

CENTRE FOR
ARCHITECTURE | THEORY | CRITICISM | HISTORY
ATCH



Author	Moulis, Antony
Title	'A brush with the architect: on the reception of Le Corbusier's art in Australia, 1953'
Date	2006
Source	<i>Contested Terrains: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand</i> , pp. 385-92.
ISBN	0-646-46594-5

A brush with the architect: on the reception of Le Corbusier's art in Australia 1953

Antony Moulis

School of Geography Planning and Architecture, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

ABSTRACT

In 1953 a major exhibition of European contemporary artworks organised by the Art Gallery of NSW toured the State Galleries of Australia. Entitled 'French Painting Today', the exhibition featured works by prominent artists including Braque, Derain, Leger, Matisse, and Picasso seen in Australia for the first time. Amongst the works were three paintings by Le Corbusier, *Le Femme au livre* (1935), *Les deux soeurs* (1933-1947), and *Deux mains et pomme d'or* (1948). By examining documents concerning the staging of 'French Painting Today' as well as critical and popular accounts of the exhibition and its tour of Australia, the paper reveals the little known history of Le Corbusier's paintings within the exhibition event and puts in context their mixed reception in local art and architecture circles.

While Le Corbusier is lauded for his architecture, it is inevitable that his art would also be of interest to his architectural critics, not least because of the architect's undying dedication to the making of art.¹ Add to this, the architect's own claims for the value of his art production to his architecture, and a territory for critical discussion is neatly established.² In taking cues from the architect's own pronouncements much useful work has been done to deepen an understanding of the relationship between Le Corbusier's art and his architecture. Yet, by putting that work to one side briefly, it is possible to see Le Corbusier's art subject to other kinds of reception not so neatly circumscribed by the architect's own claims. One surprising example of the reception of Le Corbusier's art from outside the usual circles of Europe and North America occurs when the architect's art finds itself on show in Australia in 1953. The cameo offered may be a brief one but it does produce a view from outside the usual territory of architectural criticism with potential interest to it. Certainly it is a circumstance, until now, unexamined by scholarship, demanding attention and interpretation in its own right.

In 1953 a major exhibition of European contemporary artworks organised by the Art Gallery of NSW toured the State Galleries of Australia. Entitled 'French Painting Today', the exhibition featured works by prominent artists including Braque, Derain, Leger, Matisse, and Picasso seen in Australia for the first time. Amongst the works were three paintings by Le Corbusier, *Le Femme au livre* (1935), *Les deux soeurs* (1933-1947), and *Deux mains et pomme d'or* (1948) which had been secured through *l'Association d'Action Artistique*, the French government organization charged with assembling works for the event.³

The 'French Painting Today' exhibition was unique in the way that it presented Le Corbusier's paint-

ings at that time. In Australia, no architectural images were presented alongside the architect's art, as was the case with exhibitions of his work held in Europe and North America in the post war period; Boston (1948), London (1953), Paris (1953), and Lyons (1956). As Christopher Green notes, these northern hemisphere exhibitions are part of Le Corbusier's push to reassert the role of architecture in a broader discourse of culture that included art, where the rhetoric of the inter-war Modern Movement and its devotion to functionalism had been to pull architecture away.⁴ This move by the architect to engage art is seen to parallel changes in his architectural approach, away from a functionalist position towards a humanist cultural one, which is well documented through changes in his painting in the late 1920s that become manifest in the formal language of his post-war architectural output. The synthetic possibilities of art and architectural creation championed by Le Corbusier in the 1950s demanded clear reinforcement. Thus, at these major exhibitions, 'buildings were presented as the visual complements to paintings, tapestries and sculptures, and the point was reiterated that art was the source and the buildings, ultimately, were themselves art'⁵

Yet this kind of orchestrated display of the architect's work was not the case in Australia. Instead his art was simply displayed alongside that of other artists - all shown before a public audience that was witnessing post-cubist abstraction with fresh, if not naïve, eyes. This naïve view of the public contrasted that of local critics who were far more attuned to the work on show. The reception accorded Le Corbusier's art can be usefully seen in a general context of Australian art of the early 1950s and its prior encounter with European modernist ideas.

