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"What am I?" it murmured. "What am I, What am I?"
The bunyip jumped in delight. "You are a bunyip!" he shouted. "Am I? Am I really?" asked the other bunyip; and then "What do I look like?"
"You look just like me," said the bunyip happily.
And he lent her his mirror to prove it.

JENNY WAGNER, The Bunyip of Berkeley's Creek

Over its relatively short history, the picture book in Australia, like other popular texts, has played an important role in the process of cultural production. As both cultural products and cultural constructions, picture books reflect the culture that produces them, and they actively construct and canonize images of that culture. As Graeme Turner has argued, Australian texts are not simply "the natural and organic products of our emerging national character"; instead they are "cultural constructions" of that character, or "national fictions" (20). For Turner, the narratives produced by a culture are models by which a society conceives of and articulates a view of itself. Narrative does not simply reflect the culture; it has "a cultural function of making sense of experience, of filling absences and of helping to explain the culture to itself" (9). These ideas are particularly pertinent to picture books because of the central place that these texts have in the education and enculturation of children. The texts produced by a culture for children also have a critical role in mediating that culture to its young participants. Insofar as children's texts seek to enculturate their readers within mainstream society, these texts are an index of the ways that the dominant images of the culture are ideologically reshaped.

ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature, 28:1, January 1997
Australian picture books over the last 30 years have been constructed out of a particular combination of images, symbols, myths, and ideologies that reflect shifting discourses about nationalism and multiculturalism within Australian society. These texts also have a crucial role in the process of cultural production in that they seek to make an impact on social formation by specifying preferred constructions of selfhood and social relations. These constructions constitute a meta-narrative of subject formation which underlies the discourses of nationalism and multiculturalism as they are manifest in children’s texts. Australia, like many postcolonial societies, is preoccupied with notions of a national identity. Turner has noted that the study of Australian literature in general “has been dominated by the search for the definition of Australian literature” (2)—that is, the essential features which constitute the “Australianness” of a text. Attempts to define an “Australian” literature are inextricably bound up on the one hand with the construction of a canon, and, on the other, with concepts of a cultural identity. Notions of “quality” and “Australianness” are both highly problematic. Both are an aspect of the cultural construction of value and meaning. What is seen as “quality” and “Australian” in literature and in picture books is indicative of the meanings, thematic structures, and formal strategies preferred by the culture, and, hence the dominant ideologies of the culture. Such a search for a national identity is also tied up with concepts of place (both physical and social) and the relationships between place and the human subject, wherein individual subjectivity as it is shaped within a social and natural landscape functions allegorically for a national cultural identity. In picture books, the allegoric relation between individual and cultural identity is given a particular ideological nuance and force through interaction with a central preoccupation of children’s texts—the development out of solipsism and the formation of subjectivity. Meta-narratives underlying Australian picture books see the relationship between self and other as metonymic of wider social relationships, and the development of intersubjectivity within a specific social and natural setting enacts a search for identity narrative which is shaped by broader cultural and ideological conceptions of a preferred national identity.
Recent discussions of nationalism tend to take the form a dialogue between an established Anglo-Celtic model (informed by a nostalgia for an idealized rural colonial past and stressing homogeneity) and a newer multicultural model (emphasizing the diversity, multiplicity, and heterogeneity that characterize contemporary Australian society). This dialogue has shaped the ways that the formation of intersubjectivity is depicted in Australian picture books over the last 30 years. It is almost a commonplace that the 1970s marks a “coming of age” for the Australian picture book. An increase in the awarding of the Australian Children’s Book Council Picture Book award from 1970 onwards is usually seen as an index of the higher quality of books produced. Increased production and the “higher quality” of books are largely attributable to technical developments in the design, production, and printing techniques, as well as the availability of cheap printing (Muir 125). However, the emergence of the picture book in the 1970s and 1980s is also an aspect of the larger cultural institutions, practices, and discourses, especially the discourses of nationalism and multiculturalism, through which specific kinds of texts, meanings, and ideologies are produced and privileged.

Three main shifts from the 1970s onward occur in the kinds of picture book that have been produced and acclaimed. First, is the move away from the illustrated book to the “picture book,” that is, a text in which the visual and verbal texts are given equal emphasis and interact to produce meaning. A corollary of this has been an implicit privileging of literary and artistic values associated with high culture. Second, is the move toward the production of texts which are specifically “Australian” and more or less overtly nationalistic in their ideologies. And third, more recently, is the more overtly politically-driven move toward the production of texts which reflect images of Australian society as multicultural. These last two aspects, nationalism and multiculturalism, are not exclusive, though older established forms of nationalism do present problems for the representation of Australia as a multicultural society. The move from an assimilation policy to a multicultural policy in the early 1970s and the establishment of the Australian Multicultural Children’s Literature
Awards by the Office for Multicultural Affairs in 1991 have clearly had an impact on the kinds of texts produced for children. However, this impact is discernible not just in the content of the texts (for example the tokenist inclusion of non-Anglo characters), but also in the way that the bank of images and discourses which picture books draw on is subtly re-shaped so as to construct a dialogue between concepts of a national and a multicultural identity which is played out metonymically via depictions of the development of intersubjectivity.

