

Publishing History

Magazine Culture: Notes Towards a History of Australian Periodical Publication 1920–1970

DAVID CARTER, GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY

In recent essays I've argued that Australian literary criticism lacks an institutional history, a history of the cultural institutions which govern writing, reading, criticism, careers, publication and publicity; a history, in part, of the relations between literature and the public sphere ('Literary Canons'). Our critical practices are still largely organised in terms of individual texts and writers – from the *Oxford Companion* to the Austlit database – and despite our various post-structuralisms our Australian literature courses are still mostly lists of famous writing.

My calls for an institutional history are coming back to haunt me as I begin to write what I still hope will be a history of Australian periodical publication, 1920–1970. To put it simply: I'm not really sure how to do it. The problem came to me in a form that stopped my writing in its tracks when I was working on a chapter about the magazines of the 1920s. I'd become involved in describing the social divisions of post-First World War Australia and the process whereby a new social consensus was formed around concepts of nation and race. What I'd written was respectable social history, as far as I could tell, but the magazines had become nothing but a source of examples that could have been drawn just as well from other sources. In what sense, then, was I writing a history of magazines? How would a history of magazines of the 1920s look different from a history of the 1920s that happened to use magazines for its examples? It was precisely the institutional aspects of the magazines I'd missed: their specific functions for writers and readers, their distinctive place in the print economy, how they occupied the space of culture, their role in maintaining or capturing a public sphere, the function of their literature, what the magazines did that nothing else in the culture did. On reflection, the 1920s was the right place to be confronted with these problems because, with the exception of *Vision*, almost none of its magazines could figure as famous writing.

What is a history of periodicals a history of? One answer might be: a history of 'magazine culture', after Tom O'Regan's work on Australian television. In defining his object as 'television culture', O'Regan is concerned to bridge the gap between television criticism – concerned with programs – and industry or governmental concerns with television services. Television culture describes 'the dissemination of television and its political and social disposition in space and time'; 'distribution and broadcasting strategies, institutional structures, and the different activities involved in creating, regulating, screening, criticising and otherwise pro-

ducing and watching television in Australia' (O'Regan xix). To redispense the concept, 'magazine culture' implies, first, locating a magazine in relation to other magazines, other kinds of magazine, and other kinds of publication, newspaper and book publication especially. This is the space magazines occupy in the print economy, between the newspaper and the book. But it won't always be the same space with the same internal and external relations: the 1920s, when newspapers were flourishing but there was scarcely a local book publishing industry, was a very different world for magazines than the present, with the dwindling number of newspapers becoming ever more magazine-like while magazines become ever more book-like in a volatile publishing economy. General magazines in the twenties occupied the same cultural space as the theatre, which they reviewed extensively, forms that mixed popular and literary modes, art and commerce, art and entertainment. Magazines today are forced to define themselves in the cultural space of the media. Unlike the twenties, most literature in cultural magazines today, the ones we don't buy in the newsagent's, can't help but look like the residue of book publication. Those we do buy in the newsagent's belong wholly to the realm of the media.

Magazine culture means close attention to the ways in which magazines are disposed across the cultural field: their relation to the market; to other cultural institutions (media houses, universities); to literature, publics or the nation; and to social and historical time (do they exist ephemerally, to be read and discarded, or do they appeal like works of art outside time – what is the periodical's periodicity?). To define this structured field is to define the relationship between magazines and the public sphere.

Terry Eagleton, in *The Function of Criticism*, offers a short history of literary criticism which is in many ways an exemplary institutional history. For my purposes the interest is that Eagleton's history of criticism is also a history of periodicals. Criticism begins in the early eighteenth century with the invention of the periodical, those of the essayists in the *Spectator* and *Tatler*; the periodicals bring the 'classical' public sphere into being. In this public sphere, writer and reader belong to the one community in which criticism is a public rather than private activity. Its formation in eighteenth-century England was an act of class consolidation, fusing all respectable ranks in a common discourse of taste and conduct, a discourse of educated laymen, reflected in the 'flexible, heterogeneous forms of the magazine and periodical' (19). Thus the magazines were instrumental in 'the formation of a broad, national public opinion' (17). And thus the emergence of the critic: 'What will help to unify the English ruling bloc is culture; and the critic is the chief bearer of this historic task' (12).

