In 1975 the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections released their recommendations, which outlined new directions for Australian museums. Now known as the Pigott Report, after committee chairman Peter Pigott, the report proposed a progressive vision for a new national museum, challenging the historical framings evident in museums established in the nineteenth century. Tropes such as the separation of Indigenous Australian history from European history and the separation of nature from culture were criticised as outdated. The Pigott Report recommended the establishment of a Museum of Australia, which would not ‘imitate or duplicate’ the focus of older Australian museums but instead ‘concentrate on three main themes or galleries: Aboriginal man in Australia; European man in Australia; and the Australian environment and its interactions with the two-named themes’. These themes are evident in the National Museum of Australia’s permanent exhibitions, for example in the inclusion of the Gallery of First Australians and the environmental history exhibit Tangled Destinies.

In 2003 an independent review of the National Museum of Australia was published, concluding that many of the exhibitions failed to develop a compelling narrative of the nation. Tangled Destinies was criticised for the absence of an explicit evolutionary narrative, and it was recommended that the Garden of Australian Dreams, the external courtyard exploring cultural constructions of landscape, be comprehensively redesigned. Through an analysis of these two works, this article examines how the intent to explore relationships between people and environment proposed twenty-five years ago in the Pigott Report has been realised in practice in the National Museum of Australia, and why the exhibitionary approaches adopted in Tangled Destinies and the Garden of Australian Dreams provoked such a negative reaction from this latest review.

The Pigott Report

The Pigott Report was a catalyst for the reassessment of the role and construction of history in Australian museums. Reflective of then Prime Minister Gough Whitlam’s commitment to developing a ‘new sense of cultural nationalism’, the document highlighted the continual separation of Indigenous people from European history and a general lack of post-colonisation history in Australian museums. In recommending the establishment of a national museum of history, the intent was not to duplicate or imitate the fields already represented in existing museums but instead to mend the intellectual rifts that ‘tended to divorce Aboriginal man from European man and to divorce Europeans from Nature’. Acknowledging that this schism owed much to nineteenth-century scientific
interests, this national museum was to focus on ‘the history of man [sic] and nature in this continent, their linked roles, and their interactions’, expressed in the three overarching themes of ‘Aboriginal man in Australia; European man in Australia; and the Australian environment’.5

This new museum would not duplicate the natural-history focus of older museums; instead, it would offer an interpretation of the natural environment that integrates people with their environment.6 This represents a significant departure from the approaches of many Australian State museums, which tend to separate natural and human histories. This separation fails to acknowledge that European culture has been conditioned and influenced by the natural world. Instead, the Pigott Report stressed the importance of the juxtaposition of knowledge to challenge ‘the old system of dividing knowledge into the familiar compartments of the school syllabus, into history and anthropology and zoology’.7 The report prescribed new, interdisciplinary approaches and encouraged consideration of the interpretative role played by external spaces surrounding the museum.

After twenty-five years of extensive debate over the appropriate themes and site for the museum, many of the agendas put forward by the Pigott Report were incorporated into the National Museum of Australia (NMA). Opened in 2001, the NMA aimed to develop ‘social narratives which can acknowledge and accommodate different understandings of history, place, politics and community embodied by Indigenous and settler peoples’.8 Although constructed on a much smaller site than the originally planned twenty hectares at Yarramundi Reach,9 the guiding narratives of the NMA — land, nation and people — owe much to the Pigott Report, as do the three dominant themes of Australian society and its history since 1788, humans’ interaction with the Australian environment, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures and histories.10 The permanent exhibits are reflective of these themes, including First Australians: Gallery of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples; Eternity: Stories from the emotional heart of Australia; Nation: Symbols of Australia; and Tangled Destinies: Land and People in Australia.11

Consistent with the Piggott Report, the NMA aimed to explore multidisciplinary approaches and interrelationships between permanent exhibits.12 While the Pigott Report suggested innovative conceptual and thematic approaches, it did not discuss in depth how these shifts might affect or challenge traditional museological practices. Under the heading ‘Techniques of Display’, the report suggested that market research be undertaken to determine the types of display best suited for diverse Australian audiences, warning of the perils of ‘press-button gadgetry’ in clouding communication with visitors.13 Cautioning that the use of scientists over professional curators in the preparation of exhibits could result in a ‘dreariness and intellectual dullness of many displays’, the document contains no suggestion that these new conceptualisations of history might present significant challenges to established exhibitionary practices.14

