



## Manmade Modernism: Mythical Space in Australian Painting, 1940–1970

Laurie Duggan  
Brisbane, Queensland

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a licence from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)

THE RECEIVED STORY OF AUSTRALIAN ART, WHETHER it appears in the general histories of Bernard Smith (1962), and Robert Hughes (1966), or in more specialised studies like Richard Haese's *Rebels and Precursors* (1981) tells us of a change brought about in the pressurised atmosphere of the second world war. The story usually mentions the show of "French and British Modern Art" sponsored by Sir Keith Murdoch and the Melbourne *Herald* in 1939, which contained a large variety of work from Cézanne through to some of the Surrealists (notably Salvador Dali and Max Ernst). It was the first major exhibition of modern work in Australia for a number of years and, with the outbreak of war, it was notoriously placed in storage by the Art Gallery of New South Wales. The young artists, so the story goes, were left alone to formulate an art which would be both modern and national. The rest of the world discovered this transformation in the fifties and early sixties.<sup>1</sup> In 1961 a show at London's Whitechapel Gallery entitled "Recent Australian Painting" was supported by Sir Kenneth Clark among others. It was followed by another large exhibition at the Tate Gallery.

Alongside the art of Nolan, Tucker, Boyd, John Perceval and others—the "stars" of the British exhibitions—another kind of painting had continued to develop. Artists like Grace Crowley, Frank Hinder and Ralph Balson had become increasingly involved with abstraction and a new wave of artists, many from European backgrounds like Leonard Hessing and Stanislaus Rapotec, appeared on the scene. This perceived incursion of the international was the subject of the now famous "Antipodean Manifesto" of 1959, a document largely composed by Bernard Smith and signed by Smith himself and seven artists.<sup>2</sup> The tide however proved unstoppable and by the late sixties with exhibitions like "Two decades of American Painting" (1967), "The Field," which consisted largely of "minimal" or "color field" Australian work shown at the new National Gallery of Victoria building in 1968, and the visit of American formalist critic Clement Greenberg in the

same year, the battle to defend figuration against the non-objective seemed all but lost.

This is the Australian art story as it has often been told. Developments since 1970 have taken the art of this country in different directions, yet the art of the preceding period is still often viewed through a lens of its own making.

When Bernard Smith produced the first edition of his book *Australian Painting* he followed William Moore's example, entitling the chapters covering work from the Heidelberg School up until the 1930s after books of the Bible: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus (Smith 1962, Moore 1934). These were the Old Testament years; the years before the advent of a truly Australian modernism. Short of carving his history in rock this was an attempt to give permanence to what was in reality a partial account. As one recent writer has noted, it was possible then, in 1962, to consider that a book on Australian painting was, by default, a book on Australian art. After 1970, this narrowing down of art to painting would no longer do.

Around 1970, what might be called a paradigm shift occurred in Australian visual culture. For many observers and participants the decade following was not a happy period. They saw what had seemed to be an organic Australian tradition once more diluted or rejected altogether through encroaching internationalism. The writing world grew full of resentment for this perceived collapse of characteristically Australian values. For others the period witnessed a return to prominence of women artists who had, in accounts of the preceding years been literally written out of the Australian art story. And at the very moment when the national seemed to be receding, the work of indigenous artists came to spectacular prominence.

Even before the second world war some artists were making their first moves in a new direction. Though there had been few opportunities to observe European work at first hand many artists had traveled abroad and had written home or brought back accounts of art practices in Paris and elsewhere. Booksellers like Gino Nibbi had brought cosmopolitan influences to Melbourne and

Sydney, acting as virtual reading libraries for those who could not afford the glossy publications. Surrealism proved a particularly potent influence. Its graphic devices—photomontage, layout, etc.—were more readily available in journal form than earlier styles. The English critic Herbert Read's 1936 book *Surrealism* was a great success, but Surrealism itself had been strongly oriented to publicity through its pursuit of confrontation and its sometimes shocking graphic devices. Despite its largely radical philosophy, Surrealism translated rapidly to commercial purposes and, at least in the applied arts, it became a popular style. Sydney residents accepted elements of the surreal in the work of window dressers and advertisers, and the photographer Max Dupain had no trouble placing his work in the pages of the fashionable *Home* magazine.