So the periodical and the public sphere are born at the same historical moment. But in exemplary dialectical fashion the classical public sphere carries within it the seeds of its own demise – in turning political disputatiousness into polite letters it begins that rupture between criticism and politics which marks English criticism for the rest of its history. This is a dubious lapsarian history rather than a positive account of criticism's institutionalisation (Bennett 228–32). For my purposes, how-

ever, what is interesting is that Eagleton's subsequent history relates a series of attempts to re-invent the public sphere. Eagleton applies this phrase to a range of nineteenth and twentieth-century magazines and their typical citizens, the man of letters, the sage, the critic. We might, then, describe the history of modern periodicals as a history of attempts to re-invent the public sphere but in times 'when its material conditions had definitively passed' (Eagleton 75).

Although Australian criticism is only one part of my project – magazines such as *Walkabout* call on quite other discourses – we can indeed approach the twentieth-century history of Australian periodicals as a history of attempts to re-invent a public sphere. It might be argued that some of the material conditions of the English eighteenth century survived into (or formed in) late-nineteenth century Australia, enabling the formation of a new kind of public sphere. Industrialisation was less significant; the university was less powerful as an autonomous institution; the separation between criticism and the market place, criticism and journalism, was not yet firmly institutionalised; the local publishing market outside newspapers scarcely existed.

I'm thinking, of course, of the *Bulletin* in its first two decades. Although before my starting point, the early *Bulletin* cast its shadow over all general literary magazines well into the middle of the twentieth century. To deploy Eagleton's class analysis, the *Bulletin* created a public sphere, a consensual common discourse, which enacted a class consolidation in opposition to a kind of authoritarian power, here the colonial ruling class and its imperialist institutions. Even if we want to break down the gross language of class into a more disparate analysis of institutions the general argument holds. It was no longer a negotiation between emergent bourgeoisie and residual aristocracy but between the petite bourgeoisie (like the *Bulletin* editors and managers), a section of the established bourgeoisie, and the emerging working class – wresting for this alliance, from a more traditionally constituted elite, the right and power of debate and judgement about politics or finance or culture. Thus the logic behind the seemingly incommensurate diversity of the *Bulletin's* contents: its interest in party politics, business, bohemia, banking and finance, society, labour, literature, theatre, sport, the city and the bush. Its interest in business was by no means opposed to its interest in literature, republicanism or nationality.

Sylvia Lawson's ground-breaking study of the *Bulletin* shows that this consensual heterogeneity depended, like the discourse of the eighteenth-century essayists, upon the invention of a kind of writing. Like the early periodicals, the *Bulletin* invented a form of 'high-class popularisation' (Eagleton 17). A passage from Eagleton needs hardly any adjustment to apply to the writing and public address of the early *Bulletin*:

The critic as cultural commentator acknowledges no inviolable boundary between one idiom and another, one field of social practice and the next ... The flexible, heterogeneous forms of the magazine and periodical reflect this relaxed capaciousness: fictional and non-fictional material equally co-exist, moral essays slip easily into anecdote and allegory,

and the collaboration of the readership is actively solicited in the writing. (Eagleton 19)

Or, in Sylvia Lawson's terms, the *Bulletin* turned its readers into writers on a weekly basis (Lawson 165).

It is in this sense that I also like to think of a history of magazines or magazine culture as what John Guillory calls a 'history of writing' not merely a history of writers (62). Once again this means less attention to famous writing – and famous editors – and more attention to the structural place of magazines in a print culture or print economy. It means more attention to the magazine as a genre or set of genres in its own right rather than just a container of other genres; as its own kind of text rather than merely the pre-text for book publication. It means trying to read journals prior to, in a sense in willful ignorance of, the canonisation of writers and writing. It also means not writing only about literary magazines.