Tangled Destinies

Tangled Destinies aimed to combine ‘the scientific and cultural history of a continent in a way never attempted before in an Australian museum’.15
Incorporating perspectives from archaeology, social history, ecology, botany and biology, Tangled Destinies proposed an exploration of how people have responded to the Australian environment over tens of thousands of years, including the impact of introduced species, European responses to the strangeness of Australian nature, the environmental history of Australia’s cities, agricultural interactions, and changes to the Australian landscape.\textsuperscript{16}

Early discussions, academic summits and workshops held during 1997 and 1998 focused on the development of conceptual intersections and an appropriate narrative for the environmental history exhibit. The NMA was in the process of building its collections, allowing curators to develop exhibitions concurrently with the collection of objects and artefacts. From preliminary discussions, the curators decided not to assume a deep-time narrative depicting the origins and chronological evolution of Earth and its inhabitants, an approach favoured by natural history museums.\textsuperscript{17}

Initially, Tangled Destinies was titled ‘Australian Space and Time’ and focused on ‘big picture’ environmental history. After consultation, this theme was revised to strengthen the representation of social history, especially notions of personal attachment to landscape and sense of place. Renamed ‘Links to Land’, this structure utilised a series of case studies grouped geographically within particular regions. This too was abandoned, as it was considered too difficult for visitors to relate to their own experience, while the choice of regions remained contentious. Finally, a more representative perspective was conceived, one that acknowledged the processes of socialising and physically modifying land and recognising adjustment to Australian conditions.\textsuperscript{18}

In September 1998, a concept brief based on a ‘history of ideas’ was approved. According to content developer Libby Robbin, this concept was essential to promoting an interdisciplinary approach, and characteristics for ten exhibit modules were identified.\textsuperscript{19} The final framing for the exhibition can be understood as the development of serial narratives, structured into a central narrative of response, adjustment and attachment.\textsuperscript{20}

Quoting from Bernard Cohen, Tangled Destinies introduces nature at its most foreign — the point of colonial encounter:

> Landscapes have histories and these are contained not only in the soils and fauna and the traces of human life but in the history of ways of seeing the land.\textsuperscript{21}

By nominating this moment as the starting point, the exhibit represents a significant shift from the ‘deep time’ chronology of natural-history museums, which begin with the continent breaking away from Gondwanaland more than forty million years ago. In contrast, Tangled Destinies begins in 1788 with Encountering Australia, which contains the three modules of Natures of Isolation, Endling and Biological Invasion. Together, these exhibits explore European responses to the flora and fauna of Australia, as well as the impact of introduced species and the extinction of native animals.

Central to each of the ten modules is the representation of multiple viewpoints. A major advantage of a serial approach, as distinct from a chronological approach, is the opportunity to explore concurrently cross-cultural perspectives. This is evident in Tangled Destinies through the representation of Indigenous and non-
Indigenous perspectives of environment within each module. Natures of Isolation, for example, presents the colonial scientific reaction to the ‘misfits’ of Australian fauna, such as the kangaroo, echidna and platypus. This colonial view of Australia, portrayed through diaries, preserved specimens, paintings, drawings and text, is contrasted with Indigenous understandings of these familiar, not strange, animals.

Representing multiple viewpoints radically challenges the curatorial traditions of the natural-history museum, which historically considered the display of ‘nature’s artefacts’ as a celebration of divine influence — God’s work.\textsuperscript{22} Exhibitions tended to be ‘simple collections’ with minimal interpretation — relying instead on people’s recognition of the ‘real object’ as conveying all necessary information.\textsuperscript{23} The development of taxonomic and classification systems attributed meaning to the object according to physical characteristics, supporting a framework that placed western society at the ‘pinnacle of civilization’.\textsuperscript{24}

