Leesa. "Animals endangered in our minds: children's ecodevelopment." Visiting Ecofeminist Scholar Series. Lecture delivered at Murdoch University, Western Australia, April 9th 2003.
- Flannery, Tim. *The Future Eaters: An Ecological History of the Australasian Lands and People*. Chatswood, N.S.W.: Reed Books, 1994.
- _____. "Arrival of the Easter bilby." *Natural History*, April 1996: 16–17.
- Gilligan, Carol. *The Birth of Pleasure*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2002.
- Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991. 183–201.
- Isabelle Vets. (2000–2003). Vaccinate your rabbit each year: Myxomatosis. 25 April 2003. <http://www.isabellevets.co.uk/health_advice/rabbit/info/myxomatosis.htm>
- Jensen, Derrick. *A Language Older than Words*. London: Souvenir Press, 2000.
- Johnson, Keith. "Bilby" *The Mammals of Australia*. Ed. Ronald Strahan. Chatswood, NSW: Australian Museum and Reed Books, 1995. 186–8.
- Murphy, Patrick. *Literature, Nature and Other: Ecofeminist Critiques*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1995.
- Randerson, John. "Resistant Rabbits are Fighting Back." *New Scientist*, August 2002. 13.

- Rolls, Eric. *They All Ran Wild: The Story of Pest on the Land in Australia*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1969.
- _____. *Running Wild*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1973.
- Southgate, Richard. "Distribution and Abundance of the Greater Bilby *Macrotis lagotis* Reid (Marupialia: Peramelidae)." *Bandicoots and bilbies*. Eds. J.H. Seebeck, P.R. Brown, R.L. Wallis and C.M. Kemper. Surrey Beatty and Sons, Chipping Norton Australia, 1990. 293–302.
- _____. "Habits and Diet of the Greater Bilby *Macrotis lagotis* Reid (Marupialia: Peramelidae)." *Bandicoots and Bilbies*. Eds. J.H. Seebeck, P.R. Brown, R.L. Wallis and C.M. Kemper. Surrey Beatty and Sons, Chipping Norton Australia, 1990. 303–09.
- Stevens, J. (Director) 2002 *Bilby Brothers: The Men Who Killed the Easter Bunny*. Video. Gulliver Media Australia Pty Ltd. Paddington Queensland (see 27th October 2003 <<http://www.gullivermedia.com.au/>>)
- Williams, Tess. *The Sea as Mirror*. Sydney: Harper Collins, 2000.

