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Landscape photography of Australia, and by Australians of other places, has played an
important role in the formation and maintenance of Australian national and cultural
identity. Whether it is Steve Parish’s multitudinous and ubiquitous touristic landscape
pornography or Frank Hurley’s melodramatic montages of the landscape of trench
warfare, Australian landscape photography has been, and still is, central to how
Australia and many Australians see and define it, and themselves. Yet the place and role
of landscape photography in Australian life has not been well researched or
documented. Of course, there was a flurry of interest in, and books about, Australian
photography during the bicentenary of white settlement which discuss landscape
photography, but only intermittently and spasmodically (Newton, 1988; Willis, 1988;
see Batchen, 2001, for a review of both).

This situation compares unfavourably with the American one where there is a
wealth of research about its landscape photography (e.g. Jussim & Lindquist-Cock,
1985; Weber, 2002). Some of its leading landscape photographers, such as Ansel
Adams, are national heroes (Adams, 1985, 1990; Alinder, 1985). The closest Australian
equivalent to Adams would be Olegas Truchanas or Peter Dombrovskis. Bob Brown (1998, p. 6) says that Ansel Adams was ‘a photographer Dombrovskis particularly admired’. Both Dombrovskis and Truchanas, like Adams, were avid conservationists (Bonyhady 1997, p. 237) calls them ‘environmental photographers’), though, unlike Adams, they photographed in one State of Australia (Tasmania) whereas Adams photographed in many States (predominantly western, though) of America. The difference in their national statuses could also be attributed to the fact that Dombrovskis and Truchanas died untimely early deaths whereas Adams lived into his 80s. Truchanas has had a book devoted to his work (Angus, 1980), which sold over 40,000 copies (Bonyhady, 1997, p. 247), and so has Dombrovskis (1998). Both have also been the topic of a recent documentary screened on ABC television (McMahon, 2003). Stylistically, however, Adams is much closer to Max Dupain (1986, esp. p. 139; 1988, esp. p. 28) in that both photographed predominantly in black and white. They were also born within a decade of each other—Adams in 1902, Dupain in 1911—and share a common historical aesthetic of the panoramic.

For the purposes of this article, Australian landscape photography is defined as photography of the land outside the cities, implying photography of the country, or more specifically in the Australian context, the bush, the outback and the desert (and not until recently swamps and other wetlands (Simon Neville, in Giblett & Webb, 1996)) and more recently in relation to the American context, wilderness. Australian landscape photography has been concerned primarily with Australian lands, but in some instances (such as Frank Hurley who travelled widely, including with Douglas Mawson and Ernest Shackleton to Antarctica and to the Europe of the First World War) lands not Australian photographed by Australian photographers (born here or who spent the majority of their working lives here) will be included as they were crucial in the formation of Australian nationhood.

This definition of Australian landscape photography is broad enough to include the rural landscape of farm and farm houses and other buildings such as shearing sheds which have played such an important part in the cultivation of the Australian bush and mateship mythologies, but narrow enough to exclude city and suburban scapes and crowd scenes (built landscape and its inhabitants). People are not excluded, but the static tableau of small family groups and groups of workers in some sort of social solidarity in a rural or small town setting are preferred over the random collection of individuals in an urban setting of the largely built environment (e.g. Cazneaux’s cityscapes). The concern is with what Ennis (2004, p. 84) calls ‘a peopled rather than “pure” landscape’. Landscape photography in both America and Australia has recently morphed into, or spawned, wilderness photography which is largely of a ‘pristine’, unpeopled landscape very remote from cities and usually often inaccessible to all but sophisticated transportation (helicopter, air-boat, four-wheel-drive vehicle) or to the die-hardy by more traditional means (canoe, walking in rugged or inhospitable terrain).