A history of writing must also be a history of audiences. Actual audiences as far as possible, because I want to write a thoroughly respectable empirical history, but also a history of implied or ideal audiences – in short a history of attempts to reinvent the public sphere. We might understand the first duty of any magazine to be not so much finding actual readers as inventing its ideal readership, writing and editorialising its audience into being – as citizens, souls, 'readers', members of a public (or not). The first question posed to any magazine might be, then, not who are its editors or contributors but what is its mode of address, what is the readership it calls into being.

Like the early periodicals, the *Bulletin* represents an historical moment when the market-place produced the public sphere and sustained the conditions for its coming into being. It created an imagined community of readers and writers. But as the echo of Benedict Anderson's term suggests, this was also an imagined community of Australian readers. In the *Bulletin* the discourse constituting this national community was not yet completely settled in the realm of culture. It required a political settlement as well, one form of which was Federation. The *Bulletin's* unenthusiastic endorsement of Federation spelt the end of its 'great republican refusal' (Lawson 137). But the compromises of Federation also followed the logic of the *Bulletin's* own discourse of national interest. Thus its oppositional cultural politics could be folded with barely a wrinkle into the governing rhetoric of the 1910s and 1920s. The public sphere became virtually indistinguishable from this rhetoric and in that sense the public sphere all but disappeared.

And (late in the piece) this is where my history begins, in the early 1920s which sees the end of one phase of periodical publication, carried forth from the nineteenth century, and the beginning of another which extends at least to the late 1960s. The early twenties sees the demise of the *Lone Hand* and the *Bookfellow*, both offspring of the early *Bulletin*. It sees a number of attempts, in fact, to re-invent the early *Bulletin*: the last incarnation of the *Lone Hand*; the largely unknown *Aussie* (a vehicle for Vance Palmer); *Smith's Weekly* and *Steele Rudd's Magazine*, perhaps, too, the later *Bulletin* itself. At the same time we see the beginning not just of new

magazines but new kinds of magazines: *Aussie* and *Smith's Weekly*, in their own way, but more especially *Art in Australia*, the *Home* and *Vision*. Each had a new relation to the public, to modernity, to journalism and the market. The shifts in magazine culture can be seen in the shifts of editorial profile. Whereas the editors of the *Lone Hand*, the *Bookfellow*, *Aussie* and *Smith's* were journalists first and men of letters as a consequence, the editors of the newer magazines were artists or critics first, editors or journalists second. The split between Slessor the poet and Slessor the journalist – he thoroughly inhabits both worlds, but separately – is the exception that proves the rule.

The 1920s is on the cusp of the formation of a mass-mediated public sphere and the first decade in Australia 'after' modernism. Ironically, given its anti-modernism, *Vision* has strong claims to be Australia's first modernist little magazine. Like the avant-garde it militantly opposed, *Vision* came to announce that 'the old world is dead' (2 August 1923, 4). A number of commentators have argued that Sydney Ure Smith's magazine, the *Home*, with its interests in interior design and decoration, architecture and photography, did more to introduce visual modernism into Australia than any other single source (Underhill 194–208; Holden 78ff). Ure Smith's other magazine, *Art in Australia*, first published in 1916, found its modernity elsewhere, in the conservative but still contemporary traditions of Australian pastoral painting. What's new about *Art in Australia* is its address from a specialist, if still largely amateur, discourse around Australian art. Its writers were most likely to be practising artists themselves. The critic hadn't yet emerged, but would, in the pages of the magazine, before it folded.

Still, the dominating feature of 1920s magazine culture, as Peter Kirkpatrick argues, was the *Bulletin* (100). But the *Bulletin* did not bequeath to the new century an intelligentsia that identified itself as such, 'a body of intellectuals dissociated from every established social interest, pointed in its subordination of amenity to principle, united only by its chosen cultural commitments' (Francis Mulhern qtd in Eagleton 78). The bohemian circles of the late-nineteenth century did not develop the institutions to sustain such an intelligentsia. Otherwise a fragmentary intelligentsia was only to be found where magazines had an overt political or politico-intellectual program, minority magazines such as Sinclair's *Fellowship* or Ross's *Monthly*, remnants of an earlier kind of cultural formation. Both had disappeared by 1922.

