CHAPTER ONE

MAKING A CLAIM FOR BRITISHNESS: MUSEOLOGY AND EMPIRE LOYALTY IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY ART PRACTICE OF THE TWO DOMINIONS

We owe everything to Europe, our ethic, our very conception of civilization.¹

To control a museum means precisely to control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths.²

The importance of the National Galleries of New South Wales and New Zealand was, to their respective communities, not ever simply a matter related to their responsibility to display art. For Wellington and Sydney, in the period between the First and Second World Wars, these institutions were perhaps the most powerful public tool each nation employed in order to lay claim to being a cultured, civil society. But even a claim such as this was not the greatest that could be made about the special prestige and authority these institutions possessed. Writers, including Robert Hewison, have argued that ‘in the twentieth century museums have taken over the function once exercised by Church and ruler, [in that] they [have] provided the symbols through which a nation and culture understands itself’.³ In developing this point, Hewison stresses the role of museums and galleries in affirming a certain historical and cultural outlook:

The arrangement of museums and galleries, their selection and presentation, give the objects they contain a special significance. They serve the same function as the selections that make written history. By displaying the evidence of past cultures, they help to

¹ Lionel Lindsay, in Home Magazine (1923) quoted in Joanna Mendelsohn, Lionel Lindsay: An Artist and his Family (Chatto & Windus, 1988), p.157.
³ Ibid.
locate a contemporary society in relation to a previous tradition. They give meaning to the present by interpreting the past. But this interpretive function does not stop there. As makers of meaning, they also interpret the present to itself.⁴

This chapter examines the museology evident in the art practice of the two National Art Galleries between the wars as well as the relationship of that museology to the imperative of Empire loyalty.

The tradition from which these Dominion National Galleries came was one firmly grounded in the British model of art galleries as ‘national, secular institutions with an educational purpose’.⁵ For the management of the NAGNSW and the NZNAG, the great galleries they sought to emulate were the British galleries such as the National Gallery, founded in 1824, the National Portrait Gallery of 1856 and the Tate Gallery, founded in 1896. But, more important than any of these was the London Royal Academy of Art. These were seen as noble endeavours and marks of high culture but also exemplars of social and moral ideals, where spiritual, moral and a cultured knowledge of art in its higher forms of beauty would tend directly to humanize, to educate and refine. It was the eminent position of these institutions within what was understood as the secular British and European ‘truths’ of historical and aesthetic culture that endowed their authority.

Museologists such as Carol Duncan have explored the secular – and also the ritualistic – nature of art museums. She argues that the privileged position of these institutions, based on their significant history and reputation, has enabled them to claim a particular authority within the community. This was particularly true of those art museums enjoying the added cachet of being able to claim, through their titles, national status. For art galleries such as the National Art Galleries of N.S.W. and New Zealand, the assumed relationship between objective truth and officially

⁴ Ibid., p. 85.
⁵ Ibid., p. 86.
created national institutions meant that their authority within their communities was immense. Duncan argues that western art museums of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries belong within this tradition of secular institutions that 'possessed' national history, and therefore, because of the 'scientific and humanistic disciplines practised in them – conservation, art history, archaeology' they became 'preservers of the communities' official cultural memory'.

Simultaneously, Duncan argues, an apparently opposing phenomenon to that of objective truth exists for the museum onlooker: a state of liminality is provided by the ritualistic nature of much gallery demeanour. The ritualism is that which is more normally associated with churches; hushed demeanours, imposing spaces, symbols of faith and signs of implicit authority. As Duncan has noted 'we build sites that publicly represent beliefs about the order of the world, its past and present, and the individual's place within it'. That 'represented belief' is then enhanced by the contemplation of the art works within. However innocuous this contemplative activity appears, it is by no means naïve or ideologically passive. Implicit within the liminal experience was the assumption that through the contemplation of art, the spectator would be morally, spiritually and intellectually uplifted. By the late nineteenth century the idea of art galleries as 'sites of wondrous and transforming experiences' became commonplace among those with any pretensions to 'culture'.

Throughout the period under study here, there are many examples to be found of the Trustees of both institutions acting in accordance with these ideas and also providing evidence of John Williams' argument in Quarantined Culture: Australian Reactions to Modernism 1913-1939 that Australian art became

---

7 Ibid.
8 Ibid., p. 16.
quarantined after 1918. For example, in 1922 the Sydney Daily Telegraph invited leading artists to nominate which works in the collection of the NAGNSW they considered to be ‘the best picture’. One participant, artist G.W. Lambert, selected three. His first choice was Ford Madox Brown’s Chaucer at the Court of King Edward II because ‘in the painting...the art student will find not only a revival but almost a recrudescence of the genius which enabled Titian, Veronese and others’. Exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1851, the painting is densely packed with English cultural and historical luminaries of Chaucer’s period. Lambert’s second selection was Sons of Clovis by E.V. Luminais, because it manifested ‘such an exquisite technique...that it should be a guide...for our students’. The subject was that of a fifth century French legend, illustrating a moral tale replete with ‘spiritual illumination’. The third work Lambert chose was the portrait of Marshal Foch by Jacques E. Blanche, whose painting of the head was ‘the finest of its kind in the Gallery’. This work had been awarded the highly prestigious gold medal at the 1900 Exposition Universelle, and was also awarded the Legion d’Honneur. Exhibited often in London’s National Gallery, it had impeccable credentials, especially for those in the Dominions seeking to exhibit the best of art - art that had already been acknowledged at the metropolitan centre as above reproach. All of Lambert’s three selected works were academic in style, praiseworthy for their excellence of technique and representative of European high art.

9 John Williams, Quarantined Culture: Australian Reactions To Modernism 1913 – 1939 (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
12 William Moore, The Story of Australian Art From the Earliest Known Art of the Continent to the Art of To-Day (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934), p.187.
13 Anna Waldman, op. cit., p.15.
In 1931, the Director of the NAGNSW James MacDonald presented a series of public lectures. Each was based on his selection of a particular work. His choice of paintings, like Lambert’s, reflected the British aesthetic model but they were also works which acted through narrative, as ‘lessons’ - social, historical and moral. MacDonald’s selection replicated the values inherent within Lambert’s choices. All were paintings within the high art tradition; all were narratives of moral or spiritual choices or heroic, dramatic depictions of historical events. Chosen from the NAGNSW, his selections were: Ford Maddox Brown’s Chaucer, Pennasilico’s The End Of A Dream, Marcus Stone’s Stealing The Keys, De Neuville’s Rorke’s Drift and lastly, Brangwyn’s The Scoffers.14

At the end of the period of this study, in 1939, the then NAGNSW Director, Will Ashton clearly articulated the aims for the Gallery under his Directorship. Writing in Art In Australia, he highlighted the value of ‘intellectual approachment’, the education of ‘public taste’ and also that of promoting ‘the progress of historical and artistic research’.15 These high art values were taken very seriously, so much so that when the NAGNSW was approached by the Tourist Bureau, in 1931, to have the Gallery included on a tourist map of Sydney, the reply recorded in the Minutes almost resonates with disapproval of the Bureau’s attempt to contaminate the Gallery with commerce:

A suggestion by the Tourist Bureau that the Gallery advertise in a map to be issued. Not entertained.16

Choices, then, over which works were to be displayed were not made merely as a response to individual or collective Trustee/ Councillor taste. There was a higher mission always in view. The power of the Galleries to transform, enlighten and

14 Sydney Morning Herald, Sydney, 26.6.1931.
16 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 27.11.1931.
educate was well understood to be of much greater significance than matters of personal taste. Nevertheless, artistic taste was important and was believed to be the province of connoisseurs, those who, through acquaintance with the writings of philosophers such as Rousseau, associated taste as a 'special kind of psychological encounter with distinctive moral and philosophical import'. The selection and acquisition of works involved a moral and educative duty, a responsibility well understood by those individuals occupying places on the 'official' gallery Boards in New South Wales and New Zealand. Through exposure to other European galleries and through their own connoisseurship, they were also aware of the power inherent in the liminal experience and present in the contemplation of individual works, exhibitions or the entire collection. Essentially a nineteenth century belief, this faith in the role of the National gallery to transform public taste was accepted completely in the colonial outposts of Empire under scrutiny. At least until the outbreak of the Second World War, Board members regarded it as entirely appropriate that their ideas of moral and artistic stewardship – not to mention ideas of nation and Empire – would dominate their National Gallery collections.

Through the selection of artworks, individuals in charge of these institutions were thus able, in Duncan's description, to 'control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths'. What could be more important in a society's culture than an institution empowered to determine which aspects of the community's official cultural memory were to be preserved? As with other official institutions, a large part of the power of the NAGNSW and NZNAG came from the
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17 However, much individual Trustee taste did become, as far as they were concerned, synonymous with higher aesthetic claims made for their institutions. See Chapter Three of this Thesis.
18 Carol Duncan, op. cit., p. 14.
19 See Chapter 3 of this Thesis, 'Men Who Count — Things That Matter: The Aesthetic Ideal of the Trustees and Directors'.
control wielded over what was shown, and of course, what was denied a showing. The authority by which decisions were made over what was selected and made visible, or, rejected and therefore made invisible, was linked of course to larger questions 'about who constitutes the community and who defines its identity'.\footnote{Ibid., p. 9.} As Peter Vergo argued 'the very act of collecting has a political or ideological dimension which cannot be overlooked'.\footnote{Peter Vergo (Ed.), \textit{The New Museology} (London: Reaktion, 1989), p. 2.} It was in deciding upon whose aesthetics were being represented, as well as in defining issues of identity, that the art practitioners of the two National Galleries of the Dominions most clearly declared their hand in the period between the wars. As will be demonstrated in later chapters, the art practices of both National Galleries reflect a particularly intense desire to claim a place within the cultural framework of the Motherland, however much by proxy. This identity, which allowed access to a shared British history, and at a deeper level, to high European culture, was cherished by those who had most to gain by constructing an ideal present through the illustration of a glorious British past.

Museologists, such as David Lowenthal and Peter Vergo, and Australian historians including Donald Horne, remind us also that just as an art collection is not ever politically neutral, neither is the building in which the collection is housed. Similarly in Carol Duncan's \textit{Civilising Rituals: Inside Public Museums} she presents a photo of the NAGNSW building alongside another of the Glyptothek in Munich as evidence in her argument that public museums have, 'as a long standing practice', borrowed architectural forms 'from monumental ceremonial structures of the past'.\footnote{Carol Duncan, \textit{Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums} (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 9.} The most popular model for this borrowing has been that of the temple, a practice, she argues, that has existed for over two hundred years, where temples have been ‘completely assimilated into a secular discourse about architectural beauty, decorum
Fig. 1. The Façade. Art Gallery of New South Wales (formerly the NAGNSW).
Photo courtesy Suzanne Carruthers
and rational form’. 24 An art gallery, when designed in such a way to resemble an ancient Greek temple, seeks to identify with an antiquity recognised as ‘exemplary, beneficial and beautiful’. 25 Such a structure, built to house art, reveals as much about its privileged status and its major civic importance as do the art works housed within it. Because art galleries are political and social constructs, it is important to pay attention to the structures themselves and what they reveal about the social and artistic ideas governing them at the time of their construction.

The architect initially appointed to design Sydney’s new Gallery was J. Horbury Hunt. From 1885 to 1895 Hunt produced several designs for the exterior of the Gallery, all of which were at least as grandiose as the final structure, and one of which was built as a temporary measure. For reasons that are not clear, Hunt was eventually replaced when ‘it became clear that the Government would not grant any building funds until the Trustees dumped him’. 26 His replacement, the NSW Colonial architect and designer of Sydney’s Central Railway Station and Fisher Library at the University of Sydney, W. L. Vernon, had his design (primarily plans for the façade) approved in 1895. Why would a group of citizens in early Sydney decide that, when building their ‘national’ art house, the most appropriate model would be that based on an ancient Greek temple? As Duncan has argued, such an alliance between purpose and design was not uncommon. For the citizens of colonial Sydney, eager to be received into world civil society, nothing could further their claims more than to have such a structure advertising centuries-old associations with the highest forms of civilisation and culture. As Donald Horne has written, however incongruous it may be to find a replica of an ancient Greek temple in the Antipodes,

24 Ibid., pp. 9-10.
Fig. 2. Detail, Facade Art Gallery of New South Wales.
Photo courtesy Suzanne Carruthers
'buildings are never purely functional', and, as he recommends, 'one can learn to "read" buildings and ask what do they say?'. The architecture of the NAGNSW is very straightforward in its meaning. Situated in a wide green space, its imposing façade is not obscured or demeaned by any other structure (see Figs.1 and 2). It declares to all who walk across the Domain towards it that the society that has produced such a building could indeed claim membership of the highest forms of civilisation. Self-conscious in design, the NAGNSW illustrates that 'there is the specific character of the institution both as perceived by itself, and as it presents itself to the public'.

Visitors approaching this building were instructed not only by the architecture of the façade as to the weight of the cultural offerings available within. The choice of the decorative bronze panels adorning the façade reinforced the aesthetic lesson. No less than forty-four of these panels, each naming a great European or British artist, were included in Vernon's original plan. Thought to have been selected by Eccleston du Faur, one of the original Trustees of the Gallery, those artists considered worthy enough to be paid tribute in this way included Raphael, Rembrandt, Botticelli, Leonardo da Vinci and Gainsborough. As in the case of the façade, the lessons to be learnt by association with ancient Greek heritage were not to be confined to architectural prompts. A number of the bronze reliefs were also created to pay homage to Parietals, Pythagoras and Anthemius Ictinus and placed on

28 For information on the history of the building itself see the following articles: Peter Laverty 'Art Gallery of New South Wales' and Daniel Thomas 'Institutional History' and 'Building History', Art In Australia, Vol. 10, No.1 (July, 1972), pp. 40-51. See also Richard Apperly, Porticoes To Culture: The Art Gallery of N.S.W. 1880-1909 and the State Library of N.S.W. 1905-1940, Faculty of Architecture, University of N.S.W., Research Paper No.12.
29 Peter Vergo (Ed.), op. cit., p. 41.
30 Eccleston du Faur had been secretary to the Gallery's predecessor, the N.S.W. Academy of Art. He became, with Mr E. L. Montefiore, the main founder of the NAGNSW. He was an original Trustee and acted as de facto Director, and indeed was regarded as the Gallery's chief policy maker, until his death in 1915.
Fig. 3. The architect's perspective view (1930) of the proposed Dominion Museum and National Art Gallery building and the Carillon.

the north elevation. Such illustrations, which were regarded as both decorative and instructive, were not confined to Sydney’s Gallery. Similar external decorations appear in art museums such as those in Chicago, Detroit and Washington. The NAGNSW, like many other art museums in other parts of the world, ‘both modern and historical’, continued to ‘affirm the goal of communion with immortal spirits of the past’. Indeed, as Duncan argues, the longing for ‘contact with an idealized past, or with things imbued by immortal spirits, is probably pervasive’. This contact with a European ‘idealized past’, as epitomised by the illustration of such historical artistic luminaries, lessened after 1918 as the ‘idealized past’ was sited more narrowly in British models.

The desire for contact with an ‘idealized past’ also permeated the initial plans for, and eventual structure of, the National Art Gallery of New Zealand (see Fig. 3). A commemorative souvenir catalogue accompanied the exhibition staged to celebrate the opening of the new Gallery in 1936. The cover of the catalogue used the words of Pericles to instruct the New Zealand public that ‘the wealth of a State should be laid out on such works as when executed would be eternal monuments to its glory’. The introductory notes told the reader that:

Like other member states of the British Empire, New Zealand has not been unmindful of the need for establishing and maintaining Museums and Art Galleries in the Dominion. Recognizing that such institutions have influences both educative and cultural on the progress of civilization, our colonists had from early days initiated the enterprises which have now culminated in
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31 Daniel Thomas, ‘Building History’, *Art And Australia*, Vol.10, No.1 9 (July, 1972), p.44. Other artists represented by bronze panels are Giotto, Titian, Murillo, Rubens, Andrea Del Sarto, Botticelli, Bellini, Cimabue, Correggio, Tintoretto, Velasquez, Van Dyck, Michelangelo, Donatello, Ghiberti, Phidias, Cellini, Canova, Jean Goujon, and the architects Christopher Wren, de L’Orme, Perrault, de Herrera, Mansart, Inigo Jones, Sansovino, Bramante, Palladio, Vignola, Vitruvius and Brunelleschi.

32 Carol Duncan, op. cit., p. 17.

33 See Williams, op. cit.

the erection of the Art Gallery and Museum buildings in Wellington".\textsuperscript{35}

The design of the building was determined as the result of a competition, completed in 1931. The winning design was that of an Auckland firm, Gummer and Ford, whose proposal incorporated the National Gallery, the Dominion Museum and a campanile in which the War Memorial Carillon of Bells was housed.\textsuperscript{36} Whilst obviously a twentieth century design, it resonates as much with arcadian temple references as with any modernist aesthetics. The architects must have been aware that such references to an older, classical cultural history could only enhance their prospects in the competition.\textsuperscript{37}

Built at a time of great international economic depression, the Gallery’s construction was seen as a symbol of hope. At the opening, the Lord Mayor of Wellington, Mr Hislop, delivered one of the speeches, declaring:

\begin{quote}
Today we view the fulfilment of the first step towards a great ideal. The completion of a worthy building to house our national treasures. The second step is to see that nothing but the best in each respective sphere finds a permanent home within these walls...Nevertheless the artistic and technical merit should not be the sole test. Of equal importance is the national value of a work, its influence upon the community, and its place and effect in the history and development of our country in the past, and its influence in the years to come.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

In a similar way, an anonymous 1936 article in New Zealand’s premier art journal, \textit{Art In New Zealand}, reflected upon the civic purpose of New Zealand’s new National Gallery. ‘These national institutions are dedicated to the service of beauty and knowledge’, the author wrote, adding that, as there now existed a National site

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., p.2.  
\textsuperscript{36} The campanile was included at the urging of the Carillon Society, who, ‘in a fit of enthusiasm…had purchased bells, which had played to the delight of all in Hyde Park, London, before being sent to New Zealand’. Robin Kay & Tony Eden, Portrait Of A Century: The History of the N.Z. Academy of Fine Arts 1882-1982 (Wellington: Millwood, 1983), p. 91.  
\textsuperscript{37} Roland Hipkins, ‘The National Art Gallery Exhibitions’, \textit{Art In New Zealand} (September, 1936), p. 11.  

31
of focus for the arts, it might ‘confidently be expected that their value as a means of visual education in aesthetics – the appreciation of what is beauty – will be more widely understood’.

The same edition of _Art In New Zealand_ included an article by well-known New Zealand art critic of the period, Roland Hipkins titled ‘The National Art Gallery Exhibitions’. Hipkins described the new gallery as being ‘appropriately situated on elevated ground’, its architecture ‘conceived in terms of restrained modernism’, possessed of the ‘dignity of classic standards’. Making the association of classical idealism and aesthetics clear, Hipkins argued that ‘it is not a monument to passing architectural fancy’ and that its design was based on a concept expressing ‘a sense of permanence and solidarity, which symbolises a national consciousness’. This newly articulated ‘national consciousness’, however, was, according to Hipkins’ review, situated very much within Britishness and he had no hesitancy in articulating this relationship in his review.

This position was not contentious, but rather one which was well understood within the New Zealand community. Indeed, this acceptance was symbolised in the choice of the opening exhibition, which housed a major British component, namely, that of the British Empire Loan Collection. The prominence of this British exhibition in the opening of the New Zealand National Gallery was highly significant. This did not constitute a mere travelling art exhibition. Rather, it was, as the Hipkins critique made clear, a mark of approval from ‘home’, which struck a patriotic chord with the public. The works embodied the traditions and values that were cherished above all others:
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39 Author unknown, ‘Ourselves’, _Art In New Zealand_ (September, 1936), p. 5.  
41 Ibid.
The British and Empire Art Loan Collection of paintings and sculpture took us back into British art history for two hundred years and occupied the large gallery and four smaller galleries. Historically and artistically, this exhibition was of great significance, not only for the artistically minded, but to the whole people of New Zealand – the tremendous appeal it had for all sections of the community, who flocked to see it, was not only because of its purely aesthetic qualities, but because New Zealanders are so much a part of the Motherland that they are able to read, many for the first time, pages of British history, from a new, and it must be said, little understood avenue of expression. This general public enthusiasm was more a sign of patriotic fervour than the result of consuming interest in art.\textsuperscript{42}

For his New Zealand readers, Hipkins made very clear the historical links between the new National Gallery, the ‘dignity of classic standards’, ‘national consciousness’ and Britishness. As Hipkins asserted, for its audiences the Gallery collection was indeed more important than mere art, for ‘we can hardly claim that we are aesthetically minded’. When, however, that art exhibition was ‘leavened’ by ‘something which awakens a consciousness of the greatness of our forbears or reflects the lure of the English countryside and appearance of British people of the past, there is no part of the British Empire where it is more acceptable than in New Zealand’.\textsuperscript{43} The community’s reception of the new Gallery demonstrated very clearly that its principle role was that of reiterating those elements of the New Zealand experience that were most easily accommodated within the traditions of the Motherland. For Hipkins, the importance of this inaugural exhibition was that it was ‘acceptable – because it is British, not solely because it is art’.\textsuperscript{44} Such a review, written by one of New Zealand’s premier art critics, published in New Zealand’s major art journal, makes clear the profound respect for Britishness. Here was an exhibition not of the art of another country, but ‘the art of our own British people’.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., p.12.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid.
For Hipkins, to be a New Zealander was to be British. National and Imperial identities were one and the same.

The art practices and aesthetic adopted by these two Australian and New Zealand institutions in the period of this study were formed primarily by the deeply held desire of Australians and New Zealanders that their nations be recognized not merely as English settlements, out-posts of Empire, but as integral parts of the British Empire and hence, of British national culture. The physical structures of these national institutions were visible signs that, in these two Dominions, there existed worthy inheritors of the British mantle. It was not surprising that many of the art practices between the wars expressed that sentiment before any colonial nationalist ideals.

Expressions of New Zealanders’ pride in their position within the Empire in general, and their attachment to the ‘old country’ in particular, are often recorded in the writings of the New Zealand art community. Typical is the writing of Arthur Hirst. In a 1929 Art In New Zealand article, he described an understanding of the New Zealander’s relationship with the ‘homeland’ often repeated in other forums:

Great Britain resembles a wonderful little old pater-familias, who has scattered his seed in all four corners of the earth... [T]here is a distinct family resemblance between all the varied members and there is a fine, deep-seated loyalty.

The same article also reveals another facet of the relationship New Zealanders perceived between themselves and the Mother Country. The connection was believed by those in New Zealand to be unique, and one apparently able to be supported by irrefutable scientific fact – in the form of eugenics – as well as by the emotions surrounding racial kinship:
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46 For detailed discussion of other aspects of such art practice see below Chapters 2, 3 and 4.
The youngest son is New Zealand and Eugenics has established
the fact that sons of old parents are often endowed intellectually!
New Zealand is the youngest son, the favourite son and worthily
most devoted to the whole family.48

This sense of loyalty to Empire felt in the arts community was shared by the
wider society. The writings of nineteenth century social theorists such as Edward
Gibbon Wakefield had been especially important to New Zealanders’ understanding
of their British heritage and their place within that heritage. The benefits of selective
and systematic immigration were made clear by the theories of Wakefield, and the
inhabitants of New Zealand saw themselves as possessing a ‘special destiny in the
vanguard of British civilization’.49 Central to Wakefield’s vision was a society,
which embraced ‘persons of cultivation for whom the pleasures and refinement of
intellectual society were necessary to their peace of mind’.50 From the inception of
white settlement New Zealanders accepted the mantle of this ‘worthy’ and ‘most
devoted son’, and believed themselves to be, then, a natural continuation of the
British race, albeit existing on the other side of the world. New Zealanders envisaged
themselves ‘as closely linked and part of the Mother Country as Northern Ireland or
Wales’, only further removed physically. This ‘culture by remove’ was consistently
characterised in the pages of New Zealand histories written between the wars as a
‘bigger, better England’.51 Descriptions of New Zealand as the ‘Britain of the south’
were not unusual. In the late 1920s New Zealand school children were being taught,
through their reader, Our Nation’s Story, that whilst ‘our country’ was New Zealand,
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48 Ibid.
49 P.J. Gibbon, ‘The Climate Of Opinion’ in H. Oliver & B.R. Williams (Eds.) Oxford History of New
50 J. Miller, Early Victorian New Zealand – A Study of Racial and Social Attitudes 1839-1852
51 See Eldred Grigg, A Southern Gentry: New Zealanders Who Inherited the Earth (Christchurch:
Redd, 1980).
‘our Nation’ was Britain. Popular conceptions included the belief that New Zealand pioneer settlers were a ‘better class of people than those of the average town or village’. The 1933 *Cambridge History of New Zealand*, was according to historian James Belich, ‘typical of its era’. Its conclusion assured readers that ‘one Dominion…is, and is likely to remain, more British even than Britain’.

The fact that New Zealand was, from its very inception, freely settled by people of British stock was of vital importance in the inhabitants’ perception of their relationship with Britain, and then in the construction of white New Zealand’s understanding of itself. They believed themselves to be the evidence vindicating Wakefield’s theory of colonisation; these settlers thought themselves to possess those characteristics that exemplified the best of the British populace. The ‘finest of all civilisations would prevail, they believed, free of the convict and other social contaminations suffered by Australia’. The mythology that grew up around the belief that New Zealand’s white *Pakeha* settlement was founded upon superior stock proved to be pivotal in shaping the relationship with Great Britain. The claims which white New Zealanders made as to the ‘pure’ nature of their British heritage and inheritance, enabled them to assert an especially privileged relationship and bond with the Mother Country. The way in which the colony had been constituted was the key to this, and the founding ‘truth’ was usually expressed racially in terms of the purity of Anglo-Saxon stock. Such a conclusion was perhaps not unexpected when a

---

popular claim was to declare New Zealanders themselves ‘98.5 per cent British’.

For example, in 1926, the English-born Admiral and Governor-General, Earl Jellicoe, contributed an introduction to a popular study of New Zealand history in which he noted:

...only between two and two and a half percent of the population of today are of foreign extraction. This certainly constitutes one of the reasons for the exceedingly strong spirit of loyalty to the Mother Country which is strikingly evident in the Dominion.

Other histories, such as those written by A. J. Harrop, published in the late 1920s, expressed the view that most visitors to New Zealand receive ‘the impression that it is a country quite as British as the British isles’ and that New Zealanders ‘themselves are inclined to take the fact for granted and assume that the British colonisation of New Zealand was a perfectly simple and inevitable phenomenon’. It is no wonder then that New Zealand historians have argued that ‘few colonies’ could have begun ‘under more auspicious circumstances’ than theirs.

There was no doubt that for New Zealanders, New Zealand was the ‘favoured son’ of the ‘pater-familias’. Australia, however, was, according to New Zealand writers, not so fortunate. Australia was hindered in any claim for equal ‘Britishness’ apparently by the less than savoury addition of Irish and convict populations; New Zealand historians asserted their superior familial position by constantly reminding their readers of this lapse. In such ‘myth-history’, writes James Belich, terms such as ‘select-stock’ and ‘racial harmony’ were ‘both used to distinguish New Zealand from Australia’. For New Zealand, Empire loyalty was such that, at the time of the implementation of the Statute of Westminster, New

52 Ibid. Author’s Preface.
53 A. L. McLeod, op. cit., p. 7.
Zealand remained somewhat aloof from other Dominions; the concern of citizens was not for themselves, but rather that the resultant constitutional changes would hasten the dissolution of the Empire. A certain self-satisfaction is apparent in the many writings that emphasise Britishness in New Zealand histories. For example, the historian A. J. McLeod, writing in 1968, stresses that New Zealand was:

... a free settlement rather than a convict settlement and was unattended by the stultifying effects of a military oligarchy, a sullen work force, and a controlling bureaucracy located in a hemisphere distant. Having to contend with none of the severe natural conditions encountered by the settlers of Virginia, New England and Botany Bay, encouraged by the entrepreneurial interest of the New Zealand Company, supported by the spiritual and material capital of the Church Missionary Society and its minions, and defended by the British Crown, few colonies can have begun under more auspicious circumstances.

Summarising the consensus of much recent writing, P. G. McHugh notes that that 'historically and historiographically, the relation of Australian settler society to the sovereignty to the Crown – that is, the State – has been regarded as more problematic and ambivalent than in New Zealand'. As hinted at by McLeod, Australia had a more complex relationship with Great Britain, one that mirrored the complexities and ramifications of her convict-based and multi-faceted settlement. This is, of course, reflected in the historiography of Australia and Empire. Historians seeking to position Imperial contexts in the way that New Zealand historians have done have had to qualify their conclusions by a nascent radical nationalism. This force cannot be ignored in the desire to make simple an argument for the dominance of Empire loyalty. Epitomised in such late nineteenth-century popular newspapers as the weekly Bulletin, expressions of an Australian national identity independent of Great
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Britain must be acknowledged. Later texts, such as *Out Of Empire: The British Dominion of Australia* have examined, for example, the 'derivative' and 'dependent' nature of Australia's and Australians' relationship with the Mother Country.64 However, perhaps the most pertinent and revealing study of the loyalty between Australia and her Motherland in this period was the 1933 edition of the *Cambridge History of the British Empire*. There were sixteen contributors to the Australian volume of this edition, eleven of whom were members of the Imperial Brotherhood of the Round Table, an organization devoted to imperial federation and to the sustaining of Empire.65 The preface to this volume explains the underpinning idea that the history that 'the history of both Dominions takes a special character from this comparatively free development of English life transplanted to coasts and islands on the other side of the world'.66 This book was later criticised by H.V. Evatt for its apparent 'complacent affirmation of the perspective of the educated Anglophile elite'. For the majority of commentators, however it was considered appropriate that such a major historical survey at this time should reflect Australian ties to Empire, as this loyalty on the part of transplanted Britons was thought to reflect the 'special character...of English life'.67 Although a detailed reading of those scholarly works is not the focus of this study, it is clear that where the precise issue to be examined is high art, official taste and their synonymous associations with the ruling class, then the unquestioned model was that provided by Britain. However much 'Australian working-class and radical voices rejected' any 'consolidation of imperial federation', this British model was implemented in Australia by an

65 Stuart Macintyre, 'Australia and the Empire', in Robin W. Winks, op. cit., p. 171.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., p. 172.
'Anglophile elite'. As members of this Anglophile elite, the Trustees of the NAGNSW saw that their loyalty was to Great Britain and Empire and their duty was to remind Sydneysiders of the great heritage of which they were a part. As far as they were concerned, their primary responsibility was to express this claim through acquisitions, exhibitions and aesthetics. As Donald Horne has expressed it:

So the principal national myth of Australia was that, as members of the British race, they [the Australian people] were part of God's plan for civilising the world. Their principal national legends were of audacious British struggles for freedom...and of the incomparable contributions of the British to the advance of humankind....

The relationship was almost, but not quite, one-sided. This study reveals very little in the way of the Motherland reciprocating the artistic devotion lavished upon her by her Antipodean Dominions. According to Horne, Australia and New Zealand were convinced that 'in the culture industries, Britain was the centre of endeavour in matters of scholarship, the intellect and the arts'. He was correct also in acknowledging that the relationship could be mutually satisfying, writing that 'in the Empire days, Britain gained honour from the allegiance of so many colonies, and the colonies gained honour from their allegiance to the splendour of Britain'.

For both Australia and New Zealand the quality of art to be displayed in their National Galleries was described, in the words of Sir Robert Stout as 'one test of our civilisation' and as such, fine art was asserted as a cultural value beyond national boundaries. For the National Galleries of Australia and New Zealand, the
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transference of British models in art was central to their mission of identifying with, and also illustrating, that cultural alliance. As Tony Bennett, a leading theorist of Museology, has recently written, in the case of a new society:

The nation is historicized only by proxy, only to the degree that it takes a part in and joins the longer and deeper histories of Europe.... [It is a past, which refers itself to, and seeks anchorage and support in, the deeper pasts of Europe.]  

The ultimate authority for the artistic process within this achievement of history by proxy was the Royal Academy of Arts, London. Recognition of its authority by those in the out-posts of Empire provided the vehicle by which audiences in New Zealand and Australia could be included within the British Empire, as if it were a 'divinely sponsored phenomenon By Appointment to God'.

As Hewison has asserted, for National institutions, art works are selected for 'their source of aesthetic pleasure, emotional response, historical knowledge, but above all, cultural meaning. They represent a society’s significance, and as such, they are priceless'. Certainly this was the case with the NAGNSW. The Gallery's central purpose, as an institution devoted to disclosing both historical and cultural meaning, can be seen in the following anecdote told by Donald Horne about his visits to the Gallery in the 1920s and 30s:

When we went to the Art Gallery [NAGNSW] the imperative was to display reverence to nineteenth century, mainly British, academic painting, since the Art Gallery was comprehensively stocked with it. Above all, my substantial respect for the Gallery was reinforced because at our house we had the four plump volumes of The Story of the British Nation, illustrated by all the famous academy paintings of British history and two of these, 'The Defence of Rorke's Drift' and 'Chaucer at the Court of Edward III' were in the Gallery.
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73 James Morris, Pax Britannica: The Climax Of An Empire (London: Penguin, 1968), p.117. See also Ch. 2 of this Thesis.
74 R. Hewison, op. cit., p. 85.
75 Donald Horne, op. cit., p. 206.
The alliance between British history and British academic art on the one hand, and the NAGNSW on the other, is made clear. Both National Galleries played a major role within their communities in reinforcing Empire loyalty. Art often acted, and was seen to act, as a binding mechanism within the community, providing a focus both educative and political. As Museologist Peter Vergo has argued:

> In the acquisition of material, of whatever kind...museums make certain choices determined by judgements as to value, significance or monetary worth; judgements which may derive in part from the system of values peculiar to the institution itself, but which in a more profound sense are also rooted in our education, our upbringing, our prejudices.\(^7^6\)

For both New Zealand and Australia, this Empire allegiance was often expressed before that of national loyalty and choices made over acquisitions, exhibitions, and indeed buildings, reveal the potency of the relationship.

Central to that expression of loyalty was the response of both institutions to the Great War; it was pivotal in the National Galleries’ expression of Empire Loyalty. These institutions reveal that their perception of the Allied victory was a victory for Empire first, and a national victory second. For both the NAGNSW and the NAGNZ, the Allied victory in World War One was the cause of great pride, but this national pride was framed within the ‘family mantle’ of Empire. Their lauded heroic ‘national deeds’ were always positioned within the greater triumph of Empire.

Ken Inglis’ recent publication, *Sacred Places*, reminds his readers by the title given to one of the chapters, ‘Soldiers of the Queen’, that Australians fought first for Empire. This chapter includes several examples of war memorial inscriptions throughout Australia that make the precedence of Empire obvious.\(^7^7\) In Goulburn, for example, visitors to one of its memorials can read, that ‘They Died For Love of the

---

\(^7^6\) Peter Vergo (Ed.), *op. cit.*, p.2.

Motherland’. More poetically, in Queensland the inscription announces that ‘They Heard The Empire’s Call Dear Motherland To Shield’. 78 It is important to note that when these memorials were erected, the assertion of Australia’s position within the Empire was considered more ‘national’, that is, more patriotic than any assertion of a separate nationhood. Inglis argues that ‘even the word nation might refer to the Empire’; he cites examples such as the war memorials in Geelong and Castlemaine, where Empire sentiment is evoked in such mottos as ‘One Flag, One Nation, One Destiny’ and notes that ‘on each monument a lion embodies that trinity’. 79

A significant illustration of these countries’ allegiance to, and celebration of, the imperial triumph in the aftermath of the First World War can be seen in decisions to alter the public face of the official art institutions of both Sydney and Wellington. Public commemorations in the form of monuments were common particularly when institutions made use of ‘national’ nomenclature. National Galleries, therefore, were seen as most suitable sites for this focus of celebration. The plans, for the new NAGNZ begun in 1919, soon generated discussions over how the Gallery could best serve the role of war memorial. As early as January 1919 there were moves to align the proposed new National Gallery with plans for a ‘national memorial of New Zealand’s war effort’. 80 By August of the same year the press was reporting that the Mayor of Wellington, Mr J. P. Luke was ‘in favour of a National Art Gallery being a fitting memorial’. 81 At the opening of the September 1920 NZAFA exhibition, its President, Mr T. Shailer Weston, also addressed the question of what would best constitute a suitable memorial. He argued that ‘the finest memorial they could have

78 Ibid., p.46.
79 Ibid., p.47.
80 Minute Book, Council Meeting, NZAFA, 29. 1.1919.
81 The Evening Post, Wellington, 28. 8.1919. Mr Luke was also reported as having been in favour of a “concrete highway running through the two islands” but was convinced that “there should be a fitting memorial in Wellington” and that “erecting a National Art Gallery would be a fitting memorial”.
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Fig. 4. Gilbert Bayes, *Offerings of War*. 
Photo courtesy of Suzanne Carruthers
would be a national church’ but conceded that as there ‘were many religious
communities in New Zealand’ that would be too complicated. However, next to
religion he thought the ‘glorification of art was one of the finest methods of
commemorating any great national deed’.

A sub-committee was formed in 1919 to work toward the establishment of a
New Zealand National Gallery. One of the arguments used to support such a project
was that the War had heightened a sense of Empire interdependence. The committee
argued that:

In the near future great works of art in painting and sculpture are
sure to be executed by the leading artists of Great Britain and of
the Allied countries depicting and commemorating the gallant
deeds of the Allied soldiers including New Zealanders. Some of
these works will likely be presented to us in gratitude for the
assistance rendered by our soldiers and civilians. We know the
warm feeling that exists in the old country has intensified a
hundredfold since the beginning of the War....

The report also expressed the hope that ‘even more tangible tokens of appreciation
may be forthcoming from art institutions on the other side of the world’.

The NAGNSW also made decisions to commemorate the War and, in the
immediate aftermath, the Trustees’ choices in determining which type of images
were best suited to a ‘national’ collection at that time are revealing. Again, through
reference to the central authority, the London Royal Academy, the Empire came
first. It was considered appropriate that commissions be made to have portraits
painted of ‘British Generals’ as the Trustees were ‘desirous of obtaining records of
distinguished officers who commanded Divisions of the Australian Imperial Forces
during the wars’. Three portraits of Australian and British Generals were
commissioned in 1918. James Quinn was to paint General Birdwood in London.
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83 Minute Book, Sub-Committee for the establishment of a New Zealand National Art Gallery, NZAFA, 2.1.1919.
84 Ibid. There were no instances of any ‘tangible tokens of appreciation’ that eventuated.
John Longstaff (also in London) was to paint General Monash and, in Sydney, Florence Rodway was commissioned to paint a posthumous portrait of General Bridges. In addition, two portraits of French Generals were commissioned and 'arrangements [were] being made by Trustee representatives to place the commissions with prominent French portrait painters in Paris'. Consequently, portraits of Marshal Foch and General Pau were completed.  

It was not considered of major importance to acquire images which illustrated Australian subjects. Under the heading The War and Australian Art the 1918 Trustees’ Annual report to the NSW Legislative Assembly identified the problem confronting the Gallery in acquiring such works:

In order that records, other than photographic ones, might be retained of war incidents, the Trustees issued, through the press and by circular letters to art bodies, invitations to artists in Australia to submit sketches or paintings of incidences illustrating the activities of the Australian Forces in Australia. The response, however, was unsatisfactory, owing principally to the War Precautions enforced by the Commonwealth Government.

This was surprising, as the account William Moore gave of Australian artists at work in the war zones during the Great War describes a rich source of images. Moore’s account included references to such Australian artists as G. C. Benson and Frank Crozier who produced drawings for The Anzac Book, and noted also the later release of Ellis Silas’ book, Crusading, which contained a ‘valuable collection of drawings’. Perhaps the Gallery knew that the major artists and subjects had already been deployed by the Australian War Memorial. By 1915, artists such as George Lambert had been commissioned to record major Australian epics such as the
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ANZAC landing. Only in one case were the Trustees successful in acquiring pictures of Australians at War. In 1918 the Gallery acquired five works by one of 'the most inspiring examples...of the combatant artists', Bombardier Napier Waller. These were simply recorded in the Annual Report as '5 Examples (War Pictures)', which cost the Gallery £65/17/-.  

In 1919, the war still held centre stage in Gallery exhibitions, and an exhibition of French War Art was held at the NAGNSW for the 'benefit of the widows of wounded artists and their families'. Lists of purchases from this exhibition showed that the preferred subject matter for these works was either heroic romanticism, or straightforward war narratives. These were often 'sanitised' views of the war, which would not disturb the spectators or unleash any unwanted criticism of either the British Government or military leadership. The Trustees purchased five works from the exhibition for their collection. One, Georges Scott's *Cavalry Charge* was, at £250, by far the most expensive work purchased that year. Another was *Veteran's Advice*, also by Scott, at £160. The other three works were Paul Roblin's *The Blue Devil*, Lucien Jonas' *Eve Of Battle* and Andre Devambez' *Four Etchings*. *Cavalry Charge* offered a heroic image in the Romantic tradition, but *Veteran's Advice* is a more interesting work, its narrative suggesting a parallel of Australian - British relations during the Great War. The subject is a conversation, in which the senior soldier is offering paternalistic advice to a raw but enthusiastic novice.

The Trustees did not apparently regard the purchase of overtly Australian images depicting the distinctive Australian contribution to the war effort as highly as the purchase of British and even French works. The reporting of the purchase of
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Australian war paintings that year was listed third in the Annual report to the Legislative Assembly.\footnote{NAGNSW Annual Report to the NSW Legislative Assembly for the year 1919, p.3.}

Perhaps the major ‘war works’ were those which were not originally commissioned as such. Originally part of a beautification scheme, eventually undertaken in 1919, two huge equestrian bronzes were commissioned by the Gallery much earlier in 1915. The sculptor, an Englishman Gilbert Baynes, had been asked to provide these works, which would act as a focal point for the entrance to the Gallery. The scale of the works and the artist’s English domicile, in addition to other factors, meant that these artworks, *Offerings of Peace* and *Offerings Of War* took several years to complete. Delivery was then further delayed as the Gallery Board briefly postponed the bronze casting, due to an escalation in cost.

The Trustees of the NAGNSW took great pride, however, when their newly completed memorial *Offerings of War* was exhibited at the London Royal Academy in 1918 before being shipped to Australia. The new owners regarded their inclusion in a London Academy exhibition as confirmation of their good judgement and aesthetic expertise. Indeed it was also regarded as a major cultural coup for Sydney. The Academy exhibition inclusion was proudly recorded in the NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly.\footnote{NAGNSW Annual Report to the NSW Legislative Assembly for the Year 1919.} It was inevitable, perhaps, given the timing, type and title of the sculptures at this time that the works began to be read as war commemorations. Considered by Gallery Trustees to be of far greater significance than mere pieces of ‘art’, these works in the style of Graeco-Roman equestrian sculpture were, coincidentally, replicas of ancient models of a nation’s experiences of war. They were by far the most expensive works purchased, costing the Gallery the comparatively huge sum of £4,920. The presence of these works as
the first images presented to visitors of the Gallery, indicates the aesthetic and monumental values the Trustees considered appropriate for such a site at that period in Australia’s history.

Interestingly, there is nothing of the Australian vernacular in any of the images purchased to commemorate the War. The Trustees had complained to their Government that their attempts to acquire such images had not been satisfactorily resolved. However, the conclusion must be that the Trustees did not see the acquisition of assertively Australian images as their priority in depicting the war experience, which Australians had shared, for Sydney audiences. As we have seen, their immediate project had been to secure portraits of British – and even French - military leaders. There is no record of any comparable plan for Australian subjects. Any criticism that this might be inappropriate seems not to have been anticipated. For these men, as for most Australians, Australia fought as part of the British Forces; her commitment was to Great Britain and Empire. By possessing images of British and also Australian Generals, the NAGNSW could then represent both as their own, within the collection of a British Antipodean Dominion. The War could then be viewed in much the same way as Donald Horne described a visit to the NAGNSW, where the lines between Australia and British history were ever blurred. Theirs was a collection meant to illustrate a shared history, one in which the Australian was positioned within Great Britain and the Empire.

The position of these Dominion galleries was, therefore, much more powerful than any that might have been achieved by their simply serving as the sites of art collections. Their power and authority was formed by a combination of three main components. First, was the traditionally historical role of art galleries emanating from and formed within a secular tradition. This tradition invested galleries with the
weight of centuries of knowledge and culture. Parallel to this, however, and no less important, was the power of the liminal experience (such as that described earlier in this Chapter) within the gallery precincts. This liminal experience added to the secular in an almost religious process of edification. This then, combined with the secular, educative facet of gallery experience, was believed to produce a most powerful effect upon the viewer. These effects were not regarded by gallery Trustees as specious in any way, but rather to be worthy effects flowing from the highest moral and spiritual forces. The second important component was the authority vested in those individuals entrusted with the gallery’s direction. Such power over the selection, as well as rejection, of works cannot be underestimated for it was in the Trustee’s hands that the visible culture was articulated. The third component lay in the colonial condition. As important as the other two aspects, the oft-repeated expressed desire to be seen as British, to be part of the British world’s civil society, underpinned the formation and articulation of Sydney’s and Wellington’s visual culture. The existence of these national art institutions was regarded as a vital component in that presence.

It can be seen then that the Galleries were instituted with a clear purpose to educate the community about art and through that education to provide moral and spiritual transformation. They also served as a reminder of cultural heritage and loyalty. Just as apparent is the nature of the liminal experience, which the Galleries sought to make available, one which drew on classical scholarship, narrative and imagery. Both the museology of the Galleries and their early attitudes to collecting, particularly during and immediately following the Great War, emphasise that the nature of the aesthetic they wished to promote was essentially British. Britishness was the fundamental basis of their existence. It remains to be seen how this emphasis
on Britishness was expressed in the model pursued by the Galleries and how it was both imported from without and generated from within. A vital factor in the combination of these three components was the leadership provided by the London Royal Academy.
Fig. 5. The Royal Academy of Art, London.

This photo is a copy of the one used as a full-page illustration in William Moore, *History of Australian Art From the Earliest Known Art of the Continent to the Art of To-Day* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934), p. 23.
CHAPTER TWO

‘THE MODEL’: THE PERVADING PRESENCE OF THE LONDON ROYAL ACADEMY IN THE NATIONAL GALLERY ART PRACTICE OF THE TWO DOMINIONS

‘Everything in a work of art must accord’. 1

‘Painting is a regularly taught Profession’. 2

The London Royal Academy of Arts was the epitome of the nineteenth century British artistic canon, and for the ‘official’ art institutions of both Australia and New Zealand it remained the model of artistic practice until the middle of the twentieth century. Regardless of the extent to which other art institutions and artistic practices were later to challenge (and ultimately supplant) the artistic mores of the academies throughout Europe in the first decades of the twentieth century, the London Royal Academy remained the guide for Great Britain, and hence the Dominions, regarding what could constitute art in Anglo-Saxon culture in the period between the wars. Certainly the notion of what constituted Britishness in art was evident in the ideology of the London Royal Academy. 3 Not only was this institution the means by which ‘Britishness’ could be made portable and transferred to the Dominions, but it also became the vehicle by which that successful transference

2 The words of English nineteenth century landscape painter, John Constable, used in the 1937 Academy exhibition catalogue. In his review of this 1937 exhibition, Douglas Goldring remarked that it was obvious that for most of the exhibitors, such a reminder was not necessary, as most ‘revealed so rigid a training that it appears to have over-come their own originality’.
could be advertised through the creation of a Dominion-based, yet 'official', art institution. As such, the London Royal Academy was the indisputable model for judging what was acceptable, suitable art for the local Antipodean National art institutions. Just as importantly, these Dominion gallery Trustees were aware that by adherence to this London academic model their art institutions were then also able claim membership of the most venerable, indeed ancient, tradition of western European art history. This chapter examines the nature of the ideology evident in the London Royal Academy exhibitions, its relationship with art practices in the Dominions of Australia and New Zealand between the wars and the ramifications of that closely held relationship for Dominion art practice.

The connection between both Dominion National Galleries and the London Royal Academy was one that existed from the inception of both Dominion institutions. The durability of this alliance was not surprising given the wider cultural insecurities of the Dominions and the central position held by the London Royal Academy in Great Britain. However critical certain British art audiences became of the Academy in the later 1920s and 1930s, very little criticism can be found in either New Zealand or Australia of English academic models within that same period. The allegiance of these two Dominion art institutions to the London Academy was perhaps to be expected, given both countries’ special relationship with Great Britain, and their desire to see ‘Britannia’ re-created in the South Pacific. However, it should be appreciated that the consistent and almost slavish adherence to this one artistic model had enormous implications for art practice in both
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4 Distinguished British art critic, Douglas Goldring, writing a review of the 1934 Royal Academy Exhibition related a conversation with ‘the soundest and most brilliant of our art critics’ who complained ‘when I think how many years of my life I have spent in girding against this institution’. Douglas Goldring, ‘The Royal Academy 1934’, Studio, vol. 108, 1934, p. 3. Criticisms such as these, especially when made by eminent men like as Goldring, were rare indeed.
Dominion devotion to the London Royal Academy was both a simple and a complex matter. Simple in the sense that it was obvious that the Academy, acknowledged as the centre of British art production, would be the first choice for a colonial model, but complex in that this was not simply a matter of straightforward transference. Bound up with this allegiance was the desire to be British; not only to have the same artistic values but also to be seen in fact as British. One of the most obvious ways that this desire could be made evident was in the most direct way possible, to illustrate directly those same values.

As the central British artistic institution, the Academy was transferred from London to the Dominions as the required model for acceptable art practice. It also became the vehicle through which its same values could be assigned to the Dominions. In clarifying these values, Neville Meaney, in the introduction to Under New Heavens, describes the 'literary humanism' underpinning Matthew Arnold's interpretation of culture in Culture and Anarchy. Arnold identified culture with the 'higher', including 'spiritual, moral, intellectual and aesthetic traditions of the Western world'. According to Meaney:

Culture in this guise was a critique of industrialisation and technology. It affirmed enduring values against bourgeois philistinism and democratic vulgarity. It saw its task as the refining of civilization which it equated with material progress.6

This role was also applicable to the London Royal Academy and hence, to its satellites in the Pacific. The pursuit, and illustration, of the highest artistic ideals, ideals that were the result of centuries of technical achievement, were at the heart of Academy principles. As John Constable asserted, in a much-quoted dictum, the
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5 See chapters 4 and 5 of this study.
Academy honoured the belief that art was a ‘regularly taught profession’.  

As demonstrated in Chapter One, the cultural under-pinning of the National Galleries of Sydney and New Zealand was each country’s determination to claim Britishness. Both Galleries were governed by a social and mercantile elite self-consciously British in outlook, one which very quickly articulated and presented a cultural politic. This was formed by two primary impulses. The first, as noted above, was the deep desire of the majority of the populace of Australia and New Zealand to be positioned within the cultural framework of Great Britain. This was to prove a mutually reinforcing relationship for these new societies, one that relied more on the position of the Academy as the supreme central authority in English culture than upon its role as a mere purveyor of art, although this too was important. As Philip Dodd has argued, ‘inseparable from their power to represent themselves and others, the dominant English had the power...to say what the national culture had been and was’.

The London Royal Academy, as the absolutely dominant institution in the artistic community, provided the artistic cultural reference point, vital for the identification of national culture. The second impulse can be described as a brand of Pacific-Anglo-Saxon nationalism, with each Gallery established primarily to represent and illustrate an emerging and successful, ‘quasi-British’ nation. As the Royal Academy was closely associated with the British aristocracy and upper classes, this mission of representation was naturally entrusted to the colonial counterparts, and governing committees were drawn from the agrarian, financial and
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7 The words of English nineteenth century landscape painter John Constable, used as the Foreword to the Annual Royal Academy Exhibition, reported in Studio, Vol. 114, 1937, p. 3.
8 See Appendix J.
mercantile elites. These individuals, as Trustees and Councillors of the two institutions, were entrusted with the task of illustrating each new nation’s claim to cultural membership of Great Britain. As James Morris wrote of the English colonists, ‘their ingrained deference towards the manners and customs of the English upper classes did not evaporate when they unpacked their bags in Queensland or Manitoba’.11

In the art world, nuances of class were exhibited in countless ways but perhaps the most commonly used word by members of the artistic elite to indicate acceptable class and knowledge was the word ‘connoisseur’. In this context connoisseurship was, as described by Pierre Bourdieu, an expression of a system of domination which existed in all areas of cultural practice’ and, ‘in a more general sense, taste’.12 Bourdieu has argued that this ‘competence’ which ‘derives from slow familiarization’ is an ‘art’, which ‘cannot be transmitted solely by precept or prescription’.13 Connoisseurship for the national galleries of Sydney and New Zealand was synonymous with upper class claims to exclusive, ‘higher’, artistic judgement. Again, the model was the Royal Academy, where the word was used consistently to denote those individuals of culture, able to be trusted with the judgement of a work or to determine the place of particular artists or of art movements generally. This was an entitlement apparently exclusive to the upper classes, whether they were formed by new wealth (as in Australia and New Zealand) or by British hereditary titles, often derived also from new wealth emanating from early 19th century. The words ‘connoisseur’ and ‘connoisseurship’ were used

throughout the Minutes of both Galleries, typically to assert the claims of individual Trustees, as those persons knowledgeable and intimately familiar with the British and European art centres, and, therefore, qualified to pass judgement on the higher realms of art.

The London Royal Academy had, for most of its history, catered to an audience and clientele made up of those claiming the title of connoisseur. However, social and economic changes brought about in the aftermath of the First World War and the Great Depression, combined with subsequent changes to the Academy’s traditional client-base among the British upper classes, caused the Academy considerable anxiety that its traditional patronage by the aristocracy might be decreasing. Several commentaries upon the Royal Academy written during the nineteen twenties and thirties warned the individual artist, and the Academy itself, that times were changing and that these changes were not necessarily positive. Little faith was held that any rise in popular (i.e. middle and working-class) participation would be beneficial to the Academy. London critic, C. Reginald Grundy, when reviewing the 1922 Academy summer exhibition, wrote that ‘the parting of the ways between artist and public is a serious matter [and that] he [the artist] is catering for the disappearing rich’. Further, looking forward, Grundy asserted that as the artist’s ‘bread and cheese is dependent on popular support his future outlook is even more ominous. The power of the purse will have largely passed to the working classes’. In 1929 Grundy again warned that ‘the leading institution representing British contemporary art, the Royal Academy is passing through parlous times’. This problematic situation Grundy believed, was due to ‘heavy taxation, the purchase of

motors and the substitution of bijou flats for spacious town mansions'.\textsuperscript{15} By the 1930s the warnings that the London Academy needed to take heed of changing markets had apparently become a reality; for at least one art expert there were possibilities in this new, un-tapped art market. In 1930 the world-leading London art dealer, Sir Joseph Duveen, then one of the most respected (but also feared) figures in the art world, advised that ‘these people [the middle and working classes] have got to be educated.... I believe there is an immense middle-class market for modern pictures which has not yet been touched’.\textsuperscript{16} In 1935 the President of the Royal Academy, Sir William Llewellyn in defining the policy for the selection of works for its exhibitions, reminded his committee that ‘it must be kept in mind, besides the interest of connoisseurs, the comprehension of the ordinary visitor, who seeks there [at the exhibitions] a ready means of forming a personal taste in contemporary art’.\textsuperscript{17} However, the arrival of the ‘ordinary visitor’ was not welcome at all, for any possible erosion of the premier position of the Academy, with its associations with ‘high’ art and ‘high’ society, was a source of grave discomfort to Academy members. As will be shown below, often in response, members adopted a siege mentality in defence of the Academy ideology and sought to deny entrance to those who were seen to be threatening to it.\textsuperscript{18} For the London artistic elite and its satellites in New Zealand and Australia, this sense of taste under siege was to be pivotal in shaping both acquisitions and exhibitions policies. Implicit within this attitude was the sense of protecting ‘Britishness’, with its assumed core belief in beauty, idealism and tradition in art, against increasingly vocal opponents.

Dear to the heart of most art connoisseurs in Australia and New Zealand was

\textsuperscript{18} See chapter six of this thesis, \textit{The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism.}
the conviction that, through careful attention and imitation, all that was implicit within the artistic, historical traditions of the Royal Academy could be directly transplanted to the South Pacific. Any links between the colonies and the ‘Old Country’ in the period between the wars were cherished by the art worlds of both Australia and New Zealand. The ability to demonstrate this shared aesthetic enabled the Trustees in both New Zealand and Australia to justify claims to one more tradition shared with Great Britain, a tradition which Trustees believed to be synonymous with the highest acknowledged civilization – the Academic tradition itself. This Academic tradition, with its primary emphasis on draughtsmanship, technique and ‘mastery’, was not, of course, limited only to Great Britain, but the demonstration of these values enabled new societies to make a further claim. This was the claim that membership of a tradition of high culture could be enlarged, to include European masters of the taught technique such as those of the Italian Renaissance, or, even earlier aesthetic models, such as those of ancient Greece and Rome. Such affiliations, of course, advertised the possession of artistic moral superiority, with emphasis on virtues such as nobility and refinement. To be able to assert and then demonstrate such an inheritance through acquisitions and exhibitions was a very attractive prospect indeed for young countries apparently lacking, in British eyes, a history.

The deference of the Dominions’ national art institutions toward the Academy can be gauged by the importance placed on the word ‘academy’. This dated from the earliest years. For example, at the annual meeting of the newly formed New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts in 1888, there was a motion to change the name of the Academy, but ‘someone, perhaps the President, preferred to retain
the designation of Academy'. The decision to retain the use of the title was not surprising, even though later it was criticized as being ‘pretentious and unrealistic’. In that place and time the title was synonymous with everything the first members of the Council hoped to achieve, in terms of the prestige of their institution. Any news of the London Academy, its exhibitions or members, held intense interest to the art institutions and public in Australia and New Zealand. For example, when, in 1936, Dame Laura Knight was elected ‘a full Academician of the Royal Academy’ (previously having held the title of Associate Member) a motion was passed by the Committee for the National Gallery of New Zealand that ‘the Chairman be asked to send a letter...expressing the council’s pleasure on hearing of her election’. The interest was not only in Academy events in England. When, in 1934 William Moore published his two volume Story of Australian Art: From the Earliest Known Art of the Continent to the Art of Today, the chapter ‘Artists Abroad’ reads as a litany of Australian artists and their success at the Royal Academy in London, where, it was acknowledged that ‘Australia’s association with the Royal Academy’ had ‘extended well over a century’. Moore’s reverence for this body was indicated by the inclusion of a full-page photograph of the LRA (see Fig. 5).

For the LRA, its abiding faith in traditional values in art was not only apparent in the choice of works selected for exhibitions, for instance, but was often stated quite explicitly in homilies printed on the front page of Academy exhibition catalogues. Such a homily can be found in the 1937 Academy exhibition catalogue, where the salutary words of Constable already noted above, were used to remind the

---

20 Ibid., p.23.
21 Minute book, 6.4.1936, Committee for the National Gallery of New Zealand. Dame Laura Knight was the first woman R.A to be elected a full member since 1802.
22 William Moore, op. cit., p.4.
audience that painting was not so much a matter of talent as of good teaching and
diligent application of that teaching. This was a clear warning to any emerging
artists, but particularly those who might have been seduced by modernist leanings,
that painting was not a skill which could be acquired without reference to historical
methodologies.\textsuperscript{23} Another such instruction to audiences appeared on the cover of the
1934 exhibition catalogue. Attributed to Academy artist, Mr G. F. Watts, it
announced that ‘Everything in a work of art must accord’.\textsuperscript{24} Again, this warning was
directed at modernists, artists for whom, according to Academicians, everything did
not ‘accord’ and whose aesthetics were not based upon formal academic principles.
These quotations, selected so carefully by Academy elders, were more than mere
instructive ‘hints’ for audiences about to enter the Academy portals; they were
statements of what art \textit{should} be. For Britain's colonial out-posts the import of these
missives was not lost and it was inevitable that these unambiguous statements of
artistic ‘morals’ also shaped the essential artistic ethic shaping Australian and New
Zealand arts practices.

The invisible umbilical cord that existed between Great Britain, New
Zealand and Australia appeared to be stronger at its juncture with the infant colonies.
Any public reassurances from a British authority of either Australia’s or New
Zealand’s ability to make good its claim for inclusion within British culture was
eagerly reported in the colonial press. At the opening of the 1933 New Zealand
Academy of Fine Art Exhibition, Lord Bledisloe, in his welcoming address,
announced that discussions were underway, as ‘the result of correspondence


\textsuperscript{24} When the exhibition was reviewed, it was noted that “the motto of the present exhibition, a
quoteation of G.F Watts is quite frank and explicit”. Watts had been a significant member of the Royal
Academy.
between the President of the Royal Academy and myself to determine whether the Council of the Royal Academy could not recognise with some distinction, of an equal value with the title Royal Academician, the merits of outstanding Dominion artists.\textsuperscript{25} Not surprisingly, this suggestion was reported as being ‘received enthusiastically by the audience’.\textsuperscript{26} However, as there is no further mention of it in either the NZAFA Minutes, nor in any later press articles, it seems that the matter was not as eagerly pursued by the Royal Academy in London. Certainly, the matter would not have lapsed due to any lack of enthusiasm in New Zealand. The real reason behind the London Royal Academy’s failure to take up Lord Bledisloe’s hint may be glimpsed in the somewhat superior tone habitually adopted toward the two former colonies and in the persistent references to their alleged lack of refinement. For example, a 1924 \textit{Connoisseur} article had pondered ruefully on the effect in Britain of ‘the inrush of visitors from the Dominions’ with their ‘unsophisticated ideas’.\textsuperscript{27}

In spite of British condescension towards both national gallery managements, both eagerly pursued the prestige of being able to illustrate, through exhibitions and acquisitions, close liaisons with the art ‘mecca’ of London. Indeed, domestic art was constantly assessed within the institutions themselves and in the press, in the light of the London Academy model. Therefore, the need to establish and maintain successful procedural mechanisms by which works could be procured from London, and in particular from the Royal Academy, was vital. For these colonial galleries, whose ideal model was thousands of miles away in London, there were major logistical problems concerning primary aspects of arts management.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Evening Post}, Wellington, 5.10.1933.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
One constant source of anxiety lay in the purchase of works. Never a simple procedure, physical distance and difficult, often drawn-out communications created enormous problems for Trustees. Keeping themselves informed of which works were to come on the market, which artists were to be hung in the annual Academy show, and which artists were to be regarded as the most prestigious, occupied much Trustee time. Also, the possibility of missing out on the acquisition of coveted works - when and if they could be afforded - was of on-going concern. Communication, at best, was a lengthy process and art journals, when they did arrive, could be several months old.

Another constant pre-occupation of the Trustees of both institutions was the determining of the best methods by which the eminent position of their galleries could be reinforced in their governments’ and publics’ eyes. More often than not, this seemed to be best achieved, Trustees thought, through the continual display of an intimate familiarity with English Academy’s aesthetics, art criticism and debates. The ability to parade close associations with the ‘Mother Country’ lent vital cultural assurance to both the institutions and to the Trustees themselves. Also, it was felt that without the presence of these English works, the official art institutions of Sydney and Wellington would not be able to offer guidance to domestic artists concerning the ideals toward which they should aspire in their own art practice.

How was the value of a painting offered for sale to be gauged? How were the institutions to be kept informed of which coveted artist’s works were on the Academy line for sale? For both Galleries, the most commonly used method for keeping abreast on these issues was to use their own Trustees when travelling in Europe, either whilst on holiday or occasionally when dispatched especially for the

---

28 See Chapter 4 of this study. In particular, one should note the NAGNSW chase for a self-portrait by William Orpen R.A.
task, to meet with other curators, view collections and exhibitions. Thus the Trustees could ascertain which artists’ works should be purchased - with the matter of cost always a priority. Even though most of these travelling Trustees had little ‘hands-on’ experience, those who did go, (such as NAGNSW Board member James McGregor) were considered connoisseurs, often on the strength of their possessing considerable personal collections of their own.\(^{29}\) Indeed, these purchasing trips abroad were used to purchase works for themselves as well as the Gallery collections.\(^{20}\) These Trustees, felicitously enrolled as connoisseurs, did not at any time appear to have felt doubts about their ability to acquire significant works for their national collections. That these Trustees acted with such confidence was not surprising. They presumed that they possessed all the necessary tools to do so; they were of a social class able to claim connoisseurship and they went directly to the hallowed ground, that of the London Royal Academy, in order to purchase. A purchasing excursion of this kind could have been a hazardous artistic experience, full of pit-falls for the unwary, but only rarely were the results of such expeditions the subject of criticism at home. Only later in the twentieth century would the lack of exposure to other aesthetic ideologies, in addition to their slavish adherence to Academy dictums, cause considerable difficulties for managers of the National Gallery collections of New Zealand and Australia.\(^{31}\)

A rare critique of such buying practices was written in 1932. An unnamed critic, writing in *Art in New Zealand*, recommended that the ‘trustees of our galleries’ make a ‘special visit’ to the locally mounted Murray Fuller exhibition of

\(^{29}\) See chapter three of this study, *Men Who Count – Things That Matter: The Aesthetic Ideal of the Trustees and Directors of the National Galleries of the Two Dominions.*

\(^{30}\) See Appendix J. Also chapter four of this study, *'Oh! To Be In England': Acquisitions.*

\(^{31}\) See chapter six of this study, *The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism.*
Contemporary British Art, to see if 'suitable pictures cannot be purchased here'. 32

This, the writer urged, was better than 'sending doubtful commissioners all the way
to the Old Country' to be confronted by 'the galaxy of art to choose from' and to
'return with pictures that would not be considered by discriminating buyers
elsewhere'. 33 As this exhibition consisted almost entirely of the works of London
Royal Academicians, the purchasing locale may have been different, but not 'the
galaxy of art' from which Trustees would have chosen. 34

The NAGNSW addressed the issue of physical distance in the most direct
way. They appointed advisers who were 'in situ' in London; their artistic credentials
were regarded by these Trustees as being unimpeachable. These highly esteemed
individuals were considered to have a significant knowledge of art - a knowledge
identical to that of the Trustees - and who could, therefore, be trusted both to advise
on proffered works of art, and to purchase on behalf of the institutions. The 1918
Annual Report of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales to the N.S.W.
Legislative Assembly reveals how highly the gallery elite valued 'the task of
keeping, in as direct touch as possible, with the English art world'. The report
complained that 'the war and the closing of the French salons and other exhibitions
added to the difficulty of obtaining works of the best modern painters'. 35 The
Trustees were 'pleased' to add though, that during 1918 'the London representative'
had been able to 'purchase several works by contemporary artists'. 36

The following year a 'London Board of Advice' was established with a 'view
to extending the representation in London'. Not surprisingly, of the four members

32 The writer was unnamed.
33 Art In New Zealand (March 1932), p.219.
34 See chapter 5 in this study, The Very Best in Art: Exhibition Practice as Ideology.
35 1919 Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales for the year
1918 to the Legislative Assembly.
36 The name of the London representative was not revealed in the report.
appointed to this honorary position, two were members of the London Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{37} The third member appointed to the Board was the deeply revered Australian painter, John Longstaff, whose attitudes to art were identical with both the gentlemen from the Royal Academy, and the Australian Gallery Trustees. The 1919 Report to the Legislative Assembly, announced the establishment of the Board and stipulated its powers:

The Board has been given authority to purchase British and foreign works of art up to a certain value without having first to refer to the Trustees as was necessary with one representative only - a method which frequently meant the loss of an important work. It being desirable that the new Board should have full knowledge of the requirements of the Trustees, and of the present collections of work in Australian galleries, the Trustees have arranged for Mr Longstaff to visit Australia to consult with them on various matters pertaining to future purchases of work.\textsuperscript{38}

After only two years in operation this Board was disbanded in 1921, the reasons for which are not recorded. However, it is not difficult to imagine that its closure was indicative of the problems faced when endeavouring to operate such a complex system, which was reliant upon individuals in London who, in their capacity as advisors, did not always place first importance on their assigned tasks from the Dominions. In spite of difficulties in establishing and maintaining individual representation in London, the Trustees regarded such representation as imperative. In 1925 the NAGNSW Trustees complained to the Government, making it clear that they considered having ‘no permanent representative’ in London was ‘very unsatisfactory’. Further, they felt that the matter now was of some ‘considerable urgency’ because the Venice Biennial Exhibition was to be held the following year ‘as well as other opportunities which exist for obtaining examples of

\textsuperscript{37} George Frampton R.A. and Frank Brangwyn R.A.
\textsuperscript{38} The 1919 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly.
representative work'. Consequently, the Director, Mr G. V. Mann, was despatched to Europe to view the Biennial Exhibition and to set up another advisory system in London by which works could be recommended to the Trustees for purchase.40

Just as influential as the 'overseas advisers' in providing access to the 'centre' were the English premier art journals that were available to art audiences both in Australia and New Zealand. Three major art journals dominated the field - the *Royal Academy Illustrated*, the *Studio* and *The Connoisseur*. The Trustees of the NAGNSW subscribed to the *Studio* from 1893, the *Royal Academy Illustrated* from 1895, and *The Connoisseur* from 1901. It is not recorded when the NZAFA first subscribed to the *Royal Academy Illustrated* but issues from the late nineteenth century are to be found in the Academy's library. The enormous influence of these journals in both Australia and New Zealand, as pre-eminent guides for art, artists and aesthetics generally, was reflected, according to Nancy Underhill, 'not only in the acquisitions and in the exhibitions, but also in the writing on art that was published in domestic art journals and the popular press'. The *Studio* was particularly influential. Underhill has argued that, whilst the *Studio*, *The Times* and the Royal Academy were 'incontestable authorities which represented the heart of British art', Australia was 'especially vulnerable to anything in the *Studio* which was arguably the leading English-language art magazine'.41 The very long life of the subscriptions to these journals is but one indication of the seriousness with which their pronouncements were taken by the Trustees of the National art galleries both in Sydney and in Wellington. Critics in both *The Connoisseur* and the *Studio* meticulously reviewed the annual summer exhibitions of the Royal Academy.

