

# 23

## THE MUSEUM IN HIDING

Framing Conflict

*Amelia Barikin, Lyndell Brown, and Charles Green*

Throughout the twentieth century, artists and theorists have converted the methodologies of art museum curatorship into artistic tropes to be activated and yet concealed. This chapter is composed of two related texts that confront the notion of theory at the museum with reference to artists' ideas of their works as model "museums in hiding." However, the present chapter is not concerned with a survey of the many well-known instances of artists who have mined museum archives (for instance, Mark Dion, Fred Wilson, Andrea Fraser, Martha Rosler) but with a particular instance of museological representation: the atlas. In the first part of the chapter, Lyndell Brown and Charles Green identify what they call the "memory effect" of the artistic atlas through which many artists and theorists – from the early twentieth century until now – have constructed and thus rethought the effect of memory, describing this effect from the point of view of working artists. In the second part, Amelia Barikin presents a case study of Brown and Green's work – and a specific type of museum – with particular attention to the mnemonic function of the Australian War Memorial. The curatorial synthesis of a modern memory effect is seen both as foundational to the formation of such museums and as a significant driver for the contemporary enactment of memory, in this case within Brown and Green's art.

## Lyndell Brown and Charles Green

### The museum in hiding

#### The memory effect

In 1995 Robert Nelson, art critic for the Melbourne broadsheet, the *Age*, wrote, “With great evocative sensitivity to historical material, Brown and Green propose a kind of museum-in-hiding” (1995, 14). What did he mean? Several artists and theorists – from the early twentieth century until now – have systematically organized images into a memory effect. They have explored the form of the atlas of art: a virtual museum of images organized in the form of a visual training manual. In our case, this artistic method meets a specific type of museum – the war museum – for which the curatorial synthesis of a modern memory effect was the impetus in such museums’ early twentieth-century foundations and for which the commissioning of works of art that would effectively embody a memory effect was integral. Art history and art practice have also been combined by many contemporary artists and film directors who have sought to contribute to the theory of art through works of art and in considerations about the organization of museums of art. We have written on instances of this: on conceptual art of the 1960s and 1970s and on film director Jean-Luc Godard (Green and Brown 2002; Green 2008).

This chapter’s subtext is that the memory effect has a long genealogy, starting with an atlas of frozen gesture by Aby Warburg in his *Mnemosyne Atlas* (1927–1929), continuing in Robert Smithson’s late 1960s conception of image stratification and in Jean-Luc Godard’s cinema art atlas, *Histoire(s) du cinéma* (1988–1998), re-emerging in contemporary art museums, in art theory (Michaud 2004), and even more paradigmatically in biennales across the globe with large-scale video installations that range back and forth between cinema and art. Godard explored, as do many others including ourselves, the form of the atlas – a virtual museum of images organized in the form of a visual training manual. Similarly, all of our works of art, including the works we made between 2007 and 2009 as Australian Official War Artists, incorporate other works of art and reorganize art history in miniature, whether through maps, time lines, or more often quotations and phantom models set in the work of art. Equally, many renowned art historians have sought to make contributions to art history through artistic methods. We have published research on two instances of this: art historian Aby Warburg’s *Mnemosyne Atlas* and art theorist Terry Smith’s early membership of the artists’ collective Art and Language (Barker and Green 2010). There are also an extensive number of fictional museums in which the affect of plausible cultural memory is fabricated, replete with learned commentary, for example, author-artist Bernard Cohen’s *Fictional Guidenotes to Sir John Soane’s Museum, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, Nos. 1–6* (2002), and the publications and exhibitions of the Los Angeles-based Museum of Jurassic Technology.

Within our paintings and installations, we have curated virtual exhibitions: we gathered images, works of art from many periods, texts, and photographs together; arranged them into apparently meaningful combinations; and carefully copied the result in paint, often rephotographing the result so that the distinction between painting and photography was blurred. We knew exactly what Nelson meant by a museum in hiding. For, at the same time, we had little in common with modernism's or postmodernism's careless attitudes to the past, to memory creation, and to the role of museums in this process – so much so that when, in 1992, we were introduced by French artist-archaeologists Anne and Patrick Poirier to dissident art historian Aby Warburg's then quite obscure *Mnemosyne Atlas*, Warburg's last project hit us with the full force of revelation. *Mnemosyne* was an atlas encompassing all art in which he replaced art history with the miniaturized curatorship of black and white photographs.

### Occidentalism

In the 1990s we developed a series of large oil paintings across several solo exhibitions that combined image and text, embedding images from art history and documents from history into aerial views of cities and scenes of contemporary globalization, attracting attention to what critics called our invention of highly theorized contemporary history painting. Fastidiously painted *trompe l'oeil* images appeared as a key strategy to communicate through the power of analogy rather than allegory. Here, we were developing in art the theories of white Australian hybridity that Green had developed in his book *Peripheral Vision* (Green 1995). For European reviewers, the museum-obsessed peculiarity of our contribution was immediately recognizable: according to the reviewer for *Goteborgs Posten*, “they are stupendously skilful painters ... they pitch our modern society against ancient tradition and knowledge ... Their art is difficult to grasp but exciting to experience” (Ahlström 1998). Stockholm's *Svenska Dagbladet* wrote: “To work with double worlds, double vision, is something the two youngest artists in the exhibition do with successful results ... their stage is an inner and outer Australia” (Runefelt 1998, 17).

For Australian scholars, as for us, a double vision was slightly different, and aroused referents that were at once museum-based, strategic, and postcolonial (Figure 23.1). For instance, Jeanette Hoorn wrote in *Art and Australia*:

Through yielding to the spectator the experience of the marvellous that controls the discourses of the sublime, Brown and Green force the spectator to take on the position of the imperial subject. In so doing they force a postcolonial critique. (1998, 379)

As she correctly noted, our works explored the globalization of Western culture by painting the phenomenon of Occidentalism through images from the history of oil painting and that ultimate symbol of Europe's journeying to the Pacific, the



**FIGURE 23.1** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *The Vale of Kashmir*, 1995, 155 × 155 cm, oil on linen. Collection Kings School, Sydney. Courtesy of the artists.

tattoo. From further within the Euro-American canon, Robert Nelson, chief reviewer for the *Melbourne Age*, wrote in 1999:

Lyndell Brown and Charles Green are the subtlest artists in Australia. Since the mid-80's they've collaborated on postmodern pastiches of baroque pictures and contemporary urban views, revealing a knowledge of art history, old master techniques and the hottest themes in postcolonial theory.

From a feminist perspective, Helen McDonald, in her important study of gender in art *Erotic Ambiguities*, observed: "By reinventing painting as a discursive process of hybridization, Brown and Green rebuffed the 1980s prejudice against the medium" (McDonald 2001, 210).

