in the United States in 1933 (Lockhart in press 2005) and in Australia until the 1940s (Carney 2004 pers. com.).

The Australian Glass Manufacturers Company Limited were incorporated in 1915, following the amalgamation of the Melbourne Glass Bottle Works Company Limited and Waterloo Glass Bottle Works Company Limited (Fountain 2000:92; Vader and Murray 1975:14). Therefore any bottles with an AGM mark were made after 1915, and machine-made bottles after 1918 (Stuart 1993:18). This supports the post-1934 date for the glass.

Conclusion
Dating solarized amethyst glass has recently come under discussion (Lockhart in press 2005) and the discovery of this artefact supports a later date for the use of manganese dioxide. Another possible explanation is that the particular AGM trademark was used before 1934, although to date there is nothing to indicate that this is the case. It is more likely that solarized amethyst coloured glass, whereas commonly thought to be manufactured before 1916, continued into the 1930s.
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An exhibition at the National Archives of Australia in 2002 put on view the remarkable drawings made by Marion Mahony Griffin for her husband Walter Burley Griffin’s designs, the designs that won the 1912 competition for Australia’s new national capital in Canberra. Within those designs is an archaeological element, not before noticed, which we report in this note.

Griffin’s designs, though much compromised like all grand plans for great cities, survive in the shape of Canberra today. The fundamental axis, from Mount Ainslie through the War Memorial to the Parliament, is unblemished. There have been many losses. Instead of the extensive railway system and its grand central station, there exists today only a single-platform terminus with just two trains each way a day to Sydney. Roads for Canberra’s cars now swallow up Griffin’s park lands by the lake. Other things reported in the exhibition show that there are unchanging elements in how architectural and archaeological projects are actually conducted. Mrs Griffin complained she had only five weeks to do the drawings, when ‘It isn’t possible to do them in nine weeks’. (The extra four weeks referred to the travelling time to do the drawings, when ‘It isn’t possible to do them in nine weeks’). Drawn on linen, and then lithographed on to heavy cotton, they strikingly reflect conventions of Japanese wood-block prints – the prints which the Griffins’ employer, Frank Lloyd Wright, collected.

Griffin was more than a designer charged with placing a defined set of public buildings and ancillary settlements into an ordered landscape. He largely decided what those buildings and their surroundings should be, even down to the species of street trees, as the fitting things that would define the Australian capital, and thereby the nation. This is where a place for archaeology came in. An element in Griffin’s designs were the buildings of high culture, which he concentrated into a group at the foot of Mount Ainslie, extending across the flat land to its west. Here would be a monumental railway terminus, on the European model, and on the higher ground above it the cathedral, the military college (the one element which was constructed) and the opera house (not built, whilst the opera house in Sydney was, and became famous). Then on the lower ground beneath and to the west would be three cultural buildings, a ‘Gallery of Plastic Arts’, a ‘Plant Conservatory’ – and the ‘Museum of Archaeology’ (Fig. 1).

Reid’s (2002) account of Griffin’s plans for Canberra says nothing as to why Canberra needed a Museum of...
Archaeology, what it would contain, or what would be the nature and rôle of it or its neighbouring ‘Gallery of Plastic Arts’. Still, it is true that a national Museum of Archaeology – alongside national coats of arms, mottoes, and anthems – was in that time one of the standard emblems by which nations defined and identified themselves (as they still so do today). The drawing of the museum building façade – heavy, flat, low – has a hint of Mesoamerica to it, reminder of the fashion for Mayan inspiration which ran through American architecture at this time (cf. Ingle 1984:13-24). It is similar to the Carrie Eliza Getty Tomb in Chicago, designed by Griffin’s philosophical mentor, the legendary Louis Sullivan, which may have inspired the architecture of this building. The Mayan influence is also reflected in the design of Griffin’s most important feature in the new city of Canberra; the so-called ‘Capitol’ building that was to stand where the New Parliament House stands today. Griffin’s vision for this structure referenced Meso-America (or perhaps Indo-China) with its ziggaraut cap (Vernon 2002:8). One source for the Griffins’ interest in Meso-America likely was the replicas of Mayan and Aztec architecture on display at Chicago’s 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition. The University of Chicago launching a number of archaeological expeditions to Central and South America in the early 20th century also reflected the widespread interest in this theme at the time.