Surrealism (at its source) was, if anything, even more theory oriented than other modernist styles. Coupled and entwined with it to some extent were the newer writings on psychology and psychoanalysis. Many of the Surrealist texts that reached Australia had been mediated through the eyes and ears of English devotees and the English tended to literalize the psychological dimensions of Surrealist theory. At third hand, in Australia, such influences could produce work like that of Ivor Francis (particularly his painting "Schizophrenia" of 1943), which could be read in their entirety (and indeed tend to be exhausted by one reading).

It's clear that Surrealism was an important influence on Sidney Nolan, Albert Tucker and the so-called Angry Penguins group centered around John and Sunday Reed and Max Harris. Alongside this fascination with Surrealism, the journal *Angry Penguins* directed its attentions to psychiatry. From an early date Harris was referring to Herbert Read's studies of the creative myth in art. Co-publisher John Reed wrote a review article on "Psychiatry and Literary Style" in the third issue (1942), while Harris himself wrote a "psycho-sociological study of films" entitled "The Saturday Night Mind" for the 1945 issue. By the 1940s a great deal of the pioneering psychoanalytic literature was available in English: Freud in James Strachey's authorized translations, and several works by Jung, most notably *Psychology of the Unconscious*, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, and *Psychology and Religion*. The connections between psychological thought and Surrealist practices were common to academic and conservative strands of Surrealism. With their simplified attitudes towards creativity these formulaic varieties of Surrealism were much easier to transmit and spread more rapidly than the conflicting and often confusing sets of signals from the heart of the movement.

Sidney Nolan's early work had perhaps come the closest to a non-academic Surrealism with paintings like "Boy and the Moon," "Luna Park in the moonlight," and "Boy in township." These paintings seem to have a great freshness about them. Nolan later told Charles Spencer:

"When I was very young I believed in modern art, in its buoyant freshness. I thought it was greater than the art of

the past—optimistic, fertile. I feel the reverse now; I see a kind of cannibalism, devouring both old forms and itself." He and his contemporaries [Nolan told Spencer] had been cut off by the war. "Instead of going to Paris, we were forced, so to speak, to drop the idea of becoming modern artists. Instead of working outside our natural environment we had to look inside ourselves and our society. I don't regret it." (Spencer 98)

By the time Albert Tucker began painting his series "Images of Modern Evil," myth had begun to take over in the work of most of these artists. Tucker's article "Art, Myth and Society" reflects the conservative variety of Surrealism, mentioning Herbert Read and implicitly referring to Jungian psychology in which myth becomes all important. Tucker says:

Artistic form is derived from constant archetypal forms which are in themselves incapable of change as we understand it. . . . [T]he archetypal forms can be repeated in the art object in an infinite number of ways, and embody an increasingly accurate knowledge of [the true nature of natural and subjective human constants]. (Tucker 50)

He adds:

At no stage in history has man had absolute knowledge. There has always been a quantity of real or practical knowledge, hypothesis—and myth. Man has always striven for a framework of knowledge and belief which will incorporate all the social and natural phenomena of which he is aware. From the standpoint of art the role of the myth is of first-rate importance. I am not concerned here with the popular interpretation of myth as signifying something completely illusory and unreal, but in its real meaning as a symbolic reflection in the minds of men of the forces of nature and society. (Tucker 51)

Noel Counihan and the Marxists were outraged by the conservative nature of this theory. But the writings of Jung exercised enormous influence through this period (artists as diverse as John Olsen and Judy Cassab were reading Jung's *Man and His Symbols* in the early '70s, and even more recently George Miller has argued that a Jungian approach to storytelling has enabled his movies to speak to a "universal" audience). Even James McAuley, a writer who had opposed the Angry Penguins, wrote in 1951:

Has not Jung, in his own fashion, recalled us to the truth that our modern plays, pictures, and other forms of art derive secretly whatever life they have from their forgotten source in ancient metaphysical conceptions, of which they are quite literally and exactly a secularization, profanation and desecration, in greater or less degree? (McAuley 63)