As with the Australian film industry, the picture book industry in the 1970s was dominated by the older established forms of nationalism. The picture books’ “coming of age” necessitates a privileging of texts which represent a landscape and culture which is specifically “Australian” and which is constructed paradigmatically from a particular bundle of symbols, myths, and images which are ideologically driven. We can apply Turner’s comments about the revived film industry at this time to the newer picture book industry:

In defence of the films from the seventies, the preceding long hiatus in Australian film production must have made it seem that there was something of a backlog of cultural iconography to work through. Given the demand to develop a visual mythology for the nation, in what was virtually a new medium for Australian audiences, it is little wonder that the versions of Australian identity offered for our recognition were nostalgically masculine, rural and colonial.

(Making it National 127)

This nostalgia for a colonial rural past is clearly evident in the abundance of picture book versions of bush ballads and traditional verse published throughout the 1970s and 1980s, where specific, and often clichéd, markers of “Australianness” are privileged and serve to maintain an older, pastoral version of nationalism originating in the work of nineteenth-century Australian impressionist painters such as Tom Roberts and Frederick McCubbin, and of writers such as A. B. (Banjo) Paterson and Henry Lawson. Picture book versions of bush ballads and traditional verse articulate a convergence of nationalist ideologies and high cultural forms through the pictorial modes which illustrators use to represent landscape and character. As John Stephens notes (72), this genre of picture book is dominated
by a pictorial style which recalls and sometimes overtly quotes nineteenth-century Australian impressionist painting. For example, Desmond Digby’s illustrations for Paterson’s *Waltzing Matilda* (1970) use a painterly technique and dark palette strongly reminiscent of McCubbin’s work—several commentators describe this picture book as a “landmark” in Australian picture book publishing, a comment which indicates the extent to which such stylistic choices and the ideologies which inform them are privileged and canonized. Roberts’s “Shearing the Rams” (1890) has also become a canonical pretext for a number of picture book versions of ballads, for example, two versions of *Click go the Shears* by Walter Cunningham (1976) and Robert Ingpen (1984) and John Anthony King’s “The Shearing Shed” (in Henry Lawson’s *Mary called him Mister*, 1991). The occurrence of the same image in Kan Hannam’s *Sunday Too Far Away*, a film made in 1975, and a 1995 television advertisement for a medical benefits fund, suggests that this is an aspect of the wider cultural production of texts and ideologies. More recently, King has produced naturalistic and heavily romanticized versions of bush ballads which are stylistically indebted to the naive realist conventions of early colonialist painting. Most of these picture book versions of ballads and verse evince an unreflective nostalgia for a rural colonial past, which, combined with elements of a romanticized tradition of resistance to authority implicit in the figure of the swagman and the “wild colonial boy” (for example, King’s *The Wild Colonial Boy* 1985), is displaced through the historical setting.

Analyzing the construction of national identities in picture books is not simply a matter of looking for Australian cultural icons, like the Harbour Bridge, kangaroos, and vegemite sandwiches. Such icons obviously do play an important role as markers of “Australianness,” especially for overseas consumption, and can evoke a paradigm which particular texts engage with and interrogate. As Turner has suggested, “the cultural specificity, the Australian-ness, of Australian texts” lies in “recurring principles of organisation and selection” (*National Fictions* 19). Texts draw upon a bank of myths, symbols, connotations, and ideologies that have currency in the Australian culture.
Clichéd nationalist motifs and icons do play an important part in the production of picture books. But there is also a bank or store of pictorial and literary conventions and motifs which construct and represent an “Australian” context—for example the recognizably “Australian” impressionist and colonialist pictorial styles used by Digby, Ingpen, and King. These conventions and motifs will often appear ideologically “neutral” because the ideologies inscribed in them are implicit or because those motifs and conventions are part of a long cultural tradition. Furthermore, as conventions and images are reappropriated and recycled in different contexts they accrue other meanings and enter into dialogue with contemporary and historical ideological constructions of the culture.