Reid (2002) reports no record of what the Australian National Museum of Archaeology might contain. One fears
it might have come to hold Greek painted pots and plaster casts of statues of Roman emperors – emblems of a national identity created by Australia’s immigrants from Europe, a national identity whose deep base in the distant past would be expressed archaeologically by the artefacts of ancient Europe. If a Classical-centred collection had been acquired from what was available in the 1920s or later, when the supply of artefacts of first-rate quality and secure provenance was much reduced, it could well have been a second-division affair.

Neither the Museum of Archaeology nor the Gallery of Plastic Arts ever happened. Whatever specific form the Griffin vision of a national Museum of Archaeology took (and whether archaeology would or would not have been of Australia), the idea fell away along with other aspects of his grand design for Canberra. When archaeology came to find its place in an ambitious new museum in Canberra, it took a very different form in a very different climate and context, that of a museum defined by its scope being Australia (archaeology included).

It was not until March 2001 that Canberra and Australia’s national capital acquired any substantial archaeological display – in the new National Museum of Australia. This is not where Griffin’s museum would be, but on the Acton Peninsula on the other side of the city’s central lake, named after Burley Griffin, formerly the site of the Royal Canberra Hospital, and just below the Australian National University. The university was also a part of Griffin’s larger vision and built where he planned it. The former Institute of Anatomy (now ScreenSound Australia, housing the National Screen and Sound Archive) was constructed in 1930 before the Griffins left Australia (Walter Burley Griffin left in 1935 for India where he died in 1938. Mrs Griffin subsequently returned to the United States). It housed a large number of Aboriginal and other artefacts that have now been relocated to the new National Museum. What is not known is what became of the Aboriginal artefacts that were unearthed ca. 1925 while Old Parliament House was under construction (C. Vernon pers. comm.).

The National Museum’s design, by Ashton Raggatt MacDonald and Robert Peck von Hartel Trehowan, reflects a self-vision of Australia wholly transformed from that of Griffin’s time. Its construction followed a long period of doubt in the late 20th century. First, a national museum was contemplated but not acted on. Then it was created as an institution but without a physical building in the capital. Finally, the physical museum was built, opening on the centenary of Australian federation as a single nation-state. As nation-states change and seem to weaken as entities in a changing world, it is less clear that a national museum is a defining necessity, and more doubt as to what on earth it might contain. To the specific doubts about Canberra, as a new city for the Australian capital, and about what the Australian national identity actually is, are added a broader loss of confidence in the idea of a national museum.

There is nothing in the new National Museum’s displays about ancient Europe, and its exhibits include a very significant element of Aboriginal history. It contains important major exhibits on the history of ideas in archaeology, for example, in the Tangled Destinies gallery. A collection of 80,000 stone tools is one of its significant collections, and a small portion of these artefacts is well presented in the permanent display. Both design and exhibits are emblems of a national identity to which Australia’s Indigenous people are fundamental. Alongside the many erosions of Griffin’s vision in the Canberra of today, there remains a modest place for archaeology in the kind of story the Australian nation chooses to tell of itself.
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Introduction

Bunnengalla 1 is a sandstone rockshelter fronting onto a permanent waterhole on Musselbrook Creek located on the northern margin of Boodjamulla National Park in northwest Queensland. In July 2004 excavation of the rockshelter revealed a rich 1.5 m sequence of human occupation. A preliminary report of the radiocarbon ages and stratigraphic sequence is presented here. The site provides a record of Late Holocene occupation from at least 6000 years BP with a considerable increase in occupation debris from 1300 years BP that is coincident with the amelioration of the ENSO dominated climate and increased precipitation in northern Australia.

The Bunnengalla 1 rockshelter is located on Bowthorn pastoral station, adjacent to Boodjamulla National Park (formerly Lawn Hill) in northwest Queensland, about 200 km south of the Gulf of Carpentaria. It is approximately 5 km west of the transition from the Gulf of Carpentaria savanna plain, within a sandstone gorge system on the eastern margin of the Barkly Tableland on Musselbrook Creek (refer to Fig. 1). Musselbrook Creek commences on the Barkly Tableland about 75 km west of the Bunnengalla 1 site and flows into the Gregory River approximately 100 km to the east. During the dry season (March – November), it is reduced to a series of large waterholes along its course. Bunnengalla 1 is adjacent to one of these waterholes, which is 3 km in length.

Bunnengalla 1 occurs within the traditional country of the Waanyi People. It is specifically related to the Wogaia