From Encountering Australia, the exhibition opens into Living with the Land and its modules Firetracks, Technologies of Necessity and Cities of the Edge. Examination of these modules, particularly Cities of the Edge, reveals the limitations of artefact and text in developing narratives that explore complex understandings and relationships between place and people. Originally planned as a multimedia presentation, Cities of the Edge was further complicated by the decision to present all Australian cities, rather than the initially proposed focus on Perth.\textsuperscript{25} The final exhibit reads as an arbitrary collection of objects that offer unconvincing narratives of Australia’s diverse cities. Hobart, for example, is represented through a whale harpoon and whale teeth, while Sydney, framed as experiencing ‘growing pains’, is represented by a chainsaw and a wooden bowl made out of a turpentine tree cut down to make way for the M2 Hills motorway. In contrast, the large audiovisual map Imagining the Country, featured in the adjacent exhibition Nation, demonstrates the advantages of multimedia in conveying diverse and wide-ranging information. The map displays stories, histories and facts in the spatial and temporal context of the continent. Visitors choose from an extensive range of categories exploring understandings of landscape and environment, including networks of Indigenous exchange, song
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lines, weather patterns, changes in population distributions, the location of vegetation species and holiday encounters, which are then displayed graphically on the digital map.

The final theme, Understanding Australia, explores new ideas, knowledge and attachment to the Australian landscape through its four modules: Deep Time, Drying Out, Places of the Heart and Landscapes of the Mind. Deep Time represents one of the most successful exhibits in Tangled Destinies, incorporating a multimedia presentation that traces intersections between people’s occupation of the Kakadu landscape and the cycles of climatic change. Unlike Cities of the Edge, this display successfully portrays an evolving landscape, allowing temporal shifts from deep-time history through to contemporary understandings. The exhibit’s success also demonstrates the value of a more regional approach to environmental history, compared to the daunting challenge of representing a national understanding of such a diverse continent.

Places of the Heart and Landscape of the Mind both introduce different ways that people see the landscape and form emotional attachments with place. The individual stories of Places of the Heart were intended to be threaded as ‘story beads’ throughout the exhibition, but lack of space resulted in their concentration into ten stories incorporating perspectives from scientists, farmers, travelers and Indigenous custodians. Landscapes of the Mind develops a lexical map of Lake Peddar, which unconvincingly conveys the different ways that developers, conservationists and the Tasmanian Hydro-Electric commission view this ‘lost’ landscape. Originally planned to include four lakes from across Australia, the exhibit was reduced to just one and, due to its physical isolation from the rest of Tangled Destinies, is easily missed by visitors.

Many of the exhibitionary approaches adopted in Tangled Destinies reflect shifting attitudes toward the modern national museum. No longer is the museum’s role regarded as offering ‘self-knowledge implicitly through the display of natural and human others, distanced in time or place’. Rather than framing the visitor as a receiver of knowledge, the serial and thematic approaches in Tangled Destinies promote ‘self-insertion’. The viewer is positioned in a more interactive relationship, in contrast to evolutionary or chronological narratives in which objects are displayed in ways that act to fix meaning.

A major difficulty with the structure of Tangled Destinies, however, is that this three-part theme is largely illegible as a result of the overall density of the exhibits, the poor design of signage and a general lack of space. Many exhibits in Encountering Australia are protected behind glass, while the presentation of multiple viewpoints in each module often reads as a clutter of artefact and text. Part of this responsibility lies with the ambitious spatial configurations proposed by architects Ashton Raggatt and McDougall. Curators and exhibition designers working in parallel with the construction of the building found it difficult to visualise the exact size and configuration of spaces available, and the allocated space and budgets were significantly reduced during the development process.

Tangled Destinies demonstrates the difficulties of conveying the fluid relationships between environment and human interaction through static representational techniques reliant on artefact and text. Certain iconic objects used in the exhibition, such as the Thylacine skin featured in Endling, are successful in
developing both intellectual and emotional narratives. However, the selection of objects that can relate complex stories at a national level is an extremely challenging task; in some cases, such as the attempts to represent narratives of Australian cities, it is impossible.

**Garden of Australian Dreams**

The Garden of Australian Dreams, designed by landscape architects Room 4.1.3, adopts conceptual art-based practices to develop a spatial and symbolic interactive space, conceived as an imagining of the national landscape. This project, like the Edge of the Trees at the Museum of Sydney, represents a new insertion into the museum space. It is a hybrid, blending traditions of landscape architecture, public art and sculpture to produce spaces of ‘self-inscription’, which are experienced through interaction and participation.