Australian artists felt they could utilize this mythical approach to plug into the spirit of the age: it was a way to be both local and universal. Their imagery might derive

from a particularly local event (like Ned Kelly) yet it would carry within itself an archetype—a “deeper,” less culturally specific referent which would, with its “universality” lend great power to the particular work. At times this could lead to a kind of cultural blindness; a turning away from what was, in fact, new, in the search for an underlying mythical truth. One of Tucker’s “Images,” for example, shows figures in the interior of a cinema. But they are outlined against a blank, white screen because it is “evil” that Tucker wishes to portray rather than the specifics of modern life. In his art, if not in his social life, Tucker was blind to the cinema as anything other than a “low life” place of assignation; a “set” on which evil, a universal thing, could be shown in action.

There is an interesting contradiction between the international nature of psychoanalytic mythography and the nationalist ends the mythical art was supposed to serve. The idea of Jungian equivalences was that we could all have myths (we *should* all have them) and that these myths would be legible; we should be able to “read” other people’s myths just as they can read ours. The question we have to ask here is where do these myths come from? Herbert Read, writing in *Art in Australia* a few months before Tucker’s essay, stressed that though we may consciously make use of them “myths are born in the unconscious and grow with their own dynamic force” (Read, “New Trends” 27). The “unconscious” seems here like a kind of old-fashioned vault from which discarded objects re-emerge with added value. Norman Bryson suggests:

We sometimes think of the unconscious mind as a storehouse or repository of dream-like images, which may at times surface into paintings; the idea of an image-bank was central in Jung, and for a long time that Jungian way of thinking colored much of our perception of, for example, Surrealism: the Surrealist painter was reputed to have found the key to that hidden vault. But psychoanalysis has never believed in that vault . . . The unconscious is a field of distortion, not a repertoire of contents, because the point is that the unconscious is precisely that which cannot be spoken (or painted) . . . we cannot just translate the unconscious into images. (Bryson 137–138)

The “bank of images” that the Jungians and the conservative surrealists made use of was itself a construct: If it were truly “unconscious” as Bryson suggests, it would not lend itself, like a kind of library, towards the conscious purposes of artists or anyone else. Of course the supposed access of the romantic artist to places inaccessible to other mortals has often been worn as an egoistic badge by the self-proclaimed “antennae of the race.” If the “dark mysterious forces” that produced art were beyond conscious control, then the images and structures that art made use of could be “brought to light” seemingly without the question of intention arising. But what if the imagery had been decided, as it were, by a kind of gentlemen’s agreement? The whole procedure collapses into a reading of early sources (Homer, the Greek myths, fairy tales, etc.)

to pull out common traces. It is only to be expected that the tales of male authors retold by other male authors should both reflect and suggest male paradigms. The works of Freud and Jung had done as much. So it is not surprising to observe that Australia’s new mythographers seemed to hand Antipodean art back to its male artists.

Surrealism itself was often the product of male heterosexual fantasy. Its expressed attitudes towards women were frequently quite misogynistic (and Andre Bréton himself was a notorious homophobe). The surrealist poets Paul Eluard and Benjamin Péret were responsible for the proverb: “You must beat your mother while she’s young” for example. More ambivalently a caption on a 1924 group portrait read “Woman is the being who throws the largest shadow or the greatest light on our dreams” (Brophy 128). Even so there was a dynamism at the Parisian heart of the movement that did not travel well. Like mythographic symbolism, surrealist style soon operated as a kind of armor—“it was in effect a resistance against [a truly] *anarchic* unconscious” (Brophy 138). In other words, a particular world view had been imported into Australian art: a view which claimed to be universal but which now seems to be a phenomenon of those years, the fifties especially, when life was “relaxed and comfortable.”