## The atlas

Meanwhile, we were shifting ground, developing a new understanding of trans-cultural image migration – of Aby Warburg’s theories of the dynamogram and pathos – based on meshing theories of cosmopolitanism with images of postcolonial location. We extended the exploration of image migration by working with other artists in an expanded team. The first project was four large art museum exhibitions at the Australian Centre for Photography, Curtin University Gallery, RMIT Gallery, and Adam Art Gallery, with prominent New Zealand artist Patrick Pound, consisting of installations that were art history research through images instead of text, developing large photographs printed on transparent film. Critic Nikos Papastergiadis, in his 2006 book *Spatial Aesthetics*, recognized in these works our link between art history and art: “To make artwork that performs the work of memory and mapping is a way of revealing the anxieties of history and place” (2006, 66). In a large exhibition entitled *Tales of the Unexpected* (2002) at the National Gallery of Australia, the exhibition’s curator Deborah Hart argued:

The notion of specific imagery overlapping and unfolding not only within each work but from one work to another – the concept of the dynamogram that the artists have located in iconologist Aby Warburg’s late writing – suggests the profound continuity of experience implicit in Brown’s and Green’s art. (2002, 24)

At the same time, in the Melbourne *Age*, and then in the Australian literary journal *Meanjin*, a long essay on our work by renowned novelist Alex Miller argued that the importance of our contribution lies in reconceptualizing the Australian artist’s place in the lineage of European culture from the context of our long-term research and travel in Asia, once again indicating the parallelism between our art and Green’s work as an art historian and curator (Miller 2003). Following this predictive line, renowned author Peter Conrad, in *At Home in Australia*, placed an extended discussion of these works at the culmination of his book, describing them as “glimpses of Australia’s unconsciousness, and possibly previews of the society that is in the process of becoming” (2003, 247). For all, it was clear that we were “curating” images in our works of art, whether paintings or installations.

Thus, in a 2005 exhibition entitled *Tranquility* at the Art Gallery of New South Wales which subsequently traveled to New York, we presented a joint solo show – with Australia’s other long-term artist collaboration, Farrell and Parkin – consisting of one large installation of a video projection and large transparent photographs. The four of us gathered our joint works together in a curatorial exercise, conjuring the figure of a space-time traveler in a complex interface between painting, photography, and art historical research. As Artspace director, Blair French wrote, “In these small theatres of suspended reality, hallucinations and dreams are not conditions of escape but urgent performative undertakings through which history, society and the self fleetingly come into focus” (2005, 4). *Sydney Morning Herald* art

critic Peter Hill (2005) agreed: “Within the space, there is a rare symmetry between the exhibits. It is as if within the space, the works become like some kind of flag or heraldic device, all four walls talking to each other.”

### Framing conflict

In 2007 we were appointed Australian Official War Artists. We were the first Australian war artists who were “contemporary” artists in an immensely high-profile tradition that had largely been quite conservative. War art and museums commemorating war have helped define many nations’ national identities – not least in both Britain and the United States – and have made specific contributions to Australian national identity in a particularly indelible manner. For example, no Australian can think about the Gallipoli debacle on the Turkish Bosphorus coast during World War I without visualizing the Australian War Memorial’s (AWM) great 1920s paintings by George Lambert of soldiers clambering up cliffs, developed through the AWM’s long-standing Australian Official War Artist program which had been established during that war (see Wilkins 2003; Green 2009c).

Similar much visited, comprehensive museums exist in Canada and the United Kingdom, both with long-standing artist commission programs at the heart of their collections. Progressive, even avant-garde artists have been commissioned, though the AWM’s engagement with more contemporary art practices commenced with us and continued with the later appointment of video artist Shaun Gladwell (Green and Croggan 2011). These anglophone museums have produced significant publications and exhibitions on war art, for example Shaune Lakin’s (2006) sophisticated history of war photography. Significantly, however, there is no similar museum in the United States. In addition to war art’s memorial function (for that is the place of art in these large institutions and that mnemonic function connects this section of our chapter – and our art – to the topic of the present volume), such art – and images of conflict in general – can bring to the fore another, highly critical function: in anti-Vietnam American artist Martha Rosler’s 1970s *Bringing the War Home* series, Vietnam war photographs are collaged into suburban kitchen interiors. A third investment in the art of conflict relates to their documentary function as records revealing sometimes secret and often revelatory aspects of conflict: anonymously taken photographs of Americans torturing Iraqi civilians at Abu Ghraib have provoked condemnation and scholarship centered around works of older art in art museums (Eisenman 2007). Art museums have shaped public understandings of war.

We were deployed for six weeks in combat zones and remote military bases (both Australian and US bases) across Iraq, the Gulf, and Afghanistan, later finishing a 33 painting commission and a series of mural-sized photographs documenting those wars for the Australian War Memorial (Figure 23.2). The resulting large exhibition, *Framing Conflict: Lyndell Brown and Charles Green*, opened first at the Ian Potter Museum of Art, University of Melbourne (2008), and toured to many major public art galleries around Australia, culminating at the Australian War Memorial, where



**FIGURE 23.2** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *Afghan Traders, Tarin Kowt, Uruzgan Province, Afghanistan*, 2007–2009, 155.0 × 107.5 cm, digital color photograph, inkjet print on rag paper. Collection National Gallery of Victoria. Courtesy of the artists.

it opened in 2010 (Heywood 2008b). It also traveled to the gallery of the Australian Embassy in Washington, DC. We followed up *Framing Conflict* by assembling collections of apparently very similar small photographs from war zones into grids to compile an atlas of contemporary conflict, exhibiting the result as *The Wire*. We then commenced a similar project in oil painting, combining images from contemporary war, distant history, contemporary popular culture, and painted *trompe l'oeil*.

The question we wanted to ask about contemporary art – and the reason why we were intrigued by the possibilities of working within such a hallowed and

utterly bureaucratized museum tradition as war art – was simple. We wanted to know how to revise the rhetoric – both pro- and antiwar – surrounding images of war, which remain indisputably important in the formation of national identity in Australia and are also deeply resonant in our age. We wished to add a minimalism and also a metaphorical and critical scope to images of contemporary war that had not previously been seen in Australian art. As critic Ray Edgar noted: “If the Australian military was after a gung-ho endorsement of the Iraq conflict, clearly they had recruited the wrong troops” (2008, 18). Our method was to work with documentary objectivity in apparently neutral but very large photographs of silence and stillness, or apparently literal, extremely austere paintings of dust and emptiness. In a 2008 feature in the pages of the *Melbourne Age*, Andrew Stephens assessed our contribution as follows:

CNN, YouTube and the World War II, Korea and Vietnam films that have flooded out of Hollywood have brought war images much closer for civilians, vigorously shaping perceptions. Even so, such imagery emphasises constant action. In the art of Brown and Green, the results are wholly different: stillness and the “quiet looking things” of Streeton strongly characterise their work, yet there is much to be seen. Their paintings and photographs, made after a six-week tour of Afghanistan, Iraq and the Persian Gulf are, like their other work, complex and layered but much more firmly grounded in direct representation of what they saw amid a symphony of gravel, sand, dust and bomb-blast barricades. In some ways, they resemble grand 18th-century landscapes, carefully composed and steeped in one of war’s overwhelming yet little-documented qualities: the state of interminable waiting. (Stephens 2008, 17)

For us, the aim was an apparent neutrality and objectivity as the means for creating a powerful vision of overall clarity and focus (but not necessarily the truth) in the midst of chaotic ruination. Australian War Memorial curator Warwick Heywood defined this dimension thus:

Brown and Green’s abstracted, ruined world represents the obscure dimensions of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts that exist between globalised, military systems, severe landscapes and frontier mythology. This is a complex and imaginary realm that is echoed in the larger political, operational and technological dimensions of these wars. (2008a, 54)

When we saw vast lines of concrete, blast-proof barriers arrayed across the enormous American bases in Iraq, we photographed them so that the resemblances with minimalist sculptures by Robert Morris and Don Judd were obvious. In *History Painting: Market, Tarin Kowt, Uruzgan Province, Afghanistan* (2008; Figure 23.3), we were incorporating nineteenth-century Orientalist paintings of exotic Central Asia, painting what on first glance, given the tradition of history paintings in oils, was a large battle scene which resolved on inspection into an





**FIGURE 23.3** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *History Painting: Market, Tarin Kowt, Uruzgan Province, Afghanistan*, 2008, 121 × 121 cm, oil on linen. Collection Australian War Memorial, Canberra. © Australian War Memorial, Canberra. Courtesy of Australian War Memorial, Canberra.

incongruous mix of the exotic and utterly contemporary: armed soldiers in camouflage, local traders, military vehicles, a film crew, the vast, Taliban-controlled mountains of Afghanistan in the distance.

We had attempted to address the problem that war art's affective power to shape understanding has diminished in the West, a process inversely but oddly proportional to the increasing populist investment in the commemoration of war. In the war we saw the absence of conventional action – of the sort that Hollywood creates in spectacles of active conflict – and the intensity of focus over the whole field of vision, from the apparently least important objects to the most significant – was very clear. And, for artists whose work is immersed in the past, the phantom

presences of earlier genres of art were clothed in contemporary uniforms. All three methods were our solution of how to critique the spectacle of war without recreating it, and how to expand the definition of war art during the contemporary period, reshaping public understandings of war, its feats and effects, to impact on the intense contemporary public investment in national stories shaped by war through a revelation of the past embodied – as Warburg’s atlas of pathos, gesture, and affect – in the present.

We had imagined art as one restless archive. We laid out images next to each other like a deck of reluctant cards, regardless of media. The cards flicked, a virtual metacinema of flickering figures emerged in which individual artists and works disappeared, replaced by a combinatory landscape of repeated gestures, decay, and entropy. This was, of course, a metahistorical and curatorial approach to art-making that had been underpinned by the archival turn in contemporary art, in particular toward the atlas, and linked to a long series of artists’ and historians’ attempts to embody the art museum in works of art – to embody memory’s charge by critically showing it in action instead of describing it or, less critically, simply celebrating it – just as the force and flicker of memory informs contemporary war.

## Amelia Barikin

### Framing conflict

For over two decades, Brown and Green’s paintings, installations, and photographs have been carefully interrupting and diverting flows between events, images, memories, and histories. Their work responds to a growing field of cultural production in which categories of art, document, and media are blurred, resulting in a cross-pollination of narrative fact and narrative fiction. Such porosity has also contributed to a recent museological understanding that visual history – a history based on the particularity and contingency of *images* rather than stories – has altered the shape of narrative in contemporary communication networks (including those of museums). The second part of this chapter addresses Brown and Green’s critical engagement with museological tropes of taxonomy, classification, and archival display with specific reference to their commissioned work for the Australian War Memorial.

Conceived as a pioneering reference point for a host of memorializing and commemorating sites (Condé 2007), the Australian War Memorial aims to materialize an Australian national history through the collection and display of images, objects, and stories. It can as such be regarded as a museum involved in producing narratives about the past, situated within what Bommes and Wright (1982) have termed the “public historical sphere.” The core mission of the AWM is to commemorate the lives of Australians who have died as a result of military conflict; the institution’s publically promoted aim is “to assist Australians to remember,

interpret and understand the Australian experience of war and its enduring impact on Australian society.” Tony Bennett has noted that the most striking element of this attempt is that the history portrayed through the memorial’s collection is always taking place “elsewhere”: in the Middle East, in Europe, and in the Pacific. Bennett suggests that these are, for the memorial, the “places of ‘real history’ while ... references to contemporary events within Australia are almost entirely lacking” (1988, 140). The collection constantly points outside itself, producing an almost anamorphic picture of Australian history as ideas of the nation are seemingly generated from the “negative space” of international context.

In addition to the memorial’s role as a shrine, an archive, and a collection, the AWM has, since World War I, commissioned Australian artists to create “personal and informed representations” of military conflicts involving Australian personnel. Some of Australia’s most well-known painters have been involved in this scheme, including Arthur Streeton, George Lambert, Donald Friend, and Nora Heysen, with later artists including Rick Amor, Jon Cattapan, and Wendy Sharpe. Most of the works produced through the War Artist scheme are acquired by the memorial, and exhibited both on site and through a series of traveling exhibitions (many of the commissioned works have been toured – this kind of dispersed method of display is in keeping with the dispersed of the idea of the “nation” evident within the museum itself).

In 2007 the Australian War Memorial commissioned artists Brown and Green to travel and work with the Australian Defence forces in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Gulf. During their six-week commission, Brown and Green lived and worked “embedded” in sprawling American and allied military bases. They slept in huge army camps, visited massive food courts in the middle of barren straits of desert, were transported in armored vehicles from one base to another, and waited on tarmacs, sometimes for hours, for decisions to be made about where they would go next, or if was safe enough even to move. For the most part, the artists were enclosed within “green belts” and swathed in extraordinary blankets of surveillance.

Although Brown and Green were both suited up in body armor and were constantly trailed by protective minders while in Iraq and Afghanistan, they did not come up against censorship in the production of their works on their return. At a predeparture briefing, they were told by the AWM’s deputy director Nola Anderson that they should “feel complete freedom to do whatever you want for this commission. We do not wish to push you in any direction” (Crawford 2008, 242). Given Brown and Green’s well-publicized self-characterization as pacifists (they are “implacably anti-war”), perhaps this kind of reassurance seemed necessary.