The Garden of Australian Dreams represents a considerable conceptual shift from the Pigott Report’s recommendations, which outlined interpretative themes for the external spaces surrounding the museum. Envisaging the original site at Yarramundi Reach, the report proposed the inclusion of a nature park displaying some of the ‘natural and introduced fauna of the continent’, with the museum ‘set in the kind of landscape which is loosely described as “typically Australian”’.32

The relocation of the museum to Acton Peninsula, a smaller and more urban site on the edge of Lake Burley Griffin, placed the NMA in a very different physical and cultural context. The intention that the museum’s external spaces be designed as interpretative spaces, extending narratives developed elsewhere within the museum, is manifested in the Garden of Australian Dreams, but the designers have rejected the notion of recreating a ‘natural setting’. Instead, the landscape architects proposed an exploration of the cultural constructions of landscape in Australia, which was viewed as a theme more appropriately reflective of the new site, the symbolic and spatial agendas incorporated within the museum’s architecture, and contemporary developments in landscape architecture that question the replication of nature’s images.

The courtyard has its origins in the winning architectural design for the NMA by Melbourne firm Ashton Raggatt McDougall and Room 4.1.3, in collaboration with Peck von Hartel Trethowan. The final design reinforces many of the narratives and symbolism expressed in the architecture such as the ‘tangled knot’ of contemporary Australian identities, adopted as the spatial generator for the Great Hall. The design of the architecture and surrounding landscape spaces are also intended to subvert the monumental expressions of national identity evident in Canberra’s cultural institutions — an intent shared by the Pigott Report — through the interweaving of architecture and external spaces in a gesture of anti-monumentality. This act sought to ‘re-imagine architecture and landscape as coextensive rather than as emblems of culture and nature juxtaposed’.33

The Garden of Australian Dreams positions ‘nature’ firmly as a cultural construct, exploring ‘shifting cultural constructions of landscape and identity’.34 The courtyard has no predefined narrative, with visitors simply encouraged to explore the space. The origins of the courtyard lie in the overlaying of two mythical understandings of landscape to form a warped, patterned and textual concrete surface. The ‘Great Australian Dream’ is represented by a standard
English map of Australia, revealing no trace of Indigenous presence, and the ‘Aboriginal Dreaming’ is symbolised through Horton’s map of the linguistic boundaries of Indigenous Australia (which reveals a mosaic of over 300 Aboriginal nations). These maps were overlaid and interwoven to imply a ‘difficult but nonetheless shared cartography’.35

Added to the textual surface were other ways of knowing landscape, ranging from scientific ‘objective’ representations of soil, geology and weather maps through to cultural markings including political electoral boundaries, roads and the dingo fence. Embedded within the map are the politics of power, authority and dispossession, fundamental components of the colonial project. Text was also incorporated into the surface through Indigenous and non-Indigenous placenames, and the word ‘home’ translated into the many languages spoken in Australia. Overlaid throughout the concrete surface were two mapping systems — the Mercator projection, binding Australia to the rest of the world, and a local referenced surveying grid.

The prominence of the map in the courtyard’s design is indicative of its value in exploring and exposing attitudes toward landscape and occupation, a central focus in inquiry in disciplines such as cultural geography, cultural studies, history and landscape architecture. ‘The agency of mapping’, comments landscape theorist James Corner, ‘lies in neither reproduction nor imposition but rather in uncovering realities previously unseen or unimagined’.36 As a ‘spatial language for analysis and representation of processes and events’, the map provides a
valuable point of intersection for constructing an interdisciplinary understanding of place. In the context of structuring an imagining of Australian national space, the map therefore presents a plausible device on which to base investigations. This collaging and collision of different mappings also forms a powerful strategy for disrupting binary understandings implicit in colonial narratives (nature/culture, bush/city and edge/centre), allowing for the compression of temporal and spatial boundaries. The overlay technique creates references to dispossession and contestation. The juxtaposition of an X (a sign many Indigenous people used to sign documents, often under duress) over the suburban lawn, for instance, suggests contested land ownership and Indigenous land rights.