The new, mythographic Australian painting both appealed to and puzzled its English audiences: it needed some explanation. Bryan Robertson, the organizer of the Whitechapel exhibition, showed an interest in the symbols, images and myths which the artists’ work displayed, but was not at all sure of what it all meant:

The imagery itself cut off from our European environment [he said], is highly inventive and has one unifying factor, an unremitting sense of the drama of the isolated moment . . . But whether abstract or semi-figurative, a general pull towards metaphysical abstraction now informs nearly all Australian art, in common with America. A nation based on an idea rather than on blood needs some transcendent image to reveal itself. (Lynn, “Rediscovered” 339)

According to Robert Hughes (who wrote one of the essays in the Whitechapel catalogue), Albert Tucker produced in his “Modern Evil” paintings the first true iconographic form in Australian art: a menacing red crescent which seems to stand for a devouring femininity. (Hughes, “Melbourne’s Forties” 20) Returning to Australia in the fifties after spending some time in Paris, Tucker invented a new image in his paintings: the so-called antipodean head. This cratered form is a generalized Australian male symbol. Since the forties Tucker had executed his paintings in series, but he continued to employ a kind of static mythography and his works do not connect with each other in the same way that Nolan and Boyd’s works do. He is more of a symbolist than a storyteller. This has perhaps made him a less popular painter than Nolan and Boyd who both consciously use a narrative mythology in their work.

The rescue of narrative from its burial site in nineteenth-century painting was to be an immensely successful move for these artists. Charles Spencer conversing with Nolan noted:

We then moved on to the concept of hero. To [Nolan] the idea of a hero relates to a human ideal, something present in the mythology of all virile societies. The loss of this ideal was a sign of decadence. "I'm reluctant to drop the concept of a hero figure. If I lost this I would be discarding something very Australian. Without the hero you end up with anonymity." (Spencer 96)

With the exception of Mrs. Fraser, Nolan's "heroes" have tended, as they do in classical mythology, to be mostly male figures inscribing male stories. It is highly possible that the Australian penchant for a narrative modernism exemplified in Nolan's work may have had an additional masculine origin. Ian Burn notes that the commissioning of war pictures in Australia continued into the 1930s. (Burn 64) This sense that art should "do something" rather than just sit there may well have appealed to a practical streak in Nolan's psyche.

The first Ned Kelly series started Nolan off on the course he would pursue for most of his working life. Paintings from the series had been shown in Britain before being repatriated to John and Sunday Reed's collection in Melbourne. Aware that there was room for further interest in the European market, Nolan "repainted the whole saga, only this time far larger in size, with stronger dramatic accent, and with occasional suspect surrealist devices" ("The Young Master" 13). Elwyn Lynn commented further on the opportunistic nature of the second Kelly series: "Nolan's first 'Kelly' was a somewhat whimsical outlaw, a backblocks Moses with a vision of the promised land; now he is a European Kelly of fertility myths whose rifle sprouts flowers. If there is any civilization around, this Kelly is headed further off" (Lynn, "Innocent Eye" 64).

The weekly newspaper, *Nation*, was often critical of Nolan. In one of the early issues the "Melbourne Spy" (Cyril Pearl) attacked the cult of the explorer in the works of Nolan, David Boyd, and the poets John Manifold and Douglas Stewart. "The deification of Kelly, Burke, Leichhardt and the rest [said Pearl], seems to derive from the fact that Australians, hungry for a mythology in a country barren of legend, are prepared to confection one from any old ingredients" (Dutton 157).

Many Australian figurative painters were beginning to feel uncomfortable in the late fifties with what they felt was an overpowering tide of abstractionism emanating from Europe and America. Bernard Smith and the group of artists who produced the "Antipodean Manifesto" were among the alarmed observers. "We are witnessing yet another attempt by puritan and iconoclast to reduce the living speech of art to the silence of decoration," (Blackman 608) read the Manifesto. Reviewing it in tones which are echoed by many critics today, Franz

Philipp wrote:

Nobody who has wandered through the labyrinthine wastes of fashionable and trite non-figuration, through countless rooms of the Venice Biennale . . . will deny sympathy to the [Antipodean] manifesto's assertion of the communicative nature of art. One may question, though, whether the abstract impact on *Australia* has been so devastating. (Philipp 18)