It was also in line with a broader AWM policy on the role of the Official War Artist, as set in motion by the methodologies of John Treloar, the original director of the AWM from 1920 to 1952. In a letter to a colleague in 1945 Treloar wrote that, “although it has pleased our critics to inveigh against bureaucratic controls of artists, this in fact does not and has never existed. No one – except the critics – has ever told the artists what they should paint or how they should do it” (Condé 2007, 460). An enthusiastic collector with no artistic training and little scholarly knowledge of

modern art, Treloar was more focused on obtaining “faithful coverage” of sites of conflict than he was on the aesthetic qualities of his commissions. Producing “truthful records” was equally if not more important to Treloar than acquiring notable works of art.

Although the memorial’s curatorial policies have altered since Treloar’s time, elements of this approach remain unchanged. In 2008 AWM curator Warwick Heywood emphasized that the memorial has consistently supported the need for commissioned artists to produce alternative points of view and images from those already in circulation: “they were aware that art would bring something else, a different perspective from a written document; that it could capture sensations” that would differ from the messages communicated through historical records or archival documents (Stephens 2008, 16). Despite these claims, valid questions have nonetheless been raised as to the artistic freedom of artists contracted to the AWM. Australian artist George Gittoes, who has been pursuing and making critically engaged works at the front line of conflict zones for decades without the assistance of the AWM, argues that

Official war artists always have somebody looking over their shoulder, they are fed and protected, they don’t have to think for themselves ... If artists working for the war memorial saw the equivalent of what I have seen, they would be restricted from doing anything about it. (Matchett 2009)

It appears that many of the artists who have worked for the AWM would disagree with this characterization. Wendy Sharpe, for example, who was in East Timor in December 1999, has insisted that “if I had come back with terrible, negative images – which I would have if that is what I saw – the AWM would have taken my work” (Matchett 2009).

What is interesting about both Sharpe’s and Gittoes’s comments is that they indicate a desire to draw distinctions between “accurate” and “compromised” imagery. The intensity of the discord rests on a perceived breach of integrity: the integrity of the artists, the integrity of the state, and the integrity of the image. This is anxious discursive territory, bordered by issues of expectation and prohibition. It raises important questions as to the kinds of images that are expected from coverage of these zones, while drawing attention to the critical role of the frame (and the museum) in the creation of hermeneutic borders.

The pedagogical function of the museum as a space of learning and education relies fundamentally on positioning objects and images within clearly delineated narrative contexts. Within traditional models of museological display, images and objects are frequently anchored to specific times and places through didactic captions and explanatory texts. The Australian War Memorial is no different. Even during its establishment period, the curators were open to the inclusion of any object or image so long as the “story” behind the artifact remained intact. As Treloar quipped, “a good description transforms a piece of salvage into an interesting relic”

(Condé 2007, 455). This is a way of thinking about art as a “record” or a “memorial” of specific historical events in which the integrity of the event is somehow captured and “maintained” through the preservation of the image or object.

The pressure to present the “right kinds” of images in the communication of such narratives is high. Gaining access to images of combat, and particularly those of contemporary conflicts, is also increasingly dependent on negotiating a complex regulatory terrain. Following the invasion of Iraq in 2001, for example, there has been increasing pressure on governments and media of all factions to control the flows of images in and out of live combat areas. For American media outlets at least, such measures can in part be linked to the legacy of Vietnam, and the enormous (and, from the US government’s perspective, disastrous) effect that the broadcast of graphic, horrifying footage of casualties and fatalities had on mobilizing resistance to the war as a whole. An increase in security around the movement of international journalists since 1991 (the same year the George W. Bush administration prohibited the broadcast of images of coffins of American soldiers killed in combat) has also had significant effects on the kinds of images that are able to be captured and relayed, leading to a symptomatic invisibility of the human cost of war in broadcasts from major global media networks.

This pressure leads to a perceived imparity between two different “types” of images of war. The first encompasses the sorts of images characterized by Susan Sontag in her 2003 book *Regarding the Pain of Others* as graphic, gruesome, and utterly horrifying: the kind of representations that “viewers” have either come to expect from or associate with so-called front-line coverage (and expectations are very important to this argument) but which are, for the most part, absent from the 6 o’clock news. The second type, and the one most easily accessed, includes images in which “nothing happens” – the kind of images that led Jean Baudrillard to lambast the pretense of the First Gulf War as “bloodless” back in 1991, the kind of images that art historian David Joselit (2004; 2005) has accused of replicating the blind eye of empire in their dogged, paralyzed attention to insignificant details when the action is clearly elsewhere. But there are images that refuse alignment with either particular camp – images that instead have the peculiar ability to demolish expectations and take in the conditions that surround their production.

The photographs captured by Brown and Green while in Iraq and Afghanistan provide one example. On the one hand, these color-saturated, quasi-cinematic prints are decidedly not action shots. They depict no casualties, no deaths, no devastated civilian dwellings or wasted carnage. On the other, the images are extraordinary portraits of the *infrastructure*, the *capital*, and the *resources* that directly determine and regulate the “effects” of contemporary warfare. As Brown and Green have acknowledged in an email to me (June 2009), the formalism of the works is designed to match the technical subject matter: “images of a calibrated but amorphous military machine imposed across vast and severe, hostile landscapes; a ruined world that is also a description of the conflict between globalized military force, frontier mythologies and geographic severity.”



**FIGURE 23.4** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *Helicopter Landing, View from Roof of Morgue, Southern Iraq*, 2007–2009, 37.4 × 51.7 cm, digital color photograph, inkjet print on rag paper.

Courtesy of the artists.

*Helicopter Landing, View from Roof of Morgue, Southern Iraq* (2007–2009; Figure 23.4), was one in a bank of 60 digital prints arranged grid-like on the wall of their exhibition *The Approaching Storm* in June 2009. The photograph was captured at dusk. The horizon is pushed high to the edge of the frame and below that the scene is crowded with military vehicles, storage supplies, and piles of gravel that fan out in cluttered, random patterns toward the edges of the desert. In the foreground, a grid of roof tiles betrays the photographers' elevated position. The only sign of movement is a tiny helicopter hovering above the horizon line to the right of the frame.

This image was taken while standing on the roof of an American morgue looking out toward the desert in a military base in Iraq. One of the most immediately striking aspects of this work is the quality of the light: Brown and Green's decision to shoot almost all of their images exclusively at dawn and at dusk was highly deliberate. This tactical use of half-light gestures toward the moments before and after the shutter is released. The elongated shadows are the visual signifiers of time passing. This conscious attempt to register time as movement is found not only throughout the artists' recent images of Iraq and Afghanistan, but also throughout their practice as a whole, and it functions as a signpost toward entropy. The appearance of entropy in these works also works *against* classical conventions of documentary photography. We may recall, for example, Bernd and Hiller

Becher's insistence that images be captured at midday so as not to cast shadows that might distract from the objects in front of the lens, or Andreas Gurksy's confession that he prefers to shoot on gray days so as to keep the light even.