39 The 1926 NAGNSW Annual Report for the Year 1925 to the N.S.W Legislative Assembly, p.3.
40 Ibid.
Trustees of the NAGNSW, the NZAFA and later the NZNAG had their attitudes to art (which had been formed by the Academy and the same journals) confirmed by these reviews, the ideals of which were often then reflected in the purchasing and also in the content of local exhibitions.

As Philip Dodd has noted, common to British claims of providing the framework of a national life and culture for Great Britain and the Empire was the creation of a ‘certain institution’ which should ‘define and bear…the national culture’, while also ‘providing the core from which what is of value should be disseminated to the rest of the country’.\(^{42}\) Certainly, the London Royal Academy occupied such a role in Great Britain at the time of this study. Dodd was writing of the National Theatre where ‘the centre of authority…would licence what constituted great drama’ but its parallel in art existed in the London Royal Academy.\(^{43}\) It is not surprising, therefore, to see this central position reflected in histories of British art written in the period between the wars. For example, the Studio special Autumn number of 1930 presented a survey of thirty years of British art.\(^{44}\) Written by Sir Joseph Duveen, this survey asserted that British art, for this author, was centred upon the Academy. In his account, Duveen offered a chronology of the Academy as a whole, and described the importance of its place within British art. The article also recorded the dates and details of those artists who made the transition from ARA to RA or which individuals were admitted to the Academy as ARAs. Such movements within the hierarchy of the London Royal Academy were obviously considered in the England of 1930 to be of sufficient interest and importance to rate a central place in such a ‘survey’ of the history British art. Duveen’s belief that the Royal Academy

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p.20.
\(^{44}\) Sir Joseph Duveen, Bt., ‘Thirty Years of British Art’, *Studio* Special Autumn Number (1930).
still occupied a premier place in modern Britain was also made clear in his choice of
illustrations to support the article. Of the eight colour illustrations, five were either
full Academy members or associate members. Given the authority of such a
journal, written by such a highly regarded author, it was not surprising to see the
Dominion gallery Trustees purchase works reflecting Duveen’s opinion. Work by
Academicians Sir George Clausen, Duncan Grant and the more progressive
Augustus John, were all purchased in 1932 by the NAGNSW.

As neither Gallery had a written ‘mission statement’ or recorded acquisition
policy, the aims and policies of both institutions have to be gauged from other
sources. What is obvious was the common aesthetic understanding that was shared
by the governing circles of the London Royal Academy, the NAGNSW, the NZAFA
and its off-spring, the NZNAG. One such aid, in determining that understanding,
was the article by NAGNSW Director, Will Ashton. Noted in the previous chapter,
the Director of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales, writing in *Art In
Australia*, revealed that the ‘trustees of the National Gallery have a three-fold aim.
First, they wish to promote intellectual approachment. Secondly, they want to
educate public taste. Thirdly, they aim at promoting the progress of historical and
artistic research’ and later in the same article Ashton added ‘we realise we must
constantly stimulate and educate the public to appreciate the very best in art’. All
three components would have found favour with the Gallery’s counter-part in New
Zealand, as well as with the London Royal Academy.

42 The Royal Academicians whose works were illustrated were Augustus John R.A., Ambrose
artists whose work were illustrated but were not Royal Academicians were Wilson Steer, Duncan
Grant and Paul Nash
46 The purchases were Duncan Grant’s *The Road, Sussex*, Augustus John’s *Reverie* and Sir George
Clausen’s *Watson’s Barn*

Three decades earlier, the 1908 Memorandum of Association of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts described that institution’s objects as:

first, to promote the study, practice and cultivation of the fine arts in New Zealand and to encourage the production of works of art by periodical exhibitions, second, to purchase or acquire such paintings, statuary or models as may be deemed suitable for purposes of the Academy and thirdly, to cultivate and advance the Fine Arts in New Zealand.

Again, these were aspirations that would not have been out of place in either London or Sydney. Lord Bledisloe, in one of his addresses given in New Zealand whilst Governor-General, said of a National Gallery ‘it should not only be a receptacle for “old masters”... still less should it be a mere gathering of modern pictures of varying merit and transient popularity but rather a source of unsullied inspiration...to all thoughtful citizens, a pure fountain of sound artistic taste’. Implicit within the Academy Memoranda, Bledisloe’s address and Ashton’s understanding of what constituted ‘the very best in art’, was the assumption that the aesthetic ideal was to be found in the heritage of western European art. Further, that this tradition was one determined primarily by academic rigour.

The public’s expectation of what should form a national Gallery’s collection may be gauged from a letter written to the editor of the Wellington newspaper, the *Evening Post* in 1935 by a Dr R.O. Lochore who lamented that there was only a very ‘doubtful chance’ of ‘ever getting originals’ of ‘old masters’ into the Gallery. He argued that the Directors should be conscious of New Zealand standing at the ‘end of a millennium of an old cultural tradition’ (meaning that of Great Britain) and added that the New Zealand National Gallery ‘cannot wipe out that tradition by simply turning our back on it’. As a way of reinforcing the connection with England,

---

Lochore suggested that the New Zealand National Gallery should, as ‘with the special fields of London’s three main galleries’ adopt the same three divisions of those English galleries. Specifically, ‘One, a gallery of reproductions exemplifying the history of art’, two, a gallery ‘where the works of native artists are admitted after vigorous examination’ and three, a portrait gallery ‘where the question of artistic value stands second to the historical interest of the subject’.\textsuperscript{49} Clearly, for Lochore, as with Ashton, the educational role was seen as paramount and the emulation of the practices of the London galleries was seen as the best means of honouring, and remaining within, the ‘old cultural tradition’.\textsuperscript{50}

Not surprisingly, the consequences of emulating this deeply conservative aesthetic for colonial art were certain to be remarked upon. However, real critical appraisal occurred very rarely. Writing in the \textit{Studio}, the modernist Australian art critic Basil Burdett conceded in 1938 that ‘visitors to Australia are sometimes surprised by the prevailing conservatism of Australian art.... They find work, with comparatively few exceptions, which, would do little violence to the feelings of the more respectable art societies in Britain’.\textsuperscript{51} The rarity of such criticism may be accounted for by the general unpopularity of such statements. In daring to criticise the conservatism of Australian art, Burdett was also attacking the model from which it came. The conservatism that formed one also formed the other.

Readers of the \textit{Royal Academy Illustrated} were given little indication that other ideologies (such as modernism) might exist. Throughout the twenties, reproductions in that journal offered a repetitive litany of the same artists. The works of painters such as George Claussen, Philip Connard (see fig. 21), Lamorna Birch (see fig. 18), Forbes Stanhope, La Thangue, Algernon Talmage, William

\textsuperscript{49} Dr. R.O. Lochore, Letter to the Editor, \textit{Evening Post}, Wellington, (30.4.1935).
\textsuperscript{50} See also chapter six of this study, \textit{The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism}.
Orpen (see figs. 12 and 13), Arnesby Brown (see figs. 16 and 17), John Munnings (see fig. 14), Russell Flint and John Sargent appeared consistently. The only variety offered was in the appearance of Augustus John, usually the object of confusion, derision and controversy. Only three Australian artists appeared more than once. They were Septimus Powers, the expatriate sculptor Bertram Mackennal and George Lambert. However, as most of their works were usually commissioned oils illustrating or commemorating the First World War, it could be argued that their inclusion within such prestigious pages was determined by the shared subject matter, rather than any celebration or recognition of Australian talent or interest in colonial art. These were reproductions of works for English rather than Australian eyes, however much lauded, and the subject for appreciative comment in Australia. Such artists and art work were consequently regarded as models by the NAGNSW Trustees.

There are many examples of the various ways in which particular English models were provided to the Trustees, in both Sydney and New Zealand, and used by them as ‘guidelines’. One such highly regarded model artist was the Royal Academy’s Sir William Orpen, a particularly technically highly-skilled painter, known mainly for his portraits. Runner-up for the position of LRA President in

53 The works illustrated were:
1917 *Advanced Dressing Station on the Somme Front,* p. 84.
1920, *Battle Before Villers Brettonneux, August 8th, 1918* (full page) p. 99
54 1920 *Statue in Bronze erected by the Canadian Red Cross in Memory of those who Fought in France and Died at Cliveden,* p. 44
1921 *Sketch for Model Bronze Group for Australia House,* Strand, p. 111.
1924 *The Dawn of A New Age,* p. 84
1925 Three works: *Joan, Betty and Atalanta.*
1928, he became a highly favoured artist both in Australia and New Zealand, not surprising when his work was glowingly and consistently reviewed in the English art press.56 The writing of English critics such as Charles Marriott was typical. In his 1933 article, ‘A Retrospect of Academic Painting’, written for the journal Studio, he announced that the exhibition results ‘are seen at [their] best, as in Orpen’s Mother And Child and Homage to Manet’.57 Later in the same article, Marriott observed that of all the assembled painters, ‘Orpen... with his extraordinary versatility and technical accomplishment... is the most brilliant’.58 Such reviews as this of a Royal Academy exhibition with its pronouncements on art generally, and Orpen in particular, would have found favour with the Trustees both in Australia and New Zealand.

Once again, the two colonial national Galleries would have had their total acceptance of the Academy aesthetic, with its emphasis on ‘technical accomplishment’, reinforced. Another ‘guideline’ provided for New Zealand and Australian art audiences by the LRA, was its invariable insistence upon the pre-eminence of subject painting. Once again, the selection of such works in the Academy exhibitions did not escape the art critics of the day as well as their readers in the Dominions. The comments of the critic Douglas Goldring were typical, when, in 1933, he wrote ‘...but in so far as one can infer the intentions of that body, [the Royal Academy] it aims at the interest of subject rather than the interest and variety of technique or expression’.59 Once again, the Academy lesson was one which was clear in its hierarchy. In asserting the pre-eminence of a painting’s subject rather

56 Sidney Hutchison, op. cit., p. 168.
58 Ibid., p. 148.
than 'the interest and variety of technique or expression', the LRA and its loyal followers refuted any opposing ideology such as that of modernism, with its fascination for 'variety of technique or expression' putting the new 'school' at a severe disadvantage. For most of the period of this study, modernism was simply excluded in the Academic art world of Great Britain, and, this exclusion was then mirrored by Academy acolytes in Wellington and Sydney.

The artistic perimeters of the LRA were fixed. Their governing aesthetic was one which saw little merit in innovation such as that exhibited in emerging modernism. In the grip of such artistic inflexibility, Academicians regarded any tendency to adopt modernist thinking or techniques as a direct threat. Alternate schools of art were perceived to imperil not only the superiority of the Academy, as it spoke for the British national culture, but also the foundations of the Dominion galleries' fierce cultural and even racially-conscious allegiance. Two of the most voluble art writers in Australia, Norman and Lionel Lindsay, were well known for arguing that modernism was alien to 'British' culture in Australia and made visual an unsavoury 'foreignness'.

Conservative British art critics had prepared the way well for such positions in Australia. For example, when reviewing the 1925 Royal Academy Exhibition, the conservative English critic Reginald C. Grundy decried the demise of 'subject pictures'. He attributed their demise to the pernicious influence of 'dogmas of modernist criticism which tolerate [the] telling of trivial anecdotes of modern life'. Later, when countering criticism of Sir Frank Dicksee's Daughters of Eve as being merely 'sentimental', Grundy mockingly predicted that 'if the picture portrayed instead the seamier side of any disreputable foreign quarter in the British Isles, it would doubtless have been hailed as a forceful representation of what is

---

60 See Lionel Lindsay, *Addled Art* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1942).
vaguely termed "life".\textsuperscript{61}

Criticisms of modernism in general and modernist techniques in particular, were often written in terms of lack of technical rigour. A painting like that of George Belcher's \textit{Still Life} (Fig. 6) illustrates the kind of painting considered above reproach. Nominated to NAGNSW Trustees by two Academy stalwarts, William Orpen and Arnesby Brown, this purchase could not have come with higher recommendation. It clearly demonstrates the 'technical rigour' considered vital by these Academy officers when judging a painting's worth. A common target for the Academicians was the modernist emphasis on individual expressive autonomy. The language often used in this type of criticism revealed the degree to which both the Academy and other conservatives felt threatened by the modernist aesthetic. For example, a 1922 \textit{Connoisseur} editorial was withering in its condemnation of Augustus John:

\begin{quote}
The cult for individual expression runs riot in such examples of slovenly brush-stroke as may be afforded by Mr Augustus John's \textit{Mrs Valentine Fleming}. The latter examples of Bolshevism-and-water may titillate the jaded taste of the art epicure, but they have no permanent hold on the people, because there is neither thought behind them nor beauty in their utterance.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Such criticisms reveal the ways in which modernism was considered to be in direct opposition to the aesthetic so carefully guarded by the Academy. Painstaking effort to perfect skill, in addition to intellectual endeavour, was regarded as the basis for technical mastery, and the consequent 'beauty' of the painting was judged to be at the heart of the British Ruskinian tradition. To dismiss either skill or 'beauty' as irrelevant, as much as modernism did, was to attack the very basis of the Royal Academy. The force of the Academy's opposition then, not only shaped much of

\textsuperscript{62} The Editor, \textit{Connoisseur}, Vol. 63 (1922).
the Academy’s art practice during the period of this study, it also played a major role in strengthening similar opposition to modernism in Australia and New Zealand.

The exhibitions of the Academy, with their reproductions in the *Academy Illustrated*, can best be categorized as a kind of visual journalism, a narrative in paint. As a genre, it was most apparent in the Royal Academy annual summer exhibitions seen throughout the early nineteen twenties and thirties. It was particularly evident in illustrations of the First World War where the most popular pictures were those that either stirred heroic sentiments or expressed the pathos of war. More documentary works, such as those reproduced in the 1917 issue of *Royal Academy Illustrated*, included the Australian H. Septimus Powers’ *Advanced Dressing Station On The Somme Front*.63 Powers’ inclusion in such a journal was perhaps the ultimate accolade for an Australian artist at that time. The resultant recognition of Powers’ premier position, both in England as well as Australia, still produced major commissions several years later, such as the offer in 1924 to decorate, with images from the war, a mural for the Public Library in Melbourne.64

The selection, and consequent reproduction, in the 1918 *Royal Academy Illustrated* of the ‘sketch portrait’ of *General Sir William Birdwood* by James Quinn (which had been commissioned by the National Art Gallery of New South Wales Trustees) would also have been seen as an endorsement of Trustee taste.65 Within the pages of the Academy’s own journal, not only would the Trustees have their decision to commission this artist and this subject publicly ratified for their domestic audiences, but also their artistic esteem in London was endorsed. The same issue reinforced their judgement of Powers as it included the reproduction of another work, *A Canteen - Some Story.*
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63 *The Royal Academy Illustrated*, (1917), p. 84.
64 Reproduced in *Art In Australia*, (March, 1924).
65 *The Royal Academy Illustrated*, (1918) p.128.
All of the artistic models delivered to national art institutions in the Dominions via Academy purchases or art journal illustrations were those which celebrated technique and skill. Ever vigilant for visual pollutants in the guise of innovation, conservative writers and critics attempted to keep audiences in the Pacific equally steadfast. In 1930, the conservative Academy critic, C. Reginald Grundy, writing for the *Connoisseur*, expressed the view that:

in earlier days, religious and historical pictures would have been accorded 'primacy' as it was considered a higher form of art to put into paint imaginary conceptions of the past rather than realisations of the present.  

By 1930, however, according to Grundy, portraiture was to be considered first as 'the metier which attracts nearly every figure painter who can command a clientele for such work'. Later in the same article, Grundy's appraisal of Dame Laura Knight's *Ballet Girl and Dressmaker* reveals the consistency of the messages sent south. The artistic standards he sought centred on technical excellence and narrative subjects able to engage audiences. In praise of Knight's work, Grundy wrote:

For sheer technique there is nothing finer in the exhibition: the draughtsmanship is superb, more especially the difficult foreshortening of the limbs of the dancer, while the textures of the flesh and draperies are rendered with verisimilitude.

Summing up his impressions, Grundy concluded that 'the 161st exhibition of the Academy is praiseworthy in its level of technical skill'.

The Academy’s understanding of contemporary artistic conservatism was sometimes subject to fine lines of aesthetic distinction. For example, in 1925 the Academy was accused of being reactionary, not because there was a debate about a

---

67 C. Reginald Grundy, ibid., p. 43.
68 C. Reginald Grundy, ibid. p.44.
more open or inclusive definition of acceptable artistic practice, rather there was
criticism of its definition of appropriate subject matter. When, in 1925, Sir Frank
Dicksee was elected to the position of President of the Royal Academy, The
Connoisseur reported that his election caused a ‘charge of reaction to be levelled
against that body’. The charge, apparently, was that Dicksee had in the past been
‘guilty of telling stories in paint’. Once again the critic Reginald C. Grundy argued
strongly in his defence, writing that he did not ‘regard him as being any whit a lesser
artist on this account’.\textsuperscript{70} Any recognition that perhaps such an artistic pre-
occupation may not, any longer, be appropriate in the twentieth century does not
appear to have been considered. Rather, the writer strongly supported Dicksee’s
choice of artistic milieu, that of ‘consistently illustrating episodes of history or
romance, chiefly selected from periods when picturesque costume was prevalent’. A
debate such as this, over such a narrow distinction, at a time when the art world was
in ferment over major intellectual issues, reveals the insular, quarantined world
occupied by the Academy.\textsuperscript{71}

Despite the Academy’s apparent isolation from modernist developments in
Europe and elsewhere, its blinkered view of appropriate art practice was the one
which continued to exert the greatest influence over the Dominion national galleries.
The power and prestige of the Royal Academy was particularly evident in the
acquisition of works and in the organization of exhibitions chosen for Wellington
and Sydney. When available, the first choice for purchase for both galleries in the
period between the wars, were works by English Academicians. There are many
instances recorded in the Minutes of both institutions where the premier position of

\textsuperscript{71} The NAGNSW has one Dicksee in its possession, Hermione, purchased in 1886. ‘The subject is
taken from Shakespeare’s Winter’s Tale, where the statue is coming to life’; Renee Free, Art Gallery
the Academy is made obvious. For example, when the 1937 'takings from the gate' enabled the NAGNSW Trustees to purchase two works, the works selected were both by Royal Academicians. They were *The Hamlet* by Arnesby Brown R.A and *Old Gateway at Bruges* by Frank Brangwyn R.A. Both purchases were recorded in the Minutes with great pride. The Minutes also reveal the reverence with which both institutions greeted any correspondence from the Royal Academy. Any indication of favour in this way was most carefully minuted in full and usually singled out from other communications, being read aloud to the meeting by the Secretary, and then often released to the Press. One such letter, from Sir Edwin Lutyens, President of the LRA, was sent to the New Zealand National Gallery Committee of Management and minuted on the 19 September, 1939. It 'congratulated them on a comprehensive collection of English art which Mrs Mary Murray Fuller [a prominent figure in the NZAFA, and art dealer] had assembled for the Centenary Show'. The Academy was very aware of the power of its name as a selling point for colonial art buyers. Indeed, many Academy painters were grateful for this, for purchases from the south would soon provide a mainstay when previous buyers in Great Britain moved on to wanting more adventurous paintings on their walls.

The influence of the Academy extended beyond the art practices of the colonial institutions themselves. Both galleries were aware that for their audiences, nothing was a greater draw-card than being able to announce a Royal Academy presence. Indeed, Mrs Murray Fuller in her capacity as a prominent New Zealand arts manager and entrepreneur, showed typical canny business sense when

---

72 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 9.2.1937.

73 As most of the works selected by Mrs Murray Fuller for this exhibition were works predominantly by Royal Academicians, for sale in this New Zealand exhibition, this letter from the President may be as much salesmanship as congratulatory.
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organising sale exhibitions for Australia and New Zealand. She was very much aware of the taste of her clientele and usually filled her imported exhibitions with large numbers of Academy works. To make the connection between her selling exhibition and the Royal Academy absolutely clear and to further enhance the prestige and potential profitability of her touring shows, letters from various prominent Academy members were often printed in the catalogues, and then reproduced in the press. An article in a 1935 *Art In New Zealand* article told readers that ‘Mrs Murray Fuller has brought to this country a collection truly representative of contemporary art’. It was careful to note that:

> Mrs Murray Fuller had the assistance of the President of the Royal Academy, Sir William Llewellyn, Dame Laura Knight and Messrs Phillip Connard R.A., Arnesby Brown R.A. and Campbell Taylor in making the selection.\(^{74}\)

This exhibition of ‘truly representative British art’, was in fact, an exhibition of works apparently restricted to members of the London Royal Academy. As her exhibition had been a great financial success, the following year, Mrs Murray Fuller again sought the support of members of the Royal Academy when she announced an impending British selling exhibition. Copies of letters were circulated notifying the NZNAG Committee of the ‘honour that was to be theirs’ in ‘viewing a forth-coming Exhibition in which prominent Royal Academy members had selected the works’. Again, this was virtually an exhibition of the Royal Academy transported to Wellington. The listed Royal Academicians included Sir William Reid Dick, who in a letter expressed the wish that his bronze *Madonna and Child* be presented to the New Zealand Gallery. Mrs Murray Fuller agreed that this was ‘a great honour for New Zealand’.\(^{75}\) Doubtless aware of the work’s worth, Mrs Murray Fuller included

---

\(^{74}\) ‘Ourselves’, *Art In New Zealand*, (March, 1935), p. iii.

\(^{75}\) Minute Book, NZNAG, 25. 3.1936. Mrs Murray Fuller’s behaviour in this instance must be questioned. The whereabouts of this work is not now known.
the Reid Dick *Madonna and Child* amongst those listed for sale when the collection of works arrived in Wellington for the Exhibition. Exhibitions such as these, unlike many of those arranged for domestic work, appear to have escaped adverse public criticism. This was not surprising considering the climate of adulation that accompanied most exhibitions of imported English academic work. The response to the academic exhibitions more often took the tone of a respectful review, rather than that of any true critical appraisal. The interested public could read, in 1936, for instance, that it was ‘again a privilege to see fine examples’ of works by artists such as Lamorna Birch ARA, Arnesby Brown RA, Algernon Talmage RA, Terrick Williams ARA, Sir Herbert Stanton Hughes RA and of course, Sir William Orpen RA. On the other hand, domestic art and exhibitions certainly attracted the critical attention of the art reviewer. For instance, in New Zealand, the annual exhibitions of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Art appear to have provided a constant source for critical discontent. Those given the task of writing the criticisms were considered ‘expert’ in colonial eyes. That ‘expertise’ came usually from two sources, those who could write from a position of first-hand knowledge of European and particularly London art courts, and secondly, those who could demonstrate expertise through their professions such as art writers, artists or connoisseurs. These experts would then draw comparisons between what they knew of current academic practice and domestic work. Too often, reviews such as these, written with the academic model in mind, focussed on how far the domestic art- work was ‘behind’ the English. A 1921 *Art In New Zealand* article was typical when it admonished the New Zealand art world, that ‘a journey to the other side of the world gives a new set of values, and
one again realizes how far behind New Zealand is in things concerning art’.  

Catalogues of major exhibitions coming to Australia and New Zealand invariably began with a page of abbreviations explaining the initials following artist’s names. At the top of these explanatory lists were the initials ‘R.A.’ for the Royal Academy and, ‘A.R.A.’ for the Associate membership, a clear indication to all of the importance of being able to claim Academy membership - or even associate membership, even though, as far as exhibitions of domestic artists were concerned, only one or two individuals from New Zealand and Australia could indicate membership of the Royal Academy in this way.

As the London Royal Academy was the indisputable authority on art, any Australian or New Zealand artist who was honoured by being elected as either an associate or full member of the academy had his career assured at home. Between 1918 and 1939 there are many examples of the ways in which those few artists whose work could be seen as demonstrating connections with British models were elevated to lofty positions not always reflective of their merit. Even when merit was deserved, connection to the London Royal Academy ensured a level of patronage not often experienced by those who lacked the Royal Academy ‘credential’. For instance, the way in which George Lambert’s work was received and his reputation constructed in Sydney, was arguably due to the patronage of powerful individuals, who saw in his work - as in his personality - evidence of an Australian artist who exemplified those characteristics most revered by Dominion taste-makers.

After some twenty years away from Australia, working briefly in Paris and then London, Lambert by the early 1920s, had begun to suspect that real fame in the

---


77 There were no New Zealand or Australian women who were made members or associate members of the London Royal Academy during the period of this study.
London art world might elude him. He felt his ‘achievement had been insufficiently rewarded’ and was aware that there might be more opportunity in Australia, perhaps recognising that ‘the country he had left twenty years before had done little during the intervening period to lose its sense of isolation from the social and artistic capitals of Europe’ and that he might capitalise on his English reputation.\(^78\) His decision to return to Australia was also based on the hope that he could capitalise on the commissions he had under-taken as an Australian war artist. More importantly, he was confident in the knowledge that his London reputation would be of more benefit in Australia than in London.

He was correct. Lambert returned to Sydney in 1921 and was ‘greeted as a hero’.\(^79\) However, the greatest catalyst for his decision to remain in Australia was his election, in 1922, as an Associate of the London Royal Academy. No other Australian artist had been so honoured and Lambert was absolutely aware that to be able to claim this laurel would establish his artistic and personal credentials as no other recognition could. His reputation was thereafter enormously enhanced, and indeed ‘intensified the almost idolatrous respect he had been shown on his arrival’.\(^80\) With such powerful patrons as Syd. Ure Smith, Lionel Lindsay and Hardy Wilson, Dame Nellie Melba, and the Chauvels to name but a few, his position as the premier Sydney artist was assured. Moving in circles that were not simply confined to those artistic cliques to which he had belonged in London, he was now embraced by the most patrician members of Australian society. As Nancy Underhill has argued, an artist’s position in Sydney between the wars was more often than not understood in

\(^{79}\) Ibid.
\(^{80}\) Ibid. p. 94.
terms of the ideological positions represented in their work.\textsuperscript{81} This was true, and in this Lambert was the right man, in the right place at the right time. In his 1986 biography of George Lambert and his sons, Andrew Motion described Lambert’s self-imposed task as finding ‘a modern idiom in which to express the principles exemplified by the Old Masters’.\textsuperscript{82} This was a perfect analogy for the aesthetic which the Trustees of the NAGNSW also sought in their collection.

Lambert went first to Melbourne after his arrival. At a one-man show held at the Fine Art Society there in 1922 he exhibited his latest Royal Academy picture, *The Surrender of Kazimain*. The catalogue Foreword concludes with the following remarks which make clear the qualities which were most admired by Lambert’s Australian art audiences, including National Gallery Trustees:

\begin{quote}
In these carefully selected examples of his work, whether it be in the paintings that proclaim his purpose in life to be achieved, or in the drawings which announce him as a notable and exceptional master of the pencil, we find that by the complete command of all that machinery of his craft, called technique, he gives us, without the interference of inequalities or accident, his reverence for his subject, and thus creates imperishable beauty.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

Once again those values of taught technique, subject and beauty were those selected for homage. Two years later, in 1924, *Art In Australia* produced a special number, ‘The Art Of G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.’. Writing in her memoir of Lambert’s life as an artist, his wife Amy Lambert described the article as containing a ‘fairly good selection’ of ‘available reproductions of his work’; she obviously regarded the devotion of a whole issue of Australia’s premier art journal to Lambert as no more

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{82} Andrew Motion, op. cit., p.47.
\end{flushright}
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than her late husband’s artistic due. However much Lambert missed the congenial company of artists such as he had enjoyed in London, (personal letters from those artists he much admired, such as William Orpen, were made much of in his biography), the greater Sydney plaudits, for a man of considerable ego, were hard to forego. These included praise from artists in both Sydney and Melbourne who regarded Lambert as a model of artistic endeavour. Typical was the following letter by an unnamed writer. Writing to the President of the Society of Artists in Sydney he or she made clear the value and virtue in Lambert’s work:

All the while this strife of tongues is going on in our midst we have Lambert with us, whose work is modern, that is, of to-day, and it is more: it manifests years and years of hard work and thought devoted to acquiring a technique which will enable him to express himself.... What a godsend Lambert’s coming has been: more than most of us realise. We were badly in need of some quality to stiffen us up a bit, someone to demonstrate how far short we were falling for want of someone head and shoulders above ourselves.\footnote{Ibid., p. 163.}

After his death in Sydney in 1930, Lambert’s inclusion in the 1933 Studio article, ‘Retrospective of Academic Painting’, would have confirmed the Trustees’ judgement of him as Australia’s premier painter.\footnote{Ibid., p. 167.} A similar contemporary review of Lambert’s Self Portrait with Gladioli (selected as one of the two full-page colour reproductions in the catalogue of the 1938 150 Years of Australian Art exhibition held at the NAGNSW) praises this work in terms of the ‘amazing technical skill’ which it revealed:

Mr Lambert has always found himself an interesting study, and this latest effort is attracting a good deal of attention. It shows courage, self-analysis and amazing technical skill. The artist stands in a studiously careless attitude, smoking. His rest robe, of greeny-yellow chiffon velvet, is a masterpiece of colour and texture;\footnote{Ibid., p. 167.}

\footnote{Charles Marriott, ‘Retrospective of Academic Painting’, Studio, Vol.105, (1933). The works illustrated were a full page reproduction of Mrs Dervent Wood and a half page reproduction of a World War One work, Landscape in Palestine 1918.}
against it leans a tall stem of pink gladioli. The hands are splayed out to show the clever articulations of nerve and sinew. The whole technique of the figure and facial expression is amazingly virile.  

The degree of his exaltation in Australia was determined by his being recognised as inherently British in aesthetic. He was therefore regarded by the Trustees of the NAGNSW as an Australian artist above reproach. More than any other Australian artist, Lambert’s career, and the level of adulation and patronage showered upon him reveal the power of the British academic model in Australia.

Throughout the minutes of both National Art Galleries much is made of the hindrance physical distance imposed upon the Trustees – as well as the artists – who needed access to English and European artistic models. Writing in the *Print Collectors Quarterly*, NAGNSW Trustee, Lionel Lindsay explained that ‘Australian artists have laboured under disadvantages unknown in Europe, where the great galleries lie within easy reach and the works of the masters serve as stimulus and a standard of measurement’. When Australian and New Zealand artists did arrive in ‘Mecca’, they were expected to absorb only those practices approved by the governing institutions back home. For Dominion conservatives, the most intense criticism was directed at those artists who, denied ‘sound teaching’ at home, then left to study overseas and apparently became seduced by the modernist cause. This was regarded almost as treachery. For example, during a visit to New Zealand in 1939, Will Ashton, in his position as the Director of the ‘Australian National Gallery’ gave an interview to the *Hawke’s Bay Daily News*, which was presented under the heading “Quack Artists Criticised - Displays of Bad Pictures - Public Misled”. The article certainly revealed Ashton’s vehement conservatism. The
Director was quoted observing that ‘most professions are protected against the quack. In the old days there was a certain amount of protection, as pictures had to pass an exhibition committee before they were shown’. The interviewer reported that ‘Mr Ashton criticised the effect of modern art on some Australian students who went abroad from well-known art schools or with technical college scholarships’, implying that such deviation from approved teaching amounted to deception on the part of the recipient. Ashton saw artistic standards slipping, apparently the result of gullible young artists studying away from the paternal eyes of their Dominion teachers, and of a lack of rigour evident when judging art.91

Any criticism of perceived Royal Academy dominance of arts practice, with its insistence on the pivotal position of technique and draughtsmanship, was rare and when it did occur was left to those who were usually not New Zealand or Australian-born. They were individuals, who, if they were working in the Mother Country, would have been part of the cultural dynamism that was modernism, gathering momentum to end the Royal Academy’s pre-eminence. One such artist was Christopher Perkins who was later, in spite of considerable opposition, to have enormous influence on emergent modernist New Zealand art. Born in England, his art experience included academic study at the Rome Academy and then later at the Slade in London. He became a member of the London Group ‘which was shaking off the influence of Ruskin and the academicians’.92 Perkins also exhibited at the Royal Academy before leaving for France to work in the landscape of Provence. Later, having accepted a teaching position in Wellington, he was feted (as befitting the apparently model English artist), with social receptions and afternoon teas. For

91 Hawke’s Bay Daily News, (July 12, 1939), Hawke’s Bay, New Zealand, Interview with Mr Will Ashton, Director of the Australian National Gallery.
the art circles of Wellington his arrival was welcomed as it was believed that they now could claim, as their own, an artist with significant exposure to European ideologies and one with direct and genuine experience of the European art world. NZAFA Councillors particularly, made much of both his academic training and his having exhibited within the London Royal Academy. However, they soon discovered that this artist was a man shaped by far more than just exposure to the conservative British and French art world. Certainly he was not one who believed the teachings of the London Royal Academy sacrosanct. Perkins' response to having found himself in a 'transplanted Victorian England' when he had been expecting a 'cooler version of Gauguin's Tahiti', produced a reaction that soon shocked and alienated many of the local art establishment. Most found his pronouncements on art and his rejection of their guiding artistic principles incomprehensible.93 In a review of the 1930 New Zealand Academy of Fine Art Annual Exhibition, Perkins wrote disparagingly of 'the Academic artist [who] wants initials after his name, like a chartered accountant. He wants to be 'hall-marked' and 'his work must sell on that'.94 Such public statements shocked his audience and did not endear him to the hearts of New Zealand Gallery Trustees. He quickly became disenchanted with an art world he regarded as provincial and parochial.

Consistent criticisms of the London Academy aesthetics did not begin to emerge in the publications so normally supportive of the Academy ethos until the mid to late nineteen thirties. Occasionally, it was conceded that the younger artists needed to be acknowledged. For example, in 1930 even R.C. Grundy, the Academy stalwart, made this point in his review of the annual exhibition:

Taken as a whole, the Royal Academy Exhibition may be called placid and uneventful rather than striking.... It would be well if the

93 Ibid. p. 77.
94 C. Perkins, Art In New Zealand, (December, 1930), p.105.
authorities would take steps to encourage the more distinguished of the non-exhibiting outsiders, especially those of the younger generation, to participate as otherwise the displays at Burlington House must be looked upon as semi-sectarian affairs, rather than as a full exemplification of the current art of the day.  

However, criticism even when as direct as this, was not consistent. There was no consistency in targeting just which artistic principles espoused by the Academy needed to be relinquished, nor in articulating which aesthetic should replace it.

The aesthetic confusion which this indicates was also reflected in the content of eminent art journals. The 1930 Royal Academy Illustrated, for example, reveals no evidence of modernist awareness and there are no illustrations of modernist art works reproduced. The journal’s pages were filled with the usual array of portraits, landscapes and memorial marbles. As usual, the first image in the 1930 journal was a portrait of Her Majesty the Queen by David Jagger. The only - and very tame - ‘exotica’, in terms of non-English subject matter, was provided by the inclusion of several of the French artist H.H. La Thangue’s paintings of Provencal landscapes. Once again, the lesson issued to the Antipodes by English art journals was not lost upon NAGNSW Trustees. One of La Thangue’s paintings had been purchased by the Gallery’s London advisors, (in this case Sir John Longstaff) on behalf of NAGNSW Trustees, and later three were presented to the Gallery after the death of the artist’s widow in 1942. Volume 103 and 104 of the more adventurous 1932 Studio journal reveal some of the paradoxes in understanding art in the early 1930s. The first full page advertisement in Volume 103 of Studio was for the London art dealership, Colnaghis. To advertise this gallery and dealership, the work of one of

96 Boy Filling WaterJars At Well, Italian Coast and Ligurian Hillside were given to the Gallery at the bequest of the artists widow in 1946. Cider Apples was purchased in London by Sir John Longstaff for the Gallery in 1913.
the Colnaghis stable of artists was highlighted. In this case the work of the Australian NAGNSW Trustee Lionel Lindsay, was used, *The Clipped Wing*. Lindsay was an avowed technician much respected for his etching ability, of which this was a superb example. This beautifully executed but deeply traditional work was in turn followed by a three page review of Mies Van Der Rohe’s radical *Tugendhat House* which illustrated the new International style of architecture. This article was followed by reproductions of *Les Paveurs de la Rue de Berne* by Manet and Paul Gauguin’s *Exotic Landscape, Martinique*, neither as radical as the Mies Van Der Rohe house but certainly more representative of seminal early modernist painting such as that represented by Gauguin and Manet. However, Colnaghis, one of the most highly regarded and respected art institutions in London, when seeking to best visually represent themselves in this journal, selected the work of a traditionalist.\(^97\)

A survey of either *Art In Australia* or *Art In New Zealand* over the same period reveals a clearer aesthetic perception. A list of *Art In Australia* special numbers, those compiled to give special recognition to the work of the most eminent Australian artists, provides clear evidence of which ideology was paramount:

- 1919 The Art of Arthur Streeton
- 1920 The Art of Hans Heysen
- 1924 The Art of George Lambert
- 1928 The Art of Lionel Lindsay
- 1929 The Art of Will Ashton
- 1930 The George Lambert Memorial Number
- 1931 The Art of Sir John Longstaff and also The Art of Sir Arthur Streeton
- 1932 Elioth Gruner’s Oil Painting

There were no modernist artists included. For the Dominion National Galleries, the academic model, carefully transported, and gratefully received,

\(^97\) Colnaghis, managed by Harold Wright for the period of this study, was the most commonly used London dealership. There was an especially close relationship between the company and Trustee Lionel Lindsay.
remained eminent and modernist incursions remained unwelcome. Their reluctance to accept any other tenet than that offered by the London Royal Academy and British art until after the Second World War convincingly indicates the governing circle’s desire to be seen primarily as loyal followers of ‘Britishness’, at least when it came to ‘official taste’ illustrated in art.

In conclusion, the Royal Academy’s concept of Britishness in art emphasised the values of taught technique, traditional subjects and beauty. Its position in the British art world as the holder and determinant of British values rested on the concept of connoisseurship and was reinforced by the relative exclusivity of Academy membership. For the Dominions, the Academy’s place at the centre of traditional British artistic culture ensured that it was the model to which they aspired, regardless of whether that model was under challenge in Europe, America or even in Britain.

Having accepted the Royal Academy as their model, the Trustees of the Dominion Galleries sought to imitate it and promote it. They could assert the dominance of this model safe in the knowledge that adherence to the Royal Academy’s taste would reinforce their own claims to connoisseurship as well as encourage proper Britishness in the art of the Dominions. With confidence in the values of taught technique, subject painting and traditional expression of beauty, the Trustees strengthened their endorsement of the Royal Academy model through their acquisitions and exhibitions. They were supported in this endeavour by both the main Dominion and English art journals and critics, and their influence was apparent in the public response to artists such as Lambert.

At a time when the Royal Academy model was under threat in England, due to falling exhibition attendances and a shift in public support towards
more modernist approaches, the Dominion Galleries and their Trustees continued to
dorse the artistic model which emphasised and reinforced their Britishness. In this
process, the role and activities of the officers of these institutions were paramount.
CHAPTER THREE

‘MEN WHO COUNT - THINGS THAT MATTER’:
THE AESTHETIC IDEAL OF THE TRUSTEES AND DIRECTORS
OF THE NATIONAL GALLERIES OF THE TWO DOMINIONS

They die off and are replaced.
But the institution of theyness goes on.¹

The Trusteeships of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales and the
National Art Gallery of New Zealand were offices apparently held in high esteem by
the people of their respective cities and were positions of enormous artistic
influence. This influence was felt most in the control they were able to wield, both
as the gatekeepers of artistic expression and also as the determiners of which
aesthetic should rightfully express the visual culture of their nation. Through both
the implementation and later ramifications of the decisions taken by these Trustees,
Sydney and New Zealand were provided not only with their respective artheritages,
but also their national collections. Both countries bear the consequences of these
Trusteeships, both in their procurement of works and - just as importantly - in the
rejection of others. Not the least of their powers were exercised in their patronage,
which determined the success or failure of many artists’ contemporary reputations.
This chapter explores both the nature and makeup of the Boards of Trustees and
examines the methodologies and art practices that resulted from their particular
vision.

In spite of the particular nature of this artistic stewardship, the expertise of
many of these individuals was not, primarily, in art. The type of citizen chosen to
carry out this stewardship was consistent between the two institutions, as was the
confidence with which they carried out their Trusteeships. Little external advice was

¹ Hal Missingham, They Kill You In The End (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1973), frontispiece
sought, and Trustees were rarely criticised for lack of expertise. The common source
for individuals fulfilling this role ensured that there were almost identical patterns of
acquisitions made by the National Gallery officers in Australia and New Zealand
between the wars. The resulting collections were coherent both in the aesthetic they
represented and in the artists they considered worthy of exhibition. What then
formed this apparently singular vision of art? What was the cultural understanding
upon which these Boards, in Sydney and Wellington, acted? Who were the
individuals entrusted to make this culture visible?

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the model that operated both
directly in the formation of taste, and indirectly, in the type of individual deemed to
possess the necessary criteria essential in making judgements about ‘high’ art,
reflected the shared British heritage of both Australia and New Zealand. Implicit
within this framework of identification with the British homeland, was the tradition
of connoisseurship. However, as Dixon has argued, in Australia and New Zealand,
unlike Great Britain, the perpetuation of this heritage was organised and
implemented by an elite created by commercial and mercantile success rather than
by inherited aristocratic position. The Boards of Trustees were shaped in their
aesthetic understanding by shared British systems, but the mechanisms for making
visible this British heritage was organised and implemented by a colonial quasi-
aristocracy - a mercantile and commercial financial elite.²

Dixon’s thesis, that in the colonial period, the ‘progress of society towards
the pastoral and mercantile state’ was marked by the emergence of this astonishingly
affluent class, which was still true in the period which is the focus of this thesis.
These individuals perceived themselves (and were perceived by the lower social

orders), as having responsibility for making visual, evidence of 'Britishness'. Achievement of that aim carried within it the ability to claim membership of world civil society. It is not a surprise then that those Trustees, emanating from a single class formed from a commercial mercantile elite, were also recognised as the commercial leaders of their Dominion world. A list of Board members of both the NAGNSW and the NZNAG within this period could be easily transposed to a list of Sydney's and Wellington's most successful business leaders.

For the individuals involved, nonetheless, it was an office that added to their already significant stature, as the position carried enormous social cachet and undoubtedly added significantly to their claims to 'refinement' in a cultured society. Nomination to a Trusteeship was widely acknowledged as evidence of that individual's possession of discernment and culture; it was a connoisseur's achievement, advertising the possession of both culture and class. Membership of these Boards, whether in New Zealand or Australia, was a badge that proclaimed elite status, in a community anxious to adhere to inherited social and artistic hierarchies. Brian Dunlop, in his biography of William Dobell, described the position of Trustee as being much sought after 'because of its social prominence and influence', and referred to the Board as an 'exclusive club' entry into which required 'State Government approval'. Most Board members of the NZAFA, the NZNAG and the NAGNSW were notable for expertise in spheres of life other than that of specialist art knowledge. Generally, the worthy citizens assembled around the Board table were men, who, because of their social, economic and political positions, were deemed suitable individuals both to determine and convey national pride through visual images. As with those individuals who occupied similar positions in Great

---

Britain, a certain *esprit de classe*, founded on elitism and conservatism can be demonstrated.

Coherent in their social class, consistently throughout the period of this study the citizens selected to run these two National Galleries were drawn from their respective home cities’ wealthy business and social elite. This common, and narrow, social base, in addition to the intense desire to be guided by British Academic models, explains the similarity of artistic taste and shared understandings of what could constitute art which was exhibited in the arts management of the two institutions throughout the period between the wars. Of course, this cannot be pressed too far. As in the case of its New Zealand counterpart, Board members of the NAGNSW did not attend the same schools, the same University, nor were they all Protestants. They were not all Masons and they did not all belong to the same clubs. However, they were characterised by the elite positions they occupied within the economic, political or judicial life of each society, by their obvious and over-riding conservatism, and their by devotion to Great Britain. Theirs was a collective vision formed from a common source.

The concept of the role of Trustee was one based upon implicit trust. These citizens were entrusted to make visible, on behalf of the public, through their gallery’s collection, a suitable image of ‘high’ art, which would provide compelling evidence of their nation’s ability to claim inclusion within the British Empire and consequently her culture. Not only were they given almost complete freedom in selecting the way in which this inclusion was to be demonstrated, they were also entrusted with the financial wherewithal to make this possible. This tradition of individuals from the ruling class overseeing national cultural institutions was one
taken directly from European models. In Sydney and Wellington the tradition lived on in the close alliance between academic art and the ruling class.

The method by which these individuals were appointed to Gallery Boards varied. However, for both the NZAFA, the NZNAG as well as Sydney's NAGNSW, an individual applicant's success depended upon support from within the respective sitting Boards. The administrative mechanisms that were put in place to 'control' Board replacements made it virtually impossible for a voice that raised contrary notions to those expressed by the Board to be included. By a simple, administrative framework, the closely guarded unanimity of opinion was able to be perpetuated.\footnote{See Phillip Dodd, 'Englishness and National Culture' in R. Colls & P. Dodd (Eds.) Englishness, Politics and Culture 1880-1920 (London: Croom Helm, 1986).}

Prior to the establishment of the NZNAG in 1936, the administration of the NZAFA closely resembled that of New Zealand regional art societies, in that its governance was based on election of the committee from membership. The Council of the Academy was administered by an elected body consisting of a President, two Vice Presidents, a treasurer, secretary, and also a committee of eight. Many are listed in records as 'artist members', a distinction that indicated that the individual's works had been displayed by the Academy. Dilettante Sunday artists in the main, very few were professional artists; although, as in the case of the NAGNSW Board, they were drawn exclusively from Wellington's elite citizenry. Although the annual elections enabled nominations from any member (either 'artist' or 'subscribing') the same names recurred, holding office year after year (see Appendix E). Nugent Welch, for instance, served on the Council for eighteen years, J. M. Ellis seventeen, E. D. Gore served as President in 1918 and then as secretary for nine years. A. R. D. Carbery held positions on the Council for fifteen years, five as Vice President and ten on

\footnote{See Pam James, 'Modernist Women Artists' in Maryanne Dever (Ed.) Wallflowers and Witches: Women and Culture in Australia 1910-1945 (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1994), p. 63.}
committee. The difficulty the New Zealand Academy had in limiting the number of proposed exhibits in its twice yearly exhibitions was due in part to the enthusiasm of the Committee's own artist members and to the broad definition of the concept of 'artist'. In spite of this enthusiasm, the amateurism of their efforts may be judged from the fact that little of their work was considered of sufficient worth to make up part of the later bequest to the National Gallery.

However close the Academy may have been in style to other New Zealand regional art societies, it always regarded itself as providing the basis of its national art collection for the embryonic National Gallery. So too did the New Zealand Government. The understanding that a National Gallery would evolve from, and run parallel to the Academy, was mooted as early as 1910, with the Baillie Exhibition of 1912 providing an impetus for Government to support the acquisition of pictures which would go toward the National Collection.\(^6\) Subsequent argument over what was to be the exact relationship between the collection of art works purchased by the Academy and their eventual residence at the National Art Gallery was on-going, a subject of heated debate within the Council and the community.\(^7\) However, the impetus to provide a National art collection for all New Zealanders was regarded as a noble task for a group of men and women, most of whom could best be described as 'Sunday painters'. No wonder then that they were content to rely on the models provided for them by the Mother Country and the London Royal Academy.

When, in 1936, a Committee of Management was appointed to take over the control of the National Gallery, the administrative structure, with a Board of Trustees

---


at its apex, became much more akin to that of the NAGNSW. This initial committee consisted of nine members appointed by the National Gallery Board, including seven recommended by the NZAFA Council. An additional Academy representative, one of the Vice-Presidents, was also included." The Committee consisted of Mr G. A. Troup (Chairman), Messrs. D. A. Ewen, L. Thompson, W. Fielding, S. H T. D. Hall, Mr F. Bass (as secretary of the Board of Trustees, Nationa and Museum) and Mr E. D. Gore (Secretary, N.Z. Academy of Fine Academy fought hard to ensure that their representation on the emergin Trustees was as strong as possible, fearing that in surrendering not onl the collection, but also sale of Academy premises in order to finance the Galler need for the Academy would disappear. The potential conflict of interest between the Academy and new National Gallery, was highlighted by later Academy scholars, Kay and Eden:

There was serious duplication of members on the Committee of Management of the National Art Gallery and the Academy Council: D. A. Ewen, J. M. Ellis, N. Isaac, T. D. H. Hall, A. R. D. Carbery and N. Welch were on both; in addition Ewen and Ellis were on the Board of Trustees. G. A. Troup, chairman of the committee, and S. L Thomson had also been closely associated with the Council and E. D. Gore was the secretary. It is conceivable that these gentlemen had difficulty deciding on the proper functions of the different institutions they represented and where their first loyalty should lie."

The resolution of the painful transitional process from Academy to the National Art Gallery of New Zealand is not the concern of this study. However, as the extract above reveals, in the inter-war period, the two institutions were, at least in terms of management personnel and therefore taste, one. The administrative mechanisms that supplied subsequent Trustees for the new Gallery, however, were,

---

9 Troup was also Mayor of Wellington and had been a long serving member of the Academy.
10 NZNAG Management Committee Minute, Book, No.1.
11 Robin Kaye & Tony Eden, op. cit., p. 113.
as they were in Sydney, pivotal in determining the shape of the institution.

In Sydney, the early administrative procedures put in place to govern the NAGNSW were, as they would later be with the NZNAG, critical in determining its culture. In 1899 the New South Wales government passed the Public Library and the National Gallery Act.\textsuperscript{12} The purpose of this Act was to formalise the organisation of the Public Library and the National Gallery by allocating responsibilities to separate Boards, to be held under the ministerial responsibility of the Minister for Education. However, the ramifications of this Act were to prove pivotal in the establishment and maintenance of the authority of the Trustees. Part 1.8 of the Act stated that the Trustees take ‘control and management of the Gallery and of all...paintings...works of art therein...and these powers...may be exercised [by those]...for the time being holding office’.\textsuperscript{13} This Act was to have two very important outcomes which were to determine significantly the future operation of that institution. The first was that Trustee-ships were able to become lifetime appointments, and for the majority of Trustees, they were indeed for life, with most vacancies occurring only upon the death of a Board member.\textsuperscript{14} The consequences for the Gallery of such a long-serving Board were enormous but they were further exacerbated by a Board membership that evidenced one, singular ideology that became monolithic in its entrenched conservatism. The second outcome concerned the procedure adopted for the selection of Trustees for Board membership. If a vacancy occurred on the Board, the Trustees would forward a ‘short list’ (usually no more than two or three names in order of preference), to the Minister. If the Trustees’ choice aroused no opposition from the Minister, it would be formally announced and a new member welcomed. By this method of selection, a simple,

\textsuperscript{12} Government Gazette, December 1899. Act No. 54, 1899.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} See Appendix D.
straightforward and apparently benign administrative procedure, the Board of Trustees was ostensibly able to control which individuals were to be admitted to its ranks. The Minister, however, was not always amenable to the Trustees' choices, and there were, however rare, occasions of outright confrontation between the Trustees and the Minister over proposed members, and, in one notable case, among the Trustees themselves. Unfortunately, the Minutes record few details concerning the deliberations or debates over candidates, but on the rare occasions that they do so, much is revealed about the value systems that were operating within the Trust, and the efforts that were made to maintain the status quo. Trustees, once on the Board, were unlikely to be short-lived in their occupancy, and unlikely also to present a profile outside of the prescribed mould.

Implicit within the Trustee's own sense of their duties was the duty to uphold a particular understanding of what constituted art. This very large question apparently presented no quandary for these bodies of individuals bound together by common bonds of social elitism. The matter of taste was one that held no mysteries and no uncertainties for Trustees of either the NAGNSW, the NZAFA or the NZNAG. Art lessons, if they were ever considered necessary, were provided for one another in various forms either by exhibitions organised by fellow Trustees, or by Royal Academy journals. Even an obituary for a fellow Trustee could provide evidence on what was acceptable. For example, on the death of Sir James Fairfax in 1919, an obituary in the Sydney Morning Herald praised his implacable opposition to modernism:

Gradually by study and observation in European Galleries, he acquired a highly cultivated taste in painting and became recognised as a connoisseur whose judgement was always sound and reliable. The weaknesses of certain developments of the

---

16 See Minute Book, NAGNSW, 28.4.1939.
extreme section of the modern school 'post impressionism', 'cubism' and the like, were abhorrent to him, as largely founded upon a deficiency of drawing. He held that the power of accuracy of form and colour must always constitute that sure basis of fine paintings upon which the imaginative and poetic qualities of the highest art might then be properly imposed. Amongst his many donations to the national collection was a score of exquisite class casts from the antique as an object lesson to students.\footnote{17}{Death of Sir James Fairfax - An Art Lover, The Sydney Morning Herald, March 29, 1919.}

The key descriptive phrases used here specify very clearly that those artistic values held by Fairfax were those also approved by the Board; that he, for instance, was 'admired' because of his possession of a learned 'connoisseurship'. A connoisseurship, which had been acquired through 'study and observation in European Galleries', was reckoned to be of sufficient qualification, apparently, to make 'sound judgement' in art. In the recipe for art that was adhered to by the Trustees these were key ingredients. Further, his opposition to any modernist ideology, evident in his 'acknowledging' the 'weakness' of parts of the 'modern school' because of its 'deficiency of drawing', was desirable. By contrast, he recognized that a 'fine painting' was one determined by its 'power of accuracy of form and colour'. These too were attitudes shared by other Board members.

An invariable genuflexing to British Academic models was at the core of both Galleries' art practice. It was by far the most entrenched, consistent and visible characteristic throughout the period of this study. There were many ways that this was expressed. Some incidents reveal the obsequious tone adopted when dealing with Academy 'celebrities'. One such episode occurred in 1937, when the Royal Academician, S. J. Lamorna Birch, visited New Zealand, apparently on a trout fishing expedition. NZAFA Councillor, Mrs Mary Murray Fuller, suggested that the Academy should 'give a reception for him', a very rare honour. The members were not content with that, and anxious that the Wellington Academy should capitalise on
the reflected glory of such an esteemed gentleman in their midst. Accordingly, a one-
man show was held for him at the Gallery and he was made an ‘honorary member so
that his work could be sent to Christchurch with other Academy offerings’. 18 The
Council were apparently ‘blushingly bumble-footed’ in their dealings with the great
man, wondering whether to charge him rent for the Gallery, which would be ‘thereby
setting a precedent’. Eventually the secretary ‘discussed terms with him’ and he
‘generously donated £30 in addition to the rent’. 19 Throughout the period, London
Royal Academy dealings with either of the Dominion galleries were very much a
one-sided affair. There were occasional complaints, such as the one voiced by
disgruntled members of NZAFA that at the 1936 Coronation Exhibition (planned by
the British Colonial Society of Artists) 19 of the 32 works sent to Britain had
emanated from New Zealand, but that there ‘was almost no notice taken of them’. 20

Who then were these men whose business acumen (or political office) was
the passport to cultural gatekeeper and who were so concerned to achieve
endorsement from British conservatives? Rather than being acknowledged for great
insights into the nature of art, Sydney names such as Fairfax, Lloyd Jones, Knox and
Street are usually associated in the city’s history with companies such as
Consolidated Press, David Jones Ltd., C.S.R, or, the judiciary. However, in spite of
varying degrees of exposure to artistic models in their lives, Board members
considered themselves, and one another, to be amply qualified to make judgements
about art. Each evinced this confidence in what they perceived as their aesthetic
‘good sense’ even though for most the office, however valued personally, was
merely a recreational distraction in their busy commercial lives. This was also true of
New Zealand where the Academy, when needed, was able to draw upon the support

18 Robin Kay & Tony Eden, op. cit., p. 113.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
of Wellington’s most significant citizens. For example, Sir Harold Beauchamp, Wellington banker and philanthropist, provided the initial fund for the NZNAG and became a foundation member of the NZNAG Board. Sir Joseph Ward, Liberal Prime Minister and Mayor of Wellington, described as a ‘business entrepreneur’, became the first chairman of the NZNAG Board. George Troup, Mayor of Wellington (1925), served as President of the NZAFA from 1931-1932, and whilst President had the unenviable task of negotiating a path toward the creation of the NZNAG for the Academy whilst at the same time serving as the Deputy Chairman of the NZNAG. Sir Robert Stout, as Minister for Education, organised as a Crown grant the land upon which the Whitemore Gallery (for many years the home of the Academy) stood. He was also a member of the Academy Council from 1938 to 1940.

A shared characteristic of many NZAFA, NZNAG and NAGNSW Trustees, which shaped many of their actions, was a particular type of patriarchy inherent within Victorian concepts of civic responsibility. Notions of ‘duty’ or ‘service’ were not uncommon among men of this class and social position. Prominent Trustee Sydney Ure Smith was described as having a ‘Baden Powell attitude toward service’. Similarly, Henry Gorman, a NAGNSW Trustee member from 1919 until his death in 1923, was an individual whose membership of the Board could be said to have more to do with his desire to find a vehicle for public service, rather than any particular

---


22 Joseph George Ward (1856-1930) had a flamboyant business and political career. An opportunist, he gambled on the success of his many ventures. These included a failed Southland-based frozen meat venture and another bankruptcy following from the 1894 London commodity price slump. In spite of this he was re-elected to the House of Representatives in 1897 and later that year elected Mayor of Wellington. In 1899 he was returned to Cabinet as Deputy, and in 1906, as leader of the Liberal party, became Prime Minister. See the Dictionary Of New Zealand Biography, Vol.II, 1870-1900 (Wellington: Dept. Internal Affairs, 1993), p.567. Also, Kay & Eden, op. cit., p. 93.


Right to Left (standing) are Sir William Ashton (at that time Director to the National Gallery, Sydney) and an unidentified steward.

Photo (with caption), courtesy University of New England Research Centre.
passion for art. He was best known for his position as President, then Governor, of the Real Estate Institute of New South Wales. He was also President of the Daily Telegraph newspaper Board and President of the Athenaeum Club. His obituary described him as a ‘veritable pillar of the old Methodist church in York St’. He was not an individual who had any real education in art but one who would offer sound business advice and who would feel the responsibility of the position - certainly in the advocacy of an art that was at one with his views as a ‘veritable pillar’ of the Methodist church. Civic leadership, with its political as well as philanthropic connotations, was recognised by the Board of the NAGNSW as being advantageous to its operation.

In the period between the wars several Board members were notable in their occupation of significant leadership positions within Sydney’s public life. John Lane Mullins, M.L.C., was made a Board member in 1934, and elected President in 1937. Mullins was a powerful, Catholic identity in Sydney, and in this an unusual Gallery Trustee member. In spite of an impressive civic record, Lane Mullins’s Catholic faith – and therefore Irish descent -would not generally have advanced his standing in a group such as the Trustees. Whilst Catholics did not suffer exclusion to the same degree as those of the Jewish faith, their social standing was not assumed. Catholic Sydney-siders were usually of Irish and, therefore, often of convict ancestry. They were not then of British descent, and that deficiency alone in a social strata determined by proximity to ‘Britishness’ was a severe social handicap. The alliance between Protestantism and Britishness was well understood. A recent Sydney Morning Herald article on obituaries included the following example which illustrates this partnership. The epithet referred to was on a tombstone for an un-

24 His position was described as ‘President’ in his obituary in the Journal of the Real Estate Institute of New South Wales, (August, 1923), p. 3.
25 Ibid.
named English Baronet, and recorded in the London *Times*:

Of a baronet's conversion to Catholicism, the paper said this placed the deceased in 'sharp distinction to his father, whose English Protestant God reflected the appropriate ideas about the British Empire, cricket and banking'.

In spite of this apparent religious handicap, Lane Mullins was for many years a Sydney Alderman, and later a candidate for Lord Mayor. His civic service was widely acknowledged. For example, in 1929, a *Home* article listed Mullins under the headline 'We Select for Further Honours Five Citizens Whose Services Have Benefited N.S.W.' The article listed Mullins' credentials, including his appointment as Privy Chamberlain to the Pope, Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory and Hon. Treasurer of St. Mary's Cathedral. The two entries listed last in this accolade were his position as honorary secretary for the Society of Artists and last of all, his Trusteeship of the National Art Gallery. Once again, an individual Trustee had been chosen not primarily for his expertise in art, but for his position as a city father, one who would offer the Board significant political advantages through his position, and also connections, within the City of Sydney.

Two other Board of Trustee members were also amongst the five nominated in the *Home* article, W. H. Ifould and Sir John Sulman. 'Billy' Ifould's occupation was described as 'Principal Librarian of the Public Library of N.S.W, Chairman of the N.S.W Board for International [Stock] Exchange' and a member of the 'National Art Gallery of New South Wales Board'. This combination of a cultural and business life was typical of many Trustees. Known at his golf Club, *Elanora*, as an

---

28 *Home: The Australian Journal of Quality* (January, 1929). The article includes two other Trustees as being worthy of 'further honours':- W.H. Ifould and Sir John Sulman. Not surprising perhaps, considering the publisher of *Home* also published *Art In Australia* was Syd. Ure Smith, who became a member of the NAGNSW Board of Trustees in 1927.
29 ML. Newspaper Cuttings, Vol. 148, p. 139.
almost fanatical golfer, Ifould was a man of many parts. A 1942 *Smith's Weekly* column countered an apparent criticism that Ifould’s diversity of interests (and also his ‘advanced’ age) may have ‘diluted and lessened his abilities’. Rather than simply being a ‘keeper of books’, Ifould was, the article contended, a ‘N.S.W. Public Librarian,’ but, declared the author, ‘that is not even a half-truth. His interests have been of extraordinary diversity, and he had the capacity to do anything he undertakes vigorously and thoroughly’.

Ifould was appointed to the Board in 1921, became Vice-President in 1939 and did not retire until 1960, an involvement of some 39 years. A staunch traditionalist, Ifould was apparently a stickler for English grammar. He was in the habit of reading the agenda of each Board meeting aloud to fellow Trustees ‘as if they were totally illiterate’. NAGNSW Gallery Director Hal Missinghiam complained he was always made to feel uncomfortable at meetings when Ifould, in the Chair, having heard the Director’s report, would ‘peer over his spectacles at me and say in a loud voice, "Mr Director, on page three of the report you have changed into the subjunctive mood" ’.32

The *Home* article’s listing of Mullins’ and Ifould’s other credentials before their position as Trustee, was not an unusual sequence of priorities. Indeed, the Board of Trustees itself, within its own communications, often assigned the same precedence to other qualifications. The respect with which the Board regarded civic and philanthropic positions can be gauged by the regularity of references to them throughout the Minutes. On the accession of a new member, or, as upon the death of a member, the minutes of the monthly meeting of the Board record a tribute often recognising his ‘many years of service’. The wording of the minutes revealed the focus of the Board’s appreciation. When welcoming Sir Marcus Clarke K.B.E. to the

---

31 Ibid.
32 Hal Missinghiam, op. cit., p. 34.
Board in 1938, the President, B. J. Waterhouse, recorded Clarke's being 'a keen business man' first, and then 'a lover and patron of art'. In the case of Edward Knox, who died in 1933, the Board celebrated his contribution in the following terms: 'he aided it by his sound knowledge of business affairs as well as by his interest in all that pertained to the welfare of the Gallery'. For both new and past Trustee members it was business acumen with colonial associations of wealth and therefore membership of the elite that was considered to be of the highest priority.

Direct political appointments appear to have been rare. However, when Sydney solicitor John Maund was appointed to membership of the Board in 1933, it was at the instigation of David Drummond, the then Minister for Education (and therefore also responsible for the management of the NAGNSW). His support of Maund was due initially to Drummond having sought Maund's help in settling a dispute between several independent Sydney art schools and the Sydney Technical College over fees charged. Maund was later described disparagingly by Hal Missingham, as merely a 'ruthless football player' and a member of the Board who, throughout the late nineteen-forties under Missingham's Directorship, constantly and vociferously opposed any aesthetic apart from the Academic. Consequently, he especially battled against Missingham's progressive views and their verbal jousts in Board meetings resulted in eventually each addressing the other at Board meetings only through the Chair. Although it was Maund's legal skills that initially obtained Drummond's support, when advancing his appointment to the Board, Drummond did so by emphasizing Maund's possession of a 'personal art collection amongst the

33 Minutes of the Monthly Meeting of the NAGNSW, 28 April 1939.
34 Minutes of the Monthly Board Meetings of the NAGNSW, 28 July, 1933.
35 University of New England, Research Centre, V2133. Uncatalogued papers of David Drummond.
36 Hal Missingham was Director of the NAGNSW from 1946-1971.
finest in N.S.W.' and his having pursued a 'life-long interest in art'. These two assets were obviously considered evidence of connoisseurship and therefore adequate recommendation for Board acceptance.

Many other Board members also qualified as connoisseurs due to the magnificence of their private collections. Another of Sydney's most significant art collectors was James McGregor whose collection was considered one of the major private art collections in Australia. He first joined the Board in 1929, although his association with the Gallery went back to 1917, when he was first recorded as having lent paintings to the NAGNSW. McGregor was a wealthy businessman whose career centred on wool production and export. As was typical of Gallery Trustees, McGregor's taste, evident in his own collection, was also founded on British models. Although his collection featured both British and Australian works, predominantly landscapes, they were all painted in the traditional manner. A 1934 issue of *Art In Australia* devoted a twenty-page article to his collection, illustrating works by such Royal Academicians as J. Munnings, Armesby Brown, and William Orpen as well as works by Australian artists such as Will Ashton, Arthur Streeton, Hans Heysen and George Lambert. His long association with the NAGNSW was often of benefit to Gallery management practice. On several occasions, through his own or other business contacts, he was able to offer significant commercial advantages to the Board. For instance, in 1936, the Board was grateful for his organization of a much

---

39 See *Art In Australia* (May, 1934). The Artarmon Galleries disposed of this collection after McGregor's death and regarded it as still a major collection in Sydney, although deeply conservative in taste.
41 Ibid., p. 147.
reduced tariff for the shipping of Gallery works to an international exhibition.\textsuperscript{42}

The Boards of both these New Zealand and Sydney institutions did contain members for whom art was their primary occupation. Indeed, the NAGNSW formalised such an inclusion in the legislation under which it was governed. The original Art Gallery and Library Act, in an attempt to ensure the direct representation of artists, required that two members of the Board of Trustees were to be drawn from the Sydney Royal Society of Artists and a number of members of that Society served long periods on the Board.\textsuperscript{43} Artists such as Lionel Lindsay, Sydney Long, Julian Ashton, J. S. Watkins and Lister Lister (President of the Royal Society of Artists for over thirty years) played valuable roles in ensuring a close association with art practice, or, so it was assumed by those not within the Board. The inaugural President of the Royal Society was Tom Roberts and he apparently was responsible for establishing that Society’s ‘social’ dominance by being the first artist ‘to sign his name in the visitors’ book at Government House’ and so ‘starting a movement which gave the Society’s exhibition a certain social attraction’.\textsuperscript{44} This social superiority doubtless aided its being offered exclusive representation on the Board by the N.S.W. Government. Yet, there are no instances in the Minutes of Trustees particularly seeking artist members’ advice, or deferring to their more direct knowledge of art. Instead, where there were arguments over acquisitions, they generally concerned choices within the parameters of acceptable art, as clearly understood by the Board. Several Board members who were, at best, ‘Sunday’ painters also were long time members of the Sydney Royal Society of Artists. For example, John Lane Mullins held the position of secretary and treasurer to the Society of Artists for many years. In so doing he apparently ‘provided an important

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 148.

\textsuperscript{43} The Royal Charter for the Sydney Royal Society of Artists was granted in 1903.

Fig. 8. The 1938 NZAFA Council. Seated: Mary Murray Fuller, E. W. Hunt (vice-president), G. G. Gibbes Watson (President), W. Fergusson Hogg (Vice-President), and A.R.D. Carbery. Standing: E. D. Gore (Secretary), Harry Atkinson, Nugent Welch, Roland Hipkins, Robert Stout, W. S. Wauchop and T. D. H. Hall (Honorary Secretary).

Photo (with caption), courtesy Millwood Press, Wellington.
link between artists and Sydney’s business and political elite. ⁴⁵

Artist members were much more directly involved with the NZAFA as it was formed to provide a focus for art and culture in Wellington. Membership was by nomination and election, and the governing Council was elected annually from among the nominated members. Artist members particularly sought the studio teaching, contacts and focus for socializing that it provided. ⁴⁶ Only when the Academy became the NZNAG did the membership balance alter to contain more civic dignitaries and fewer artists in the mould of those of the NAGNSW.

Any Dominion institution anxious to associate itself with the Mother Country cultivated Vice-Regal connections and the NZAFA in particular set great store by its close ties with Governors General. Portrait Of A Century: The History of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts was published in 1983 and acknowledges the association in its Foreword. In it a letter from the then Governor-General, Sir David Beattie, describes the nature of the century old relationship between the Academy and New Zealand’s Governors-General, one that had ‘existed since Sir William Jervois was invited to be the first patron of the Academy’s parent, the Fine Arts Association of New Zealand’. ⁴⁷ Such an inclusion at the beginning of a history of this institution was very apt. Governors-General in New Zealand in the period between the wars played a pivotal role in the public expression of Academy ideals. The Earl of Liverpool (1917 – 1920), and particularly Lord Bledisloe (1930 –1935), attended Academy functions as often as possible, and were always invited either to open, or be present, at exhibition openings. Beattie describes previous Governors General as being ‘painters or photographers’, and notes that ‘some of their families

---

⁴⁶ See Appendix B.
⁴⁷ Kay and Eden, op. cit., Foreword.
Fig. 9. The selection for the Academy's 1937 Annual Exhibition. The caption of this Evening Post picture from the 20th September is 'the selection committee of the NZAFA viewing pictures submitted for the forthcoming annual exhibition to be held at the National Art Gallery. The selection committee consisted of the Academy Council.'
exhibited with the Academy', and that many were 'patrons and prolific art buyers
and collectors'. Vice-Regal patronage lent great weight to Academy
pronouncements on art. Indeed, that task was most often performed by these Vice-
Regal officers, with both Bledisloe and Liverpool speaking publicly on art generally
as well as specifically on the role of the Academy.

