Retrieving an archive: Brook Andrew and William Blandowski’s *Australien in 142 Photographischen Abbildungen*

Kerry Heckenberg

Contemporary Australian artist Brook Andrew reinterpreted six images from a colonial archive compiled by a Prussian geologist and naturalist, William Blandowski (1822-78), in his 2008 series *The Island*, transforming the original pictures in size and medium and upsetting their straightforward perception with shifting surface effects created by the use of reflective foil. At first glance, this seems to be a continuation of the post-colonial critique of documentary images of Indigenous Australians accumulated in the colonial period that commenced in the 1980s when artists first began to interact with such archival material. Much of the critical commentary that greeted the series when it was first exhibited supported that interpretation. For example, art writer Anthony Gardner suggested that Andrew’s efforts in ‘trawling’ through the collections of various libraries and museums were undertaken in order to discover ‘more material with which to expose colonial mindsets of the past and all-too-present.’ In making this judgment, it is important to note that Gardner does not discriminate between the impact of the engravings on which the *Island* images are based and colonial photography. He describes the engravings as ‘bizarre drawings’ ‘of burial mounds that look like spaceships, or one of Étienne-Louis Boullée’s futuristic mausoleums’ and ‘caricatures of kangaroos and Indigenous ceremony’. As well, he suggests,
At stake in these images is the need to uncoil forgotten histories back into conscious perception. There is a degree of humour in this process: the caricatures in *The Island* are so blatantly twisted in appearance, such a telling mix of proto-sci-fi and “primitivist” constructions, that it’s remarkable how any person or culture could possibly believe in their veracity.\(^6\)

In a similar vein, critic Ashley Rawlings described Andrew using ‘19th-century anthropological illustrations in museum collections and archives to expose both the torment and the absurdity of Australia’s colonial past.’\(^7\) He also stated that, Andrew’s reworking of the images in “Gun-Metal Grey” and “The Island,” as well as his assemblage of the components that made up “Theme Park,” can be interpreted as an act of demystification and cultural reclamation.\(^8\)

Indeed, he linked the *Island* images with the very different photographs used in *Gun-Metal Grey* when he maintained that Andrew ‘drew on institutional archives to spotlight hidden legacies of past abuses.’\(^9\) Less combatively, Nicholas Thomas pointed to difficulties in judging the extent to which the Blandowski images were based on first-hand observation, concluding: ‘the corpus possesses an enigmatic status, that Andrew’s work literally magnifies, and renders magnificent.’\(^10\) In marked contrast, however, Sally Butler interpreted the series as a contemporary form of history painting that demonstrates the difficulties of re-inscribing Indigenous history into the history of Australia:

These images convey how Australia’s history has been told from a perspective that erased indigenous presence; we only “see” this Indigenous

---

\(^6\) Gardner, ‘Skin of now’, 83. See also Anthony Gardner, ‘Brook Andrew: sensation and sensory politics’, *Art and Australia*, 47:4, 2010, 671, where the author argues: ‘In other instances, most notably in his 2008 suite of paintings ‘The Island’, Andrew has emphasised the European fantasies through which nineteenth-century imagists such as Wilhelm Blandowski depicted Australia, its landscapes and inhabitants. Land formations come to resemble crop circles or a UFO parked in a wooded grove, while hounds engage in a battle for cultural supremacy with an anthropomorphised kangaroo rearing on its hind legs.’ For another confused and confusing response to the Blandowski images as transformed by Andrew, see Charlotte Day, ‘Lost & Found: An Archeology of the Present’, in *TarraWarra Biennial. Lost & Found: an archeology of the present*, Healesville, Victoria: TarraWarra Museum of Art, 2008, 54.
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presence now through layers of self-reflection and fragile remnants of “evidence.”

While Gardner and Rawlings readily accepted the notion of critique in Andrew’s appropriation of earlier imagery, my conclusion is that the artist’s attitude is less easy to pin down, particularly in the case of the Blandowski images. Although he has called for ‘further engagement in rigorous discussion, to share, learn and test ideas about the use of ethnographic images’, Andrew happily admits that it was the apparently fantastic element in those he chose for the Island series that appealed to his imagination. Whether or not they had any basis in fact does not seem to have been of much concern. Furthermore, the artist has suggested that the Island ‘as a reflective surface of golden and silver foils reverberates with the bright magical and utopian feelings of social reform, religion, and discovery.’ As well as being unclear (are these feelings found in - or inspired by - the original prints or Andrew’s reinterpretations?), the relevance of this statement for the scenes of mourning or burial sites that predominate in the series is puzzling. A lack of seriousness has been strongly rebuked by Indigenous curator Djon Mundine who argues that Andrew’s re-use of colonial imagery, particularly photographs, smacks of dilettantism and a lack of appropriate respect:

Around the world there are [sic] any number of researchers looking at collections of colonial images of “the other”, finding out who the people are, the place they come from and the context of the actual photograph. By contrast, isn’t Andrew rather like the colonial gentleman on a grand tour of museums? He appears to distance himself and the use of images completely from the Aboriginal society of their origin.