Added to this mapped space are a series of symbolic and metaphoric references, most notably the iconic suburban backyard with its well-kept grass, swimming pool, barbeque and palm tree. At this point, the legibility of the space fragments into what appears to be a series of random gestures, referencing Australian history and cultural moments, sampling from painting, popular culture, political history and mythology. These symbols, objects and spaces are composed in a manner that confounds any clear message, with many critics of the work likening the approach to a ‘postmodern theme park’. Rather than following the Pigott Report recommendation for a traditional European framing of landscape as nature, devoid of people, the Garden of Australian Dreams instead reflects on the question of what a national Australian landscape might be, challenging the visitor to think about landscape rather than to experience passively a reconstruction of nature.

None of the concepts used to generate the work are unique to the Garden. Therefore, the Garden of Australian Dreams fails not in its intention but in how the work is understood and contextualised. For instance, the text-based landscape shares similarities with Landscapes of the Mind, which is located inside the museum. Rather than viewing cultural constructions of landscape through distant image and text, in the Garden visitors become part of a textual landscape, assuming the scale of a giant as they walk over the map, discovering the tracings, words and symbols etched onto the surface. The ‘concrete’ map in the courtyard provides an extension of the ‘virtual’ map that forms Imagining the Country. Suburban icons such as the Hills Hoist clotheslines, exhibited within the Nation display, are revisited in the suburban dream and quarter-acre block referenced in the courtyard Garden. Indigenous stories of dislocation and dispossession evident in the Gallery of First Australians are referenced physically and symbolically in the contested map surface in the Garden. Located directly opposite the Landscapes of the Mind are extensive views of the Garden of Australian Dreams, yet the two works sit silently adjacent to one another despite obvious conceptual similarities.

While dismissed by many critics as an unintelligible chaos, most references within the Garden are extensions of themes developed elsewhere in the museum’s permanent exhibits. Despite the NMA’s commitment to exploring interrelationships between exhibits, there are no interpretive links between the internal exhibits and the Garden. The failure to make connections between the Garden and other exhibits owes much to the way that the exhibitions and built works were conceived and constructed, with the Garden lying outside the official exhibition program and instead constructed as part of a fast-tracked architecture program.
These ambiguities cloud the role the Garden is expected to play in relation to museum exhibitions, generating confusion over whether its function is as an interpretive space requiring intellectual engagement or instead a space of respite from the demands of the internal exhibits, where people can relax under a tree with a coffee.

National Museum of Australia Review of Exhibitions and Programs

Both Tangled Destinies and the Garden of Australian Dreams challenge curatorial practices associated with the exhibition of natural history. While criticism can be directed at their approaches, together they represent important precedents for reintroducing understandings of environment and landscape into social history. However, the report of the National Museum of Australia Review of Exhibitions and Programs completed in July 2003 reflects a less sympathetic view of these exhibitionary practices, particularly in relation to Garden of Australian Dreams.

The four-member review panel was chaired by Dr John Carroll, reader in sociology at La Trobe University, and included Richard Longes, Dr Philip Jones and Professor Patricia Vickers-Rich. While the panel agreed that each of the modules in Tangled Destinies ‘covers the subject matter in an interesting manner, with relevant objects’, they felt that the lack of an overarching narrative resulted in the individual units appearing ‘as disparate, unconnected elements rather than being linked together as chapters in the same story’. Further, the panel concluded that the concept of ‘deep time’ was not adequately covered, stating that there needed to be a focus on the ‘dynamic evolution of the Australian continent and its effect on humans who have occupied it’. The panel’s recommendations for Tangled Destinies included the extension of the coverage of deep-time history and the development of a more ‘chronological thread’ to provide a stronger link between the modules.

These conclusions, which seek to reinsert a more evolutionary narrative into the exhibit, are not surprising, given the profile of the panel members. For example, Professor Vickers-Rich lists her research interests as the late Mesozoic flora and fauna of Gondwana and the early evolution of life and animals (Precambrian). While experienced in museums as both a director and curator, Professor Vickers-Rich has worked mainly in natural-history museums. Similarly, anthropologist Dr Philip Jones, the only other panel member with curatorial experience, has extensive work experience at the South Australian museum, another predominantly natural-science museum.