There are many instances in the Council Minutes where 'His Excellency' was
thanked for various services. These ranged from the mundane task of presiding at
Academy functions to more specialised assistance. For example, 1930, the Council
recorded 'its appreciation of His Excellency's interest in art education in New
Zealand' and 'signified its willingness to co-operate with him in the introduction of
Medici prints for Exhibition in New Zealand'. For the National Art Gallery of New
Zealand, a close association with the Vice-Regal office was the most obvious way in
which identification with Great Britain could be expressed and claims to direct links
with both the London Academy and the Mother Country could be maintained. Not
surprisingly, the Council was anxious to please its Patron, and was only too happy to
oblige when asked to co-operate with some Vice-Regal project, even one with
political overtones. A 1931 Minute, for example, disclosed that the Council was
asked to 'inspect a series of posters which his Excellency had received from the
Empire Marketing Board' because the Governor General 'wished to have the posters
exhibited in Wellington, preferably under the auspices of the New Zealand
Academy'.

It is evident throughout the Minutes that the Council took great pride in this
Vice-Regal association. The relationship offered an assurance of the highest
authority for New Zealand's cultural endeavour and an accompanying faith that the

---
49 Minute Book, Council of the N.Z. Academy of Fine Arts, 23.9.1931. See Stephen Constantine, Buy
Figure 10. The Academy Council selecting works for an exhibition in 1928. Standing: J. A. Heginbotham, W. S. Wauchop, W. Gray Young, Nelson Isaac, M. E. R. Tripe and Nugent Welch. Seated: Dr W. Fell, Dr A. R. D. Carbery (vice-president), C. Wilson (President), J. M. Ellis (Vice-President) and H. M. Gore. D. Crowther, the custodian, is on the right.

Photo (with caption) courtesy Millwood Publishing, Wellington.
Council’s mandate was unimpeachable. It was later considered entirely appropriate that the then Governor-General, Lord Bledisloe should open the new National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum in 1937.

Once again, a Vice-Regal officer took the opportunity to edify the public with pronouncements of his own on art. The National Art Gallery ought, he said, become:

a source of intellectual and aesthetic enlightenment, which will revitalize every sphere of educational effort, afford endless scope for self-realization, and mould public taste in appreciation of all that is beautiful and edifying both in Nature and human achievement.\textsuperscript{50}

At the same time Bledisloe warned Gallery Trustees against 'lack of expert knowledge and vision', and 'neglect of educational zeal', and advised them also of the need for 'firmness in dealing with gifts or bequests'. Bledisloe particularly cautioned against any 'inclination to pander to the transient and distorted tastes of a period of artistic abnormality', a remark easily understood at the time as a denunciation of Modernism.\textsuperscript{51} These pronouncements, and others like them, were taken as serious instructions.

In Australia, the NAGNSW did not have the direct involvement of Governors as was the case in New Zealand. However, there is strong evidence to suggest that other bodies, representing the same allegiances, were regarded as highly advantageous allies. Normally, quite convinced of their own authority, Trustees looked to few authorities beyond their own Board. There is no evidence that they sought validation from authorities outside their own appointed London-based overseas advisers or outside the London Royal Academy circles. If affirmations,


\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
when they came, were voiced by those of identical ideology they were gratefully acknowledged, particularly so if commendations were made by members of the ruling class. For instance, the relationship that developed between the Board of Trustees and Robert Gordon Menzies, was seen of great mutual benefit. As Attorney General of Australia, Menzies sought to establish Australia's equivalent to the London Royal Academy, the Australian Academy of Art.\textsuperscript{52} Menzies' view that academic art represented the epitome of British culture, and as such, needed to be bolstered against the threatened incursion of modernism was met with overwhelming support from within Trustee ranks. Not only did they share the cultural assumptions upon which his pro-academic ideology was based, but, as the acquisitions between 1918 and 1939 demonstrate, they also shared his anti-modernist position. For the Trustees, an ability to claim affinity, and indeed admiration, from one of the most senior conservative politicians in Australia, was of inestimable value in its validation of their own stature. Menzies supported their individual artistic and literary endeavours, and his political and social eminence (particularly after he became Prime Minister in 1939) gave inestimable value and weight to the Trustees' authority.\textsuperscript{53}

The relationship between Menzies' Academy (launched in 1937) and the NAGNSW Trustees was significant for many reasons, not least because of its self-confirming nature. Each endorsed the other's claims of authority. It was not surprising that an elitist institution such as the NAGNSW should seek affirmation

\textsuperscript{52} The founding Patrons of the Australian Academy of Art were the Rt. Hon. R. G. Menzies, PC., M.P., J. R. McGregor, Charles Lloyd Jones, Hon. John Lane Mullins and Howard Hinton. All NAGNSW Trustees, except for Lloyd Jones, who was named as the Director of the new Academy. The Academy was first proposed by Menzies in 1932 but was not acted upon until 1936 when as Attorney-General he travelled to London, and as part of his work itinerary, he proposed a Royal Charter for such an Academy.

\textsuperscript{53} Menzies wrote the Foreword to James MacDonald's \textit{Australian Painting Desiderata} (Melbourne: Lothian Press, 1958).
through close ties with another such elitist group as Menzies’ proposed Academy, as indeed the London Royal Academy cultivated close relations with members of the British aristocracy. The large number of NAGNSW Board members who held office in the Academy reveals the close affinity between the two institutions. In terms of its officers and the type of artists invited to participate, one operated almost as an extension of the other. This affinity was made particularly evident in the first local Academy Exhibition of 1938, which, in a highly unusual gesture of support, was housed in the NAGNSW. Perhaps, however, this gesture was not so surprising given the large number of NAGNSW Board members who held office in the Academy; each appeared to operate virtually as one in terms of officers and the type of artists invited to participate.

The catalogue, which accompanied the inaugural exhibition, singled out two members of its Board, J. R. McGregor and Charles Lloyd Jones (Chairman of David Jones Ltd.) thanking them ‘for their donations to the funds of the Academy’. Three members of the Art Gallery of New South Wales Board (J. R. McGregor, John Lane Mullins and Howard Hinton), plus the Director (Will Ashton) were named as Patrons of the new Academy. In addition, John Lane Mullins and Charles Lloyd Jones were named as Honourary treasurers. Sir John Longstaff, another long-serving Trustee, was made President, and the selection committee for the first Academy Exhibition included Longstaff and two other Trustee members, Lionel Lindsay and Sydney Ure Smith.\textsuperscript{54} For both these institutions, their shared basis was in the individuals

\textsuperscript{54} J. R. McGregor to Menzies, 24.2.1937. ML MSS 2615. Other long-serving Trustees were not considered suitable for foundation membership. Lister Lister was the subject of a 1937 letter written to Menzies by J. R. McGregor who admitted he was ‘disturbed to learn’ that of the 52 names suggested as foundation members of the Academy, the name of Lister Lister was ‘ruled out’. ‘The old man’ McGregor assured Menzies is a ‘deplorable painter...and he is also a pretty dreadful person’. But, he noted, he [Lister Lister] had been ‘for more than 30 years President of the Royal Society of Artists and an equal number of years Vice President of the National Art Gallery Trustees’. Furthermore, Menzies was told ‘he is already incredibly old and I cannot see that they are asked to give too much, as with any luck at all he should fairly soon be dead’.
responsible for guiding them. Given their common background and artistic taste, it was therefore not surprising that the dominant determinants were class and British heritage.

The tacit links that had been forged between a colonial British history, nostalgia, ‘connoisseurship’ and class were so closely wedded in conservative eyes, that Sir Robert Menzies publicly articulated this phenomenon when, in his address at the annual exhibition of the Victorian Artists Society, he said:

...every great country has its Academy. They have set certain standards of art. Great art speaks a language which every intelligent person can understand. The people who call themselves Modernists talk a different language. I represent a class of people which will, in the next 100 years, determine the permanent place to be occupied in the world of art by those painting today.\(^{55}\)

This London Royal Academy to-be, was, Menzies believed, positioned to become the major force in Australian art.\(^{56}\) It did not, perhaps because ultimately it was open to public scrutiny and criticism, unlike the enclave of the NAGNSW Board, which not only appeared impervious to such critical scrutiny but also to a large degree was quarantined from it. However, the synergy between Menzies’ desire for a British art establishment in Australia and the Trustees’ desire that the NAGNSW should foster identical sentiments accounts for much of ‘official’ art practice between the wars in Sydney. The endemic conservatism evinced by institutions such as Menzies’ Academy, was perpetuated and reinforced by an equally conservative aesthetic core common to Board members of both National galleries.

In his vociferous advocacy of conservative artistic principles Lionel Lindsay


was a typical Trustee. Educated in Melbourne at the National Gallery Art School, Lindsay became best known for his ‘black and white’ works, etchings originally created as illustrations for Henry Lawson’s and Steele Rudd’s stories. Eventually he became better known in high art circles for his exceptional skills as an etcher, and was recognised in England and in Europe as well as in Australia. Widely travelled, he made several trips to Europe, particularly to Spain, where he was ‘enraptured by the romance of Don Quixote’.

As a prominent member of the Society of Artists, he exhibited and worked prolifically. Perhaps as well known for his work as an art critic, he took the responsibility upon himself to refute, denigrate and castigate any artist he did not consider ‘legitimate’. For Lindsay, legitimacy in art meant only the acknowledgment of a classical tradition, with its inherent discipline of taught technique. As a member of the Board of Trustees of the Art Gallery from 1918-1929 and then again from 1934-1949 he wielded enormous power in Sydney’s art world between the wars. This power came not only from his position on the Board of Trustees but from his close association with major English art publishers, dealers and galleries. His patronage by the leading London print dealer Harold Wright of Colnaghis & Co. gave enormous weight to his pronouncements on art. In Sydney’s artistic milieu there were few individuals who could claim such prestigious, highly respected associations. His autobiography, A Comedy of Life, includes a passage which best captures the vitriol he reserved for modernist artists and their disastrous impact on European art:

To break completely with tradition is to smash the continuity of civilization. That has been attempted and there are modernists in Europe who have suggested the destruction of the Louvre and all museums of art. This delightful cretinous ideal shows us the depths to which a vain credulity can descend, and perhaps the year ‘29 had its artistic uses; for it dispersed nearly all the unfit then infesting Paris and the capital cities of Europe, who had turned good paint and

57 The Lionel Lindsay Centenary Catalogue, Ballarat Fine Art Gallery, 1974.
canvas into a public nuisance. The passion for theories has been a particular lunacy of the age. To it have been sacrificed the means of expression, the absolute form and all the humanistic relationships. Man has attempted to operate outside his normal sphere of experience, so that we have surrealism, fathered by Freud and the alienists - a vain attempt to stabilize nightmare - and cubism, a play-thing with jig-saw puzzles and children’s blocks; and expressionism, which can mean anything you like.\textsuperscript{58}

Typical of many conservatives, Lindsay regarded Modernism as a ‘conspiracy of incompetents’.\textsuperscript{59} His aesthetic was formed by that of the nineteenth century, as was the case for most Trustee members. Quick to denounce anything that was modern, he confused any departures from nature as evidence of artistic or technical incompetency. He is now seen as almost reactionary in these pronouncements. The catalogue of Lindsay’s \textit{Centenary Exhibition} described him as ‘an ardent conservative’. His authoritative position, coupled with an ability to argue eloquently and vehemently on behalf of the English academic tradition helped construct and then support a single artistic ideology. There is no doubt Lindsay’s was a major voice in the perpetuation of a nineteenth-century understanding of what could constitute art on the Board. This authority was then reflected in the National Art Gallery of New South Wales’ arts practice between the wars.

Throughout the period of this study there are also many examples of equally deeply entrenched conservatism amongst Gallery officials. Council members of the NZAFA and later the same individuals on the NZNAG espoused similar attitudes as their Sydney cousins. However untutored these individuals’ knowledge of art may have been, their position on the Academy Council and therefore in the art world of the capital of New Zealand, enabled their pronouncements on art to carry considerable weight. Their judgements were reported, not only in the Wellington

\textsuperscript{58} Lionel Lindsay, ‘Modernism; with a note on the work of Arnold Shore’, \textit{Art In Australia} (May, 1937).

\textsuperscript{59} Lionel Lindsay, \textit{The Comedy Of Life}, (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1967).
press, but throughout New Zealand. For example, Col. A. R. D. Carbery, an Irish
army doctor, and long term member and office holder of the N.Z.A.F.A., was
reported in the Otago Daily in 1932, reminding the New Zealand art public that:

Living so remotely from the world’s art centres it is necessary - if
there is to be any betterment in our standards of taste - that we in
New Zealand should be brought more frequently into intimacy with
the best contemporary work of British schools. 60

When opening the 1930 Academy Annual Exhibition, two years earlier,
Carbery responded to charges that the Academy was too conservative and too
dominated by British models. He attempted to allay the suspicions of various critics
by announcing that ‘New Zealand art’ had ‘generally been in the past accused of
being mid-Victorian’. To demonstrate that this was no longer the case, and that the
committee members were ‘not hostile’ to ‘change and modernism’, he declared that,
‘those pictures they considered modern, and not academic or Victorian’ had been
hung ‘together on the north wall’ of the Gallery. Carbery concluded by announcing
the names of those pictures ‘purchased by the Council for the permanent collection’.
None hanging on the north wall, however, were found to be worthy of acquisition.61

Carbery’s views were typical of the Academy’s Councils in their fear of
contemporary art and their rigid adherence to British models. For example,
Professor James Shelley, an English academic holding the Chair of Education at
Canterbury University College, often commented upon New Zealand’s cultural life.
His remarks in the Lyttleton Times newspaper expressed the prevailing view:

...we must remember however, that the British nation is never more
British than when it is colonising; and that our colonising genius
functions through the adaptability of our culture to new and strange
environments in pursuit of fundamental ideals.62
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60 A. R. D. Carbery, Otago Daily Times, 16. 4.1932 p. 22.
61 Charles Perkins, ‘New Zealand Academy Annual Exhibition’, Art In New Zealand (December,
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62 Professor James Shelley, Lyttleton Times, 14.3.1921,p.2. Cited in Gordon H. Brown, New Zealand
Painting 1920-1940 (Wellington: Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Of New Zealand, 1975), p.34.
Similarly, the biographer of Australian artist William Dobell, Brian Adams, wrote of the NAGNSW Board as having existed as an ‘exclusive club’.

The Board certainly shared several characteristics with other elitist Sydney establishments; its members were drawn from the ruling class, British modes of education and manners were necessary ‘passwords’, and there existed definite, although tacit exclusions. As with other exclusive and conservative Sydney ‘clubs’ (such as the Royal Sydney Golf Club, the Australia Club and the Queen’s Club), the NAGNSW Board of Trustees shared another characteristic with fellow bastions of the British elite. A forceful, if unspoken, anti-Semitism prevailed. Once again, the lead appears to have been taken from their models in Great Britain where anti-semitism often took the form of upper-class conservatives blaming the Jewish community for ‘undermining British cultural values’.

Robert Wistrich describes the anti-semitism of British poet T.S. Eliot for example as typical in its overt ‘snobishness’, its ‘gentility’, and ‘anti-modernity’.

This form of anti-Semitism was, Wistrich believed, typical of views held by many British conservatives, an attitude shared by many ‘cultural critics and artists in twentieth century Britain, ambivalent about progress, modernity, mass politics and urban values’.

Many Sydney elite conservatives held the same view. Never publicly admitted, it was however well known that, except for a very few exceptional individuals, Jewish membership of the elite Sydney clubs was near impossible.

Joanna Mendelssohn wrote in her biography of Lionel Lindsay that,

63 Brian Adams, Portrait of An Artist (Melbourne: Hutchison,1983), p.34.
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67 In a conversation with Mr Tom McKay (26.3.1999 & 28.3.1999), an officer of the Elanora Golf Club in Sydney, and long time member of Royal Sydney Golf Club, I was told Jewish inclusion within these clubs was only open to ‘exceptional Jews’. Even those that had served their country in an outstanding capacity during war-time, were admitted only reluctantly.
‘Jews were unable to belong to the Melbourne Club, the real seat of power in Victoria and other institutions were discreetly unavailable to them.’

Hal Missingham referred to a ‘tremendously strong anti-Jewish feeling’ amongst the Board where paintings by Jewish artists’ were ‘disregarded’ and ‘gifts or loans offered by Jews smartly declined’.

Only very rarely did this prejudice become public and the under-lying anti-Semitism within the Board reveal itself. In fact, such an occasion did occur, not in Sydney, but rather in London on at least one occasion within the bosom of the London Royal Academy, at that time also a bastion of anti-Semitism. Trustee Lionel Lindsay, whilst speaking at a London Chelsea artist’s function, used the opportunity to denounce Jewish art dealers, and in his argument against them was publicly supported by the London Royal Academy President. Lindsay’s attitude toward what he saw as the perceived proliferation of Jewish art dealers, and his conviction that Jewish dealers were solely responsible for the growing popularity of ‘decadent’ modern art (also much despised at that time by the London Academy), was not an uncommon complaint in this particular artistic milieu.

Lindsay later repeated these allegations in his autobiography, *The Comedy of Life*. Not only did Lindsay regard Modernism as a ‘conspiracy of incompetents’, he, like the Gallery Director, James MacDonald, blamed Modernism on Jewish art dealers, and he did so publicly. At the London Royal Academy dinner he attacked both modernism and the Jewish connection as a ‘blight’ upon the world of art, blaming Jewish art dealers for
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70 This view of the Academy can be gauged in Lionel Lindsay’s autobiography, *Comedy Of Life*, (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1967), p. 259 – 260. They were also written in his 1942 text *Added Art* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1942).
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'bribing a corrupt press', 'cleverly' making 'modern art fashionable and vitiating public taste'. This 'malady', this 'continual infection' he fulminated, was responsible for falling Academy sales, as the Academy was not able to counter Modernist promotion. NAGNSW Director, James MacDonald, also voiced his belief that 'Hebrew dealers' were responsible for modernism, dealers that had 'given themselves dispensation to deal in paintings' for those who 'knew no better'.

The consistency with which the Board operated, and the immovable conservatism of its art practices, as demonstrated in the acquisition and rejection of works, exhibitions and in its championing of particular artists, can be clearly demonstrated and is discussed in later chapters. However, the dominance of the model can just as clearly be gauged by examining the personal taste of some of the Trustees when they operated outside of the Board's confines. The power of the NAGNSW Board, when it spoke as a single voice, was such that the Minutes reveal only very rare cases of dissent amongst the Board. The imperative of providing Sydney with a visual expression of a heritage which was morally uplifting for its populace was powerful enough to override reservations arising from the taste of an individual Trustee.

There are several instances where the power of this force can be seen in contest with an apparently contradictory set of values. For there were indeed occasions when private and personal Trustee tastes appeared to be completely in opposition to that which was supported by the same Trustees when sitting as Board members. Depending upon which 'hat' the individual Trustee was wearing, it could be argued that opposing aesthetic values appear to have been operating simultaneously. Contradictions in taste between public persona and private domain
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are apparent in two particular cases.

Although in his non-NAGNSW life Sir Charles Lloyd Jones (1878-1958) was considered quite a progressive, open to new ideas on contemporary art and design, he was also, however, typical of the body of Trustees. When occupying his seat on the Board there were very few examples of progressive or modernist sympathies evident. His company, David Jones Pty. Ltd., was one of Sydney’s eminent business houses, and his social circles those of the elite. He had, in his youth, set out to be a painter, having studied at the Julian Ashton school in Sydney, then at the Slade School in London. When his painting was not accepted at the Royal Academy of Art in London he gave up plans for an artistic career and returned to Sydney to work in David Jones Pty. Ltd. He went on to have a distinguished business career, holding positions such as Treasurer of the Sydney Chamber of Commerce, President of the Retail Traders Association, Director of radio station 2BL and was the first Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Throughout his life, however, he continued to paint. His works were usually landscapes painted in the manner of those artists with whom he had studied when young, specifically, French Impressionism learnt via English translations. However much a Sunday painter, fellow Trustees considered these works by Lloyd Jones to be of such high calibre that they were worthy of inclusion within the national collection. The Gallery owns two, an oil, *Auckland Blue*, which Lloyd Jones had presented the Gallery in 1937, and *Afternoon Light*, another oil, purchased by the Marshall Bequest Fund in 1941.

Lloyd Jones, however, exhibited very different taste when purchasing for his own collection, or for the David Jones store. This apparent contradiction was between Lloyd Jones’ own late nineteenth, early twentieth style of painting, evident
in his willingness to support his fellow Trustees in their preference for nineteenth
British academic taste, on the one hand, and his purchasing of modernist designers
and artists’ works for his business enterprise, the David Jones Art Gallery and for his
own personal collection, on the other. The David Jones Art Gallery, opened by
Lloyd Jones in August 1944, provided a vital opportunity for modernist painters,
craftspeople and designers to exhibit their work. Earlier the Department Store had
housed the radical 1939 Melbourne Herald Exhibition (which the Trustees of the
National Art Gallery of New South Wales had refused to display).

As early as 1923 Lloyd Jones was buying, for both his own collection and
for sale in David Jones, the work of English and French modernist artists such
Archibald Barnes and Utrillo as well as the French designer Paul Poiret. 73 Of all the
National Art Gallery Trustees between the wars in Sydney, Lloyd Jones, who held
office for twenty-four years, was more prepared than any others to countenance
modernist thinking, but any evidence of such sympathy was not reflected in his
actions whilst a Trustee. It cannot be assumed that just because the Minutes do not
reveal any dissent there was none, however, when Lloyd Jones wore his Trustee
‘hat’ the Minutes do not record his having championed any such modernist artists. It
was not until 1939, some 16 years after he had personally collected examples of
modernist work, that there is any evidence of his influencing other Trustees in the
purchase or advocacy of modernist works. 74 The power of the conservative Trustee
culture was such that although David Jones Pty. Ltd. was part of the vanguard which
offered modernist products to the Sydney public, Lloyd Jones, as National Art
Gallery of New South Wales Trustee, adopted a far more conservative stance,
genreflecting to British academic models and displaying his apparently determined

73 Mary Eagle, Australian Modern Painting Between the Wars 1914 – 1939 (Sydney: Bay Books,
74 See Chapter Six of this study, The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism.
view of what he considered appropriate art for the national collection.\textsuperscript{75}

Lloyd Jones’s somewhat contradictory values in art were also apparent, although to a lesser degree, in the public and private art collection of John Maund. The ‘Rugby loving’ solicitor, referred to earlier in this chapter, is listed in Jean Campbell’s \textit{Early Sydney Moderns} as one of the major patrons of the Macquarie Gallery. Campbell described Maund as ‘never missing a show’, and as a ‘supporter of Wakelin’ whom he obviously collected.\textsuperscript{76} He was also described as a ‘well known artists’ friend and patron’, one who ‘concealed a very kind heart beneath a very brusque manner’.\textsuperscript{77} Whilst Maund would not, apparently, deal with the ardent modernist supporter, Macquarie gallery partner, Basil Burdett, he supported the early modernist Wakelin by purchasing two of his paintings when Wakelin was facing financial difficulties in 1923.\textsuperscript{78} Hal Missingham would have been surprised by such references to a ‘kind heart’, and especially his support of any facet of modernism. Certainly, according to Missingham, any modernist sympathies were certainly not obvious whilst Maund was occupying a chair at the Board table of the NAGNSW. Again, Maund made a clear distinction between what was suitable for a national collection and what he would purchase for his own private viewing. What was appropriate to represent the national cultural interest was not always representative of his personal taste.\textsuperscript{79}

The Board of Trustees of the NAGNSW did not find it necessary to justify their actions by a formal, written acquisition policy for the collection, nor to make

\textsuperscript{75} See Chapter Four of this study, \textit{Oh! To Be In England!}
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., p. 94.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., p. 71.
\textsuperscript{79} The National Art Gallery of New South Wales had only one Roland Wakelin work in its possession before 1940, \textit{Mount Wellington, Tasmania}, purchased in 1935. Another five works were obtained in the 1940s.
any public, written, explanatory statement for their decision-making. It is ironic that the only occasion on which they attempted, as a body, to explain what their attitudes to art might have been, or their understanding of the value of art to society, was in a letter to the Minister in 1936 requesting increased funds for proposed additions to the Gallery building. In it the Board reminded ‘those responsible’ that ‘where there is no vision the people perish’, and added:

Art plays a definite part in the life of the community, the cultural side of life draws its inspiration from art, the plastic arts in their higher expression in turn influence the minds and work of the craftsman and artisan, forming and influencing most, if not all, of the things that surround us in daily life. Moreover, the spiritual side of life draws inspiration from the work of great artists.80

The thirteen Trustees of the NAGNSW acted as one. They sought no advice domestically except their own. The exception was when that advice came from either their own advisers situated in London (and more often than not these were members of the Royal Academy) or if counsel was proffered directly from the London Royal Academy. There are some extraordinary examples of how this high-handedness impacted upon the collection. The Trustees relieved advisory committees of any authority to purchase if they did not approve of the recommendations made and felt no compunction, for instance, in deciding not to include external judges in the Archibald and Wynne prizes. There were occasions when, either by destruction or sale, they determined the fate of works in their collection, which had been purchased at a time when a different ethos dominated. The removal of works in the collection was dealt with in the following manner: the Director was asked by the Trustees to assemble a list of works he thought ‘should not be shown’ and instructed that ‘for each meeting he should hang six in the Boardroom so the Trustees could determine

80 Draft of a letter to be sent to the Minister of Education. Minute Book, National Art Gallery [NAGNSW], 2. 9.1936.
their worth'. Conrad Martens, for example, was lucky to have escaped culling in 1930 by only a narrow margin. De-accessioning in one form or other was obviously on the agenda, as at the same May 1930 meeting the Director was asked to ‘submit to the Board a list of those pictures which, in his opinion, should be removed from the walls and be sold or destroyed’. Records of the September 1936 meeting of the Trustees indicate that the option to destroy works had been used in the past, indeed at least one Minute points to such disposals being made without any consultation with other authorities. A letter from a Mr Ian MacPherson was minuted in September 1936, offering to ‘buy Bazaar Gossip for £100’. The Trustees then noted ‘that from Mr Mann [the previous Director] it was afterwards learnt that any such disposal of gallery pictures must be by auction sale’. Obviously in the years since Mann had ceased to be Director they had not disposed of works by this method, but by destruction or outright sale. At no time were any individuals consulted who may have had particular expertise in the artist’s work before these steps were taken.

This somewhat alarming high-handedness by Sydney and Wellington National Gallery Trustees had its lighter moments. A portrait, of Sir Joseph Ward by the New Zealand artist W. A. Bowring, had been purchased by members of Parliament for presentation to the new National Art Gallery of New Zealand. The Board ‘agreed to accept the portrait, provided the donors were agreeable to the lower part of the canvas being cut off as it was considered there was [a] fault in the drawing of the legs’. The donors asked the Board to ‘reconsider as it was well known
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Ward had short legs. In the end, the Board accepted the painting of an apparently diminutive ex-Prime Minister.

It is also important to note the supreme confidence the inter-war Gallery Boards possessed in the exercise of their responsibilities. For example, during the period 1918-1939 several attempts were made to open the judging of the premier Sydney art awards, the Archibald and Wynne prizes, to other than members of the Board. That the Trustees continued to be the sole judges was often the object of criticism in the press, but they saw no need for an outsider’s opinion, believing that theirs was a collective expertise of irrefutable judgement.

Advisory committees were often formed from within the Board to undertake specific projects but their autonomy was often short-lived and their judgements questioned. Decisions by these committees were often revoked. Once again, the Board jealously guarded its power of decision-making, deciding in 1929 that it would ‘purchase all works of art’ and that ‘committees were to advise only’. For example, one of the few bequests to the Gallery was that of the Marshall Gift of 1931. This benefactor provided a small sum of money which could be spent on acquisitions at the discretion of the Board. A Marshall Gift Advisory Committee was set up, duly visited exhibitions and proposed purchases, only to find their decisions discounted by the Board, or ‘that in the opinion of the Trustees the pictures selected by the Marshall Gift Committee were not acceptable’. Even though these recommendations made by the committee were discounted, when judging the worth of a particular art-work dissent was rare amongst Trustees. Their shared ideological position was too deeply ingrained, and the way in which the Board constituted was
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too homogeneous to generate any real difference of opinion.

As unified as the Board was in matters of taste, they were occasionally forced to acknowledge another power, that of their Minister. This relationship appears to have been largely one of non-interference, until the appointment of David Drummond in 1930. Drummond, an extremely ‘hands on’ Minister, quickly dispelled the Trustees of any notion that he would merely rubber-stamp any NAGNSW Trustee proposal. He quickly became, as far as the Trustees were concerned, an irritant. They especially disliked any interference in what they saw as their special domain. Evidence suggests that difficulties in dealing with the Minister, over matters clearly within his area of responsibility, including maintenance of the Gallery itself, funding appropriations and the filling of vacancies on the Board, were on-going. Exchanges between Drummond and the Trustees were, at times tense, most often arising in the form of peppery, short-tempered communications between the two over the Gallery’s fixed determination to pursue proposals for increases in the Gallery’s allocated funds. Communications became more heated, however, over the Board’s perception of the Minister’s interference in Gallery operations, particularly in the process of nominating replacements for Board vacancies. In 1931, for example, the Trustees took the unusual step of minuting the following resolution which clearly reflects obvious frustration and irritation:

The President reported that he had an interview with the Minister respecting the attendances at meetings of the Trustees and satisfied him thereon. He also obtained a promise from the Minister that in the event of a vacancy occurring in the Trust he would await nominations by the Board before making an appointment in view of the fact that the Board represented many donors of property, money and works of art amongst whom individuals were conspicuous.

89 Mr D. Drummond, M.L.A for Armidale, N.S.W, was Minister for Education from 1927-1930 then 1932-1941.
91 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 23.10.31. The authority of the Minister was such, that in his dealings with the Gallery, the Acting Minister would not, in his absence make decisions. See NAGNSW Minute Book, 25.9.1936.
The Trustees made it very clear to the Minister that theirs was a Board capable of making judgements, and not only concerning highly cultivated matters, but also in politics, hinting broadly that the trust membership was one capable of using financial as well as political clout if necessary. Thinly veiled threats such as these did not seem to shake the Minister’s determination to override the Trustee’s wishes. Rarely were these kind of deliberations recorded in detail, but one in particular exposes the tensions that existed. A Minute from the March 1939 meeting records a decision to forward to the Minister a list of five candidates from which a new Board member might be selected. The proposed candidates included S. H. Ervin, Sir Marcus Clarke, John Young, Norman Carter and J. D. Moore. However, the Board, in its communication with the Minister attempted to limit the Minister’s opportunity to make the selection, and reinforced their authority, by ‘informing him of the following resolutions’ which in effect reduced the field to three:

1. That if it be the intention of the Minister to appoint a collector or connoisseur of eminence to the position of trustee, the Board is pleased to nominate Mr S. H. Ervin, who was the second nomination when the last vacancy occurred.

2. That should the Minister prefer the appointment of an artist, then the Board nominated Mr Norman Carter & Mr J. D. Moore in that order of preference.92

The next month’s Minutes record the result, which testifies to the Minister’s obduracy: ‘The President, on behalf of the Trustees, welcomed Sir Marcus Clarke, K.B.E.’.93 That Sir Marcus Clarke was gazetted as the new Trustee must have been a surprise to the Board, as instructions to the Minister had been so clearly spelt out. Unfortunately, many of David Drummond’s papers of this period do not survive so
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that his side of the quarrel cannot be told.\textsuperscript{94} There is nevertheless, evidence that some of Drummond’s appointments to the Board, at least on one occasion, were in the nature of political appointments, perhaps a return of favour by the Minister. For example, in 1932 Drummond had been asked by the Directors of several independent art schools (in particular by Julian Ashton) to enquire into the fees charged by the Sydney Technical Colleges. The claim, made by Ashton, was that classes were ‘carried on with total disregard to public finance and efficient control’.\textsuperscript{95} Drummond gave the delicate task of enquiring into the situation to J. W Maund, the city solicitor mentioned earlier in this chapter.\textsuperscript{96} In reporting on this ‘honorary commission of enquiry’ to the Premier, Drummond informed him that he intended also to ‘propose Mr Maund to the vacancy of the Art Gallery Trust’. He did so because Mr Maund had ‘taken a life-long interest in art’, his family ‘being closely associated with fine art and [because] he himself possesses one of the finest collections in N.S.W., valued at something not less than £10,000’. This report to the Premier reveals that Trustee appointments could have been in the nature of political pay-backs. It also suggests that individuals sought admission to the Board by direct application to the Minister. Drummond further supported his decision to appoint Maund by telling the Premier, ‘he [Maund] was strongly recommended by Judge Boyce and others when a previous vacancy occurred’. Realising that this appointment would not be received well by the Trustees, Drummond warned the Premier ‘that there will be a few soreheads when the gazettal takes place’.\textsuperscript{97}

\textsuperscript{94} University of New England Research Centre. D. H. Drummond Accession Paper Work (so named by the Research Centre). See also UNE Heritage Centre 3005/4, V1087, V3000/1, V3016/2, V 2117-2129.

\textsuperscript{95} University of New England Research Centre V2133. Letter to the Hon. B. S. Stevens M.L.A, Premier of New Wales from D. H. Drummond, 27 Feb. 1932.

\textsuperscript{96} Maund & Kelynack, Sydney.

\textsuperscript{97} University of New England Heritage Centre Archives: V 2133.
Within the Board of Trustees Minutes there is only one recorded incident of outright rebellion from within the Board over a proposed member. A Minute of the December 1932 meeting, contains evidence of an extraordinary event, concerning the ‘appointment of a new Trustee’. At this meeting ‘after a long discussion’, the Trustees, actually voted on whose name would be forwarded to the Minister. This is the only time that such an event was recorded. Lionel Lindsay was the individual up for ‘appointment to the Trust in the place of Sir Joseph Carruthers’. The vote was 4 to 3 in favour of his name going forward, but to reinforce their application, ‘a further resolution was carried by the same votes’ that a ‘deputation be made to the Minister to urge the appointment of Mr Lindsay’. A ‘minority report’ was then presented to the meeting recommending that the names of both ‘Messrs Lindsay and [Sydney] Long be submitted to the Minister from whom he be requested to select one’. The three Trustees who did not support Lindsay’s sole application also sought ‘the same privilege of approaching the Minister personally thereon’. Unfortunately, there is no record in Drummond’s papers of the details, or indeed the outcome of this proposed meeting. However, in spite of obvious lobbying, the eventual successful applicant was Sydney Long. Because Drummond was a long-time admirer of Long’s work, perhaps this outcome might have been expected.

Lionel Lindsay was not off the Board for long. Indeed, he was to prove to be undoubtedly one of the most influential and important members of the Board between the Wars. But his long term association with the Gallery appears at times to have been problematic both in his relationship with fellow Board members, and with the Minister. By 1935 Lindsay was back in favour with the rest of the Board, having been ‘unanimously selected by the Trustees to fill the vacancy caused by the death of
Mr Marshall’.  

The Trustees ‘resolved that the Minister be written to’ advising him of the ‘wishes of the Board’. Ten days after this meeting, however, Drummond wrote to Gallery Board member James McGregor, revealing that his (Drummond’s) support for Lindsay’s candidature was limited, making plain his reluctance and underlining McGregor’s role in the decision-making:

It may also interest you to know that however much I may have wished to meet the views of the Trustees, had it not been for your own very personal and eloquent advocacy of the claims of Mr Lionel Lindsay I am afraid that he would at least have missed out on this occasion.

One explanation may be found in the politics of the day. Lindsay’s ‘supposedly radical stand on Spain had led to considerable opposition to his appointment from the newly-elected conservative United Australia party government’; it took ‘strong representations’ by McGregor before Lindsay was reappointed. However, Ministerial appointments such as that of Maund, or indeed Lindsay, did not alter the makeup or the authority of the Board. As Drummond’s appointments were always drawn from the ranks of the establishment, artistic or social, they were invariably individuals whose ideological base was identical with members already on the Board. No changes were to be expected. If, inadvertently, new appointees had advocated change, they would certainly not have been welcomed. For example, Drummond’s letter to Stevens in 1932 concerning Maund’s appointment quoted above, refers to the same value systems that Menzies later articulated, indicating which type of citizen was entitled to speak for art: one
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100 D. Drummond to James R. McGregor, 31.12.1939, ML MSS 2615.

who was a connoisseur, whose knowledge of art was the product of an upper-class education, and whose experience was underwritten by the kind of wealth necessary to fund personal collections. Drummond was an unusually active Minister, his whole political career characterised by pro-active decision-making, expeditiously carried out.\(^{102}\) Whilst the National Gallery of New South Wales and its Board of Trustees was not, compared with the demands of his other Ministerial portfolio, one of his major preoccupations, he was very reluctant to let the Trustees have the sole say in the running of the Gallery. A 1937 letter, minuted by the Trustees, reveals just how forcefully he was prepared to express his opinions. The matter concerned an upcoming exhibition of contemporary British artists, over which the Trustees had been prevaricating as to whether or not they would participate. Drummond’s short, sharp response indicated his displeasure at their inability to make a decision, especially one that did not suit his wishes. The Minister was, apparently, ‘disappointed’ that the ‘State may not be represented at the proposed exhibition’.\(^{103}\) His Under Secretary communicated the following to the Board:

The Trustees of the National Gallery are specially vested by Act of Parliament with the preservation and encouragement of art in this State. If they do not see their way clear to take action apparently they have fully made their decision after review of all the facts.\(^{104}\)

Again, in a letter to the Trustees, this time concerning the approaching appointment of a new Director, Drummond asked that the Trustees supply him with ‘the grounds on which the nomination of the Trustees was made’ and ‘whether the question of administrative ability of the successful applicant was thoroughly discussed’.\(^{105}\) Often forced onto the defensive in their dealings with the Minister,
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\(^{103}\) Minute Book, NAGNSW, 14.1.1937.

\(^{104}\) Ibid.

\(^{105}\) Minute Book, NAGNSW, 15.1.1937.
they responded with a rather vague, irritated response that 'with regard to the Minister's question as to administrative ability' they 'had in mind the necessary requirements'. They were not to any interference, they apparently found that Drummond's blunt manner, derived perhaps from his background as a State ward and dairy farmer, tested their patience.

In spite of such spats between Drummond and the Trustees, he, as the one individual who could have altered the ideological make-up of the Board, was unlikely to do so. Whilst not particularly an art lover, nor even an admirer of English or European art, Drummond was an ardent Round Tabler, a fervent believer in the links with the British Empire and later the Commonwealth. His diary of 1952, written whilst on a tour of the U.K and Europe records his belief that 'Australia with over 90% still of British stock is probably more British than Britain'. He believed that Great Britain was the 'key to our continued existence as a great power' but also that Australia was the 'strongest link of the external chain of the British Commonwealth'. Although he had a love for Australian art, particularly that which depicted the landscape of the bush, his respect for all things British, especially when it came to culture and heritage, was deeply embedded. The impressions made by particular art galleries and museums, the sense of history evident in Britain, were, for a self-educated man, raised as a ward of the State, enormous. So much so, that he took time, whilst in London to write to a
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Fig. 11. Lionel Lindsay, Chinon.

Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This image appeared in the exhibition of 150 Years of Australian Art and was reproduced in the catalogue.
Tenterfield newspaper in support of the preservation of an historic building there.\textsuperscript{113}

Coming from the Armidale region of New South Wales, Drummond was situated within a powerful elite rivalling that of Sydney. The north and north-east regions of N.S.W was home to many wealthy pastoral families, such as the Whites of Beltrees, who were able to wield power effectively and dispense culture, even though based well away from the metropolis of Sydney. Drummond’s rural background and passionate commitment to the Armidale region of New South Wales nurtured a personal choice of art that was Australian in character and locale. His personal collection favoured Australian landscape paintings, in particular, those of Douglas Pratt, James Jackson and Sydney Long. His long-term association with Trustee Howard Hinton (through their joint efforts to establish the Armidale Teachers’ College) also informed his taste in art.\textsuperscript{114} A subscriber to \textit{Art In Australia}, he counted its publisher and Gallery Trustee, Syd Ure Smith amongst his friends.\textsuperscript{115}

In addition to the Trustees and their Ministers, the other individuals who held responsibility for the art practices of the NAGNSW were the Directors. There were three appointed during the period of this study:

- G.V. Mann (1912-1927)
- James MacDonald (1927-1937)

Administrative mechanisms established by the Board made this position one of little power. Whilst publicly advertised, these positions were in effect appointments made directly by the Board. Usually, they were individuals chosen in advance by the Board on the basis of their perceived appropriateness and then

\textsuperscript{113} Letter to the Editor of the \textit{Star} newspaper, Tenterfield, 4.8.1952, UNE Heritage Archive Centre V3016/2.
\textsuperscript{114} Interview with James Bellshaw, grandson of D. H. Drummond, 31.8.1998.
'nursed' through the application and selection process. Will Ashton, for instance, rather coyly refers to his being 'inspired' to 'apply for the position' by Trustee James McGregor.¹¹⁶ Not surprisingly then, these gentlemen displayed attitudes to art that mirrored those of the Trustees. The duties and responsibilities of the Director were not formalised until 1937 when the Minister (Drummond) requested that the Board do so. However, the Trustees had, once again, a battle with the Minister for Education when he sought to have the position of Director placed directly under the control of the Public Service Board, rather than the Trustees. The Minister's proposed 'amendments' to the Public Library and National Art Gallery Act, namely, that 'officers shall be appointed under and be subject to the provisions of the Public Service Act' were met with alarm. Fearful that unwanted individuals might be placed amongst them, the Trustees smartly informed the Minister that 'they desired that the nomination of the Director' remain with them as 'the Trustees consider that appointment of vital importance to the Gallery'.¹¹⁷

The Board duly produced a document which defined the 'Duties Of The Director', listing nine areas of responsibility.¹¹⁸ Only the first two actually referred directly to the management of art-work, while the other seven were administrative only. The first announced that 'subject to the powers of the Trustees' the Director 'shall control and manage' the national collection. The second, however, made it clear that this 'control and management' would extend only to his 'informing the trustees of his opinions' of works 'submitted for purchase, loan or gift'. The Director might purchase, but 'only when specially authorised' when 'it is not possible for the Trustees to go as a body'.¹¹⁹ The Director's role was then very much

¹¹⁷ Minute Book, NAGNSW, 18. 7.1934.
¹¹⁸ Duties Of The Director, Minute Book, NAGNSW, 19.3.1937.
¹¹⁹ Minute Book, NAGNSW, 19. 3.1937.
an advisory one. Not that this situation created any tensions within Board operations, as the three Directors who were appointed during the period 1918-1939 could be described as equally - if not more - conservative and subservient to British models as their masters.

It was not until Hal Missingham’s period of office (1945-1971) directly after the period focussed upon in this study, that the Trustees found themselves with someone in their midst who was of a different ilk. Missingham, in his book not altogether light-heartedly entitled *They Kill You In The End*, complained that Boards of Trustees in all the state Galleries ‘expanded their proper concern with policy-making to virtually choosing the paintings for the collections, over-riding the advice of Directors supposedly appointed for their life-accumulated and special knowledge of art’. ¹²⁰ The high-handedness of Trustees was commonplace, the Gallery being regarded as an extension of their living rooms:

> The Trustees had been in office so long that they regarded the gallery and its collections as their personal property. Not long after I took office I noticed that many of the paintings would suddenly appear re-hung in different positions on the walls. On my asking the Chief Attendant why this was so, he would say “The President (or some other member of the Board) called during the weekend and asked that they be moved to a more appropriate position”. ¹²¹

Earlier Directors had been more accepting of Trustees’ taste than was Missingham. Mr G. V. F. Mann was appointed secretary and superintendent of the Gallery in 1905 and then served as Secretary/Director from 1912-1927.¹²² During that time he organized an important loan exhibition of Australian art and visited Europe in 1914 and 1926 to buy for the collection. He was a close friend of Charles
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¹²¹ Ibid.
Conder, and had attended painting classes with Julian Ashton, Tom Roberts, and Arthur Streeton. Having originally trained as an architect, his understanding of art was formed by this background in English/Australian Impressionism. His exposure to art outside of Australia came from occasional tours of European Academic galleries (usually in the company of Trustees such as Lionel Lindsay). His pronouncements on art other than academic, reveal just how provincial and parochial official utterances on art were in this period. For example, his letters to the Board written whilst in Europe purchasing for the collection, and indeed the report presented to the Board upon his return, reflected a view that good art could only be seen in either London and Paris.123 Even though his fundamental support for Australian Impressionism was well grounded, he was unable to persuade the Board to purchase works which today are considered Australia’s major paintings from that period.124 For the Directors of the NAGNSW this was not an unusual situation. Upon his retirement from the Gallery however, Mann was offered the role of acting as a London adviser for the Trustees, a high accolade indeed.125 The Board both demonstrated its gratitude, and perhaps reminded the public of their officer’s artistic merit, by purchasing three of his paintings from his one and only one man show at the Macquarie Galleries in May, 1930.126

Upon the retirement of Mann in 1927, James MacDonald was appointed Director and he held that position until 1937 when he left to take up the position of Director at the much larger National Art Gallery of Victoria. He became one of the most influential figures in Australian art in the twenties and thirties, operating very much in the public domain. Having spent several years previously as art critic at the

123 NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 31.3.1926, p.3.
124 Ibid.
125 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 16. 1.1930.
126 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 7. 5.1930. See also Minute Book, NAGNSW, 16.1.1930.
Melbourne *Herald*, he was accustomed to expressing his views publicly on art. Even though this was a new phenomenon for the Board, his ability with the pen gave the Board a new, and louder, voice. Here was a voice which could, in a more public forum than had ever been considered before, support both Board acquisitions and the aesthetic ideal that they reflected. Once again, the Director was chosen with those value systems that were as one with the Board. He had studied art in the mid 1890s at the National Gallery of Victoria art school and then the Westminster School of Art in London. He exhibited with the Royal Academy in London as well as the Old Salon in Paris. The centre of the artistic compass, as far as the Trustees were concerned, was somewhere between London and Paris. The pivotal point, however, was the London Academy. MacDonald’s monographs on McCubbin, Penleigh Boyd, David Davies and George Lambert also clearly reflect the standards of art that both MacDonald and the Trustees expected. In the Foreword to his monograph on McCubbin, MacDonald wrote:

An artist is one who has become expert in creating and representing signs suggesting the beauties of nature. In the face of this acquiescence in superior knowledge, it is not asking too much that the layman should in turn heed the professional when he declares this way or that in favour or disfavour of a picture, for his criticism is based on considerations reasoned out from of his educated taste, disciplined by advice and practice.127

MacDonald’s argument for the precedence of ‘educated taste’, one ‘disciplined’ by ‘advice’ and ‘practice’, would have received unqualified support from the Trustees of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales, and no less his stipulation that a true artist was one who confined their endeavours to ‘create’ the ‘beauties of nature’. As a passionate opponent of modern art, at a time when the modernist aesthetic was almost commonplace in Europe, MacDonald’s

pronouncements appear to be the utterances of a violent reactionary. His book *Australian Painting Desiderata* contains chapters written at various times during his career and later collated for publication. One chapter in particular, ‘Present Day Art’, written in the 1940s, proclaimed contemporary art as a movement that ‘crawled’ on to ‘the shores of this country’, a foreign movement ‘propelled’ by those in Europe ‘craving for Power and Pelf’.

The same article places the blame for this ‘conspiracy’ on Hebrew dealers, those who had ‘long given themselves a dispensation to deal in paintings’; according to MacDonald, these dealers found themselves ‘pressed to supply with standard works’ which apparently were in short supply, and so they proclaimed ‘that an outworn era in Art had finished and a new and vital one had begun’. In so doing, modernism had been boosted, with Jewish dealers ‘supplying those who were newly rich and others who knew no better’. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the blatant anti-semitism expressed by MacDonald was repeated publicly by other leading figures in Sydney art circles. Lionel Lindsay, as noted, spoke publicly about the ‘menace’ of Jewish art dealers. The fact that these leading Sydney personalities on the NAGNSW Board were able to make public pronouncements of an anti-semitic nature suggests that they had the implicit support of the Board. Later, eminent art historian, Bernard Smith, denounced this association between certain prominent individuals in ‘high’ art circles and anti-semitism, when he wrote that ‘the two most influential writers on Australian art at the time were James Stuart MacDonald and Lionel Lindsay’ both, according to Smith, ‘racists and anti-semitic’.

MacDonald’s highly conservative attitudes to art were supported by several
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powerful figures. Robert Menzies wrote the Foreword to his book *Australian Painting Desiderata* and was the force behind MacDonald's move to the National Gallery of Victoria; apparently Menzies' support of MacDonald was a factor in the over-riding of the request by the Trustees of that institution that W. Hardy-Wilson be appointed as Director.  

Menzies’ desire to have MacDonald in Melbourne was such that Hardy-Wilson’s appointment was over-turned by Government.

The way in which MacDonald accounted for the arrival of modernism upon our shores reveals just how extraordinarily limited was the conservative view:

The situation, then, as far as Australia is concerned, was that in 1925 (and solely owing to its geographical remoteness from the so-called centres of culture) for the first time this country had become aware of the turning inside out, or, for that matter throwing overboard of all that had hitherto been adjudged to be indispensable to and conclusive in art. Here the Australian incompetents saw their opportunity and some of them even went to England and France to learn the new lingo. As elsewhere, these local people had been failures in their profession and contemporary art held out for them the promise of that which they valued more than anything else - notoriety.\(^{133}\)

Later, he described modernism in the most insulting terms. It was an:

...imported and perverted art, germinated in the soil of affliction and squalor, self-distrust and self-deception and alien from Australian life.\(^{134}\)

The departure of James MacDonald to Melbourne in 1937 was accepted by the Trustees ‘with regret’, and the ensuing search to find a replacement provides clear indications of the desired profile for such an officer of the Trustees.\(^{135}\) This time, advertisements were placed both within the public service and outside of it. The applicants invited for interview from within the public service were ‘Douglas
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Dundas, Rah Fizelle, E. Osborn and Phyllis Shillito. Interviewed from outside the public service were ‘J. W. (Will) Ashton, Basil Burdett, Eric Langker and Douglas Pratt’. Amongst this most interesting combined group, all but Ashton were known to be, if not outright modernist sympathisers (Dundas, Fizelle, Osborn, Shillito, Burdett and Langker), then at least aware of the rising prominence of modernist principles. All, apart from Ashton (who hailed from Adelaide), were well known in the Sydney art scene of the thirties. Several of the applicants came with significant sponsors. Douglas Pratt, a painter most admired for his paintings of the Australian countryside, would have had the support of the Minister, David Drummond. Will Ashton was approached to nominate for the position by Trustee, Sir James McGregor, and Basil Burdett was proposed by the forceful Margaret Preston. Apparently, however, none of the applicants from within the public service were considered ‘capable of filling the office’. The Minutes do not record why this was so but the modernist sympathies of most would have made their inclusion highly unlikely.

Will Ashton, quite apart from his later work as the Director of the NAGNSW became a major figure in the Sydney art scene of the period. His actions whilst Director, like those of the Trustees, do not indicate any uncertainty of mind over the aesthetic choices the Gallery should take. His own art practice, like that of Lloyd Jones, was based on a background of French and English Impressionism: ‘I have worshipped Claude Monet whom I believe is the greatest of the Impressionists’; he
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136 Dundas and Fizelle were modernist teachers within the National Art School (East Sydney Technical College), and Phyllis Shillito ran a contemporary design studio in Sydney.
137 Minute Book. NAGNSW, 23. 10.1936. Basil Burdett was nominated for the position of Director by Margaret Preston.
138 Works by Douglas Pratt were included in the Minister’s private collection.
139 Minute Book, National Art Gallery of New South Wales, 13. 11.1936. The Board received correspondence from the Public Service Board, embarrassed by the process of the appointment and by ‘information published in the press’ that none of its applicants was considered of sufficient merit.
declared. His autobiography, however, exhibits a far more liberal approach, revealing apparently contradictory pronouncements on art which were not those of a typical conservative. When recounting his student days at the Académie Julius in Paris and the Olsson school in Cornwall, he nominated those students he considered remarkable. In this list he steps outside those accepted parameters of aesthetic taste illustrated in Gallery exhibitions and acquisitions, naming well-known Expressionists (Derain, Denis, Bonnard, Matisse, Vuillard), in addition to well-known Academicians (Phillip Connard, Alfred Munnings and Sargent). In spite of his early exposure to the myriad ideas of modernism and his obvious admiration of the work of modernist artists, whilst Director of the Gallery Ashton made no efforts to advance the cause of those French avant-garde artists. Likewise in 1931, when writing his autobiography, he paid particular homage to Monet, who was essentially a nineteenth century artist. Thus, as in the cases of Lloyd Jones and Syd Ure Smith, Ashton demonstrated an understanding of other art practices than those of the Academy (such as those illustrated by Monet), and yet, when it came to the National Gallery collections, the over-riding desire was to express ‘Britishness’ with all its connotations.

That Will Ashton was the successful applicant for the position of Director in 1937 was no surprise, as of all the applicants, he was the one most in sympathy with the Trustee’s own values. Nevertheless, the Trustees did ask the Minister to limit his appointment to five years. But this did not show any want of faith in Ashton’s new position within the Sydney art world; indeed, in order to demonstrate visibly their selection of an eminent artist, the Trustees, upon Ashton’s appointment, visited the David Jones Art Gallery where Ashton was having an exhibition of his works and

purchased two oil paintings for the Gallery. His support from the politically influential was unqualified. Menzies said of him, ‘I cannot imagine that his mark will ever date, or that his superb integrity will ever be out-moded by the spurious or merely fashionable’ [modernism], and later ‘that he stands in distinguished succession to people like Streeton and Roberts’.[41] This was a tremendous accolade, but surprising, for in no other but these deeply conservative art circles could Ashton possibly be considered in the same league as either Streeton or Roberts. However, Will Ashton was an accomplished painter, one whose family name was synonymous with Australian art. He was sent by his father (who operated an art school Ashton’s Academy of Arts, in Adelaide) to Cornwall, to study with Julius Olsson’s School of Landscape and Sea Painting. In his autobiography, Ashton singled out from those experiences the subsequent recognition of Olsson by the London Royal Academy as a highlight; he selected Hans Heysen, Phillips Fox and David Davies as highly talented fellow Australian students. Of the English artists he knew, Phillip Connard and Munnings he regarded as exceptional. All of these artists later became major figures in the London Royal Academy. When able to be purchased for the Antipodean Galleries the works of all were considered prized assets by the Trustees.

Although Ashton’s artistic experience was a direct one, it was of a type shared by the Board of Trustees. Those same English, Royal Academy names occur regularly on lists of acquisitions under Ashton’s Directorship as before. In 1929 Hans Heysen wrote of Ashton’s paintings that ‘with each successive visit to European art centres he returns with strengthened qualities and a finer appreciation of spacing’ and a ‘newer sense of orchestration’; and Heysen added his fervent hope that Ashton would ‘never sacrifice for pure colour and pattern those very excellent

qualities with which we associate him'. An earlier review of his work described his painting as an 'adaptation of the modern Impressionism' which is 'agreeably modern without departing from the sound tradition of design and draughtsmanship'.

A 1925 editorial in *Art In Australia* expressed admiration of Ashton for his having 'given little thought to synthetic arrangement or to the interactions of colour or design'. The language here reveals the difficulties of (and therefore hesitancy in) framing an understanding of what might properly be considered modern art. Flattering but meaningless statements about Ashton's 'colour and pattern' or 'newer sense of orchestration' reveal the difficulties which writers, exposed to no more than reproductions of modernist works, had in trying to come to terms with a new art thinking that took as its most basic premise that all old ideas in art should be replaced. Fears of 'aggressive' modernism, with its implied social upheavals, reduced many art critics of the day to reactionaries. For most commentators, modernist artistic devices, such as streamlined composition, were acceptable only if they did not interfere with traditional, taught, techniques of draughtsmanship. Ashton's taste, formed as a young man and cultivated in an English climate suspicious of 'foreign' ideas, found an ideal home in the NAGNSW.

Will Ashton's ideas for the Gallery were revealed in an *Art In Australia* article, which was prefaced by an unattributed assertion insisting that during Ashton's terms as Director 'that institution has prospered exceedingly'. In this article, noted in previous chapters, Ashton reminded his readers that 'we realise that we must constantly stimulate and educate the public to appreciate the very best in

---

144 Lionel Lindsay, 'Will Ashton', *Art In Australia*, No. 12 (June, 1925) p.40.
145 Will Ashton, 'A National Gallery's Expansion', *Art In Australia* (February, 1939) , p. 37.
The ‘very best in art’ was, according to these Trustees, to be found in the rich source of British academic work. Academic art, always associated with ‘high art’, was thought, by these Gallery officers, to offer the best instruction possible. The importance and value of ‘high art’ was repeatedly conveyed by the purchase and displaying of such European works. The Trustees, in common with most conservatives, felt that it was the higher purposes of art that should be reinforced by Gallery art practices, that this ‘high’ art not only gave status to the institution but befitted the image of such august individuals. As Leigh Astbury wrote in *City Bushman*:

> Distinctions between high and low art were even more important to critics of a conservative mould, for whom a painting’s worth was judged according to both its power to elevate the mind and the universality of its theme.\(^{147}\)

One of the major reasons the art practice of these galleries remained fixed in primarily nineteenth century aesthetics was the longevity of their serving officers. With no length of office stipulated, Hal Missingham’s description of the Trustees as being ‘unshiftable’ in *They Kill You In The End* was accurate. Perhaps in common with other elitist ‘clubs’ the membership was for life. Certainly, with members such as Sir John Sulman serving 35 years, W. H. Ifould, 39 years and B. J. Waterhouse 36 years, longevity was most apparent.\(^{148}\) Continuity of appointment was a characteristic of the Board (this pattern was also, I should add, characteristic of most employment in the city at that time), but it did become a point of criticism which did not escape the attention of the writers of a report for the Museums Association in 1933:
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Generally the standard of trusteeship is high, but somewhat lacking in youth: it would therefore appear that some artificial term should be placed in their tenure of office and possibly a seven year term would provide opportunities to get one or two additional young men on some of the Boards.\textsuperscript{149}

The annual NAGNSW Board of Trustees Annual Report to the NSW Legislative Assembly included notice of the replacement of Trustees when necessary. Exceptions were remarkable. ‘Leave’ from the Board was, however, granted reasonably often. It was expected, indeed regarded as highly advantageous, for Trustees to take opportunities to familiarise themselves once again with London cultural life. Lionel Lindsay sought leave to undertake an extensive European tour in 1936, as did several other members throughout the period of this study.\textsuperscript{150}

The NAGNSW Annual Reports to the NSW Legislative Assembly compiled by the Trustees made clear the extraordinary length of service enjoyed by Board members. Indeed, the reports could read like a newspaper obituary column. For example, the 1933 Annual report contained the following;

\begin{quote}
Trustees

During the year Mr Edward W. Knox died. Mr Knox had been a member of the Board of Trustees since 1907 and a Vice-President since 1923. The Hon. Sir Philip Street, K.C.M.G., Chief Justice of N.S.W., was unanimously elected Vice-President in place of Mr Knox.

Mr J. W. Maund was appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Sir Joseph Carruthers in 1932 and Mr Sydney Long to take the place of the late Sir Edward Knox.\textsuperscript{151}
\end{quote}

Similarly, the 1935 Report announced that:

\begin{quote}
Trustees

During the year Sir John Sulman, F.R.I.B.A., died. Sir John had been a member of the Board since 1899. Vice-President from 1915 and President since 1919. This last office he held for fifteen years; a longer period in the chair than any of his predecessors.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{149} S.F. Markham and Professor H.C. Richards \textit{‘A Report on The Museums and Art Galleries of Australia and New Zealand’, for the Museums Association}, Carnegie Corp. of New York, 1933, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{150} For instance, the Annual report for the year 1937 tells of the President, Sir Philip Street taking leave for three months, Mr J.R. McGregor, for six months and Mr J.W. Maund for three months.

\textsuperscript{151} NAGNSW Board of Trustees Annual Report to the NSW Legislative Assembly for the Year 1933.
His zeal, energy and judgement were of very great help to the board and resulted in substantial gains to the gallery, which also benefited by a gift from him of a bronze panel, designed to embellish the exterior wall of the building. This is the work of W. Reid Dick, R.A and has already been referred to in the annual report for the year 1931.

The Hon. Sir Philip Street, K.C.M.G., Lieutenant Governor of New South Wales, was unanimously elected President in place of Sir John Sulman. The Vacancy in the office of Vice-President, caused by the acceptance of the Presidency by Sir Philip Street made it necessary to elect in the latter's stead a new Vice-President. To this office the Hon. John Lane Mullins, was unanimously elected. To fill the vacancy on the Board of Trustees caused by Sir John Sulman’s death, Sir Charles Lloyd Jones was appointed.\(^{132}\)

The longevity of NAGNSW service undertaken by members of the Trust had highly significant implications for the Gallery collection. A Board constituted by members who held their positions for so many years would not be characterised by innovative thinking, or give a lively reception to, or interest in, new ideas. The ‘unshiftability’ referred to earlier, concerned attitudes to art as much as to stubborn tenure.

It was this homogeneous body of Trustees that was the major factor in determining National Gallery art practice in the period between the wars. That the individuals were drawn invariably from a class that had at its heart the desire to be British, meant that it was the art of Britain that was to be emulated. Even those that displayed different inclinations in their own painting or their private collections subscribed wholeheartedly to the conservative line when acting as Trustees. Once this model had been recognised as that of the London Royal Academy of Art, the Trustees of these Antipodean Dominion Galleries set their sights on using that institution to demonstrate the inseparable nature of these public institutions with the Mother Country. Theirs was to be, if possible, two versions of the English Royal

\(^{132}\) NAGNSW Board of Trustees Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1934, p. 2.
Academy, which would, with proper nurturing, flourish in the South Pacific.
Figure 12. Sir William Orpen, *Après le Bain*.
Image provided courtesy Dunedin Public Art Gallery.
CHAPTER FOUR

‘OH! TO BE IN ENGLAND!’: ACQUISITIONS

All high art consists in the carving or painting of natural objects, chiefly figures; it has always subject and meaning, never consisting solely in arrangement of lines, or even of colours. It always paints or carves something that it sees or believes in; nothing ideal or uncredited.¹

In the period between the wars the collections of both Galleries were formed primarily by their Boards seeking to position these institutions within a European high art culture. The art-work housed within their walls was the vital tool, they believed, in the visualisation, and indeed, proof, of that claim for inclusion. A survey of the acquisitions made is a key to the understanding of the aesthetic values which shaped both gallery’s collections. Decisions that were made over which works were to be purchased and which were to be rejected, provide the clearest signals as to the ideology considered appropriate by the officers of these two national galleries.

This chapter explores the origins and genres of the works which were purchased, and also examines the hierarchies of taste that such decisions reveal. It is appropriate given the earlier findings of this study that the English acquisitions, particularly those emanating from the London Royal Academy, provide the initial focus and indeed, the foundation of this chapter. Aspects of both galleries’ financial management are also included, primarily as an indication of the priorities applied to purchases, but in particular to show the lengths that could be taken to expedite particular English acquisitions. The administrative mechanisms instigated by these Dominion art institutions in order to provide more efficient access to London studios, artists and dealers is also discussed as a valuable gauge of London-

Dominion artistic relationships. It becomes obvious also that particular subject matter was especially favoured by the Boards of Trustees and these are explored as another method of establishing the most preferred models and therefore taste. Particular types of art practice were obviously more highly regarded than others and these preferred models laid the foundations of the collections. The chapter also explores the disputes that could arise concerning the acceptance and rejection of certain models. For example, the Trustees’ most favoured genres resided in English work, then domestic expressions of these genres. Acquisitions lists provide proof of both the Trustees’ perceptions of what constituted appropriate purchases for such august institutions as theirs, and also clear indicators of what was, as well as what was not, considered art.

Whilst advancing a particular ideology in art, the Trustees were always conscious of the over-riding educative and moral responsibility implicit within the exhibition of art. This duty was one, which throughout the period of this study, informed the choices made as to the acceptance, and also the rejection, of art. For these Boards, judicious purchases would meet two aims: first, to advertise New South Wales and New Zealand as cultured members of the British race; and second, provide images whose idealism could only improve the moral constitution of the populace.

At the outset it is important to note two vital aspects informing Gallery purchase. The first was the absence, for both Galleries, of a written acquisition policy. Apparently such a policy constraining, or guiding, purchase was deemed by Trustees to be an unnecessary formality. There is no suggestion that either Board thought that such a document should need to be enunciated. However, in spite of the
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2 See Chapter One of this study, Making a Claim for Britiishness: Museology and Empire Loyalty in the National Gallery Art Practice of the Two Dominions.
Fig. 13. *The Italian Major*.
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was purchased at David Jones Ltd. Sydney, 1928.
absence of such a policy, the purchasing patterns were so constant that it becomes clear that a tacit one certainly existed. The second aspect takes account of the different financial and population base from which the NZAFA and the NZNAG functioned. Although this study shows very little difference in the type of art practice most favoured between the two Galleries, in New Zealand there were undoubtedly variations produced by a smaller citizenry and consequently reduced funding.\(^3\)

Whilst both Boards complained regularly to Government of the paucity of their purchasing budgets, the effect of smaller budgets did play a major part in the evolution of the New Zealand national collection.

It is appropriate that the examination of National Gallery acquisitions should begin with the work of one London Royal Academician, William Orpen. Of all the English Royal Academicians whose works were sought by both galleries in the period between the wars, Sir William Orpen was the most highly regarded. The Minutes of both galleries reveal the great respect in which he was held, and the lengths to which the Trustees of both institutions were prepared to go to possess his works.\(^4\) He was the only artist - English, Australian or New Zealander - whose work the Trustees of both Galleries simultaneously and actively pursued.

The attempt by the Trustees of the National Art Gallery in Sydney to commission a self-portrait by Orpen was remarkable for the determination with which such an acquisition was pursued. In 1926 the Trustees of the NAGNSW first notified the New South Wales Legislative Assembly of their having commissioned Sir William Orpen ‘the distinguished portrait painter to complete a Self Portrait to

\(^3\) The differences between the two Galleries is discussed in the following chapter of this study, The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism.

\(^4\) See NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Parliament for the year 1926, 31.3.1927, p. 3. Also, Minute book, NZAFA, 20.10.1931.
the value of 500 Guineas.⁵

In 1928, the Trustees’ Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly again reminded its readers that ‘the commission given to Sir William Orpen, R.A., to execute a self portrait to the value of 500 Gns (referred to in last year’s report) is still in hand’.⁶ Again, in 1930, the N.A.G.N.S.W Annual Report announced that ‘the commission was given to Sir William Orpen, R.A., to execute a self portrait (referred to in last year’s report) is still in hand’.⁷ By 1931, the Annual Report still included notice of the quest for Orpen’s portrait, but it took on a plaintive tone, with the Trustees requesting ‘the Director to contact Mr Molloy [their London agent] requesting him to enquire if the Self Portrait of the late Sir William Orpen is still available and at what price’?⁸ Perhaps the difficulty the Gallery experienced in getting Orpen to fulfil the commission may have had something to do with the rather paltry sum they were offering. In Great Britain during the late twenties, Orpen was able to charge £1,500 for a single portrait commission.⁹

Earlier, in 1928, the NAGNSW’s purchase of Orpen’s oil, The Italian Major, had cost the Gallery £520 (apart from a £630 Rupert Bunny, the most expensive work by far acquired by the Gallery that year) which was, even then, not a significant price for an Orpen. ¹⁰ The position this artist held in the eyes of the Trustees was reflected not only in the five year quest to possess Orpen’s Self Portrait but also in their careful cataloguing of their efforts to secure the commission in the Annual Report to Government, even though successive reports recorded their pursuit

---

⁵ NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1926, 31.3.1927, p. 3.  
⁶ NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1928, 25.3.1929, p. 2.  
⁷ NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1930, 4.3.1931, p.3.  
⁸ Minute Book, National Art Gallery Of New South Wales, 23.10.1931.  
⁹ Fellow Royal Academician, Sir Alfred Munnings, complained of Orpen's prices, saying 'they would frighten a Lord in his castle'.  
¹⁰ The Rupert Bunny was an oil, Summertime.
as unsuccessful. That they did so was a clear statement of the prestige with which Orpen was held in the world of conservative Antipodean art. Apparently the New South Wales Government, as well as Gallery Trustees, could identify with the importance of this on-going quest on behalf of Sydney. Unfortunately for the Gallery, by the end of 1930 the ageing Orpen’s ability to carry out portrait commissions seems to have come to an end. However, none of the London advisors appears to have informed the Gallery.  