15 Djon Mundine, ‘Nowhere Boy’, Artlink, 30:1, March 2010, 93; see also David Hansen, “But this is about them, not me”: Brook Andrew: Eye to eye in Melbourne’, Art Monthly Australia, 202, August 2007, 9-13 for a measured analysis of Andrew’s work. Hansen concludes (p.12): ‘At its best ... the work of Brook Andrew achieves an heroic synthesis. But all too often, when you unpack it, when everything comes out and everything is labelled, the black and white suitcase is simply empty.’ For Andrew’s attitude to ‘ethnographic protocols’, see Laura Murray Cree, ‘Brook Andrew’, Artist Profile, 11, 2010, 56; but see also Fiona Foley, ‘When the circus came to town’, Art Monthly Australia, 245, November 2011, 5-7. Marshall Bell’s careful
How should we judge these comments in relation to The Island series? The archive with which Andrew engaged in this case, Australien in 142 Photographischen Abbildungen [Australia in 142 Photographic Illustrations], was completed by Blandowski in 1862. It has languished unseen and largely unknown until recently in the form of two copies held in libraries in Germany and England; thereby limiting any influence it might ever have had on attitudes to Australia and its Indigenous peoples. As well, Blandowski’s career in Australia ended in controversy due in part to his troublesome personality, precipitating a hasty return to Germany in 1859 and contributing to a general lack of knowledge of the man and his archive.17

Derrida describes the basic function of archives as being both ‘a memorial and a reminder’.18 But remembering requires action on the part of those who seek to delve into archives,19 and the particular actions employed will impact on the nature of the acts of remembrance engendered by any archival encounter. With his explorations of colonial archives, Andrew is part of recent artistic trend described by Hal Foster as ‘an archival impulse’ in which there is ‘a notion of artistic practice as an idiosyncratic probing into particular figures, objects, and events in modern art, philosophy, and history.’20 Furthermore, ‘archival artists’ try to retrieve information and objects from past obscurity, making them ‘physically present’, often in the form of installations.21 The attention given by Andrew to Blandowski’s archive is certainly an ‘idiosyncratic probing’ of it, and his enlarged, shimmering images have a marked if elusive physical presence, but how effective are they in overcoming historical amnesia? It is noteworthy that Blandowski has been the subject of extensive scholarly research in recent years, particularly in essays published as the proceedings of a symposium held in 2008 to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the naturalist’s expedition to the Murray in 1856-57. These explore in great depth the circumstances of Blandowski’s career, the expedition and its aftermath.22 In addition, his archive is now much more readily accessible thanks to anthropologist Harry Allen’s edited book entitled Australia: William Blandowski’s Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Aboriginal Life (2010).23 This includes both the archive of images and

---

Retrieving an archive: Brook Andrew and William Blandowski’s *Australien in 142 Photographischen Abbildungen*

an English translation of the accompanying text in the version of the album held in Berlin, plus several essays, including one by Andrew on his *Island* images, but no links are made between this essay and the main content of the book.

How does this serious attention fit in with Gardner’s suggestion of fantasy and make-believe, or with Thomas’s more tentative concerns about distance from first-hand observation? What is the nature of the ‘colonial mindset’ revealed in Blandowski’s images? This study will attempt to answer this question by looking at issues surrounding copying, authenticity, the role of art in science, the nature of the observer and visual communication in relation to the broad scope of Blandowski’s archive, but particularly with regard to Andrew’s intervention in it. The sources and histories of the six images chosen by Andrew and the results of his reinterpretation will be a particular focus. In short, the aim is to provide a detailed, critical examination of the way that the past is brought into the present by means of Andrew’s transformative artistry. By explaining the historical background and original context of the images, it is hoped that a more informed and nuanced response will become possible for viewers of Andrew’s artworks. But before discussing the ideas underlying the use of visual images in the original archive, some essential background information needs to be provided.