"We are not [the Manifesto assured its readers], seeking to create a national style" (Blackman 609). History has ruled otherwise. Yet the perceived enemies of figuration were also involved in a search for meaningful symbols. It is apparent that the concern to dig for underlying truths, and the concern to represent them with varying degrees of symbolism embraced all kinds of painting in the fifties and early sixties. So, even abstract painters were involved. Apart from artists whose work dealt obviously with religious symbolisms, like Leonard French, John Coburn or Roger Kemp, abstractionists like Robert Juniper, Lawrence Daws and Donald Laycock were making use of such "universal" symbols as the mandala, incorporating these into desert-like fields of color. Dennis Duerden noticed that "a number of dedicated painters [were] quietly working over and over again with a common stock of symbols, [although, he said] the symbols are not any that can be rationalized in terms of Australian landscape or history or social background" (Lynn, "Rediscovered" 339). At this point the nationalist and surrealist/symbolist projects seem to come into conflict.

The imperative for an Australian repertoire of symbols dates back to Margaret Preston and her arguments for "aboriginality" in the thirties. In 1943 the anthropologist A.P. Elkin put it forcefully in his essay "Alcheringa: Steps into the Dream-Time":

What about ourselves? Have we any steps which lead us to our "eternal dream-time," to that sanctuary of thought, sentiment, and inspiration, whatever be its outward form, where the manifold streams of our country's past flow again in us—blood of our blood, thought of our thought; and where, too, the future is already present. . . . If our answer be "no," it is obvious that we have not yet fashioned an Australian culture . . . Perhaps we are not yet sure where our "eternal dream-time" is . . . It may be that we are pondering whether it lies in the eastern Mediterranean in the sanctuary of Plato and Virgil . . . or in the more northern lands, in the "gallery" of Marx, Engels, and Lenin . . . or in a land across the Pacific. . . . The elements of a great myth are in our heritage. Let the myth-makers arise and express them in such a way that they will become an integral and dynamic part of our life from childhood to death. (Elkin 15–16)

Elkin suggests not that we should appropriate Aboriginal mythology but that we should all have our own myths. Yet the sources for these myths, especially when they express themselves in the Jungian formula of

the journey of the hero are peculiarly masculine and the result of this, when transposed to the canvas, is a kind of reductionism which indirectly succeeded in marginalizing the work of women.

Of course not everyone was happy with the idea of an "Australian Legend." In a symposium held in *Overland* magazine in 1962, some doubts were expressed. The young Phillip Adams said:

There are many of us who feel that there are suspicious, exotic elements being deliberately woven into the legend at the moment. Isn't it more than a coincidence that when Australian painters and filmmakers and novelists want both local interest in their work and success overseas, they exploit this ambiguous and marketable legend? (Murray-Smith 37)

David Martin, a communist writer of central European background, was perhaps the most perceptive member of the (all male) symposium, noting that in the postwar era "powerful nationalism" was a worldwide phenomenon, reflected in Australia "just as it appeared everywhere else." (Murray-Smith 33) In other words, "nationalism" was an international (and artificial) product. Hence the anxiety over the "international" phenomenon of abstraction.

From an opposite pole of the political spectrum, the young art critic Patrick McCaughey suggested something similar when he discussed "The Field" exhibition of 1968:

The new convention, the alignment of Australian art with the modernist tradition . . . has been mistaken for a surrender to the gods of fashion and the vicissitudes of an anonymous internationalism. The Field has done us all a service by bringing to a head the phony debate between the conflicting allegiances of regionalism and internationalism. It is high time these two myths were laid to rest. (McCaughy 235)

Concerns for the "national" and the "international" during the 1950s seem to parallel the current dilemma of "globalism" and local culture. In the visual arts nationalism, as an overt form of fundamentalism, concerned itself with the particulars of supposed Australian myths; something that we always and already knew had to be brought to light as illustration. Aesthetic internationalism concerned itself with the uncovering of universals which could only be done in a manner that would suggest rather than depict specific instances since these universals were the bases of all myth and religious ritual. In both cases art made of the "buried" truths something that was supposedly available for all, though the mechanics of this data base were not explained (the French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari were later to observe, "The first principle of philosophy is that Universals explain nothing, but must themselves be explained") (Deleuze 7). Artists of both persuasions believed their work could be "read" by anyone, though the nationalists were concerned that viewers should also see the particularity of their versions of the myths (just as the "local color" of a tourist

space should not become something so utterly and incomprehensively different as to frighten off its audience). It is not surprising that such concern for underlying truths should have assumed in both instances a proselytizing aura; nor that the resulting art should, through its larger scale, present itself as theatre.