It was the 1940s that saw the emergence of an Australia modernist art. This emergence combined the reception of the European modernist tradition of the 1920s and 1930s with the identification of specifically Australian cultural perspectives. Yet conservative forces in Australian society were undoubtedly resistant to this combination of cultural movements and a conservative view of the parameters of art remained strong during this period.⁶ There were also broader issues for an emerging modernist vision to contend with in Australia – what Richard Haese refers to as that “philistine character of Australian life” and the potential for “the trivialization of art by [its] popularisers.”⁷ Despite these conservative forces, key Australian artists were able to develop their own take on modernist approaches during the 1940s, and began to set themselves free of the European models that had brokered their art.

The convergence of war, politics and art in 1940s Australia produced trenchant and radical positions, only deepened by strong personal alliances between artists and writer-critics. Some avant garde artists pursued an art of social realism aligned to communism, others pursued an art of negation and shock in response to the brutalising images of war generated both at home and abroad, while others drew more directly upon surrealism.⁸ Irrespective of this diversity of views, there was a sense in which these artists were seeking to capture an authentic, and identifiably local, cultural tradition that could effectively picture the nation to itself beyond a pastoral vision. By 1947 this wartime era of experiment and radicalism in Australia art was all but over, yet, beneath this radicalism, a working tradition had been effectively established in a fledgling form, leaving artists in the following years to ‘explore an art that was both Australian and Modernist.’⁹ By 1953, then, it was clear that those artists and critics involved in the critical reception of ‘French Painting Today’ were doing so from a position of knowledge and familiarity with European Modernist Art filtered through local circumstance and the contestation of ideas.

In this context a broad critical consensus emerges that the selection of works for ‘French Painting Today’ produces a significant exhibition yet one that is, in parts, below expectation. The art critic Bernard Smith, writing in *Meanjin*, calls it “the finest exhibition we have seen in Australia since the Exhibition of French and British Modern Art (1939)”¹⁰ but also observes that it is “extremely uneven in quality.”¹¹ He praises the work of Braque, Matisse, Picasso and the lesser-known Lagrange, but criticises the work of others, Leger in particular (an artist who works closely with Le Corbusier through his Purist period). Smith’s criticism of Leger begins with ambiguous praise, acknowledging Leger’s control over colour, and describing him as “the great decorator of the Paris School.”¹² His particular claim, however, is that the artist’s work on show is somewhat self indulgent, “too self-assured” and even “flabby.”¹³ Smith goes on to criticise the

weaker pictures of the exhibition in general, saying they “have the eloquence of skilled oratory but lack an inner personality of their own.”¹⁴ Smith, who favours a social realist art, cannot help but point to what he sees as an excess of technique in the lesser works on show, which appear merely formalist with no strong social or political subtext.

The art critic of Sydney’s *Daily Telegraph* is more direct in observing the exhibition’s mix of significant art with its ‘also-rans’, and singles out the work of Le Corbusier (Leger’s artist stable-mate) writing:

It is true that there are a few blank spots, and that a few pictures, such as those by Le Corbusier, are not up to the high standard the show achieves. With a show such as this, critical levels must be raised considerably.¹⁵

That Le Corbusier’s work is judged in Australia to be below the critical standard of the art of its day accords with judgements of the architect’s art from within cultural circles in Europe. French art critics were equally negative with one claiming that the architect’s efforts at painting have “no more importance than his first morning cigarette.”¹⁶ The architect’s claims to status as an artist is questioned by his critics on both sides of the globe, and yet Le Corbusier’s own claims for his role as an artist in the 1950s and his changing self-perception of it, are equally problematic.

Prior to 1923 Le Corbusier understands himself as a public artist, showing and selling his Purist work in the usual commercial settings. Post-1923 Le Corbusier characterises himself as an artist working in private, allowing himself the freedom to explore forms and ideas beyond the public gaze and the pressures of the commercial world.¹⁷ Out of this period the legend of Le Corbusier’s art practice as a personal and secretive activity grows, fed by the image of the artist working alone in his apartment’s studio each morning, a claim that is supported by the architect’s biography in the catalogue for ‘French Painting Today’, which states that ‘From 1923 to 1952 Le Corbusier painted continuously without exhibiting.’¹⁸ To an extent then the architect’s critics in Australia and elsewhere had a point. In choosing to expose his ‘private’ paintings to public scrutiny there was the chance that his work would be rejected or misunderstood. In Australia, without architectural drawings, images or models in support, the architect’s art was well and truly prised from its primary or intended function as exploration for his architectural form making that would confirm his buildings as art. The paintings, sent alone to the antipodes are effectively stranded, out of their depth in a by then well-established context of modernist art criticism.