Silesian-born Wilhelm (or William as he was known in Australia) Blandowski came to Australia in 1849 after receiving some training in mining engineering. He may have been sponsored by a wealthy German who was interested in developing a collection of Australian specimens. By 1852 Blandowski was deeply involved in scientific and philosophical circles in Melbourne, setting up the Geological Society of Victoria in that year. Two years later, he became the inaugural government zoologist on the staff of the newly established Museum of Natural History in Melbourne and also helped to form the Philosophical Society of Victoria. A number of successful small expeditions provided information for a planned study comprising ‘a natural history, a botanical classification, and a geological arrangement.’ Then, a major expedition to the Murray-Darling junction in 1856-7 provided numerous specimens and drawings, many of the latter executed by German naturalist Gerard Krefft (1830-81). However, various factors undermined Blandowski’s position in Melbourne, in particular his rivalry with Frederick McCoy (1817-99), the professor of natural science at the newly established University of Melbourne who succeeded in having the museum transferred to the
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university at the time of the Murray expedition.\(^{28}\) Blandowski’s difficulties were exacerbated by his own actions in alienating members of the Philosophical Society by naming newly discovered fish species after them, complete with unflattering descriptions.\(^{29}\) Finally, he refused to hand over specimens, returning with them to Europe in 1859. He settled in Gleiwitz (now in Poland), worked as a photographer and died in 1878 after being admitted to an insane asylum. It may be that knowledge of the circumstances of his death has licensed judgements about ‘bizarre’ and ‘twisted’ images in his archive, but there is no reason to doubt Blandowski’s sanity earlier in his career.

While Blandowski initially aimed to compile a comprehensive pictorial collection based on firsthand investigations that summed up contemporary knowledge about Australia, his abrupt departure meant that compromise (something that is characteristic of all archives) intervened in the final production. This draws on both original sketches or photographs and a number of images taken from other publications, mainly published exploration journals, worked up by young German artist Gustav Mützel (1839-93), who went on to have a distinguished career as an animal artist and illustrator.\(^{30}\) Some of these sources are acknowledged, but Krefft’s contribution is a major omission.\(^{31}\) The extant copies are also the result of compromise. The version held in the Haddon Library in Cambridge is roughly foolscap in size, oriented vertically with six pasted in paper photographic prints (each c.74 x 100 mm in size) on each page, arranged in two columns.\(^{32}\) Although small, the prints are very crisp with sharp detail. They reproduce larger plates produced for a more ambitious book that never eventuated, presumably because of expense. It should be stressed that photography was used only as a means of reproduction; the original images were engravings.

With his aim of providing a complete description of the country he was investigating, Blandowski demonstrates the influence of the work of Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859). ‘Humboldtian science’ was concerned with detailed systematic empirical research and also with the relationships of such details to overarching ‘dynamical systems’.\(^{33}\) Accordingly, Blandowski’s book starts with a consideration of Australia as a whole, from a global perspective with ‘an idealized illustration of winds influenced by the sun crossing the equator’.\(^{34}\) Then the focus

---


\(^{29}\) Humphries, ‘Blandowski misses out’, 160-5.

\(^{30}\) Mützel’s death was noted in leading international newspapers: ‘Obituary for 1893’, *Times* [London], 1 January 1894, 14; ‘Obituary Notes’, *New York Times*, 31 October 1893, 2.


\(^{32}\) Wilhelm Blandowski, *Australien in 142 photographischen Abbildungen nach zehnjahrigen Erlangungen*, Gleiwitz, 1862; copy held in the Haddon Library of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England. Thanks to Aidan Baker for permission to view this rare work.


\(^{34}\) Caption to Plate 2 of Blandowski, 1862.
narrowed onto the outline of the continent (Illustration 3) followed by pictures representing landscape formations (Illustrations 4-18). Scenes depicting Blandowski’s 1857 Murray River expedition are next, followed by pictures detailing Aboriginal weapon-making and hunting, interspersed with natural history images of birds and animals. Finally, Aboriginal ceremonies (Illustrations 83-116) are followed by scenes of mourning and tomb structures (Illustrations 117-142). In what might be termed a romantic concept of science, art and imagination played an important role in Humboldt’s approach, something that is alien to present-day notions of what is properly scientific.  

35 This combination of fact and emotion is also evident in Blandowski’s work. Writer Nicholas Rothwell describes it as ‘a work of subjective artistry as much as a piece of ethnographic science.’