When the exhibition "Two Decades of American Painting" appeared in Australia (in 1967) some critics expressed doubt about the size of the works. From the impressionists and through the work of the early modernists paintings, reflecting their private rather than public nature, had generally become smaller. The American abstract expressionists and pop artists had returned to the larger scales not seen since the nineteenth-century salons: their art assumed a public nature. We have gotten used to such large scales now; so much so that when we see photographs of Australian exhibitions in the forties or early fifties what stands out - even appears quaint - is the smallness of the works (even the abstracts). For the critics of the time, however, size was still a cause for comment. Ronald Millar, writing for *The Australian* had doubts about the scale of some of the paintings (Wallace-Crabbe 422). And the *Nation's* critic G.R. Lansell was moved to note:

There seems to be a streak of gigantism in the American temperament, whether it be multi-clover leaf turnpikes or 70mm. cinema screens. The impact of these paintings—as in the 8-ft. by 24-ft. Norman Bluhm painting—seems to depend on their size. The results, however, are far from being pretentious. It merely seems to be that these painters are painting directly for museums; they already feel themselves to be part of a great tradition (and justly so). (Lansell 19)

Painting in Australia had also been undergoing changes of dimension as though it too were readying itself for the museum walls. Franz Philipp, reviewing the Antipodean exhibition of 1959 was struck by "the large dimensions of most pictures (nothing small, intimate, comfortable)" (Philipp 18). Nolan's Northern Australian paintings and his second Kelly series had also made use of larger canvasses.

It was perhaps inevitable that the new preoccupation with myth should result in a return of art to the salon or museum scale. This increase in size had its parallel in the literature of the period. Australian poets in the fifties had embarked on long poems dealing with exploration and discovery. While these mythical strategies, including the use of history as myth assume a strongly national character they nevertheless reflect a concern which we can now see as characteristic of modernist art in general: its belief in the universal. Whether it be a mandala or a fertility myth in bushranger's guise the art of the period reflects a pervasive sense of wider legibility. American poet Kenneth Koch jokingly referred to academic poetry of the period as preoccupied with "the myth, the missus, and the midterms" (Koch 57). Australian visual art tended to

avoid any mention of the "missus" at all. Instead, anxiety for myth (whether "national" or "international") coupled with the desire to work on a public scale, made the "mainstream" of Australian art in the period before 1970, as the historians and contemporary critics recorded it, a largely masculine affair. The problems of balancing "universal" and "national" were never satisfactorily resolved and were perhaps incapable of resolution. The priorities of our art have shifted since then: it has become less "national," less "universal," but perhaps more inclusive.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Russell Drysdale, Sidney Nolan and Albert Tucker exhibited extensively in Britain and Europe through the 1950s. See Smith 1991, 295-302 for details of these exhibitions. Smith argues against "the myth of isolation" in Smith 1962.

<sup>2</sup> The signatories were Smith, Charles Blackman, Arthur Boyd, David Boyd, John Brack, Bob Dickerson, John Perceval and Clifton Pugh.