The NZAFA’s desire to possess an Orpen was no less enthusiastic. In spite of a parlous financial position, the Academy Council was prepared to devote much time and energy to secure one. In October 1931, Mr Murray Fuller cabled the Academy ‘offering Orpen’s last self-portrait for seven hundred guineas and a war picture for four hundred’. The Council quickly resolved that ‘the Secretary be instructed to cable to Mr Murray Fuller asking his personal opinion of the picture and also whether he would be prepared to send it on approval’. Realizing that if they were to find the funds to purchase the pictures, exceptional methods would have to be found, ‘the President and Mr Ewen, agreed to approach Mr Shirtcliffe [a wealthy Wellington businessman] to see if he would be prepared to make a contribution towards the purchase of the pictures’. The search for financial backing continued throughout November and December, with the Minutes of the 1932 January meeting reporting:

With reference to the suggestion that the interest on the Harbour Board’s Donation to the National Gallery Fund should be spent on one of Sir Wm. Orpen’s pictures, Mr Troup said that he thought that the whole of this interest would be required for the building.... Mr Hogg said that the opportunity of obtaining the Orpen Self Portrait was one that would not occur again.... He did not think

12 Minute Book, NZAFA, 20.10.31.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
that there would be any chance of raising the money by public subscription.\textsuperscript{15}

By March, the Academy Council had still not been successful in raising the funds, but had not yet given up. Attempts to use interest from the Beauchamp Bequest had looked promising initially, but proved difficult to access. Sir H Beauchamp had informed them that ‘the fund could...be applied to the purc picture’.\textsuperscript{16} However, ‘the Council would have to obtain an overdraft of 700 for purchasing Sir Wm. [William] Orpen’s Portrait’.\textsuperscript{17} Academy Councillor with civic authorities to hasten procedures. Mr Isaac assured them of the pi worth and told them ‘that by the time the overdraft had been paid off, the Portrait would be of far greater value than 700 guineas...’\textsuperscript{18}

The Council then appointed a sub-committee to interview the Public Trustee to see if he would support an overdraft being raised on the Beauchamp Bequest. Significant lobbying followed, supported by Beauchamp himself, trying to access the interest on the Bequest. In support, the Council passed the following motion:

\begin{quote}
It is the unanimous opinion of this Council that the Self Portrait by the late Sir William Orpen, which forms part of the Murray Fuller Collection now showing in Wellington, should be acquired for the National Art Gallery. Not only is the portrait a work of outstanding merit, but if it is not acquired now, it may never be possible in the future for our National Gallery to obtain a portrait by that distinguished painter, and certainly not at the price at which this portrait is being offered. The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts has no funds available for the purchase of the picture, but it could no doubt arrange the necessary finance for the purchase if the Board Of Trustees would undertake that, from the first accumulations of interest received by it from the Sir Harold Beauchamp Trust, it would purchase the portrait from the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts, the price to be paid by the Board of Trustees being the actual cost of the picture to the Academy at the date of purchase by the Board.\textsuperscript{19}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{15} Minute Book, NZAFA, 25.1.1932.
\textsuperscript{16} Minute Book, NZAFA, 7.3.1932.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
In spite of all attempts to procure the Orpen through various financial dealings, the Academy could not raise the purchase price quickly enough to suit Mr Murray Fuller. The end came with a letter from that gentleman:

thanking the President and Council for their efforts to obtain the Orpen portrait for the National Collection, expressing regret that the work did not remain in Wellington, and explaining that he was unable to extend the option further as the time allowed by the trustees for exhibition in New Zealand was limited. The Portrait had now been purchased by the Dunedin Public Art Gallery.  

Graciously, the Academy Council wrote to the President of the Dunedin Public Art Gallery Society 'congratulating the Society on the wisdom they have displayed in selecting the Orpen Portrait for their collection and expressing the Councils pleasure that it is to remain in New Zealand'. The Murray Fuller Exhibition of British Contemporary Art, containing Orpen's Après le Bain (Fig. 12), had travelled to Dunedin in April, 1932, where the exhibition was housed in the Pioneer Hall. Using funds made available through the Robert Hay Bequest, the work had been promptly acquired for the Dunedin City Council Gallery. The purchase of this work was regarded as a coup by the Dunedin gallery, and one which was seen as being good for all of New Zealand. In his preface to the Exhibition catalogue, Academy Councillor, Col. A.D. Carbery wrote 'the dominant note of this Exhibition is the self portrait of the late Sir William Orpen, which was brought to New Zealand by the express desire of the late artist'. At the time the NAGNSW Trustees were still pleading for this work to be delivered to them, they were unaware that the object of their desire had found a home across the Tasman.

Orpen painted very few self-portraits in the latter years of his life, and it is

---

20 Minute Book, NZAFA, 23.5.32.
21 Ibid
22 This work is still in the Dunedin Gallery’s collection, although exhibited rarely since the 1970s.
very likely that both Galleries were pursuing the same painting, as it appears that, due to his final illness, little work was undertaken after the winter of 1930. Orpen died on September 29, 1931, aged 53. In Great Britain, Orpen’s artistic reputation suffered considerably in the years immediately after his death. Orpen’s biographer, Bruce Arnold, described the considered measure of the eulogies:

After the service, the Chairman of the Walker Art Gallery in Liverpool referred to Orpen’s greatness.... The tributes paid were guarded and cautious, laying stress on the society portraits, his technique was often praised; vision hardly at all. The Times adversely criticised his craftsmanship both as draughtsman and painter, referred to his ‘inferiority’, and claimed he could not paint ‘tenderly, humorously, ironically, or satirically’. He was soon forgotten. Awkward to accommodate in any pattern or development of English painting, he was neglected, and in due course merely named as a figure in the early years of the twentieth century. The Life by Sydney Dark and the consideration of his work by Konody was the only book to follow his death. In 1933 the Royal Academy did a joint Memorial Exhibition for Orpen, Ricketts and McEvoy.

It is important to note Orpen’s apparent rapid decline in popularity in his home nation, where the Academy and its artists were, by the 1930s, increasingly the subject of criticism for their entrenched conservatism. However, in contrast, in the 1930s in both Australia and New Zealand, Orpen’s star was still very much in ascendancy. Perhaps in recognition of this, or more cynically, knowing that Orpen’s prices were, in consequence, likely to be higher in the Pacific than at home, as late as 1939, two of his oils were included in the Centennial Exhibition, organised by the Tate Gallery, which was to open the new National Gallery in New Zealand. The chase for Orpen’s Self Portrait indicates the regard in which his work was held; his work was the work of an artist whose position in the London Royal Academy was

---

24 Ibid. The Times critique referred to was, October 1, 1931.
25 The two works were a water-colour, The Model and an oil portrait of an old family friend, the actress Madge Kendal. Portrait Of Madge Kendal, were reproduced in the catalogue.
Fig. 14. Laura Knight. *The Frozen Pond*.
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was purchased in 1918, in London, by Sir John Longstaff.
still considered exemplary and therefore a highly desirable model for Dominion art
audiences. There was no other artist in the history of purchases made for these
collections that was as highly regarded as Orpen. For these institutions, Orpen
represented all that was essentially British.

It quickly becomes evident that it was the artists of the London Royal
Academy that set the standard for art in the Dominions. As demonstrated by the
pursuit of Orpen, premier English artists (whose artistic allegiances lay with the
Royal Academy) were regarded by the managers of the national collections of New
Zealand and Australia as the jewels in the crown of their collections. In the first year
of the focus of this study, the NAGNSW Trustees were able to purchase art works up
to the value of £2,000 provided from a Statutory Endowment. Of that endowment,
£559 was spent on the purchase of four English and ‘foreign’ works. In what was to
become the normal sequence of Trustee priorities, the London purchases were
mentioned first in the Annual Report. These were, in 1918, an oil by Sir John Lavery
ARA The Basque Country (cost £150), a Munnings drawing (cost £21), and the
major purchase for the year, a Laura Knight oil, Landscape and Figures, which cost
Trustees the enormous sum of £367. 26

Although inherently much more problematic to obtain, English pictures in
correct style were so highly valued that no measure was seen as too difficult for the
Gallery Trustee to shoulder in pushing forward the central project of displaying
Britishness to their audiences. Unlike domestic work, which could be acquired
directly by Trustees visiting various exhibitions and selecting those works which
best suited their eye and budget, the administrative procedures necessary to procure
works internationally required constant attention by Trustees, eager to do whatever

was necessary to ensure advantageous dealings with various officers in London. In 1919 the Trustees of the NAGNSW established their London ‘Board of Advice’. Members of this Board included three artists, two of whom were members of the Royal Academy, George Frampton R.A. and Frank Brangwan R.A, one English Member of Parliament, the Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P., and one long-time NAGNSW Trustee, Mr John Longstaff, who was at that time visiting Great Britain for a lengthy sojourn. One of Longstaff’s purchases made at this time on behalf of the Gallery was Laura Knight’s Frozen Pond (Fig. 14), which had been exhibited at the LRA the year before.27

Whilst not a Royal Academician, Longstaff’s membership of such an august group was countenanced because his paintings demonstrated identical aesthetics to those visible in the London Academy. Once this group of advisors had been established, its maintenance proved to be a major enterprise, one which was to occupy much Trustee time and money over the next decade. Sydney newspapers responded positively to the London purchasing venture; readers were assured that ‘visitors to the National Art Gallery of N.S.W. usually find something new on its walls. The Trustees’ representative in London, Mr John Longstaff, is always on the lookout for pictures worth purchasing’.28 An initial sum of £500 was sent to these advisors to purchase pictures for the Gallery. However, this was soon deemed to be insufficient and Trustees began to plead, both officially in their Annual reports, and unofficially in their correspondence with various Government Ministers, for more purchasing funds. Anxious always to accumulate more expensive British works, the price paid for one work could easily absorb most of the annual allowance:

The Trustees are of the opinion that the present amount voted for the purchase of works of art is inadequate to maintain the standard required and to compete with America and other countries had added considerably to the value of works of art. The necessity for an additional sum for the purposes mentioned is a matter for early consideration.\textsuperscript{29}

In 1919 two of the most expensive works purchased were both by artist, Georges Scott. Large scale, elaborate drawings in the ‘high art’ tradition, they were \textit{A Veterans’ Advice} (£160) and \textit{Cavalry Charge} (£250).\textsuperscript{30} In addition, another £99 was spent on the acquisition of four other English works, two by W. H. de Glehn,\textsuperscript{31} and two by T. C. Dugdale.\textsuperscript{32} A mirror, made by an Associate of the Royal Academy, R. Anning Bell, was also purchased. More expensive purchases soon followed.

Whilst Gallery Trustees were always impressed by the opportunity to purchase high art examples from Parisian studios and academies, it becomes obvious that the ‘Foreign’ listings in the Annual Reports become less frequent, due in the main to the greater price of these European works, but also in large part to the difficulty Gallery officers had in procuring works where the dealer relationships, established more easily in London, were problematic. However, these difficulties were over-come in the patriotic desire to acknowledge the efforts of their Allies. Consequently, from a 1922 exhibition of French war pictures several works were purchased, including two of the most expensive works purchased that year. Indeed, a substantial percentage of the 1922 purchasing budget over £1,000, was spent on these ‘British and Foreign’ works. In spite of the occasional presence of ‘foreign’ works, London purchases were mentioned first in this Annual Report, before the

\textsuperscript{29} NAOMSW Annual Report Of the Trustees to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1919, 22.3.19120, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{30} Interestingly, but not surprisingly, current Gallery records show that neither work has been exhibited since 1919.

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Le Pont Marie} and \textit{Le Pavillon Musique}.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{The Jordan Plain From The Desert} and \textit{Bethany From the Jericho Road}.
French acquisitions. The British works were two Fred Leists,\textsuperscript{33} and two by Royal Academician, Arnesby Brown.

In 1923 the London purchasing account was the beneficiary of £2,541, a significant increase and the result of a grant by the New South Wales Treasury Endowment. However, only two works were purchased and listed under ‘London Purchases (British and Foreign)’. They were \textit{The Picnic} by Will C. Penn, and \textit{Les Felines} by C. Watelet, a not insignificant work for which Trustees paid £300. In addition, the remaining £2,199 of the year’s endowment was used to pay for the Gilbert Bayes bronze equestrian sculptures destined for each side of the entrance portico of the Gallery. That year also saw the London account with its own listing in the Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly. During 1923 there was a large exhibition of European work organised by Penleigh Boyd, at which the Trustees purchased four works costing Trustees £1,435. They were: Gaston La Touch’s \textit{Le Baiser du Soleil} (£840), J. A. Meunier’s \textit{En Ecoutant Mozart} (£287), Lucien Simon’s \textit{Les Seneurs} (£294) and Muirhead Bone’s \textit{Justiciary Buildings, Glasgow} (£44).

In 1925 the Trustees had two major on-going concerns. One was the problem of possessing sufficient funds to compete for works on the English market, and the second was the retaining of the right advice in Britain for the purchase of works. The Trustees considered the paucity of funding a major concern, and again they mentioned it in the Annual Report:

\begin{quote}
The Trustees have for some years experienced the want of adequate funds for purchasing works of art. In June last this question was brought under the notice of the Minister For Education with the view of provision being made for an increased vote on the 1925-26 estimates. The Minister expressed sympathetic approval and made the necessary provision on the Draft Estimates. The trustees regret that the line was eliminated in the final Estimates submitted to Parliament.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Shadows} (£250) and also \textit{Lights} (£150s).
\textsuperscript{34} NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 31.3.1926, p. 3.
Fig. 15. A.J. Munnings, *The Coming Storm*.
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was purchased in London by the NAGNSW Director, G.V. Mann in 1926 on the recommendation of Lionel Lindsay and B.J. Waterhouse.
However keen the Trustees were to establish and maintain advisors in London (particularly those such as Academicians, Orpen and Arnesby Jones), it appears that these English individuals, working by invitation, did not hold the mission of obtaining British works for the New South Wales gallery as important as did the Trustees. As historian Heather Johnson has noted, these London art purchases were ‘in the hands of two or three people...familiar with the collection only through forwarded catalogues, [and] informed of Trustees’ instructions only through vague instructions’.35 Always limited by the relative paucity of Gallery funds, these gentlemen were apparently ‘busy in other aspects of their lives and with little motivation to create a collection of masterpieces in the Antipodes’.36 The Annual Reports often reflect the changing personnel involved in this task. The ongoing lack of Gallery representation in London was addressed in the same 1925 document:

The Trustees have considered the necessity of making adequate arrangements in London and elsewhere for their proper representation for the acquisition of examples of British and Foreign works of art. Since the disbandment of the Advisory Board in 1921, the Trustees have had no permanent representative, which has been found to be very unsatisfactory. The appointment of purchasing advisors and a qualified person to succeed the present business agent in London is a matter that has to be settled...37

The considerable sum of £1,470 had been remitted to London to acquire works for the collection, but only one was purchased, a W. Russell Flint A.R.A oil, The Lemnians, for which the Gallery paid the large amount of £420, and which was listed first in the acquisitions presented in the Annual Report. The remainder of the amount had been sent to London in preparation for the 1926 Venice International

36 Ibid.
37 NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 31.3.1926, p. 3.
Biennal Exhibition. The Gallery Director, G.V. Mann, was in Europe that year, and on behalf of the Gallery, his aim was to purchase works for the collection. The following is a précis of his report, which was included in the Annual Report to the New South Wales Legislative Assembly:

**Purchases of Works of Art and Representation in London**

In compliance with the commission referred to in last year’s report, the Director visited England and the Continent on behalf of the Trustees and inspected the Royal Academy, the Paris Salon, the Venice International Exhibition and minor collections, and stated in a report submitted to the Trustees that he selected 34 works to the value of £3,357, which he was successful in purchasing for £2,951 viz., 14 oils, 6 water-colour drawings, 7 pencil drawings, 3 etchings, 4 pieces of bronze sculpture, a list of which is included among the purchases.\(^{38}\)

Of this enormous number of works purchased for the collection, nearly all were English, and most of those were works by members of the Royal Academy. Paintings by artists such as Lamorna Birch, Arnesby Brown, W. Russell Flint, sculptor W. Reid Dick, and A. J. Munnings (see Fig. 15) were all added to the collection.\(^{39}\) The relatively high prices paid for these works (compared to the average price asked by Australian painters) reveals the commitment Gallery Trustees had to the possession of these English works.

The most expensive was Munnings’ *The Coming Storm* at £730. In an unusual pattern of purchase, three significant French oils were obtained at the same time. Not since the purchase of Great War works in the immediate post-war years had French painting figured as a major financial or artistic component in annual NAGNSW acquisitions. Nevertheless, in 1926 these three works were: a Corot at

---

\(^{38}\) NAGNSW Annual Report of the Trustees for the year 1926 to the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly, 31.3.1927, p.3.

\(^{39}\) These works were Arnesby Brown’s *Summer Pasture*, purchased for £131, Mark Fisher’s *Landscape and Cattle* £45, W. Russell Flint’s *A Guardian*, another watercolour which cost £45, A. E. John’s drawing *Woman Standing* (£40), Terrick William’s *Rialto, Venice*, an oil which cost £210, an F. Derwent Wood R.A. bronze, *Head Of A Baby*, a W. Reid Dick A.R.A. bronze *Two Heads*, and A. J. Munning’s oil *The Coming Storm*. Several French works were also purchased: R.G. Brundrit *A Northern Winter*, J. B. Corot’s oil *Le Vieux Pont* (£522), and *La Plage*, an oil by Eugene Boudin. A water-colour, *Fan Design* by Charles Conder was also purchased at the cost of £80.
£522 (Le Vieux Pont), Brundrit's A Northern Winter at £262 and a Boudin, La Plage at £230. Whilst these French works were undoubtedly major acquisitions for the Gallery, some of Mann's other European purchases were not so successful. In the report, listed as 'Purchases In Venice', seven works are itemized; of these, two by Venetians, Ettore Tito (Zephyr and the Sea £400), and Italico Brass (Procession To The Cemetery at £150) have not lasted the tests of time and taste; nor did two Hungarian works G. Pentelei Molnar (Study Of Pears) and R. Burghardt (The Courtyard and My Model). Two works by the Belgian artist F. Rops, Beb and Modern Art were bought but these also proved to be imprudent choices; Rops' profile as an artist of lasting respect was short-lived. Mann appeared to have been aesthetically out of his depth when he attempted to step outside the known artistic parameters of the Royal Academy.

As Nancy Underhill has noted, by 1928 the system of NAGNSW representation in London was still 'erratic'. A system was 'sanctioned' by which 'any Trustee when visiting London could associate' with the 'Gallery's official advisors Sir William Orpen and Arnesby Brown'. As a result of which, prior to 1933 (when the Trustees were forced to take on the task themselves due to the death of Arnesby Brown and Orpen), the advisory system, according to Underhill, had achieved very little outside the purchase of a 'splendid Munnings, and little else outside the kin of Orpen'.

At this time, however, in spite of their position as the major art institution in NSW, the issue of inadequate finances was also again on the NAGNSW Trustees’ agenda. In their Annual Report for 1928, a strong message was sent to Government arguing the case for an increase in their Endowment:
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41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
Perennially the insufficiency of purchasing funds besets and handicaps the Trustees. With insufficient money at their disposal no adequate additions of works of art worthy of the Gallery, or compatible with Sydney's growth and rank, can be made. The purchase of a few very good works soon exhausts the Trustees' resources and the periods of marking time while awaiting replenishment are frequent and long. The situation is hardly a right or dignified one for the National Gallery of the capital city of Australia's oldest and richest state, and each year the Trustees realise more and more how much the stinting of funds baulks the fuller appreciation of art to which the people are entitled. The attendance statistics prove how much art is enjoyed by the people. Nevertheless, a comparison of this year's figures with those of last year shows a slight falling off in the number of visitors. This is due primarily to the absence of new works reflecting the spirit of the times. Annually certain works in the Gallery, long since purchased become practically valueless, they belong only to a particular period and are not for all time and for them atrophy is natural. If the Gallery is to have and keep up a high standard, the waste so occasioned must be made good, and, as at present situated, the Trustees' financial strength is unequal to the task of reparation. But replacement gives opportunity for the acquirement of living works of art; not necessarily many, but of fine quality; for mere quantity means little or nothing in a National Gallery. For such a necessary object ampler funds are imperative; without them little headway can be made.43

The task, the Trustees' claimed, was indeed onerous, indeed perhaps impossible with the annual sum Government granted them. It is interesting to note, however, that the major argument Trustees used here was that the primary aim of purchasing works should be to 'reflect the spirit of the time'. This indicates an apparently indefatigable blindness or self-deception on the part of the Trustees. If the lists of acquisitions made in the period between the Wars are a true indication, then the one characteristic they have is NOT reflecting the spirit of the time. Indeed, for Gallery Trustees the 'spirit' of the 'time' which they sought to capture in their acquisitions, was one atrophied in nineteenth-century English Academicism.

Even in the context of the Depression, and with only meagre resources to spend, the Trustees persisted in purchasing in the expensive English market. At the January meeting of the NAGNSW Board in January 1930, the Trustees expressed

43 National Art Gallery Of New South Wales Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 25.3.1929, p. 3.
Fig. 16. John Arnesby Brown, *The Marshes near Norwich*. Courtesy of the Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was purchased in London by NAGNSW London advisor, Julius Olsson in 1922.
their 'approval of the 1929 selection of etchings made in London and instructed the Director to express to the selectors the thanks of the Board'.

Thanks were also sent to Mr Wright 'for his assistance in the matter'. In fact, the Trustees were so pleased with the selections sent to them by their London advisers that, at the following meeting 'it was decided to cable Mr Molloy and purchasing advisors to inspect pictures preferably by Steer, Cameron, Nicholson, John, Philpot, Velly Sorin, with a view to spending 1200gns, before the end of March'.

Minutes record the Trustees' decision to forward the whole of the purchase for that year to London for such purchases. Once again, the most highly considered acquisitions were those of Academic England.

In 1933, NAGNSW Trustees were still preoccupied with organising the most trustworthy and efficient manner of purchasing works in England. The April meeting of the Board focussed on the proposed European travel by three members of the Board and debated which members (or the Director) would be responsible for purchasing whilst in Europe. Two Trustees, J. R. McGregor and Syd Ure Smith were to be holidaying in Europe; accordingly, Mr Waterhouse proposed a motion that the Director should also travel to England, joining Lionel Lindsay who was already in London. The decision was postponed until the following May meeting, when Mr Waterhouse again proposed 'that [the] Director travel to assist the Trustees in the purchase of pictures'. This time the motion was seconded by Lister Lister and, 'after Mr Waterhouse's opening speech, the President read a letter from Sir Philip Street'. Later, 'after a full discussion in which every member present took part the
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44 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 16.1.1930.
45 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 16.1.1930.
46 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 28.2.1930.
47 Ibid.
48 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 5.5.1930.
Fig. 17. John Amesby Brown. *Norfolk Landscape.*
Courtesy of the Art Gallery of New South Wales.
resolution was negatived by 7 votes to 2.\textsuperscript{49} The Board did not, apparently, consider the presence of the Gallery Director necessary to aid in the selection of works. Such confidence on the part of the Trustees was further enhanced when another member, Sir Philip Street, also announced his intention to travel, so that in 1933, four Board members were entrusted with the Gallery seal to purchase on its behalf: McGregor, Lindsay, Ure Smith and Street. The enormous sum of A£3,000 credit was established for them in London. The Annual Report summarised this complex situation in these terms:

\textbf{Purchases In Europe}

The Trustees commissioned two of their body, Messrs. S. Ure Smith and J.R. McGregor, whilst abroad to make purchases of works of art to the amount of 3,000 Pounds Australian. The Presence of Mr Lionel Lindsay in London at the same time was availed to secure his cooperation with the two Trustees aforementioned and later the departure of Sir Philip Street for the same destination was made the opportunity by the Board still further to reinforce the judgement of those already in London. A list of works purchased appears at the beginning of this report.\textsuperscript{50}

Not surprisingly, given the individuals involved and the sum at their disposal, some thirty-seven works were purchased whilst the Trustees were in Europe. Of those, thirty-three were English. These English works were, once again, the most expensive purchases for that year. For instance, Alan Beeton’s oil \textit{Marguerite} cost £400, Augustus John’s R.A. oil \textit{Reverie} (£391), James Bateman \textit{Woodland With Cattle} (£267), Sir George Claussen R.A. \textit{Watson’s Barn}, (£250), a Duncan Grant oil \textit{The Road, Sussex}, (£90), a Spencer Gore \textit{The Pool, Panshanger Bay} (£72), a Sir William Orpen drawing (£50), and a Muirhead Bone drawing (£15). A Rembrandt etching, \textit{Beggars At The Door of A House} (£150) was also included. The French

\textsuperscript{49} ibid.

\textsuperscript{50} NAGNSW Annual Report Of The Trustees to the Legislative Assembly for the year 1933 of New South Wales, 3rd. May, 1934, p. 3.
Fig. 18. S.J. Lamorna Birch. *Changing the Fly, River Dove, Ashbourne, Derbyshire.*

painter J. J. Tissot, who often exhibited with the Royal Academy, was included with a crayon *Study Of Two Ladies*. The works of two sculptors were also included, Maurice Lambert's iron head bust of *R. Scott Goddard, Esq.* and also a Jacob Epstein bronze *Meum*.\(^{51}\)

Nancy Underhill describes the purchases made by the travelling Trustees in 1933 as 'hardly daring': not surprising, cocooned as they were within the orbit of the LRA and its artists.\(^{52}\) No wonder then, that the 1933 purchases reflected the work of 'safe British artists'.\(^{53}\) It is important to note, however, that the difficulties of such a problematic purchasing system, with its reliance on an individual artist's enthusiasm and commitment to a Gallery a world away from the London centre, was not always a failure. Underhill describes the success of the National Gallery of Victoria in a similar venture. The result was that the Victorian Felton Bequest was able to endow the Victorian Gallery with 'a distinguished and varied collection of European art'.\(^{54}\)

The pattern of purchases shows that it was the possession of paintings of European and English subjects that Trustees regarded as being more appropriate than any other genre for their Sydney audiences. For Gallery Trustees, the twenties and thirties were opportune times to purchase works, which were, apparently, designed to present to Gallery audiences consoling views of 'home', or to provide scenes of such cultural significance that even the second-hand experience that a painting might provide was judged to be a sufficient reason for purchase. As reflected in the acquisitions, these two facets of subject matter continued to dictate the acquisitions made throughout the twenties and thirties.

The artistic value of many of these purchases appears questionable today.

---

\(^{51}\) Maurice Lampert was the elder son of George W. Lampert.

\(^{52}\) Nancy Underhill, op. cit., p. 47.

\(^{53}\) Ibid.

\(^{54}\) Ibid.
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The Galleries acquired the works of very little known artists whose only claim for inclusion seems to have been the result of a happy choice of their English subject matter (see Figs. 16, 17 and 18). In 1922, five etchings collectively titled *The Arteries of Great Britain* were acquired, in addition to John Arnesby Brown's oil, *The Marshes Near Norwich* and *Norfolk Landscape* (Figs. 16 and 17).\(^5\) In 1924, watercolours were acquired from various artists with titles such as *The Twickenham Ferry, Port Issyk Cornwall, Buckinghamshire Pastoral Durham, Elvet Bridge Durham* and *The Strand On The Green*.\(^6\) Even at the time when the overt 'Australianness' of Heidelberg School art had finally been accepted by Gallery Trustees as having a legitimate place in the scheme of 'proper' art, the Trustees continued to uphold the almost contradictory view by consistently presenting scenes from the Motherland. At times these two elements were combined in the one work, such as when art paintings were acquired featuring a British landscape subject but painted by a Heidelberg painter. Such was the case in 1932 when Roberts' *Spring In Sussex* was purchased. Parallels were the purchase of A. H. Fullwood's *Vauxhall Bridge* in 1924, Sydney Long's 1925 painting of *The Blackfriars Bridge*, and in 1926, another oil, *In The Constable Country*. The element of nostalgia was evident in such purchases as those made in 1926, *The Lonely Tower* by Percival Gaskell and an etching of *Old English Shepherd* by Thomas Friedensen. The then Gallery Director himself, G.V.F. Mann, contributed to this pattern, when his watercolour *The Doorway To The Banqueting Hall, Wardour Castle* was purchased in 1930. Similarly, Gallery Trustee Lionel Lindsay, whilst on a European tour etched a number of scenes such as *Lolly Shop, Essex Street*, and his series was acquired in 1931, as were paintings by Gallery Director Will Ashton, of subjects such as

\(^5\) *The Arteries of Great Britain* were by artist, W. Walcot. £36 was paid.

\(^6\) Artists were M. J. McNally and H. Herbert.
Monmouth England in 1931 and later, in 1938, Winter Sunshine, St. Ives Cornwall. A major purchase made by the Gallery was another of Ashton's oils, The Cornish Coast, painted in 1933, for which the Gallery paid £105. This was a significant purchase price when the average amount that year for a domestic work was £35. Assorted other works by various artists acquired by Gallery Trustees claimed titles such as Sussex Weald, Dome of St. Pauls, Harley Street, Offham Church, Ludlow Castle and Mrs Scott Siddons. Throughout the thirties, the purchase of such works continued unabated, not affected, it would appear, by any surge of Australian nationalism or desire to forego images of Great Britain in favour of a solely Australian representation. Apparently, one of the main criteria for selection appeared to have been the subject matter, namely idyllic locales from the Motherland, almost as if the Trustees were seeking reminders as that of a parent in danger of being forgotten. Or, perhaps, as a momento mori.

Genre scenes of foreign or 'exotic' locales became increasingly popular throughout the twenties and thirties. Once again there is little variety in the works purchased over the two decades, their distinction apparently residing once again in subject content. Here the NAGNSW was not alone in its appetite for such works. The London Royal Academy also was characterised (and in some more avant-garde art circles often criticised) for its propensity to favour works which displayed aspects of 'life' rather than works of aesthetic or intellectual importance; even if this 'life' was notable mainly for its exotic locale The NAGNSW was in distinguished company when in pursuit of occasional examples of Continental exoticism. For

---

57 In the period 1918-1939, a total of 343 British (including several 'foreign' works) were purchased and 652 'local purchases'. The cost of these British works in total was £24,529 and the local acquisitions £29,978. The average price paid for British works was £71/10/- and for local purchases, £46. In percentage terms, British and Foreign purchases totalled 34.5%, and local purchases 65.5%. Because of the higher cost of the British and foreign art works, the expenditure percentages were British and foreign 45% and local, 55%.
example, works such as Lawson Balfour’s *Spanish Girl*, acquired in 1921, cost the
Gallery £157, a very significant sum for that time. Along with two works by Hans
Heysen acquired the same year, it was the most expensive 1921 purchase. The
Trustees’ fondness for works of this sort was exemplified by purchases such as those
made in 1925, when six paintings by Sydney artist A.H. Fullwood, were added to
Gallery collection. The titles indicate that their value was as much decided by
and place as much as any aesthetic value. Again, there was a mixture of
Continental exoticism and English idylls. Fullwood’s works were: *Ol.*

*The Island Pont Neuf, Banks of the River Seine, Norfolk Landscape, Cley N.*
*Sea* and *Windsor*. Other examples were perhaps more exotic, although almost
invariably European in their subjects. A list of the 1924 acquisitions gives a clear
picture of the importance of works whose very titles bespoke art, and whose subject-
matter had as much literal as visual meaning.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£/s/p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Farm</td>
<td>Daniel Vierge</td>
<td>4s/1s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of W. Lister Lister</td>
<td>Lawson Balfour</td>
<td>157/10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauxhall Bride, London</td>
<td>A. H. Fullwood</td>
<td>105/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sultan And His Camp by the Enchanted Lake A. Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>75/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Place, Bruges</td>
<td>Flora M. Reid</td>
<td>32/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twickenham Ferry</td>
<td>M. J McNally</td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Issyk, Cornwall</td>
<td>H. Herbert</td>
<td>26/5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bridge at Moret</td>
<td>H. Herbert</td>
<td>26/5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masquerade</td>
<td>Dora L. Wilson</td>
<td>10/10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; White Drawing</td>
<td>L. Raven Hill</td>
<td>7/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire Pastoral</td>
<td>D. Murray Smith</td>
<td>15/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>Fred Richards</td>
<td>5/5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>Kenneth Robson</td>
<td>2/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Puy, France</td>
<td>Malcolm Osborne, A.R.A.</td>
<td>5/5s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvet Bridge, Durham</td>
<td>A. Raine Barker</td>
<td>4/4s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunny Hill</td>
<td>L. R. Squirrel</td>
<td>7/10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulli II</td>
<td>Anders L. Zorn</td>
<td>24/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>Prof. L. Wilkinson</td>
<td>52/10s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargas Cathedral</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seville Cathedral</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showery Weather</td>
<td>Oliver Hall</td>
<td>3/3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Strand On The Green</td>
<td>Sydney Long</td>
<td>3/13s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*58 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W Legislative Assembly, Second Session, 1925, p.2.*
Fig. 19. Phillip Wilson Steer, *The Beaver Hat*.
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was purchased in London with the assistance of the National Arts Collection Fund and recommended by NAGNSW Trustee, Mr. J. R. McGregor in 1937.
In 1932 the Trustees' admiration for such genres was demonstrated again; typical works, such as Normand H. Baker's *Morning In The Markets*, were added to the Gallery collection at the not insignificant cost (£131) as, later, were others such as Fred Leist's *Pigeon Loft* (£89) and works by C.W. Cain with titles such as *Desert Caravan* and *A Persian Bazaar*. However, the greatest accolade for this kind of art in the Gallery collection was received with the acquisition, from London, of the oil by Wilson Steer *The Beaver Hat* (see Fig. 19) for which the Trustees paid the enormous sum of £1,258. As the price indicates, Trustee taste was still, in the thirties, positioned strongly in the decorative, as well as the narrative and most certainly not in the modern.

Aware of the difficulties of purchasing old masters whose cost and availability were often beyond the Gallery resources, Trustees nevertheless continually sought to furnish their audiences with as much access to high art as possible. Most often this was done through acquiring illustrations of what amounted to 'remnants' of European culture. Once again, there was very little change throughout the two decades in what works were recognised by the Trustees as appropriate for this aim. References to ancient Greek and Roman culture were revisited through the purchase and display of works such as Eva Benson's sculpture *Psyche* in 1925 and Sir Bertram Mackennal's marble bust of the *Madonna* purchased in 1926. In 1932 the Gallery was able to purchase a small J. M. W. Turner, *Venice*, which cost the Trustees £50. In 1933 several etchings were purchased with titles suggesting their added cultural significance. They were, the *Theatre of Marcellus* by Hedley Fitton, and two pencil drawings by artist A. J. Brown, *St. Salvi, Albi and St.*
Trophime, Arles.

In 1933 a strange purchase was made, one which indicates the sometimes questionable provenance and standard which Trustees were prepared to accept in their desire to acquire works even remotely related to periods of significant European art history. This work, entitled The Coronation (Miniature after Fra Angelico) by Gertrude Odillo Maher, admitted in its title that it was a copy. The acquisition of works which were copies of great masters was common practice amongst galleries too remote, too new, or financially handicapped, to acquire major original pieces. However, the Trustees of the NAGNSW believed that such acquisitions were still appropriate for their collection until the end of the period of this study, at the outbreak of the Second World War.

There was, however, an Australian artist who appeared to fill the role of illustrating historical antecedents. As early as 1918 Norman Lindsay's works were acquired for the collection, one of the two acquired that year was Dionysius, a considerable purchase for the day at £15. Robert Hughes wrote of Lindsay, that he 'disliked and distrusted the present' and his 'fleeing backwards into an imaginary past' was, in essence, a provincialism in time and space. 59 Such artists could represent even a tenuous link with the Renaissance – or so it was believed – a link which a deracinated population of a colony such as Australia could not really claim, however much such a history was desired. Throughout the period of this study Gallery Trustees remained committed to the inclusion of Lindsay's work in the collection. It is interesting that they continued to do so in the face of significant criticism from another of their heroes, Sir William Orpen. Writing of the 1923 Exhibition of Australian Art in London, Orpen argued that Lindsay was, in fact, a

bad artist, that his works were 'badly drawn, and show no sense of design and a total lack of imagination'. Further, he claimed that 'the serious intent of the new Australian school is greatly marred by the work of one man – Norman Lindsay'.

A popular method used by both Galleries (as with many other major galleries, especially those distant from the mainstream of European art) to allow audiences access to an art history they did not possess, was to acquire copies or reproductions of European, but particularly British, works. One teaching practice most strongly supported in Victorian England, was that of learning to paint by copying 'old masters', and this had prepared audiences to accept the idea of looking at originals 'once removed'. Also, as both Galleries were financially unable to bid for major European and British historical works (particularly against young American galleries with large private bequests), one solution was to purchase copies and later reproductions of works which could add prestige and educative value to existing collections. It was also seen as a viable, and perfectly correct, way to counteract the isolation of distance. Scholarly work on this area is rare but, in a 1992 Exhibition catalogue, Alison Inglis and Ann Galbally have argued that 'it was the availability of such exact replicas and reproductions that encouraged many nineteenth century museums to consider the possibility of a totally “comprehensive” collection formed along art historical lines'. Although frowned upon now as almost cheating, in the twenties and thirties these works were a respected part of both collections. They were of two kinds, either copies made by an artist reproducing or copying the work of a master in front of the original, or, they were reproductions of works made by photographic processes.

60 Orpen quoted in ibid., p. 84.
61 Ann Galbally and Alison Inglis, The First Collections: The Public Library and The National Gallery of Victoria in the 1850s and 1860s, The University Gallery, The University of Melbourne Museum of Art, 1992, p. 34.
Throughout the period of this study, the NAGNSW placed considerable emphasis upon the acquisition of these works, and was prepared to spend significant proportions of its purchasing budgets to do so. Historically, copies were accorded the same laudatory language as was used to describe the originals. In the nineteenth century, as well as in the twentieth, they were regarded as ‘worthy of the label art treasure’. The 1922 purchase of an engraving, *Fortune In The Clouds*, was a typical example of such purchases. The name of the artist was simply styled ‘After Van Dyck’. Works such as this were listed as with originals in the annual reports to the Legislative Assembly. A 1924 presentation to the NAGNSW of ‘folio of reproductions of works of old masters’ was ‘received with thanks’. These ‘old masters’ were almost impossible to identify, or even verify, but their obvious link with history was enough to evoke respect. A Dr R.O. Lochore, writing in the *Wellington Evening Post* in 1935 advocated modelling the emerging National Gallery of New Zealand on ‘fields existing in London’s three main galleries’. ‘The first function’ he believed, was ‘exemplifying the history of art’, this is to take place in ‘a main gallery - the Gallery of Reproductions’. This gallery, with ‘a few originals’ would fulfil the major purpose of such a Gallery, that is, its educative role. The reception of domestically produced work was not nearly so assured. Lochore believed, as did National Gallery Trustees, that only after ‘vigorous examination’ should the work of ‘native artists be admitted’. This constant concern to purchase works, often of highly dubious origins but which, nonetheless, would represent a link to European high art, often resulted in the purchase of ‘old masters’ for which the provenance was highly doubtful. This did not appear to matter to Trustees. In 1925, the Council of the NZAFA received a letter from Sir Harold Beauchamp ‘covering

---

62 Ibid., p. 31.
63 *Evening Post*, Wellington, 30.4.1935.
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offer for sale of several old masters in possession of a Mrs Oldfield of New Plymouth’. Councillor Col. Carbery was asked to ‘view the collection when next in New Plymouth’ even though his lack of professional training in ascertaining the calibre of such works could not have made him competent to do so.\textsuperscript{64} The possibility that some of these ‘old masters’ may have indeed been just that, but not recognised for what they were, is tantalising:

“Old Masters” continued to be offered. Teaching exercises included copying old masters, which resulted in many paintings that resembled old masters, some of which defy any but an expert to identify. While copies of famous paintings such as the Mona Lisa present no problem, copies of works by an obscure ‘master’ are another matter, and among the chattels brought to New Zealand by the early settlers were some fine examples.\textsuperscript{65}

However valuable these reproduced works were considered in Australia and New Zealand, they had become redundant in Europe by early in the twentieth century. In Australia and New Zealand they appear to have held legitimacy well into the late 1930s. As late as 1936, the National Art Gallery Of New South Wales Trustees still purchased reproductions. Indeed, a large collection was purchased that year of ‘approximately one hundred and forty coloured reproductions; the collection being entitled ‘After Gainsborough’. In New Zealand in 1932, the Council of the NZAFA inspected a ‘copy of the Mona Lisa, presented to the National Gallery by Mr Antonio Bin’, by whom the copy was painted. The Council ‘expressed their appreciation of the copy and it was decided that it be hung with the Permanent Collection’.\textsuperscript{66} Obviously it was considered more important that audiences had access to the image, rather than the original artwork. In 1934, Academy Councillor, Mr N Isaac, suggested:

\textsuperscript{64} Minute Book, N.ZAFA, 5.11.25.
\textsuperscript{66} Minute Book, NZAFA, 4.4.1932.
that a collection of prints of works by the world’s greatest masters for the new gallery would be an excellent thing from an educational point of view as well as making the gallery more international... [It was] resolved that acquiring a good and well selected collection of facsimile reproductions of the major masters not only the British school but also of the French, Spanish, Italian and other schools would be of considerable benefit to the collection. 67

A few months later the Academy decided to expand its collection of prints, instructing the secretary to ‘write to the Medici Society, the National Gallery, London, Der Rij [sic] Museum Amsterdam, the Louvre and the Dresden Gallery inquiring what really good modern prints are available which would be suitable for hanging in our National Gallery’ 68

Photographic reproductions were also acquired through the late nineteen twenties and thirties. The acceptability of this medium was assured by the patronage of the American Carnegie Foundation, responsible for many exhibitions of art reproductions throughout New Zealand and Australia. In 1926 the Trustees of the NAGNSW received a presentation of a ‘collection of French prints’ given by Mr Harry Tighe, an English benefactor. In 1933, Trustees purchased a ‘collection of twenty-two coloured reproductions’, including ‘Cezanne’s L’Estaque, Gauguin’s Ta Matete, and several Van Gogh’s Sunflowers, View Of Arles, and Row Boats Cornfield with Black Birds’. 69 In June 1936, an exhibition of mainly English, ‘modern’, prints were loaned to both Galleries in Sydney and Wellington through the Empire Art Loan Society. In November and December of 1937 a ‘special exhibition’ was held and fifty-one prints and drawings purchased ‘in London for the Trustees by Mr Harold Wright’. 70 It ‘stimulated considerable interest, as some rare prints and drawings by early masters were seen for the first time by the Australian

68 Minute Book, NZAFA, 9.11.1934.
69 This collection is discussed in detail in Chapter Six of this study, The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Towards Modernism.
70 Harold Wright was the Director of Colnaghi’s art dealership and Gallery in London.
public'. The 1938 Annual Report of the NAGNSW recorded ‘two purchases of special note’: these were a ‘set of 151 prints and drawings’ acquired through Colnaghis and a ‘book of drawings in two volumes, Old Spain by Sir Muirhead Bone’. The latter was held to be of historical as well as artistic importance as it ‘represents a true record of Spain as it was before the recent war’. The artistic time-warp between the Antipodes and Europe applied here not only in the type of art print chosen, but their number, and also the selection of artists whose work was copied. In the late 1930s these Trustees were still operating on an aesthetic not only based firmly on a British model but also based on the presumption that no rival to that model existed.

The Trustees’ own review of the highlights of 1937 serves to underline this interpretation. Gallery Trustees considered the major purchase for the year 1937 to have been the ‘fifty prints, mainly etchings and engravings, and drawings specially collected by Mr Harold Wright of Colnaghi & Son, London’. Either contemporary English or medieval, the English prints included those of Sir Muirhead Bone, Francis Dodd R.A., Stephen Gooden A.R.A., one Augustus John R.A., one John Sell Cotman, two James Whistlers. Pre-nineteenth century European examples included a Peter Breughel engraving Charity (10 Gns), one Anthony van Dyck etching portrait of Peter Brueghel, a Canaletto etching Panorama Of A Town Beside A River (5 Gns), a Durer woodcut, The Angel Appearing to Joachim, two Antoine Masson engravings, a Rembrandt etching Christ Among The Doctors, a Tiepolo
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71 NAGNSW Annual Report To The Legislative Assembly Of New South Wales for the Year 1937, 6.10.1938, p. 5.
72 NAGNSW Annual Report to the New South Wales Legislative Assembly for the Year 1938, p. 5.
73 Two etchings: Evening, Genoa and The Apse, Leon Cathedral, Spain.
74 Two dry-point etchings: Hester and Bologna.
75 An etching, Jewess Resting her Head On Her Hand.
76 A drawing, A Ruined Church.
77 A lithograph, The Steps, Luxembourg, Paris and also Draped Figure.
etching *The Flight Into Egypt*, a Goya, *A Bull Overturning a Horse*, and four Alphonse Legros etchings. The Annual Report made special mention of this show and Wright’s contribution to what was considered a major additional asset to the collection:

**SPECIAL EXHIBITION**

A special exhibition of fifty-one prints and drawings, which had been purchased in London for the Trustees by Mr Harold Wright, was held in November and December and stimulated considerable interest, as some rare prints and drawings by early masters were seen for the first time by the Australian public.\(^78\)

Both Galleries consistently strove to display examples of art considered by their Trustees to illustrate the highest principles of art making. Just as providing copies, or reproductions of works, was considered by them to be essential in providing comprehensive instruction in the history of art, the genre of portrait painting was no less important. Sir William Orpen’s reputation was made as a portrait painter, at a time when portraiture was perhaps the most highly regarded expressive form in art. Indeed, the scramble to possess the Orpen self-portrait discussed earlier in this chapter was as much to do with the fact that it was a *portrait* of the great artist as much as it was a work by that individual. Each Royal Academy Summer Exhibition had, as its focus, a royal portrait. Each illustrated Royal Academy Exhibition Catalogue had, as its beginning, a reproduction of that royal portrait. Other portraits in the exhibition were then reviewed ahead of landscapes, seascapes and ‘unusual subjects’. The NAGNSW acquisitions and commissions exemplify the respect with which the ability to capture physical likeness was regarded. The significant profile of portraiture within the Galleries in Australia and New Zealand reflected the importance of that genre in Great Britain and both

\(^78\) NAGNSW Annual Report Of the Trustees to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1937, 6.10.1938, p. 5.
Galleries regarded the acquisition of portraits (however sometimes remote and unknown the subjects were to their Antipodean audiences) as seminal to the prestige of their institutions. The premier position held by portraiture, particularly up until the 1920s, was reflected in the establishment of the Archibald Prize. An annual award for 'the best portrait, preferentially of some man or woman distinguished in Art, Letters, Science or Politics', was first awarded in 1921. Ironically, given Archibald's own fervent Australian nationalism, the prize came to reinforce British and conservative values in art. While Archibald supplied the money, the Trustees undertook the judging. This prize, was for many years the richest prize for art in New South Wales. It was appropriate that it should be for portraiture.

The NAGNSW collection of portraiture was already well established by the early period of this study, as noted above, with the commissioning of several portraits of Generals immediately after World War One. In 1917, the subject matter of commissioned portraits was broadened with a Trustee resolution that 'with a view to perpetuating the names of Australian artists who had distinguished themselves in their profession, one or more might be invited to paint and present his portrait to the National Art Gallery'. Typically these were works designated both in the Annual Reports and Gallery Catalogue as a 'Gift of the artist at the request of the Trustees'. The collection that developed included, W. B. McInnes' 1925 Self Portrait, and in 1930 three portrait 'presentations', self-portraits by Margaret Preston, A. E. Newbury and Charles Wheeler (Wheeler later won the 1933 Archibald prize with his portrait of Ambrose Pratt). These portraits also included some unlikely choices of

79 The Archibald Prize was a substantial bequest by the first editor of the Bulletin newspaper, J. F. Archibald, to the Trustees of the Gallery to found an annual prize for portraiture. The initial value of the prize was £400. Whilst Archibald was often antagonistic to Britain, he stipulated that the judging of this prize be carried out by gallery Trustees, well aware of their LRA bias.

80 "The value of the Prize increased from £499 in 1921, to £592 in 1928, fell to £371 in 1933". William Moore, op. cit., p. 196.
artists deemed to have ‘distinguished themselves in their profession’. A 1931 self-portrait by H. B. Harrison was commissioned at the special request of the Trustees. There is no explanation in the Minutes of this choice; the Gallery possesses only two of his works, this self-portrait and a landscape given later to the Gallery by his widow.\(^1\) He is not an artist included in any history of Australian painting, the initial 1934 edition of the *History of Australian Art* by William McCay- artist, Ernest Buckmaster presented his 1936 *Self-Portrait* at the trustees.\(^2\) Although Buckmaster had won the Archibald prize for his Sir William Irvine, this self-portrait is the only work by this artist collection. The Trustees seem to have been particularly grateful for this work, ‘resolving to accept from Mr Buckmaster his self-portrait and to thank the artist for it’.\(^3\) Strangely, only three months later, when selecting those artists to be included in the *150 Years of Australian Art Exhibition*, Buckmaster was not included in the list. This sort of inconsistency occurs many times in the acquisition of domestic artists and their works. In the broad sense it reveals the lack of direction and planning that is often evident in gallery acquisitions, but more so, it illustrates the lack of confidence the Board displayed when purchasing Australian works. Often support for a particular artist was the result of his being championed by a sole Trustee. This type of inconsistency seldom occurred when purchasing English works.

The Trustees also commissioned portraits of fellow Trustees. In 1919 a portrait of Trustee Sir James R. Fairfax was commissioned by the Trustees and painted by John Longstaff. Sydney Ure Smith’s portrait by W.B. McInnes was the

---

\(^1\) *Landscape*, a 1938 oil, was the gift of Mrs H. B. Harrison in 1951.

\(^2\) The Trustees’ inclusion of Mr Buckmaster in this program was surprising as this is the only work of his in the collection.

\(^3\) Minute Book, NAGNSW, 22.1.1937.
'gift of the artist' in 1929, and the 1931 Archibald winner was Sir John Longstaff's portrait of John Sulman - having been commissioned by the Trustees for the gallery, then purchased by them. A portrait of Director G.V. Mann was purchased in 1935 having been painted by W.B. McInnes. Nora Heysen's 1941 portrait of Sir Lionel Lindsay, was given to the Gallery by fellow Trustee, J. R. McGregor in 1943.

Portraits of business luminaries were also acceptable subject matter for acquisition with, for instance, Lyndon Dadswell's sculpted bust of E. W. Knox presented to the Gallery in 1933 (the Gallery also owned a 1902 portrait of Knox by Sir John Longstaff). The more general portraits acquired during the period between the Wars included gifts from Howard Hinton of Tom Roberts' portrait of Sir Henry Parkes (in 1922), the self-portrait by Royal Academician Thomas Philips (in 1923), and the George Lambert portrait of Miss Halford (1923). In 1925 the Trustees purchased a portrait of the artist J. D. Moore painted by Norman Carter. In 1932, Hinton again presented the Gallery with a portrait, this time a self-portrait, by Nora Heysen. In 1936 four portrait drawings were acquired, John Longstaff by Phil May, Bertram McKennal by Abby Alston, and also a self-portrait by this artist, and a self-portrait by Rupert Bunny. The Normand Baker Self-Portrait, winner of the 1937 Archibald, was later presented to the gallery.84

Art writers in New Zealand also agreed with the premier position of portrait painting, and argued that 'nothing requires more concentration, knowledge and intense work than a portrait...'.85 As Gordon Brown has observed '[B]etween the two World Wars the portrait claimed special attention...[and] as a subject it became associated with a handful of names, the most obvious being Archibald F. Nicoll,

84 Normand Baker's Self-Portrait was presented to the Gallery in 1956, by Baker's widow.
85 Otago Daily Times Newspaper, 17.11.1924, p.10.
Elizabeth Kelly, [and] M. E. R. Tripe'.\(^{66}\) The New Zealand Academy of Fine Art agreed with these sentiments, acquiring, when funds allowed, a substantial collection of their works. Six oils of Archibald Nicoll's were purchased between 1922 and 1933,\(^{67}\) and an Elizabeth Kelly portrait, *Andrew*, was purchased in 1931. M. E. R. Tripe (a member of the Academy Council in 1929, 1931 and 1934) was perhaps New Zealand's best-known portrait painter between the wars, the Academy acquiring four of her works, including a portrait of H. C. Williams, in 1923.\(^{68}\) Of the Academy's collection of New Zealand artists that were presented to the National Art Gallery of New Zealand in 1936 nine works were portraits. The subjects of these tended to be prominent Wellington citizens or Academy artists. For instance, Sir Harold Beauchamp's portrait was painted by Walter Bowring and acquired by the Academy in 1929, H. Gore, Academy Council member and secretary) was the subject of a portrait bust by Joseph Ellis, acquired by the Academy in 1927, a portrait of the painter J. M. Nairn, by Mabel Hill, was acquired in 1921 and another of D. K. Richmond by Ceridwyn Thornton, was acquired in 1935.

The reception of another art genre, landscape painting, was, surprisingly, more problematic. It might be expected that the reception of domestic Australian art by NAGNSW Trustees, would be enthusiastic; such paintings, after all, could capture the physical uniqueness of their land and might be expected to appeal to their audiences on at least a nationalist level. However, for most Trustees Australian art was definitely the second prize. Australian art was simply not British art, and therefore, for NAGNSW Trustees, the valuing and acquiring of domestic work

---


\(^{67}\) These works were: *The Citadel, Cairo* in 1920, *Valley Of The Spey* in 1922, two in 1926, September, *Finisterre and Winter* (a mid-Lothian canal), a portrait of Thomas George Macarthy in 1930, and *Peninsula, Winter* in 1933.

\(^{68}\) The others were: *The Blue Ribbon* (1927), *The Favourite* (1920), and the *Purple Veil* (1921).
required an extrapolation of the British model onto Australian art production before Board acceptance was assured. Consequently, as the acquisition lists of this period between the Wars reveal, it was only that Australian art which mimicked those British Academic values that easily found honoured places on the walls of Sydney’s National Art Gallery. Ultimately Trustees applied the same aesthetic principles to art, whether the work was of Australian or British origin. The governing standard was that of British Academy works and given the genuflexion to these British models it was not unexpected that Australian works would be judged by the same standards. The artistic conventions prescribed by the London Royal Academy demonstrated the continued ‘importance of painting technique and of subject, academic style was identified in terms of technically conservative treatment of significant subjects’. However, the critical aspect for the reception of Australian work at the NAGNSW was the path through which it was transformed, as far as the Trustees were concerned, from popular to high art.

The taste of Trustees, confined by their devotion to British academic models, was characterised by a sense of exclusivity, which was then transformed by the Trustees into a kind of visual, artistic, embargo. Australian art, then, was judged in terms of Englishness. A cursory examination of NAGNSW acquisition lists suggests that there was, however limited in type, little hesitancy in Trustee support of the chosen brand of ‘correct’ Australian art, even if, for most of the period of this study it was extremely limited in its scope. Certainly the Minutes record very few dilemmas over which works should be acquired. Financial reasons, if not pressure from local art societies, would have provided an incentive for Trustees to actively pursue local products even had the Trustees not been required by Gallery policy to

---

purchase a proportion of Australian works each year.  

The purchases of Australian art made in the period between the Wars, clearly reflect the narrow corridor of artistic acceptability. Throughout the 1920s the number of Australian artists from whom the Trustees purchased consistently, numbered less than twenty. As with the majority of works purchased from Great Britain, they were nearly all either of landscape, or portrait subjects. The absolute model for Australian art was that provided by George W. Lambert. The £630 paid for his oil White Glove was the most expensive Australian work purchased, more typical of a price paid for English works. Lambert’s position within the orbit of the NAGNSW has been discussed earlier in this study, but the consistency and comparative expense of his patronage by the Gallery is exceptional, emphasising Lambert’s position, in Trustees eyes, as having provided the aesthetic bridge between English and Australian art.

Apart from Lambert, work was most consistently acquired from W.B. McInnes, Norman Lindsay, Norman Carter, Charles Bryant, James R. Jackson, Septimus Powers, Hans Heysen, A. H. Fullwood, Lawson Balfour, John D. Moore, Elioth Gruner, Rupert Bunny and Sydney Long. These artists can be divided into two categories. The first can be represented by artists such as Norman Lindsay, Sydney Long and Rupert Bunny, all of whom could be seen as representing a past which Australia did not possess, to an audience all too keen to forsake contemporary artistic understandings for the fabulous representations of European history.

The second category was that of ‘contemporary’ Australian artists who worked in a ‘contemporary’ technique, which was not, as far as the Trustees were

---

90 'Soon after Julian Ashton was appointed a Trustee in 1889, he had a rule passed, that out of the government sum, a sum of not less than £500 a year should be spent on Australian works'. William Moore, The Story of Australian Art From The Earliest Known Art of the Continent to the Art of To-Day (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934), p. 189.
concerned, to be confused in any way with modernism. The works of artists such as A. H. Fullwood, W. B. McInnes, Norman Carter, Charles Bryant, James R. Jackson and John D. Moore were consistently bought by the Gallery throughout the twenties. They were all part of the Macquarie Galleries stable in its early years and regarded by Gallery historian, Jean Campbell, as 'top-ranking artists'.

The patronage of these particular artists correlates to the patronage of 'contemporary' British artists by the Royal Academy, meaning, that they manifested 'a highly mediated interest in French art [Post-Impressionism], and the avoidance of subjects which might conceivably be taken as moral exhortations'. These Australians were painters who used a broken brush-work technique and were advocates of 'en plein air' landscape painting. For the LRA in the twenties, as for the NAGNSW Trustees, the use of the word 'contemporary' as a description, did not mean an approach that was 'modern'. The 1930s saw many of the same artists' names re-appearing. Once again, the work of James D. Moore, Hans Heysen, Sydney Long, Charles Bryant, A. H. Fullwood, Norman Carter, James R. Jackson and Norman Lindsay dominated the acquisition lists. Melburnians Max Meldrum and Herbert Badham were also purchased for the Gallery's collection.

For the Trustees of the NAGNSW, landscape painting became increasingly the most important genre in the period between the wars. It was not only apparently the chosen genre of most Australian painters, it also held a premier position for imported works. As Ian Burn has argued:

Pictures of landscape became and have remained the most valued within a hierarchy of subject matter and provide the strongest threads of continuity in any history of Australian art. Consequently shifts in the conception of the landscape are

---

especially significant to an understanding of Australian art and its history.93

Much of the debate surrounding landscape painting in Australian art history has inevitably centred around that of the Heidelberg school, regarded by many as still the pinnacle in the expression of the Australian psyche. Work produced later, which did not conform to the aesthetics established by those Heidelberg painters, has been in the past fifty years, denigrated, and dismissed as unworthy. This has particularly been so for much of the landscape work purchased in this period by the NAGNSW, which has been the subject of criticism by contemporary writers. Many of these acquisitions in the twenties have proven to be easy targets for critics for whom either the Heidelberg School or Modernism were their models. Most of these painters were neither. The Trustees had as their premier aim to follow the British lead, and so they selected work which, although of Australian subjects, was embedded in a different psyche – that of Britain and in particular the London Royal Academy.

A survey of Australian landscape painting purchased between the Wars by Gallery Trustees illustrates the persistence and power of this British Academic influence. Once again, the range and number of individual artists patronised was not great. The number of artists who had significant works purchased (as indicated by the sum of money the Trustees were willing to pay for them) numbered under twenty. Therefore, it should not be surprising that very little stylistic variation was evident in the work of these artists, the characteristics of most acquisitions being easy to list by what they evidence as much as what they did not.

Hans Heysen, was regarded by Gallery Trustees, as the premier landscape

---

painter in N.S.W. and this high regard was reflected in the acquisitions of his work by the Gallery between the Wars. In fact, Gallery Trustees had first purchased his work as early as 1904, in 1909 and again in 1911. Heysen's works were amongst those for which the highest prices were consistently paid and his paintings were also the most consistently acquired until the late thirties. Throughout the twenties there were only two years when Gallery Trustees did not purchase works by Heysen. In 1922, £136 was paid for Heysen's *The Quarry*, the most expensive oil purchased that year apart from English works. In 1923, £78 was paid for *White Gums*, an enormous sum for a watercolour. In 1924 two more Heysens were purchased, both oils, *Study* and *An Afternoon In Autumn* at £157 each. Apart from the huge purchase sum paid that year for the Baynes equestrian bronzes, these Heysens were the most expensive works purchased that year. More works were acquired in 1926, 1928 and 1929. The thirties saw a significant reduction in the number of Heysen's purchased, with only three works having been added to the collection. One was acquired in 1931, *Gums of The Far North*, a watercolour (£136) and then nothing until 1938 when two works were added to the collection, *The Farmyard Gum* (£52) and *Landscape* (£105), both of which were also watercolours. As indicated by their purchase prices, they were still considered significant inclusions for the collection.

The pattern of the Gallery's consistent patronage of Heysen's work was significant for several reasons. It indicated clearly which type of portrayal of the Australian landscape was consistent with Trustee understanding. In the twenties, as far as the Trustees of the NAGNSW were concerned, that understanding did not reside in the Heidelberg school, but rather, as the acquisitions demonstrate, the desired representation of the land was to be expressed in the work of those artists

---

94 *The Coming Home* was bought in 1904, *Summer* in 1909 and *Hauling Timber* in 1911.
95 1927 and 1930.
96 £157 was also paid that year for Lawson Balfour's oil portrait of Lister Lister.
whose vision most closely mirrored those highly ideological paintings which adorned Burlington House. A review of the Exhibition of Australian Art held there in 1923 wrote of Heysen’s contribution:

These are watercolours with something more in them than mere literal translation. They have a lyrical quality, a poetic feeling entirely successfully treated with a technique sound and of the best watercolour tradition.\(^7\)

As the Academy urged artists to gauge their skill by reference to skills of draughtsmanship, it was high praise indeed when that accolade could be applied to an Australian artist. Lionel Lindsay, when writing the catalogue Foreword for the same exhibition, described Heysen as ‘our greatest draughtsman of landscape’, one who ‘alone has conquered the gum tree and added cubic weight to its presentment’.\(^8\) However, by the thirties Heysen’s patronage by the Gallery had significantly diminished. I believe this can be accounted for by the re-positioning of the Heidelberg School whose artists were now invested with a ‘new’ vision by the Trustees of the NAGNSW. This did not come swiftly, because for artists of the Heidelberg school, neither the premier position of draughtsmanship nor the ability to depict the ‘cubic weight’ of a gum tree figured sufficiently in their aesthetic.

This slow, upward shift in the appreciation of the Heidelberg School marked the only major aesthetic change in Trustee thinking between the Wars, and therefore, in Trustee patronage. The essential ingredient for this altered perception was the eventual acknowledgement of the place of the Heidelberg School within ‘high’ art. In spite of persistent lobbying by Trustee Lionel Lindsay, other Trustees had been reluctant to accord to the members of the Heidelberg School the accolades that had been theirs much earlier in popular culture. In the reviews of the 1923 exhibition of

\(^7\) P.G.Konody, ‘The Australian Exhibition in London’, *Art In Australia* (Special Number, 1923).
\(^8\) Lionel Lindsay ‘Foreword’ in, *Catalogue of the Art In Australia Exhibition of Australian Art In London*, 1923.
Australian Art in London, only Streeton had been singled out for particular accolades. Even when British art critics focussed on what they saw as the pre-eminent place of Streeton within the Australian landscape tradition, that place was still largely ignored by Gallery Trustees. However, by 1930 Australian landscape as seen through Heidelberg eyes was just beginning to secure a place in the Gallery collection. One of the first indications of this was that Arthur Streeton was given the responsibility to bid at an auction of the late Louis Buvelot’s work in Melbourne. Trustees had been given notice of the forth-coming exhibition in July of that year, and their decision to instruct a purchase in such a way was evidence of a shift in the position of the Heidelberg School within ‘official’ taste. At this auction Streeton was able to secure a Buvelot watercolour for the NAGNSW, On The Banks of The Yarra. Recognition of Buvelot, who had been the teacher and mentor of most of the Heidelberg artists, also meant the beginnings of a change in status of these artists, from the popular to ‘high’ art.

The changing stature of the Heidelberg School landscapists can also be gauged by the Trustees’ desire to purchase Sir Arthur Streeton’s Land of The Golden Fleece. Although eventually an icon in Australian culture, as the sequence of events reveal, complete acceptance of even this seminal Streeton work was to be slow in coming. The Trustees were unsure of the Heidelberg aesthetic and the Board Minutes reveal this hesitancy. A resolution was passed at the 1930 September meeting that a ‘letter to be sent to Sir Arthur Streeton to enquire if he would consider accepting £500 for Land of The Golden Fleece, on exhibition at the Society of Artists Show’.

Streeton responded cheekily with a telegram, which read: ‘... best

---

99 See reviews such as those responding to the exhibition of Australian Art in London in 1923, where critics such as those of the Nottingham Guardian, and the London Evening News, highlighted the contribution of Streeton. See also Art In Australia (Special Number, 1923).
100 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 2.9.1931.
landscape 500 Guineas its destination now Royal Academy this prevents future
dissatisfaction re commission figure. Picture still available at 500 Guineas including
commission’. Streeton’s tactic in mentioning the Royal Academy was one he knew
would most likely result in a purchasing scramble from the Trustees. However, in
this instance, the Board of Trustees were too tardy, the work being bought by the
National Gallery of Victoria. Perhaps coincidentally, at the following meeting the
Trustees minuted a letter from Lionel Lindsay urging the Trustees to purchase Tom
Roberts’ *Bailed Up*.101 The price of this work was also 500 Gns. The Trustees
obviously did not share Lindsay’s enthusiasm for the work as ‘it was decided to
thank Mr Lindsay for his suggestion and say that it was appreciated and would be
kept in mind’.102 At the same meeting they also declined an offer from the Anthony
Hordern’s Gallery to purchase Tom Roberts’ *The Scrub Cutter* at 200 Gns.103

The Minutes record that immediately after the items of the Roberts were
discussed, the Trustees instructed the Director ‘to contact Mr Molloy [NAGNSW
advisor in London] requesting him to enquire if the *Self Portrait* of the late Sir
William Orpen was still available and at what price?’.104 Obviously, although the
1930s brought a changing comprehension of Heidelberg artists and their relationship
to Australia’s perception of itself, when pushed, the Trustees were unwilling to fore-
go any chance at the acquisition of major English works. However much the
Trustees wished to purchase Streeton’s *Land Of The Golden Fleece*, and the trouble
taken to acquire a Buvelot, it is important to recognise that these steps did not,
however, indicate the final supremacy of Australian over English models. The
somewhat contradictory behaviour indicated by these deliberations was not unique.

---

101 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 23.10.1931.
102 Ibid.
103 Ibid.
104 Ibid.
At the same meeting, in September 1931, the Trustees accepted "with thanks a presentation, by the late Tom Roberts, of a portfolio of etchings by the French artist Claude du Jardin". Furthermore, they accepted a loan of eleven major oils by Arthur Streeton, offered to them by a Dr Oscar Paul. At the December meeting, a Tom Roberts oil (not named) also offered by Dr Paul, was declined, as was his *Lake Como*.

It is in the language used in major art reviews and criticisms to describe the work of the Heidelberg artists that the changed stature of their work can be seen most clearly. The words used by conservative art critics, such as the NAGNSW Director, James MacDonald, to discuss the merits of the landscape works of Streeton, are of the tenor used previously by the same writers to argue the artistic supremacy of English works. By late in 1931 writers in *Art In Australia* were lauding the work of Heidelberg painters, particularly Arthur Streeton, in ways that had previously been reserved for either British Academic or historical European masters. MacDonald’s 1931 *Art In Australia* article entitled simply *Arthur Streeton*, was penned in the style of an acolyte worshipping a genius and he established Streeton’s artistic credentials as a ‘youthful’ prodigy at the beginning of the article. The point MacDonald made was that, in Streeton, Australia had found its art master, not a mere artistic hack, but an individual touched by genius:

At the age when most youths are mentally fumbling as to how and through what medium they shall express themselves, Arthur Streeton had made up his mind about it and gone far forward mastering the means of forthtelling what his eyes and feelings reported to him.... He had a natural selective sense that never failed him so that he was at liberty to devote to the rendering of what was before him; the composite vision of his inner and his outer eye.

---

105 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 2.12.1931.
Once Streeton’s innate genius was established, MacDonald’s writing positioned him, as far as official art patronage was concerned, not within an Australian visual arts context, but within one of European, high art:

We have been accustomed to hearing that Streeton is lyrical, but as we are using the terms of literature we can go further, and say that he paints in the pictorial form and spirit of the ode, the sonnet, and, in the case of certain great pictures, almost the epic.\textsuperscript{107}

MacDonald’s writing, which asserted this association between Streeton’s insights and European literary genius, was repeated in various depictions throughout the eleven page article. Parallels with composers and ancient Greek philosophers were also asserted, these obviously considered appropriate cultural parallels for Streeton. MacDonald declared that ‘I am for the Streetonian view, for his pictures to me are like the description of Australia I should expect from Theocritus set to music by Mozart’.\textsuperscript{108}

Only in the final paragraph of MacDonald’s lengthy essay did he address the relationship between Streeton and Australian nationalism:

Finally, it is the national chord that Streeton has struck that will endear his work to us: the colour, the tone, and the form that compose it and which are so peculiarly ours. For long it and its overtones will vibrate and sing in our national being. For we are not only nation, but a race and both occupy a particular territory and spring from a specific soil.\textsuperscript{109}

The close relationship between the art of the Heidelberg School and emergent Australian nationalism was one that has been thoroughly explored by many Australian scholars. However, it appears to this writer that the ultimate acceptance of these painters was not as straightforward, nor as inevitable, as those arguments would suggest. Certainly this article of MacDonald’s suggests another, and I believe

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., p. 18. 
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid. p. 22. 
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid. p. 23.
just as important, rationale. That is, that the reception of the Heidelberg School changed certainly as the result of a more tempestuous political climate throughout the twenties, but its acceptance by official high art circles came about ultimately when that genre could be positioned within the British, high art context. This recognition of Australia’s possession of a dual artistic nationality had been recognised and commented upon by earlier critics. For instance, in a review of an exhibition of Australian art held at the London Royal Academy’s home, Burlington House, the eminent critic, P.G. Konody wrote:

Though very much of the tone and flavour of the Annual Summer Exhibition at Burlington House, it would be a mistake to suppose that there is anything in the present show that might pass for the work of an English artist. Australian soil, air and sun, with Australian psychology, produce a vision entirely individual to the Southern Continent, although this is expressed by means of a technique not a whit different from that of the academic phase of painting in the Mother Country.\footnote{P.G. Konody, ‘The Australian Exhibition in London’, \textit{Art In Australia} (Special Number, 1923).}

Other writers, such as NAGNSW Trustee Lionel Lindsay, also often drew upon the nature of Britishness in its new land:

The federation of the States emphasized this racial consciousness. The Englishman, transmuted by climate and different conditions, had changed a little his skin and modified not a little his ideas. He had become the Australian, that more casual Englishman, whose character has been formed by drought and flood, vast distance, and the sovereignty of the sun.\footnote{Lionel Lindsay, ‘Australian Art’, \textit{Art In Australia: Exhibition of Australian Art In London}, 1923.}

The subject may be Australian, almost aggressively so, but the soil at its base, was British.