The *Lone Hand* was born, in 1907, of an attempt to transpose the success of the *Bulletin* as a newspaper into the higher key of the magazine, a quality review of arts and letters on the model of the London *Strand*. If it was in some sense a magazine of ideas it was also committed to 'entertain': shorthand for not highbrow. If it could still imagine a public sphere this was, by now, virtually identical with the nation. On one side this meant the people, the 'public interest' to which the magazine explicitly addressed itself. On the other, its rhetoric was indistinguishable from official patriotism; its founding note was empire nationalism (Fox 67–8). This is why its commitment to culture, and even to the national culture, seldom rises above 'genial amateurism'. The same could be said for A. G. Stephens's *Bookfellow*,

which struggled along until 1925. When in the early twenties the *Bookfellow* begins a column called, significantly enough, 'Public Opinion', Stephens's views, for all his principled scorn of political rhetoric, are again indistinguishable from official patriotic nationalism.

Most telling is the *Lone Hand* in its final years, 1919–21, under the editorship of Walter Jago. Jago attempted more aggressively than anyone to re-invent the early *Bulletin* but only succeeded in missing his target by more than most, turning the *Lone Hand* into a flag-waving advertisement for White Australia. He later consummated his identification with the 1890s by running off with Henry Lawson's daughter Bertha. Jago had the Australian Flag calling on the young population to produce more 'white babies' ('Our Flag' 5). Most significant, despite his unrelenting nationalism, the magazine's literature has almost nothing to do with the rest of the magazine in any intellectual sense. The stories and poems are standard magazine fare, entertaining or uplifting as appropriate. Literature was no longer something to think with, no longer new – and, in Lawson's terms, no longer news either (176).

It is in this context that we can understand the appearance of *Vision* (1923–24), a context defined by a flourishing newspaper scene but also by the closing down of any kind of public sphere that was not identical to the nation. Like its modernist predecessors overseas, the anti-modernist *Vision* gave up on the public altogether and proclaimed itself the organ of a self-electing elite. The community of writers and readers was reconstituted, not even around the more public figures of the intellectual or critic, but around the poet or artist. Thus its pre-modernism, its mere aestheticism. Aestheticism carried its own strain of anti-intellectualism, but *Vision* did invent a speaking position for a new kind of intellectual; or two kinds, the self-sufficient poet and the writer committed to art and ideas as weapons in a struggle over the future of civilisation. It had some success, too, infiltrating other sites such as the *Bulletin* and *Art in Australia*. But its high talk ultimately had nowhere else to go; it could only repeat its initial gesture or relax into a general literary magazine. Outside the magazine itself the cultural institutions to support a literary intelligentsia did not exist.

Vision projected its own transcendence beyond society and nation (although strangely its belief in a youthful Australian-led recovery repeats the cheerful optimism of the nationalist magazines). Surrounded by exhaustive identification with the national public its greatest fear was man 'in the mass'. The two success stories of the twenties went in the other direction: down-market. Both *Smith's Weekly* and *Aussie* captured the sense of contemporaneity which the older magazines had lost by recasting nationalism in more populist forms. If they shared a conservative, racist nationalism which was the consensual rhetoric of government – more than that, both played a significant role in the process of embedding that consensus as a cultural fact – nevertheless their populist address always had the potential of opening up a space of criticism for readers – for public opinion – within the nation. Both offered readers, especially male readers, a new kind of citizenship in the unsettled post-war world based on the sense of belonging that the war had created: its central image of course was the returned digger.

But 'Australianism' finally defeated any intellectual discourse about politics or culture. It both sealed off the cultural from the political and rendered it largely indistinguishable from the national political consensus. The one bit of politics that stayed was White Australia, inevitably, not just because of racism but precisely because it was just such a piece of non-political politics – it was 'culture' – a consensual common-sense discourse which guaranteed the 'non-political' space of the nation at the core of public discourse. Fittingly, the *Lone Hand's* Walter Jago became *Aussie's* final editor, until 1931.