This emphasis is extended even further in the recommendations for Garden of Australian Dreams. In their submissions to the panel, many architects and landscape architects argued that the Garden lay outside the review’s frame of reference, given that the design was conceived as part of the architectural competition. The panel was particularly critical of the Garden of Australian Dreams, stating that visitors were unlikely to decipher the intricacies of the space, preferring an approach that is more self-explanatory. Similar to Tangled Destinies, the panel felt that the space offered the opportunity ‘to extend a view of deep time, together with the unique nature of the Australian biota’. However, unlike the recommendations for Tangled Destinies, which remained general, the panel did not hold back on their own suggestions, offering the following advice:
Add a number of large rocks that trace the geological history of the continent. Begin with a block of Banded Iron Formation from Tom Price in Western Australia, followed by a number of blocks representing different times in Australia’s history. Add planting of vegetation typical of Australia’s past and present – for example, the pond and surrounds could support some of the most primitive of Australia’s flora. Other time periods, such as the Mesozoic and Cenozoic, could be represented in discrete areas. These could be labeled, and the story of the development of the continent’s unique flora – including how it is a hybrid of the past and present could be told.

A sundial might be added, with an explanation of how it works to help people place Australia geographically. Explanations of the tilt of the earth’s axis and its effect on Australia’s seasonal climate could be explored here, given the sunshine pours into the courtyard. Well-produced representations of Aboriginal rock art might modify the alienating effect of Braille embellishments on the building’s surfaces.

The panel also suggested that a specialist advisory group examine other uses for the garden, ‘complementary with Tangled Destinies’, with ‘a particular focus on the way that Australia developed over the billions of years’. According to the panel, this group should include ‘a geologist, an ethnobotanist, an archaeologist, a palaeontologist, a specialist in soils, an Indigenous Australian and a “deep time” environmental historian’. A significant omission from this list is the input of the original designers, Room 4.1.3.

These recommendations for the Garden of Australian Dreams effectively seek to erase a cultural construction of landscape through the addition of a layer of ‘authentic’ nature. However, the suggested list of additions to the space, ranging from a sun dial to plants from the Cenozoic period, warrant the same criticism of arbitrariness as those leveled at the existing Garden. These recommendations, together with the suggestion of a more evolutionary framework for Tangled Destinies, shift the focus of the exhibits from interactions and interrelationships between people and environment back to a framing that replicates the role of the natural-history museum.

There is no doubt that the insertion of evolutionary narratives into these works provides a more familiar structure, placing the stories of the Australian continent within a broader global context and thus avoiding the conceptual difficulties associated with developing a national narrative. However, this decision also reverts to nineteenth-century scientific framings bound up with processes of imperialism and colonialism, and the separation of nature and culture. Chris Healy comments that ‘the utilitarian obsession with the natural resources of the country … and the fascination with the flora and fauna of a world upside-down’ evident in Australian natural-history museums has contributed to the inability to comprehend ‘nature and culture as one’.

Deep-time narratives, like all linear narratives, emphasise systems of classification over events or interaction. These narratives establish a framework that leads to the separation, rather than integration, of nature and culture, especially in the context of settler societies. Beginning with the continent’s separation from Gondwanaland, these framings establish a continuum ranging over 400 million years, with 60,000 years of Indigenous occupation and 225 years of European occupation. This structure reinforces the perception that Europeans
lie outside nature while maintaining colonial understandings that Indigenous Australians are part of nature. It assumes that history is linear, promoting reductive historical constructions, such as the ‘apocalyptic’ narrative where the arrival of Europeans has resulted in environmental disaster, or conversely a ‘neo-Whiggish’ construction supporting the ‘notion of humans becoming progressively more environmentally conscious’. Consequently, many environmental historians, such as John MacKenzie, argue that museums should avoid a linear or vertical approach to history, and instead promote exhibits that can demonstrate cyclical understandings of nature and environment and multiple points of view. This position is supported in contemporary developments in museological practices, which suggest that exhibits no longer have to make absolute claims, allowing the development of exhibits that rely more on ideas rather than object-based displays.

**Conclusion**

Realised more than twenty-five years after they were first proposed in the Pigott Report, Tangled Destinies and the Garden of Australian Dreams represent first attempts to develop an Australian national history that integrates people with their environment. As the Piggott Report concluded, these new histories would present a significant intellectual challenge, requiring the departure from old systems of dividing and framing knowledge, which support the separation of nature from culture.