Ian Burn, in his book \textit{National Life and Landscapes}, has proposed that ‘over recent decades it has been argued – generally by way of dismissal – that the pictures of the inter-war landscape painters were simply a degenerated or exhausted version
of the Heidelberg School'. This was certainly not so as far as the Trustees of the NAGNSW were concerned. Far from being either 'degenerated' or 'exhausted', the landscape pictures purchased in this period were works considered by the Trustees to be in the twenties more important than the Heidelberg School; in the thirties those artists were patronised whose art was considered a vital parallel to the School, that is, in their illustration of 'links' with British aesthetics.

The nineteen twenties offered once more a narrow list of landscape artists considered appropriate for acquisition. Narrow it may have been, but Trustees were generous with their patronage of particular artists: artists such as G. W. Lambert, Will Ashton, W. B. McIvor Smith, Norman Carter, Charles Bryant, James R. Jackson, Septimus Heysen, A. H. Fullwood, Lawson Balfour, John D. Moore, Elioth Bunny and Sydney Long appear constantly in the acquisition reports to government. Even though the Gallery had commissioned portraits of both Arthur Streeton and Tom Roberts in 1924, the acquisitions of their works in the twenties do not indicate a commitment to acquire their works. Indeed, apart from the 1920 painting Harrow On the Hill, the 1926 landscape Shadow Of The Hills and then in 1932 his Spring In Sussex, the only other Roberts works acquired in this period were the results of presentations to the Gallery. The most expensive landscape painting acquired during the twenties was Elioth Gruner's On the Murrumbidgee which had been the winner of the 1929 Wynne Prize and for which the Trustees paid £420 in 1930. By comparison, three years later the Gallery paid only £350 for Roberts' Bailed Up.

113 'The presentations were a Portrait of Sir Henry Parkes presented by Howard Hinton in 1922, a portrait of Mrs A.B. Greaves presented in 1935, as well as his self-portrait commissioned by the Trustees in 1924.
The thirties saw a repetition of purchases of works from those artists acquired during the twenties, however there were fewer Heysens, and greater representation of Heidelberg painters. The artists whose paintings of Australian landscapes were purchased were Arthur Streeton, G. W. Lambert, Louis Buvelot, Tom Roberts, John D. Moore, Hans Heysen, Sydney Long, Will Ashton, Charles Bryant, A. H. Fullwood, Lionel Lindsay, Norman Carter, James R. Jackson, Max Meldrum and Herbert Badham. Two major Sydney Longs were purchased during the thirties: in 1931, *Reflections, McDonald River* (£84) and in 1937, *The Morning Moon* (£210). In 1937 three Streetons were purchased, *Passing Showers* (£210), *Slopes of Olinda* (£157) and *Melon* (£105). Also in 1937 a major Gruner was acquired, *Weetangera* (£210). The very limited range of expression of landscape would have been almost fossilized in its development without the addition of the Heidelberg School artists brought into the fold of high art.

Another aspect of both Gallery acquisitions, which played a major role in both forming their collections and displaying the complex, and at times contradictory nature of Trustee taste, was that of bequests. Throughout the period of this study, bequests were of vital significance to the Trustees, a fact reflected in their being constantly reported in the monthly Minutes and in the Annual Reports. For both Galleries, there appeared to be little in the way of consistency in what was accepted, and what was rejected. Consequently, many of these works were found to be lacking in lasting value and, therefore, many are no longer in the Gallery's collection.

The acceptance or rejection of the various bequests offered to both National Galleries at this time appears to have been haphazard at best. The result was that all too often Trustees were left to deal with artistic legacies, which were later deemed to be unworthy of continued presence. However, to various degrees both Galleries were
dependent upon gifts, made as either presentations or bequests. The annual financial allocation made to each institution was not enough to provide for what was regarded as the most basic of acquisitions, so individual benefactors played a major role in the shape of both Gallery collections. The quality of the works received in this way varied enormously, as did the knowledge and taste of the benefactor. Undoubtedly, the most significant benefactor in the history of the NAGNSW was Howard Hinton. A Gallery Trustee, his gifts to the Gallery collection added enormously to its depth. Beginning in 1919, he presented Gallery Trustees with three etchings and two watercolours by Lionel Lindsay. In 1922 he presented the Gallery with another etching by Lindsay, an oil self-portrait by Norman Carter, The Story by Harry J. Weston and a portrait of Sir Henry Parkes by Tom Roberts. Two years later, in 1923, he presented five works, including another two Lionel Lindsay etchings, a self-portrait of Royal Academician, Thomas Phillips, and four etchings by Eileen Soper. The following year, Hinton made several significant gifts, including a watercolour, Hawkesbury River Above Wiseman's Ferry by J. R. Ashton, and a F. P. Mahony watercolour, Settling Down To Finish. In 1925, he presented a Peneligh Boyd water-colour, The Three Sisters, Blue Mountains and an E. Phillips Fox oil, Twilight On The Seine. In 1926 he presented some sixteen works including, a Rayner Hoff bass relief Love and Life, a J. Muir Auld oil Summer Time, Broken Bay, ten Norman Lindsay watercolours, and four of his drawings.

In 1928 another four works were presented, a Sydney L. Thompson, Vines In Autumn, a Harley Griffiths oil, The Beach, B. E. Minns’ The Wheat Wagon, and an Elioth Gruner oil Snapdragons. In 1930 he presented nine works. Most of these were of English origin and they included a Juliuss Olson R.A. The Longship’s Light, Augustus John R.A., The Woollen Cap, Francis Dodd, A.R.A. Pall Mall

Howard Hinton's generosity to the Gallery was commemorated in 1926 with the Trustees' acknowledgement that 'as a recognition of Mr Howard Hinton's valuable donations to this institution', the Trustees decided to hang these works by Norman Lindsay in a panel in the Australian court, 'with a special tablet as follows: Presented by Howard Hinton Esquire, one of the Gallery's most munificent benefactors'.

Presentations by other benefactors increased significantly in number and importance throughout the period of my study. The early twenties were characterised by the variety of artefacts considered appropriate by the Trustees for inclusion within the collection. The Annual Report for 1923 illustrated their scope. Objects such as china, coins, stamps, photos (a collection of photos of the Australian Art Exhibition in London, presented by the Society of Artists) and medals, were accepted along with Trustee John Lane Mullins presentation of Gallery Director J. S. MacDonald's lithograph, and two folios of etchings by Durer and Fromentin presented by a Miss C. L. Montefiore. In 1924 a plaster bust of the Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes, by sculptor F. Derwent Wood, R.A. was presented by Mr Ernest Watt. In addition, three
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114 NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1926, 31.3.1927, p. 3.
important oils were given to the Gallery by a Miss Grace Joel, of London; these were portraits of Arthur Streeton and G. P. Nerli (painted by Miss Joel) and a portrait of the benefactor painted by G. P. Nerli. There was an upsurge of 'presentations' in 1925 with some important works being donated, including a 'signed proof reproduction in colour from the work of W. Russell Flint A.R.A.', presented by Mr J. A. Thompson. A monotype, *Misty Morning* by A. H. Fullwood, was presented by Lane Mullins (and several oils by Fullwood were also purchased that year for the Gallery). Two Phillips Fox oils were acquired, *Summer*, presented by Mr F. Grimley, and another, *Arranging Flowers*, presented by Howard Hinton. A George Lambert drawing, *Milking Time*, was presented by Mr B. J. Waterhouse, also a collection of 'French prints' presented by Mr Harry Tighe in London. R. B. Davison presented a *Princess Alexandra* medal, struck by J. S. Wyon, in London. Also, as a bequest from a Mr Frith, a watercolour by Conrad Martens (*Rushcutters Bay* 1840) and another, a water-colour, by H. C. Allport, *Sharp's Bay* of 1847, were given to the Gallery.

As the Gallery had no written acquisition policy, and as the type of works described above demonstrate, there appears to be no consistency in the type of donations accepted. However, apart from artefacts of curiosity value, anything from Europe, whether they were originals or copies, appeared to have been acceptable. The position of Australian acquisitions, however, at this time remained more problematic. The year 1926 was typical in the type of works acquired, but not in the volume. In addition to the large number of Hinton gifts (thirty-five works in all), the presentations included, an oil, *The Sick Lady*, described as a 'Replica of a work in the Hermitage Gallery at St.Petersburg', by Gabriel Metsu and presented by a Mrs Charles Lamb. A Mrs Carvick Webster gave several works including: *Study Of A Head* by Lotto, *Drawing* by Virgil Solis, *Study Of A Dog* by Veronese and *Crowning*
Of A Pope by Taddeo Zucarro. A collection of 97 medals were presented by Sir James and Mr Geoffrey Fairfax. Sir Arthur Streeton presented two works, an oil, Boulogne and a water colour, The Stairway, Peronne. In addition, a collection of six 'Old Italian drawings', by artists unknown, was given by Mr C. Campbell-Lloyd. In 1931 an interesting bequest from an unusual source was accepted by the Board on behalf of the Gallery; the presentation from the Estate of the notable British actor the late George Du Maurier of some twenty drawings of un-named artists and various etchings by Du Maurier himself. Another example was the 1937 gift of Mrs F. A. Stephen, of an oil, by an unknown artist, entitled Christ Giving The Key of Heaven to St. Peter. The Trustees appeared happy to accept these European works, even though their authorship (such as that of the Old Italian Drawings), c indeed, their authenticity could not be verified. The Minutes of particular meetings, when these gifts were noted as being 'gratefully received', do not record any concern over this.

Just as presentations of works of European subject or origin appear to have been particularly popular with the Trustees, so too were works which were gifts from individual Gallery Trustees. Throughout the period of this study, Trustees endowed the Gallery collection with works either especially purchased for that purpose, or which came from their own personal collections. Such a list not only provides valuable information as to the taste of individual Board members, but also clearly demonstrates what kind of art was considered appropriate for the National collection.

The year 1932 was particularly noteworthy in that regard. In that year retiring Board President, Sir John Sulman presented the Gallery with a 'bronze bas-relief panel', by the eminent English sculptor William Reid Dick R.A. Lionel Lindsay presented a pencil drawing The Joiner's Shop, by another Trustee, Mr B. J.
Waterhouse. Another Board member, Mr J. R. McGregor, presented four works which included a B. J. Waterhouse pencil *Mill St., Pyrmont*, and also *Clifford’s Inn, Observatory Hill* by Sydney Ure Smith. Included in McGregor’s gift was a two-volume catalogue of a recent London exhibition of Italian Art. Trustee John Lane Mullins, presented a copper plaque commemorating the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, which had been made by Rose Gayer Phipps. In 1934 John Lane Mullins presented a Ure Smith’s drawing of the *Old Mint, Macquarie Street*, and another, *Wylde Street, Potts Point* was given by fellow Trustee Charles Lloyd Jones. A water-colour, *The Canal, Copenhagen*, by Daryl Lindsay, was presented by Gallery Trustee The Hon. Sir Philip Street K.C.M.G. In 1937 Mr B. J Waterhouse presented ‘thirty three Autotype reproductions, in a folio entitled *Masters In Famous Galleries*. Mr John Lane Mullins presented a book, *American Wonderland* by Leslie Shane. Charles Lloyd Jones presented one of his works *Auckland Harbour*, Mr J. R. McGregor presented an oil, *Nude*, by Alexandre Iacovleff. Sir Philip Street gave two works, John Sell Cotmans’ *Four Etchings* and a lithograph by J. McNeill Whistler.\footnote{116}

Members of the Board of Trustees were also willing to submit their own creative endeavours as gifts for the national collection, often given either by the artist himself, or by a fellow member of the Board. It could be argued that even if the occupation of individual Trustees was not that of an artist - if he had the skills of even a ‘Sunday-painter’ - his work was accepted. For example, Charles Lloyd Jones’

\footnote{115 Presentations for 1933 included: the Society of Artists presentation of a drawing by Syd Ure Smith, *The Bridge*. Miss C.L. Montefiore was again a benefactress, donating a book of sketches by E. L. Montefiore. A Miss Louisa MacDonald presented her own portrait, painted by R. O Dunlop. J. R. Ashton presented his own watercolour *Livingstone Hopkins, Still Waters*, and an oil by Yeend King presented by Charles Binnie. A copy of Adelaide Ironside’s *St. Catherine* was presented by a Miss Spinks.}

\footnote{116 NAGNSW Annual Report for the Year 1937 to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 6.10.1938, p. 4.}
gift of Auckland Harbour is one of the two Lloyd Jones in the collection. The other, Afternoon Light was acquired by the Marshall Gift Committee (made up of members of the sitting Board) and presented to the Gallery in 1941. Most examples of this type of presentation did not stand the test of time, as, for example, the 1923 gift of Director J. S. MacDonald of a lithograph by John Lane Mullins, or the 1932 B. J. Waterhouse drawing of Mill St., Pyrmont (presented by J. R. McGregor). Neither remains in the collection. More fortunate was the fate of the legacy of the ‘rugby-playing solicitor’ Trustee, J. W. Maund, referred to in Chapter Three of this study. He has five water-colours still in the Gallery’s collection, most acquired during the 1940s, four of which were gifts from the artist.117

In 1930 the Gallery was, however, the recipient of a significant collection of works by the late George Lambert. Presented as a gift of the Lambert Memorial Fund, some twenty works were initially donated. Further donations from the Lambert Memorial Fund followed and included an oil portrait of fellow artist Hugh Ramsay, and three pencil drawings.118

The huge variety of work considered appropriate for Trustee acceptance continued throughout the 1930s. Presentations for 1934 included A Landscape, an oil by A. D Peppercorn, an etching by F. L. Griggs St. Leonard and also a bronze relief plaque commemorating the battle of Zeebrugge by P. de Soets. A photograph of the late Charles Conder was presented by Miss Margaret Conder; a Syd Ure Smith drawing was presented by a Mrs F. Nesbitt and a George J. Coates pencil drawing by Mrs Coates. In 1936 Dame Mary Gilmore presented her Rayner Hoff Portrait Head In Bronze and Mr J. R. McGregor gave a Syd Ure Smith watercolour, Harbour From

117 She-Oaks of 1942, Black Wattle Bay of 1947, From Tomali of 1947, End of the Day of 1952 and Nera Spencer, Hawkesbury of 1951. The latter was the gift of the Marshall Bequest Fund.
118 In 1930 other presentations included: a ‘portfolio of etchings by two various artists’ (unfortunately artists unnamed) which were bequeathed by Tom Roberts. A tinted drawing of Government House by Syd Ure Smith was anonymously donated.
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*Potts Point*, and one from a Dr Andrew Davidson of *Parliament House*. It was inevitable, given the plethora of type, origin and provenance of the works accepted that the majority would have little lasting value. The pattern of gifts also demonstrates the difficulty the Trustees had in discerning which works were to have lasting value to their national collection.

In amongst the gifts to the Gallery there was, however, a remarkable donation made in 1937. Remarkable because the transaction involving this donation indicated a shift away from slavish adherence to the London Royal Academy but also indicated the emerging (as far as the National Gallery was concerned) prominence of the Australian Heidelberg school painters. The Annual Report for 1937 reported that ‘the Oil painting, *A Garden in Grenada*, by Lord Leighton, P.R.A., which was presented to the Gallery by Mr Howard Hinton, O.B.E. was exchanged with him for a watercolour entitled *Cutting The Tunnel* by Sir Arthur Streeton’.[120] The epitome of the nineteenth century London Royal Academy high art, Lord Leighton was relinquished for an image representing an unashamedly Australian subject of popular culture.[119]

Private Trustee collections were often useful sources for providing works to support Gallery exhibitions. These types of loans became increasingly evident throughout the 30s. In 1937, for instance, Trustee J. R. McGregor loaned some 14 works from his personal collection, to display in a Gallery exhibition organized as a response to the *Contemporary British Art* show. McGregor’s was a significant contribution to the Gallery’s counter-offering and reveals the scale of connoisseurship that existed within the Board. The works included an Augustus John

[120] NAGNSW Annual Report for the Year 1937 to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 6.10.1938, p. 4.
[119] For further discussion see Chapter Six of this study, *The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism*.

203
drawing, a Sir William Nicholson still life oil, a Wilson Steer oil landscape, two Stanley Spencer oils *Cookham Wharf* and *Cockmarsh Hill, Cookham*, a chalk drawing by A. J. Munnings, two Alexandre Iacovleff oils and a Jacob Epstein head in bronze - also a Streeton, *Hawkesbury Landscape*. Private purses, such as those of McGregor, were deeper than that of the public issue, and the art works such financial resources provided were often made available to boost NAGNSW claims for artistic superiority.

When reporting on the success of the exhibition in the Annual Report for 1933, the Trustees took the opportunity to record, for 'special mention', those artists whom the Trustees regarded as being the most significant of British painters. The list highlighted, not surprisingly, those members of the LRA considered sacrosanct: 'Sir Joshua Reynolds P.R.A., J. W. M. Turner R.A., John Crome, John Constable R.A., Augustus John R.A., Thos. Gainsborough R.A. However, it also extended the list of these artists to include 'our modern painters, A. J. Munnings R.A., Sir William Orpen R.A., Glyn Philpot R.A., Jacob Epstein, Frank Dobson and Henry Lamb'.

The naming of *our* 'modern painters' in this way was highly significant. *Our* artists were British, not Australian. Either way, they were modern only in their birth dates.

In this report, the Trustees were having the final say in an uncomfortably public debate in the press of the day over the apparent failure by the Board to recognize the importance of the Zander British Contemporary Art works. A Minute of the 18.4.1933 records the intention of the NAGNSW Board to 'inspect an exhibition of British Contemporary art with a view to possible purchase', however,

---

120 Ibid.
121 For further discussion of these points, see Chapter Six of this study, *The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Towards Modernism*. See also the NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1933.
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‘nothing was bought’. The letters to the press criticizing Board members for their inaction is described in the following chapter of this study.

Presentations made in 1939 indicate, for the first time, the eventual if rather tepid, recognition of modern French art movements of the twentieth century. As in the previous year, Gallery purchases and presentations made to the Gallery were of an identical aesthetic, so it is no surprise to see bequests such as those made by George Patterson be echoed later in the year with Trustee attempts to purchase Post-Impressionist works. George Patterson presentations were some 13 coloured ‘reproductions of European moderns’, a Cézanne Mt. St. Victoire, Gauguin’s Tahitian Mountains, Dufy’s Boathouse, van Dongen’s In The park, van Gogh’s Restaurant La Sirene, Valadon’s Sacre Coeur, Pissarro’s Rouen, Degas’ Danseuse, Manet’s Bar At The Folies Bergeres, Sisley’s Road at By, Renoir’s Seashore, Utrillo’s House At The Corner and finally, Derain’s Landscape.

The difficulty Gallery Trustees had in absorbing modernism and in any relinquishing British Academic models, can be gauged by their acceptance of Mrs Colin Anderson’s gift of Tissot’s The Widower whilst at the same time accepting the offer of George Patterson’s collection of French prints.122

The Annual Report for 1939 also included a list of works ‘On Loan’. Most were provided by the Sydney County Council collection.123 Again, most were reproductions, but some European moderns, Seurat, Picasso, Renoir, Utrillo, van Gogh, Manet, Gauguin, Pissarro, Sisley, Manet, Degas, Cezanne were included, as well as some significant oils lent by others, including Sir Marcus Clarke’s The

---

122 In 1939 other presentations were a Dattilo Rubbo self-portrait, J. Lawson Balfour’s Portrait of A Lady, Mrs Norman Lindsay gave three of her late husband’s works as well as three works by Ethel Gruner; one etching and two oils, Bondi Beach and Beach at Bondi. Many donations also came the estate of the late Sir Philip Street. These were, in the main, British works from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

123 These had been acquired through a Mr Harry Tighe in London.
Digger, a bronze by C. Webb Gilbert, Sir Bertram McKennal's bronze Reclining Nude and another, Circe.

Major financial bequests, such as those which so benefited the National Art Gallery of Victoria, were not in existence in the NAGNSW. However, there were some and perhaps the most significant was the Marshall Gift, provided by Tom Marshall, a Gallery Trustee, and his wife. The amount of the bequest was not consistent, and often the subject of controversy. However, the purchases commenced in 1931 with The Glass Bottle, an oil by Bernard Hall, at a cost of £105. Charles Bryant's The Quay, Concarneau, of 1931 was also purchased. Whilst these purchases were made under a separate budget to that of the normal purchasing account, the selections were made, as with usual acquisitions, by the Trustees.

There were two other smaller bequests, the May Grainger Gift, instigated in 1937, and the special, one-off bequest by A. R. D Watson (of Auckland) which enabled the purchase of Watson's Barn by Sir George Clausen, R.A. This Watson bequest involved the not insignificant sum of U.K. £250.

Although not a bequest in the sense of the others, the Carnegie Foundation of America undoubtedly provided both New Zealand and Australia with access to reproductions of works and also books, on a scale impossible for these galleries to have purchased alone. For example, the initial 1937 Carnegie Corporation gift

---

124 Also in 1929 Mr and Mrs Tom Marshall presented the Trustees with a freehold property which is estimated to bring in £300 a year, which is devoted to the purchase of pictures. William Moore, The Story Of Australian Art (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934), p.186.
125 See Chapter 3 of this study, Men Who Count - Things That Matter: The Aesthetic Ideal of the Trustees and Directors of the National Galleries of the Two Dominions.
126 The Marshall Gift also provided, in 1932, Interior by Bernard Hall, Gathering Clouds by Eric Langker, Jamieson Valley by Howard Ashton. A water-colour by G. K. Townsend, Coastline was purchased in 1934 as was J. Muir Auld's The Oat Patch. In 1936 three oils were purchased: The Road To Wollombi by J. Salvana, Interior by Max Meldrum and Old Buildings, Sospel, France by Will Ashton. In 1937 three more works were purchased with the funds: The Morning Moon by Sydney Long, Plaza del Coonsttitucion by Lionel Lindsay and Banksia and Bottlebrush by Lister Lister.
127 A gift of £1,000 bequeathed by the late Mrs May Grainger, to be known as the May Grainger Gift, was made to the Gallery for the purchase of works of art. NAGNSW Annual Report of The Trustees to the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales for the Year 1937, 6.10.1938, p. 2.
amounted to U.S. $6,600 dollars (which equalled £1,667), an enormous sum for the period. Although very prescriptive in the way the money was to be used, it undoubtedly provided access to additional services, which otherwise would have been impossible. Notably, the Foundation enabled access to library and general museum services and in particular the provision of lectures, and the purchase of colour reproductions in London.  

These acquisitions were the major tool, as far as Gallery Trustees were concerned, to advance their project of making solid the representation of a cultured society, however distant from its Homeland. The individuals involved in the selection of works emanated from the one class, unified in their desire to present their new homes as part of an English artistic culture. The lack of a written acquisition policy scarcely disproves this: the reality was that, for these men (and one New Zealand woman), no debate on the issue was necessary. There was only one aesthetic, and that was centred on the London Royal Academy. The acceptance of domestic work was consequently problematic, reflected in the haphazard pattern in the acquisition of these works. Other artistic codes, considered outside of the Academy, were regarded by these Galleries with suspicion and hesitancy. In particular the work of women artists, modernists and those representations of indigeneity were regarded by Trustees as areas outside of the domain of high art. These facets are discussed in the following chapter. For these Trustees their blatant adoration of the art of the Motherland, made visible through the auspices of the LRA, would no doubt have had most of them constantly wishing ‘Oh to be in England!’.

---

128 A large sum of £300 was provided initially for the purchase of reproductions in London. The lectures enabled by the Foundation are discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER FIVE

‘THE VERY BEST IN ART’: EXHIBITION PRACTICE AS IDEOLOGY

One might be apt to think, following the cry of the modern movement in art, that the nature of man changed with the mode, because the fashion of the hour imposes a different line upon a coat, or invests woman with a change of shape or colour.

It is true that the moment colours our lives in its passage, but great art does not arise from such a simple impact with life, being the expression of the emotional intelligence of man, and set above all catchpenny theories or temporary crazes. The great artist is a seer. He grasps not only the skin, but the content and meaning of things. Whatever is eternal in the moment he seizes with unerring instinct and uses. He reflects, but he also re-embodies life.

The art of the hour is all surface; it has no depth. That is why its mode declines as swiftly as the dresses of yester-year, which are the derision of their former wearers, forced to the latest confection by the arbiters of elegance.¹

It is not surprising that countries sharing a common colonial cultural foundation would also, at least initially, share an understanding of what constituted ‘art’ for the governing elites in both nations. Both Australian and New Zealand elites considered art both a civilizing and educative tool, one that would illustrate the heritage of Great Britain. It was primarily through the exhibition programs of both Galleries that such a heritage could be displayed to the public, and thus reinforced.

For the administrators of both institutions, as much prestige was to be gained by the connections they could claim to ‘the old progenitor’ through their exhibitions as through works acquired for the collections.

Apart from the acquisitions obtained between the Wars by both institutions, the exhibitions programs offered to their respective public audiences provide the clearest evidence of the nature and extent of their preferred artistic models; they offer also an opportunity to test claims concerning the sustained pre-eminence and influence of British Academic models. In order to do so, this chapter examines the exhibition practice of both

¹ Lionel Lindsay, ‘Australian Art’, The Exhibition of Australian Art in London 1923: A Record of the Exhibition Held at the Royal Academy and Organized by the Society of Artists, Sydney, Art In Australia Special Number, 1923, not paginated.
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Galleries in order to determine the nature and significance of the role of British models in Dominion ‘official’ art practice. The mechanisms that were put in place to sustain Empire loyalties will be explored, in addition to specific exhibitions.

The works that were chosen to come to New Zealand and Australia, both by acquisition and exhibition, formed the basis upon which decisions were made by audiences of both these most prestigious galleries, about the state of ‘art’ in their own countries. Through predominantly English lenses, Australian and New Zealand eyes examined these exhibitions seeking both artistic models and cultural reassurance. As discussed earlier in this study, models were thus provided by which New Zealand and Australian domestic art was to be judged and its standard gauged. These visual lessons were not simply models of formal composition, tone, colour or subject. Equally they were to do with ‘Britishness’; British standards, British culture as well as British aesthetics.

It was evident throughout the exhibition programs that for New Zealand audiences, as with those in Australia, the primary role of art was to provide the same educative purpose as was propounded in conservative art circles in England. The primary purpose of art was to raise the level of culture and if the model was British art, then it should be no surprise that the exhibitions negotiated to visit New Zealand and Australia were illustrative of that model. As New Zealand art historian, Ann Calhoun, wrote in her 1982 essay on the entrepreneur Wellington art dealers, the husband and wife team, Mr and Mrs E. Murray Fuller, ‘they sought to educate New Zealand artists and art audiences by offering the work of “eminent” artists, albeit academic, from “Home”’. Of course, this sentiment was by no means restricted only to art. The slogan for a prospective 1931 New Zealand coalition government

for example, declared ‘Keep in step with the Motherland!’

The educative value of ‘high’ art was constantly referred to as the ‘most effective means of stimulating the appreciation of art in any community’. It was vital, so it was argued, that ‘the man in the street is brought into contact, as frequently as possible, with the best work of acknowledged artists’. The perceived quality and weight of these English exhibitions, as well as the rarity of a local opportunity to view them, meant that audiences regarded these artistic offerings as the most valuable of aesthetic experiences. Reviewers exhorted individuals having any artistic aspirations to view these exhibits because, in the words of one awestruck viewer ‘one cannot but be conscious of its importance as an influence for good on art and on the popular appreciation of art in New Zealand’.

This enthusiasm for British art - more specifically, British art made by Royal Academicians - was expressed repeatedly in material accompanying the exhibitions, or could be read later in the reviews of those shows seen both in New Zealand and Australia. William Moore, writing in 1929, was correct in his assertion that ‘there is not a wide difference between New Zealand and Australian Art’. Certainly, in both countries, a painting’s status in the eyes of the Gallery elites was determined by whether or not its maker was a member of the Royal Academy. Therefore, a work’s suitability for inclusion in a proposed exhibition to either southern dominion was decided by a taste and appreciation that had not moved from that dominant in England in the nineteenth century. Aesthetic opinion, when it came to Britishness, was one of shared fervour and allegiance. Aesthetic taste and political conviction were at one in this regard. At least one political commentator believed that for New

---

4 ‘Review of Mr E. Murray Fuller’s Exhibition of British Contemporary Art’, *Art In New Zealand* (March, 1929), pp. 22-25.
Zealand, British Imperial sentiment in the inter-war period was stronger than any national one. For example, a report to the New Zealand Cabinet on the visit of the Imperial Federationist L.S. Amery to New Zealand, asserted that:

If Imperial sentiment is strong in Australia, in New Zealand it is a passion, almost a religion. Alone of the dominions, New Zealand is much more interested in her Imperial, than in her national status.\(^6\)

For both National Art Galleries, the primary desire to reflect this zealous Imperial sentiment shaped an artistic taste singular in its focus. Their exhibition programs were, during the period of this study, limited in the main to various ‘in-house’ exhibitions punctuated by more highly regarded prestigious loan exhibitions. The former emphasised the display of Royal Academy works already in their collections while the latter primarily illustrated the host institution’s relationship with prominent English Royal Academicians.

Throughout the period of this study, each institution’s exhibition programs did nothing to widen understanding of any art practices beyond those exported from Britain to New Zealand and Australia. The narrowness of artistic models ensured not only a lack of discrimination within those precincts but also an enduring ignorance (for most associated with these Galleries) of any new aesthetic developments. The result of this ‘enclosure’ of artistic principles was seen primarily in such aspects as the response to modernism and also in the difficulty of assigning a status or worth to domestic New Zealand and Australian art.\(^7\) Gordon Brown, writing of New Zealand art, describes this problem of alignment as ‘an irrational enthusiasm’ for European models resulting in the viewing of domestic work with ‘patronising disparagement’.\(^8\)

---


\(^7\) Both aspects are discussed in Chapter Six of this study, _The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Towards Modernism._

\(^8\) Brown, op. cit., p.16.
This reliance upon, and respect for, Royal Academy models became self-perpetuating, as the art critics, the art teachers and art patrons absorbed the artistic lessons being presented to them and in turn passed them on to their students, their readers and their artists.

In contrast with the NAGNSW, it was common practice in both the NZAFA and then the NAGNZ to house exhibitions of work that were for sale. It was a practice which suited both the limited size of the market in New Zealand and the smaller audience. The Murray Fullers, referred to earlier in this chapter, were astute art purveyors. They knew which works were most likely to appeal to such buyers as New Zealand’s prominent regional galleries and wealthy individuals. Of particular focus, as a potential buyer, was always the New Zealand Academy of Fine Art, and later, the National Gallery of New Zealand. It was not by chance that one of the Murray Fuller exhibitions brought to New Zealand in 1932 was described as a ‘small Royal Academy exhibition’. This was an accurate assessment of the show’s content, a review sure to meet with approval, as this was ‘praise indeed in a period when “R.A.” was an insignia of artistic success’. These exhibitions carried the cachet of high art. As art critic Roland Hipkins remarked:

> there is no part of the British Empire where it is more acceptable than in New Zealand – acceptable because it is British, not solely because it is art.

The artistic traffic between Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia was primarily that of a one-way street. Whilst other Sydney art societies did, albeit rarely, exhibit Australian art in London, there is no record of either Dominion National Gallery institution being approached specifically to draw, from their collections, a

---

9 Sir Lindo Ferguson, *Otago Daily Times*, 16 April, 1932.
10 Brown, op. cit., p. 31.
representative exhibition of work for display in Great Britain. Overtures, when they were made, were usually forwarded under the auspices of individual societies whose primary agenda was to further cement Empire relations. Art was seen as another vehicle able to illustrate a shared physical and cultural heritage.

Much more common travellers on artistic roads to the northern hemisphere were individual artists, either those lucky enough to be financially independent or the fortunate recipients of art scholarships which were to be taken up in Europe. Highly sought after and prestigious, these awards, for example, the NAGNSW Travelling Scholarships, offered winners artistic opportunities unparalleled in the Dominions. Sometimes these opportunities were not directly related to art institutions but to societies anxious to promote Empire unification. For example, the New Zealand Society of Imperial Culture, as part of its strategy of aiding Empire unity, awarded a travelling scholarship to the winner of an art competition. In 1926 the recipient of this scholarship was the happily named painter James Cook, who, in the approved manner, took up the scholarship in order to study at the Edinburgh College of Art and the Scottish Academy.¹² Not, perhaps, as prestigious as the London Royal Academy, but Scottish art schools were apparently more generous with their educative opportunities.

Only on rare occasions in the interwar period did the artistic elite in England see fit to direct the flow of art in the reverse direction. The organisers of the 1924 British Empire Exhibition held in London, did convey a request from ‘the Imperial authorities’ for ‘works of typical New Zealand subjects by living New Zealand artists’.¹³ However, surviving records of the Exhibition do not reveal which, if any,

¹² Prof. James Shelley, ‘James Cook, a Painter of Promise’, Art In New Zealand (March, 1933), p. 146.
¹³ Chairman of the Central Committee to Gore, New Zealand Art Section, re the British Empire Exhibition, 8.5.1923. NLNZ, MS Papers 1372, Folder 1.17.
artists were represented. Much more certain of representation, on the other side of the Tasman, Australian art was represented at the 1928 Imperial Gallery of Art (organised by Sir Joseph Duveen). Artists whose works were hung included George Lambert, A.R.A., Sir John Longstaff, Arthur Streeton, Elioth Gruner, Norman Lindsay, Blamire Young, Margaret Preston, Florence Rodway, Thea Proctor, Hans Heyson, Bernard Hall, Will Ashton and Charles Wheeler. This was a generous representation, not organised through the NAGNSW but via Sydney’s Art societies.\textsuperscript{14}

In 1930, the regular London contributor to \textit{Art In New Zealand}, Russell Reeve, reported for New Zealand readers on the second Exhibition of the British Empire Academy. ‘There were no New Zealand inclusions’ he wrote, but ‘Australia was represented’ by its ‘expected contingent’ of Trustee selected NAGNSW representatives ‘J. S. Watkins, Lister-Lister [sic], Sydney Long, Dattilo-Rubbo [sic], James R. Jackson’ and ‘others’.\textsuperscript{15} Similarly, in 1936, the \textit{Evening Post} reported an ‘invitation’ to ‘send a collection of pictures to London, to be included in an exhibition of works by artists of the British Empire as part of the coronation program’.\textsuperscript{16} These were exceptional moments and they appear to have had more to do with the need for Dominion representation in Great Britain’s special efforts to promote Empire propaganda than any curiosity on Great Britain’s part regarding the artistic practices in the Antipodes.

It could be argued that the greatest representation of Australian art in London was not the result of any initiative undertaken by the NAGNSW but rather by other prominent Sydney art societies. Whatever the source, these rare occurrences were made much of in Australia. For example, in 1923 Gallery Trustee, Syd. Ure Smith

\textsuperscript{14} William Moore, \textit{The Story of Australian Art From the Earliest Known Art of the Continent to the Art of To-Day} (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1934), Vol. II, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{15} Russell Reeve, ‘London Letter’, \textit{Art In New Zealand} (September, 1930), p. 57.
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Evening Post}, 16.11.1936.
was instrumental in organising ‘an exhibition of Australian art [that] was to be held at the Royal Academy’ held ‘under the auspices of the Society of Artists’. To this exhibition, the Gallery loaned ‘twenty-seven works from the Australian Courts’.

A different approach to British-Dominion art, and Empire co-operation, was promoted by a Dunedin businessman, Mr P. R. Sargood. As President and major patron of the Dunedin Public Art Gallery, he devised the most prized artistic exchange between Great Britain and her Dominions. Indicative of New Zealand fervour for all things British, it was envisaged as accomplishing two things, perhaps of equal importance. First, a method was to be provided by which audiences in the Dominions could also have access to those works which audiences in London could see easily, and second, it was intended to enhance relationships between those Dominions and the Motherland.

Sargood was a typical member of the mercantile elite, which carried the burden, both in Australia and New Zealand, of reinforcing the ties between Great Britain and her Pacific Dominions. He was the product of a family intent on perpetuating English models of class and behaviour. His father, Frederick Sargood, whilst Victorian Minister of Defence, sought, through the instigation of school Cadet Corps throughout private boys’ schools, to instil models of behaviour and value systems such as those moulded in the English public school system. Brought up in the splendour of Melbourne’s Rippon Lea, the product of Geelong Grammar, then ‘finished’ at Cambridge, P. R. Sargood, as one of five sons, was sent to Dunedin to look after the affairs of the family company, Sargood, Butler, Nichol and Ewen in

---

17 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Parliament for the Year 1923, 17.7.1924, p.3.
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New Zealand.\textsuperscript{19}

Given his social and financial position, in addition to the ‘Anglo-fied’ climate of his upbringing, it is not at all surprising that such a scheme, primarily based on the desire to further encourage closer relationships between ‘mother and child’ should have come from such an individual. It was in 1933 that Sargood first proposed to Imperial authorities in London the scheme for artistic visits from the Motherland.

The scheme was enthusiastically adopted in principle. Lord Conway, in his opening address at the Inaugural Dinner for the Empire Art Loans Scheme in 1933, revealed that the impetus for the scheme had come from New Zealand and was frank about its purpose:

\begin{quote}
it was to give those people - those less fortunate people - an opportunity of seeing some of the best works of modern Art that this Society was formed.\textsuperscript{20} The idea originated with Mr Sargood of Dunedin. The demand came from New Zealand.\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}

Given New Zealand’s fervour for the Mother Country, such a scheme to bring the two even closer together was not surprising.\textsuperscript{21} Although devised by Sargood, it was administered by a British organisation designed specifically to foster closer ties with British art. As such it was regarded by both the NAGNSW and the NAGNZ as a scheme of major importance.\textsuperscript{22} Certainly, it became the major vehicle by which the two Dominion National Galleries were able to consistently exhibit British works as well as, occasionally, works from other Dominions. Although two of the major contributors to the touring exhibitions were the Tate and National

\textsuperscript{19} This company also had branches in London, Sydney, Adelaide, Perth, Ballarat, Newcastle and Kalgoorlie.

\textsuperscript{20} Lord Conway, Report of the Inaugural Dinner of the Empire Arts Loans Scheme, House of Commons, 4.4.1933. NLNZ, MS 1372, Folder 3.15. The reference to modern art refers to art that was produced no later than the 19th century, not contemporary 20th century work as we understand by the term ‘modern’.

\textsuperscript{21} See NLNZ, MS 1372, Folder 3.15.

\textsuperscript{22} P. R. Sargood, Dunedin, to NZAPA, 26.5.1933. NZNL, MS 1372, Folder 3.15.
Galleries in London, others contributed mainly from private collections. Other sources for works included in the tours were the Victoria and Albert Museum, the Joseph Duveen Fund, the Contemporary Art Society, the Arts Exhibition Bureau, the Arts and Crafts Society and the National Loan Fund as well as 'other kindred organisations in Great Britain ...with probably Royal patronage'. The LRA was not listed amongst those bodies contributing, because Academy members or those who exhibited at the Academy, when it came to the selling of their work, acted individually. Exhibitions organised through this scheme toured Australia, New Zealand and Canada throughout the thirties and forties. Thus, the art presented to exhibition audiences of Australia and New Zealand, emanating from such acclaimed collections and representing the most highly regarded artistic ideology, reinforced a cultural alliance established between British academic art, the British Empire and the Dominions to which the exhibitions travelled.

For the NZAFA, the involvement in the scheme was not easy. The financial commitment involved in maintaining the scheme was prohibitive. At a time when the Great Depression of the thirties was hitting the Academy hard, the demand for extra financial outgoings to support this scheme, however desirable, was an extremely difficult one to meet. It is worth noting here that the amount of Government financial support received by the NZAFA at this time was approximately one third of that received by the NAGNSW. When the scheme was first mooted, E. D. Gore, the New Zealand Academy Secretary, reported on behalf of the NZAFA, to Sargood (who acted as the New Zealand organiser on behalf of the London administration) that, 'whilst the Academy was most anxious to co-operate in the scheme,' it could

23 The Secretary, Dunedin Public Art Society to the President, NZAFA, 18.12.1929, from the Incorporated. N.L.N.Z., MS 1372, Folder 3.15.
24 S. F. Markham & Professor H. C. Richards, A Report To the Carnegie Corporation of New York on The Museums and Art Galleries of Australia and New Zealand, 1933.
Page 218 – 225 are missing from the thesis
Wright of Colnaghi & Co, London. Wright was a great friend of Trustee Lionel Lindsay and this collection was further evidence of a long standing purchasing relationship between the NAGNSW and the London dealership of Colnaghi. The collection, when exhibited, provided clear evidence as to the values still thought dominant in the conservative, elite world of the Gallery Trustees. Once again, the purchase of this collection (which consisted mainly of ‘old master’ engravings) revealed the artistic values that were thought to be the most valuable. Once more the public was shown, through exhibition, that art was to be a properly taught, academic process. The significance with which the Trustees regarded these purchases can be gauged by the price they were willing to pay for the collection. £236 was the purchase price, which was a significant portion of that year’s purchasing budget.52 The Annual Report for that year assured the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly that ‘it stimulated great interest’ as ‘some rare prints and drawings by early masters were seen for the first time by the Australian public’.

It was not until the late thirties that either the NAGNSW, or the NZNAG exhibition program could be said to have offered viewers images representing broader horizons – beyond those which illustrated predictable, Empire loyalties. That shift, when it occurred, was due more to the Trustees’ eventual recognition of the importance of maintaining audiences, which the exhibiting of ‘new’ work achieved, rather than any change in exhibition policy.54 No Trustee argued that there was any fault or limitation in the type of artwork the Galleries were normally prepared to

52 See Chapter 4 of this study, ‘Oh! To Be In England!’: Acquisitions.
53 NAGNSW Annual Report to the 1938 N.S.W. Legislative Assembly (Second Session), p. 3.
54 The 1938-39 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Parliament for the Year 1938, for instance makes special mention of the fact that ‘2,510 visitors attended the opening and from then till the closing date 208,880 passed through the turnstiles. It is interesting to record that 4,134 of the illustrated catalogues were sold’. The exhibition was the One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Art.
exhibit.

There were two exhibitions in particular that provide clear evidence of the models that were considered appropriate for the art audiences of Wellington and Sydney National Galleries. Both consisted of imported British works and they shared the same title, *Exhibitions of British Contemporary Art*. They arrived within a year of one another, each organised independently, but both were ‘selling’ exhibitions. The first was organised by Wellington dealer Mr Edwin Murray Fuller and opened at the NZAFA in February 1932. The second was organised by English art dealer Mrs Alleyne Zander and opened in Sydney in 1933. The Murray Fuller Exhibition with its home at the NZAFA was thereby invested with ‘official’ status. The Zander exhibition was housed at the commercial Farmers’ Store Gallery. The policy of the NAGNSW was that it could not house any exhibition whose content was for sale. Even if that had not been the case, it is unlikely, for reasons that will be discussed later, that the Trustees would have considered the content, in spite of that exhibition’s emanation from Great Britain, appropriate for their audiences.

Because of the common artistic source implied by the shared title, and the close proximity in time, it could have been assumed that these exhibitions would be alike. It would not be unreasonable to expect that they would perhaps consist of the same artists. They did not.

The New Zealand version of *Exhibition of British Contemporary Art* was brought to Wellington, as another commercial venture for Mr Edwin Murray Fuller. As the earlier collections of works he had brought to New Zealand illustrated, Murray Fuller’s aesthetic was one based firmly on English soil. He had an ‘intense love for the country of his birth’ and sought to ‘develop’ New Zealand’s public galleries ‘along the lines which would make our national collections truly
representative of contemporary British art’. He assembled the works he knew would appeal to his audience and housed his show in a venue most likely to endow the works with associations of high art, connoisseurship and elitism. Listed simply in the ‘private view’ invitation, the venue was ‘the Art Gallery, Wellington’.

NZAFA Councillor, Col. A. D. Carbery, wrote the ‘Prefatory Notice’ in the Exhibition catalogue. In it, he told readers that Mr Murray Fuller had spent ‘two and a half years in Europe’ devoted to a ‘survey of modern art in France, Italy, Belgium and especially in England’. The preface also announced the credentials of this show by assuring those invited to the exhibition that these works were selected on the advice of ‘the late Sir William Orpen, his ‘close friend’, and noted that to ‘Orpen’s guidance and ever-generous help’ much was owed. Carbery also noted that Murray Fuller owed much to ‘the esteem and encouragement of leading English painters’.

Guests at the exhibition were specifically told of the premier role of Orpen, and that indeed, his works were included ‘by the express desire of the dead artist’.

Thus, the ingredients were gathered for a lesson in art. First, the works were to be British. Secondly, the works were to be not only British but preferably created by a Royal Academician (even better if the artist was an eminent Royal Academician, such as the President). Thirdly, the works were acquired by an identity that the New Zealand public knew to have close connections with, and be able to claim, British connoisseurship. Fourthly, these works, when they arrived, had to be exhibited in a space, which would add significantly to the already accrued aesthetic credentials. The NZAFA Annual Report for that year thanked Mr Murray Fuller for his ‘enterprise’ in ‘bringing out this collection at such a difficult time’, and declared
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56 Archive File: Murray Fuller Exhibition, 1932, Hector Library, Museum of New Zealand.
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that it had ‘aroused keen interest amongst the public of Wellington’ and was ‘undoubtedly of considerable educational value’.\textsuperscript{59} As A. D. Carbery’s history lesson in the catalogue described the passage of artistic models from English (Constable), to French (Manet & Degas) and then back to English (the new English Art Club), it was made clear to viewers that English art was at the centre of the collection and had a matchless pedigree:

Towards the close of the century that impetus which Constable had given French art was echoed back to England at last. Young ardent painters, fresh from the Paris studios, founded the Scottish school, the Slade School, and the New English Art Club; Manet, Degas, Carolus Duran were their teachers, and so modern British art inherited the patrimony of Constable, increased by French culture a thousand fold.\textsuperscript{60}

Clearly, it also highlighted the following values as those that had been perfected by the new English schools, values which should instruct those less fortunate New Zealand artists trying to hone their skills, notwithstanding their distance from the art centre:

Searching and revealing drawing was regarded as the vital impulse of the new schools, so that the skill of the English artists in the use of graphic line became everywhere acclaimed.\textsuperscript{61}

In support of ‘revealing drawing’ and the use of the skilled ‘graphic line’, Whistler was held up as the example of all that is best in art. Readers were told that ‘Whistler had perfected the art of etching and handed on to his successors a knowledge of the bitten line which has made a British school of etchers of unsurpassed technical ability’.\textsuperscript{62} Another medium prevalent in the exhibition, that of water-colour painting, was said to be ‘a medium of expression almost exclusively

\textsuperscript{59} The NZAFA Annual Report for the Year 1932.
\textsuperscript{60} A. D. Carbery, ‘Prefatory Notice’, Exhibition of British Contemporary Art: Catalogue of Original Paintings in Oil and Water Colour (February, 1932), NZAFA.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid.
British’. For Carbery, this exhibition was evidence that ‘British art to-day had never stood on a firmer basis of craftsmanship or on a higher plane of aesthetic experience’.

It was no wonder, given instruction such as these, coming from what were considered by most to be the highest authorities in the land on the matter, that New Zealand audiences continued to genuflect to British models. This exhibition was reviewed in the following month in *Art In New Zealand*:

One of the most effective means of stimulating the appreciation of art in any community is to contrive that patrons and the man in the street are brought in contact, as frequently as possible, with the best work of acknowledged artists. In this way their environment will unconsciously educate them.

It was obvious that both Murray Fuller and his selections of art works were perceived by the people of Wellington as the major factor in countering artistic and cultural isolation. After his death in 1933, the loss for New Zealand was widely acknowledged. In one ‘epitaph’, the writer expressed the degree of loss:

Murray Fuller’s death will entail for New Zealand a serious deprivation, in that the collections of contemporary British art which from time to time he brought to this country were not only of outstanding interest to all art lovers, but had become part of our national life. Murray Fuller’s friendship with leading artists of the Old Country made it possible for him to obtain for exhibition in this country art works which otherwise we would not have had the opportunity of viewing.

In Australia, the attitude of the NAGNSW Trustees’ both to exhibition policy in particular and to art in general, can most often be gauged in the period between the wars by the examination of those Sydney exhibitions which were housed outside of the Gallery and organised by authorities other than their own. The *Exhibition of British Contemporary Art*, held at the prestigious Farmers’ Exhibition
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63 A. D. Carbery, Prefatory Notice, *Exhibition of British Contemporary Art: Catalogue of Original Paintings in Oil and Watercolour* (February, 1932). NZAFA.
64 Ibid.
65 *Art In New Zealand* (March, 1932), p.42.
Gallery in April 1933, was just such an external exhibition. The Foreword to the
catalogue, written by the organiser, Alleyne Zander, admonished Australian arts
administrators, claiming that although the Australian public had been made familiar
with British art, it had been British art of the past. She was right in claiming:

So far the majority of work shown by English artists at exhibitions in
Australia has had little relation to the most important movement in
British art today. Conventional academic work, with a pretence of
representing the Classic tradition, gives a false and insincere effect,
and Australia cannot be blamed for refusing to be seriously concerned
with these travesties of art, and their lack of virility, emotion or
intellectual stimulus. The present collection of paintings and sculpture
is a survey of the work of the most significant artists of the last forty
years who have refused to continue paraphrasing their art on
traditional lines. It was felt that Australia cannot continue to know
only by hearsay what the newer movements in art stands for, and that
cultivated Australians should at least have first-hand evidence on
which to base their judgement in this important matter. 67

And further, in a brave denunciation of colonial conservatism:

...although the work is not pictorial or photographically realistic art,
for the general level of artistic appreciation in England today is
immensely higher than it was twenty years ago. Just as nobody
demands that a musician shall faithfully reproduce the sounds of
nature, so, no serious art lover in Europe today requires that a
painter shall place the considerations of naturalistic representation
before all others. A picture is a complete thing in itself, in which
form is eloquent. As such it must be considered as an aesthetic
harmony without reference to ideas outside itself. 68

The catalogue Foreword was straightforward in its aesthetic statement.
Indeed, the design of the catalogue itself declares immediately the governing
aesthetic that will be seen in the works exhibited: the typeface is simple, unadorned
and bold, the design minimalist. This exhibition is one unashamedly modern with all
the aesthetic precepts that that epitaph flags: the autonomy of the artwork, and the
rejection of all emphasis on the 'photographic' reproduction of nature. Primarily, the
rejection of everything that academic art had stood for.

67 Mrs Alleyne Zander, Foreword to the Catalogue, The Exhibition of British Contemporary Art,
Melbourne and Sydney, 1933.
68 Ibid.
The art critic for the *Sydney Morning Herald* (who always wrote anonymously), when reviewing the exhibition in April 1933, introduced his critique by describing the exhibition as ‘interesting’ and ‘stimulating’. He then announced that it was ‘the most important exhibition of contemporary English work that has come to Australia’. The writer, indicating that he had, at least, some sympathy for modernism, compared this exhibition to the earlier exhibition of English art brought to Australia in 1923 by Penleigh Boyd. The Alleyne Zander show was, he wrote, ‘more comprehensive’ and did not ‘concentrate so much on the declining stars of the academic painters’. Rather, it illustrated, he believed, those painters who might be described as ‘brave new planets [that had] swung into the ken of English art lovers with a feeling of adventure and courageous experiment’.

An experiment indeed. It became an experiment, which ‘diehards’ like Julian Ashton felt Sydney could have done without. Before the exhibition had opened, Ashton declared that ‘if one takes out perhaps half a dozen works of real technical accomplishment and artistic vision it is considerably below the standard of the average Society of Artists Exhibition’. Using, old, well-tried arguments, Ashton railed against these artists, equating their modernist techniques with ineptitude: ‘we have here adventures by painters who cannot take the time to learn how to draw’. Ashton asserted that modernism was chiefly a ‘foreign’ disease, and rejoiced in the fact that ‘the vagaries of the French, German and Italian modernists have no following in England’.

In fact, one of the participating artists was an Englishman, Charles Sims.
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69 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19.4.1933.
71 *Sydney Morning Herald*, 18.4.1933
73 Charles Sims R.A. was an artist not accustomed to controversy. When, in 1922, Sims had been granted ‘sittings for a portrait of George V’, the consequent portrait was shown in the London Royal
His work *Spiritual Protection* became the focus for much of the debate published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* involving the paper’s unnamed art critic, Julian Ashton, Thea Proctor, John Moore and the NAGNSW Trustees. For the purposes of this study, these letters provide a clear picture of the contentious aesthetic positions adopted by those in Sydney’s art world, not only the core of the debate concerning what artworks merited the title ‘art’ in Sydney between the wars, but also the mutually antagonistic understandings of the wider art world and its accelerated rate of change. The letters deserve consideration at some length here.

To begin, the *Sydney Morning Herald* art critic described *Spiritual Protection* as a ‘painting, which will attract much attention’. The work was described as consisting of ‘a huge pair of hands, long and sensitive’ which hold within them ‘the tiny figure of a child’. The picture is ‘the outward symbolisation of a subjective concept, like the extraordinary paintings of William Blake’ and ‘also El Greco’. It was, the critic wrote, ‘worthy of careful study, though it would probably bring to wreck any student misguided enough to imitate it’. And finally, in a comment certain to damn, ‘the art of Sims is outside all question of schools and technique - purely individual’.

Such an artist, painting outside of established ‘schools’, nor possessing acknowledged ‘technique’, was bound to incite opposition from conservatives opposed to modernism. This was especially so when it was packaged and delivered to them in an exhibition coming from the home of the ‘ideal’ - the London Royal Academy Exhibition of 1924 and illustrated on the front-page of that year’s *Royal Academy Illustrated*. Unfortunately for Sims this portrait did not meet with royal approval as it appeared the royal subject was depicted with ‘legs like a ballet dancer’. Sims duly received his fee but the King requested that the painting be destroyed. Rather than do this Sims took the work to New York and Canada, where it was exhibited ‘causing a very embarrassing position for Academy’.


Academy. Two days after the initial review was published, Ashton dashed off a letter to the Editor, which launched into the exhibition in general and Sims in particular:

It is in the work of poor Charles Sims' Spiritual Protection that your critic makes his worst break. Quite a good example of his work was purchased by the trustees of our National Gallery some years ago, An Island Festival which is marked by good drawing and colour, whilst it is full of vivacity and movement. He became keeper at the Royal Academy School, a position of responsibility, which seems gradually to have become too much for him, for his mind was affected and there was much mystery about his death. Spiritual Protection is amongst his last works.

Ashton appears to have been particularly insulted by the apparent 'turning' of a Royal Academy official. The implied association that Ashton makes between mental instability and modernism was one made by many other stalwarts of academic art, including Lionel and Norman Lindsay.

Another common vehicle for attack was mystification: 'how is this work to be interpreted?' 'How is to be understood when it refers to nothing I can recognise or know?' Especially common was apparent mystification in claims of the artist to expertise. Typical were questions such as: how can these people call themselves artists? How can this be art, when I, who know more about art than many, do not regard it as such? Ashton pursued his theme along well-trodden inquisitorial paths:

I should very much like to know what this picture means, and I am sure that the hundreds of men and women who have seen it would be glad to have it explained to them. Evidently the "subjective content" is understood by your critic. Might we hope for an explanation in lucid English as to what it means? Why are the hands so big and badly drawn, and where is the baby? I may be a "diehard" but I am always willing to learn.

Ashton a 'diehard'? Yes. But 'willing to learn'? Apparently not.
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75 This painting, An Island Festival was acquired in 1917 probably on the advice of John Longstaff, who in a 1916 letter to the Gallery Trustees wrote: 'The Island Festival...brought him [Sims] notoriety and secured him election to the Academy'. Also see Renee Free, Art Gallery of N.S.W Catalogue of British Paintings, (Art Gallery of N.S.W.), p. 177.
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The modernist sympathiser and painter, John D. Moore, had also written to
the paper, but this time the Trustees of the NAGNSW were the subjects of criticism.
The Trustees had earlier let it be known in the press that there was nothing in the
exhibition they would consider purchasing.\(^78\) In contrast, Moore described the
exhibition as being one of ‘high standard’, an ‘event of great importance’. ‘For the
Trustees of our national galleries to ignore this important exhibition is a sign they
should not occupy the positions they do’, he wrote. Further, he asserted that they did
not ‘possess the necessary artistic knowledge to administer their trust’. Finally, in
fierce condemnation:

...as a body they have failed, as leaders of artistic thought, to
help make our art galleries representative of the vital art of our
time. Instead, we find in our collections, with a few exceptions,
lifeless examples of the work of artists who, though physically
alive are mentally dead.

In support of Moore, Thea Proctor, the modernist artist (and also protégé of
Academician George Lambert), entered the debate, also in a letter to the Editor of
the Sydney Morning Herald. She wrote:

Sir: - I should like to add my appreciation of your article on the
exhibition of British art to that of Mr John Moore. May I also reply
to Mr Julian Ashton, who asks for an explanation of Mr Charles
Sim’s picture, Spiritual Protection? I am a teacher of drawing, and I
should hold up the hands in this picture as an example of good
drawing to any student. Added to beautiful drawing, there is
rhythm, balance, lovely colour, and imagination, the last a quality
so lacking in Australian art. That is the aesthetic meaning of the
picture, and I am surprised that Mr Ashton should still look for
literary meanings, which are as dead as the early academic work of
Sims, which he so much admires. A work of art is judged on its
merits alone. No one has tried to disparage the songs of Hugo Wolf
because he had periods of insanity, and Mr Ashton’s efforts to be
witty about what he calls the mystery surrounding Sims’ death are
regrettable. The fact that Manet and Degas were responsible for
movements which, if Mr Ashton had been willing to learn, he would
have at least accepted the fact that this exhibition is giving
enjoyment to many artists and art lovers.
It is a pity that one who has done so much in the past to advance art,
should now ally himself with the Trustees of our art galleries, who,

\(^78\) ‘Epstein and Augustus John’, Sydney Morning Herald, 19.4.1933.
as Mr John Moore says, have failed to make our galleries the vital source of visual stimulus they should be.70

The Trustees' method of approaching such an 'outside' exhibition was dealt with in typical fashion. First, they met 'to inspect an Exhibition of British Contemporary art with a view to possible purchase'. The Minutes declare in one short sentence: 'nothing was bought'.80 However, five days later they decided to 'go as a body' to inspect the Show.81 Again nothing was recommended for purchase.

Eventually, in a rare public statement, the Trustees were forced to respond to the public criticism of their refusal to purchase any of the works from the show. The Trustee President, Sir John Sulman replied, also using the forum of the Sydney Morning Herald:

Sir, - In your issue of the 21st inst., Mr John D. Moore criticises the Trustees of the National Art Galleries of Victoria and New South Wales for their failure to purchase pictures from the collection of Modern Art now exhibiting in Sydney. Without referring to the supposed merits or demerits of the exhibition, may I inform your correspondent, and your readers in general, that two of my colleagues are now on their way to Europe, where they will meet Mr Lionel Lindsay, a former trustee, who are jointly authorised to purchase, up to the limit of our available funds, such examples of art as they may consider suitable for our gallery. They will thus have the whole field of art from which to make a selection, and, in addition, such purchases will be free of Customs taxation, a matter of considerable importance, as, owing to the depression, our subvention from the Government for purchases has been necessarily reduced from £3,000 to £1700 per annum. Under these circumstances I think that even Mr Moore will admit we have acted for the best in this matter. Visiting collections are, however, welcome, as they afford the general public an opportunity of seeing what is being done abroad and acquiring specimens: but it does not necessarily follow that the National Galleries must purchase there. Like Victoria, it is possible we may obtain a few etchings (as they cost only a few guineas each) if our etching committee, which is making a detailed inspection of the exhibits, reports favourably thereon.82

70 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 13. 4.1933.
80 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 13. 4.1933.
81 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 18. 4.1933. The Trustees often when faced with contentious issues, would visit a particular exhibition en masse to present a 'block' opinion.
82 Letter to the Editor, Sydney Morning Herald, 24. 4.1933.
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The controversy continued in the press for some time. Within the Board the Trustees were silent, the only indication of discomfiture a short entry in the Minutes in May of the same year:

Concerning articles appearing in the *Sydney Morning Herald*. The Board decided to ignore them.\textsuperscript{13}

The reactions to these two visiting British exhibitions in Sydney and Wellington clearly reveal the ideology of those determining the elite ‘official’ aesthetic. The 1932 *Exhibition of British Contemporary Art* brought to New Zealand by Murray Fuller was housed in the quasi ‘official’ gallery. At a time of great financial strain the hosts struggled, but managed, to purchase a few of the paintings. Critical voices were few. Why? Because the Exhibition had come, in the main, from the ‘hallowed ground’ of the London Royal Academy. It had been gathered, with the help of the British artistic scion, Sir William Orpen, and gathered by a man able to claim the closest of artistic connections with British art, Mr Edwin Murray Fuller. Finally, the exhibition was opened by the New Zealand Governor General. There could no higher level, in New Zealand conservatives’ eyes, of social and artistic patronage and approval.

In contrast, Mrs Alleyne Zander's exhibition contested the academic ideology evident in all aspects of the NAGNSW art practice. Gallery Trustees were unwilling, initially, to purchase any of the works. Even when publicly chastised for their inaction, they were only reluctantly persuaded to buy only some of the least expensive and most academic etchings. Why? Unlike the show in Wellington, the works that reposed in Farmers' Exhibition Gallery illustrated a taste unacceptable to those understandings of art held by NAGNSW Trustees. For them, Mr Murray Fuller’s show in Wellington would have been a far more welcome, certainly less

\textsuperscript{13} Minute Book, NAGNSW, 26.5.1933.
contentious illustration of high art.

For the Trustees of both institutions between the wars, by far the two most important domestic exhibitions were the NAGNSW *150 Years of Australian Art* held in 1938 and the Exhibition gathered in Wellington in 1936 to celebrate the opening of the NZNAG. The Trustees regarded both exhibition opportunities to impress. For both institutions it was the first time they were made to determine which artists and images should be represent the Dominions’ artistic growth. In so doing, the decis selection process undertaken provide the clearest evidence of the Truste... not only to art, but also to the on-going strength of the relationship with Britain.

The exhibition held to celebrate the opening of New Zealand’s new National Art Gallery in Wellington consisted of three main components. The first was the collection of the touring British Empire Art Loan Collection (discussed earlier in this chapter), and the second was a collection of British works brought to New Zealand by the Murray Fullers. The latter consisted of some 200 especially selected works, which, although housed in the National Gallery, and collected for the purpose of this opening, were for sale. The third exhibition category was that of domestic New Zealand work, exhibited under the title *Loan Exhibition of New Zealand Retrospective Work*.

‘New Zealand now possesses a National Art Gallery worthy to receive the finest art’, declared art writer Roland Hipkins after the Gallery’s opening in 1936. This ‘splendid edifice’ he wrote is ‘dedicated as a National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum, and is appropriately situated on high ground almost in the heart
of the capital city".  

In what was the major review of the exhibition written shortly after its opening, *Art In New Zealand* critic Roland Hipkins made very clear which parts of the exhibition were of the greatest significance. For this writer it was the relationship between the British content and the New Zealand public which was to be most lauded and he made this very clear:

> We can hardly claim that we are aesthetically minded, but when art is leavened by something which awakens a consciousness of the greatness of our forebears or reflects the lure of the English countryside and the appearance of the British people of the past, there is no part of the British Empire where it is more acceptable than in New Zealand — acceptable, because it is British, not solely because it is art.  

Hipkins saw in this coupling of a new, New Zealand national edifice with such important British art, evidence of a New Zealand culture that was, at its core, British. Throughout the lengthy review, readers were reminded that this exhibition was primarily a 'survey of British art' and that the significance of the exhibition lay in that source. This part of the celebratory exhibition consisted of sixty-four works. 'Historically and artistically', Hipkins wrote, this exhibition was of 'great significance', not only for those art-minded New Zealanders but also for 'the whole people of New Zealand'.  

Whilst acknowledging that the exhibition was important for its 'aesthetic qualities', it was equally important, he believed, for its providing images that allowed the public to 'read, many for the first time, pages of British history'. Further, he accounted for the attraction of this factor, reminding readers that New Zealanders were 'so much a part of the Motherland' that the 'general public enthusiasm was more of a sign of patriotic fervour than the result of a consuming  
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interest in art. 87

'Through this introduction to the art of our own British people', Hipkins believed that the 'presence of these British paintings should do much to make us art conscious' and to 'help establish within ourselves a standard of values'. According to Hipkins, this would not be difficult for 'there is no doubt that we have our share of natural endowment in our quest for beauty, in common with all British people'. 88 The review focused almost entirely on the two British components of the exhibition. The first provided by the Empire Arts Loan Collection and the second, that of the Murray Fuller collection of British works. This was perhaps not surprising in light of the writer's belief that 'the presence' of such works 'ensures for it [the exhibition] a standard of artistic attainment which cannot but have an enlightening education value'. 89 Further, Hipkins claimed that exposure to such work should do much to 'make us art conscious' and:

should prove stimulating to artists and art lovers, but command the respect of the greater public, as yet almost unaware of the spiritual satisfaction, which is born by an intelligent study of the finest art. 90

The souvenir catalogue also reinforced the position of the British works, by selecting those art works for illustration over domestic work. Even when those British works were part of the New Zealand national collection, they were selected over New Zealanders' works also in the national collection. The catalogue opened, as was traditional with the London Royal Academy's Burlington House summer exhibitions, with a portrait of the monarch. In this case it was John St. Helier Lander's portrait of King George V. Another portrait shared the opening pages of the catalogue, that of New Zealander, Admiral Crawford, painted by Royal

87 Ibid.
88 Ibid., p.12.
90 Ibid., p.12.
Academician, Sir Henry Raeburn.

Other full-page reproductions were Royal Academicians Sir George Claussen’s *Haymakers* (which belonged to the New Zealand national collection), Sir John Millais P.R.A., *The Knight Errant, Mrs Hartley and Child* by Sir Joshua Reynolds R.A., *The Glebe Farm* by John Constable R.A., *Yacht Racing On The Solent* by J. W. M. Turner P.R.A., *The Rev. Sir Henry Bate Dudley, Bart*, by Thomas Gainsborough R.A., and a portrait of *Miss Frances Robertson* by Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A. Another portrait, a self-portrait by Laura Knight R.A. was included, as was an oil by Sir Frank Brangwyn R.A. of *Santa Maria Della Salute*. Two New Zealand works were also reproduced. One, a water colour by Alfred Walsh, *Havelock South*, the second an oil, *Waterfall In The Otira Gorge* by Petrus Van Der Velden.91

The NAGNSW major exhibition of the period between the wars was the *150 Years of Australian Art*. Held in 1938, it was initiated as part of the sesquicentenary of that state. By the Gallery’s participation in such a highly regarded, official commemoration, Gallery Trustees were on their mettle to provide, for their State, as well as for the rest of Australia, a powerful representation of cultural and material growth. This exhibition was regarded as evidence that Australia had, by sustained communion with the aesthetic lessons of Great Britain, indeed taken root as the British Empire in southern climes.

The exhibition title implies that the intention of Gallery Trustees was to present a survey show, illustrating 150 years of Australian colonial artistic practice. The reality was quite different. The works, so carefully selected by the Trustees, reveal it to have been a representation of a highly selective view of history and also

---

of aesthetics. Given the continual demonstration by the Trustees of exactly which type of art-making they considered appropriate to a ‘national’ gallery, it is not surprising that the Exhibition’s title is similarly misleading. An early indication of this is provided in the catalogue’s Foreword, where author, Lionel Lindsay, admitted that ‘there were very few works included that had been painted before the turn of the century’. The rationale for this he made very clear in the first paragraph:

This exhibition covers the 150 years of our history. Though it contains picked examples from the work of earlier men, its main concern is with the art of the native born, for we must traverse nearly half a century before an art appears which reveals the idiosyncrasy of Australia.\(^92\)

This ‘Australianness’ appears initially to be contrary to all the aesthetic precepts, which had hitherto governed Trustee exhibitions and acquisitions. However, the type of work (Australian or not) selected for this most prestigious ‘official’ exhibition was, in fact, not out of step with those understandings of art that had underpinned Empire and academic principles. Lionel Lindsay, in particular, had championed the cause of Australian art - especially landscape painting - for many years.\(^93\)

A committee was appointed from within the Board to organise the exhibition. Members included W. Lister Lister, the Hon. John Lane Mullins, B. J. Waterhouse, S. Ure Smith, J. S. Watkins, Sydney Long and the Director, Will Ashton. At an initial meeting ‘selected’ artists were to be contacted asking them to furnish a ‘list of their best works’. It was also resolved that a ‘small section dealing with the early history of Australian art should be included’ and ‘contact made with the Mitchell

\(^{92}\) Lionel Lindsay, ‘Catalogue Foreword’, One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Art, January 27 to April 25, 1938 (Sydney: Board of Trustees, NAGNSW, 1938).
\(^{93}\) See Chapter Six of this study, The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism.
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Library to gain access to their collection'. The original list of artists thought suitable for inclusion numbered 184 with, from today’s perspective, some surprising inclusions and more surprising omissions. Most of the artists included were those whose works were already in the Gallery’s collection. Artists of stature such as the Ashtons (James, Howard, Julian and Will, who was both Director and Secretary of the Gallery at that time), Elioth Gruner, Hans Heysen, Lister Lister, Sir John Longstaff, Frederick McCubbin, Hugh Ramsay, Tom Roberts, Sir Arthur Streeton, the Lindsays - Daryl, Lionel, Norman and Percy - George Lambert, E. Phillips Fox and Rupert Bunny, were ready inclusions.