#### Works cited

- Blackman, Barbara. "The Antipodean Affair." *Art and Australia* 5.4 (1968): 607-16.
- Brophy, Kevin. *Creativity: Psychoanalysis, Surrealism and Creative Writing*. Melbourne UP, 1998.
- Bryson, Norman. *Word and Image: French Painting of the Ancien Régime*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Burn, Ian. *National Life and Landscape: Australian Painting 1900-1940*. Sydney: Bay Books, 1990.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *What is philosophy?* London: Verso, 1994.
- Dutton, Geoffrey. *The Innovators: The Sydney Alternatives in the Rise of Modern Art, Literature and Ideas*. Melbourne: Macmillan, 1986.
- Elkin, A.P. "Alcheringa: Steps into the Dream-Time." *Meanjin Papers* 2.2 (1943): 14-17.
- Haese, Richard. *Rebels and Precursors: The Revolutionary Years of Australian Art*. Ringwood: Allen Lane, 1981.
- Harris, Max. "The Saturday Night Mind: A Psycho-Sociological Study of Films." *Angry Penguins* 8 (1945): 36-46.
- Hughes, Robert. *The Art of Australia*. Ringwood: Penguin, 1966.
- . "Melbourne's Forties." *Nation* 11 Aug 1962: 19-20.
- Jung, C. G. *Man and His Symbols*. London: Aldus Books, 1964.
- . *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1933.
- . *Psychology and Religion*. New Haven: Yale, 1938.
- . *Psychology of the Unconscious: A Study of the Transformations and Symbolisms of the Libido*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1921.
- Koch, Kenneth. *Thank you and other poems*. New York: Grove Press, 1962.
- Lansell, G.R. "Where the action is." *Nation* 1 July 1967: 18-20.

- Lynn, Elwyn. "Art and the Innocent Eye" *Meanjin* 22.1 (1963): 60-8.
- . "Australia Rediscovered." *Meanjin* 20.3 (1961): 337-9.
- McAuley, James. "The Traditional View of Art." *Australian Quarterly* (December 1951): 57-66.
- McCaughey, Patrick. "The Significance of The Field." *Art and Australia* 6.3 (1968): 235-42.
- Moore, William. *The Story of Australian Art*. 2 vols. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934.
- Murray-Smith, Stephen, Albert Tucker, Tim Burstall, David Martin and Phillip Adams. "The Legend and the Loneliness: A Discussion of the Australian Myth." *Overland* 23 (1962): 33-8.
- Philipp, Franz. "Antipodeans Aweigh." *Nation* 29 Aug 1959: 18-19.
- Read, Herbert. "Herbert Read writes on New Trends in England." *Art in Australia* (March 1942): 24-7.
- . *Surrealism*. New York: Praeger, 1971 [1936].
- Reed, John. "Psychiatry and Literary Style." *Angry Penguins* 3 (1942): 53-6.
- Smith, Bernard. *Australian Painting*. 1st ed. Melbourne: Oxford UP, 1962.
- . *Australian Painting 1788-1990*. 3rd ed. Melbourne: Oxford UP, 1991.
- . *Australian Painting Today* (the John Murtagh Macrossan Memorial Lectures, 1961). St Lucia: U of Queensland P, 1962.
- Spencer, Charles S. "Myth and Hero in the Paintings of Sidney Nolan." *Art and Australia* 3.2 (1965): 95-9.
- Tucker, Albert. "Art, Myth and Society." *Angry Penguins* 4 (Undated ca. 1942-1943): 49-54.
- Wallace-Crabbe, Chris, et al. "Two Decades of American Painting." *Art and Australia* 5.2 (1967): 422-27.
- "The Young Master: Sidney Nolan's Conquest of Two Worlds." *Nation* 2 July 1960: 10-13.

---

LAURIE (LAURENCE) DUGGAN was born in South Melbourne, Australia, in 1949. He studied at Monash and Sydney Universities, completing a Ph.D. in Fine Arts at Melbourne University in 1999. He has worked as a scriptwriter and art critic and has taught media, poetry writing and art history. He has published ten books of poems as well as *Ghost Nation*, a work of cultural criticism. He is well known for his sequence on Gippsland, *The Ash Range*. In 1987 he participated in a reading tour of the USA organized by Lyn Tranter and partly funded by the the Australia Council and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and in 1990 he was a guest at the Wellington, NZ Festival of the Arts. In 1992 he lived for three months in Manchester (UK) and three further months in Washington D.C. In 2003, he won the poetry section of the *Age Book of the Year* for Mangroves. He currently lives in Brisbane.