Yet Le Corbusier clearly seeks acknowledgement of his art as such and this inevitably sees his work positioned in contexts, like the one in Australia, that operate beyond his curatorial control regarding the use or meaning of his work. Again, the biographical notes of the ‘French Painting Today’ catalogue reveal the complexity of the architect’s

claim to make a private art, but also to have that work shown publicly. There is a manifest ambiguity in the previous claims for the art's privacy where the catalogue goes on to state that "his works could still be seen at the public exhibitions."¹⁹ Le Corbusier did exhibit publicly in this period of 'isolation' at Paris (1938) and Boston (1948), indicating, as Christopher Green suggests, that the architect is no less interested in the commercialisation and display of his work despite his own claims.²⁰ 'French Painting Today' brings out this desire of the architect to be acknowledged as an artist. In Australia many of the artworks, including Le Corbusier's, were up for commercial sale (despite a policy that forbade the State Galleries of Australia from acting as agents in the purchase of work from their premises)²¹ a clear sign of the architect's desire to be acknowledged alongside other artists as their peer.

Le Corbusier was on the move in European art circles in the early 1950s and his selection for 'French Painting Today' was undoubtedly related to this push for greater recognition of his art at home. Yet it was also the case that the French government, through its ministries, required many artworks for loan and sale at various exhibitions it was mounting, seeking to promote the work of its artists through cultural exchange in the post-war period. Sourcing work for exhibition became a problem, raising further problems for perceptions of the quality of the work being selected. A letter from the Ambassador of France in Australia to the Director of the National Gallery of NSW, Hal Massingham, in May 1950 explains how the French government were unable to lend a great enough cross-section of French Art from the period 1900-1950 at that time because of the number of exhibitions already travelling abroad with works on loan to *l'Association d'Action Artistique*.²² Indeed problems in the selection of works still remained as the final arrangements for the exhibition were being made in July 1952, causing great concern in Australia. In a letter to Monsieur D'Erlanger, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Hal Massingham expressed "...alarm and consternation at the omission of the names of important French Artists contained in the original list."²³ Many of the artists being included in the exhibition, such as Le Corbusier, had not been featured on the list originally furnished to the French government from Australia. Thus, from an Australian viewpoint, there were significant issues regarding the quality of works being made available from less well-known artists.

There was, in Europe too, particular wariness of Le Corbusier as an artist, not simply based on concerns about the perceived quality of his art, but also in relation to his overarching approach to 'the synthesis of the arts.' Awareness of these issues also filtered through to Australia. One of the Australian delegates to the International Conference of Artists, taking place at the Venice Biennale in September 1952, Douglas Dundas, returned home having observed 'a sharp conflict between the views of M Le Corbusier, French Architect, and Mr.

Henry Moore, the English sculptor.'²⁴ The disagreement centred on Le Corbusier's proposals for new communities where architects, sculptors and painters "might work in close co-operation."²⁵ Moore's response was to see this potential 'synthesis of the arts' as a grab for cultural authority that would compromise the freedom of artists. He made the counter argument that such an outcome "would be artificial and lifeless because it had been consciously imposed on a group of individuals and not generated by a way of life."²⁶

In Australia these kinds of cultural battlelines between artists and architects and claims for cultural authority were not drawn so emphatically. Where the dominant and authoritative commentary on 'French Painting Today' came from the art world itself, any specific interest in Le Corbusier's unique position as an architect/artist hardly rated a mention (not even to dismiss it). While eminent Australian critics such as Bernard Smith could happily discuss the architectural qualities of artworks by Villon and Lagrange, which were able "to combine brilliant impressionist effects with an architect's interest in form and space."²⁷ no equivalent discussion ensued of the artistic or architectural qualities of Le Corbusier's painted works. The Australian art world was clearly not predisposed to a discussion of the architect's art in 1953 and would judge that art on its merits, that is, in the context of work by those more familiar and dedicated European artists whose work was included in the exhibition. As a result the main response of Australian critics was to account for the European Modernist tradition, with which they were clearly familiar through the incendiary local debates of the 1940s. There was no particular interest in, or acknowledgement of, the category of artist/architect.