‘Contemporary’ artists were, for these Trustees, problematic, especially if they were contemporary enough to be aware of modernist advances being made and illustrated elsewhere. In the eyes of Trustees, ‘contemporary’ was not the same thing as ‘modern’, and consequently those Sydney artists patronised by the Gallery in the thirties were not, in the main modernists in the ‘avant garde’ sense. The ‘contemporary’ Sydney artists favoured by the Gallery were artists such as John D. Moore, Norman Carter, W. B. McInnes, Bernard Hall and James Jackson. However, a very few true modernists were included - even if some were later additions to the list of the ‘most distinguished artists in Australia’. Following a later Committee meeting in April, when the initial list of ‘most distinguished artists’ had been distributed, the names of ‘Margaret Preston, Charles Wheeler, John D. Moore, Rayner Hoff and Thea Proctor were added’. Interestingly, a few other ‘contemporary’ artists had been included in the original list of those considered ‘most distinguished’, several of whom were comparatively modern in the avant-

94 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 2. 4. 1937.
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96 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 16. 4. 1937.
garde sense. They included Harold Abbott, Roi de Mestre [spelt as in this list], Adrian Feint, E. A. Harvey and A. J. Murch.

There were a significant number of women included in the exhibition, surprising since the acquisitions over the years did not mirror what seems to have been regarded here as their prominence. The sculptor Daphne Mayo was an initial omission, but later included. Given her prominence, (because she had recently completed major First World War memorials) her inclusion was perhaps to be expected. Given their profile in the Society of Artists, so too one might not have been surprised at the inclusion of Florence Rodway, Janet Cunbrae-Stewart, Bessie Davidson, Bernice Edwell, Alice and Helen Hambidge, Dora Meeson, Alice Muskett, Dora Ohlfsen, Ethel Stephens, Maud Sherwood, Bessie Norris-Tait, Violet Teague, Jessie Traill, Barbara Tribe and Amalie Colqhoun. However, poor Mary Allen was dismissed from inclusion because she was ‘looked upon as being doubtful’. ⁹⁷

Thea Proctor and Margaret Preston were only added to the list only ‘after further discussion’ at later committee meetings, although eventually they both were honoured by the reproduction of their work in the catalogue - *Rose and Banksia* by Preston and Proctor’s *Too Early*. ⁹⁸ These two women were the most prominent women artists in Sydney at the time. Why then their names were added only to subsequent lists of those artists to be included, is intriguing. In Proctor’s case, she eventually had thirteen works included in the exhibition, most of which were in the Gallery’s own collection! The reasons for the Trustees’ change of heart is not recorded in the Minutes of the Committee responsible for the organization, although
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a key may be found in the identity of those Trustees selecting works. Eight works by Preston were eventually shown. Given Trustee understandings of suitable subjects for women to paint, it is important to note that all were flower studies, all apparently suitable subjects as these were seen to be part of the women artists' domain.

Other late inclusions are also most significant. At the November meeting of the organising committee - only two months before the exhibition was to open - Grace Cossington Smith and Treania Smith were ‘invited to submit work’. Cossington Smith eventually had three works included in the exhibition, Firewheel, House with Trees and Wild Flowers in a Jug. Treania Smith had only one successful inclusion, an oil of St. John's, Canberra. Another woman, the wonderful Queensland painter of botanical specimens, Ellis Rowan, was included in the initial list of possible exhibitors, but when that list was revised in June she was amongst those who were ‘not to be included’. These women, who are now so highly regarded for their individual artistic innovation, were, as far as the Trustees were concerned, not considered appropriate choices for initial inclusion. The particular implications of these inclusions and exclusions is discussed later in the thesis, but what was clear was that it was the Trustees’ own, single aesthetic, informed by years of British ‘schooling’, which determined the artistic expression which would be permitted in such a prestigious, commemorative, show.

The Trustees’ opinion of what constituted appropriate representation also extended to which depictions of Australian history were to be exhibited. An early committee meeting expunged the names of Nicholas Chevalier and John Glover.
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They were removed from the list of ‘those most distinguished’. These two artists, now considered amongst the most important colonial painters, were ‘considered not to be sufficiently prominent to be included’. Of the earlier colonial artists, there were few. Considering the absence of John Glover, the inclusion of J. Skinner Prout and S. T. Gill was an apparent contradiction, although their inclusion is perhaps accounted for in the Foreword to the catalogue. In it Lionel Lindsay suggested that the early painters were painting to order rather than depicting an authentic artistic approach. He wrote:

the founders of these Crown Colonies were interested in the depiction of the settlement and its progress and the various views of Sydney and its environment were made to fulfil the exacting demands of topography.

Eventually, one of Glover’s works was included in the ‘early historical section’ of the exhibition, Milles Plains, Ben Lomond, Ben Loder and Ben Nevis in the Distance, painted in 1836. No explanation was provided in the Minutes for this apparent change of mind but once again, Lindsay’s Foreword to the catalogue offers a clue for the omission of so much earlier work. Lindsay noted that the exhibition contained ‘picked’ examples from the work of earlier artists; however, Lindsay added, its main concern was with the art of ‘the native born’. More revealing evidence clarifying the aesthetics underpinning the exhibition was to be found in words Lindsay chose in justifying the ‘picked examples’. He claimed that ‘we must traverse nearly a century before an art appears which reveals the idiosyncrasy of Australia’.

The desired ‘idiosyncrasy’ in the representation of Australia, however, did not extend to the work of the English born nineteenth-century artist Conrad Martens.

---
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His romantic depictions of an Australian landscape, replete with sublime form, colour and compositions, did not preclude his inclusion. Further proof of his high esteem was the reproduction of his oil *Middle Harbour* in the catalogue, one of the few such reproductions. His inclusion may be accounted for by a previous endeavour of Lindsay’s; that of a monograph on Martens which he wrote in 1920 for publisher George Robertson. ¹⁰⁴ ‘Gallery Number 6’ in the Exhibition housed the collection of ‘earlier works’ and other notable inclusions were works such as those of S. T. Gill’s *Government Domain, Sydney of 1856, King William Street Adelaide looking North* and *A General View of the Burra Burra Mine of 1847*. J. S. Prout was represented by *Flinders, Van Diemen’s Land*, of 1845, *Mt Wellington from Sandy Bay of 1845, The Creek, Hobart and The Tank Stream, Pitt Street, Sydney*. Duttereau’s *Self Portrait* was included and also Buvelot’s *On the Banks of the Yarra*. In this Gallery section Martens had five oils in addition to the reproduced *Middle Harbour*. The others were *Sydney Cove, Illawarra Norton’s Basin, Nepean River* and the *Shoalhaven River*.

Twenty-eight of the works exhibited were the Trustees’ own. Where these were the work of the artist members of the Board, their inclusion was perhaps to be expected; Lister Lister, for instance, exhibited six works, Sid Long, four and Sydney Ure Smith, seven. Charles Lloyd Jones, an enthusiastic amateur, exhibited four. Given the stated cultural importance of the exhibition and the sometimes ruthless culling, it was inevitable that well-known artists, living and dead, would be excluded. However, that so many works were provided from the Trustees’ own collections – and indeed, from their own palettes - was an eloquent demonstration of

the confidence with which they played out their roles as cultural gate-keepers, dubbing some products worthy of public exhibition and denigrating others as quite unworthy. Of course, this assurance also permeated all operations of the Gallery; acquisitions, other exhibitions, the election of Trust members and so on.\footnote{105}

There was a significant presence of the Lindsay family, in particular works by brothers Norman and Lionel. Undoubtedly, individually as well as a family, they were a significant force in the cultural shaping of Sydney’s art scene in the early part of the twentieth century. Norman Lindsay’s position as the ‘artist-genius role model’ for Australian artists \footnote{106} (and Australia as a young country was lacking in such models) would have made his inclusion as a major presence mandatory and so his fifteen entries were no surprise.\footnote{107} His brother, Lionel, the author of the catalogue essay and a prominent member of the Board, as well as a major ‘black and white’ artist and critic, exhibited nineteen - four more than the more famous Norman. Three works were contributed by the lesser-known Lindsay artist, Daryl.

That landscape was the most prominent genre in the exhibition correlated with Lionel Lindsay’s emerging ideology, and one which was clearly articulated in the catalogue Foreword.\footnote{108} Even though Lionel Lindsay had resigned (without acrimony) from the organising committee of the exhibition quite early in their deliberations, (pleading lack of time to undertake the work), his stamp on the

\footnote{105}{Other Trustees exhibiting were J. S. Watkins’ Portrait of C. Jeffreys Esq. and B. J. Waterhouse’s Canterbury, N.E. Transient. The Director and Secretary to the Board, Will Ashton, exhibited one work, Malaga, Spain.}


\footnote{107}{Norman Lindsay’s work could, however, be problematic. When several of his works were to be included in the contentious ‘Exhibition of Australian Art’ in London 1923 there were several prominent artists who publicly expressed their concern. W. B. McInnes, for instance, wrote in a letter to the Melbourne Herald on the 20 June, 1923 that ‘I think it is a big risk the selectors are taking sending away Norman Lindsay’s works as representative of Australian art’.}

\footnote{108}{The author, Lionel Lindsay, was an early champion of Streeton and one of the first powerful voices to articulate the link between the Heidelberg School and emergent Australian nationalism.}
Exhibition was very clear. Lindsay’s thoughts on the aesthetics of landscape - as it was appropriate to this country - occupied most of the catalogue content. He wrote in the Foreword that “The Gum tree should be the symbol of this Commonwealth and will endure when the kangaroo has become extinct”. He further declared that the Gum was the ‘first characteristic of our land’, and, that ‘until its form and manifold aspects had been mastered, Australian landscape was empty of any real presence’.

Lindsay attributed this ‘mastery’ of the Gum to Streeton, Roberts, Withers, Davies and Gruner, via the teaching of Buvelot. The special merits of Heysen, Ashton and Lambert were then added and so, as Lindsay put it, ‘thus, true to the mood of the hour and light, was the Australian scene gradually won for Art’. The works especially singled out for commendation were not surprising given Lindsay’s homily. They included Streeton’s *Golden Summer, Still Glides the Stream and Shall Forever Glide, Fires On* and his Hawkesbury series, Roberts’s *Breakaway, the Shearing Shed and Bailed Up*, Gruner’s *Frosty Sunrise* and Lambert’s *Squatter’s Daughter*. To make the point clear, this ideology must have been unmistakable to those viewing the Exhibition. Streeton had nine works in the show, Roberts eleven, Lister-Lister eight, Gruner twelve, Lambert thirteen, Heysen ten, and Condor, four. McCubbin, although apparently included amongst those who could adequately depict the ‘national essence’ of landscape, was in fact included for a different reason. Lindsay accounted for his inclusion by describing McCubbin as revealing the ‘pathos and struggles of the bush worker’. Lambert, with his majestic *Self Portrait with Gladiolus*, was credited with being a ‘Renaissance personality’, one, who ‘did
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everything with distinction through his mastery of form'.

At first sight the Exhibition catalogue appears to reflect an art focus that was very much of a direct Australian interpretation and interest. However, a close reading of the Trustees' arguments concerning which artists would or would not be included, the eventual list of those considered 'most distinguished', the type of works from those artists accepted for inclusion, and the selection of which works would be elevated by full-page colour reproduction in the catalogue, all reveal that the status of the teachings of the Academy was undiminished. It is in the Lambert portrait that the continuing presence and stature of academic teaching can be seen to be still pre-eminent. I have discussed Lambert's position in Sydney's art world of the twenties earlier in this study, but for this exhibition, this work's significance, eight years after Lambert's death, marks an academic presence with an exclamation mark! Both Lambert - and his portrait - were the personification of Academy values. For Lindsay, the emergence of a distinctly national character in art was founded on aesthetic principles, artistic genius and stature that were embedded within the LRA.

At the close of the One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Art Gallery Director, Will Ashton, wrote that he believed that the exhibition 'plainly demonstrated that the Australian artist at his best will compare favourably with artists in other parts of the world'.

The taste evident in that show was to be made evident in other forums for displaying the nature and quality of Australian art. When the NAGNSW was approached at this time to lend works internationally, which was a rare occurrence, the works selected were those that the Trustees considered would portray to the world, not only an example of 'taste' as established by British artistic standards, but
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also those works that would, under that umbrella, illustrate the Australia that had been evident in the Heidelberg School. For example, when, in 1938 the *Golden Gate Exposition* was held in San Francisco, the NAGNSW was approached to contribute to this ‘Pageant of the Pacific’.¹¹⁴ Predictably, the seven works selected to be exhibited in San Francisco included works by Streeton, Heysen, Gruner, Syd. Long, Will Ashton, John D. Moore and James Jackson.¹¹⁵

Considering the relatively close proximity of the two countries and the easy exchange of residents – and artists - it was surprising that only rarely did exchanges of New Zealand and Australian art exhibitions take place. When they did, it was more often the case that New Zealand was the welcoming recipient of Australian work rather than vice versa. For example, a large exhibition of some 147 Australian works from the NAGNSW travelled to New Zealand to be seen at the opening of the NZNAG in 1936. The 1937 New Zealand National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum Annual Report noted its presence in the exhibition, describing the contribution as works by ‘Australian, British and foreign artists generously lent by the Trustees of the NAGNSW’.¹¹⁶ Obviously, the British works included in the Sydney collection were as much appreciated as the Australian. However, the Australian component of the exhibition was regarded by New Zealand critics as a ‘notable collection’.¹¹⁷ Again, these selected representatives of Australian art were works that displayed an aesthetic that would have caused no shock waves to the art audiences of the NAGNZ. For example, the traditionalist Sydney portraitist, W. B.

---

¹¹⁴ 'Golden Gate Exposition: Pageant of the Pacific', *Art Forms of the Pacific* (San Francisco: Covar, 1943).
¹¹⁷ 'Art Notes', *Art In New Zealand*, (September, 1936) p. 54.
McInnes was described as ‘the finest portrait painter in Australia’, the even more conservative Melbourne painter, Max Meldrum, was described as being the equal of McInnes. Other Australian artists singled out in the Art In New Zealand review for particular merit were Hans Heysen, Elioth Gruner, James Jackson and Albert Collins.\footnote{Ibid. Meldrum was conservative in the sense that he was primarily a realistic artist whose emphasis was on tonal intensity rather than draftsmanship.} There were no surprises in any of the works selected for inclusion in this show. Many of them were also selected later for inclusion in the major show of the thirties in the NAGNSW, 150 Years of Australian Art. Included were works such as George Lambert’s White Glove, W. B. McInnes’ Silk and Lace, Arthur Streeton’s Cremorne Pastoral, A. H. Fullwood’s Banks of The River Seine, End of the Day by H. S. Power and Eileen by Tom Roberts.

Some effort had also been made by the organisers to include examples of those New Zealand artists who were resident in Australia. The ex-New Zealand contingent in this show included the only artists likely to illustrate a modernist aesthetic. One notable inclusion was Robert Wakelin [sic], who was described in the Art In New Zealand review as an artist ‘who had been a member of the NZAFA’ and ‘had studied art in Wellington’. Others included Maud Sherwood, Septimus Power and Violet Bowring. New Zealand readers were reminded that the latter was the widow of the ‘late Mr Walter Bowring (whose self-portrait in the respective collection now on view is one of the best examples of portrait painting in the Art Gallery)’ and further, that this ‘exceptional work had also been recognised by its being awarded second in the Archibald contest in Sydney in the recent past’.\footnote{Ibid. p. 56} The message was clear. The standard and principles as they applied to art were the same for the two Dominions, whether they be in Sydney or Wellington.

The Centenary of New Zealand was celebrated in 1938 with two major art
exhibitions. The first, organised by the NAGNZ Trustees, was planned to include an ‘exhibition of British and Continental art’ which they hoped ‘would be the largest yet assembled in the country’. The other exhibition was organised by the Department of Internal Affairs and consisted entirely of New Zealand art. Highly ambitious in its scope it wished to exhibit:

art, old and modern, a representative collection, paintings, drawings, etchings, lithographs, cartoons, book illustrations, and sculpture, including the work of the earliest surveyors and artists who visited this country a century ago.\textsuperscript{121}

The enormous task of gathering works which would illustrate the ‘British and Continental art’ component of the exhibition was given to Mrs Murray Fuller. She was appointed as the NAGNZ Trustees’ representative in Europe responsible for organising all aspects of the Exhibition - which was also to be a ‘sale’ exhibition. Responsible for choosing, single handedly, some 562 works which would eventually travel to New Zealand, she must have been only too aware of the need to provide simultaneously works which were worthy of such an occasion, but also works which would be personally financially remunerative. The result was that all but 47 selections were the work of British artists, nearly all Royal Academicians. There were, however, critics of the plan to import works for what essentially was a New Zealand national celebration and critics who pointed out that this exhibition would, once again, be predominantly made up of works that were seeking homes. No comment at the time can be found, however, of the fact that a lone individual was selecting the works, or of the fact that the largest component of the exhibition was chosen to benefit financially one Gallery officer.

However, the later National Centennial Exhibition of New Zealand Art was

\textsuperscript{120} Gordon Brown, \textit{New Zealand Painting 1920-1940 Adaptation and Nationalism} (Wellington: Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council Exhibition, 1975), p. 70.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
organised by the Department of Internal Affairs, and had a far greater domestic presence and agenda. It was to be primarily a loan exhibition drawn from various regional galleries and individual collections (this exhibition was not seen in Wellington until 1942). However, the September 1940 edition of *Art in New Zealand* noted, when discussing the plans for this exhibition, that 'Mrs Murray Fuller is now in charge'.\(^{122}\) There were 408 works eventually exhibited. The first works listed in the catalogue were those of the London Royal Academy artists. The prices asked for these twelve Royal Academicians were many times more than for any other artist. For example, a W. G. De Glehn oil portrait, *Jane*, was priced at £900, an A. J. Munnings, *The Whip*, at £525 and an Arnesby Brown, *The Fellside*, at £525.

The International Exhibition catalogue provides a suitable conclusion for this Chapter. In it the twin ingredients in a colonial culture are, once again, positioned together: a national vision that could exist only within a particular British heritage - that of the London Royal Academy. In the Foreword to the catalogue the then New Zealand Labour Party Prime Minister, Michael J. Savage, wrote:

> Art is perhaps, more nearly than any other factor, the true expression of that evolving outlook on life which constitutes a people’s vision.... A study of progress in this field of culture is, probably, a surer indication of the growth of a distinctly national genius than any other evidence.

Most importantly, he added the loyal observation:

> New Zealand in the early days of its art started with a vigorous culture and with a sound British tradition.

This chapter has sought, by an examination of the exhibition practices of both National Galleries, to reveal the position of British models in the Antipodes until the latter thirties. The primary position of British models was impressed again, and

again, on a public only too ready to accept them, by individuals who regarded these models as the pinnacle of artistic expression. The model provided by Great Britain was one made more powerful and reinforced consistently in several ways: by acquisitions, by exhibitions, and by the implicit belief in the association of connoisseurship, class and taste.

The method by which this British academic model was imprinted upon its audience was through a self-reinforcing cycle of need and desire. The need of a colonial society to remain attached to its Motherland, was consistently reinforced by the desire to be held within the orbit of English culture. This apparently simple equation determined the exhibition practice administered by a system that was in its turn, circular in its reach, illustration and reinforcement.

The ‘distinct family resemblance’ so proudly proclaimed by Dominion subjects accounted for the ‘deep seated loyalty’ accorded visiting British academic art in the period between the wars. These two elements also accounted for the quarantining of that aesthetic by the officials of those National art galleries most keen to perpetuate both the ‘family resemblance’ and ‘loyalty’ to Great Britain. The quarantining of this particular ideology was to have enormous ramifications for the place of art practices that were outside the artistic parameters allowed by Academic values and principles.
CHAPTER SIX

THE GATEKEEPERS OF CULTURE AND THE TILT TOWARD MODERNISM

...we, the destined race, rulers of conquered isles, sprouting like bulbs in warm darkness, putting out white shoots under the wet sack of Empire.\(^1\)

As previous chapters have shown, the Boards of the two national Galleries, supported by their administrative structures, positioned Imperial relations and Britishness as perhaps the most dominant consideration in their art practice. Membership of this British, Imperial, pan-Anglo-Saxon ‘family’ came with clear definitions of familial characteristics, supported then by equally clear understandings of those characteristics which were outside acceptable boundaries. As with all attempts to define a nation of persons, that definition is determined as much by who they are not, as by who they are. The task, therefore, for the national institutions was to guard the gates against those who were ‘other’. Accordingly, this chapter examines the ways in which the Boards of the National Galleries of New South Wales and New Zealand guarded the gates of their institutions against unwanted artistic intruders. It explores also the late and rather hesitant tilt towards modernism on the part of the Boards on the eve of the Second World War.

The desire to be, and to be seen to be, an integral part of British culture, meant that new developments in aesthetics were received in terms of British evaluations. For these Galleries, once their British counterparts had determined the parameters of art practice, the bastions that were their Boards raised the barricades,
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making any incursions by newcomers practically impossible. For these Boards, there were apparently two particular antagonists: women artists and, more particularly, modernism. Once again taking their cue from the London Academy, they viewed women as simply ‘lesser’ artists, not capable of participating in the higher modes of art. Women were, however, at their most dangerous when they were seduced by the modernist teachings of the ‘new woman’. For both women artists and modernists, the basis of much of their art practice was in direct opposition to those tenets laid down by Gallery officials and illustrated both in their acquisition policies and exhibitions. The Boards themselves imposed a quarantine, ensuring by the exclusive processes of making appointments to the Boards that individuals, who were either modernists or women, were denied entrance. Even if Board members, in other forums, displayed sympathy to women artists or modernists, when they were seated at the Board table, such transgressions were never evident.

These gates of culture were guarded with many weapons. One weapon was that of the public lecture programs which were organised by both Galleries. Such lectures provided the perfect opportunity for each Gallery to publicise its collection and to advance the civilizing aspect of art connoisseurship, in addition to reinforcing the visual lessons presented on the Gallery walls. The lectures provided very clear instruction to the audiences as to what the National Gallery considered ‘proper’ art. Once again, the practices supported the ideology. The Trustees selected the lecturers, and their topics were decided in consultation with the Board.

The 1908 Memorandum of Association of the NZAFA made the importance of the connection between the Academy’s art functions and education very clear. The first two objects for which the Academy was established were:
(1) To promote the study, practice and cultivation of the fine arts in New Zealand, and to encourage the production of works of art by periodical exhibitions at Wellington.

(2) To provide means of instructions to students in the several branches of the fine arts.

Very early in the history of the NZAFA art history lectures had become part of Academy life. The Annual Report for 1919 noted that 'evening lectures were well attended'. Presented by various individuals, topics such as The Relation Of Decorative Art To Utility in Maori Art, The Relation Of Painting To Poetry, New Zealand Artists Abroad, and the Illustrated Life Of The Renaissance were examples of the lectures offered that year. In the cultural life of Wellington, its citizens were accustomed to links between high art and high culture. These links were made evident in numerous ways and on numerous occasions, but none more potent than when the chief officers of the city were involved. One such occasion was at the opening of the Academy's 1919 October exhibition, when the Chief Justice of New Zealand, Sir Robert Stout, 'delivered an eloquent address on Art and Ideals', based on 'Tennyson's Canto 106 In Memorium'.

Mentioned earlier in this study, only rarely were the objectives of the NAGNSW articulated. Gallery Director, Will Ashton took the opportunity in a 1939 Art In Australia article to reinforce education as the premier role of the Gallery. As far as the governance of the Gallery was concerned, Ashton listed the first priority as 'intellectual approachment', and the second as 'educating the public'. It was understood that the first could, however, only be achieved by the second. Ashton explained that:

The Trustees of the National Art Gallery have a three-fold aim. First, they wish to promote intellectual approachment. Secondly,
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they want to educate the public taste. Thirdly, they aim at promoting the progress of historical and artistic research.  

What does this listing reveal? Apart from the obvious emphasis on education, it can also be read as a gauge of the values implicit in the NAGNSW collection. Ashton’s analysis of Gallery objectives resounds very much of ‘duty’. The Trustees felt a responsibility to present to the public art for which intellectual analysis was the guiding principle, such as that of the Royal Academy. All acknowledged the primacy of a style of art which most valued historical models and, therefore, made constant references to the art and cultures of the past. Quite clearly, the Trustees saw their responsibility primarily as one of education, to educate the public in the respect for these same artistic models and thus promote a very limited understanding and appreciation of art. It is both implicit and explicit in all three aims. The primary function of education was as important at the beginning of the period under study here as it was at the end of the 1930s. In 1939, the NAGNSW Annual Report announced that ‘prints and reproductions have been released’ from the ‘national Collection’ to a number of ‘Art Societies’ and ‘secondary schools’ for the first time in order to encourage ‘illustration in art classes’. This move, the Trustees believed, would satisfy ‘one of the Gallery’s main aims’ which was to provide ‘educational development’ and ‘to bring art to the people and develop the cultural tastes of the community’.  

But what type of art? Art that was founded primarily on ‘intellectual approachment’, ‘progress’, ‘historical and artistic research’. Not surprisingly then these lectures, organised by the NAGNSW in the period between the Wars supported all these tenets.
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As noted previously in this study, in 1931 Mr J. S. MacDonald, the Director of the National Art Gallery delivered a series of six lectures and a report on the lectures appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* in June. The report emphasised the public success of the program, informing its readers that the first lecture was presented to an audience of some two hundred people. MacDonald, the *Herald*'s reporter told his readers, was to speak on 'subject pictures', a genre much endorsed by the London Royal Academy. Choosing works from the Gallery's collection, Macdonald lectured on Ford Madox Brown's *Chaucer*, Pennasinico's *The End of A Dream*, Marcus Stones' *Stealing The Keys*, De Neuville's *Rorke's Drift*, and Brangwyns's *The Scoffers*. None of the works chosen would have been out of place in a nineteenth century milieu, rather than the nineteen thirties in which this selection took place. Given the conservative nature of both speaker and host institution, this was not surprising. However, scholars of Australian modernist art today would undoubtedly find it so, with the pivotal places in contemporary art of that period occupied today by artists such as Thea Proctor, Grace Cossington Smith and Margaret Preston.

New Zealand's *The Evening Post* newspaper announced in July 1934, that a series of lectures on art would take place over six weeks. The advertised topics were *What is Art? Three Masters of the Woodcut, Art In the Middle Ages, Some Italian Renaissance Painters, Art and Everyday Life, and The Art Of William Blake*. Like the earlier NAGNSW series, these New Zealand lectures reflected an understanding of art that bore little relevance to the twentieth century, much less to modernism. Listeners would have gone away with a reinforcement of academic ideals.

In 1936, another facet of art education was undertaken at the NAGNSW with
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another series of lectures, but this time they were organised in combination with Sydney University. The Annual Report for that year described the project as having been devised ‘with a view to encouraging an appreciation of art in the community’. A sub-committee was appointed to ‘confer with Dr. Wallace, of the Sydney University, and the Trustees, in co-operation with the University of Sydney, and arrange for a series of lectures to be given at the University’. Throughout 1937 several more lectures were held and ‘were well attended’. Max Meldrum, the deeply conservative Melbourne tonal painter played his part in the reinforcement of anti-modernist aesthetics in the topics selected for his two contributions, *The Physical Basis of Depictive Art* and *The Evolution of Depictive Art*.

Other series of lectures held at the NAGNSW in 1937 were designed to accompany particular exhibitions. These were a valuable opportunity for Trustees to reinforce the artistic models evident in the works. During the *Exhibition of British Masters* of that year, the Director, Will Ashton and Trustee Charles Lloyd Jones, as well as artist Norman Carter, gave ‘short addresses’. John Young also delivered a lecture on *Two Centuries Of British Art*. Young was an interesting choice; an avowed modernist supporter, and later unsuccessful applicant for Board membership, his sympathies made him a more unreliable choice than most who filled this role at the Gallery. Unfortunately copies of his lectures do not remain, but the content of his paper, an analysis of two hundred years of British painting may, given his modernist leanings, have proven a shock to his hosts and audience. The inclusion of such an avowed modernist in this program, even if the topic was covered was that of British art, provides an important clue in the Trustees’

---

9 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N. S. W. Legislative Assembly for the Year 1936, 20.12.1937, p. 3.
10 Ibid.
11 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N. S. W. Legislative Assembly for the Year 1937, 28.10.1938, p. 5.
problematic reception and understanding of modernism.

Of the several other lectures that were organised and delivered that year none would have delivered any aesthetic surprises. Amongst those 'who lectured to appreciative audiences, were Sir Arthur Streeton, Mr Julian Ashton C.B.E., Mr Lamorna Birch, R.A. and Miss Eleanore Lange'.\textsuperscript{12} The last of these deserves some comment. Lange 'gave a series of six lectures at the University of Sydney, and four in the Gallery, in connection with the Carnegie's Corporation's-Scheme for Educational Services' and offered no surprises in the choice of topics covered. Her focus on the Renaissance would have reminded the audiences that, like the art produced under the auspices of the Royal Academy, true art was the result of strict tutelage, and the recognition of Greek models. Lange's four lectures delivered at the NAGNSW 'dealt with The Renaissance In Italy under the following headings: (1) Historical background of the Period, (2) Reality and Design in the Renaissance Picture, (3) Colour In The Renaissance Picture and (4) Some Masterpieces Represented in the Print Room, for instance, the Mona Lisa'.\textsuperscript{13} However, as a NAGNSW lecturer Lange was, in fact, an interesting choice to be entrusted with such traditional fare. She was, compared to most Sydneysiders, an authority on art. Most surprisingly, she was also an advocate of modernism. Recently emigrated from Germany, she brought with her an artistic philosophy closely allied to that of theosophy, a religion associated with many European modernists. Her theories, a peculiar mix of 'internationalism, art history, race, social and biological necessity, pseudo-science, elitism and theology' would have set her apart from most Sydney

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
Fig. 20. Augustus John. *Canadian Soldier.*

Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This work was painted in 1918, and acquired for the NAGNSW by William Orpen and Arnesby Brown in 1930. Augustus John was one of the few contentious Academicians, contentious, both in his use of technique but also in his dealings with the Academy.
audiences, much less those of the NAGNSW. The appointment as a lecturer was not a one-off. With the added financial impetus provided by the Carnegie Grant, lectures, as a serious part of the Gallery's mission for education, were instigated on a regular basis. In 1938 Lange once more contributed to the program. How is this to be explained? It appears that even a foreign-born modernist could be appointed as a lecturer as long as the subject matter was carefully limited. In Lange's case she was given an historical focus. Her four lectures in 1938 were, *The Brothers Van Eyck, Duerer* [sic], *Holbein* and lastly, *Rembrandt*. These topics would not have given her any opportunity to promote or publicise modernist ideologies. The Gallery Trustees obviously recognised her authority in the area of art education, but were not prepared to allow her expertise on modernism to be used. Like Young, her inclusion appears surprising; a modernist lecturing on conservative, historical art. Another significant modernist Sydney identity, artist Margaret Preston, also presented five lectures in 1938. Delivered in June and July of that year, her topics were also, given her own art practice, unexpected. However, not surprising when the interests of the venue are considered. The first four were, *The Importance of Understanding Art with some Early Murals to those of 1938, How to Understand Paintings with Illustrations taken from 1366 to 1938, Discussing Schools of Art, Especially the Dutch and Spanish of 1580 and Explaining Simply the Impressionistic and English Art of 1748*. Her final talk was the only lecture whose title indicates the content addressed the art of the twentieth century, *The Moderns to This Year, 1938*. Such a range of titles provides insight into the apparent difficulty experienced by Trustees in offering guidance into modernist precepts – or, indeed, the unqualified acceptance of modernism.

15 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Legislative Assembly for the Year 1939, 13.3.1940, p. 11.
The inclusion of information on lectures organised by the Gallery became a regular item in the NAGNSW’s Annual Report to the New South Wales Legislative Assembly. The Report for 1938, for example, includes the regular item of the number and titles of public lectures conducted by the Gallery and offered to their audiences.\textsuperscript{16} In 1939, no fewer than four separate series of lectures were organised ‘in conjunction with the Carnegie Corporation Educational Scheme’.\textsuperscript{17} Again, the lecture topics, for the most part, reveal the deeply conservative aesthetic climate in which the Trustees operated, apparently unaware of any post-nineteenth century art. During June and July of that year Eleanore Lange again was a lecturer of choice. This time she addressed Gallery audiences with a series of eight lectures. The first four subjects were ‘(1) Landscapes From Brueghel to Corot, (2) Interiors from Roger van der Weyden to Vermeer, (3) The Great Portraits, and (4) Neo-Classicism.\textsuperscript{18} These four lectures were typical in their historical focus.

The subjects of the last four lectures in Lange’s series, however, were a major shift in time and aesthetics, and indicate the beginnings of the Gallery Trustees’ attempts finally to come to grips with modernism. For these, Lange spoke on Cezanne, Signac, Van Gogh and Matisse. Unfortunately records do not remain of these lectures, as it would be fascinating to read how Lange’s knowledge and understanding of Post-Impressionism and Fauvism related to, and perhaps informed, the Trustees’ very limited understandings of modernist art practice. The Annual Report for that year, 1939, provides a clue. For the first time modernist European artists were included, and indeed, ‘celebrated’. Under a report on acquisitions made during the year by Trustee J. R. McGregor, entitled French Art, Gauguin was described now as a ‘name’, that was ‘so well known, that no art collection is

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
complete without an original by this celebrated artist'.\textsuperscript{19} Trustees had, by 1939, found the doors of their institution ajar to some, very limited, modernist styles and had initiated purchases that reflected their new acceptance of a brand of modernism, however tame.

Despite this late conversion to modernism it was not embraced to the exclusion of the Gallery's more traditional aesthetic or with anything like complete commitment. In November of 1939 another lecture series at the Gallery was delivered by Frank Medworth, R.B.A. Medworth was later to become Head of Art at East Sydney Technical College, which was well known for its openness to modernism. However, when lecturing at the NAGNSW Medworth's topics were as far from modernism as was possible. His four contributions were *Christian Art, Genre Painting, Portraiture in Art* and the *Rise of Landscape Art*.\textsuperscript{20}

It is not the intention of this study to dwell on all aspects of the arrival and reception of modernism in Australia and New Zealand, but to explore the understanding, and reception of modernism by the officials of these institutions and also to mark its consequent presence within the collections of the two National Art Galleries of New Zealand and Australia. As indicated by the titles of various lectures organized by the NAGNSW in this period the reception of modernism required both insights and a willingness to relax dearly held tenets about Britishness and aesthetics that were bound to occupy contested ground.

In spite of the eventual if hesitant reception of modernism by these two elite art institutions, the slow percolation of the new art merely provided another body of evidence testifying to the overwhelming presence of art works demonstrating loyalty to Britishness and the Royal Academy model. Donald Horne recalls that, in his youth

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 9.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 11.
Fig. 21. Phillip Connard, *Sir Hubert Wilkins.*
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This painting was acquired for the NAGNSW in 1928, by Sir William Orpen.
Fig. 22. Glyn Philpot, *The Draughtsman*.
Courtesy Art Gallery of New South Wales. This 1923 work was acquired from the artist in 1930, on behalf of the NAGNSW by William Orpen and Arnesby Brown, who were acting as London advisors.
during the inter-war period, 'Kookaburras, sprigs of wattle, emus, gum trees, merino rams and other expressions of national character were anaemic besides Imperial loyalty to Empire and Crown'. His explanation is cogent: 'there was a sound reason why operative national chauvinism in Australia derived from British imperialism, not Australian nationalism. If chauvinism demands feelings of dominance, as well as superiority, where else could Australia look?' 21 At least until the late nineteen thirties the Trustees of both institutions were united with the Royal Academy in their vehement opposition to modernist ideologies, believing it to be, at its core, 'foreign' and therefore anti-British. Not only was it anti-British, but by not being British it also diminished understandings of Dominion nationalism that required a context of Britishness.

One of the pitfalls along the road to acceptance of modernism was the nomenclature used to describe and announce its presence. For these institutions, the terminology used to describe and define modernism (terminology emanating from the Galleries as well as travelling to them) was often both misleading and confusing. Initially, for the first thirty-nine years of this century, the term 'modernism', for the governing arts management in both New Zealand and Australia, meant contemporary work being undertaken by those artists most admired by Gallery officials. The word was used interchangeably with the word 'contemporary' representing, for these Trustees, an 'increased vigour of treatment, in a certain freshness and freedom of style, and in an effort towards sincere interpretation'. 22 Artists that 'fitted the bill' were, in the main still London Royal Academicians, men such as Sir William Orpen, Arnesby Brown, Augustus John (see Fig. 20), Phillip Connard (see Fig.21), Glyn Philpot (see Fig. 22) and Frank Brangwyn. In fact it often meant the opposite of

modernism - painters were admired because they rejected 'the bizarre and crude barbarities which in diverse time and place have been foisted on a long suffering world as true art'. 23 Often, even when there was access to information about modernism, it was still frequently rejected in favour of British 'reasonableness in the visual arts'. 24

What then, in these bastions of conservatism, provided the vehicle by which modernism could become accepted? Throughout the history of Gallery practice no aspect of art practice was regarded with such vehement opposition and withering disdain as modernism. For the first four decades of the century both Gallery Board and Council Minutes are littered with disparaging remarks as to the contaminating capacity of all artists illustrating the modernist techniques of Post-Impressionism. Any innovation was denigrated as providing 'pitfalls for the unwary and instruments for evil in the hands of charlatans'. 25 British art, in contrast, was described consistently as 'characterised by its sanity, and maintaining a 'stern front against rash innovations'. 26 British art was believed to have maintained a 'higher standard than that of any country'. Its citizens were by their own estimation, 'respectable and staunch citizens of the Empire with the highest ideals'. 27 The typical New Zealander, was 'less likely to be swept away by passing crazes', and having breathed 'his own pure air he reverences the fine traditions of the old Mother Country'. 28 Most art writers and curators were conscious of the responsibility of maintaining the closest connections with Home, that they be a 'worthy scion of a worthy race', not willing to

23 Ibid.
25 Ibid., p. 31.
26 Ibid.
28 Art In New Zealand, March, 1929, pp. 175-8.
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be treacherous in their adoption of a new aesthetic at the cost of relinquishing the old. Writing of a posthumous 1927 exhibition of works by Rhona Haszard, painted after a lengthy sojourn in Europe and Egypt, one critic responded to her work by claiming that 'one sees her experimenting in a direction which is peculiar to a foreign people'. This denunciation, implying that her work was fitting neither for a New Zealander, nor therefore for a Briton, was not unusual.

The association of modernism with foreignness was an association accepted by many. One of the most public and highly credentialed opponents of modernism was NAGNSW Director, James MacDonald, who wrote, and spoke often about unwanted modernist foreign imports. As we have seen previously, these were, for MacDonald, not simply examples of bad art but the ploy of despised Jewish art dealers, nefarious in their dealings with the unwary and susceptible.

MacDonald’s trenchant hostility to, and dismissal of modernist art, was due to a conviction which he shared with many other conservatives; that modernism was an ‘imported and perverted art, germinated in Europe in the soil of affliction and squalor, self-distrust and self-deception’. Lionel and Norman Lindsay, like many other conservatives active in Sydney’s art life between the Wars, also believed modernism had no place in Australia’s pristine blue skies and open spaces; it was ‘alien from Australian life and tone’.

A certain smugness characterises many of these pronouncements on the antipodes, art and modernism. Far from bemoaning the distance from the heartland of modernist art in France, Australia and New Zealand’s physical quarantining from

29 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
that centre was regarded, by many, as an advantage. For example, one of the bastions
of the NAGNSW Board, Sir John Longstaff was interviewed for the Daily Telegraph
in 1931. The headline for this article proclaimed No Art Crazes! ‘People in
Australia’, Longstaff smugly announced, ‘think for themselves about art matters’ and
do not ‘follow blindly the cults and crazes which are so prevalent in other
countries’.34

As the centre of Empire, Great Britain was at the heart of eventual changes
in her former colonies’ perception and valuing of modernism. Complex sociological,
political and economic contexts (many the result of the disputations of the First
World War and the Great Depression) had resulted in a spasmodic shaking of the
shackles with the Mother Country and art was not immune. However bitterly
contested by the conservative majority, in Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia,
there had existed enclaves within art societies, artists and groups, that believed that
modernism was the only way forward and that the stultifying confinement of ‘dead
white males’ offered by the Academy had finally run its course.

Rare individuals, as a way of expressing a new, brave and perhaps
independent world, understood Modernism. During the twenties and thirties,
elements in both New Zealand and Australia, consisting of small numbers of
individuals, had pioneered modernist art practices. Many of those artists are the ones
who are now most immediately recognised, filling the pages of art texts dealing with
art at this time. In the period between the wars, however, artists such as Charles
Perkins, Margaret Preston and Clarice Beckett were in a stark minority. However
passionate, modernists occupied only a very small proportion of their nation’s art
practice.

34 Daily Telegraph, 14.9.1931.
Apart from belonging to an aesthetic minority, the other characteristic these modernists had in common was their exclusion from any National Art Gallery presence. Modernism, when it was seen, was made evident only in spheres outside of the official ‘national’ art practice. For example, in New Zealand, regional art centres were often, by comparison with their National Gallery, much more receptive to ideas of the avant garde. Dr G. M. L. Lester, a reviewer of the 1930 Christchurch’s Group exhibition, boldly concluded that the show ‘represented the artists’ sense of revolt’ against the ‘whole body of convention in art, a convention that has filled the Royal Academy in London with mediocrity for the past seventy years, a fettering of ideas which meant that the pretty, sentimental stuff must go on the wall or unpopularity result’.

However, the path by which this despised art became acceptable, eventually even desirable for these national galleries, reveals more about the power of the British and London Royal Academy alliance than it does about acceptance of an artist’s ‘sense of revolt’. We know that these Galleries are now absolute in their representation of modernist aesthetics, and that over the past fifty years most of the works and artist regarded as most important by these two institutions in the period 1914-1939 have not been exhibited for many decades, if indeed they are still included in the Gallery’s collections. For modernism to be accepted by these elite, official, art institutions, whose founding ideals were planted so firmly in British soil, it first had to be accepted by British art, in particular, that of the Royal Academy. Modernism had first, to be British, be seen to be British and then be accepted by the British central art institution, the London Royal Academy.

As these art institutions had always looked to Great Britain for their artistic inspiration, they did so too, when faced with previously unpalatable examples of modernism. When even the most tame evidence of modernist thinking in art works was demonstrated - obvious by the twenties and thirties in much of European art - readers of art criticism in New Zealand, were assured that these moves were now also acceptable to viewers, because they were 'fully established in England' and painted by the more 'significant British artists...members of the Royal Academy or of other institutions'. New Zealand audiences were reassured by critics that:

Although all these pictures are of a representational character, some may appear to be of a more "advanced" tendency than we are familiar with in New Zealand. A few works may seem to present an unusual outlook, yet there are none whose worth is not fully established in England.\textsuperscript{36}

Modernist art, when associated with the art of Great Britain, and especially when that work emanated from British bastions of high art, could be heartily endorsed in the Antipodes. For example, the second Empire Arts Loan Exhibition of 1936 included some sixty paintings provided by the London National and Tate Galleries. A review by Roland Hipkins, as noted previously, claimed that these works must be recognised not only because they 'indicated the main trend', but also and more importantly, that they should be accepted because they represented 'a splendid introduction to the art of our own British people'.\textsuperscript{37} According to the terms of this typical endorsement, therefore, when New Zealand audiences were first introduced to some modernist works, then their acceptance was more likely if these works were shown under the umbrella of British art. For example, it was through an exhibition of generally conservative British work, which happened to contain six Surrealist works, that New Zealanders were first exposed to Surrealism, amongst the

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{37} Roland Hipkins, 'Empire Art Loan Exhibition' in Art In New Zealand, September, 1936, p. 12.
most threatening ‘isms’ of modernism. The reviewers, rather than reviling the alleged distortions or ‘ugly’ nature of the works, wrote that ‘the result of this exposure’ was positive. Indeed, reviewers agreed that ‘the collections of contemporary British art which have been shown throughout the country in each of the last two years have given to all our artists a renewed vision and a fresh confidence’. 38 They now claimed that ‘it is also clear that many things which a few years ago would have been misunderstood and viewed with alarm, can now be appreciated and enjoyed in an ever widening way’. 39 Other writers went further and denounced the type of artwork that had dominated the walls of most provincial and central art galleries. The ‘pretty pot-boiler must gather up her skirts and go’ declared a Christchurch newspaper in 1931. 40

Even Dr Carbery, the normally conservative NZAFA Committee member, when opening the 1930 NZAFA Exhibition, was reported as having suggested that ‘there was a tendency to stick to mid-Victorian ideals and styles, while the newer modes expressed the more complex life of the modern world’. 41 However, in spite of such writing, the wholehearted acceptance of modernism in the official art institution of New Zealand, as with the NAGNSW, was by no means guaranteed. As late as 1938, the Chairman of the organising committee for the International Exhibition as part of the New Zealand Centenary expressed concern that ‘he did not think that people would come to see a contemporary show’. 42 The Committee’s solution to this perceived problem of public taste was interesting in its revelation regarding artistic alternatives to ‘contemporary’ art. At a meeting of the organising committee in September 1938 an alternative was suggested by one committee member, a Mr Hall,

38 Marion and Robert Field, Art In New Zealand, December, 1935, p. 30
39 Ibid
40 Christchurch Times, 10.9.1931.
41 Evening Post Newspaper, 27.9.1930.
42 Ibid.
who thought that, ‘an exhibition of some 900 “current works” with perhaps some
Impressionist and Post Impressionist works, [and] Salisbury’s Coronation picture’
would suffice, and proposed also that ‘a few other special loan works such as a water
colour by Winston Churchill and one by Hitler would draw the general public’.
One cannot be sure whether this request was made in a sarcastic vein or not, but
perhaps not surprisingly, no works by Churchill or Hitler eventuated.

Contemporary observers of the art practice of New Zeala
depend on seeing art practice in the late thirties revolving around
example, the New Zealand art historian, Michael Dunn, observed that the 1930s and
1940s are often seen as the crucial time for the growth of modern New Zealand
painting’. However, Dunn also concedes that this represents a somewhat ‘skewed’
view of history acknowledging that, ‘although this belief has some truth in it, much
of what was painted during this decade by local artists had little to do with
mainstream modernist art’. In New Zealand, as Dunn asserts, by far the major
concern of artists was rather, ‘a pre-occupation with place and local identity’. What
emerged was ‘a New Zealand regionalism, which concerns itself with a realist
depiction of scenes that typify small town and rural life’.

What was important for the eventual acceptance of modernism in New
Zealand was the growing exposure to, and recognition of, a new crop of English
painters in the early nineteen thirties. The works of these British artists were
undoubtedly modern, no longer simply the ‘contemporary’ works of ageing
Academicians. A 1933 Art In New Zealand article listed these new British stars.
They included Augustus John (see Fig.20), C.R.W. Nevison, Paul and John Nash.

\footnote{Ibid.}
\footnote{Michael Dunn, A Concise History of New Zealand Painting, (Sydney: Craftsman House, 1991), p. 81.}
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and Stanley and Gilbert Spencer.\(^{45}\) Whilst the NZAFA was by no means totally convinced, the appearance of these artists in premier English art journals, as well as in their own *Art In New Zealand* and *Art In Australia*, was enough to prompt cautious assent. This acceptance did not, however, immediately result in purchases of their works by the two Antipodean National Galleries. It was not until after the Second World War, in the nineteen forties, that the NAGNSW purchased several works by Christopher Nevison, Paul Nash and Stanley Spencer.\(^{46}\)

Indications that some NAGNSW Trustees were prepared to consider contemporary European art, other than that defined by the London Royal Academy, came initially with the purchase, in 1933, of a collection of prints, which included reproductions of works by Cezanne, Derain, Gauguin, Van Gogh, Matisse and de Vlaminck.\(^{47}\) These were very inexpensive; the average cost was one Guinea, and the Trustees made nothing of them in their Annual Report. It was not until 1938 that the NAGNSW Board moved to encompass some degree of European modernity in their purchasing. A Minute of July 1938, recorded a letter from Mr W. H. Ifould, who gave 'notice of intention' that the gallery Trustees 'allocate out of their income every year £1,500 for the purchase of contemporary art, other than Australian, and that we request the National Art Collections Fund to purchase for us first rate examples of work by certain contemporary artists whom we will nominate. This motion seconded

\(^{45}\) W. Basil Honour, ‘New Zealand Society of Artists’ in *Art In New Zealand*, September, 1933, p. 25.

\(^{46}\) Christopher Nevison’s *Loch Lomond*, was purchased on behalf of the Gallery by Harold Wright of Colnaghis’, in 1947. *The Thames in Black and Silver* was purchased in 1946. Two works by Paul Nash were purchased; *Mimosa Wood* (painted 1926) in 1946 and *Sunflower* (1942) purchased in 1944. Stanley Spencer’s *Garden Study* (1947) was purchased in 1947, his *Christ In Cookham* (1952), and purchased in 1952 ‘on the recommendation of trustees J.R. McGregor & C. Lloyd Jones’, *Cookham Lock* (1935) was purchased 1937, *The Scrapheap* (1944) was purchased in 1949 and *Wheatfield At Starlings* (1947), purchased 1947.


\(^{47}\) NAGNSW Annual Report to the Legislative Assembly of N.S.W. for the Year 1933, 3.5.1934, p. 2.
by Mr Waterhouse'. It was unanimously decided 'that one half of the available spending money be allocated for the purchase of pictures. The proposed list of painters to stand over until the 28.8.1938 meeting'. The timing of this move was appropriate because at the same meeting a letter was read from Mr David Meldrum, Secretary of the National Arts Collections Fund, 'in connection with our proposal to purchase certain French Impressionist paintings, [and suggesting that] works by the French Impressionists, Degas, Manet, Monet and Sisley be purchased at a quoted price not exceeding £800 or £1000'. However, in a major step backward, it was decided that the National Arts Collections Fund could be used only for the purchase of British paintings. This limitation once more quarantined British works from competition and made the acquisition of premier French artists more unlikely. Again, the premier position of British works was inviolate, and by placing a cap on purchase price in any case, the Trustees made the acquisition of works by such French Impressionist artists as Monet and Renoir, by 1938, impossible.

Indications of shifting values on the part of the Trustees were made clear in the 1939 NAGNSW Annual Report. It revealed the difficulty the Trustees had in understanding that modernism was now, in most art circles, recognised as the victor. A significant change in the style of the Annual Report saw several new acquisitions reproduced as images for the first time. In one sense they show the Trustees sitting squarely 'on the fence' in regard to modernism with the primary position of traditional works maintained. This was not surprising for men who had spent most of their lives defending the status quo. The first image in the Report was a pencil drawing of the late Board President, John Lane Mullins, very much in an academic

---

48 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 22. 7.1938.
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50 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 22. 7.1938.
51 Ibid.
style. However, there was also a new and major presence. There were six images reproduced, including two by European Post-Impressionists that had been acquired by the Gallery that year, *Le Pont Neuf Sous la Neige* by Albert Marquet, and Gauguin’s *La Cabatiere*.\(^{52}\) The less surprising inclusions were images by the stalwarts, Hans Heysen and Darryl Lindsay.\(^{53}\) The final reproduction was a bronze by quasi-modernist Paul Landowski. This work, *Le Haleur* had recently been presented to the Gallery by Board member, James R. McGregor. The inclusion of the work, and indeed, the highlighting of their presence by reproduction, was highly significant. By so doing, the Trustees announced to their Parliamentary authority that modernism, however tentatively, was now to be included under their mantle of ‘high’ art.

More ‘coloured reproductions’ were purchased that year in 1939 including prints of works by Impressionist and Post-Impressionist artists such as Van Gogh, Degas, Monet, and Gauguin.\(^{54}\) However, another major Gallery acquisition that year reminded their audiences that the apparent acceptance of modernism was not yet whole-hearted. In one of the most puzzling acquisition decisions, the Gallery acquired a folio of some 1,677 reproductions, most of which were by obscure European ‘masters’. These were purchased through the Gallery stalwart in London, dealer Mr Harold Wright of P.& D. Colnaghi & Co., a purchase reflecting the Trustees’ faith in Mr Wright rather than any continuing faith in the quality, or the appropriateness, of the reproductions themselves.\(^{55}\) Apart from one George Lambert drawing, not one work by an English Academician was acquired that year.

\(^{52}\) NAGNSW Annual Report to the Parliament of N.S.W. for the Year 1939, 13.3.1940, p. 10. This work had recently been presented to the Gallery by Trustee, J. R. McGregor.

\(^{53}\) The Hans Heysen was a charcoal drawing, *Woodside Pastures* and the Daryl Lindsay, a water-colour, *Waiting Their Turn*.


\(^{55}\) NAGNSW Annual Report to the Parliament of N.S.W. for the Year 1939, 13.3.1940, p.5.
Such was the force of the aesthetic shift that the Trustees, in their 1939 Annual Report, obviously felt the need to explain the large number of French purchases. Perhaps too it was a way of announcing this momentous awakening to Parliament. The large number of modernist purchases was endorsed by the following:

FRENCH ART
There were several notable acquisitions during the year, which have greatly strengthened the section devoted to French art in the Gallery. Mr J. R. McGregor, acting on behalf of the Trustees, purchased in Paris an oil painting entitled “The Red Roofs” by Vlaminck, which is in his best manner. Two works by the noted French sculptor Paul Landowski “Le Haleur” (bronze) purchased by the Trustees and “Les Porteuses d’eau Aveugle” (bronze) presented by Mr McGregor are welcome additions and worthy of a place in any Gallery.56

The attention given to these contemporary French artists in the profile of the collection was clearly announced in the reproduction of two of the acquisitions in the Report. Their importance was reinforced in these paragraphs of explanation:

The name of Paul Gauguin is so well known that no art collection is complete without an original by this celebrated artist. Coloured reproductions have their place, and have done much to bring the work of old and modern masters before the public, but, however good they may be, they are not originals, and the Trustees welcome the addition to our collection of “La Cabarière” by Gauguin. This was purchased from the Melbourne “Herald” Exhibition of French and British Modern Art held in Sydney. “La Cabarière” is an early work, a fine direct study in glowing colours, and would grace any Gallery, although it is not as typical of him as his paintings of Tahiti.

Albert Marquet, although well known on the Continent, has seldom exhibited in Australia, and therefore his work is little known in Sydney. His “Le Pont neuf sous la Neige” purchased from the same Exhibition, may be regarded as a fine example. Painted from his studio, the artist has seen the famous bridge over the River Seine from a new angle, which makes an interesting composition.

It is hoped before very long to purchase a Claude Monet for the Gallery. Mr Charles Lloyd Jones while in France, and acting on behalf of the Trustees, arranged with the Director of the Louvre in Paris to make the selection.57

56 Ibid., p. 7.
57 NAGNSW Annual Report to the N.S.W. Parliament for the Year 1939, 13.3.1940, p. 9.
Having embraced this new aesthetic, the Board was determined to include the work of French ‘moderns’ in their collection, resulting in almost frantic strategies in their attempts to find, and purchase examples. The momentum of modernism had proven impossible to resist, and Board members found themselves in the unusual, and uncomfortable position of having to seek new alliances, and to compete with other Galleries far more familiar with this new market for art works, dealers and values. Given the physical barrier of distance and communication, much less the lack of any real knowledge and understanding, negotiations of this kind could only have been problematic.

Of all the Board members, the one Trustee who was most competent in offering real expertise in modernism was in Paris at this time. Charles Lloyd Jones wrote to fellow Board members and the letter was minuted at the February, 1939 meeting. ‘Mr Chas. Lloyd Jones’ the minute reads ‘has inspected many private collections [and] private galleries, expressing the opinion that if the trustees desire to purchase examples of Contemporary French painting [emphasis as in Minutes] they should act now, as it was possible to get now what they wanted for £500’.58 The Minutes record Lloyd Jones’ efforts to prod the Board into making purchases from among the works of the very best artists: ‘Mr Jones mentions the following artists who are doing good work - Derain, Dufy, Vlaminck, Utrillo, Kissling, Marie Laurencin, and if possible he would like a Picasso and Matisse selected’.59 A special Board meeting was then called the following month to discuss Lloyd Jones’ proposal, in addition to the more pressing matters of electing a new President and filling a vacancy on the Board.60 At this March meeting, ‘Mr Chas. Lloyd Jones’ letter was fully discussed’ but the decision the Board made was far from Lloyd

58 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 24. 2.1939.
59 Ibid.
60 Minute Book, NAGNSW, 10. 3.1939.
Jones' recommendation. Ignoring any mention of Picasso, Derain or others, 'on the motion of Mr McGregor' and 'seconded by Mr Ure Smith', the Board decided to attempt to procure only a 'Monet through the Louvre, Paris'. They communicated their desire to Paris and stipulated that Lloyd Jones purchase 'no other artist' and that he could use up to Stg£1000 only to finance the Monet. That the Board would choose a Monet, however disappointing in the light of Lloyd Jones' advice, was not surprising. For these men, a Derain, Dufy or Matisse would have required an artistic sophistication that they simply did not possess. The suggestion that the Board consider the purchase of a Picasso was not given the dignity of a reply. The seconding of the motion not to pursue these works by fellow Trustee Syd. Ure Smith, was more surprising, as, of all of the Trustees, apart from Lloyd Jones, he should have known enough about both modernism to support his friend's perspicacity. The timidity revealed by such a decision would characterise many Board deliberations made that year; most would prove to be disadvantageous for the future content of the Gallery collection.

In their communication to Lloyd Jones the Trustees not only stipulated the amount that could be paid for the Monet, but pompously instructed him that it should also be 'an outstanding example' of his 'best sunlight period'. At best a naïve request, it illustrated the positions of these gatekeepers. In the face of Lloyd Jones' proposed purchases of Post-Impressionist and Expressionist works, the Board could, as a body, sanction only the tamest of modernist aesthetics. However beautiful and valuable, a Monet was, by 1939, not only well beyond the financial reaches of the NAGNSW budget but within a modernist milieu the most conservative choice possible. Within the context of that meeting, the choice of a Monet was perhaps to
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have been expected, as, at the same meeting, the Board determined that the subjects of the ‘proposed series of four lectures by Miss Lange under the title ‘Rambling Through The Gallery’ would be lectures on Whistler, Sargent, Munnings and Australian Landscapes. Apart from the latter landscape topic, all were English, and all were Academicians. An earlier 1938 Daily Telegraph article might explain in part for this apparently contradictory behaviour, as it reminded its readers that ‘we live on isolated islands at the very antipodes of all that is latest in thought and method’.

Still in Paris several months later, Lloyd Jones wrote again to the Board, obviously working diligently on behalf of the Gallery, but not apparently in the milieu the Trustees welcomed. Again promoting modernism, Charles Lloyd Jones, as the Minutes recorded, proposed a touring ‘exhibition of French art in Australia, from the Impressionists to Cezanne’ in conjunction with a ‘French association’. The Board agreed to the proposal in principle, but, ever hesitant, the Trustees asked the Director ‘to get in touch with the French Consul to obtain particulars of the Society referred to’. Another letter from Lloyd Jones in May announced further progress in the organization of the exhibition. More importantly, as the Minutes report, Lloyd Jones told the Board that he had successfully ‘arranged for the purchase of a small Renoir and Bonnard with the money remaining after the Monet had been bought, and this suggestion was accepted by the Trustees’.

The purchase of the Monet proved not to be so simple after all. For reasons
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that are not recorded, Lloyd Jones' apparent purchase appears not to have
eventuated. In July the Board itself wrote to the Louvre telling its officer, Mr
Huyghe, that they were 'anxious to secure a Monet when an opportunity occurs' –
but there 'was no great urgency'.

In December of that year the Monet appeared to
be no closer to a new home in Sydney, and more letters were sent to the Director of
the Louvre, 'in regard to the proposed purchase of a painting by Monet'.

However, another purchase was completed and proudly recorded in the Annual Report, namely
Gauguin's La Cabatier. This Post-Impressionist acquisition was all the more
surprising in a climate where the Director of the National Gallery of Victoria (and
previous NAGNSW Director James MacDonald), had been approached by the
Trustees only six months before, seeking his opinion on some French Impressionist
works offered for sale in a Melbourne exhibition. The reply was brief, 'the works are
spurious!'

And so too, as it turned out, was the Trustees' 'Gauguin', discovered to be a
fake several years after purchase. The story of this 'Gauguin' is perhaps a perfect,
ironic finale to this particular episode of the Board's history and its tentative tilt
toward what it regarded as a respectable, tame modernism. Hal Missingham, in his
autobiographical account of his term as NAGNSW Director, tells of the revelation of
discovering that the much-prized 'Gauguin' was in fact by another Pont Aven artist,
Camoin. The work had been purchased from the Melbourne Herald show, and was
labelled as being by Gauguin. However, Missingham began to have his suspicions
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about its authenticity, which he raised with the Board in 1951.\(^2\) Their response reveals much about Board methods, misunderstandings and general approach to alien aesthetics. When apprised of the doubts over authenticity, the initial dealer offered to buy the work back for its original purchase price. Rather than accepting what was a generous offer, the Trustees refused, believing that if the dealer wanted the work back ‘the painting must be valuable’.\(^3\) At the same Board Meeting the argument over whether or not the work was indeed a Gauguin, or perhaps a work by Van Gogh, took on a note of farce. Missingham related the following exchange:

J.W. Maund, as usual belligerently hostile to anything I said or did, pooh-poohed the very idea of it being by Camoin, producing a book in which his work was reproduced and in which was a painting of a nude reclining with her legs apart in a very French-studio position.

“Mr President,” he said “surely we cannot believe that the painter who would perpetuate this obscene picture could have produced our beautiful *La Cababiere*?”

“Gentlemen,” said the president, “you have all heard Mr Maund and the Director; what is your opinion of our Van Gogh?”

“NOT Van Gogh, Mr President, Gauguin,” I whispered to him.

There was not much response from the members so the President gave his opinion that the painting looked very much like a Van Gogh; and I said again, “Gauguin, Mr President.”

“All right, all right, you can take it, gentlemen, that every time I mention Van Gogh I am, in fact, referring to Gauguin”.\(^4\)

In July 1939, another Trustee, J. R. McGregor was in London and Board Minutes suggest he had taken over the negotiations for the Monet. Certainly he appears to have found one, and also a Degas. Still not happy, the Board, in spite of much correspondence and many instructions as to the subject and price, once again changed its approach to the purchase of the work. Minuted at the July monthly Board meeting, the Trustees decided upon another course of action. Headed ‘Proposed
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Purchase of a painting by Claude Monet in Paris’, the Minute referred to ‘recent correspondence from Mr J. R. McGregor who is at present in London’. It was decided after a discussion, ‘not to purchase the Monet or Degas mentioned in Mr McGregor's letter’. A cable to this effect informing him that a letter will be forwarded to Mr C.Voss, Commonwealth of Australia representative in Paris, regarding the purchase of a painting by Claude Monet at £1000 Australian, when the opportunity arises'. A letter was also to be sent to Mr Huyghe, ‘informing him that the Trustees are anxious to secure a Monet when an opportunity occurs at a cost of £1000 sterling’. Once again the Trustees stipulated that ‘it must be an outstanding example of his best period and a sunlight subject’. Again they prevaricated telling Mr Huyghe at the Louvre that ‘there is, however, no great urgency and trustees are prepared to wait’.

However, at the same meeting the impetus for the Trustees to confront modernism was seen to become suddenly more urgent. The Trustees had to deal with the announcement, in July, in Melbourne, of Sir Keith Murdoch’s proposal to bring to Australia a major ‘representative exhibition of recent and contemporary European painting and sculpture’. He suggested that the exhibition should visit Sydney and also be housed at the Gallery. Ever vigilant against claims of superiority from Melbourne, the Trustees called a special meeting to consider the approach. The aim, according to Murdoch’s letter was ‘to give Australians first hand knowledge of the work of all significant French and British painters’, an aim, which, as we have seen, was not likely to have great appeal to the Trustees. Interestingly, not all the artists were French or British, for there was one ‘lapped’ Australian in the show, John
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Power.⁸⁰

Murdoch’s touring exhibition proved to be Sydney’s first ever ‘blockbuster’ exhibition, without doubt the most important exhibition ever to be seen in Sydney to that date. It was also the most viewed exhibition ever seen in Australia. Some 65,000 people saw the exhibition in Melbourne, Adelaide and Sydney.⁸¹ Significantly, this pivotal show was not initially displayed in the Gallery, because of administrative and legislative problems. It was, perhaps more appropriately, given the modernist sympathies of Trustee Charles Lloyd Jones, housed at the Exhibition Gallery in the retail store, David Jones Ltd.⁸² The business home of Trustee Charles Lloyd Jones had long been regarded in Sydney as the epitome of sophistication. Indeed, since the twenties many modernist designers, as well as artists, had their wares accepted for display and sale.⁸³ The curator at the David Jones Exhibition Gallery was Basil Burdett, notable critic and advocate of modernism. There was no one more appropriate to curate and publicize such an important window to the new aesthetic world, even if many of the works by then were almost passé in Europe.

The reason the Board gave for not being able to house this exhibition appears to have been quite legitimate. Sir Keith Murdoch sought a ‘contribution of £500’, and promised that if ‘this could be assured for Sydney then they would be able to lend the exhibition to the Trustees’.⁸⁴ The Trustees had offered that sum ‘toward expenses’, but they stipulated that the Gallery would keep all admission charges and ‘would not render any assistance in connection with hanging etc’.⁸⁵ When it was

⁸³ See the biography of Kathleen O’Connor, Janda Gooding’s, Casing Shadows: The Art of Kathleen O’Connor (Roseville: Craftsman House, 1966).
⁸⁴ Minute Book, NAGNSW, 28.7.1939.
⁸⁵ Minute Book, NAGNSW, 4.7.1939.
discovered that the Trustees 'were unable to make a charge for admission, [that] no pictures could be sold in the Gallery, and [that] no costs with regard to catalogues could be incurred' it was obvious that Murdoch, and his exhibition, would have to go elsewhere. The Trustees' response to it was typical in their hesitancy and mistrust of the art represented. Their suspicion of artists included in the show, such as Salvador Dali, resulted in a growing defensiveness in the face of increasing, ongoing opposition in the Press. In the midst of criticism, the Trustees steadfastly maintained a posture of artistic superiority.

The Trustees' handling of the Murdoch Melbourne Herald exhibition makes clear their perception of an aesthetic that was the antithesis of all Academic values. Not only did it contradict centuries of art methodology, it was not, at its core, British. The Trustees did in fact buy some works from this show but typically, when they did so, the choices were cautious and predictable. The November meeting minuted the exhibition inspection and recorded that 'after a careful inspection' the following works were 'proposed for consideration', 'Knesborough' by Englishman, P. Wilson Steer, and proposed by Sydney Long, Pont Neuf by Albert Marquet proposed by Mr J. R. McGregor, and Le Lac by M. Brianchon, and proposed by H. Hinton.

An important communication was received by the Trustees and read at the December meeting, three months after the outbreak of the Second World War. Basil Burdett, writing as Curator of the Exhibition on behalf of Sir Keith Murdoch, asked if the Board 'would be interested in having a number, say twenty or more works from the modern art exhibition on loan in the Gallery?' Apparently Murdoch was 'anxious that some of the more important works should find asylum' within the
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The Gallery agreed to do so, and the Director (Will Ashton) was directed to do the selection. Once more, the system worked to reinforce the Trustees' preference for works closest to established norms. With Ashton choosing the works, however broad and exciting the choice, he could be relied upon to select for safe housing and exhibition in the Gallery, only those works with most closely approximated or matched Trustee expectations.

These gatekeepers of culture kept a very close watch on which artists were able to enter their gates, but by 1940 the economic, if not aesthetic ramifications of their rejection of modernism were beginning to be obvious. The Director reported on the opening of the NAGNSW exhibition of *Continental Art*, which consisted of a 'number of works selected from the permanent collection, others lent, and seventeen from the much-discussed *Melbourne Herald Exhibition of Modern Art*'. However, the Minutes stipulated that the paintings by 'Georges Bracque [sic], Pablo Picasso, Marie Laurencin, Henry Matisse and Eduard Vuillard were not included as, acting under instructions from Mr Basil Burdett' they were to be ‘forwarded to Duveen & Co., New York’. These names, now amongst the most highly respected of early twentieth century art, appear only as they are to leave the country. All were for sale, but not considered suitable by the Trustees for inclusion in the collection. It is ironic that Charles Lloyd Jones had urged the purchase of works by Picasso, Matisse and Marie Laurencin over a year earlier, but they had been over-looked in favour of an almost farcical hunt for a Monet 'best sunlight period' work. The Trustees continued to have the last word. After reporting to the meeting about the exhibition of *Continental Art*, and Burdett's refusal to let them exhibit what must have been the 'eyes' of the works still for sale, they concluded with a final, parting shot at the
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Murdoch’s collection and Modernism. ‘Since the beginning of the Exhibition the attendance had been very poor. Noted.’ 92

United in their long-standing condemnation of modernism, the gatekeepers of culture in New Zealand and Australia did, however, display different attitudes in their response to two special aspects of art practice within their domains. Each deserves some extended discussion here. The first was the place allowed women, both as artists and Board members, and the second was in the representation of indigeneity. Both areas were bound to be problematic in one degree or other, as both constituted part of the ‘other’, existing outside the artistic, social and cultural precepts which these institutions claimed as high art.

To a large degree the dramatically different place allowed women artists in the two countries was the result of the different formative administrative functions of the two institutions. The NZAFA was, from its inception an ‘Academy’ founded upon the desire to provide a central focus for those interested in the visual arts, providing a site where the ‘study, practice and cultivation of the fine arts’ could be promoted.93 The academy was also established to provide instruction in the arts, and ‘to classify students into various grades and award certificates or diplomas’.94 As such, its foundation principles were quite different from those of the NAGNSW, however ambitious the Academy became in its aspirations to provide the nucleus of the New Zealand National Gallery. From the outset, the Academy could be seen as a rare nineteenth-century institution, where the women members (both exhibiting and non-exhibiting) were as strong a presence as the male members. Whilst women

92 Ibid. Original under-lined as in Minutes.

93 The Memorandum of Association, New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts, Wellington, 1908.
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Council members were not as numerous, nor long-serving as their male colleagues, it could be argued that one of the most powerful individuals within the Academy in the period between the Wars was a female, Mary Murray Fuller. On the basis of membership, Council representation and exhibition ratios, one could argue that there was no obvious bias against women artists.