Second, *Helicopter Landing* epitomizes the paradoxical relationship between narrative and aesthetics that marks Brown and Green's approach toward their subject. To put it plainly, there is not a lot happening in this image. The helicopter referred to in the title is a mere speck in the sky, pictured far off in the distance. There are no figures in the frame, and so the composition, instead, foregrounds the machinations and objects of a situation. The roof of the morgue is used as a vantage point for a scene in which narrative – though seemingly everywhere in the title and formal composition of the work – appears as an alibi for something else. Death is literally below us: the morgue and the bodies interred below provide the foundation that enables this image to be read. Brown and Green have remarked that

everywhere we went there had been or was about to be rocketing or shells or in Afghanistan, suicide bombing. So in zones like these you can never wander around free, even inside the bases ... Anyone with the military is also a target. Either you are in the base or you are would be hostages, the same as for the soldiers themselves. (Crawford 2008, 22)

The artist's lens, then, is constantly trained on areas of potential blindness (ironic, given the level of surveillance that abounds). At the edges of the frame lies a liminal space of potential extinction, a zone in which the makers of the image "are would be hostages, the same as for the soldiers themselves."

It is little wonder that this body of work is dominated by wire fences, vast installations of crumbling concrete bunkers, and countless, no doubt hugely expensive, barriers of indeterminate military purpose. The desertscape seem to blend into one another, one scene replaced by the next. There is little visual attempt to distinguish images shot in Iraq from those taken in Afghanistan, leaving the titles alone to articulate geographic contexts. When figures do appear, they are either absorbed entirely in their work (preparing helicopters for take-off on the tarmac at night), have their backs to the camera (like the group of Afghan traders with soldiers pictured at a market inside Tarin Kowt Base), or are dwarfed by the environment.

In 2009 Charles Green noted that "if the media assumes the role of witnessing, we would argue that art explores the nature of an event's perception: the realisation, rather than the representation, of an event, especially such a vast panorama as The War on Terror" (Green 2009a). This is a crucial and telling statement. The sheer scale or "vast panorama" of contemporary warfare is linked to a lack of representation, or an inability to re-present. It is no accident that all of the photographs in this series appear poised in anticipation of events that constantly elude representation. Green's comment also makes an important distinction between infrastructure (the "realisation," or the way in which something is brought into being) and effects (the "representation," and also the aftermath, of events). Under

these terms, the role of the artist is not primarily to “witness” or represent what has come about, but to unpick the “realisation” of the representation itself.

This process has been a key element of Brown and Green’s projects since 1989. At the center of their practice lies a vast archive of images, documents, texts, and diagrams – a huge personal collection gleaned from numerous sources including art history, journalism, television, literature, cinema, and also from the artists’ own photographs. Their by now well-known process of production usually involves floating multiple images within new frames (the frame of the canvas, the frame of the lens) in order to produce intricate visual atlases that are assembled, in Green’s (2009a) words, “into something like complex flow charts or maps.”

It was this collection and redeployment of images that led Tom Nicholson to suggest that “the tension between narrative and its refusal constitutes arguably the underlying structure of [Brown and Green’s] works” (1999, 64). The tactic is clearly at odds with traditional modes of museological display that position narrative as a key signifier of historical and pedagogical value. For decades, artists, writers, and curators have interrogated these kinds of narrative assumptions and museological values, leading to a counterhistory of museology in alignment with open structures and unresolved forms. As museums became crucial framing devices for a burgeoning model of institutional critique (as in the works of Daniel Buren, Hans Haacke, Martha Rosler, and *Art and Language*, for example), remapping the museum from within the museum’s walls led to an expanded notion of “site” as discursive terrain (Kwon 2002). Working at once inside and outside the museum, artists renegotiated the terms of institutional engagement in dialogue with curatorial and museological imperatives. What was the role of the museum in this process? As Hal Foster noted in the 1990s, “in order to remap the museum or to reconfigure its audience, [one] must operate inside it” (1996, 191). The importation of countermuseological works into the museum can function, Foster continued, as both “a show of tolerance or for the purpose of inoculation (against a critique undertaken by the institution, from within the institution).” In this scenario, the museum, although far from a reluctant host, remains “in hiding”: its self-reflexivity displaced onto the works of art themselves.

In 1969 Robert Rauschenberg produced an offset lithograph for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York that features collaged photographic reproductions of some of the museum’s most famous “masterpieces” inked in red, yellow, and blue. Entitled *Centennial Certificate, Metropolitan Museum of Art*, the print contains no titles, no artists’ names, and no didactic captions. At the center of the work is a note handwritten in capital letters and signed R.R. The text reads:

Treasury of the conscience of man. Masterworks collected, protected and celebrated commonly. Timeless in concept the museum amasses to concertise a moment of pride serving to defend the dreams and ideals apolitically of mankind aware and responsive to the changes, needs and complexities of current life while keeping history and love alive.



Read in the context of Rauschenberg's practice, the statement exudes a certain level of irony. Unlike the Metropolitan Museum, which as a "treasury of the conscience" can be seen to order in a hierarchical fashion the "masterworks" of culture, Rauschenberg's flat-bed picture planes evicted narrative context, re-presenting disparate images as if they had been torn from the scrapbook of history.

It was no accident that Douglas Crimp used *Centennial Certificate* as the parting image in his much reproduced essay "On the Museum's Ruins" (1980). For Crimp, Rauschenberg's lithograph embodied the flipside of André Malraux's vision of the "museum without walls." Malraux infamously visualized the museum's collection as a deck of photographic cards that could be shuffled at will, but always with the purpose of creating a homogeneous sphere for display: "in our Museum without Walls picture, fresco, miniature and stained-glass window seem of one and the same family ... For all alike ... have become 'colorplates'" (Malraux 1978, 44, quoted in Crimp 1980, 52). For Rauschenberg, the same concept – that of history as a stack of reproductions – could be put to work to reveal the ways in which museums can obscure the heterogeneity of visual knowledge. This kind of thinking was not an isolated occurrence for Rauschenberg. As the American art critic Leo Steinberg maintained, "against Rauschenberg's picture plane you can pin or project image because it will not work as the glimpse of a world, but a scrap of printed material" (1972b, 32).