Perhaps surprisingly the response of Australia's architectural community was generally similar to that of its art world. Local architects and their circle were conspicuously silent on the visit of Le Corbusier's painting to the country despite the fact that public commentary was invited of select individuals. When the prominent Australian architect and critic, Robin Boyd, was asked his opinion of the exhibition by the *Herald* in Melbourne, he generalised rather than mention any work in particular, remarking that the public should be ready to accept the unconventional beauty of many of the paintings on show.²⁸ A lengthier review of the exhibition for the *Courier-Mail* in Brisbane by Austrian émigré Gertrude Langer, prominent art critic and founder of the State Arts Council, is also oddly silent on Le Corbusier's presence amongst this group of European artists.²⁹ While Gertrude Langer was not herself an architect, she would surely have been familiar with Le Corbusier's architectural work through her partner, Dr Karl Langer, a leading local modernist architect of the day whose design for the Broadbeach Hotel (1956) clearly borrows the formal language of Le Corbusier's architecture. Even amongst local architects and their circle, the architect's art could not seem to find its place.

However, it was in the response of the broader Australian public that Le Corbusier's art was to make a small but significant mark, one that is usefully read in context with the exhibition's general reception and its portrayal in the public media.

'French Painting Today' was a key public event, instrumental in introducing Australians of the post war period to Modernist Art on an unprecedented scale. Yet the purpose of the Exhibition went further for it was effectively asking the public to take up new ways of viewing art and actively set aside their accustomed ways of seeing. Hal Massingham, Director of the National Gallery of NSW, writes pointedly in the catalogue's introduction how 'the whole vision of the Australian public has been conditioned by acquaintanceship with the paintings of the late Victorians' and that 'these visual habits once acquired are not easily lost or changed.'³⁰ The popular reception of the exhibition bore out the problem of cutting a nation's viewing habits adrift, revealing, more broadly, that philistine character of Australian life that had led to an indifferent and occasionally hostile reception of Modernist art in the 1940s.³¹

While the storm that greeted Modernist art in Australia had subsided in the local art world, it now gathered strength again for the general public invited to see the work for itself, and it was into this context that Le Corbusier's art received a different kind of reception to the one afforded by his critics.

In a sign of what was to come, 'French Painting Today' gathered public headlines, even before its works were put on display. After four years of planning, and having finally reached Australia in December 1952, the exhibition immediately met with disaster. On Christmas day the vessel carrying the French paintings to their initial showing at the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery in Hobart ran aground in a thick fog near Wineglass Bay off the east coast of Tasmania and was feared unsalvageable.³² Though the contents of the exhibition had been valued at 100,000 pounds sterling, the Director of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales, Hal Massingham admitted to the *Sydney Morning Herald* that many of the works contained were 'irreplaceable.'³³ His counterpart at the National Gallery of Victoria, G Thompson, concurred, suggesting that the loss of the paintings 'would be a disaster to the art world.'³⁴ No doubt the loss of the work would also have been a disaster for Australia's reputation as a venue for such international cultural events. Despite concerns that the vessel would remain stuck fast, it was eventually refloated 8 days later and continued on to Hobart. More delays followed with the paintings being held at Customs until payment for the salvage costs was guaranteed (an amount of over 19,000 pounds).³⁵

Once on show, the exhibition built a considerable audience around Australia. In Sydney special arrangements were made to open the gallery in the evening and in Brisbane the exhibition drew record attendances with 60,000 people witnessing the

event. The crowds were motivated more by their curiosity for modern art rather than their admiration of it and the show evidently divided its audience. These divisions were played out in the popular press through articles and letters both laudatory and inflammatory. M Claude Bonin-Pissarro, representing *l'Association d'Action Artistique*, captured the mood perfectly in announcing that Australia was now "on a taste test" as far as its preferences for art were concerned.³⁶