Like Blandowski, Brook Andrew (b.1970) is adventurous, enterprising and, above all, curious. Seeking not to be pigeon-holed, the artist draws on both his Wiradjuri Aboriginal and his Scottish/Irish European ancestry.  

37 He uses a wide variety of media in his work, including photography, neon, sculpture, screen-print and, most recently, inflatable plastic. Such formal and technical devices result in works of great beauty and striking impact. In the case of his Gun Metal Grey works (where Andrew reworks ethnographic photographs) and then, with a wider colour scheme, The Island series, the technical expertise of master printer Stewart Russell was essential in screen printing the greatly enlarged archival images selected by the artist onto a fragile surface consisting of foil on cotton. Straightforward viewing is disrupted by shimmer and the play of light, random folds and pleats, helping to create a sense of magic and mystery, and also cognitive uncertainty, especially when seen as a group in the case of the six images that make up The Island. It is difficult to know what these scenes represent.

Andrew maintains that his output is informed by a central interest in power relations and perception, ‘how we see things’. He also aims to use a playful approach to serious topics, maintaining that he ‘thrive[s] on ambiguity and misinterpretation.’  

38 The artist also states that ‘the connection between local and

---


international is what grounds me’, arguing that ‘International perspectives will help us challenge dominant Australian and Western ways of speaking about Aboriginal art and culture.’ A ‘driving fascination’ with museums, starting in his teenage years, and ‘a desire to make visible images and objects that have never been visible in the public domain’ are further avowed aims. But when he then goes on to state that such ‘hidden’ ‘objects and images’ ‘are about ‘the conquest of “Australia”,’ the notion of critique comes to the fore.

The artist has also been quoted as saying, ‘“I’m interested in who gets remembered”’; ‘“And I’m interested in the theme park way in which indigenous and other cultures around the world have become part of a freak show.”’ With the Blandowski images in mind: was there a theme park element apparent before they were blown-up and exhibited in Andrew’s Theme Park show exhibited at the Museum of contemporary Aboriginal art in Utrecht in 2008? Is vague critique (along the lines expressed by Gardner and Rawlings at the beginning of this article) an adequate response to the archive with its informative and valuable pictures? Should misrepresentation and ambiguity be tolerated for the sake of fun and mystique? Andrew has acknowledged that, as a whole, the album contains valuable information about Indigenous culture, stating that the pictures ‘are important as they depict one of the very first contacts with Aboriginal people and cultures through Blandowski’s expedition.’ Are The Island images an exception? These are the issues that will now be explored in a careful examination of the pictures chosen by Andrew in relation to both their textual accompaniment and their visual history.

The first image of the series (The Island I, 2008) is based on Illustration 137 of Blandowski’s album archive, one of many pictures in the album having the title Aborigines of Australia. The plate in turn is derived from an earlier published image, not original sketches or photography, in a process that involved a complex sequence of translation and editing: Mützel has developed his picture from Native Burial Place near Budda, which was drawn on lithographic stone by W. (William) Purser (c.1790-c.1852) (Figure 1). This was taken from a sketch by Charles Sturt and included as the Frontispiece of Volume 1 of Sturt’s Two Expeditions into the Interior of Southern

---

41 Brook Andrew interview with Anne Loxley,176.
42 Brook Andrew interview with Anne Loxley, 176.
43 Brook Andrew quoted in Joyce Morgan, ‘“There might be big artworks but you can’t jump in them”’, Sydney Morning Herald, 8 May 2010, 4.
45 Brook Andrew, ‘The Island’ (www.brookandrew.com/images/brook_andrew.pdf) (last accessed 25 March 2014). Note that Andrew gives a wrong date for the expedition (1854-55 rather than 1856-57) in this document. See also Andrew, ‘Remember How We See: The Island’.
46 Allen, Australia, 156; University of Cambridge, Haddon Library (http://haddon.archanth.cam.ac.uk/haddon-specials/library-online/blandowskipublcans/nggallery/page/3?nngpage=3/) (last accessed 25 March 2014).
Australia (1833). Mützel has made some obvious changes, cropping the original image so as to concentrate attention on the carved trees, the central dome-like Aboriginal tomb and distinctive ground markings, or perhaps to avoid copyright issues. A seated Aboriginal figure is moved from left mid-ground to the right foreground and the slightly elevated point of view of the original image is shifted so that it is more front-on. His final picture has then been photographically reproduced. The essential elements remain, but with slight differences. Nevertheless, this is a highly mediated image. Was this a source of concern in the nineteenth century?