How does this idea of the "scrapbook" of history sit with Charles Green and Lyndell Brown's images, or – somewhat trickier – with their photographs for the AWM? The key lies in drawing a distinction between ideas of the archive and ideas of the atlas as they appear in the artists' works. Whereas an archive is primarily directed toward "naming" (cataloging, indexing, classifying), the atlas, in contrast, foregrounds the interstices of relationships. In Brown and Green's painting *Styx* (2005; Figure 23.5), Robert Smithson's *Spiral Jetty* is overlaid with image fragments of Joseph Beuys and Johnny Depp from Jim Jarmusch's *Dead Man* (1995); in their DuraClear photographic print *Island* (2002), a page from an eighteenth-century manuscript on gardening and a Godard film still are juxtaposed against the backdrop of an astronaut on the moon (the astronaut is a recurrent motif for Brown and Green, who have also described themselves as "artist-astronauts"). Forging relationships between these fragments is at the discretion of the viewer. Meaning shifts depending on context, memory, and levels of image saturation. As Blair French has so beautifully written of these works: "in these small theatres of suspended reality, hallucinations and dreams are not conditions of escape but urgent performative undertakings through which history, society and the self fleetingly come into focus" (2005, 4). These are images about how the past figures in the present, and how it might be accessed and remembered. They are about the realization and reconstitution of events. As such, they constitute a deeply political project.

One of the most significant and recurring ciphers for Brown and Green's image politics (and an extensive subject of their collaborative research) is Aby Warburg's



**FIGURE 23.5** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *Styx*, 2005, 155 × 155 cm, oil on linen. Private collection, London. Courtesy of the artists.

*Mnemosyne Atlas* (1927–1929). Warburg's *Atlas* was made up of 60 separate wooden panels, across which were arranged monochromatic photographs of varied subjects, including Renaissance paintings, ancient Greek sculptures, and Native American rituals. Warburg's *Atlas* was not intended to function as a work of art, nor was it designed to serve an explicit taxonomic purpose. According to Brown and Green (2010), the *Atlas* was, instead, intended to operate as a "memory storage device" that sought to communicate a "psychological history and language of affect, encoded and transmitted in visual images." Rather than seeking to recall something specific, the pages of Warburg's *Atlas* enacted memory as a process or technique. Green has written elsewhere with respect to this memory process that "catharsis is not the object. The addictive object is recollection. The point is to have something to remember ... in order to overcome forgetting" (2007, 54).

This idea of "overcoming forgetting" or combating amnesia also helps to explain Warburg's unique methods for organizing visual material. Whereas in Malraux's imaginary museum each item in the collection existed autonomously (only one image per card), Warburg set his numerous images within specifically delineated relationships. In the *Mnemosyne Atlas*, they were affixed to plates that montaged multiple images in singular frames, the borders between each image carefully preserved. This was primarily because, as Anthony Gardner has noted,

Warburg's primary interest lay in the motifs recurring between images from different times and contexts: in frozen moments of gesture – or dynamograms, as he called them – [that] were imprints of the historical contexts and often traumatic events that engendered them, a conductor of the petrified affective charge from those events. (2009, 360)

It was these “dynamograms” or frozen gestures that formed the basis of Warburg's collection of reiterations, leading to the challenging idea that not only the visual form but the *affect* of an image can recognizably reappear over time.

For Brown and Green, the AWM commission was an opportunity to build on this atlas form both within the context of their own practice and against broader discourses of “the archival turn” within contemporary art (Foster 2004). As Green (2009a) has noted:

we were assembling atlas pages of contemporary history unfolding, but collapsing into the archive or memory at the same time. At the moment that we realised we had to gather our own high quality photographs of contemporary history, the AWM appeared coincidentally and mysteriously to offer us the fieldwork in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Clearly, the methodological drive from their earlier works remained intact. Visually, however, the images produced out of the commission were strikingly different from their previous work. These new photographs of figures and landscapes produced in Iraq and Afghanistan were not collages or palimpsests but were instead singular images of near-documentary quality that seemingly elided the curious affect or pathos so central to Warburg's ideology.

However, and this is critical, we must also remember that, when Brown and Green publicly exhibited the photographic component of their commission, the images were presented (1) as a series and (2) in grid formation. This grid formation undermined the singularity of the separate frames, bringing the series as a whole much closer to the form of the atlas visible in Brown and Green's earlier works. Although there are numerous reference points for the appearance of the grid in Brown and Green's practice, two in particular are of special significance. The first is the photography of Bernd and Hiller Becher, and their long-term typological study of prewar industrial architecture in Germany and America from the 1960s onward. Brown and Green are keenly aware of the Bechers' project and its attempt to both memorialize and neutralize forms across time and space. The second reference, also familiar to the artists, is Rosalind Krauss's essay on the grid from 1979.

In this essay, Krauss described the grid as an irritant to “historical” (by which she meant “developmental”) time. She regarded it as a “myth” form, remarking that, “like all myths, [the grid] deals with paradox or contradiction not by dissolving the paradox or resolving the contradiction but by covering them over so that they seem (but only so they seem) to go away.” She continued: “The grid's mythic

power is that it makes us able to think we are dealing with materialism (or sometimes science, or logic) while at the same time it provides us with a release into belief (or illusion, or fiction)” (Krauss 1979, 12). The grid’s antidevelopmental structure prefigured the kinds of connections that would later reappear in Deleuze and Guattari’s writings on the rhizome. The logic of categorization suggested by the grid is a decoy that leads straight into the construction of fiction. What emerges is a dialectical relationship between materialism and mysticism, objects and beliefs.

The description closely resonates with the operation of Brown and Green’s works. In their photographs of military encampments and desert landscapes, we are presented both with a timeless horizontal vista of unending war (landscapes blend into each other; the same codes of infrastructure appear again and again at different locations in time and space) and at the same time an *entropic* vision of specific fields of conflict – visible in the ruins of industrial decay, the elongated shadows, the signals of time passing. History unfolds, but is at the same time arrested. It is then particularly pertinent that for Brown and Green the grid, as a primary structural mechanism, appears at times interchangeable with the atlas. As Green has explained:

An atlas is more than a method of navigating an archive. An atlas is a highly specific type of archival form, a different medium, which draws on a separate form, the map ... The atlas is distinct: it is relational and geographic-spatial, not taxonomic. It is governed by grids, not categories. (2009b, 972)

Numerous artists have invoked the sign of the atlas under similar terms, including Gerhard Richter (in his ongoing *Atlas* project) and also Marcel Broodthaers, particularly in his 1975 book *La conquête de l'espace: Atlas à usage des artistiques et des militaires* (see Buchloh 1998). The conjunction between the atlas and the grid reveals a fundamental difference between Krauss’s thinking and Brown and Green’s perspective on what constitutes “history.” In Krauss’s reading, the form of history was construed as “developmental,” meaning that one thing leads to the next and so on, which enables a visible trail of causes and effects in the progression from past, present, to future. Although this may seem an intuitive approach, to my mind it appears reductive. It needs to be updated in order to address what happens when we begin to picture “contemporary history,” particularly as captured by the Australian War Memorial.