While criticism can be leveled at both works, many problems can be attributed to difficulties in developing exhibits in parallel with the construction of the museum, as well as severe budgetary and space constraints. Other problems reflect blurred boundaries between curatorial and disciplinary territories, as well as between what is considered art, exhibit, artefact, gallery and multimedia. However, both exhibits hint at the new opportunities afforded by interdisciplinary practices, which ‘through the inter-penetration of fine art and design, image and instrument, imagination and industry’ promote new ways of representing and exploring histories and stories. Rather than be subjected to the hasty changes proposed by the latest review, which prescribes a regression to familiar historical framings and exhibitionary practices, these works should become the catalyst for further rigorous, informed debate over, and evaluation of, appropriate methods for reconnecting understandings of environment and landscape with social history.
Yu translated *Fly Away Peter*, *Tirra Lirra by the River*, *The Man who Loved Children* and, in Taiwan, *Ancestor Game*.


64 Bonnie McDougall and Kam Louie track this period, noting that ‘During the 1970s, a form of cultural modernism took root and spread to such a degree that more conventional works were also affected by it; by the end of the 1980s, as contacts between China and the outside world developed at a breathtaking pace, there appeared its self-reflexive, self-conscious, post-modernist successor.’ Bonnie S McDougall and Kam Louie, *The Literature of China in the Twentieth Century*, Bushbooks, Gosford, NSW, 1997, p 448.


67 ibid.

68 Susan McKernan (Lever), ‘Cultural history, literary history and literary criticism’ in Delys Bird, Robert Dixon and Christopher Lee (eds), *Authority and Influence*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, Queensland, 2001, p 316.


70 ibid.


---

**Garden without a Destiny: Untangling Landscape Narratives at the National Museum of Australia**

**Jillian Walliss**


4 Pigott, op. cit., p 70.

5 ibid., p 71.

6 ibid.

7 ibid.


13 Pigott, op.cit., p 73.

14 ibid., p 74.

17 Dr Mike Smith (Program Director), Presentation, Dr Libby Robin (Content developer), Presentation, Tangled Destinies Formal Review, National Museum of Australia, 2 November 2002; National Museum of Australian ‘Links to the Land’ Public Programs Section Advice, 1998, NMA Archive.
21 Introductory panel of Tangled Destinies exhibition, National Museum of Australia.
22 Geoff Hicks, ‘Natural history in the environmental age’, Negotiating Histories, Negotiating Museums, National Museum of Australia in association with the Centre for Cross-Cultural Research and the Australian Key Centre for Cultural and Media Policy, Canberra, 2001, p 183.
23 ibid.
26 Dr Mike Smith, Personal communication, 5 November 2002, National Museum of Australian ‘Links to the Land’ Public Programs Section Advice, 1998.
28 ibid., p 128.
30 Dr Mike Smith, Personal communication, 5 November 2002, Dr Mike Smith, presentation, Dr Libby Robin, presentation, Matt Kirchman (Interpretative planner) presentation, Tangled Destinies Formal Review, National Museum of Australia, 2 November 2002.
31 ibid.
32 Please give source for budget reductions.
34 ibid., p 75.
35 ibid., p 78.
41 ibid., p 32.
42 ibid.
43 ibid., Appendix ii, pp 76–7.
44 ibid., Appendix ii, p 76.
45 Submissions to the NMA Review Secretariat including Dr Catherin Bull, Dr John Dixson Hunt,
Notes to pp 114–123


Carroll and Longes, et al., op. cit., p 38.
47 ibid., p 38.
48 ibid., pp 38–9.
49 ibid., p 38.
50 ibid.
52 Whitcomb, op. cit., p 107.
54 ibid.
55 Witcomb, op. cit., p 117.

Biography, Narrative and Christina Stead: An Imperfect Match?
Susan Tridgell

3 ibid., p 206.
4 ibid., pp 211–12.
6 ibid., p 163.
8 ibid., p 350.
9 Taylor, op. cit., p 47. Italics in original
10 ibid., p 51.
11 MacIntyre, op. cit., p 212.
16 ibid., p 501.
17 ibid., pp 520, 527.
18 ibid., p 501.
19 ibid., p 484.
22 ibid., p 484.
23 ibid., p 524.
24 ibid., p 514.
25 ibid., p 544.
26 ibid., pp 527, 544.
27 ibid., p 473.
28 ibid., pp 518, 526.
29 ibid., p 504.
30 Molly Lefebure, The Bondage of Love: A Life of Mrs Samuel Taylor Coleridge [1986], Norton,