Previous work on Australian landscape representation has been concerned primarily with painting and writing (e.g. Bonyhady, 1985, 2000; Hills, 1991; Giblett, 2004 and its
The relationship between photography and colonialism has been considered (Ryan, 1997), but not in relation to Australia, though the role of photography in exploration has been discussed in a couple of articles, but again neither extensively nor systematically (Carter, 1988; Rossiter, 1994). Some work on Australian landscape painting has discussed photography in passing (Bonyhady, 1985, 2000) and some very recent work on Australian photography has discussed landscape photography in passing (Conrad, 2003; Davies, 2004; Ennis, 2004), but there has been no systematic exploration of Australian landscape and wilderness photography in a monograph. This article aims to begin to remedy that situation somewhat. One of the few PhD theses related to the topic, with a couple of chapters devoted to it, was completed at the University of Exeter (Quartermaine, 1987). Two extensive bibliographies of work on Australian photography indicate no monographs or PhD theses devoted to the topic to date (Willis, 1988, pp. 288–295; Downer, 1999, pp. 192–197). Recently, a PhD on the photographic sublime in Tasmania from 1982 to 2000 has been written (Stephenson, 2001) but this is limited in stylistic, geographical and historical scope.

Part of that exploration would be to test the limits of applying models of interpretation drawn from American landscape photography (and the European landscape aesthetic more generally) to Australian landscape photography. In a survey of some main currents in American landscape photography (Giblett, forthcoming) I argue that the work of three prominent American landscape photographers, namely Ansel Adams (1985, 1990), Carleton Watkins (Nickel, 1999; Palmquist, 1983) and Timothy O’Sullivan (Snyder, 1981, 1994), falls largely within, and subscribes to, the modes of the sublime, picturesque and uncanny. This article will argue that these modes are applicable to Australian landscape photography. It will also argue for a shift away from the aesthetics of landscape photography of the sublime and picturesque towards what could be called a conservation counter-aesthetic of photography for environmental sustainability (see Giblett, 2004). Finally, it will argue for a shift from a nationalist mythology of landscape photography to a new national mythology of photography for environmental sustainability.

The picturesque has its parallels in Australian pictorialist landscape photography from the 1860s to 1930s with two distinct phases of an earlier soft-focus, impressionist style of depiction and a later style emphasizing bright light and spaciousness (Ennis, 1999, p. 136). Max Dupain’s landscape photography from the 1930s demonstrates this shift clearly (Dupain, 1988). His early landscape photographs are soft, dreamy, impressionistic and self-avowedly pictorial (pp. 20–23); his later ones often panoramic and brightly lit, even at night with artificial lighting. Both are phases of what Ebury (2002, p. 35) calls ‘the natural Pictorial school descended from the nineteenth-century picturesque tradition’. This view needs to be nuanced, given the differences in style between the two phases. Perhaps, though, it simply attests to the durability of the picturesque mode across these shifts in style, which is still very much with us in contemporary landscape photography. In the earlier phase, Willis (1988, p. 60) argues that:
many landscape photographers working in Australia in the 1860s and 1870s organised their landscape images according to the conventions of the picturesque, seeking out elements such as framing trees, foreground logs, winding paths and rivers. These were the means by which nature, conceived of as original wilderness, could be tamed and rendered visibly manageable.

Indeed, Willis (p. 71) argues later that ‘scenic views performed a ... normalising function, assuring [the erstwhile settler?] that the antipodean landscape was not rugged and inhospitable but picturesque and pleasing to behold’—and so ripe for settlement and exploitation.

Invoked crucially here is ‘the pleasing prospect’, if not the ‘commanding prospect’, in which the land was not only aesthetically pleasing for pastoral leisure but also economically viable for pastoralist industry (see Giblett, 2004). Charles Kerry and Co.’s View Wolgan Valley (Willis, 1988, p. 80, figure 44) represents what Willis calls ‘a transition between the vision of the landscape as scenic view and that of the land as site of settlement and development. Devices of the picturesque are deployed to make pastoral properties aesthetically pleasing.’ Landscape is an aesthetic object, the surface of the land, whereas the land, its depths, is an object of economic exploitation. The aesthetic and economic go hand in hand and support each other, no more so than in the bush and mateship mythologies in which ‘the small-scale landholder’ (Willis, 1988, p. 84) battles big squatters, big banks, big government and the big land to carve out a small, economically viable and aesthetically pleasing farm (see Giblett, 2004).