In confronting the field of contemporary history, the notion of site as discourse again comes to the fore. Artists have approached history as both a discursive condition and a site for work in much the same way, as Foster has argued, that artists have treated “conditions like desire or disease as sites for work” (Foster 1996, 199). How, then, does this sit with history’s diachronic investment in tracking (and recalling) progressions and shifts across a temporal axis? From the 1950s onward, the idea of art as a component of an informational network has been linked to the emergence of a “horizontal” mode of production, wherein artistic production is located

within a cultural continuum (Alloway [1959] 1987; Steinberg 1972a). Reflecting on this condition in the 1990s, Hal Foster insisted that

the horizontal mode of working demands that artists and critics be familiar not only with the structure of each culture well enough to map it, but also with its history well enough to narrate it ... one must understand not only the discursive breadth but also the historical depth. (1996, 202)

Straddling this double imperative results in a renewed alliance between the expansive, horizontal terrain of *culture as text* and the vertical imprint of *image as memory*, the vertices of time on which history and memory are enacted (the memory effect). The form that this alliance takes is precisely that of the grid: the operating system of the atlas.

Pause for a moment to review the story so far. Brown and Green accept an invitation from a museum within the “public historical sphere” to travel to war zones in which, as they see it, contemporary history is unfolding. Out of this experience they produce a body of work in which “history” as a developmental concept is nullified, broken into fragments and positioned against a timeless landscape in which, seemingly (but only seemingly), nothing happens. A strange and weird honesty emerges out of the photographs’ inscrutable lucidity. We see everything and know nothing. Tactics of disguise and decoy seem to point inward, back toward themselves. Politics and aesthetics are indeed one and the same. We encounter the *realization*, not the representation, of events – images of resources, capital, and infrastructure. This approach is in stark contrast to dominant media-based (and more conservative museological) doctrines that would have us believe that history can only ever be constituted by the access and circulation of *re-presentations* alone.

That the photographs were presented in grid formation and as a series also emphasizes their distinctive place within the collection of the Australian War Memorial. Brown and Green were keenly aware of the history of the memorial’s collecting policies and the curatorial imperatives that have shaped its collection. The images they produced for the commission were perceived not only as part of the artists’ personal “atlas” of contemporary history, but were also created in proportion to the AWM’s cultural role as a “memory storage device” – a means of making sense of the archive through the form of the atlas. Museum collections, although guided by policy, evolve organically – they can be shaped through the availability of particular works at auction houses, for example, or by networks of collectors or changing public needs. The unique element of the War Artist scheme is that it is tailored a priori. Artists knowingly produce works that will be absorbed back into the collection. There is, then, an additional awareness of context for participating artists, as images are created with their future trajectories intact. That the AWM supported Brown and Green’s practice despite the evident challenges their work presents to “traditional” museum-based pedagogy also speaks to an increased self-awareness within the museum profession as to the limits and



**FIGURE 23.6** Lyndell Brown and Charles Green, *Hare Rama Hare Krishna*, 2008–2009, oil on linen, 170 × 170 cm. Private collection, Brisbane. Courtesy of the artists.

possibilities of museological control (Stam 1993; Message 2006). And, given Brown and Green's conceptual priorities, their contribution to the AWM's existing system of mnemonic control and image management becomes doubly significant.

There is an addendum to this narrative, or perhaps another beginning – a final image that acts as both a coda to the main event and a parallel tale. At the center of Brown and Green's 2008 painting *Hare Krishna, Hare Rama* (an image also produced out of their commission in Afghanistan and Iraq) is a precisely rendered scene of two women absorbed in an ecstatic dance (Figure 23.6). Images spin like shrapnel around this extraordinary focal point: a field of opium poppies in Afghanistan (based on photos taken from a military helicopter by Brown and Green in 2007); travelers on a bridge crossing an abyss in the Himalayas; an ashram in northern India; an almost unrecognizable newspaper clipping; and, finally, as if to somehow hold this volatile constellation together, painted renditions of ripped and torn paper, immediately evocative of the ruined shards in Caspar David Friedrich's 1824 painting *Das Eismeer (The Sea of Ice)* (also known as *The Wreck of Hope*). Not only is the content of each image fragment primarily related to shifts in being (physical and mental border crossings, drugged states, trances) but the edges between the fragments are also totally fluid.

*Hare Krishna, Hare Rama* is a psychedelic history painting: a blur of events in which time and space are collapsed and yet anchored to determinate contexts. Surprisingly, it performs exactly the balance of atemporality and social contingency evident throughout Brown and Green's photographs of war. The controlled violence of warfare is out of control. Borders, territories, and subjectivities are liquidized as images spread virally across surfaces. History, too, is unhinged from moment-making trajectories. The effect is humbling. These works teach us something about how we get to where we are, and what is at stake in locating ourselves in history through the collection and circulation of images. They forge an interzone in which the form of the atlas emerges as a catalyst for the production and consumption of situated visual knowledge. In layering these ideas onto the form of the museum, it becomes possible to theorize museum practice from the inside out – by positioning works of art as potential models for, rather than symptoms of, museological governance and display. As the artists have noted, “the so-called natural thing to do is to forget the viewfinder and just see the view; we want to make art where we see both at once” (Crawford 2008, 25). We are left with double vision, a mirror trail through the “calibrated but amorphous” remainders of the museum's ruins.

## References

- Ahlström, C. 1998. “Tradition and Pioneering Spirit without Any Kangaroos.” *Göteborgs posten*, March 30.
- Alloway, L. (1959) 1987. “The Long Front of Culture.” In *This Is Tomorrow Today: The Independent Group and British Pop*, edited by B. Wallis. New York: Institute for Art & Urban Resources.
- Barker, H., and C. Green. 2010. “The Provincialism Problem: Terry Smith and Centre-Periphery Art History.” *Journal of Art Historiography* 3. Accessed November 3, 2014. [https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/media\\_183176\\_en.pdf](https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/media_183176_en.pdf).
- Bennett, T. 1988. *Out of Which Past: Critical Reflections on Australian Museum and Heritage Policy*. Nathan, Qld: Griffith University Institute for Cultural Policy Studies.
- Bommes, M., and P. Wright. 1982. “‘Charms of Residence’: The Public and the Past.” In *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics*, edited by R. Johnson, G. McLennan, B. Schwartz, and D. Sutton, pp. 253–302. London: Hutchinson.
- Brown, L., and C. Green. 2010. “The Memory Effect: Making Modern Images of Memory in the Twentieth Century.” Unpublished manuscript.
- Buchloh, H. D. 1998. “Warburg's Paragon? The End of Collage and Photomontage in Postwar Europe.” In *Deep Storage: Collecting, Storing and Archiving in Art*, edited by I. Schaffner, pp. 50–60. Munich: Prestel.
- Condé, A. M. 2007. “John Treloar, Official War Art and the Australian War Memorial.” *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 53(3): 451–464.
- Conrad, P. 2003. *At Home in Australia*. Canberra: Thames & Hudson/National Gallery of Australia, pp. 246–247.