For those antipodeans who could not come to terms with the meaning and use of abstraction, it was the artists, not the public, who had failed the taste test. In Brisbane's *Mail* a self-proclaimed 'man-in-the-street' agreed with a prominent national artist that Australia was here witnessing "the art of persons who cannot draw and cannot paint!"³⁷ Such criticism was subtle compared to that found in a letter sent to *The Age* in Melbourne that described the exhibition 'as a deliberate attempt to deprave our [Australian] tastes to the level of morons'³⁸ Others were equally hostile describing the work as "the product of diseased and deranged minds", "hideous" and "obscene."³⁹ Photographs of the art on display in the popular press played up the oddness of these abstract modern images by juxtaposing them with the faces of curious on-lookers. Under a headline proclaiming "Which-side-up Art Show Here" the *Brisbane Mail* showed a "puzzled attendant" unpacking one of the works apparently unable to understand the image's proper orientation.⁴⁰ These kinds of responses, repeated around Australia, were ample evidence of the public philistinism that dogged the reception of modernist art from the late 1930s onwards.

Not all the public commentary was so broadly dismissive with some members of the public brave enough to praise the work on show. Those defending the art were more reflective in coming to terms with the cause of abstraction, understanding that the works demanded an active, rather than passive, way of looking. Others saw that these images were a fit for the times; with one letter writer to the *Courier Mail* proclaiming that "one must concede that Modern Art tells the truth about the age."⁴¹ Post-war Australia might have been naturally conservative in outlook, but it was a place where modernity would gain a foothold through new images and objects of consumption. It was against this backdrop that Le Corbusier's art found surprising acknowledgement, not in the critical press but in the nation's social pages.

Sydney's *Sunday Herald* featured two of the architect's paintings in its pictorial review of the exhibition opening.⁴² *Deux mains et pomme d'or (1948)* is pictured with a young woman and contains the following caption (Figure 1):

A modernistic white and black outfit was worn by Miss Marisa Martelli, examining the black, white and orange composition by Le Corbusier. Her necklace of jet and white beads was like an African native woman's collar.⁴³



"TWO HANDS AND A GOLDEN APPLE": A modernistic white and black outfit was worn by MISS MARISA MARTELLI, examining the black, white and orange composition by Le Corbusier. Her necklace of jet and white beads was like an African native woman's collar.

Source: (Sunday Herald)

Figure 1. Photograph from *Sunday Herald* social pages of one of Le Corbusier's paintings with exhibition guest, Marisa Martelli

There is a clear didacticism in the description, which implies a comparison between the African style of the women's necklace and the forms of modernist painting behind her. More than this, however, the photograph presents a thoroughly contemporary fit between the painted image and the female onlooker. Though the pairing is contrived before the camera it is, in the context of the social setting, a fortuitous meeting of like with like, one that includes matches of colour, demeanour and line, as if the woman was herself the one abstracted in the portrait. By extension, the painting appears like an object of style or décor, participating in a greater schema defining modern taste at that time, encompassing the relationship between individuals, clothing, objects and interiors. And yet that relationship is not about a deliberately designed set (in the manner of the total work of art) but more in terms of the zeitgeist – that unconscious relationship between the way things look today. Accordingly, there is continuity between the elements presented in this photograph that is presented for appreciation by the knowing eye. Compare this to other pairings of viewers with art works that seem more discordant.

The presentation of another of Le Corbusier's paintings, *Les deux soeurs* (1933-1947), captures a brief moment of a couple standing before the work. Neither viewer actually looks at the painting, rather the image seems to act as a backdrop to their meeting – incidental rather than central. Yet simultaneously the photograph captures a type of trop'loiel effect whereby the figures of the two sisters in the painting seem spatially related to the two viewers outside the paintings frame in their act of bodily framing it. In discussing Le Corbusier's art



"THE TWO SISTERS" Le Corbusier's painting of vivid orange-faced women with masses of black hair is examined by LAURENCE ALCOCK and MRS. IVAN PHILLIPS.