This photograph is of a particular place but increasingly, Willis (1988, p. 78) argues, ‘views were no longer simply of a specific place, but increasingly came to signify “Australianness.” At this point landscape photography began to intersect with ideas of an emerging nationalism.’ It also intersects with early tourism. The bush, mateship, nationalism and tourism were strongly associated in the landscape photography of Joseph Bischoff, Nicholas Caire, John Watt Beattie and John William Lindt (Davies, 2004, pp. 60–61, 64–65; Willis, 1988, pp. 85–90). Caire, according to Willis (1988, pp. 86–87; see also Pitkethly & Pitkethly, 1988; Thwaites, 1979), was ‘a keen explorer who wrote pamphlets and gave talks about the beauties of the bush, as well as producing picturesque photographs of rivers, waterfalls and fern tree gullies. Many of his photographs were used to promote tourism’ as most locations were ‘little more than 80 kilometres from Melbourne and easily accessible by rail. His photography was used to promote these locations as places that city day trippers could visit to enjoy the beauties of nature.’ His photographs were later used by Victorian Government Railways to promote travel.

The ‘pictorialist’ tradition of Australian landscape photography that dominated from the 1860s to the 1930s thus falls firmly within the domain of the picturesque (see Josef Lebovic Gallery online). Indeed, pictorialism is to photography what the picturesque is to painting. Willis (1988, p. 142) enunciates some of the key conventions of what she describes as ‘the pictorialist aesthetic’, including that ‘there had to be a single dominant highlight, which should not be too close to the edges or the centre. Horizons could not cut the picture in half: either landscape or sky had to dominate.’
By and large Australian landscape photography in picturesque mode conforms to these conventions. Even in those apparent exceptions, such as the Anson brothers’ photo of Lake St Clair c.1880 (Willis, 1988, p. 61, figure 33) in which the horizon divides the photograph roughly in half, the two sections are not exactly the same size and the framing devices of a log in the foreground and overhanging branches to the left and right with a point of land jutting into the lake is the centre of interest, means that the bottom half of land dominates over the top half of the sky. It conforms to the conventions of picturesque painting and establishes the norm for pictorialist photography and its cultural and political functions.

Australia initially forged a sense of cultural and national identity in the 1890s through the bush mythology of the _Bulletin_ school of writers and the Heidelberg school of painters (see Giblett, 2004). With the Boer War (1899–1902), federation (1901) and the First World War (1914–1918) this sense of national (if not nationalist) identity was then tempered into full-blown nationhood in the heat of battle. After the First World War, Willis (1988, p. 145) argues in a section devoted to ‘Pictorialist Australia’:

> the view that Australia had forged its nationhood through the sacrifice of its manhood on the battlefields of Europe was widely promoted and the need to define that nationhood became crucial … The Australian landscape, which was widespread in both popular imagery and high art, came to be imbued with national sentiment.

The tempering of Australian nationhood on, and in, the battlefields of the war was documented by Frank Hurley and many other Australian photographers (Bean, 1923). The Australian national landscape was not just the rural landscape of Australia ‘at home’ but also the landscape of European trench warfare abroad which was photographed in an Australian nationalist style. What Willis (1988, p. 146) calls ‘a more aggressively nationalist style of “Australianness” [was] equivalent to bright sunlight’. This could be depicted at home, or away as in Hurley’s concocted sunburst through the clouds over the battlefield in his composite photograph, _Morning after the Battle of Paschendaele_ (Willis, 1988, p. 185, figure 114; for the two images that make up this composite see Jolly, 1999, figure 3 and 4).

The battlefield scene, and not the composite, made it into the official history of the war as Bean (1923, p. vii and figure 403) distinguished between ‘photographs for the historical record, and the taking of them for propaganda or for the press, [which] were to some extent conflicting activities. Captain Hurley devoted himself to the latter work.’ His devotion to this work was not without conflict with Bean and ‘Authorities’ as Hurley (1917, pp. 52, 58–59; see also Jolly, 1999) records in his diary that he:

> had a great argument with Bean about combination pictures. [I] am thoroughly convinced that it is impossible to secure effects, without resorting to composite pictures … Our Authorities will not permit me to pose any pictures or indulge in any original means to secure them. They will not allow composite printing of any description, even though such be accurately titled, nor will they permit clouds to be inserted in a picture.
Perhaps with good reason, as Hurley’s composite, with what Willis (1988, p. 184) calls ‘its sublime backlit clouds rising over a scene of death and devastation’, aestheticizes the landscape of trench warfare. For Hurley, as Ennis (2004, p. 143) argues, ‘the battlefield was sublime’—perhaps the last thing ‘Authorities’ wanted.