However, much as the management records of the Academy suggest an equal place for the men and women of Wellington within the most important art institution in New Zealand, there were significant incidents that cast some doubt on this verdict. It seems that when the Academy carried out its every-day affairs, there was no apparent bias; but when the agenda changed to one of high art, where the representation of the state was concerned, then the position of women artists became precarious. For example, when the NZAFA collection of one hundred and seventy-four works by New Zealand artists was presented to the National Art Gallery of New Zealand upon its formation, only fourteen were by women. Of the one hundred and twenty works by ‘British and Foreign artists’ presented to the national collection by the Academy, only five were the work of women artists.

There was also an apparent shift of attitude when the Academy gave way to the Gallery. When the new Committee of Management for the National Gallery was formed and met for the first time, no women were part of that committee. The
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souvenir program celebrating the opening of the National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum listed its Board members, but there were no women included.\textsuperscript{99} The indomitable Mary Murray Fuller, who had organised a large section of the exhibition to open the new National Gallery and had been a long serving NZAFA Council member, was listed only as a member of a sub-committee responsible for 'Hanging'.\textsuperscript{100}

Similarly, there were no women on the Board of Trustees of the NAGNSW and their absence became increasingly contentious. Not as far as the Trustees were concerned, however, as there is no discussion recorded in the Minutes of the NAGNSW to indicate that any woman ever sought a position on the Board, nor any debate about whether such an inclusion was considered appropriate. Other sources, however, contradict this silence. The popular \textit{Tabletalk} tells of one such attempt by women to gain access to the Board of Trustees. In 1918 it reported:

\begin{quote}
There are at least two other bodies in N.S.W. on which women desire representation and for which they are making a spirited stand. One is the Board of Trade, the other is the National Art Gallery Trusteeship and it is no secret that Mrs W.A. Holman is a candidate for that post, and, as most of the artists of Sydney are favourable to her election, the Minister will probably over-come his fast-wavering anti-feminist predilection and appoint a woman to sit with the august body of Trustees.\textsuperscript{101}
\end{quote}

Mrs Holman, the wife of the former N.S.W. Premier, W.A. Holman, was not appointed.

The Sydney \textit{Bystander} also drew attention to this lapse when in 1922 it exhorted other women's organizations to take action:

\begin{quote}
The fact that no women were on the Council for the National Art Gallery is a condition that should engage the attention of the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{101} \textit{Tabletalk}, 20. 11.1919
National Council of Women, and all other associations aiming at progress. The exclusion of pictures painted by women is said to be due to other causes than their merits. The subject gave rise to much animated discussion at the opening of the Women Painters Exhibition. 102

In 1939 two Sydney newspapers, the *Sunday Sun* and the *Guardian* again raised the issue. In this case Thea Proctor responded, using the press to advance the argument that women Board members would ‘add many advantages’, amongst them a woman’s ‘better sense of colour’. Although she also criticised other facets of the Board’s structure, such as that of life-long membership, the facile nature of such an approach was easily refuted and then ignored. Historian Caroline Ambrus has argued:

In their lobbying, the main error that the women made was making out a case for specific feminine attributes which would qualify them for Trusteeship: that women had a better colour sense than men and a concern for the needs of children. Such arguments only served to underscore the separation of the sexes and the inferiority of the feminine position. The strongest argument the women had was against the power structure of the various boards, which ensured that privilege remained in the hands of the elite. 103

The Trustees were not swayed by either arguments or public pressure. It was not until 1943 that a woman was added to the august body of Trustees, with the appointment of Mary Alice Evatt (wife of the then Federal Attorney-General, H. V. Evatt). The appointment of Mrs Evatt was said to have been made on political grounds, rather than from any sense that, as an individual, Mrs Evatt would make a significant contribution to Board action. 104 As a woman and a modernist, Evatt’s arrival must have been seen as something of a defeat by the Board, though the President, Mr Waterhouse, announced that ‘he was sure that her appointment would
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please women artists, who for many years had urged the appointment of a woman to the Board’. ¹⁰⁵

The exclusion of women from management positions at these galleries was for much the same reasons that their art making was also regarded by these bodies as problematic. For the most part, women artists worked as ‘Sunday painters’, exhibiting subjects that were of the intimate, or domestic domain. They were not, in the main, participants in the world of art in the widest sense, where genius was assumed to be the precinct of men, and whose subjects were the domain of high art. Consequently, because they were typically painting such subjects as still lifes, interiors and children, women were often denied serious consideration. If they attempted to move outside of those genres, art critics were quick to cut them down as women attempting ‘to emulate literally the achievements of the masculine mind’. ¹⁰⁶

Reviews of exhibitions all too often damned with faint praise:

The still lifes and bowls of fruit and flowers were there in full array, though happily the bowls of marigolds, the still-lifes with hanging curtain, brass tray and orange, on which a closed season should be imposed, were absent. ¹⁰⁷

Damned if they did and damned if they did not, some of these women artists today, however, are seen as having represented the ‘new woman’. ¹⁰⁸ Exemplified by artists such as Thea Proctor, the new woman, especially when this new creature was in alliance with modernism, was most alarming to Trustees. As feminist writers of this period have concluded ‘it may be that women cannot at once rise to the level on which men stand after ages of culture and conscious freedom, or, more likely it may

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
¹⁰⁷ Ibid.
be that no woman is, or ought to be, able to free herself from domestic duties and associations'.

Trustee Lionel Lindsay believed, as did many, that the emerging association between the 'new woman' and modernism was detrimental to both the course of art, and to the sanctity of the family. Lindsay abhorred the rising status of women artists almost as much as he abhorred modernism. For this Truste combination in an artist of both womanhood and modernism wa there are more women-than men painters' he wrote and, 'they hav the superficial nature of modern painting attracts their light hands is one'.

In September of 1936, Thea Proctor wrote to the Board, inviting them to 'view' her current exhibition of works. The Trustees declined, but they asked, did 'she have any fan decoration paintings'? Their rejection of Proctor's invitation to view her exhibition, and their counter offer, seeking only a specific type of decorative craft, in spite of her considerable reputation both as an artist and designer, was absolutely in keeping with the Board's understanding of the type of art production considered suitable for a woman. It indicated also the Board's unwillingness to condone or confront Proctor's problematic modernism. Their response was typical. Judged to be outside the realm of high art and relegated to the ranks of the dilettante, women like Proctor were to discover that the acquisition of their work for a national collection was a constant struggle against contradictory cultural positions and hierarchies.

The persistence of landscape as the dominant genre in the thirties served to

110 Lionel Lindsay, Added Art (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1942), p. 52.
exclude women further. Women artists, even when landscapists, were not considered part of this genre, as they were judged unable to illustrate, as Ian Burns wrote, the ‘investment of national character in the landscape’. The vocabulary used to describe the work of women artists was also culturally loaded. ‘Decorative’, a term which by the twenties had become dismissive, or ‘feminine’, one which immediately demoted the artist to the category of ‘other’, were the words habitually chosen. Compared to work, which could carry the mantle of nationalism, these works were seen as, by default, superficial, passionless and lacking in conceptual rigour.

There are many examples recorded in the NAGNSW Minutes of women artists writing to the Trustees (just as Thea Proctor did), inviting them to visit their exhibitions with a ‘view to purchase’. However, compared with their male colleagues, these artists’ urgings were generally unsuccessful. Most paintings by women, when they were acquired, were bought at the annual exhibition of the Society of Women Painters. In the years between 1918 and 1940, however, only seven paintings were purchased for the Gallery from that Society. Admittedly, many of their more prominent members also exhibited with other artists’ societies and the Trustees could purchase their work through those avenues. When compared to the general level of purchases made at other Annual Exhibitions, seven works represents, at best, only a token gesture of Board approval. A survey of responses to later Society of Women Artists exhibitions in 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933 and 1934 reveals a stock response in the Minutes of the NAGNSW Board: ‘nothing was bought’ or, ‘there being no quorum, no recommendations for purchase were made’.
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The Trustees often used the ‘lack of a quorum’ as an excuse not to purchase, but this was not necessarily a problem, as in the case of fellow Trustee, Lionel Lindsay’s exhibition. When, in April 1931, Lionel Lindsay held an exhibition, only two or three Trustees arrived to view the show. They were, however, in this case, able to recommend that four of the works be purchased. Later an extraordinary meeting was called to confirm the proposed purchases and also to add four more to the list. This largesse was not seen when the prospective sellers from the Society of Women Painters sought the endorsement of Trustees. The paltry nature of Trustee patronage did not go unnoticed. As early as 1922, women artists had made representations to then Minister for Education, accusing the Trustees of boycotting their Society of Women Painters Exhibition. The Minister wrote to the Board requesting an explanation. The Director at that time, Mr G. V. Mann, replied:

The Trustees devote a large portion of their limited funds to the purchase of suitable works of Australian artists.... A very careful inspection was made by the Committee present who regretted that beyond several works made by artists already represented in the collection, there was nothing they could recommend.

The fact that the Gallery’s collection might already contain works by a particular artist did not usually stop the Trustees from adding to that repertoire, especially if that artist was also a Trustee. A survey of the NAGNSW Annual Reports for the years 1938, 1939 and 1940 indicates no purchases by women artist, although this was the same period in which the Gallery showed no hesitancy in purchasing the collection of 1,677 reproductions from Colnaghis’, works they had not even seen.
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For the Trustees, as with other conservative art circles, women’s art appears to have been easily tainted with the slur of amateurism, too far removed from the high intellectual and moral ground required to illustrate Australia’s place in civil society.\textsuperscript{119} Certainly, there was much work produced in societies such as the Society of Women Painters where the work could be criticised for the dilettante nature of its exponents, but that explanation does not account for the Trustees’ rejection of works that had found international favour elsewhere. One such a work was Violet Teague’s oil, \textit{Boy with Palette}, which in spite of having been awarded a ‘medal from the Old Salon in Paris’ in 1922 was not purchased for the Gallery collection and now hangs in the Australian National Gallery.\textsuperscript{120} Nor does it account for the consistent rejection of works, not only for purchase, but also for inclusion in major Gallery-organised exhibitions. For example, as noted previously, the major \textit{One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Art Exhibition}, included Margaret Preston and Thea Proctor only after ‘much discussion’ and some months later ‘Grace Cossington Smith and Treania Smith’ were ‘invited to submit work’ for appraisal.\textsuperscript{121} The initial list produced by the Exhibition committee numbered some one hundred and eight artists, and of these only seventeen were women.\textsuperscript{122} In other major Gallery travelling exhibitions this pattern of exclusion was repeated. For example, in the 1939 \textit{Golden Gate Exposition} held in San Francisco, no women artists were included and in the Australian contribution to the celebration of the New Zealand \textit{Centenary Exhibition}, only two of the twenty-four were women, a New Zealander, Maud Sherwood and sculptress,
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Daphne Mayo.\textsuperscript{123}

The two most prestigious art competitions in Sydney were both organised under the auspices of the NAGNSW and as discussed earlier in this chapter, judged by the Trustees. The Archibald Prize for portraiture and the Wynne Prize for landscape were awarded to only two women in the period between 1918 and 1941. Nora Heysen with her portrait of \textit{Mme. Elink Schuurman} won the Archibald in 1938 and Lorna Nimmo won the Wynne in 1941 with her oil, \textit{Valley Farms}. Unusually, the Gallery acquired neither work.\textsuperscript{124}

All this seems rather at odds, in one sense, with Bernard Smith’s description of the importance of women painters in the nineteen twenties. In his book \textit{Australian Painting} he appeared surprised to discover how much liberal and progressive thought in the arts in Australia was owed to women. ‘Indeed’ he wrote, ‘the contribution to Post-Impressionism in Australia appears to have been comparatively greater by women artists than men’.\textsuperscript{125} He accounted for the receptivity of the art world to the work of modernist women artists by citing the ‘occurrence of the First World War’, an argument that was also used to explain the premier position of women writers in the same period. The implication appears to be that the shortage of men, and therefore real artists, enabled lesser talents to flower.

Throughout the nineteen twenties and thirties, the Trustees appear to have maintained a Victorian outlook, placing women’s art firmly within the Ruskinian ideal of women’s art practice.\textsuperscript{126} The Trustees’ exclusion of both modernism and the work of women artists was, in the period between the Wars, undeniably successful.

\textsuperscript{123} ibid.
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These gatekeepers kept the gates firmly closed. If one visits the Gallery to see works which are regarded today as the canons of art practice in the twenties, thirties and forties, it is salutary to pay attention to the date when the particular works were purchased for the Art Gallery of N.S.W. collection. The discrepancy between the date in which these canonical works were painted, and then purchased for the collection, is often evidence of the Trustees' nineteenth-century attitudes to both women and modernism. For example, some of the best known are Dorrit Black's *Heat Haze*, painted in 1919 but not purchased until 1967, Grace Crowley's *Portrait of Lucie Beynus*, painted in 1936 and acquired in 1965, Margaret Preston's famous *Implement Blue*, painted in 1927 and presented to the Gallery by the artist in 1960. Grace Cossington Smith's *Sock Knitter* of 1915 was purchased in 1960, her *The Reader* of 1926 was purchased in 1974, and *Soldiers Marching* painted in 1917 was finally acquired in 1967. Thea Proctor fared better; her works were most likely to have been acquired in the year of production or close to it. However, as many of these works were her 'painted fan decorations', and therefore, as illustrated by the Trustees' request to her in 1936, far more digestible to their taste, this was not surprising.

Also apparently not digestible to NAGNSW Trustee taste were images of Australia's indigenous peoples. Gallery officers were seen to be associated with attitudes that would account for the absence of any representations of Aboriginality in their halls. For example, Director James MacDonald believed that Australia's future was one based not on an ancient land inhabited by an ancient people but rather one that, 'if we so choose', could see Australia catapulted to an enviable status as 'the elect of the world', incorporating the last of the pastoralists, the 'thoroughbred
Aryans in all their nobility'.\textsuperscript{127} Also very telling in this respect are the illustrations of Lionel Lindsay. He was responsible for the illustrations for a series of ‘yarns’ appearing in the \textit{Bulletin}’s ‘Aboriginalities’ column. Lindsay apparently ‘hit the bulls-eye everytime’ as he depicted Aborigines as ‘useless dolts and at worst stupid, shifty, physical degenerates fit to only act as a target for the white man’s jokes or drawings’.\textsuperscript{128} We know that many artists did paint Aborigines. Tom Roberts, for instance, paid particular attention to the Aboriginal characters he came across on painting excursions into the outback. His biographer, Humphrey McQueen, describes Roberts as unusual in that ‘he did not share European culture’s most vicious prejudices against the blacks’. However, McQueen notes also that his painting style reflected perhaps more of an ethnographic interest in the subject rather than the insights of studio portraits, for when painting these subjects Roberts applied a discipline that ‘was more casual than the one he applied to mayors’.\textsuperscript{129}

Margaret Preston, much feted for her excursions into Aboriginal art and design, and the most likely of the moderns to be acceptable to the Trustees, found no support at the Gallery for these works. Bernard Smith has suggested that if ‘as she had hoped’ these ‘brave forays into the \textit{forms} of Aboriginal art’ were to provide ‘a new direction for Australian art’, then the ‘clue’ for the failure of this hope might be found in ‘Yosl Bergner’s paintings of contemporary Aboriginals’.\textsuperscript{130} The social plight of Australia’s indigenous people was not of a concern to most Australians, whether depicted in social realist paintings such as Bergner’s, or not. For Gallery Trustees, not only were \textit{forms} of Aboriginal art unacceptable, representations of

\textsuperscript{127} James Macdonald, ‘Arthur Streeton’, \textit{Art In Australia}, October, 1931, p. 22.


\textsuperscript{129} Humphrey McQueen, \textit{Tom Roberts} (Sydney: Macmillan, 1999), p. 294.

Aboriginal people did not exist. For Australia’s premier art institution, the ‘guardians’ of this land could be personified by gum trees, such as Hans Heysen’s *Guardian of The Aroona Valley*, but not by its indigenous people. A perusal of the Minutes of the Board would suggest that there were, in fact, no indigenous peoples of Australia, or, if there were, they were invisible.

However, in perhaps the only striking difference in the art practice of the two Galleries, the neglect of indigeneity was not the case in New Zealand: Whilst this facet of the two former colonies’ history has been the subject of exploration by historians, this facet of their art histories remains to be written. The Trustees of the NAGNSW were not alone in Australia’s selective viewing of their native peoples. Readers of New Zealand’s history are told, for example, that:

> While colonial Australian history has been predicated on the exclusion of Aboriginal people, who were marginalised and written out of histories as they were marginalised and dispossessed of their lands, the history of New Zealand has been written around, even if it was not exactly made around, the Treaty of Waitangi.\(^\text{12}\)

In both the recently opened Museum of New Zealand (incorporating the NZNAG), as well as in the old Museum and Gallery in Buckle Street, Wellington, the most immediate presence upon entering their halls is that of the Maori. A *Marae* is the central exhibit, the art of the *Pakeha* housed in halls radiating from that centre. Almost from the inception of the colony in New Zealand, the Maori were depicted with a respect and reverence that did not exist in their Antipodean neighbour. Certainly, the circumstances were different, the Treaty of Waitangi encapsulating the degree to which the Maori were regarded as both a noble enemy, and, in their race, the closest thing Europeans could claim as the ‘noble savage’. Even so, the art forms

---

\(^{11}\) Hans Heysen’s water-colour *Guardian of the Aroona Valley* was purchased in 1928.

\(^{12}\) K. Neumann, N. Thomas & H. Erickson (Eds.), *Quicksands: Foundational Histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 1999), p. 239.
of the Maori, both as subject and object, were appreciated and valued a century before the international art market suggested that Aboriginal art could be unique and therefore valuable. This Maori ‘pride of place’ was a constant in New Zealand art histories and general histories. Typical were writings such as that of Roland Hipkins:

In this latter respect the arts of the Maori are justly given pride of place in the Dominion Museum and are so excellently displayed that we can appreciate anew the greatness of the Maori as an artist. His instructive sense of beauty and consummate skill of execution, in creating carving and in the various forms of domestic arts, are an inspiration for all time.\footnote{Roland Hipkins, \textit{Art In New Zealand}, September, 1936, p. 11.}

What is remarkable is that in a colony whose art appreciation was governed by a model ostensibly the opposite of ‘primitive’ expressiveness, just such qualities in design, craft and appearance were most highly valued. Not all of these were regarded, of course, as ‘high’ art, but the diversity with which the indigenous peoples of New Zealand were represented gave a further indication of importance. They ranged from:

- ethnographic portrayals intended to document the dress, adornment and physical appearance of members of various ethnic groups to exercises in the exotic picturesque, novel and spectacular for European audiences.\footnote{Leonard Bell, ‘Looking at Goldie: Face to face with ‘All e Same T’e Pakela’ in Nicholas Thomas and Diane Losche (Eds), \textit{Double Vision: Art Histories and Colonial Histories in the Pacific} (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 163.}

In New Zealand, from the earliest efforts to record aspects of the English, Scottish and Welsh settlement, portraits were also painted of the Maori population, with exactly the same approach as was taken to record the white colonials. These portraits of the Maori, painted by artists such as, C. F. Goldie and Linley H. Richardson are remarkable. The NZAFSA acquired works by both artists of Maori subjects early in its history: Goldie’s \textit{Memories: Te Hei} in 1909 and Richardson’s \textit{All, All Are Gone}, in 1910. In 1919 the Academy Council recommended that the
‘Lindauer portraits of Maori chiefs’ be ‘accepted as an addition to the Museum Maori collection’.

Paintings representing the Maori were purchased, borrowed, bequeathed, loaned and exhibited throughout the history of the Academy and National Gallery. In these works, the artists deal sympathetically with Maori life and legends, however exotic the subject; these are not mere dramatisations, but sincere, deeply respectful, pictorial responses. Paintings of Maori subjects were often those selected by the Academy to be sent to London and Paris as representing not only New Zealand art but also New Zealand itself. The Dominion newspaper told its readers in 1935 that ‘all of the paintings by the Auckland artist, Mr C. F. Goldie have been accepted by the Paris Salon’, and also that in the previous year Goldie ‘had sent three of his paintings to the Royal Academy and all three were hung’. Lord Bledisloe, when opening the 1933 annual exhibition of the New Zealand Academy Of Fine Art, announced that if any ‘distinctive national school of painting is to be evolved in New Zealand’ it should be ‘sought after’ and incorporate especially ‘Polynesian portraiture and its racial environment. Nothing lends itself more readily to imaginative treatment as well as ethnological interest’. These works, by artists such as Richardson and Goldie, were regarded by the Council of the Academy as being as inseparable from the representation of their land as the landscapes of Archibald Nicoll, T. A. McCormack or even Christopher Perkins. It is important to note, on the other hand, that however remarkable these portrayals of the Maori were, at their core they were still respectful of British styles and expectations. These artists, none of whom were Maori, were genuinely fascinated with the exotica offered by Maori subjects, but they positioned them within the framework of

---

135 Minute Book, NZAFA, 22.5.1919.
136 Dominion Newspaper, 1.5.1935.
137 Wellington Evening Post, 5.10.1933.
European pictorial culture. Although featuring non-European subjects, these works do not indicate an embracing of a non-European culture. They were painted for British settlers in New Zealand, circulated through British high art galleries and centred within the privileged mode of British high art.

Representations of Australian Aborigines, as well as the art production of women and modernists were, by their nature, excluded from the two major formations of high art in Australian in the period between the wars. Women artists were excluded from both academic 'high' art as well as the ethos of national landscape because these were formed primarily of masculine mythologies of the land. High art and landscape had become synonymous with nationhood. The work of women was easily dismissed; the slurs of dilettantism, superficiality and the decorative nature of women's art practice were all too easily repeated. All three alleged characteristics of women's art were outside of those artistic conventions which would ensure prestige in the eyes of the Boards of Trustees. The apparent largesse offered to New Zealand women artists by the Council of the NZAFA existed only until the institution was invested with national importance. Once the artistic agenda became one of representing the nation, the place allowed women became much more precarious. Modernism, an idiom now closely identified with Australian and New Zealand women artists of the early twenties and thirties, was anathema to the managing bodies of both Galleries. It threatened all those tenets of beauty, idealism and technique held dear to the hearts of National Art Gallery managers, whose own identity, prestige and concept of nation was inextricably bound up with nineteenth-century academia.

This chapter has explored the way in which these self-appointed guardians of public taste apprehended three major modes of cultural representation; that is
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modernism, the place of women artists, and the representation and participation of indigenous peoples. The chapter has demonstrated how, by their adoption and allegiance to one aesthetic model, the governing circles ensured that other forms of art outside that model were regarded as problematic, or indeed, in the case of modernism, its antithesis. The ingrained prejudice against the works by women artists, and modernists and the outright hostility or condescension shown to indigenous subjects (except in New Zealand), had enormous consequences for the future calibre of the two national collections. Eventually modernist satellites, had to be recognised as victorious. In so doing, the majority of the acquisitions by both galleries during the period between the wars became automatically redundant, and only a few of these works have seen the light of day since.
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## APPENDIX A

Trustees of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales (NAGNSW) 1918-1939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name and Title</td>
<td>Elected Treasurer and Officeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Sir Philip W. Street K.C.M.G</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister and the Hon. John Lane Mullins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Sir Philip W. Street K.C.M.G</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister and the Hon. John Lane Mullins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Sir Philip W. Street K.C.M.G</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister and the Hon. John Lane Mullins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Sir Philip W. Street K.C.M.G</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister and the Hon. John Lane Mullins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>The Hon. John Lane Mullins. Replaced by B.J. Waterhouse (President 1939-1958)</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister (held this position until 1943)</td>
<td>Howard Hinton (until 1948), W.H. Ifould (President 1958-1960, Vice-president 1939-1957, Member 1921-1960), Sir Charles Lloyd Jones (Vice President 1947-1958) Sir Lionel Lindsay (member until 1949), Sydney Long A.R.E., J. R. McGregor (was a Board member until 1958), Sydney Ure Smith, O.B.E. (Ure Smith was a member of the Board until 1947. He held the office of Vice-President from 1943-1947), Prof. E.G. Waterhouse M.A. (Professor Waterhouse served as Vice-President 1958-1960, President from 1960-1962 and Board member from 1938-1962), Sir Marcus Clark K.B.E. (Board member 1939-1953).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### Office Bearers and Council of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>T. Shailer Weston</td>
<td>J. M. Ellis, W.A. Bowring</td>
<td>A. Bender, W. Fell, E. Murray Fuller, E. W. Hunt, D. K. Richmond, N. Welch, C. Wilson, W. Gray Young</td>
<td>H. E. Anderson</td>
<td>H. M. Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>T. Shailer Weston</td>
<td>J. M. Ellis, E. W. Hunt</td>
<td>A. Bender, W. Fell, E. Murray Fuller, J. E. Munnings, D. K. Richmond, N. Welch, C. Wilson, W. Gray Young</td>
<td>H. E. Anderson</td>
<td>H. M. Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name 1</td>
<td>Name 2</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Editors</td>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Contributors</td>
<td>Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>D. A. Ewen</td>
<td>W. Gray Young, E. W. Hunt</td>
<td>T. D. H. Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.R.D. Carbery, M. Murray Fuller, R. Hipkins, M. King, H.H. Tombs, G. G.</td>
<td>E. D. Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibbes Watson, N. Welch, W.S. Wauchop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Atkinson, A.R.D. Carbery, M. Murray Fuller, R. Hipkins, M. King, G. G.</td>
<td>E. D. Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gibbes Watson, N. Welch, W. S. Wauchop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Atkinson, A.R.D. Carbery, M. Murray Fuller, R. Hipkins, M. King, R. stout, N. Welch, W.S. Wauchop</td>
<td>E. D. Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Atkinson, A.R.D. Carbery, M. Murray Fuller, R. Hipkins, M. King, R. Stout, N. Welch, W.S. Wauchop</td>
<td>E. D. Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C

Office Bearers in the National Art Gallery of New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Sir George A. Troup, Kt., C.M.G.</td>
<td>D.A. Ewen, Sydney L. Thompson, W. Fielding, H. Gummer, T.D.H. Hall, F.H. Bass (Secretary of the Board of Trustees, National Art Gallery and Museum), E.D. Gore (Secretary, NZAFA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Deputy Chairman</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Committee of Management of the New Zealand National Art Gallery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir George A. Troup, Kt., C.M.G.</td>
<td>W. Fielding (Acting Chairman), C.M Turrell (acting as Deputy for Sir George A. Troup), D.A Ewen, A.D Carbery, T.D.H.Hall, Nugent Welch, Mrs Murray Fuller (Wellington), W.H.Gummer (Auckland), Sydney L. Thompson (Christchurch).</td>
<td>E.D Gore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1938</th>
<th>Chairman</th>
<th>Deputy Chairmen</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### New Zealand National Art Gallery Committee of Management

- **Sculpture:** Messrs. J.M. Ellis, F.H. Shurrock and Richard Gross
- **Graphic Arts:** Messrs. L.T. Watkins, Walter Blundell and H.H. Tombs
- **Architectural:** Messrs. W.H. Gummer, S.W. Fearn, and Wm. Page
- **Educational:** Messrs. T.D.H. Hall, A.D. Carbery, and Sir George Troup
- **Finance:** Sir George Troup, D.A. Ewen, T.D.H. Hall
- **Hanging:** Mrs. Murray Fuller, Nugent Welch, A.D. Carbery
- **Purchase of Reproductions:** Mrs. Murray Fuller, Messrs. Nugent Welch, A.D. Carbery, T.D.H. Hall
### APPENDIX C (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1939</th>
<th>Board of Trustees New Zealand National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Deputy Chairmen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Zealand National Art Gallery Committee of Management**

- **Sculpture:** Messrs. J.M Ellis, F.H Shurrock and Richard Gross
- **Graphic Arts:** Messrs. L.T Watkins, Walter Blundell and H.H Tombs
- **Architectural:** Messrs W.H Gummer, S.W Fearn, and Wm. Page
- **Educational:** Messrs T.D.H Hall, A.D Carbery, and Sir George Troup
- **Finance:** Sir George Troup, D.A Ewen, T.D.H Hall
- **Hanging:** Mrs Murray Fuller, Nugent Welch, A.D. Carbery
- **Purchase of Reproductions:** Mrs Murray Fuller, Messrs Nugent Welch, A. D Carbery, T.D.H Hall
APPENDIX D

NATIONAL ART GALLERY OF NSW:

Length of Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.H. Ifould</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Charles Lloyd Jones</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward W. Knox</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Marshall</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Maund</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Morton</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. John Lane Mullins M.L.C</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Philip W. Street K.C.M.G.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir John Sulman F.R.I.B.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. E.G Waterhouse</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*J.S. Watkins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. St. Vincent Welsh</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sir Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*W. Lister Lister</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sydney Long A.R.E</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. McGregor</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hinton</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sydney Ure Smith</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sir Charles Wade</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ Waterhouse O.B.E. F.R.I.B.A.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Gorman</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.F. Archibald</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sir J.H. Carruthers MP</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Marcus Clarke</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir James Fairfax</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J.D Fitzgerald M.L.C.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average length of service to the Board: 22.6 years.
* Indicates artist members
## APPENDIX E

Years of Service of the Officers of the NZAFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Years of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*H.M Gore</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.D Gore</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*J.M Ellis</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*D.K. Richmond</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*W.Bowring</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M.E.R Tripe</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E.Murray Fuller</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A.R.D Carbery</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Murray Fuller</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.D.H Hall</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.A Ewen</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Shailer Weston</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.Wilson</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.Gray Young</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. von Haast</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A.F Nicoll</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*N.Welch</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*H.E Anderson</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*J.A Heginbotham</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*N.Isaac</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*H.H Tombs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*W.Fell</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.F Hogg</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.S Wauchop</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M.King</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S Elliott</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes those individuals that exhibited with the Academy.
APPENDIX F

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1918.

National Collection

Work/s                                           Artist/s
Vol. II Cartoons                                   Louis Raemackers
20 Framed Photographs of Works                     Franz Hals, Rommey, Geo. Inness, and John S.
10 Etchings by, 1 Aquatint and 1 Wood             Sargent R.A.
    Engraving.                                       Rembrandt

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1919.

Work/s                                           Artist/s
Woods, Upper Thames (watercolour)                 H. Tebbitt
Diana (oil)                                       Giovanni Paolo Pannini
Façade, Roven (etching)                           Mortimer Menpes
The Citadel, Cairo                                A. F. Nicoll

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington.


Work/s                                           Artist/s
Beryl                                            Harley Griffiths
An Idyll                                          W. A. Bowring
Birch Trees                                       E. G. Hood
Original drawing                                  R. Cleaver
The Favourite                                    M. E. Tripe
Drawing (lithograph)                              Muirhead Bone
St. Christina (bas relief)                        Geo. Frampton, R.A.
Wellington Harbour                                J. M. Nairn
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The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington.

Annual Report 30th June, 1921.

Permanent Collection – The Following Works Have Been Added to the Permanent Collection.

**Work/s**

The Weald of Surrey  
Portrait of the Late J. M. Nairn  
Portrait of Miss Margaret Butler  
Seascape  
Portrait of a Lady  
Landscape  
Portrait of George Dawe  
The Captive Before Caesar  
Fruit  
Two Marble Busts  
Seascape  
The Lady and the Harper  
The Eagle's Nest  
Imogen  
Petrocleus  
The Duke of Wellington  
Princess Charlotte  
Andromache Pleading for the Life of Her Son  
Negro and Bull  
Two Small Landscape Sketches  
Several Engravings

**Artist/s**

F. McCracken  
Mabel Hill  
M. E. R. Tripe  
E. Gouldsmith  
F. McCracken  
Arthur Tucker R.B.A.  
By his godfather Geo. Morland, R.A.  
Artist Unknown  
Chas Stuart  
Artist Unknown  
John Gibb  
George Dawe R.A.

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1922.

**Work/s**

The Model  
The Valley of the Spey  
Zinneas  
Portrait of Mrs Fowlds  
A valuable and representative collection of paintings and drawings.

**Artist/s**

Maud Sherwood  
A. F. Nicoll  
D. K. Richmond  
R. S. Clouston  
The late Petrus Van Der Velden
### Annual Report 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1923.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of the late H. C. Williams</td>
<td>M. E. R. Tripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once Upon A Time</td>
<td>H. Linley Richardson, R.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>B. C. Dobie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Top of the Hill</td>
<td>The late F. Sedgwick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scene in Wales</td>
<td>David Cox, Junr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three steel engravings</td>
<td>Gustave Doré</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Report 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1924.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>Terrick Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>Nerl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Landscape</td>
<td>E. Noel Barraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odette</td>
<td>Ruth Hollingsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Horses</td>
<td>Sydney L. Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Last Rays</td>
<td>Sydney L. Thompson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Report 30<sup>th</sup> June, 1925.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Scene</td>
<td>The late J. F. Lewis, R.A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Beach, Dee Wye, Sydney</td>
<td>Maud Sherwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirinoa</td>
<td>Nugent Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses</td>
<td>M. O. Stoddart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Small Sketches</td>
<td>The late Chas. North, A.R.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Rock-bound Stream</td>
<td>E. Gouldsmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marble Bust</td>
<td>L. Summers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-colour Drawings</td>
<td>John Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses</td>
<td>J. L. Macfarlane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess Weir Bridge</td>
<td>Hester Frood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil drawings</td>
<td>Chas. Nuttells</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1926.

Work/s  Artist/s
In the Valley of the Doone  Harry Watson
September Finisterre  A. F. Nicoll
Midlothian Canal  A. F. Nicoll
In Fancy Dress  H. Linley Richardson

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1927.

Work/s  Artist/s
The Blue Ribbon  M. E. R. Tripe
Zinneas  D. K. Richmond
Two drawings  John Flaxman
Set of Sketches  John Constable, R.A.; Sir F. Grant, P.R.A.; S.
Portrait Bust of Mr. H. M. Gore  G. Reid, P.R.S.A.; and H. U. Allan.
                J. Ellis

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1928.

Work/s  Artist/s
Autumn  Armesby Brown, R.A.
May Morning  Harold Speed
The National Park  John Gully
Right of Way  Lee Hankey
Sunrise, Wellington Heads  Esmond Atkinson
West Coast Scene  E. Goldsmith
Avalanche from Mt. Sefton  John Gibb
One Mile Creek  J. D. Moultray
Mount Titoko  E. Chapman
### The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

**Annual Report 30th June, 1929.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Cook</td>
<td>Cecil F. Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonrise</td>
<td>Marcus King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon Light</td>
<td>T. A. McCormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Spring</td>
<td>P. C. Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Nicholson Heads</td>
<td>John Gibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Sir Harold Beauchamp</td>
<td>W. A. Bowring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Wakazipu</td>
<td>W. Menzies Gibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Hawea</td>
<td>J. Morice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claygate</td>
<td>W. H. Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphan's Rock</td>
<td>H. M. L. Atcherly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Inlet</td>
<td>E. Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Harbour</td>
<td>H. M. L. Atcherly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paekakariki</td>
<td>John Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>John Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>C. D. Barraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>C. D. Barraud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

**Annual Report 30th June, 1930.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Lands</td>
<td>N. Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor's Mistake</td>
<td>A. E. Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Gold Country</td>
<td>W. S. Wauchop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfall</td>
<td>Edmund Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhills, New Brighton</td>
<td>W. Menzies Gibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toadstool Land</td>
<td>Jean McKay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Breeze</td>
<td>Sir William Orpen, R.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two steel engravings</td>
<td>A. F. Nicoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of the Late T. G. Macarthy</td>
<td>Algernon Taluemg, A.R.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue and Silver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1931.

Work/s                  Artist/s
Roses                  M. O. Stoddart
May, Daughter of Brig.-Gesi. Andrew C.M.G.  Elizabeth Kelly
Pencil Study of a Boy’s Head  H. Linley Richardson, R.B.A.
In the Trees            W. Tiler
From Bail Hut           M. O. Stoddart
Forty Winks             James Cook
The Stream Heretaunga   H. M. Gore
Riviera Landscape       C. N. Worsley
Interior Study          De Brackelee
The Spit, Middle Harbour, Sydney  W. Robt. Johnson
Landscape               W. Menzies Gibb

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1932.

Work/s                  Artist/s
Sandhills               W. Menzies Gibb
Dunedin from Pine Hill   C. W Carrington
Copy of Virgin and Child After Murillo
Maori Girl              Artist unknown.
Two engravings in colour F. Bartolozzi, after Hans Holbein
The Spit, Middle Harbour, Sydney  W. Robt. Johnson
Drawing                 Christopher Perkins
Wood-cut, Haughton Bay, Wellington  W. J. Cooch
Silver Sea, Irish Coast  Julius Olsson, R.A.

For the National Collection

Copy of Mona Lisa  Antonio Biz, after Leonardo da Vinci

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1933.

Work/s                  Artist/s
Peninsular Winter       Archibald F. Nicoll
Portrait of Professor James Shelley  Leonard H. Booth
Landscape  
Landscape  
Malindi Market, Zanzibar  

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1934.

Works

Finistere (oil)  
Morning Calm, Camaret (oil)  
The Mill Meadow (oil)  
The White Terraces (water-colour)  
The Encounter (water-colour)  
Seascape  
Five steel engravings

Artists

Rhona Hasard  
Rhona Haszard  
Yend King, V.P.R.I.  
C. D. Barraud  
A. S. Paterson  
Alfred Walsh  
Lumb Stocks, R.A. (2), Charles Sharpe (1), an  
A. Willimore, A.R.A. (2).

The New Zealand Academy Of Fine Arts, Wellington

Annual Report 30th June, 1935.

Works

Mountain Harvest (oil)  
Snow-Stocking Glacier (water-colour)  
Portrait of the late Miss D. K. Richmond (oil)  
A valuable collection of China, Furniture,  
Pictures, Bronzes, etc.  
Dieppe  
Changing Pasture (oil)  
Two pieces of Sculpture in Marble

Artists

Cedric Savage  
Miss Margaret O. Stoddart  
Miss Ceredwyn Thornton  
Phillip Conuard, R.A.  
James Nairu  
One by Miss Margaaret Butler; the other a reproduction.
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APPENDIX G

The National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum


Prior to the erection of the new Art Gallery, a number of pictures were presented for inclusion in the National Collection. These pictures were entrusted to the care of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts, and were handed over by that body to the National Art Gallery. Included in the collection were:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Sir Harold Beauchamp (oil painting)</td>
<td>The late W. A. Bowring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A number of pictures from the Baillie Collection brought to New Zealand in 1913.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of china, furniture, pictures, bronzes etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of oils, water-colours, and drawings.</td>
<td>The late Petrus Van der Velden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts also handed over its permanent collection, valued at £13,619. This collection represented the works acquired by the Academy by way of gifts, purchases and through public subscription during the last fifty years, and included several pictures purchased by the Academy with funds granted by the Board of Governors of the T. G. Macarthy Trust.

In addition, the following gifts have been accepted by the Board of Trustees:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quatre Bras</td>
<td>Veriker Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze figures, Giri and Fawn</td>
<td>Dalon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Rain (oil painting)</td>
<td>Quinquella Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace in her Loneliness, Lledyr Valley, Wales</td>
<td>S. J. Lamorna Birch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(oil painting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of the late Sir Robert Stout (oil painting)</td>
<td>Archibald F. Nicoll.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses becomes the son of the Pharoah</td>
<td>George Tinworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughter (terracotta panel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Summer Idyll</td>
<td>Frances Hodgkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A collection of New Zealand pictures</td>
<td>Sydney Thompson, Nugent Welch, C. H. Howarth, Menzies Gibb, John Gully and W. N. Hodgkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Oxen Plough Team and Ploughman on the Sussex Downs</td>
<td>J. C. Dollman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of His Late majesty King George V</td>
<td>John St. Helier Lander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Carrier's Stable</td>
<td>George Morland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two architectural drawings</td>
<td>Ferdinando Galli da Bibiena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Portrait of Sir James Allen
Portrait of the late Sir Francis Bell
Lambton Harbour from Khandallan Track
Wellington Harbour
Shipping, Wellington Harbour
Head of an Old Man
Self Portrait
A Wharfdale Landscape
The Old White Gun
Behind the Scenes
My Own Freshening River
Spring in an English Orchard
Still Life and Katwick
Portrait of the late John Newton, Esq.
Rhododendron, Mt Egmont and the First
Seven of Seventy
An Oil Barn
The Hamlet
Old Gateway, Bruge
Storm on the Moon
Street of the Leather Merchants, Tetuan
Three Boys
The Garden Wall
Lord Rutherford of Nelson
Portrait of the late Archbishop Redwood
Collection of pictures
Portrait of Lord Bledisloe, Governor-General, 1930-1935
Portrait of Sir James Mills (oil painting)
Portrait of Sir Truby King (oil painting)
Portrait of Sir George Troup (oil painting)
Shandon Landscape (water-colour)
Two original drawings
Carillon
Copy of Mona Lisa (da Vinci)
Canberra
Otira Gorge
Pencil sketch
Pohutukawas, Piha

Archibald F. Nicoll
Nugent H. Welch
Sydney Lough Thompson
Mina Arndt (Mrs. Manoy)
Dame Laura Knight, R.A., R.W.S.
John Goe
Hans Heysen
Dame Laura Knight, R.A., R.W.S.
S. J. Lamorna Birch, R.A., R.W.S.
Fred Footet, R.B.A.
Emily M. Paterson, R.W.S.
James Nairn
Miss D. K. Richmond

J. S. Cotman
Armesby Brown
Frank Brangwyn, R.A.
Sir Charles Holmes
James McBey
B. Fleetwood Walker
Sir Charles Holmes
Oswald Birley
F. V. Ellis
The late J. C. Richmond.
John A. A. Berrie

Sir William Llewellyn, P.R.A.
M.E.R. Tripe
Archibald F. Nicoll
Nugent H. Welch
The late George Du Maurier
Captain Longstaffe
Professor Antonio Bin
Robert Johnson
Petrus Van der Velden
Van der Velden
S. J. Lamorna Birch, R.A.
From The National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum

Report of the Board of Trustees for the Year Ended 31st March 1938.

Work/s

- Pines (water-colour)
- Pohutukawas, Piha (water-colour)
- Portrait of His Grace Archbishop Redwood
- Three Engravings, The Duke of Wellington, Judge Chapman, and Captain James Cook
- Anemones and Coast Scene

Artist/s

- Frances Hodgkins
- S. J. Lamorna Birch, R.A.
- C. Porta
- Artist Unknown
- Both by T. A. McCormack

---

1 The committee has no endowment available at present for purchasing pictures...During the year, however, chiefly through the generosity of public-spirited citizens, a number of interesting works were added to the National Collection.
From The National Art Gallery and Dominion Museum

Report of the Board of Trustees for the Year Ended 31st March 1939.

Presented to Both Houses of the General Assembly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work/s</th>
<th>Artist/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Truby King (drawing)</td>
<td>George Finey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Heavy Sea at Moeraki (oil)</td>
<td>George Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A collection of French Fans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two landscapes (watercolours)</td>
<td>Margaret O. Stodart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seascape (watercolour)</td>
<td>Nugent Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deserted Mine, Cornish Coast</td>
<td>Eleanor Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Banks of the Serpentine (pastel)</td>
<td>James W. Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Arbrouth (pastel)</td>
<td>James W. Herald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Across the Straits (water colour)</td>
<td>T. A. McCormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie</td>
<td>A.H. O’Keeffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn, Christchurch</td>
<td>A. Elizabeth Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Angles, South of France (water colour)</td>
<td>James Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl in an Orchard (oil painting)</td>
<td>James Naim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of her Majest the Queen Mary (oil)</td>
<td>Simon Elwes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Sir Joseph Ward</td>
<td>W. A. Bowring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX H**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Reverie 1914</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased in London by S. Ure Smith and J. R. McGregor, 1933 from Christies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Lamorna Birch</td>
<td><em>Changing the Fly, River Dover, Ashbourne, Derbyshire</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased from a one man show at the Grosvenor Galleries Sydney. Birch had travelled to New Zealand and perhaps came to Sydney for the exhibition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Summer Pastures</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased in London from the artist by G.V. Mann, 1926.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald Brundrit</td>
<td><em>A Northern Winter</em>, 1926.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased by the Director G.V. Mann in London, 1926.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Connard</td>
<td><em>Sir Hubert Wilkins</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased in London by William Orpen, 1928.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dugdale</td>
<td><em>The Jericho Vallery and Jordan</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased in 1919.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Dunlop</td>
<td><em>The Pier, Walberswick</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Purchased from Tooth &amp; Sons London by S. Ure Smith and J. R. McGregor, 1933.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX H (Cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Flint</td>
<td><em>The Lemnians</em>, 1924.</td>
<td>Purchased in 1925 on the suggestion of Mr P.H. Morton (Trustee).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Harcourt</td>
<td><em>Spring</em>, 1915.</td>
<td>Purchased from the artist by John London Selection Committee 1917.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pine and Tomato</em> 1932</td>
<td>Purchased by S. Ure Smith and J. R. McGregor in London 1933.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX I**

National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1918

---

**London Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Basque Country</td>
<td>Sir John Lavery, A.R.A</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Eric Kennington</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>A. Munnings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Figures</td>
<td>Laura Knight</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Gloucester Buckets</td>
<td>Arthur Streetton</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Grey Road</td>
<td>W.B. McInnes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Model (Pastel)</td>
<td>Cumbrae Stewart</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Dombey (Pastel)</td>
<td>Cumbrae Stewart</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Disrobing (Pastel)</td>
<td>Cumbrae Stewart</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont Phillipe, Paris</td>
<td>Will Ashton</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launching of the Adelaide</td>
<td>C.E.S. Tindall</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful and Fair (Pastel)</td>
<td>Alfred Coffey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaucluse House (Sketches)</td>
<td>J.A. Crisp</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porto Bello</td>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vale's Chicken</td>
<td>W. Hardy Wilson</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Beach</td>
<td>Percy Leason</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Lloyd Rees</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius</td>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Etchings</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 examples by Members of the Arts and Crafts Society</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 examples (War Pictures)</td>
<td>M.N.Waller (late A.I.F)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Ship &quot;Kanowna&quot;</td>
<td>C.E.S. Tindall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductions from the Works of Old Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Art Gallery of New South Wales

#### Purchases of Works of Art

#### 1919

**London Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Pont Marie</td>
<td>W.H. de Glehn</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Pavillion de Musique</td>
<td>W.H. de Glehn</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jordan Plain from the Desert</td>
<td>T.C. Dugdale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany from the Jericho Road</td>
<td>T.C. Dugdale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror (Applied Arts)</td>
<td>R. Anning Bell, A.R.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Australian Arts Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The River</td>
<td>Penleigh Boyd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haymakers</td>
<td>W.B. McInnes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting</td>
<td>J.R. Jackson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ferry</td>
<td>M.J. McNally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket Willows</td>
<td>M.J. McNally</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors, Widsor</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of New South Wales,</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Royal Art Society of New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirribilli Wharf, Morning</td>
<td>Will Ashton</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.M.S. &quot;New Zealand&quot;</td>
<td>Will Ashton</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready</td>
<td>Martin Stainforth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return from the War</td>
<td>C.E.S. Tindall</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling the Billy</td>
<td>Lawson Balfour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crossing (Etching)</td>
<td>Dorothy Beedham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fishing Net (Etching)</td>
<td>Dorothy Beedham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Etchings</td>
<td>Alfred Coffey</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of a Head (Miniature), and return of a former purchase</td>
<td>Gladys Laycock</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeunesse (Miniature)</td>
<td>Daisy M. Brooks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Society of Artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>Percy Leason</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bella Donna</td>
<td>Norman Carter</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Light</td>
<td>Albert Collins</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tunnel</td>
<td>Albert Collins</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour, Morning</td>
<td>J.R. Eldershaw</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I Don't Like Cook&quot;</td>
<td>Joyce Dennys</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sunlight</td>
<td>Percy Lindsay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kiln</td>
<td>W. Hardy Wilson</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Mill (Etching)</td>
<td>Sid Long</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorers (Pen Drawing)</td>
<td>Percy Leason</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturt at Fort Grey (Pen Drawing)</td>
<td>Percy Leason</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Night Piece in Green</td>
<td>Howard Ashton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quince Tree</td>
<td>Karna Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Society of Women Painters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalind</td>
<td>Dora Wilson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Flowers</td>
<td>Hetty Dynock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Banjo Girl</td>
<td>Maude W. Sherwood</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections</td>
<td>Maude W. Sherwood</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Society of Arts and Crafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings and Design for Embroidery</td>
<td>Muriel Cornish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Dagger Knife</td>
<td>Millicent Elliott</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Silver Spoons</td>
<td>J.R. Linton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Silver Spoon</td>
<td>J.R. Linton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Ethel Atkinson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Exhibition of French War Pictures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Veteran's Advice</td>
<td>Georges Scott</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blue Devil</td>
<td>Paul Roblin</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve of Battle</td>
<td>Lucien Jonas</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Etchings</td>
<td>Andre Devambez</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavalry Charge</td>
<td>Georges Scott</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Purchases (Australian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait</td>
<td>L. Bernard Hall</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staircase, Public Library,</td>
<td>L. Bernard Hall</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Hilda Rix Nicholas</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand 'mere</td>
<td>Hilda Rix Nicholas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Slave Woman</td>
<td>Hilda Rix Nicholas</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Difference of Opinion</td>
<td>Hilda Rix Nicholas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three examples of lalique Glass</td>
<td>W.B. McInnes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plough</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Drawings by Old Masters</td>
<td>A.J.W. Burgess</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.M.A.S. &quot;Australia&quot; leading the 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Cruiser Squadron</td>
<td>The Kiss (Bronze)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Remounts (Bronze)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four French War Medallions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales  
Purchases of Works of Art  
1920

**London Purchases & Commissions completed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Marshal Foch</td>
<td>J.E. Blanche (French)</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of General Pau</td>
<td>P.M. Dupuy (French)</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oil Paintings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth</td>
<td>Mrs. Marion Stokes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August Morning</td>
<td>Arnesby Brown, R.A.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Somme</td>
<td>Charles Bryant</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarkation at Southampton</td>
<td>Mrs. Dora Meeson Coates</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sculpture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comedy and Tragedy</td>
<td>Alfred Gilbert</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Metal Pourer</td>
<td>Albert Toft</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>W. Reid Dick</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kiss</td>
<td>Alfred Drury, R.A.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Purchases**

**Julian Ashton Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullock Team (Water Colour)</td>
<td>F.P. Mahony</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Sydney Identity</td>
<td>Phil May, R.I.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother (Oil Portrait)</td>
<td>Julian Ashton</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tom Roberts' Exhibition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrow Hill (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>Tom Roberts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Miss C. (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>Tom Roberts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arthur Streeton Exhibition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Catalogue Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Siege Gun (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisies (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villers Brettoneux (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Corbie Under Fire (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Subsequently exchanged for an Australian subject - Below the Peaks, Grampians.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.H. Fullwood Exhibition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist/Commissioner</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Castle, Capetown</td>
<td>A. Henry Fullwood</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Lane, Canterbury</td>
<td>A. Henry Fullwood</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(The two works purchased for £120, and the return to the artist of "Billets in France", previously purchased for £120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition of the Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nasturtiums</td>
<td>Margaret Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Margaret Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning, Middle Harbour</td>
<td>Jas. R. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two's Company</td>
<td>Jas. A. Crisp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreaming (Pencil)</td>
<td>J.S. Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Drawing</td>
<td>J.S. Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Greyhound (Sculpture)</td>
<td>M.P. Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>J.W. Tristram</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition of the Society of Artists</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twilight (Pastel)</td>
<td>Howard Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tired Dancer</td>
<td>Olive Crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Interview (Pastel)</td>
<td>Florence Rodway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Sunshine</td>
<td>J. Muir Auld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlit Hydrangeas</td>
<td>W. Hardy Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creepers (Pen and Ink Drawing)</td>
<td>Karna Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Deserted Courtyard (Etching)</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral (Etching)</td>
<td>S. Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolum Mosque (Etching)</td>
<td>David Barker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society of Women Painters</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evening, Bellevue Hill</td>
<td>Gladys Owen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society of Arts and Crafts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six various examples of Applied Art</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Purchases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design for Silk Fan</td>
<td>Florence Mofflin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Bridge, Mosman (Etching)</td>
<td>A. Henry Fullwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Artillery in Action (Photogravure)</td>
<td>H.S. Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward the Guns</td>
<td>Lucy Kemp-Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Lancastrian Vases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1921

(Oil Paintings)

London Purchases

Refugees returning from Cambrai under the protection of an Australian Trooper
Major J. Kerr Lawson 225 0 0

Local Purchases

Under London Bridge
A Busy Afternoon, Pool of London
(These two works accepted in exchange for “The Embarkation at Southamplton” purchased 1920 for £200)

The Polish Lady
Sketch Portrait, Will Dyson
The Sisters
Portrait of J.F. Archibald (commission)
George Coates 262 10 0
Hugh Ramsay 262 10 0
Florence Rodway 105 0 0

From the Royal Art Society of New South Wales
Halcyon
An Old Colonist (Charcoal Drawing)
Lawson Balfour
A. Dattilo Rubbo
131 5 0
15 15 0

From the Society of Artists
Flowers and Fruit
Morning Sky
Hans Heysen
J.D. Moore
210 0 0
31 10 0

From the Society of Arts and Crafts
Five examples of Applied Art
14 1 0

Various Purchases

Portrait of the Artist’s Son
The Valley of the Tweed, New South Wales (commission)
John Longstaff
E. Gruner
315 0 0
315 0 0

Torcello
Poole Harbour
Baddows Meade
Weary
Summer
The Stranger
Richmond Bridge
The Monarch
Etchings
Percival Gaskell
C.H. Baskett
C.H. Baskett
E. Blampied
E. Blampied
E. Blampied
E. Blampied
E.J. Pattison
H. Van Raalte
2 16 0
2 2 0
4 4 0
4 14 0
8 8 0
8 8 0
2 16 0
31 10 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Artist/Title</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Coast Road</td>
<td>Sir Frank Short, R.A.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Mosman</td>
<td>A.H.Fullwood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Castle</td>
<td>Alfred Bentley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ramparts</td>
<td>Alfred Bentley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont Sucre, Bruges</td>
<td>Eirene Mort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quai Vert</td>
<td>Eirene Mort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Gate, York</td>
<td>Eirene Mort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court-house and Cells, Hartley, New South Wales</td>
<td>Eirene Mort</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Temple of Baal</td>
<td>W. Walcot</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Old Woman</td>
<td>L. Squirrell</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont de la tournelle</td>
<td>Archener</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Vizier</td>
<td>M. Bauer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox at Worcester</td>
<td>Robert Spence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the Painter Etcher’s Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosque, Cairo</td>
<td>Herbert Rose</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cottage, Hartley</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull and Bush</td>
<td>A.H.Fullwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Aban’s, Xmas Eve</td>
<td>A.H.Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Cobbles</td>
<td>J.B. Godson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomb in Bethlehem</td>
<td>D. Barker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazaar, Baghdad</td>
<td>D. Barker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning of the Plough</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Jew’s Head</td>
<td>Mina Arndt (N.Z.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From G.W. Lambert's Exhibition, Melbourne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame le Clerc (Oil Painting)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-com. of the Light Horse (Pencil Drawing)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Surrender of Kazamain (Reproduction)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture, Vases, &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Royal Doulton Vases</td>
<td>Royal Doulton Sung Glaze Vase</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Doulton Sung Glaze Vase (Old Sung)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Knot (Bronze)</td>
<td>A. Angel</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(London Purchase)</td>
<td>Web Gilbert</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dutch Cap (Bronze)</td>
<td>E. Finley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

371
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Purchases of Works of Art
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(Oil Paintings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>London Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shadows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Leist</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Leist</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshes near Norwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnesby Brown, R.A.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking towards Skye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Stockes, R.A.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Royal Art Society of New South Wales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Kiss (miniature)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Laycock</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two pencil drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson Balfour</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Society of Artists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The White Glove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. de Mestre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two water-colour drawings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muriel Nicholls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's Cathedral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Friedensen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Bertram Stevens Memorial Exhibition)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Glory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Leason</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.P. Mahony</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Roman Soldier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Fry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Rehearsal (lithograph)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thea Proctor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Chalk Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.S. MacDonald</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Society of Arts and Crafts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six examples</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Exhibition of Institute of Architects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural sketch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.B. Dellit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural sketch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Crust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(From the Painter Etchers' Society)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The River from Waterloo Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Long</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micomicon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barges, Chiswick Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Friedensen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Alley in Antwerp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Friedensen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of the Day (oil)</td>
<td>H.S. Power</td>
<td>52 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team of Bays (water-colour)</td>
<td>H.S. Power</td>
<td>42 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last of the Season</td>
<td>A.M.E. Bale</td>
<td>26 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Harbour</td>
<td>Penleigh Boyd</td>
<td>105 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fiddle Maker (etching)</td>
<td>L. Hopkins</td>
<td>8 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arteries of Great Britain (five etchings)</td>
<td>W.Walcot</td>
<td>36 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.P.O. Adelaide (etching)</td>
<td>J.C. Goodchild</td>
<td>3 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven drawings New Zealand subjects (subsequently transferred to the Mitchell Library)</td>
<td>Chas. Meryon</td>
<td>15 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune in the Clouds (engraving)</td>
<td>After Van Dyck</td>
<td>10 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing the Catch</td>
<td>Chas. Bryant</td>
<td>396 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Tide, St. Ives. And the return to the artist of “On the Somme”, purchase 1920 for £50</td>
<td>Sir F. Seymour Haden</td>
<td>23 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulham (etching)</td>
<td>Douglas Fry</td>
<td>31 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of sketches (pencil)</td>
<td>La Lique</td>
<td>35 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1923

London Purchases (British and Foreign)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Picnic (oil)</td>
<td>Will C. Penn</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Felins (oil)</td>
<td>C. Watelet</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Purchases

From the Royal Art Society of New South Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Bay, Sydney Harbour (oil)</td>
<td>James R. Jackson</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bush Team (watercolour)</td>
<td>H.S. Power</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Workshop (black and white)</td>
<td>F. Whitmore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Society of Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait Study (oil)</td>
<td>Norman Carter</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady in Black (oil)</td>
<td>George Bell</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last of the Trees, Kosciusko (oil)</td>
<td>Howard Ashton</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martigues, South of France (watercolour)</td>
<td>Harold B. Herbert</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ah Lum's Farm, Windsor (etching)</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Society of Artists' London Exhibition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The White Gums (watercolour)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the Society of Artists' Gift Exhibition at Farmer's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Fows (woodcut)</td>
<td>Napier Waller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Ducks (woodcut)</td>
<td>Napier Waller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys (woodcut)</td>
<td>Napier Waller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pengilley's Waggon (etching)</td>
<td>E. Warner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Society of Women Painters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mignon (pastel)</td>
<td>Dora Wilson</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her Garden (black and white)</td>
<td>Muriel Cornish</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flight</td>
<td>Muriel Cornish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Winifred Betts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>A.M. Parsons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blotter</td>
<td>M.D. Bamberger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Painter Etcher's Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sliprails</td>
<td>Squire Morgan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the Range</td>
<td>Bruce Robertson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Landscape</td>
<td>S. Long, A.R.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal in Venice</td>
<td>Thos. Friedenson</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scows at Rest</td>
<td>J.B. Godson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gust</td>
<td>H. Van Raaalte</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm Sheeds</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands of Afternoon</td>
<td>Norman Lindsay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting/Artwork</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rocks, 1898</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Soup Seller</td>
<td>Fred Finley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Lindsay Gordon's Kitchen</td>
<td>J.C. Goodchild</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Milking Shed</td>
<td>Raymond Wallis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Mills</td>
<td>Herbert Rose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Society of Arts and Crafts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Vi Eyre</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Vi Eyre</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Oyley and Design</td>
<td>Bertha Maxwell</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarf</td>
<td>Jessie Booth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag</td>
<td>Jessie Booth</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Penleigh Boyd's Exhibition of European Works**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting/Artwork</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Baiser du Soleil (oil)</td>
<td>Gaston la Touche</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Ecoutant Mozart (oil)</td>
<td>J.A. Meunier</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Senneurs (oil)</td>
<td>Lucien Simon</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justiciary Buildings, Glasgow</td>
<td>Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Various Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting/Artwork</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chatting (oil)</td>
<td>Rupert Bunny</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Garden Bench</td>
<td>Rupert Bunny</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil Drawing</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers and Fruit (oil)</td>
<td>H. Fantin Latour</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Taquine (watercolour)</td>
<td>Thea Proctor</td>
<td>26 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rats' Castle, Tasmania (watercolour)</td>
<td>Blamire Young</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Day, Villefranche</td>
<td>Harold Herbert</td>
<td>36 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moss Grown Tiles</td>
<td>Alfred Coffey</td>
<td>63 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales  
Purchases of Works of Art  
1924

\textit{London Purchases} \hspace{2cm} £ \hspace{1cm} s. \hspace{1cm} d.

Two bronze equestrian groups  
\begin{itemize}
  \item The Offerings of Peace  
  \item The Offerings of War  
  \item Ben Lomond (etching)  
\end{itemize}
  
Gilbery Bayes, sculptor  
(Design and casting)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item £4920  
  \item 0  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.  
\begin{itemize}
  \item £26  
  \item 5  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

\textit{Local Purchases} \hspace{2cm} £ \hspace{1cm} s. \hspace{1cm} d.

From Royal Art Society of New South Wales  
\begin{itemize}
  \item The Road to the Beach (oil)  
  \item Dawn (oil)  
  \item Frankincense and Myrrh (black and white drawing)  
  \item A Spanish Café (black and white drawing)  
\end{itemize}
  
John D. Banks  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 31  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

J.R. Jackson  
\begin{itemize}
  \item --  
  \item --  
  \item --  
\end{itemize}

John Richard Flanagan  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 22  
  \item 1  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

John Richard Flanagan  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 31  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

From Society of Artists  
\begin{itemize}
  \item A Study (oil)  
  \item An Afternoon in Autumn (watercolour)  
\end{itemize}
  
Hans Heysen  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 157  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Hans Heysen  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 157  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

From Society of Arts and Crafts  
\begin{itemize}
  \item D'Oyly  
  \item Table Centre  
  \item Vase  
\end{itemize}
  
Bertha Maxwell  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 1  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Mabel Lush  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 1  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Vi Eyre  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 2  
  \item 2  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

From Exhibition of the Younger Group of Australian Artists  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Illustration (pen drawing)  
\end{itemize}
  
Adrian Feint  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 10  
  \item 10  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

\textit{Various Purchases} \hspace{2cm} £ \hspace{1cm} s. \hspace{1cm} d.

The Farm (oil)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Daniel Vierge  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 45  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Portrait of W. Lister Lister (oil)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Lawson Balfour  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 157  
  \item 10  
\end{itemize}

Vauxhall Bridge, London (oil), (and return of "Canterbury" purchased 1920)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item A.H. Fullwood  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 105  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

The Sultan and His Camp by the Enchanted Lake (oil)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Albert Goodwin, R.W.S.  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 75  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Market Place, Bruges (oil)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Flora M. Reid  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 32  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Twickenham Ferry (watercolour)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item M.J. MacNally  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 15  
  \item 15  
\end{itemize}

Port Issy, Cornwall (watercolour)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Harold Herbert  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 26  
  \item 5  
\end{itemize}

The Bridge at Moret (watercolour)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Harold Herbert  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 21  
  \item 0  
\end{itemize}

Masquerade (pastel)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Dora L. Wilson  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 10  
  \item 10  
\end{itemize}

Black and White Drawing  
\begin{itemize}
  \item L. Raven Hill  
\end{itemize}
  
\begin{itemize}
  \item 7  
  \item 7  
\end{itemize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckinhamshire Pastoral (charcoal)</td>
<td>D. Murray Smith</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (etching)</td>
<td>Fred Richards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granada (etching)</td>
<td>Kenneth Hobson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Puy, France (etching)</td>
<td>Malcolm Osborne, A.R.A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvet Bridge, Durham (etching)</td>
<td>A.Raine Barker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sunny Hill (etching)</td>
<td>L.R. Squirrel, R.E.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulli II (etching)</td>
<td>Anders L. Zorn</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo (pencil)</td>
<td>Professor L. Wilkinson</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgos Cathedral (pencil)</td>
<td>Oliver Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seville Cathedral (pencil)</td>
<td>Sydney Long, A.R.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showery Weather (etching)</td>
<td>Thomas Friedensen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1925

London Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lemnians (oil)</td>
<td>W. Russell Flint, A.R.A.</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Royal Art Society of New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury Landscape (oil)</td>
<td>S. Long, A.R.E.</td>
<td>5105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Society of Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sunny Farm (tinted drawing)</td>
<td>S. Ure Smith</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape, Eltham (watercolour)</td>
<td>Daryl Lindsay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Printer’s Shop, Wynyard Lane (drawing)</td>
<td>W. hardy Wilson</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lighthorse Veteran (drawing)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of J.D. Moore, artist (oil)</td>
<td>Norman Carter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Depths of the Jamison (oil)</td>
<td>Howard Ashton</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pastel) purchased 1919</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Australian Painter – Etchers’ Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timber Haulers (After a painting by C.W. Furse, A.R.A.)</td>
<td>Malcolm Osborne, A.R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forerunners of Fruit</td>
<td>Anna Airy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old English Shepherd</td>
<td>Thomas Friedensen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Grammar School</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Pits on the Downs</td>
<td>Percival Gaskell, R.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thames from Blackfriars Bridge</td>
<td>S. Long, A.R.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Australian Watercolour Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronulla</td>
<td>John D. Moore</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the Hills</td>
<td>Harold B. Herbert</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Society of Arts and Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Ada I. Newman</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Merrie Boyd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel, Batik</td>
<td>H.V. Justelius</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair Ear-rings</td>
<td>Rhoda Wager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounted Pearl Brooch</td>
<td>Rhoda Wager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canal Labia, Venice (oil)</td>
<td>Will Ashton</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploughing (oil)</td>
<td>Harry Garlick</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bowl of Roses (oil)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unloading Boats, Concarneau (oil)</td>
<td>Sydney Thompson</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noon on a Summer's Day (oil)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Slave Market (oil)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Island, Pont Neug (oil)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks of the River Seine (oil)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Landscape (watercolour)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cley Near the Sea (watercolour)</td>
<td>A.H Fullwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor (monotype)</td>
<td>A.H. Fullwood</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait (oil)</td>
<td>P. Mignard (1610-1695)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Easter Holiday (oil)</td>
<td>John D. Moore</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Satyr (sculpture).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Purchase price £250, Purchased by the</td>
<td>Frank Lynch</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees in conjunction with the Millions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung Bronze Vase and Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tang Tomb Figure of a Priest</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bronze French Medallions</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil Drawing</td>
<td>J. Coney</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**London Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting/Work</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rosy-cheeked Ones (watercolour)</td>
<td>Anna Airy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamorna Lane, Evening (watercolour)</td>
<td>Lamorna Birch, A.R.A.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm (dry-point)</td>
<td>Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Germain l’Auxerrois (drawing)</td>
<td>Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plage (oil)</td>
<td>Eugene Boudin</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Pastures (oil)</td>
<td>Armesby Brown, R.A.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Northern Winter (oil)</td>
<td>R.G. Brundrit</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan Design (watercolour)</td>
<td>Charles Conder</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Vieux Pont (oil)</td>
<td>J.B. Corot</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior of the Chapel of Our Lady</td>
<td>J.S. Cotman</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the Mount (pencil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Arch in Thetford Abbey (pencil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape and Cattle (oil)</td>
<td>Mark Fisher, A.R.A.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Guardian (watercolour)</td>
<td>W. Russell Flint, A.R.A.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman Standing (pencil)</td>
<td>A.E. John, A.R.A.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Indian Garden (watercolour)</td>
<td>R.H. Kitson</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing (etching)</td>
<td>Laura Knight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Charlotte Lawrenson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Garden from the Serpentine</td>
<td>Algernon Newton</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(oil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Summer’s Day (watercolour)</td>
<td>A. Riginald Smith</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Flood (oil)</td>
<td>Harry Watson</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto, Venice (oil)</td>
<td>Terrick Williams, A.R.A.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of a Baby (bronze)</td>
<td>F. Derwent Wood, R.A.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statuette (bronze)</td>
<td>Gilbert Bayes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Gize Plaque (“The Lily Maid”)</td>
<td>Gilbert Bayes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Masks (bronze)</td>
<td>W. Reid Dick, A.R.A.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coming Storm (oil)</td>
<td>A.J. Munnings, R.A.</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purchases in Venice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting/Work</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zephyr and the Sea (oil)</td>
<td>Tore Tito (Venetian)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procession to the Cemetery (oil)</td>
<td>Italico Brass (Venetian)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Pears (oil)</td>
<td>G. Pentelei Molnar (Hungarian)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Drawings</td>
<td>A. Rassenfosse (Belgian)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Courtyard (oil)</td>
<td>R. Burghardt (Hungarian)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Model (oil)</td>
<td>R. Burghardt (Hungarian)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebe (etching)</td>
<td>F. Rops (Belgian)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Art (etching)</td>
<td>F. Rops (Belgian)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Purchases

From Royal Art Society of New South Wales
- A Spanish Girl (oil)  
  Lawson Balfour  
  157 10 0
- An Elizabethan Farm, Kent  
  (watercolour)  
  T. Friedensen  
  36 15 0

From Society of Artists
- Sea Cliffs (oil)  
  John D. Moore  
  42 0 0

From Australian Painter – Etchers’ Society
- Ambleside Farmyard  
  Sydney Ure Smith  
  3 3 0
- The Bridge  
  Sydney Long, A.R.E.  
  4 4 0
- The Lonely Tower  
  Perceival Gaskell  
  4 4 0
- A Yorkshire Dell  
  Sir Frank Short, R.A.  
  12 12 0

From Society of Arts and Crafts
- 1 Bowl  
  Ethel Atkinson  
  5 5 0

### Miscellaneous Purchases

- Delphiniums and Lilies (oil)  
  (150 guineas)  
  Hans Heysen  
  157 10 0

- The Track to the Farm (oil)  
  (150 Guineas)  
  “Primroses” (oil), purchased 19224 for 150 guineas, returned to the artist at full value in part payment for these two works

- In the Shadow of the Hills (oil)  
  Tom Roberts  
  91 17 6

- Man and Mountains (oil)  
  E.Gruner  
  157 10 0

- Spring, St. Albans, MacDonald River (oil) (£42)  
  Sydney Long, A.R.E.  
  52 10 0

- In the Constable Country (oil) (£63)  
  “Evening” (oil), purchased 1912 for 50 guineas, returned to the artist at full value in part payment for these two works

- Madonna (marble bust)  
  Sir Bertram Mackennal, K.C.V.O., R.A.  
  168 0 0

- Left and Right (pencil drawing)  
  George W. Lambert, A.R.A.  
  84 0 0
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London Purchase

The Cable Ship (pencil) Rowland Hilder £ 36 5 0

Local Purchases

From Royal Art Society of New South Wales
Noon Dreams (oil) Charles Wheeler £262 10 0

From Australian Painter – Etchers’ Society
The Blacksmith’s Forge (etching) F.V. Burridge, R.E. 10 10 0
Pencil and Wash Drawing Sydney Long, A.R.E. 10 10 0
Pencil Drawing (Study of Trees) Sydney Long, A.R.E. 5 5 0

From Society of Arts and Crafts
Hand-woven blue and rose scarf Joan Mackenzie 2 5 0

Various Purchases

Silk and Lace (oil)
(purchased from accumulated funds of Archibald Prize Bequest) W.B. McInnes 400 0 0
Monaco (oil) Will Ashton 52 10 0
Shipyards, Berrys’ Bay (oil) Percy Lindsay 36 15 0
The Avenue (oil) Robert Johnson 36 15 0
Tulips and Other Stimulants (oil) G.W. Lambert, A.R.A 157 10 0
Decoration for Fan “The 18th Century” (watercolour) G.W. Neville 18 18 0
Blood and Sand (black and white) John R. Flanagan 78 15 0
The Gift (coloured drawing) John R. Flanagan 78 15 0
La Vie de Boheme (lithograph) Charles Condor 10 10 0
St. Maria della Salute (lithograph) Charles Condor 6 6 0
Model Seated (pencil) Randolph Schwabe 8 8 0
Portrait of M.W. (pencil) F.C. Britton 12 12 0
The Slips (etching) F.C. Britton 3 3 0
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1928

**London Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longstock, Winter (oil)</td>
<td>Mark Fisher, R.A.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ash Tree (oil)</td>
<td>Harry Bush</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Sir Hubert Wilkins (oil)</td>
<td>Philip Connard, R.A.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome (watercolour)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, A.R.A.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Society of Artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Athlete (oil)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onions (oil)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smiggin’s Camp, Kosciusko (oil)</td>
<td>Will Ashton</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veda (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>F.H. Coventry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Australian Watercolour Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Shores (watercolour)</td>
<td>M.J. ManNally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Australian Painter Etchers’ Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly Circus (etching)</td>
<td>John Goodchild</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Langston Harbour (etching)</td>
<td>Sir Frank Short, R.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Young Man (pencil)</td>
<td>Thea Proctor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Various Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian Major (oil)</td>
<td>Sir Wm. Orpen, R.A.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Gub Blossoms (oil)</td>
<td>Margaret Preston</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aphrodite (oil)</td>
<td>G.Lyall Trindall</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summertime (oil)</td>
<td>Rupert Bunny</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian of Arroona Valley (watercolour)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont Marie, Paris (etching)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, A.R.A.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The High Mill (messotint)</td>
<td>L. Squirrel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin and Child with the Pear (engraving)</td>
<td>Albrecht Durer</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of Arms with the Cock (engraving)</td>
<td>Albrecht Durer</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Juif de Tafilarat</td>
<td>Alexandre Jacovleff</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Dancer (pencil)</td>
<td>Tha Proctor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recumbent Nude</td>
<td>Randolph Schwabe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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London Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Life (oil) (etching)</td>
<td>George Belcher</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Renan (etching)</td>
<td>Anders Zorn</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Capstan (etching)</td>
<td>Arthur Briscoe</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Amberley Boy (etching)</td>
<td>G.L. Brockhurst, A.R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeze Day, King's Lynn (etching)</td>
<td>H.J. Stuart Brown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launds (etching)</td>
<td>F.L. Griggs, A.R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egham Lock (etching)</td>
<td>Sir F. Seymour Haden, P.R.E.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vachere (etching)</td>
<td>Charles Jacque</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au Marais inonde : le Berger (etching)</td>
<td>Auguste Lepere</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Upper Reach, Benares (etching)</td>
<td>E.S. Lumsden, A.R.S.A., R.E.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Deal (etching)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, A.R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Silver Tide (etching)</td>
<td>Sir Frank Short, R.A., P.R.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Armistice Medal</td>
<td>C.L. Doman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Purchases

From Society of Artists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hill of the Creeping Shadow (oil)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;The Guardian of Arroona Valley&quot; returned to artist in part payment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Society of Arts and Crafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>H.J. Lindeman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>Vi Eyre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Box</td>
<td>K. Blomgren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>K. Blomgren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vase</td>
<td>J.M. Lesslie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Violet Mace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Julian Rossi Ashton (oil)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Roderic Quinn (oil)</td>
<td>J. Muir Auld</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastline (oil)</td>
<td>Charles Wheeler</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quimper (watercolour)</td>
<td>Dora Jarrett</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil sketch of &quot;Hop&quot;</td>
<td>W.T. Smedley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Morrians, Venice (pencil)</td>
<td>John C. Goodchild</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Flowers (woodcut)</td>
<td>Margaret Preston</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twickenham Church (etching)</td>
<td>Sir F. Seymour Haden, P.R.E.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iken (etching)</td>
<td>Martin Hardie, R.E.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Num.1</th>
<th>Num.2</th>
<th>Num.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun and Storm, Suffolk (etching)</td>
<td>Leonard Squirrell, R.E.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George's, Hanover Square (etching)</td>
<td>Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere Gerard (etching)</td>
<td>J. McN. Whistler</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Seville (etching)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### London Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Soldier (oil)</td>
<td>Augustus John, R.A.</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Draughtsman (oil)</td>
<td>Glyn Philpot, R.A.</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman Praying (etching)</td>
<td>Robert Austin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman Milking Goat (etching)</td>
<td>Robert Austin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Purchases

From Society of Artists:
- Self Portrait (oil) (unfinished) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Petunias (oil) by Nora Heysen
- A Young Australian (bronze) by Daphne Mayo

From Special Exhibition of works of G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.:
- The Smiling Sister (oil) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Portrait of a Lady (oil) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Mare and Foal (oil) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- La Croix de Guerre (with large cartoon in pencil and two panels in oil colours) (oil) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Important People (oil) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Trewarmitt, Cornish Landscape by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Head of Woman with Dark Hair (drawing) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- An Old Man with a Pipe (drawing) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Cartoon, 10th Light Horse at the Nek, Gallipoli (drawing) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Coster Girl and Child (drawing) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.
- Pencil and Watercolour study for composition (drawing) by G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.

### Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the Murrumbidgee (oil)</td>
<td>Elioth Gruner</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roses (oil)</td>
<td>Arthur Streeton</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Passing of the Gabo and the Manly (oil)</td>
<td>G.V.F. Mann</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorway to Banqueting Hall, Wardour Castle (watercolour)</td>
<td>G.V.F. Mann</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chez Moi (oil)</td>
<td>L. Bernard Hall</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm (watercolour)</td>
<td>Harold B. Herbert</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Quay, Marseilles (watercolour)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, A.R.A.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Wilson Forest (watercolour)</td>
<td>John D. Moore</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Banks of the Yarra (watercolour)</td>
<td>Louis Buvelot</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulips (watercolour)</td>
<td>Thea Proctor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bay (watercolour)</td>
<td>Thea Proctor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Palace of the Popes Viterbo' (drawing)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, A.R.A.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayside Tale, Dieppe (etching)</td>
<td>Malcolm Osborne, R.A.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Twenty Japanese Prints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girl with Koto</td>
<td>Sukenobu</td>
<td>25 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl and Young Man</td>
<td>Harunobu</td>
<td>150 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Shunko</td>
<td>30 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actor</td>
<td>Shunyei</td>
<td>30 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Woman with Two Maids</td>
<td>Koryusai</td>
<td>65 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Genji in peony garden</td>
<td>Yeishi</td>
<td>45 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bride with Attendants</td>
<td>Shuncho</td>
<td>55 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two courtesans and attendant</td>
<td>Toyokuni</td>
<td>50 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Girl</td>
<td>Yeizan</td>
<td>18 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtesian Kaomachi</td>
<td>Kunisada</td>
<td>22 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman Combing</td>
<td>Toyokuni, 3rd</td>
<td>9 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Yenoshima</td>
<td>Hokusai</td>
<td>45 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasants</td>
<td>Hokusai</td>
<td>35 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Biwa</td>
<td>Kuniyoshi</td>
<td>15 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegon Fall</td>
<td>Yeisen</td>
<td>18 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiko, Tokaido</td>
<td>Hiroshige</td>
<td>18 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Station on Kisokaido</td>
<td>Hiroshige</td>
<td>12 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple at Kyoto</td>
<td>Hiroshige</td>
<td>30 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kameido in snow</td>
<td>Hiroshige</td>
<td>30 yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Utamaro</td>
<td>75 yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1931

Owing to lack of funds no purchases were made abroad during the year.

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FromRoyalArtSocietyofNewSouthWales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflections, McDonald River (oil)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville (drawing)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Portrait (red chalk)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FromSocietyofArtists</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Maid (oil)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mannequin (oil)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Gums of the Far North (watercolour)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball's Head, Sydney Harbour (pencil)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (woodcut)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owls (woodcut)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Crab (woodcut)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FromAustralianWatercolourSociety</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Still Life</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowers and Drapery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FromAustralianPainter-Etcher'sSociety</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Mill by the River (etching)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FromSocietyofArtsandCrafts</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woven Silk Piece</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen Hand-woven Scarf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woven Silk Piece</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kosciusko (oil)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth, England (oil)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Summer’s Eve (oil)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Upper Murray (oil)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses (oil)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fencer (pencil)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolly Shop, Essex-street (drawing)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Burwood Hotel (drawing)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Lane (drawing)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Rajah’s Palace, Benares (etching)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Entry, Madura (etching)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Zafra Market (etching)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rocks at Princes Street</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>3 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition in Regent-street</td>
<td>Stanley Anderson</td>
<td>2 10 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape near Scone (etching)</td>
<td>Squire Morgan</td>
<td>3 3 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales  
Purchases of Works of Art  
1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning in the Markets (oil)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Society of Artists</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Quay, Concarneau (oil)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccaneer (oil)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cosmopolitan (pencil)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinon (pencil)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eldest Daughter (pencil)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hillside (pencil)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curassow and Oleander (woodcuts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbill (woodcuts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Australian Water Colour Society</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bantams (colour lino-cut)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Society of Arts and Crafts</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vase (inlaid clay)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blotter (beaten pewter)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Macleod Gallery</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazons (aquatint)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Model (coloured drawing)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building the Bridge (oil)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring in Sussex (oil)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seine at Pont Neuf (oil)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex Weald (oil)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice (oil)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dome of St. Paul's (etching)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley Street (etching)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offham Church (etching)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Quarry (charcoal)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of the Work</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Price, £</td>
<td>s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite (oil)</td>
<td>Alan Beeton</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Road, Sussex (oil)</td>
<td>Duncan Grant</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pool, Panshanger Park (oil)</td>
<td>Spencer Gore</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerites (oil)</td>
<td>Walter Grieve</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverie (oil)</td>
<td>Augustus John, R.A.</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blue Shop (oil)</td>
<td>Wm. Nicholson</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine and Tomato (oil)</td>
<td>Wm. Nicholson</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pier, Walberswick (oil)</td>
<td>R.O. Dunlop</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney field, Teesdale (oil)</td>
<td>Sir Charles Holmes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parrot and the Roses (oil)</td>
<td>Ethel Walker</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still life, fruit (oil)</td>
<td>S.J. Peploe</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland with Cattle (oil)</td>
<td>James Bateman</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Cornish Farm (oil)</td>
<td>C.G. Guy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in Bretagne (watercolour)</td>
<td>Lucien Simon</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson's Barn (oil)</td>
<td>Sir George Clausen, R.A.</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Boathouse (watercolour)</td>
<td>John Nash</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Nude (pencil)</td>
<td>Eric Gill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Evelyn Beauchamp (charcoal)</td>
<td>Sir Wm. Orpen, R.A.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer (crayon)</td>
<td>J.R. Skeaping</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eland (crayon)</td>
<td>J.R. Skeaping</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Pryde (etching)</td>
<td>Joseph Simpson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Brangwyn (etching)</td>
<td>Joseph Simpson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wingless Chimera (etching)</td>
<td>Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chimera of Amiens (etching)</td>
<td>Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tantallon (etching)</td>
<td>Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Market Place, Wells, Somerset (pencil)</td>
<td>Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Tourelle de la Tixeranderie, Paris (etching)</td>
<td>Charles Meryon</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beggars at the Door of a House (etching)</td>
<td>Rembrandt</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecile (pencil)</td>
<td>Gerald L. Brockhurst, A.R.A.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding at Antwerp (pencil, tinted)</td>
<td>Henry Rushbury, R.A.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street in Antwerp (pencil, tinted)</td>
<td>J.J. Tissot</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral, Antwerp (pencil, tinted)</td>
<td>Maurice Lambert</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Meum (bronze)  Jacob Epstein  100 0 0

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quayside, St. Ives, Cornwall (oil)</td>
<td>Charles Bryant</td>
<td>47 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret (oil)</td>
<td>Leslie Wilkie</td>
<td>78 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirindi Meadows (pencil)</td>
<td>Douglas Pratt</td>
<td>9 9 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Society of Artists</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Homestead Garden (watercolour)</td>
<td>B.E. Minns</td>
<td>15 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repose (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2 2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning Glory (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>3 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensive (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>1 11 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Various Purchases**

| After the Storm (oil)                    | J.Ford Paterson | 157 10 0 |
| Pastures, Bacchus Marsh (oil)            | Will Ashton     | 105 0 0 |
| The Cornish Coast (oil)                  | Tom Roberts     | 350 0 0 |
| Bailed Up (oil)                          | A.J. Murch      | 26 5 0 |
| Allen (oil)                              | Howard Barron   | 42 0 0 |
| Afternoon, Kangaroo Valley (oil)         | A.J. Murch      | 150 0 0 |
| Idle Hours (oil)                         | Gertrude Odillo Maher | 17 17 0 |
| The Coronation (miniature after Fra Angelico) | John Eldershaw | 15 15 0 |
| The Waterwheel (watercolour)             | Maud Sherwood  | 21 0 0 |
| White and Yellow Flowers (watercolour)   | Maud Sherwood  | 52 10 0 |
| Viterbo' (watercolour)                   | Mme. Bresslem Roth | 2 0 0 |
| Macaws (coloured woodcuts)               | Mme. Bresslem Roth | 2 0 0 |
| Hubertus (coloured woodcuts)             | Leo Frank       | 3 3 0 |
| In the Tropics (coloured woodcuts)       | Stanley Anderson | 6 6 0 |
| The Reading Room (etching)               | A.J. Murch      | 8 8 0 |
| Alpallugna (coloured chalk)              | A.J. Murch      | 7 7 0 |
| Kudingra (pencil)                        | A.J. Murch      | 7 7 0 |
| The Mail Man (pencil)                    | Hedley Fitton   | 8 8 0 |
| Theatre of Marcellus, Rome (etching)     |  |  |
| Gums and Sheds on Southern Tablelands (pencil) | Douglas Pratt | 15 15 0 |
| St Salvi, Albi (pencil)                  | A.J. Brown     | 12 12 0 |
| St. Trophime, Arles (pencil)             | A.J. Brown     | 12 12 0 |
| Vase in the Manner of Liang Yao          | Ernest Finlay   | 10 10 0 |
| "Australian Chivalry" (book)             | 3 3 0 |

**Collection of 22 coloured reproductions as under**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L'Estaque</td>
<td>After P. Cezanne</td>
<td>1 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House on the Hill</td>
<td>After P. Cezanne</td>
<td>1 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Pine Tree</td>
<td>After Derain</td>
<td>1 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta Matete</td>
<td>After Gauguin</td>
<td>1 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahiti</td>
<td>After Gauguin</td>
<td>1 10 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunflowers</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Arles</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Boats</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Way to Work</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornfield with Black Birds</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pumpkin</td>
<td>After Matisse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris la Cite</td>
<td>After Signac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Road</td>
<td>After de Vlaminck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of St. M.</td>
<td>After Utrillo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Portrait</td>
<td>After Van Gogh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldfish</td>
<td>After Matisse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Station</td>
<td>After Rousseau</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Poppy Field</td>
<td>After Monet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria della Salute</td>
<td>After Signac</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of La Rochelle</td>
<td>After Signac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The River Bank</td>
<td>After de Vlaminck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Seine</td>
<td>After Monet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1934

Local Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Old Road, South Coast (oil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Portrait (charcoal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 12 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Abbott</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Australian Watercolour Institute</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chines Jar (watercolour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vida Lahey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Pigeon Loft (oil)</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The BeguHNages, Bruges (oil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening of Centennial Park (watercolour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street Singer (watercolour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympus (watercolour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Light (watercolour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Streeton (pencil portrait)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Wheelwrights (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 14 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Bilbo (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Bluff (pen drawing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Paris (pen drawing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Desert Caravan (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Persian Bazaar (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barksea from BirkriGG (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Beach (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago (etching)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Art Gallery of New South Wales  
Purchases of Works of Art  
1935

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Art Society of New South Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drying Sails (oil)</td>
<td>James R. Jackson</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old St. Paul’s, Cobbity (oil)</td>
<td>Henry A. Hanke</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Society of Artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Chaumiere (oil)</td>
<td>Camille Pissarro</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Point to Point Meeting (watercolour)</td>
<td>Daryl Lindsay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Painter Etchers and Graphic Arts Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study for Etching (pen drawing)</td>
<td>Cedrie Emanuel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Docks (etching)</td>
<td>Wm. Hunter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Three Spires (pen drawing)</td>
<td>Lloyd Rees</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Various Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Wellington, Tasmania (oil)</td>
<td>Roland Wakelin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of G.V.F. Mann (oil)</td>
<td>W.B. McInnes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Farm, Ermington (oil)</td>
<td>H.R. Gallop</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookham Lock (oil)</td>
<td>Stanley Spencer, A.R.A.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber (watercolour)</td>
<td>Harold B. Herbert</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Scene (watercolour)</td>
<td>W. Callow</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves, Sunlight and a Bridge (watercolour)</td>
<td>J.R. Eldershaw</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Hills (watercolour)</td>
<td>Kenneth Macqueen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martigues, Evening (watercolour)</td>
<td>J.H. Young</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the Revolution, Malaga (watercolour)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penguins (coloured woodcut)</td>
<td>V. Murray Griffin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Day (coloured woodcut)</td>
<td>V. Murray Griffin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kookaburras (coloured woodcut)</td>
<td>V. Murray Griffin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canna (coloured woodcut)</td>
<td>V. Murray Griffin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound for the Rio Grande (etching)</td>
<td>Arthur Briscoe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia and Trunk (woodcut)</td>
<td>Margaret Preston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting Gravel (etching)</td>
<td>E. Warner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Peacock (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The White Fan (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dancer (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Heron (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat and Rhododendron (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Goats (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pelican (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigonias (woodcut)</td>
<td>Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

395
The Mask (bronze)  G. Rayner Hoff  42  0  0
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National Art Gallery of New South Wales
Purchases of Works of Art
1936

Local Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Road to Wollombi (oil)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peonies (oil)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese in Blue (oil)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Egoist (Glazed Head)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Society of Artists</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior (oil)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Piece (oil)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Habour (oil)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Painter Etchers and Graphic Arts Society</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to Old Stables of Cobb &amp; Co., Melbourne (etching)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Fullwood Memorial Exhibition</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow Castle (oil)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chalk Quarry (watercolour)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proud Maisie (pencil drawing)</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Javanese Woman (oil)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Feast (watercolour)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Argument (watercolour)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose and Banksia (oil)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charred Tree Stumps (watercolour)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concarneau from Ramparte (oil)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl with Gloves (drawing)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marbella, Spain, from My Hotel (oil)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Buildings, Sospel, France (oil)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately one hundred and forty Coloured Reproductions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Longstaff</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bertram MacKennon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Phil May
By A. Altson
By Himself
By Himself
By A. Altson
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### National Art Gallery of New South Wales
### Purchases of Works of Art
### 1937

**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Royal Art Society of New South Wales</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Afternoon, Autumn (oil)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Morning Moon (oil) (Marshall Bequest)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From Society of Artists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L'Alza del Constitucion (watercolour) (Marshall Bequest)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Macquarie Street Interior (oil)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mlle. Alice (oil)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Piece (oil)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Various Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Portrait (oil)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of a Lady (oil)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter of the Innocents (oil)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of John Farmer (oil)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Showers (oil)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slopes of Olinda (oil)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melon (oil)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Street Runners (oil)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument in Micomicon (watercolour)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs for Comfort (watercolour)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life in the Temple (etching)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tryst in Arcadia (etching)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the Fly, River Dove, Derbyshire (oil)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group - Mrs. Lambert, Mr. Gordon and Mr. Snekker (pencil)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Wet Day in Tunis (watercolour)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetangera, Canberra (oil)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeons (watercolour)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (watercolour)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James (pastel)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Beaver Hat (oil)</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Road near Cobbity (watercolour)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan (pencil)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matinee Rehearsal (oil)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of Mme. De Pompadour (engraving)</td>
<td>Jean L. Anselin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klos Wuczer und Acker Concz (engraving)</td>
<td>Hans Sebald Beham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity (engraving)</td>
<td>Peter Brueghel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Muleteer (etching)</td>
<td>Jan Both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicholas Preaching (etching)</td>
<td>Jacques Callot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama of a Town beside a River (etching)</td>
<td>Antonio Canale (called &quot;Canaletto&quot;)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Aretino (engraving)</td>
<td>Cornelis van Dalen</td>
<td>Gift to Galler from Colnaghi &amp; Co</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice, Count of Orange-Nassau etc. (engraving)</td>
<td>Willem Jacobszoon Delff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Angel appearing to Joachim (woodcut)</td>
<td>Albrecht Dürer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Breughel (etching)</td>
<td>Sir Anthony van Dyck</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles I (engraving)</td>
<td>Willaim Faithorne</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Departure for the Pastures (etching)</td>
<td>Claude Gelle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muffs, Mask, Gloves, etc (etching)</td>
<td>Wenceslas Hollar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin Cureau de la Chambre (engraving)</td>
<td>Antoine Masson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier le Fevre d'Ormesson (engraving)</td>
<td>Antoine Masson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of J.G. Wille (engraving)</td>
<td>Johann von Müller</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Chrystin (engraving)</td>
<td>Jean Morin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Poncelet (engraving)</td>
<td>Robert Nanteuil</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appollo and Daphne (engraving)</td>
<td>Agostino de Musi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ among the Doctors (etching)</td>
<td>Rembrandt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Adoration of the Magi</td>
<td>Cristofano Robetta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sleeping Shepherd (etching)</td>
<td>Johann Roos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flight into Egypt (etching)</td>
<td>Giovanni Tiepolo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bust of a Man with Curly Hair (etching)</td>
<td>Jan Georg van Vliet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope Pius Eneas and the Emperor Frederick III sitting on one Throne (woodcut)</td>
<td>Michael Wolgemuth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening, Genoa (drypoint)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Apse, Leon Cathedral, Spain (drypoint)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Haut d'un battant de porte (etching)</td>
<td>Felix Bracquemond</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester (drypoint)</td>
<td>Francis Dodd, R.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna (drypoint)</td>
<td>Francis Dodd, R.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanctuary of St. Francis, Assisi (etching)</td>
<td>Percy Francis Gethin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Bull overturning a horse (aquatint)</td>
<td>Francisco Goya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Dog and a Cock upon a Journey (engraving)</td>
<td>Stephen Gooden, A.R.A., R.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wolf and Kid (engraving)
A Jewess resting her head on her hand (etching)
Prayer (etching)
En Foret (engraving)
La ferme au grand arbre (etching)
Une femme pres d'une haie (drypoint)
Le long de la rive (etching)
La Ferme de l'abbaye (etching)
"Zero": A Sixty-five pounder opening fire (drypoint)
Mediaeval Magic, Louviers (etching)
The Steps, Luxembourg Gardens, Paris (lithograph)
Draped Figure, seated (lithograph)
A Ruined Church (pencil drawing)
A Woman, in profile to right (red chalk drawing)
Countess Weir Bridge, Near Exeter, Devon (watercolour drawing)
Portrait of Dorji Passan (pencil drawing)
The Covered Waggon (tinted drawing)
A Monkey (coloured drawing)

Stephen Gooden, A.R.A., R.E.
Augustus John, A.R.
Julius Komjati, A.R.E.
Jean Laboureur
Alphonse Legros
Alphonse Legros
Alphonse Legros
Alphonse Legros
James McBey
A.C. Webb
James McNeill Whistler
James McNeill Whistler
John Sell Cotman
Mrs. Catherine Dodgson
Miss Hester Frood
Francis Helpes, R.B.A.
Thomas Rowlandson
John Skeaping
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**Local Purchases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Society of Artists</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Flowers (oil)</td>
<td>Nora Heysen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canal, Venice (watercolour)</td>
<td>Daryl Lindsay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Sunshine (oil)</td>
<td>Lloyd Rees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Farm (drawing)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady with a Fan (oil)</td>
<td>Geo. W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From XV Group</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sunshine, St. Ives, Cornwell (oil)</td>
<td>Will Ashton, R.O.I.</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Palace, D'Vignon (drawing)</td>
<td>D'Auvergne Boxall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos (oil)</td>
<td>Fred Leist</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into the Light (oil)</td>
<td>Percy Lindsay</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Australian Watercolour Institute</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oriental Harmony (watercolour)</td>
<td>Margaret Coen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Sketch (watercolour)</td>
<td>R.H. Stuart</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Painter-Etchers and Graphic Art Society</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halvorsen's (etching)</td>
<td>Cedric Emanuel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Man (drawing)</td>
<td>Cav. A. Dattilo-Rubbo</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's Square (etching)</td>
<td>Cedric Emanuel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkesbury Corn Barn (etching)</td>
<td>Squire Morgan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the Australian Academy of Arts</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Farmyard Gum (watercolour)</td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Various Purchases</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banksia or Bottlebrush (oil) (Marshall Gift Fund)</td>
<td>W. Lister Lister</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Peaks (coloured print)</td>
<td>Ethleen Palmer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algernon Talmage, R.A., Martha and James (oil)</td>
<td>Geo. W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misty Morning, Dora Creek (oil)</td>
<td>Julian Ashton, C.B.E.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamarama Beach, 40 years ago, Summer Morning (oil)</td>
<td>Julian Ashton, C.B.E.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Afternoon (oil)</td>
<td>Howard Ashton</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Lye, Esq. (decorative head in marble)</td>
<td>Raynor Hoff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta (bronze)</td>
<td>Raynor Hoff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules, Archelous, Deianeira (bronze)</td>
<td>Raynor Hoff</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Scott Siddons (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>Alexandre Iacovleff</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bridge, South Coast, Landscape (pen drawing)</td>
<td>Sir Thomas Lawrence, P.R.A.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Richard Want (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>Lloyd Rees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape (watercolour)</td>
<td>G.W. Lambert, A.R.A.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hans Heysen</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of 151 prints and drawings purchased by Mr. Harold Wright for Colnaghi and Co., London, viz -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Calais Pier (watercolour drawing)</td>
<td>W.R. Beverley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Noria, near Cartagena (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>Edward W. Cooke, R.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Italian Peasant reclining on the Shore, Alassio (pencil, black chalk And wash drawing)</td>
<td>John Copley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh Church, Norfolk (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>John Sell Cotman</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheal Betsy Mine, Dartmoor (watercolour drawing)</td>
<td>Cecil Arthur Hunt, R.S.W.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Young Woman Standing (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>Augustus E. John</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bust of a Young Woman (pencil drawing)</td>
<td>Jacob Kramer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Blown&quot; - A Paris Cart-horse (black chalk drawing)</td>
<td>Lowes Dalbiac Luard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series of 14 pen and ink drawings</td>
<td>Leonard Raven-Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study for a Painting - &quot;The Sower&quot; (red chalk drawing)</td>
<td>C.H. Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of a woman stooping (black and coloured chalk drawing)</td>
<td>William Strang, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annunciation (etching and engraving)</td>
<td>Federigo Barocchio</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Burgo Master (line engraving)</td>
<td>Jacques Beauvarlet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatius Loyola (Mezzotint)</td>
<td>John Faber, Jr.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriaen van Ostade (Mezzotint)</td>
<td>Jacob Gole</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The whole etched workof Adriaen van Ostade Smoker and Drinker (line engraving)</td>
<td>Georg Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of Arms of Sebald Beham (line engraving)</td>
<td>Hans Sebald Beham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat of arms, with a lion on a shield (line engraving)</td>
<td>Hans Sebald Beham</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Mistress (line engraving)</td>
<td>Abraham Bosse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sultan&quot; (aquatint in colours)</td>
<td>Edward Duncan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Jacques Rousseau (mezzotint)</td>
<td>David Martin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Page to the &quot;Carceri&quot; (Prisons) Series (etching)</td>
<td>Giovanni Piranesi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and the Woman at the Well (etching)</td>
<td>Rembrandt van Rijn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rat Poison Seller (etching)</td>
<td>Rembrandt van Rijn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artwork Description</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ Healing the Sick (etching)</td>
<td>Rembrandt van Rijn</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn Evening, Lowestoft (drypoint)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Convent of San Payo (drypoint)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Sheds, Marseilles (drypoint)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Clyde (set of 6 lithographs)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Ships (set of 6 lithographs)</td>
<td>Sir Muirhead Bone</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel chapotard reading in the &quot;Law Journal&quot; the Eulogy of himself, written by himself (litograph)</td>
<td>Honore Daumier</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes, La Communion des Malades (drypoint)</td>
<td>Jean Louis Forain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherton Chapel (etching)</td>
<td>Frederick Landseer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madame Jacquemoise (drypoint)</td>
<td>Griggs, R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The House of Mystery (aquatint)</td>
<td>Paul Helleu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sleeping Square (Brieg) (aquatint)</td>
<td>Sydney Lee, R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MacNab (mezzotint)</td>
<td>Sydney Lee, R.A., R.E.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Somme Front, 1917 (drypoint)</td>
<td>Henry Macbeth Raeburn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Petit Pont, Paris (etching)</td>
<td>James McBey</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Morgue, Paris (etching)</td>
<td>Charles Meryon</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue des Toiles, a Bourges (etching)</td>
<td>Charles Meryon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romantic Landscape (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Letter (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Sturge Moore, wearing a cloak (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wood Nymph (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Snow, Winter (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrait of the Artist (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Estuary (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Re-Birth of the Arts (lithograph)</td>
<td>Charles Shannon, R.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deux Chats (lithograph in colours)</td>
<td>Alexandre Steinlen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham (woodcut in colours)</td>
<td>Yoshijiro Urushibara</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twilight (aquatint in colours)</td>
<td>A.Y. Whishaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumette (etching)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vieille aux Loques (etching)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wine Glass (etching)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billingsgate (etching)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drouet, a Sculptor (drypoint)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rag Gatherers (etching)</td>
<td>James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tiny Pool (etching)</td>
<td>Anders Zorn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark Angers (reproduction)</td>
<td>After Sir D.Y. Cameron, R.A.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturne (Old Battersea Bridge) (reproduction in colour)</td>
<td>After James McNeill Whistler</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Volume reproductions of the lithographs of H. Fantin-Latour</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### National Art Gallery of New South Wales
### Purchases of Works of Art
### 1939

#### London Purchases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Boy at the Basin (oil)</td>
<td>William Dobell</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Man (coloured reproduction)</td>
<td>Vincent van Gogh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing Girl (coloured reproduction)</td>
<td>Edgar Degas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition (coloured reproduction)</td>
<td>Edgar Degas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station (coloured reproduction)</td>
<td>Claude Money</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Barcas (wood engraving)</td>
<td>Frank Medworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning by the Bech Straithes (oil)</td>
<td>Frank Medworth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Roofs (oil)</td>
<td>Maurice de Blaminck</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Red Pheonix (watercolour)</td>
<td>Antique Chines - Ming Dynasty</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Cabaretiere (oil)</td>
<td>Paul Gauguin</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Pont Neuf sous la Neige (oil)</td>
<td>Albert Marquet</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A collection of 1,677 reproductions in 57 folios purchased by Mr. Harold Wright of P. &amp; D. Colnaghi &amp; Co., London</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Local Purchases

**From Society of Artists**
- **Suspense (oil)**: Norman Lindsay 63 0 0
- **Study of a Balinese Legong Dancer (terra-cotta)**: Arthur Fleischmann 26 5 0
- **Windsor, New South Wales (watercolour)**: John C. Goodchild 13 2 6

**From the Royal Art Society**
- **Milking Time (oil)**: J. Salvana 36 15 0

**From the XV Group**
- **White Gum Blossoms (oil)**: George Finey 42 0 0
- **George H. Forsyth, Esq (oil)**: J.H.R. Rousel 15 15 0

**From the Australian Water-Colour Institute**
- **The Sketch Club (watercolour)**: J. Baird 8 8 0

#### Various Purchases
- **Farm in Sussex (watercolour)**: Daryl Lindsay 12 12 0
- **La Haleur (bronze)**: Paul Landowski 127 17 0
- **The Mill (coloured reproduction)**: Albrecht Durer 3 3 0
- **Landscape (coloured reproduction)**: Thos. Gainsborough 2 12 6
- **Blue Vase (coloured reproduction)**: Paul Cezanne 4 4 0
- **Seven pencil drawings**: Eric Gill 5 5 0
**APPENDIX J**

**TRUSTEES OF THE NAGNSW**

**SOURCES OF INCOME**

Listed Alphabetically:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Archibald</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Marcus Clarke</td>
<td>Retail. Marcus Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Politician. M.L.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Hinton</td>
<td>Benefactor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Ifould</td>
<td>The Public Librarian, Library of New South Wales, Chairman N.S.W. Board for (International) Stock Exchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lloyd Jones</td>
<td>Retail. David Jones Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. Knox</td>
<td>Co-Director C.S.R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Lionel Lindsay</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Long</td>
<td>Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. McGregor</td>
<td>Company Director, P &amp; O Pty. Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Marshall</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Maud</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip H. Moreton</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Lane Mullins</td>
<td>Solicitor and M.L.C. Hon., Treasurer, St. Mary's Cathedral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Ure Ssmith</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip W. Street</td>
<td>Judge and Chief Justice 1925 - 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. J. Waterhouse</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. G. Waterhouse</td>
<td>Horticulturist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Watkins</td>
<td>Artist and Art School Owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John St. Vincent Welch</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated, through an examination of the art practices of two Dominion national art galleries in the inter-war period, that the sustained, premier presence within their walls was that of the British model. This model not only determined the relative place of such areas as domestic art, modernism and indigeneity, but also ensured that the official taste disseminated to the viewing public of both Sydney and Wellington was one steadfastly loyal to British Royal Academy art practice.

For these two galleries at least, theirs was the art of the family of Empire. It was a family which had clear understandings and definitions of familial characteristics, supported by equally clear understandings of what was outside of those acceptable characteristics. Given these boundaries, very little anxiety over what art practice was acceptable was evident in their practices. The result of their shared ideology was a particular coherence of art practice, creating a canon of sustained dominance whose purpose was to reinforce imperial sentiment. Equipped with well-understood codes of culture and connoisseurship, the officers of these institutions were able emphatically to confirm and consolidate an affiliation with the metropolitan centre and to insist upon this with all the power and prestige of their institutional authority.

The major findings of this study, therefore, centre on the institutionalised structures through which the canon of British art, as determined and decreed by the London Royal Academy, became the lynch-pin for both galleries as both the illustration of Empire membership and the model for aesthetic taste. By no means was this model merely the vehicle for providing art lessons to the enthusiasts of the
antipodes. For these Galleries, the ability to represent British art as their own meant that not only was Britishness, and therefore the Empire, reinforced but also a claim to membership of British culture and all that this implied. As this study has demonstrated, the London Royal Academy provided all that was considered necessary for these tasks. As a recent history of British art has concluded, 'as far as the London Royal Academy was concerned it was British art'.

This understanding was not confined to the antipodes. In Great Britain too, 'local authorities' throughout the country 'did their annual shopping [at the LRA] so that those in the regions could see the latest triumphs of the British School'. As this study argues, those in the 'regions' were not the only beneficiaries of Academy art works and teachings; the Academy's presence in the NAGNSW and the NZNAG was also paramount. Indeed, although not a claim pursued in this study, it could be argued that the Academy's influence was arguably greater, and certainly more sustained in Australia and New Zealand than in Great Britain itself.

This study has shown that inherent within such patronage was a belief in the social, as well as the artistic, importance of high culture which was shared by both galleries. The cultural ideal is best exemplified in the writings of Matthew Arnold. In his essay Culture and Anarchy, Arnold argued that the proper origin of culture lay not in curiosity but in the love of perfection. 'It moves' he wrote, by 'the force, not merely or primarily of the scientific passion for pure knowledge, but also of the moral and social passion for doing good'. This 'love of perfection', together with a faith in the close association of culture and high-minded moral and social endeavours, formed the essential philosophy which was shared by the gallery

---

2 Ibid., p. 587.
officers of both countries. As this study has argued, the implications of their adherence to these cultural and artistic convictions had major impacts upon the collections and exhibitions held by the galleries, and also had tremendous ramifications for the domestic art practices in both countries. The effect of this was a cultural embargo felt in ways both direct and indirect. Denied access to their State’s and nation’s most powerful art institutions, artists working in ways not condoned by gallery Trustees and Councillors endured a major loss of prestige and profile. Their work was simply not included in the gallery collections. The official, visual culture offered by both galleries was the result of choices made by a group of individuals united in their desire to promote Britishness and guard against any perceived philistinism or nihilism.

This didactic artistic philosophy meant, for instance, that the reception of modernism first had to be determined by its acceptance within the aesthetic metropolis of London. This study argues that, for these Dominion institutions, modernism first had to be seen as British, and second had to be accepted by the LRA before its presence could be acknowledged and included within these galleries’ collections.

The Australian scholar Leigh Dale argues that ‘conservative definitions of culture prefer to present it as a pure and timeless entity’, unaltered by contact with ‘other’ peoples. This conceptualisation, however, depends upon ‘a constant making and marking of difference between those who are cultured, and those who are not’. In the world of art, connoisseurship in a similar way was a major credential in the determination of which individuals were to be trusted with the responsibility of manning the watchtowers of culture, ever alert to the intrusions of modernism. To

---
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possess 'connoisseurship' was a credential acknowledged by the Trustees themselves as absolutely essential - it implied all that was considered admirable in a discerning cognoscenti. As revealed in this study, gallery officers were drawn, in the main from a single class, a mercantile elite. Among this class, those most likely to be considered connoisseurs might be found, officers who would seek the kudos and approval of the various cultural associations to be found at the heart of the Empire, most importantly the London Royal Academy. The power of this collective ethos has been demonstrated in both acquisitions and exhibitions as each became institutionalised within gallery practice.3

The findings of this empirical study provide, for the first time, a proper analysis of the essentially British taste and aesthetics advocated by these most important art establishments between the wars. By so doing, the study argues for a re-examination of the place allocated to these significant elements of Australian and New Zealand art histories. A tendency in both Australian and New Zealand art historical writing to dismiss past patronage, and the exhibitions and models of these institutions, as simply 'conservative' or 'traditional' has been typical in judging art practices which have subsequently become peripheral. Also, as these British art practices are seen to reflect an historical and political alliance no longer considered advantageous by most Australians and New Zealanders, any acknowledgement of the importance of the British model in art history has become problematic. Even to acknowledge Britishness and the teachings of the Academy was to argue against modernism and the independence of domestic, 'national' art, areas which had become by the seventies, the focus of art history writing and criticism. Equally, histories written within the frame of modernism, for example, have ensured that the

histories of cultural practices that were always outside that frame also lost out. The art practices of these National art galleries between the wars were just such casualties.

The space occupied by the centre and the peripheries of art was, for both Australia and New Zealand, eventually reversed. The heart of Empire was the centre, the periphery both physically distant and aesthetically problematic. The reversal of this order was achieved with complex accommodations, both political and aesthetic. However, in the period between the wars, as Ian Burn has written so emphatically, ‘imperialism was the sanest form of nationalism’ and ‘Australians were really off-shore Englanders’.⁶

Therefore, clearly to identify and articulate the source and make-up of the ‘traditional’ and ‘conservative’ presence in Australian and New Zealand art in the period between the wars is to restore its presence within the art historiography of these two countries. Just as much art history writing since the Second World War has been too prescriptive in demanding a focus centred on a modernist perspective, the careful identification and re-examination of its apparent apotheosis in this particular gallery practice is over-due. Proper accounting needed to be done, not only to argue for the continued presence of Britishness, but equally to argue for further acknowledgement of the complexities inherent within this inter-war period in Australian and New Zealand art histories. As Ian Burn has noted, post-modern art historians should ‘do justice to the more traditional work which has been written out of the history of Australian art’.⁷ This study has undertaken just such an examination.

---

⁷ Ibid., p.243.
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ABSTRACT

This study examines the art practices and management of the National Art Galleries of Australia and New Zealand in the period between the wars, 1918-1939. It does so in part to account for the pervading conservatism and narrow corridors of aesthetic acceptability evident in their acquisitions and in many of their dealings. It aims to explore the role of Britishness, through an examination of the influence of the London Royal Academy of Art, within these emerging official art institutions.

This study argues that the dominant artistic ideology illustrated in these National Gallery collections was determined by a social elite, which was, at its heart, British. Its collective taste was predicated on models established in Great Britain and on traditions of connoisseurship. This visual instruction in the British ideal of culture, as seen through the Academy, was regarded as a worthy aspiration, one that was at once both highly nationalistic and also a tool of Empire unity. This ideal was nationalistic in the sense that it marked the desire of these Boards to claim for the nation membership of the world’s civil society, whilst always acknowledging that the vehicle to do so was through an enhanced alliance with British art and Culture.

The ramifications of an Empire-first aesthetic model were tremendous. The model severely constrained taste in domestic art, limited the participation of indigenous peoples and shaped the reception of modernism.
INTRODUCTION

Yet there is something strange, I would agree,
    In those dumb continents below the Line.
The roots are European, but the tree
    Grows to a different pattern and design;
Where the fruit gets its flavour I'm not sure,
    From native soil or overseas manure.

    And this uncertainty is in our bones.
Others may think us smug or insular;
The voice perhaps is brash, its undertones
    Declare in us a doubt of what we are.
When the divided ghost within us groans... 

This study is an examination of the art practices of two Antipodean national Art Galleries, that of the National Art Gallery of New South Wales (NAGNSW), the New Zealand National Art Gallery (NZNAG) and its precursor, the New Zealand Academy of Fine Art (NZAFA), in the period between the wars. The purpose of such an examination is to explore the importance of the imperial context for these national galleries and also gauge the relationship between them, and by so doing account for art practices that were later to be much criticised for their conservatism, in particular their resistance to modernism. Both Galleries, as this study will demonstrate, were 'children' of Empire, and as such, shared a common relationship with the 'Motherland' and were the 'national' art institutions of their State (in the case of the NAGNSW) and country.

Through their nomenclature, these institutions announced to the public of their respective cities, that they were the pre-eminent public, artistic representatives

---

of nation. Understandings of the relative meaning of the term ‘National’ (as it was used in the titles of these institutions) and the term ‘nation’ as it described these emerging Dominions were, in the period of this study, quite different. The public expectation of the representation of their respective cultures, through the collections and exhibitions of their National galleries, was, apparently, fixed. Whilst the pendulum of debate over the wider meaning of what should constitute ‘nation’ swung between membership of Empire and the cutting of those ties, no such vitality in understandings of ‘National’, as it applied to these galleries, was evident.\(^2\)

Apparently, when it came to high art and culture, the public, nationalist face was one that could be entirely accommodated within the larger imperial loyalty. They were the Galleries through which official taste would be disseminated to the art viewing public, their purchases providing the models by which art would be gauged. Yet the power of this particular Empire allegiance, its role in the determination of what constituted appropriate art, and the ramifications of such imposed artistic models in this period have been largely ignored in the scholarship of both countries.

A. D. Hope’s reflections on the nature of the ‘divided ghost’ of white Australian heritage captures something of the dilemma over what had become by the Second World War, an increasingly contested debate in Australia over national loyalties and Empire allegiances. However much tensions over such ‘divided ghosts’ shaped other histories in the inter-war period, such contests over allegiance were not apparent in the art practices of these two art galleries. They were institutions that regarded themselves as institutions of Empire. These were institutions for whom national pride was a sentiment positioned first within that of the Mother country; institutions whose collections, it was hoped, would provide
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visible evidence of their country's ability to claim a place within world civil society. The values of Empire were consistently and constantly re-affirmed, leaving little room for the expression of values outside those declared valid by Gallery officers. These officers were cultural ‘leaders’ for whom the collection and exhibition of European, but particularly British works, would provide the vehicle by which their own connoisseurship could be gauged, in addition to providing artistic evidence of their Gallery’s cultural superiority.

Certainly for the elite of the populace of New Zealand and Australia in the inter-war period, Britain was ‘Home’ and an extrapolation of Empire loyalty onto cultural identifications was considered a natural expression of this relationship and of nostalgia. Indeed, Gallery identification with the central English art institution, the London Royal Academy, was in line with other cultural, political, social, religious and economic affiliations. As Dodd has argued, English dominance in Britain ensured that Britishness was cast in an English mould.3 For young countries, which were part of Empire but distant geographically, to claim Britishness was to claim its power, prestige, longevity and wealth. The transference of British models in art, and the reverence with which they were received, resonates throughout the records of the national art institutions of New South Wales and New Zealand in this period.

Britishness, as a cultural myth, is one, which, according to recent writing by Neville Meaney, may ‘have been a more powerful national idea in Australia than Britain’.4 Meaney has argued that the myth of Britishness was bound to be more pervasive in Australia, for within Great Britain there could be no single all-encompassing national, or, indeed no single over-arching cultural mythology. ‘It was

implausible within the British Isles where it could not incorporate the Welsh, Scots and the Irish, each of whom had their own homeland, language, traditions and ways of life.\textsuperscript{5} However, Meaney asserts that such an identity became possible when ‘transported as then an Anglo-Celtic heritage was more easily homogenised’.\textsuperscript{6}

Studies of the ways in which ‘fragments’ of the parent culture are transported and transferred, are, however, rare. The major study, written in 1964 by Louis Hartz, offers a view that is helpful in general approaches to this subject. However, its argument that cultural fragments ‘skew’ when removed from the parental European culture, rather than undergo intense reinforcement of the parent culture, as this study argues, indicates that more work needs to be done in the area of colonial cultural memory.\textsuperscript{7} The transference and fragmenting of culture is the central focus of this study. It argues that one vital, particular, artistic fragment, that of the ethos and practice of the London Royal Academy, was not qualified nor its values lessened by its removal from home. Instead, the values associated with this bastion of artistic Britishness became even more firmly embedded in its new domicile.

However powerful the relationship between the artistic culture of Empire, the London Royal Academy and its followers in the south Pacific, it is important to note that this transference was by no means a passively received imposition, foisted by the dominant culture onto the weaker. Rather, the alliance that was perpetuated was regarded by the greater proportion of the populace in both countries as essential in the formation and continuance of the British culture in the Pacific. In its time this heritage was as fiercely defended, as contested and virile as modernism was later to be. Indeed, Robert Dixon argues, while speaking of an earlier period, that a

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid.
harmonious relationship between Imperial models and colonial national pride should not be over-looked and he offers an important alternative view to the often-prescribed understanding of Australian nationalism that was to be found only in resistance to English values.⁸

Regardless of widely acknowledged loyalty to Britain before the Second World War, contemporary Australian and New Zealand historians have, until very recently, apparently found such subservience to Britain distasteful. Most have preferred to explore the journey out of Empire rather than the persistence of loyalty to Empire. Only very few contemporary scholars have continued to explore either Australia or New Zealand within an Imperial context. Neville Meaney, in Under New Heavens: Cultural Transmissions and the Making of Australia for instance, accounts for the lapse in 'Britishness' since the 1950s as an 'embarrassment of circumstances'.⁹ 'Britishness' had, apparently, to be put aside in the face of new political, cultural and economic imperatives. Meaney reminded his readers that 'most white Australians had instinctively identified themselves' with Britain, but now 'contemporary Australians have almost sought to blot Europe from their consciousness, to refuse to put Britain into the making of Australia'.¹⁰ There are, however, indications that the presence of Britishness in Australian and New Zealand history is under-going a process of re-assessment and re-examination. The 1999 Australian Historical Society Regional Conference had, as its theme, Australia and Britain Over Two Centuries,¹¹ and more recently the April 2001 number of
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¹⁰ Ibid., p. 5
¹¹ The Australian Historical Association Regional Conference, Australia and Britain Over Two Centuries. University of Tasmania, 29 September, 1999.
Australian Historical Studies\textsuperscript{12} devoted several articles to the discussion of the role of Britishness in Australian historiography and culture.

Nevertheless, the story of the cultural, artistic relationship between Great Britain and her Pacific National Galleries has never been told in its own right. It is an aspect of New Zealand and Australian art history largely expunged from scholarly research, all the more surprising given the premier, 'official', 'National' stature of these institutions within each country. The presence and prestige of these Galleries was well understood by the people of Sydney and Wellington. Recognised in the period as arguably the most importantarbiter of NSW artistic taste, the NAGNSW was, for instance, 'the single most important market for art [in NSW] and its opinion was authoritative'.\textsuperscript{13} In spite of this authority and power, the roles of both national galleries have been marginalised in most art histories written since World War Two. The apparent neglect of the artistic arms of Empire needs to be accounted for, just as the importance of their re-emergence into the art history of New Zealand and Australia must be argued for here. Whilst there are many scholarly interpretations of the politics of Empire, little has been attempted in the cultural sphere, exploring the relationship between the British Empire, New Zealand and Australian art. Jeffrey Auerbach, writing in the recent Oxford History of the British Empire: Historiography, claims the 'history of the art of British Empire remains to be written'.\textsuperscript{14}

Perhaps because of the lack of substantial studies of these institutions, most scholars of Australian and New Zealand art, observing the period between the wars, have only occasionally acknowledged the presence of these institutions; much less

\textsuperscript{12} Marian Quartly (Ed.), Australian Historical Studies, April, 2001, No. 116.
have scholars been willing to acknowledge a pervasive British presence within them. Usually, any reference to the galleries was to give writers the opportunity to criticize the deeply conservative views held by Gallery officers, without a proper accounting for it. For example, Jean Campbell, writing in Early Sydney Moderns: John Young and the Macquarie Galleries 1916-1946 observed that ‘the Trustees of the Art Gallery of NSW...determinedly defended art as it had been in their youth, art as they thought it should remain’. Richard Haese, in Rebels and Precursors: The Revolutionary Years of Australian Art, singled out Trustee Lionel Lindsay and NAGNSW Director, J. S. MacDonald for comment, arguing that they, amongst other conservatives, operated a ‘rearguard action’ in the face of modernist incursions. ‘Conservatives such as Lionel Lindsay’, Haese wrote, ‘understood or thought they understood the values they wished to preserve...[and] as modernism gained a hold, the conservatives closed their ranks even more’.

While it has been noted that the officers from both Galleries often provided sensational statements to the art press and newspapers of the day, mostly in their support of anti-modernist, anti-decadent art, the institutions for which they spoke have not been the object of comprehensive critical appraisal. To ignore the collective opinion of these two National Galleries is to ignore, to a large extent, the evidence that points to the existence of a very powerful conservative culture, a culture which embodied imperial sentiment. There have been, apart from one comprehensive survey of the NZAFA, no extensive studies of these institutions, neither as part of the art history of Empire, nor, as significant cultural institutions in
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17 Ibid.
their own right. Until very recently the focus of the historians of this period was invariably on modernism; therefore, the implication accepted by historians such as Haese, was that any art practices outside that genre were without substance or value. As Haese asserts, these conservatives ought to have understood ‘that the old establishment was in its death throes and a new one was being born’. Certainly there is no recognition that this governing aesthetic ethos was reflective of a substantial, sustained, Empire-based and Academy-endorsed, aesthetic model.

One explanation for this exclusion may be found in the later resounding victory of a nationalism separate from Empire and in the triumph of aesthetics opposite to those espoused by the London Royal Academy at this time. Certainly, examination of the exhibition practices of these institutions would soon reveal aesthetic associations that would sit uncomfortably with those seeking to affirm the chronologically inevitable, natural progression of a nationalism situated in unique landscape formations, or, the early success of modernism and its exponents in the first three decades of the twentieth century. The later art histories of New Zealand and Australia, seeking ‘national reclamation projects’, located ‘an independent tradition independent from the British’, divorced not only from the model of the London Royal Academy, but from its ‘homes’ in the south Pacific, the National Galleries of New Zealand and New South Wales.

However much the period has been one of fascination for contemporary scholars of modernism, this particular practice took place to a large extent outside the boundaries of the most powerful gallery presence and outside of the subsequent national collections of New Zealand and New South Wales. Modernist advocates,

20 Ibid., pp. 573 & 574.
such as Margaret Preston, were aware of the quarantined nature of the National Art
Gallery of New South Wales when she wrote:

Australia is a fine place in which to think.
The galleries are so well fenced in.
The theatres and cinemas are so well fenced in.
The libraries are so well fenced in.
The universities are so well fenced in.
You do not get bothered with foolish new ideas.
Tradition thinks for you, but Heavens! How dull!²¹

Most Australian and New Zealand art histories written during the past fifty
years have privileged those artists whose work evidenced modernist ideologies and
techniques. Indeed most texts limit their discussion about art in the inter-war period
to only those artists. Writers who have included mention of art practices other than
that of modernism have generally done do so in a way that glibly dismisses these
modes and artists as simply ‘conservative’, or have inferred that because these
conservative artists were not modernists they were, therefore, ignorant of art itself.
The problem with accounts such as these is the inference either that there were no
other art practices in Australia or New Zealand in this period other than modernism,
or, if there were, that they were rendered so impotent by their conservatism as to be
of negligible importance.

Most contemporary Australian art historiography has argued, for example,
that there was, apparently, no meaningful artistic occurrence between the
landscapists of the Heidelberg school and the early moderns, such as De Maistre,
Wakelin, Preston or Proctor. The inter-war period was described recently, by critic
John McDonald, as ‘in cultural terms...the most insular decade in Australian
history’. No acknowledgement is made of the earlier English Academic tradition,

and its life and influence in the colonies. This tradition is deemed to have been expunged altogether with the rise of French Impressionism and then the advent of Australian Impressionism in the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{22} This accords with a pattern established by earlier scholars, such as Bernard Smith, who, when writing in 1945 in \textit{Place, Taste and Tradition}, argued that Impressionism was, for example, primarily a ‘reaction by artists from the complacent acceptance’ of the academic qualities of ‘literary values, sentimentalism, the Pre-Raphaelite form of naturalism and emphasis in landscape of the heroic subject’.\textsuperscript{23} The 1979 revised edition of Smith’s study argued more emphatically that academicism had come to an end in Australia ‘when the last years of the nineteenth century saw Impressionism conquer the European academies’.\textsuperscript{24} These apparently reactionary, ‘academic qualities’, were soundly denounced by art historians both in New Zealand and Australia. However, it seems that reports of the early death of British academic art have been much exaggerated; most of the works acquired by the New South Wales and New Zealand National galleries in the period between the wars illustrate just such academic qualities.

Other scholars too have recognised that it was the ‘first study of the art of the British Empire to highlight the relationship between the course of art of the colonies and the concurrent European tendencies from which that art drew so substantially’.\textsuperscript{25} Smith’s assertion in 1979 that respect for British academic art had collapsed by the beginning of the twentieth century was a position that was later to be endorsed, and ironically and misleadingly, by these Galleries’ own officers over recent decades. In an astonishing rewriting of history, the galleries’ own exhibition programs have also largely ignored, over the past thirty years, British academic art, the artistic ethos

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p.146.
\textsuperscript{25} Auerbach, ibid.
which was the dominant force in Australia and New Zealand’s art practice until after
the Second World War. Many of the works highlighted in this study, whilst still
amongst the gallery’s collections, and regarded as premier pieces in their day, have
not been displayed to the public for many years. One such case, for example, was
that of the highly sought-after William Orpen’s Après le Bain, obtained by the
Dunedin Public Art Gallery in 1932, and which was regarded then as a seminal work
by art officers in the south Pacific. It has not been exhibited since the 1970s.26

An assumption of the necessity, progressiveness and even the superiority of
modernism was derived from the perspective of modernism itself. If the period were
to be seen as a struggle between modernism and its opponents, subsequent art
histories were written by the victorious modernists. Scholars, having inherited the
mantle of modernism, have tended to view the period through a relatively narrow set
of lenses, particularly those that explain the period as culminating in the emergence
of modernism. This victorious modernist identity, its artists and critics, then
demanded subservience, and apparently silence, from the academic genre it replaced.
Contemporary art scholars have tended to dismiss most of the academic art practice
of Australia and New Zealand between the wars as simply derivative, or degenerate
or, indeed, invisible. It was a time, apparently, when a culturally empty ‘hole’ was
waiting to be filled by modernist energies.27 More recent examinations, such as that
of John Williams’ Quarantined Culture: Australian Reactions to Modernism 1913–
1939, have acknowledged the conservative artistic presence within the NAGNSW,
but have done so as part of a broader investigation of the ramifications of the First

26 See Chapter Four of this thesis, ‘Oh! To Be in England’: Acquisitions.
27 As a corollary to this apparently unbreakable modernism there needs to be acknowledged the
growing body of work which has critiqued modernism itself. Texts such as Rosalind Krauss’ The
Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1985),
Peter Burger’s The Decline Of Modernism (Cambridge: Polity, 1992) and Jurgen Habermas’ The
Philosophical Discourse of Modernity (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1987) are such examples.
Rather than languishing in any 'hole', Academic artistic principles, this thesis will demonstrate, were still dominant in the major Antipodean art practices at this time. The Academy's principles and practices were most fervently supported and pursued by the officers of the national art institutions of New South Wales and New Zealand. Rather than dozing in any state of suspended creativity in the period between the wars, these satellites of the British Empire vigorously participated in the ethos and work of the London Royal Academy, doing all they could to disseminate its teachings, emulate its aesthetics and indeed purchase its works. For these men, any artistic ethos outside that of the academy was the enemy.

The sources for this study have been drawn in the main from the documents of the institutions concerned. In particular, the Minutes of the monthly Board meetings of the Board of Trustees of the NAGNSW, the Council meetings of the NZAFA, and later the Board of Trustees meetings of the NZNAG, were indispensable. In addition, close attention was paid to the annual reports provided to their governments by these institutions, and the personal archives of those Trustees and Council members. There are, however, scholarly works to which this study owes a debt. In particular two volumes of Gordon Brown's comprehensive catalogue of the history of New Zealand art and its regional art societies, New Zealand Painting 1900-1920 Traditions and Departures and New Zealand Painting 1920-1940 and the commissioned history of the NZAFA, Portrait of a Century: The History of the N.Z. Academy of Fine Arts 1882-1982 by Robin Kay and Tony Eden. Five art journals

28 John Williams, Quarantined Culture: Australian Reactions to Modernism 1918-1939 (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
have also proven invaluable: three English journals; the *Connoisseur*, *London Royal Academy Illustrated* and *Studio*; and two Dominion productions, the New Zealand *Art In New Zealand* and the Australian *Art In Australia*.30

This study is organised in the following manner:

The position and power of a major art gallery is far greater than the sum of its structure and the works of art displayed on its walls. As Robert Hewison has argued, ‘to control a museum means precisely to control the representations of a community and its highest values and truth’.31 Chapter One of this thesis, *Making A Claim for Britishness: Museology and Empire Loyalty in the National Gallery Art Practice of the Two Dominions* argues, accordingly, that it is most important if we are to understand the dominant aesthetic of the inter-war period for these nations, that we understand the aesthetics and museology of the two National institutions. This has been achieved in this chapter by identifying the tools available to the Galleries to express their aesthetic and to promote it within the community, by examining the architectural expression of the Galleries’ aesthetic in terms of the choices made in housing the collections and by analysis of the wider cultural and historical contexts within which they operated. For these Galleries, the ‘highest values and truths’
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represented were those of British cultural heritage.

Chapter Two, *The Model: The Pervading Presence of the London Royal Academy of Art* examines the relationship between the Antipodean National Galleries and the London Royal Academy. In the three major twentieth century studies of the London Academy, no mention is made of its wider place in the liaison between the Empire and her satellites in the Pacific. The first, *The History of the Royal Academy of Arts From Its Foundation in 1768 to the Present Time, with Biographical Notices* consists of a compilation of Academy officers and major events.\(^{32}\) Sydney Hutchison's *History of the Royal Academy 1768-1968*, published in 1968, meticulously records the politics and annual exhibitions of the LRA. However, apart from mentioning the Academy President having attended the American launch of an Academy of Arts and Letters in 1930, no suggestion is made that the Academy may have had a role to play in the wider sphere of Empire art politics.\(^{33}\) The third, commissioned in 1981 by the Royal Academy, *The Genius of the Royal Academy*, thematically surveys the collection held by the Academy, making no comment as to the position or power of that institution outside of the art world of Great Britain.\(^{34}\) Notwithstanding the lack of any 'colonial' perspective in these histories, this is in stark contrast with the 'colonial' experience. In fact, the Royal Academy loomed very large in the art management practices of the National Art Galleries of Wellington or Sydney, and in the activities of many Dominion artists in the period between the wars. Through an investigation of the relationship between the London Royal Academy and the two National Galleries of New South Wales and New Zealand much can be revealed concerning the nature of 'official', National art


practice, the transportation of British canons of connoisseurship and the hierarchies of aesthetic taste. This chapter argues that, for both these institutions, the most desirable presence, both directly and indirectly, was that of the London Academy. Much time and energy was expended in order to facilitate as close a contact as possible. Given the great physical distance, this sustained genueflection to London indicates the reverence with which Gallery officers regarded Academy standards in aesthetics, painting technique and subject matter. The Academy model also prescribed the way in which domestic artists were received by these Galleries, and, as importantly, provided the language by which nationalist and later some - particularly British - modernist expressions could be transposed from popular culture, become ‘high’ art and consequently be incorporated into the Academic fold. This chapter argues that the overwhelming artistic model was the London Royal Academy, that artistic acceptance came primarily through ‘Britishness’ and the ability to be positioned within Royal Academy aesthetics.

Chapter Three, 'Men Who Count – Things that Matter': The Aesthetic Ideal of the Trustees and Directors, examines the individuals who, as members of the Boards and Councils of the two National Galleries, governed all aspects of the management of those establishments. There were a great many shared characteristics amongst the officers of the two Galleries, social and economic elitism among the most obvious. Membership of these Boards and Councils was considered by the people of their respective cities to be an elevation to a position of great honour, socially desirable not least because of the close connections between the Galleries and the highest echelons of Government and indeed Vice-Regal patronage. Closely associated with a class most likely to endorse ‘Britishness’ in most facets of life, this group of citizens sought, through demonstrations of connoisseurship, to verify each
respective city's ability to claim membership of world civil society. In addition to the Board officers, this chapter includes an examination of the role, and type, of individuals who were employed as Directors at the NAGNSW. Attention too is paid to the process by which members were selected, the gratification they experienced through their selection, and also the political relationships that existed between NAGNSW Board members and political leaders, as exemplified by the case of one particular overseer, the NSW Minister of Education, Mr David Drummond.

Chapter Four, 'Oh! To Be In England' examines the collections formed by the officers of these institutions in the period between the wars. It is in the purchases, accepted gifts, commissions and not least in the works offered for inclusion but rejected, that the strongest evidence can be found of the taste thought appropriate for the audiences of a national collection. The outcomes of these procedures can be stated at the outset. The aesthetic, educative and moral values in art were those most highly revered; the model most commonly aspired too was that of European high art. Neither Gallery possessed a written acquisition policy; obviously such a tool was not considered necessary. For these individuals, seated at the Board tables in both countries, believed they possessed the necessary skills to form a national collection. These officers emanated in the main from their cities' social, financial, professional, political and mercantile elites, their taste formed by their own sense of connoisseurship and devotion to the Mother Country. Theirs was a straightforward task: to reinforce both the cultural and historical ties of Empire through the evidence of art.

Domestic acquisitions were scrutinized by both galleries in the light of Royal Academy models, judged against those works either acquired for the collections or touring in exhibitions. Using the Minutes of the monthly Board and Council
meetings to reveal the kinds of decision-making and priorities that were evident, the focus is especially on the origins and genres of works selected. Whilst particular attention is paid to the acquisition practice of the NAGNSW in this chapter, the pattern of acquisitions in both institutions is explored. Any significant differences between Australian and New Zealand practices are highlighted and discussed in Chapter Six of this thesis.

Chapter Five, 'The Very Best In Art': Exhibition Practice as Ideology explores the shared understanding of appropriate art illustrated in the exhibition programs of the two Galleries. The formation of this model and its consistent representation in exhibition practice provided clear indications of the ideal in terms of subject, tone, colour and draughtsmanship.

As this chapter shows, the model, as represented in the art practice most favoured by the LRA, dominated exhibitions in both New Zealand and Australia in the period between the wars. Whether the work was drawn from imported touring exhibitions or domestic artists, the works and the language used to describe them in exhibition catalogues was that of the Academy. The prestige of being able to 'claim' an Australian or New Zealand artist when he was made a member of the Academy (even if that membership was only that of the lesser Associate status) was great. The work of one such artist, Australian George Lambert, is discussed in this context.

In spite of the uneven direction in the flow of traffic of Academy artists’ exhibitions, both Galleries went to great lengths to ensure as close a contact as possible. Regarded by many as mechanisms to enhance the bonds of Empire, administrative bodies such as the New Zealand Society of Imperial Culture, the British Empire Exhibitions and the British Empire Academy worked to promote the
unity of Motherland and her Dominions. Particular attention is paid to the Empire Art Loans Scheme. Instigated by a New Zealand businessman, it was perhaps the most sustained and successful vehicle for the promotion of primarily British Academy works.

Three National Gallery exhibitions in particular are highlighted. All connected with marking particular milestones in the history of nationhood, they are first, the One Hundred and Fifty Years of Australian Art exhibition held to compliment other celebrations of Sydney’s Sesquicentenary in 1938, second, the exhibition held to herald the opening of the new NZNAG in 1936, and third, the New Zealand Centenary Exhibition which toured New Zealand for several years, beginning in 1938.

Early chapters in this study have established the premier position of British artistic traditions in these two Antipodean national galleries. Given the power of this ‘quarantined’ culture, it is not surprising to see the precarious position of art practices operating outside those parameters. Chapter Six, The Gatekeepers of Culture and the Tilt Toward Modernism examines three aspects of art practice that were considered by gallery officers to be peripheral at best, or indeed nefarious to proper art production. The three aspects identified and explored in this chapter are: modernism, the place of women artists and officers, and the representations of indigeneity. The latter is an important addition, however, as it also marks the one exceptional difference in approach to art practices between the two galleries. In all
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35 In this thesis, the phrase ‘Dominion art galleries’ is used as a phrase of convenience to describe both the National Art Galleries of NSW and New Zealand. Officially, both Australia and New Zealand achieved ‘Dominion status’ at the Colonial Conference of April-May 1907. This title was used in London to distinguish the status of the self-governing Colonies of the British Empire. To mark this transition, the British Government agreed to divide the Colonial Office into three, a General Department, a Department of Crown Colonies and Protectorates, and a Dominions Department which would deal in future with the self-governing Colonies. While Canada and New Zealand eagerly embraced the title ‘Dominion’, in Australia the word ‘Commonwealth’ remained more popular. On the achievement of Dominion status, see Gordon Greenwood and Charles Grimshaw, eds., Documents on Australian International Affairs (Melbourne: Thomas Nelson, 1977), pp.40-106.
but this one aspect, the two galleries demonstrated a shared approach to aesthetics and arts practice. The process of the galleries’ slow acceptance of modernism is also explored. The modernist aesthetic was finally made palatable for these ‘gatekeepers’ of culture by evidence of its acceptance by the LRA itself. The deliberations over which modernist artists and which of their works were worthy of patronage provide insights into the record of persistent deference to the LRA.

This study offers a counter argument to the prevailing histories that position modernism as the dominant mode of art practice between the wars in Australia and New Zealand, and equally, argues for a re-evaluation of the importance of British heritage and Britishness. An examination of the extent to which this Britishness impacted upon domestic art practice and values will provide clear evidence of the need for this re-evaluation. These two ‘national’ art institutions of Sydney and New Zealand carried the imprimatur of the nation, able to claim through their titles the responsibility for representing their nation. The Boards of these National Galleries acted as gatekeepers of culture. Often dismissed as mere bastions of a thoughtless conservative elitism, by ideological opponents, the Boards in fact selected and displayed art according to a carefully constructed ideologically driven model – they chose art that was regarded by them as expressing both national claims to a British cultural membership and broader, and perhaps more important claims, to that transforming ideal, Britishness itself.

This study examines the art practices, administrative mechanisms and museological approaches of the two institutions in the period between the wars. It seeks to go behind popular constructions of this period in art history and to establish the facts of a specific art practice, one associated with official taste and nationhood. In the process, characteristic patterns of taste, models and patronage are elucidated
and nearly identical responses to Britishness discovered. The findings of this study of Australian and New Zealand art practices argue for a reappraisal of Britishness and its power as a force in art in the interwar period.