The authority of the eye-witness was often invoked by explorers and travellers seeking to assure readers and viewers of their works that they provided a trustworthy account of what they saw and experienced on their travels.\(^47\) A sketch produced by the author was a desirable addition, but the original sketcher was rarely responsible for the published engraving or lithograph. Such prints were usually the result of a collective enterprise. The foreground was considered to be the place where an artist could contribute a personal note since its elements were less fixed,\(^48\) and this is where changes are most frequently made by Mützel.


Andrew continues the editing and translation process according to his own ends and interests, eliminating the Aboriginal figure so that the focus is on the form of the tomb, something that he has described as resembling a space ship, a description that is repeated without any questioning by Gardner in the passage quoted above. The vast change in scale produces something monumental and eerie, aided by the silvery, violet-grey colour of the foil. In other words, the artist has intensified his vision in the final product. Gardner picks up on Andrew’s comments, but should we accept them as the commonsense reaction of a present-day enlightened individual to the original archive? After all, the comparison with spaceships is only available to the contemporary viewer; nineteenth century artists could not have had any of the proto-sci-fi intentions suggested by Gardner. Furthermore, there is no reason to doubt that the various explorers and artists reported faithfully (within the limitations of style and skill) on the shape of these Aboriginal burial mounds. They reward further investigation.

Sturt’s verbal account of the grave he sketched was brief:

About a mile, or a mile and a half, from the lake we examined a solitary grave that had recently been constructed. It consisted of an oblong mound, with three semi-circular seats. A walk encompassed the whole, from which three others branched off for a few yards only, into the forest. Several cypresses, overhanging the grave, were fancifully carved on the inner side, and on one the shape of a heart was deeply engraved.

The shape of the mound is not clear in the illustration produced by Purser since it appears more dome-like than oblong. Examining the process evident in other sketches by Sturt that formed the basis of published lithographs, the lithographer has probably also tidied the scene, giving the forms more precision than the original sketch, perhaps reflecting his training as an architect. Nevertheless, the essential elements of the scene are communicated.

Other nineteenth century artists also provided visual representations of mound tombs, notably surveyor William Romaine Govett (1807-48), whose watercolour sketch entitled Three black women weeping over a grave was published as an

49 See also Rawlings, ‘Brook Andrew: Archives of the Invisible’, 115.
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engraving in the Saturday Magazine in 1836.\textsuperscript{52} The accompanying text includes the following description of the ‘three feet high’ mound:

\begin{quote}
It was shaped as a dome, and built of a reddish clay: it was surrounded by a kind of flat gutter or channel, outside of which was a margin, both formed of the same material.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

Govett also comments,

\begin{quote}
I have never heard of one of these mounds being examined, or whether they contain anything; they appear, however, to be formed with as much care and trouble as we may imagine a native to possess.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

Another example was painted with great delicacy by Edward Thomson (fl. 1840-1870): Black’s grave near Pindari, New South Wales, c.1848.\textsuperscript{55}

This evidence leads to the conclusion that such tombs were constructed by some Indigenous Australians. They were rare, perhaps only used for particularly important individuals, and part of the mortuary rites of Aboriginal tribes in central-western New South Wales, particularly the Kamilaroi and Wiradjuri people.\textsuperscript{56} Blandowski probably included images from other explorer accounts in his album in order to broaden the coverage of his work, part of the Humboldtian urge to universality. Rothwell suggests that he ‘even samples the ideas and reports and images of other authorities in disarming fashion, as if his were the last, definite account of Aboriginal society, the indigenous book to end all books.’\textsuperscript{57} Nevertheless, this also highlights the diversity of Aboriginal cultural practices. Blandowski acknowledges his sources in these cases, part of appropriate practice in the nineteenth century when published exploration journals were meant to be not only entertaining travel narratives, but also informative, part of a burgeoning scientific culture. Because the mounds were constructed of materials subject to decay and weathering, little or no material evidence of their existence remains today and such


\textsuperscript{54} Govett, ‘Sketches of New South Wales’, 184 [note].


\textsuperscript{57} Rothwell, ‘Sign language’, 8.
explorer accounts are a valuable source of information about past practices.\(^58\) In this light, is any imagined likeness to spaceships a justifiable cause for mirth and derision?