Yet rather than a field of battle, this scene is a depiction after the event of what Willis (1988, p. 187) calls ‘fields of mud’, ‘a flattened, rubble-strewn, burnt-out, and ravaged landscape’. This landscape of destruction is the wetwasteland of trench warfare commented upon so often by First World War writers such as Henri Barbusse in Under Fire, Ernst Jünger in Storm of Steel, and photographed by Australian photographers too (and described by Hurley in his diary) (see, for example, ‘The Swamps of Zonnebeke on the Day of the First Battle of Passchendaele’, Bean, 1923, figure 400; and other ‘swamps’ figures 372, 394, 396). By contrast, in Hurley’s composite photograph of Passchendaele the sublime and the slime (or uncanny) counterpose each other in one composition and show their complementarity encapsulated in the portmanteau word s(ub)lime (see Giblett, 1996). In Hurley’s composite the land dominates the photo as it takes up two-thirds of its area (and so conforms to the pictorialist rule of thirds (Willis, 1988, p. 142)) but this is surmounted and transcended by the sky in the top third. The overall effect for Willis (1988, p. 184) of this and other photos by Hurley is ‘to glorify war’. The slime and uncanny of the depths of the earth and the wastewetland of the hell and gore of trench warfare below is sublimated into the heavens and glory of heroism above.

The wasteland of trench warfare is anti-aesthetic and an industrial waste product (the product of industrial technology) similar to the wasteland of mining. Both are places where the uncanny rears its ugly, monstrous head, though Hurley also sublimates it into the heights of clouds and sunshine. For Willis (1988, p. 52), ‘the spectacle of mining presented a kind of landscape not widely represented by painters so photographers had few compositional devices on which to draw’. The landscape of mining did not conform to the conventions of the picturesque and sublime. How, then, to depict it in photographs? Richard Daintree’s Swiss Tunnel at Jim-Crow Diggings 1858–1859 shows what Willis (1988, p. 53, figure 27; see also Carew, 1999, p. 157) describes as ‘a land gouged into, turned over and re-formed into a strange vista of bare earth, tree stumps and mullock heaps’. This is not a pleasing prospect but the displeasing prospect of a sadistic wasteland (see Giblett, 2004, for mining and sadism). Mining works the depths of the earth, not the surface of the land (see Giblett, 1996, 2004).

The sublime prospect can also be found in Peter Dombrovskis’s most famous photograph, ‘Rock Island Bend’ (hereafter RIB) (http://nla.gov.au/nla.pic-an24365561). Photography theorist and critic Geoffrey Batchen (1992, p. 48; see also Bonyhady, 1997, pp. 249–253) in an article entitled ‘Terrible Prospects’ has described it as ‘the Save the Franklin advertisement’. In fact, it was the vote for the Franklin ad (see Batchen, 1992, p. 47). For Batchen this photograph ‘works in terms of the sublime’. It is not a pleasing prospect but a terrible prospect in both the temporal sense of the future
stretching out before one (the damming of the Franklin River would be terrible, too terrible to contemplate) and the spatial sense of the landscape lying before one (see Giblett, 2004). For Batchen (1992, p. 48; 2001, p. 54) it is not only ‘an expertly constructed piece of conservation kitsch’ and ‘chocolate box photography’ but also a photo whose ‘awful sublimity’ makes it ‘one of the rare photographs that has made an almost demonstrable political impact on its viewers’. In the later reference Batchen deletes ‘almost’, so confident had he become in the intervening decade that RIB had had a demonstrable political impact. Indeed, Bob Brown (2004, p. 28; see also Bonyhady, 1997, p. 253) says that ‘old hands in Canberra tell me that this is still the most effective election advertisement they have ever seen’. This ability of photography to engage with the political at the level of voters’ election preferences means that it is not confined to the merely artistic and crosses the border between aesthetics and politics.