What these magazines together indicate is the beginning, in the mid-twenties, of the modern separation between high and popular modes of cultural address within the national culture – on one side, specialisation, minority audiences, aesthetic values, culture as critique, and anti-commercialism; on the other, populism, mass markets, public opinion, and professional journalism. Jago signed off from the *Lone Hand* with a bitter diatribe against 'Charlie Chaplinism', half-recognising what was wrong with his magazine ('Obituary' 7). The boundary lines were still fluid, as *Smith's* bohemian artists, writers and journalists suggest, more fluid than *Vision* itself wanted to know. It was as if bits and pieces of the early *Bulletin* were heading off in different directions – some up, some down, some into new kinds of magazines like the extraordinarily successful women's papers. *Vision* was a new kind of publication itself, not just because of its platform, but because it manifested a new sense of art's autonomy – it is difficult to say whether *Vision* feared most the democratisation of art or its professionalisation. After the mid-twenties, any new attempt to imagine the classical public sphere back into being would have to begin with the split between the institutions of high and popular culture, the split, as it would often appear, between culture and society.

Much less than a five decade history of Australian periodicals, I've done little more than describe my starting point. Perhaps some themes, at least, have emerged: the disappearance of a certain kind of public sphere; its dispersal into aesthetic, populist or 'culturalist' modes; the shifting relation between culture and the market; the deferred formation of a modern intelligentsia; the role of magazines in securing a post-war social consensus; the failure of writing to find anything other to say, to create a space or style of difference. These themes might be summed up in two words: nationality and modernity. *The Home* is the one magazine in the twenties which finds a different way of talking about modernity, because it stays below the horizon of nationality.

A number of major shifts in magazine culture emerge subsequently, when new kinds of magazines appear as vehicles for new ways of talking; of conceiving audiences and authors; and of articulating a relation to modernity, the national culture and the public sphere: the post-Depression early 1930s, when the first avant-garde and modernist little magazines began to appear; the emergence with *Meanjin* of the serious literary-cultural quarterly in the early 1940s (*Angry Penguins* I think belongs here rather than to the earlier phase); and in the late fifties and early sixties, the emergence of neo-liberal magazines such as the *Observer*, *Nation* and *Outlook*. By the end of the sixties there is another major and sudden shift which seems to

me to be as significant as that of the 1920s. Hence my cut off point, 1970.

The consensus that settled around empire nationalism in the twenties was suddenly fractured by the Great Depression. The cultural effect of the Depression was intellectual shock, suddenly presenting artistic, intellectual and political problems that could not be solved using traditional forms (Carter, 'Documenting'). It demanded that something new be said: it produced new kinds of writing – fiction and pamphleteering especially; and new kinds of institutions – magazines, manifestos, and writers' and artists' organisations. It produced a new kind of literary intellectual.

The earliest magazines were *Strife*, *Masses*, *Stream*, *Proletariat*, *Pandemonium* and *Yesterday and Most of Today* (Carter 'Paris'). All appeared between 1930 and 1935. Together they suggest that the moment of the historical avant-garde was loosely reproduced in Australia in the early thirties. But the avant-garde moment in a post-colonial situation such as Australia's depended upon the socio-political catalyst of the Depression and the sense of crisis, internationalism, mass history and simultaneous modernity it produced. If we follow Bürger's argument, the avant-garde developed in European bourgeois society as a reaction to the aestheticisation of art. The defining avant-garde gesture, then, is its attack on art's autonomy. In Australia the institutions of art were disposed differently, less powerful and less autonomous; even more clearly than elsewhere, the avant-garde could not emerge dialectically from within the art institutions themselves. Rather than a violent reaction to art's autonomy, here it was a reaction to the nationalist consensus – its almost total absorption of culture and talk about culture. Although middlebrow rather than high aesthetic it left little space for art outside patriotism or mere entertainment. All the new magazines were internationalist.