Based on Illustration 140 of Blandowski’s album,\(^59\) the Island II, 2008, continues the burial ground theme. Mention is made in the original plate’s caption to the findings of John Oxley on the Lachlan River, illustrated in The Grave of a Native of Australia [sic], one of the images included in Oxley’s Journals of Two Expeditions into the Interior of New South Wales (1820).\(^60\) This engraving has been freely adapted by Mützel as the basis for his plate: the main form of the burial with its central mound and partially enclosing rounded concentric ridges plus a decorated tree on the right is retained, but the mound is represented in cross section, revealing a body covered with sticks within the mound. Here Mützel utilizes a conventional device from the visual language of geology to impart more information about the precise structure of the tomb,\(^61\) using the detailed information provided by Oxley in his written text (albeit with apologies for perhaps ‘wantonly disturbing the remains of the dead, or needlessly violating the rites of an harmless people’):

Almost directly under the hill near our halting-place, we saw a tumulus, which was apparently of recent construction (within a year at most). ... The form of the whole was semi-circular. Three rows of seats occupied one half, the grave and an outer row of seats the other; the seats formed segments of circles of fifty, forty-five, and forty feet each, and were formed by the soil being trenched up from between them. The centre part of the grave was about five feet high, and about nine long, forming an oblong pointed cone.\(^62\)

Oxley then describes the internal structure, the soil supported by layers of wood with bark, leaves and grass, the body within, folded over and wrapped in possum skins,\(^63\) and this is depicted by Mützel. Researchers David Bell and Zoë Wakelin-King report that the site was ‘rediscovered in 1913.’ Neither the mound nor the encircling ridges survived, and only one tree was intact (the other was a stump), but local Aborigines ‘remembered the grave as that of a “karadga”, an important medicine man or chief of the Calare tribe, who was drowned while crossing the


\(^{59}\) Allen, Australia, 159; University of Cambridge, Haddon Library (http://haddon.archanth.cam.ac.uk/haddon-specials/library-online/blandowskipubjscans/nggallery/page/3?nggpage=3/) (last accessed 25 March 2014).


\(^{62}\) Oxley, Two Expeditions, 138-9.

\(^{63}\) See Oxley, Two Expeditions, 139-41.
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flooded river by canoe.’  

In his blown-up image, Andrew obscures the body with a mound of dirt, presumably in deference to Indigenous viewers of the picture. The colour scheme employed is a dull greenish-gray gold.

A reviewer writing in the *West Australian* newspaper praised the beauty of Andrew’s work in *Island II* while also remarking on the “‘Germanic forest’ (complete with pine trees)” setting of the original image. This is a valid criticism of Mützel’s picture: in both the Oxley illustration and Mützel’s adaptation of it, the trees are not well represented. It should be noted, however, that Oxley records that the carvings were done on ‘cypress-trees’, in other words, a native Australian *Callitris* species that resembles European pines. Mützel was perhaps taking notice of the written comment, but lacked the personal experience that would have enabled him to depict these trees with more accuracy. But such criticism of early depictions of Australian scenery is hardly new. More broadly, the use of written as well as pictorial evidence in Mützel’s construction of his pictures suggests close supervision by Blandowski in some aspects of the process at least. The reviewer of Andrew’s work also shows little care with detail, stating that the image is ‘based on a drawing from an 1850s expedition’ rather than Oxley’s much earlier expedition.  

This is perhaps forgivable in a newspaper review, but the suggestion that the ‘tree carvings ... bear no resemblance to Australian Aboriginal art’ is made without any evidence apart from the reviewer’s presuppositions. A photograph held in the collection of the National Library of Australia, Canberra, *Edmund Milne [?] standing next to the carved trees, Goobothery Hill, New South Wales* (1913) shows the site at the time of its ‘rediscovery’ by European Australians. This clearly reveals that the carvings on both the intact tree and stump are very accurately depicted in the Oxley engraving, although reversed due to the engraving process. Describing the scene as depicting an ‘idyllic native’ reveals a lack of attention to what the scene actually shows.