For Tim Bonyhady (1993, p. 172) RIB became ‘the visual embodiment of a turning point in Australia’s environmental and political history’. It also embodied a turning point in the production and consumption of photographic images of Australian landscapes. It was the culmination of a flood of conservation and touristic landscape images in books, calendars and diaries (Bonyhady, 1997, p. 248). From Dombrovskis to Parish (see Parish, n.d.) ubiquitous touristic landscape pornography there is a clear line of descent. Dombrovskis, for Mulligan and Hill (2001, p. 69), ‘raised the art of wilderness photography in Australia to a new level’—just as his work has been raised to sacred, iconic status. The Wilderness Gallery on Tasmania’s Cradle Mountain has a special, dimly lit room dedicated to Dombrovskis’s work whereas all the other rooms are well lit. For Batchen (2001, p. 53), Dombrovskis’s images ‘probably contributed more than any other to the eventual transformation of the word wilderness from a pejorative to a positive term in the Australian lexicon’, RIB being the prime example. This is a very large claim indeed that can be backed up only by further research. Recent work on wilderness in the Australian context does not discuss Dombrovskis at all (see Giblett, 2004).

Ian McLean (2002) gives an alternative reading of this photograph. He picks up, like Batchen, its sublime elements, but also relates them to what he sees as its abject elements using the terminology of Julia Kristeva (which I have discussed elsewhere in relation to the sublime; see Giblett, 1996). The sublime and the abject are two sides of the same coin, with the sublime lifting one above what is below and the abject pushing one down into what is below. The sublime takes one away from what is old, familiar, familial and long forgotten; the abject returns one to it. For McLean, RIB ‘memorialises a cosogenesis in which the waters of the Franklin River, swirling beneath the cliffs of “Mother Earth’s” supine body suggest the originary chora [or receptacle—in other words, the womb] from which life is born’. Yet cliffs can hardly be supine so this earth is not the benign mother earth of agriculture. Rather, she is the Great Mother, or Goddess, who is both creative and destructive and who precedes and refuses Mother Earth (see Giblett, 2004).

Australian wilderness photography is both art and politics and that is part of the reason why it has received so little critical interest and been so poorly researched (again compared to the American situation). Australian conservationists and green
politicians (e.g. Brown, as we have seen) and historians of Australian conservation (e.g. Mulligan & Hill), Australian art historians (e.g. Bonyhady), historians of Australian photography (e.g. Willis) and writers about it (e.g. Conrad & Ennis) acknowledge and make passing reference to the power of wilderness photography, but the conjunction of these elements of politics, conservation and art in Australian wilderness photography has not been explored, especially in relation to environmental sustainability. They have tended to be addressed in and by their siloed discourses and disciplines. This article will remedy that situation somewhat by being inter-discursive and transdisciplinary in typical cultural studies fashion, which does not mean taking the moral or academic high ground—more the swampy low ground where discourses and disciplines mix and flow into each other.

Green politicians and conservationists are happy to reap the benefits of such photographs without questioning the politics of the pictures and the cultural traditions of the modes of depiction they employ, and deploy. Progressive art historians are probably equally happy to bemoan the fact that wilderness photography is, as Bonyhady (1993, p. 171) puts it, ‘one of the notable omissions from the collections of most Australian art museums’, largely because it is not regarded as art. If it is included, as RIB is, it is because of its social significance as a political poster rather than any perceived artistic value (as Batchen’s discussion above suggests; see also Bonyhady, 1993, p. 171).

Neither conservationists nor curators have really explored the relationship between art and wilderness photography. Is wilderness photography notably absent from Australian ‘art museums’ because its politics is green? What is the relationship between wilderness photography, green politics and art acquisition policies at Australian ‘art museums’? The whole question of whether photography is art is, of course, an old and tired one that is of merely taxonomic interest at the ontological level, but of great political and cultural interest at the epistemological level. In other words, whether photography is art is largely a matter of definition (on both sides); how it is classified and how that classification functions culturally and politically is of much greater import. This article will focus on the latter rather than the former.

The sublime, picturesque and the uncanny thus do seem to have their analogues in Australian landscape and wilderness photography. Landscape photography in tourism, conservation and culture has played an important role in forming and maintaining national identity. It has played, and still plays, an important but undervalued and misunderstood role that is not aware of the cultural politics of pictures that underpins them. What role it will play in developing environmental sustainability in Australia is another question. Representing the natural environment as an aesthetic object does not promote environmental sustainability.