Source: (Sunday Herald)

Figure 2. Photograph from *Sunday Herald* social pages of one of Le Corbusier's paintings with exhibition guests, Laurence Alcock and Ivan Phillips.

and its placement in the Villa La Roche, Rosalind Krauss observes that the relationship of art to architecture in his work might be seen in terms of 'nested relationships' that are partially spatial - where the painting is subject to the room in which it is placed just as the room is subject to the architectural work entire and so on. Such a notion of nested relationships broadly suggests a particular synthesis of art and architecture where the 'weaker' role is played by art – a product that comes off as secondary to, and supportive of architectural conceptions of space at the very outset. Perhaps again Le Corbusier's painting seems like a type of décor - a scene-setting device rather than something independent that tells its own truth beyond its personal meaning to the architect.

That Le Corbusier's art could be readily identified in the social pages of 1950s Australia alongside modern fashion and appear to possess similar types of decorative qualities might also tell us something about the apparent dismissal of Le Corbusier's art

in the context of the 'French Painting Today' exhibition. The fact that the architect's art might squarely benefit the exhibition title may also have been a reason why the work did not sit well with the critics. The notion of art as décor might potentially lessen the possibilities of art, where a work cannot stand alone or provoke the viewer apart from announcing its own 'fit with the times' or its setting. Curiously, the specific value of contemporary art in relation to architecture and modernity is highlighted by one critic of 'French Painting Today' who puts the following question to his readers: 'If we accept the architecture of today, is it not logical to accept the best of modern painting, which fits in so well with modern architecture?'¹⁴⁴ Yet somehow Le Corbusier – the artist/architect of modernism – fails to become his exemplar.

The silence of the Australian architectural community on Le Corbusier's art is even more curious considering the architect's towering public profile. Yet differences over the artistic or technological basis of architecture that remained strong in the 1950s might offer some explanation. Le Corbusier's move to a so-called humanist position and his making of a deliberately expressive architecture polarised critics and the architectural community and was viewed by many as a betrayal of the modernist project. These kinds of differences may well have had a particular resonance in Australia where the local condition may have strongly mitigated any overt public claims about the synthesis of modern art and architecture as presented by Le Corbusier's work. In Australia were modern art and abstraction were easy targets of philistinism (as exemplified by the exhibition's reception) there

was perhaps a certain natural advantage in pitching architecture to the public not as art but in the technological terms of efficiency, economy, function and climate. This was certainly the pitch of architects such as Boyd and Langer who preferred a technological and scientific rhetoric to back their presentation of modern architecture. Le Corbusier's position as an artist/architect may not have been publicly rejected by the Australian architectural community and yet, unconsciously perhaps, it remained completely unacknowledged.

Le Corbusier's art was clearly at a disadvantage in Australia in not being presented alongside images of his architecture and perceptions of its quality as 'stand alone' art played into its reception in the antipodes. Yet the apparent ambivalence to the presence of the architect's work in Australia goes further than this. It was precisely the claim for a synthesis of art and architecture, so interesting to Le Corbusier, which may have worried those in the art world who heard it. In Australia both the art world and the architectural community seemed unmoved by its call when the great architect's work arrived on shore in 1953, whether through conscious criticism or unconscious silence. Despite this apparent rejection of his work, another quality of Le Corbusier's art was faintly recognised by its reception in Australia, namely, its exemplary modern style. Seen in this light Le Corbusier's work might be viewed as more modest or straightforward in its aims as *art*, not as an epic struggle to address new possibilities of form for architecture, but rather as a fashionable complement to it: something decorous to hang on its walls.

¹ Le Corbusier's output of artworks over his career included 419 paintings, 100 engravings, 44 sculptures and 27 tapestry cartoons according to the catalogue of artworks compiled by the Foundation Le Corbusier, Paris.

² Some useful examples of critical discussion of Le Corbusier's art can be found in the following sources. Simon Richards, 'The Science of Painting' in his *Le Corbusier and the Concept of Self*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003, pp. 67-122, Françoise Ducros, 'From Art Nouveau to Purism: Le Corbusier and Painting,' in Stanislaus von Moos & Arthur Rüegg (eds), *Le Corbusier before Le Corbusier – Applied Arts, Architecture, Painting, Photography 1907-1922*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002, pp. 133-141. and Christopher Green, 'The architect as artist,' in Michael Raeburn and Victoria Wilson (eds), *Le Corbusier: Architect of the Century*, London: Arts Council Great Britain, 1987, pp.110-157.