Printed on a violet blue background, the *Island III*, 2008, reproduces Illustration 120 of *Australia*, which is based on an original drawing by Blandowski. Mourning women wearing gypsum caps are shown sitting in a wooden hut-like structure erected over a grave. The walls at the front and right of this structure are removed to allow the viewer to see details of the mourning ritual. It is puzzling that Rawlings writes as a criticism,

---

64 Bell and Wakelin-King, ‘Living Monuments’, 304; see also R. Etheridge, Jnr., *The Dendroglyphs, or Carved Trees*, Sydney: Government Printer, 1918, 2-3 and Plate 32.  
66 Oxley, *Two Expeditions*, 141.  
However, Andrew explains that Mützel’s drawing is likely to be a reconstruction of many rituals combined into one, and that the original image shows a pair of feet jutting out from the shelter, making it a more accurate illustration of a funeral site.70

But Blandowski does describe the women mourning at a burial site. Furthermore, the image is not a photograph. The idea of a snapshot of a single moment was not part of the notion of a picture in the nineteenth century. The protruding feet are retained by Andrew. Rawlings goes on to state,

Faced with images filtered through so much subjectivity—both of the ethnographers’ dominant gaze and the artistic license that Mützel took in his reinterpretations—it is impossible to ascertain what, if any, truth may be left in them.71

But this is a bland, catch-all statement. Such an image can be evaluated by gathering evidence from other sources. The practice of women, mainly widows, donning gypsum caps as part of the process of mourning the death of their men folk is well attested in other writings.72

In the case of *The Island IV*, 2008, a very bright blue is used for a ceremonial scene taken from Illustration 84, one of many ceremonies depicted in Blandowski’s archive.73 When seen out of context, it appears to be a bizarre corroboree, especially as Andrew has cropped the original, removing a group of solemn Indigenous spectators to the right of the dancing and gesticulating group. A very different impression ensues when the complete sequence of related images is viewed (Illustrations 82-94) in combination with the accompanying written text.74

Blandowski is describing an initiation rite for young boys, involving removal of their front teeth. The complex ceremony took place over a number of days and the various steps are detailed in the image sequence. The plate isolated by Andrew depicts warriors with expressive faces enthusiastically enacting a tooth removal, a preparatory step in the overall ritual. The candidates are seated on the right, the very group omitted by Andrew and the key to the meaning of the whole since this part of the ceremony is meant to prepare them for their subsequent ordeal.

---

In *The Island V*, 2008, Andrew reproduces and transforms Illustration 67 in *Australien*, another image included by Blandowski under the general title of *Aborigines of Australia*. The connection with Australian Aboriginal life is less obvious here, however, since the main scene shows a kangaroo struggling with many large dogs. In the background an Aboriginal man runs towards the kangaroo with a raised club. The source of the original image is unclear, but presumably the aim is to show Indigenous hunting practices, although the accompanying written text describes the ferocity of the male kangaroo:

If the kangaroo is publicly known as harmless, this is a misconception. Many, even very strong dogs die during the kangaroo hunt. Others have shattered shoulders and do not care to go near a kangaroo again, least of all near the old male kangaroo named “Boomerang”, who knows how to keep a whole pack of dogs at bay. Humans have to watch out for him as well, for it has happened on occasion that the kangaroo has grabbed a person, carried him to the nearest water and held him under the surface until he believes the person has drowned.

The dogs are not traditional dingoes; rather they are an introduced breed, the Kangaroo dog, suggesting the resilience of the Aborigines and their willingness to adopt useful European imports. A broad hunting theme is found in other images on the same page of Blandowski’s work.

Andrew’s change of scale in his interpretation of this plate turns the kangaroo into a towering tragic and heroic figure while the use of red foil intensifies the anguish. Returning to Gardner’s comments again: should this image be regarded as a caricature? Is the suggestion that large male kangaroos may be dangerous risible? Pictures of large male red kangaroos, or ‘Boomers’, ‘at bay’ (Figure 2) were popular in the colonial period and may have influenced Mützel. Furthermore, their ability to resist dog attacks and swimming prowess were also reported from time to time in the colonial press and such actions are corroborated by an incident described in a recent newspaper article in which a man was injured by a kangaroo as he tried to rescue his dog from drowning by a kangaroo. Although kangaroos are usually not dangerous, large males will attack when cornered. Blandowski’s comments exaggerate both the state of knowledge of this
trait in the colonial period and the degree of threat, but are not a caricature of kangaroo behaviour.79

Figure 2 At Bay. — “Sticking up a Boomer” (1850). Wood-engraving on paper, 12.6 x 9.9 cm.
From The Illustrated London News, 1850, p.144

Another image included by Blandowski under the general title Aborigines of Australia, Illustration 123, is the source of Andrew’s Island VI, 2008.80 It is a puzzling and shocking image when seen in isolation from the preceding two plates in the Blandowski archive. The text accompanying Illustrations 121-123 make clear that the sequence describes the mourning ritual of Encounter Bay and Coorong Aborigines, based on Blandowski’s original observations made soon after his arrival in Australia as well as his drawings in the case of Illustrations 121 and 123 (Mützel produced 122).81 George French Angas (1822-86) had described and illustrated similar practices in his South Australia Illustrated (1846), using information collected on an expedition in 1844.82 Blandowski notes how dead warriors are ‘attached to a

