**Example: Annotated Bibliography**

Project: ‘Harry’s London: Pictorialism, Photography and New Zealand’s Colonial Culture, 1880-1940’ (you can see how it turned out: ‘Pictorialism, Photography and Colonial Culture, 1880-1940’, NZJH, October 2013.)

Bate, David, ‘Photography and the Colonial Vision’, *Third Text*, Vol. 7, No.22, 1993, pp.81-91.

Not useful – fairly post colonial reading of some ‘orientalist’ images, complete with Bhaba mimicry which of course is not at all useful for white set soc, all enmeshed images in context, etc.

Coulston, Isobel N. ed., *Photographic Endeavours of the Gisborne Camera Club, 1916-1998*, Gisborne Camera Club, Inc., Gisborne, 1998.

Brief pre-war existence, then set up again in 1934, when it would ‘work on similar lines to the camera Pictorialists of Auckland and that membership should be open to all workers sufficiently advanced too be doing their own work and with aspirations towards pictorialism.’’, p. 3 Also arranged to ‘affiliate immediately with Royal Photographic society of England. This latter organisation makes available to its affiliated members from time to time collections of print, lantern slides and lectures which will be of inestimable value to the young society’. P. 3-4

Also saw ‘Here and there’ in April 1935. P. 5. Photographic circle folded in1938, and was immediately reborn as the camera club, contued with its programmes of lectures etc – 1938 portfolios from Edinburgh, south Africa, Tasmanian and RPS

W. J. T. Mitchell, ed., *Landscape and Power*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994.

W. J. T. Mitchell, ‘Introduction’, pp.5-34 resituates landscape not as a genre but as a ‘vast network of cultural codes’, p.13. So this very relevant and of course evident in works like James Ryan and Fowkes Tobin. Suggests the usual categories – picturesque heroic, pastoral etc should define not the painting activity but the visual spaces to be painted. Also notes the double movement – imperial expansion ‘typically accompanied by a renewed interest in the re-representation of the home landscape.’ P. 17

Two case studies – NZ and Palestine ‘ notes NZ is ‘virtually synonymous with pristine natural beauty, a nation whose principal commodity is the presentation and representation of landscape’.p.20

See F Pound , *Frames on the landscape*, argues landscape is built on borrowed conventions – Mitchell intends to do more that unseat a nationalist conception with a derivative one …‘Not simply retrieve their conventionality but explore the ideological use of their conventions in a specific place and time.’p.23.

Fowkes Tobin, Beth, *Picturing Imperial Power: Colonial Subjects in Eighteenth Century British Painting*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 1999.

 ‘Paintings, as is the case with all cultural production, are not merely reflections of larger social and economic forces; they participate in the production of meaning, in the dynamic construction of identities, and in the structuring within discursive fields of particular positionalities.’ P. 1

Imperial power was asserted, redeployed, and negotiated in what seem to be relatively benign, even mundane paintings.’ P. 2 (CF photos)

Also argues, as Linda Nochlin does, that art historical categories , with the emphasis on great art, can mean we miss their role as ‘political documents’ p. 3 – this is true of amateur art photography. But in the just the same way, these photos can ‘make visible to us today the relations of power that structure these paintings’. P. 3 Now, if we reveal structures of power in these cultural artefacts, we come close to the idea of ‘colonial knowledge’ generally kept in the province of the colonised/coloniser binary, and contentious enough when kept within that.