Typically they force together radical political and aesthetic positions. Some begin from an extreme proletarianism, others from super-aestheticism. But the modernity of their positions is gauged by the way the two extremes cannot be kept apart, or only by violent assertion. Each wanted to change radically the relation between art and life. That was where their energy came from, although it usually killed them too. They were all 'little magazines' – indeed the kind of magazine, as Peter Porter has said, for which the adjective 'little' is a form of gigantism (88) – but they were addressing a new constituency: young artists, writers, students, journalists and communists from the fringes of the established institutions but part of an historical international movement (or so it seemed). The irregular, montage, manifesto-ish form of the little magazine was their absolutely typical form of expression, like ephemeral manifestations of the world historical movement.

Political events – the Spanish Civil War, fascism, global war – meant that nationalism would re-emerge. But it did so, in the later thirties, as an oppositional discourse now able to sustain a kind of counter public sphere where serious debate about the nation, international politics, contemporary literature, communism, and, not least, the social role of the writer or intellectual could occur. Having said that, we need immediately to qualify the point: it could be sustained only because of the degree to which such a nationalist discourse had also entered government.

This was a social context just waiting for a text – a magazine. What's interesting is that *Meanjin* (1940–) didn't begin as this kind of magazine at all but as a thin volume of poetry; it's as if, given the time and place, the magazine couldn't do otherwise than become a magazine of cultural politics. The first issue was entitled 'Traditionalist Number'; number 8, by contrast, was a 'Crisis Issue'. *Meanjin's* success depended upon the invention of a common, public intellectual discourse, a point made not to celebrate it as an ideal form but to define its style of talk, its mode of address. Founding editor, Clem Christesen, was a journalist not an academic; even if the majority of his contributors became academics they mostly wrote as general intellectuals, practising critics, men and women of letters, not as specialists. Nationalism at its best, in the first decade or so of *Meanjin*, was a mode of accessing the modern, of aligning Australian cultural life with what could now look like a modern tradition. Its success in inventing a liberal, intellectual public sphere can be gauged by the appearance in the mid-1950s of *Overland* and *Quadrant*, one to the left and one to the right but each wanting to stake its own claim to the piece of ground *Meanjin* had already made its own (Carter 'Capturing').

Criticism was being increasingly professionalised both within and beyond the academy. Vance Palmer's death in 1959 marked the final passing of the age of the man of letters. *Meanjin's* own institutional status, its volatile relationship with the university, was not just an accident of temperament or circumstance but utterly symptomatic. The fault-lines within *Meanjin* were less those between culture and politics than those within the realm of culture itself. A great deal of its talk is in this sense self-reflexive, bringing its public sphere into being by talking about the role of the critic, the intellectual, the writer, indeed of the magazine itself. Its broad liberal discourse is crossed by the competing claims of specialist versus generalist, academic versus amateur, committed versus abstract, and elitist versus democratic public forms of address. What's remarkable, perhaps, is for how long the magazine managed to contain these competing claims within something that looked like a shared domain.

The final shift in magazine culture I want to mention can be understood as a realignment of the forces that stood to either side of *Meanjin's* middle disposition – not the left and right of politics but the worlds of journalism and the academy. A significant number of those involved in the new magazines – the *Observer* and *Nation* in particular – were products of both journalism and the universities (in some cases communism too): Donald Horne, Tom Fitzgerald, Ken Gott, Robert Hughes, Sylvia Lawson, Mungo MacCallum. This was a new intelligentsia, at home in the university and in the emerging forms of 'higher journalism' although still less comfortable with what was beginning to be called 'the media'. The *Observer* and the *Nation* were established precisely to talk about issues that weren't discussed in the daily press and in ways that were rare in newspapers and the quarterlies. They were fortnightly, expressing a closer relation to the world of politics and news. The essay and the critical review were their characteristic forms, assuming something of their traditional public role, and pitched to an educated public conceived in less hermetic forms than in *Meanjin*: a dispersed rather than organic audience; not

primarily a literary audience but a variously-interested public. The nation once again meant the state not just the culture; and the sense of what culture might mean also began to change, for example with *Nation's* essays on cinema (Inglis).