## 508 Theory from Practice/Practicing Theory

- Crawford, A. 2008. "Interview: Lyndell Brown and Charles Green in the War Zone." *Photofile* 83: 20–25.
- Crimp, D. 1980. "On the Museum's Ruins." *October* 13: 41–57.
- Edgar, R. 2008. "The Art of War." *Age*, November 5, 18.
- Eisenman, S. F. 2007. *The Abu Ghraib Effect*. London: Reaktion.
- Foster, H. 1996. "The Artist as Ethnographer." In *The Return of the Real*, pp. 171–203. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foster, H. 2004. "An Archival Impulse." *October* 110: 3–22.
- French, B. 2005. *Tranquility*. Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, pp. 2–4.
- Gardner, A. 2009. "Politically Unbecoming: Critiques of Democracy and Postsocialist Art from Europe." Doctoral thesis, University of New South Wales College of Fine Arts, Sydney.
- Green, C. 1995. *Peripheral Vision: Contemporary Australian Art 1970–1994*. Sydney: Craftsman House.
- Green, C. 2007. "Broken Screen." *Broadsheet* 36(1): 54–55.
- Green, C. 2008. "The Memory Effect: Anachronism, Time and Motion." *Third Text* 22(6): 681–698.
- Green, C. 2009a. "Contemporary Art and Contemporary War." Harn Distinguished Scholar Lecture Series, University of Florida.
- Green, C. 2009b. "The Atlas Effect: Constraint, Freedom and the Circulation of Images." In *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, edited by J. Anderson, pp. 971–975. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Green, C. 2009c. "The Gallipoli Series." In *Sidney Nolan: The Gallipoli Series*, edited by L. Webster and L. Wilkins, pp. 23–30. Canberra: Australian War Memorial.
- Green, C., and L. Brown. 2002. "Robert Smithson's Ghost in 1920s Hamburg: Reading Aby Warburg's Mnemosyne Atlas as a Non-Site." *Visual Resources: An International Journal of Documentation* 18(2): 167–181.
- Green, C., and N. Croggan. 2011. "Shaun Gladwell: Gesture, Critique and Skateboarding." *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Art* 35: 116–137.
- Hart, D. 2002. *Tales of the Unexpected*. Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, pp. 20–25.
- Heywood, W. 2008a. "Obscure Dimensions of Conflict: Lyndell Brown and Charles Green." *Artlink* 28(1): 52–55.
- Heywood, W. 2008b. *Framing Conflict: Iraq and Afghanistan; Lyndell Brown and Charles Green*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial.
- Hill, P. 2005. "Somewhere in a Gallery Far, Far Away." *Age*, June 8, Metro, 10.
- Hoorn, J. 1998. "The Desiring Phantom: Contemplating the Art of Lyndell Brown and Charles Green." *Art and Australia* 35(3): 374–381.
- Joselit, D. 2004. "Commanding View." *Artforum* 42(7): 45.
- Joselit, D. 2005. "Terror and Form." *Artforum* 43(5): 45–46.
- Krauss, R. 1979. "Grids." *October* 9: 50–64.
- Kwon, M. 2002. *One Place after Another: Site Specificity and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lakin, S. 2006. *Contact: Photographs from the Australian War Memorial Collection*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial.
- McDonald, H. 2001. *Erotic Ambiguities: The Female Nude in Art*. London: Routledge.



- Malraux, A. 1978. *Museum without Walls: The Voices of Silence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Matchett, S. 2009. "The Art of War." *Weekend Australian Review*, April 25. Accessed October 31, 2009. <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,25365423-22242,00.html>.
- Message, K. 2006. *New Museums and the Making of Culture*. Oxford: Berg.
- Michaud, P. 2004. *Aby Warburg and the Image in Motion*. Translated by Sophie Hawkes. New York: Zone.
- Miller, A. 2003. "The Artist as Magician." *Meanjin* 62(2): 41–58.
- Nelson, R. 1995. "A Little Temple of Klio." *Age*, September 20, 14.
- Nelson, R. 1999. "Capturing Images of Abduction." *Age*, October 6, 6.
- Nicholson, T. 1999. "Archives after the '70s." *Artlink* 19(1): 63–65.
- Papastergiadis, N. 2006. *Spatial Aesthetics: Art Place and the Everyday*. London: Rivers Oram.
- Runefelt, E. 1998. "Out of Australia's Living Heart." *Svenska Dagbladet*, March 29, 17.
- Sontag, S. 2003. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. London: Penguin.
- Stam, D. C. 1993. "The Informed Muse: The Implications of 'the New Museology' for Museum Practice." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 12: 267–283.
- Steinberg, L. 1972a. *Other Criteria*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 82–91.
- Steinberg, L. 1972b. "Reflections on the State of Criticism." Repr. in *Robert Rauschenberg*, edited by B. Joseph. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Stephens, A. 2008. "Once Were Witnesses." *Age*, November 29(2), A2, 16–17.
- Wilkins, L. 2003. *Artists in Action: From the Collection of the Australian War Memorial*. Canberra: Australian War Memorial.

Amelia Barikin is a contemporary art historian with a research interest in philosophies of time. She has worked as a lecturer, curator, and editor for numerous Australian arts institutions including Liquid Architecture and the Australian Centre for the Moving Image, and is also a founding board member of the art history journal *emaj*, a board member of the Institute of Modern Art in Brisbane, and a member of the Research Unit for Public Cultures (University of Melbourne). Her recent publications include *Parallel Presents: The Art of Pierre Huyghe* (MIT Press, 2012), and the coedited anthology *Making Worlds: Art and Science Fiction* (Surplus, 2013). Amelia is currently researching the intersection of art and science fiction as a postdoctoral research fellow in art history at the University of Queensland.

Lyndell Brown and Charles Green have worked in collaboration as one artist since 1989. In 2007 they were Australia's Official War Artists, deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq. Their works are included in most Australian public collections. They live in regional Victoria. At the moment they are working with Jon Cattapan on a project documenting the aftermath of war with the assistance of an Australian Research Council Discovery grant. Lyndell Brown is a Research Fellow at the University of Melbourne. Charles Green is Professor of Contemporary Art at the University of Melbourne. He has written *Peripheral Vision: Contemporary Australian Art 1970–1994* (Craftsman House, 1995) and *The Third Hand: Artist Collaborations from Conceptualism to Postmodernism* (University of Minnesota Press, 2001), and has

been an Australian correspondent for *Artforum* for many years. As Adjunct Senior Curator for Contemporary Art at the National Gallery of Victoria, he worked as a curator on *Fieldwork: Australian Art 1968–2002* (2002), *world rush\_4 artists* (2003), *2004: Australian Visual Culture* (ACMI/NGVA, 2004), and *2006 Contemporary Commonwealth* (ACMI/NGVA, 2006). Currently, Green and Anthony Gardner (University of Oxford) are writing a history of biennales since the 1950s with the assistance of an Australian Research Council Discovery grant.