³ *French Painting Today – Peintres Vivants de l'Ecole de Paris*, Sydney: National Gallery of New South Wales, 1953, Exhibition catalogue.

⁴ Green, 'The Architect as Artist,' p.110.

⁵ Green, 'The Architect as Artist,' p.110.

⁶ For example, at an institutional level, the Australian Academy of Art, established in 1937 by

Robert Menzies, effectively sought to unify the nation's artists around aesthetic norms and the pastoral vision of the Heidelberg School painters that was clearly at odds with radical modernist approaches beginning to arrive from Europe. See Richard Haese, *Rebels and Precursors: The Revolutionary Years of Australian Art*, Melbourne: Allen Lane, 1981, pp.40-46.

⁷ Richard Haese, *Rebels and Precursors*, pp.3.

⁸ Useful accounts of this period in Australian Art include Richard Haese, *Rebels and Precursors*, and Humphrey McQueen, *The Black Swan of Trespass: The emergence of Modernist Painting in Australia to 1944*, Sydney: Alternative Publishing Cooperative, 1979.

⁹ Haese, *Rebels and Precursors*, p.288.

¹⁰ Bernard Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' *Meanjin*, 53, Vol.12: No.2, p.165.

¹¹ Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' p.168.

¹² Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' p.166.

¹³ Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' p.166.

¹⁴ Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' p.174.

¹⁵ 'French Art in Sydney,' *Daily Telegraph*, Sydney, February 27, 1953.

¹⁶ Green, 'The Architect as Artist,' p.110.

¹⁷ Green, 'The Architect as Artist,' p.111.

- 18 French Painting Today, Sydney, National Art Gallery of New South Wales p.23. 1953 (Exhibition catalogue)
- 19 French Painting Today, p.23.
- 20 Green, 'The Architect as Artist,' p.111.
- 21 Letter to French Ambassador, April 16, 1952 (AGNSW Archive)
- 22 Letter to Hal Massingham. May 25, 1950 (AGNSW Archive)
- 23 Letter to French Minister of Foreign Affairs, July 14, 1952 (AGNSW Archive)
- 24 Ian Bow, 'Australian Provinciality in the World Art,' *Meanjin*, 53, Vol.12: No.2, pp.177.
- 25 Bow, 'Australian Provinciality in the World Art,' p.177.
- 26 Bow, 'Australian Provinciality in the World Art,' p.177.
- 27 Smith, 'The French Art Exhibition,' p.168.
- 28 'French Art called vital, courageous,' *Herald*, Melbourne, June 8, 1953.
- 29 Gertrude Langer, 'A sensitive person will understand,' *Courier-Mail*, Brisbane, April 10, 1953.
- 30 French Painting Today, p.4.
- 31 Robert Hughes, *The Art of Australia*, Ringwood: Penguin, 1970, p.137.
- 32 'Ship carrying art treasures still on sand bar,' *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 27, 1952.
- 33 *Sydney Morning Herald*, December 27, 1952.
- 34 *Sunday Herald*, Melbourne, December 28, 1952.
- 35 *Daily Telegraph*, Sydney, January 9, 1953.
- 36 'Art test in Aust,' *Mail*, Brisbane, May 3, 1953.
- 37 'His verdict: I agree with Norman Lindsay,' *Mail*, Brisbane, April 19, 1953.
- 38 *The Age*, Melbourne, June 20, 1953.
- 39 *Courier-Mail*, Brisbane, April 14, 1953.
- 40 *Mail*, Brisbane, April 5, 1953.
- 41 *Courier Mail*, Brisbane, April 14, 1953.
- 42 'Sydney people and French paintings,' *Sunday Herald*, Sydney, March 1, 1953.
- 43 *Sunday Herald*, March 1, 1953.
- 44 'There's nothing new under the sun,' *Telegraph*, Brisbane, April 10, 1953.