Landscape photography (including environmental and wilderness photography) plays an important role in how we see and live in relation to the land. In this regard it is related to developing an environmentally sustainable Australia at a number of different levels both through looking back into the past and forward into the future. In relation to rural landscapes, photography has been important in developing and maintaining
the bush and mateship mythologies. These stereotypical images of a pastoral, and pastoralist, country helped to create a theory and practice of land use, a way of seeing and doing, which increasingly is being seen as unsustainable. On the other hand, touristic and wilderness images of remote or accessible sites that fuel the tourism industry and the conservation backlash of the ‘setting aside’ of sanctuaries of ‘pristine’ places may both be unsustainable too (see Giblett, 2004). Both touristic and wilderness images exploit the land they photograph and create unrealistic expectations of aesthetically pleasing or aestheticized landscapes that bear little relation to the lives of people, Indigenous and not, who live on or near them and who rely upon them for their livelihoods.

I have argued recently for a shift from mastery over ‘nature’ to mutuality with it. In conservation and ecology this entails a shift from the setting aside of special places in sanctuaries, such as national parks, to the sacrality of all places, rural and urban, pristine and spoiled (see Giblett, 2004). These shifts from mastery to mutuality, from sanctuarism to sacrality, could be developed in relation to landscape photography. Environmental sustainability comes down to everyday land practices in local places involving what I call symbiotic livelihoods in bioregions. Photography for environmental sustainability could document and display Australians engaged in biological and psychological symbiosis in gaining and sustaining their livelihoods in their bioregions. This would mark a similar shift in photographic practice as I have argued for in environmental theory and practice, which would lead to changes in land practices to ones that are environmentally sustainable. The postmodern, political and psychoanalytic ecology I develop in this book and earlier (Giblett, 1996) could be developed in a new photography that would address the historical, social and psychological dimensions of environmental sustainability and promote their interdependency.

There is little Australian landscape photography that depicts environmentally sustainable land use in everyday life that would promote it to the wider community. Quite the contrary has in fact been the case. For example, Max Dupain’s (1986, 1988) two volumes of photographs of Australia and its landscapes do not include any photographs of Australians engaged in working the land other than in the agricultural and pastoralist industries. They do not show Indigenous Australians hunting or gathering, nor non-Indigenous Australians gardening, one of the major leisure activities of urban Australians. This is surprising in that much of his work was shot in the 1940s and 1950s when the vegetable garden was a standard feature of the Australian suburban backyard. In the broad sweep of his panoramic and pictorialist photographs biodiversity is lost in the monoculture of archetypal rural and bush settings which celebrate these nationalist mythologies. To find a photograph of a vegetable garden by a recognized landscape photographer in a major collection, such as the National Library of Australia, we have to go back to c.1887 and Nicholas Caire’s photograph of his allotment in Gippsland (Conrad, 2003, pp. 12–13). Yet this scene, with its rectilinear grid of plots, hardly constitutes environmental sustainability, but an attempt at a degree of self-sufficiency.

Many photographers before Dupain, such as Caire, had a nationalist fixation with trees (see Conrad, 2003, pp. 99–113). Many photographers since Dupain have
documented and celebrated the biodiversity of Australia. Both focus on, and
document, individual species in isolation from their habitat or surrounds. Few, if any,
promote sustainability in relation to it. Proponents of environmental sustainability
have not considered the role of landscape and wilderness photography in either
inhibiting its development by producing inappropriate pastoral or unpeopled
landscapes or in promoting its development by producing images of people working
with the land in a sustainable way that conserves biodiversity. Just as landscape
photography helped to form and maintain the Anglo-Celtic Australian national
identity steeped in the bush and mateship mythologies, so landscape photography
could help to form and maintain a new Australian national identity around
environmental sustainability. This could involve producing a body of photographs
exploring, documenting and developing environmental sustainability by representing
communities working the land in ways that conserve biodiversity. These could include
Indigenous people living traditional lifestyles, permaculture practitioners, organic
farmers and gardeners, natural energy technologists, etc. It could create a new genre of
photography—photography for environmental sustainability.
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