These magazines were not necessarily radical in politics, although exasperation with the conservatism of Menzies' Australia was a binding intellectual force. They were in their own way cold war products, a modernising, 'end-of-ideology' liberalism that found, in the notion of a rational public sphere and the principle of intellectual freedom, a way beyond what already looked like political and intellectual stalemate between old left and new right. One of its enabling conditions, though importantly not necessarily a central one, was the privileging of literature as a category of freedom against all the ideologies – communist, nationalist, conservative or commercial. Indeed, from this vantage point, *Meanjin* could suddenly look old-fashioned, both too amateur and too academic at once. This was the kind of modernising spirit best summed up in Horne's *The Lucky Country* or, for present purposes, the *Observer's* takeover of the ailing *Bulletin* in 1962 when Horne tossed out everything except the name.

Working on the notion of institutional history in general and twentieth-century magazines in particular has made me re-think the narrative of Australian cultural history in terms of specific moments when, in a given time and place, a given cultural formation or disposition, there was what I can best call a relatively sudden accession to modernity; when certain writers, artists or intellectuals could feel an absolute contemporaneity with what was happening in London, New York, Paris, Moscow, Dublin or Johannesburg, and perhaps everywhere at once. This was what made the early *Bulletin* 'anti-colonial', not its nationalism. I suspect this view puts me at odds with post-colonial histories, but hanging out for the latest thing from England wasn't always and everywhere a matter of colonial deference or belatedness. It could be almost the reverse, a sense of simultaneous contemporaneity or, in different terms, a sense of Australia as exemplary not merely supplementary. Something like this was true I think in the periods I have emphasised, although never as a general characteristic of the culture. A history of magazines in Australia might also be conceived of as a history of contemporaneity.

Works Cited

- Bennett, Tony. *Outside Literature*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Birger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.
- Carter, David. 'Documenting and Criticising Society' in *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*. Ed. Laurie Hergenhan. Ringwood, Vic: Penguin, 1988. pp. 370–85.
- . 'Capturing the Liberal Sphere: *Overland's* First Decade' in *Outside the Book*, Ed. David Carter. Sydney: LCP, 1991. pp. 177–92.
- . 'Paris, Moscow, Melbourne: Some Avant-Garde Australian Little Magazines, 1930–1934'. *Australian Literary Studies* 16.1 (May 1993): 57–66.
- . 'Literary Canons and Literary Institutions.' Delys Bird, Robert Dixon and Susan Lever, eds. *CanonOZities: The Making of Literary Reputations in Australia*. *Southerly* 57. 3 (1997): 16–37.
- Eagleton, Terry. *The Function of Criticism: From The Spectator to Post-Structuralism*. London: Verso, 1984.
- [Fox, Frank]. 'Prolific Australia: The Continent of the British Race.' *Lone Hand* 1 (May 1907): 67–68.

- Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Holden, Robert. *Cover Up: The Art of Magazine Covers in Australia*. Rydalmere, N.S.W.: Hodder and Stoughton, 1995.
- Ingis, Ken. *Nation: The Life of an Independent Journal of Opinion 1958-1972*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1989.
- Jago, Walter. 'Our Flag: Its Mute Message.' *Lone Hand*, (May 1920): 5.
- . 'Obituary: The Passing of "The Lone Hand".' *Lone Hand* (February 1921): 7.
- Kirkpatrick, Peter. *The Sea Coast of Bohemia: Literary Life in Sydney's Roaring Twenties*. St. Lucia, Qld.: University of Queensland Press, 1992.
- Lawson, Sylvia. *The Archibald Paradox: A Strange Case of Authorship*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin/Allen Lane, 1983.
- O'Regan, Tom. *Australia's Television Culture*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1993.
- Potter, Peter. 'News from the Front' in *Outside the Book: Contemporary Essays on Literary Periodicals*. Ed. David Carter. Sydney: Local Consumption Publications, 1991.
- Underhill, Nancy. *Making Australian Art 1916-49: Sydney Ure Smith Patron and Publisher*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1991.