81 See Allen, Australia, 140-2.
82 George French Angas, South Australia Illustrated, London: Thomas McLean, 1847, Plate 40, James William Giles lithograph after a sketch by George French Angas, Native Tombs and
frame in a sitting position. Ochre and grease are rubbed over them and the frame placed over a fire in order to smoke the bodies to become mummies.\textsuperscript{83} The next image shows one part of the mourning ritual in which visiting warriors seek to dispel any evil spirits by attacking with spears, taking care to avoid touching the body. The picture used by Andrew shows the final phase in which mourning warriors cast their weapons aside and ‘give themselves up to grief.’\textsuperscript{84} In other words, the original is a complex, respectful depiction of this ritual practice. The impact of Andrew’s magnified version is strengthened by the deep pinky-red background. It is very difficult, however, for anyone who encounters it without any knowledge of this essential textual and visual context to understand what might be going on.

Blandowski’s archive did not achieve any prominence when it was first produced, due to factors such as the author’s alienation from contacts in Australia and his own personal difficulties. As already noted, other pictures in the archive depict in extraordinary detail the activities of the Indigenous peoples of the Murray River region in Victoria, revealing their highly developed social and cultural organization, an aspect developed further in Allen’s book Australia as indicated in the subtitle: William Blandowski’s Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Aboriginal Life (2010). The rich detail about Aboriginal life and industry it provided could perhaps have impacted on attitudes to these people if it had been more widely available.\textsuperscript{85} Nevertheless, it is a valuable resource that can still have an important influence. As noted earlier, remembering requires action on the part of those who seek to delve into archives and Allen’s book makes it possible for many readers and viewers to explore what it contains. But Brook Andrew’s intervention is the main concern of this study. In the light of the detailed background research presented here, is the remembering facilitated and encouraged by The Island an adequate response to the complexity of the original archive?

As has been demonstrated, much of the commentary that the series has evoked concentrates on notions of critique and revelation of damaging mind-sets from earlier history. Gardner’s work is included in the catalogue to the Theme Park exhibition and on the artist’s website, suggesting his endorsement. But what ‘past abuses’ have been exposed in the Island images? The present appraisal of Andrew’s

\textit{Modes of Disposing of their Dead}: Canberra, National Library of Australia:

\textsuperscript{83} Caption to Plate 121 of Blandowski, 1862: Allen, Australia, 140.
\textsuperscript{84} Caption to Plate 123 of Blandowski, 1862: Allen, Australia, 142.
\textsuperscript{85} For images of Victorian Indigenous peoples that were circulated in the nineteenth century, see Jane Lydon, \textit{Eye Contact: photographing Indigenous Australians}, Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2005.
choice of images, their background and the artist’s own comments suggests a more subtle, ambiguous relationship between artist and archive. In particular, Andrew has seized on images that could be exploited for their apparently exotic and alien, but also intriguing character in his own work. A more representative sample from the archive would have had a very different impact. Furthermore, the impression of romance or exoticism or even confusion aroused in the viewer who is confronted with the images that were transformed by Andrew can be dispelled when context and essential background information are supplied, something lacking in much of the commentary produced when The Island was first exhibited. This criticism reveals more about the critics, their limitations and prejudices, than it does about the original archive. Although Andrew maintains that he is interested in a combination of play and seriousness, the conclusion must be drawn that any serious understanding of Blandowski’s extraordinary archive cannot be gained from Andrew’s intervention in it. This is not to deny, however, the impact of Andrew’s work and the potential it has to attract attention to Blandowski’s images, giving them a sumptuous presentation even greater than anything he might ever have desired. With a different framing, The Island series could play a role in helping to reveal the complex cultural life of the Indigenous inhabitants of Australia prior to its disruption by Europeans. As noted earlier, the physical form of the artworks with their shimmering uncertainty has been seen as a metaphor for the fragmentary transmission of historical knowledge about the Indigenous inhabitants of Australia. But, as the historiographical investigation undertaken in this article shows, it is possible to explicate a great deal of the original context of Blandowski’s images. With this background, a much richer and more rewarding viewing experience would be possible for those encountering Andrew’s work.
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