One way of examining ideological shifts in the representation of “Australianness” is for us to look at re-editions of picture books, such as Lydia Pender’s *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* (1963; 1987) and *Sharpur the Carpet Snake* (1967; 1982). Both picture books have been re-published with illustrations by a different illustrator (Tony Oliver) and there is an obvious contrast in the quality of the production and the printing techniques used for the 1960s and 1980s editions. However, a comparison of the earlier and later editions also demonstrates changes in the dominant modes of representation and ideologies that are privileged by Australian culture of the 1960s and the 1980s. *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer*, on which I will focus my discussion here, tells the story of the journey of a bushman (and his bulldozer) from the bush to the city and back to the bush. In the city, Dan becomes confused by the traffic and crowds and, losing control of the bulldozer, wreaks havoc in the middle of the city; Dan and Dozer return home to the bush in disgrace. Minor changes to the text in the 1987 edition of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* indicate changing attitudes toward the natural environment. For example, the 1963 edition reads, “Sometimes there were trees to fell, and that was best of all”; the 1987 edition reads: “Sometimes there were trees to fell. That was a pity, but it had to be done. And wasn’t it exciting!” In the 1963 edition, the felled tree waves its “broken, foolish roots” at the sky; in the 1987 edition, the roots are “torn and broken.” In the 1963 edition,
Dozer tears up the mulga and the wattle (native Australian species); in the 1987 edition, Dozer tears up the prickly pear and bracken (imported noxious weeds). These are overt reflections of changing environmental policies and attitudes.

More implicit ideological shifts are revealed by the pictorial styles of the two editions of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* in the representation of the landscape, the architecture, and the characters. The pictorial style of the 1960s editions uses flat colour and simple line drawing. There is little attempt to suggest an illusionistic space and the figures are given a cartoon-like treatment. *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* (1963) also depicts some fairly obvious iconic markers of Australianness (kangaroos, koalas, and aborigines) in an otherwise non-specific landscape. The three Aboriginal figures who greet Dan and Dozer on their return to the bush are not mentioned in the text. In the picture, they receive stereotypical representation (naked and carrying spears), and they appear as a part of the landscape. (In the 1987 edition they are replaced by three dairy cows—a curious effect, whereby politically incorrect illustration is removed, but which then reminds us how Aborigines are effaced from such texts). These iconic features connote an image of "Australia" as a generalized concept—lacking in particularity. The pictorial style of the 1987 edition is more naturalistic. The illustrator uses naturalistic perspective, animals and plants appear in detail, and there is a wide range of types of plants, animals, and birds. The "Australian" features are a more integral part of the pictorial design and are more particularized. I am not suggesting that the pictorial style of the 1987 edition of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* is doing anything new, nor that the 1963 edition is all that outdated in its style. The tokenism of the 1963 text is of course still prevalent in contemporary picture books—for example vegemite sandwiches, pavlova, and lamingtons in *Possum Magic* (1989). And naturalism was also used in earlier texts—stylistically, the 1987 edition of *Dan McDougall* is similar to *Shy the Platypus* (1945). However, the pictorial styles used in these re-editions of Pender's work do show how naturalism has become a dominant and privileged mode for representing the country or bush landscape and for representing the past. By contrast, where
naturalism was used in earlier texts, such as *Shy the Platypus*, it was generally associated with a pseudo-documentary approach to Australian wildlife.

The re-edition of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* also demonstrates what have become two archetypal icons in the Australian picture book: the nineteenth-century cottage and the bushman figure. Stephens argues that "the humble, nineteenth-century cottage—a simple oblong, with a simple corrugated-iron hip roof and a separately roofed verandah running across the front, is the basis for the vast majority of domestic homes depicted in Australian picture books" (73). Architecturally, the cottage dates from about the 1850s, but in picture books it occurs in historical rural settings and contemporary inner city settings alike and has been occurring with increased frequency over the last twenty-five years (8on). As Stephens also notes, the cottage signals an idealization of colonial society which in contemporary urban settings has the ideological function of transposing traditional communal values associated with an idyllic rural childhood onto a suburban landscape (69). What is interesting about the two editions of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer* is that the classic features of this archetypal cottage present as a trace in the earlier edition have been emphasized in the later edition. In the 1963 edition, Dan's house is a simple weatherboard construction with a corrugated-iron roof; in the 1987 edition the hip roof, verandah, and rocking chair have been added.

The image of the Australian "bushman" has a more celebrated history than that of the tin-roofed cottage, but like the cottage, the bushman is an aspect of the Australian pastoral in which an idyllic rural past is implicitly imposed on a contemporary urban age. In the 1963 edition of *Dan McDougall and the Bulldozer*, Rose depicts the characters using a cartoon-style illustration—he sketches the male figures with black and white line drawing, though their hats, sex, stance, and posture signal an Australian bush archetype. Again this is emphasized in the 1987 edition through Oliver's detailed drawings, where although Dan and the farmers appear in more detail, they conform to the Anglo-celtic mythology of the "Australian male" wearing steel capped work-boots, Akubra hats, either pulled down over the eyes or pushed
back "larrikin" style as in the case of Dan, standing slouched with folded arms or leaning on a shovel or a fence, chewing on a piece of grass or stick.

Together these two cultural icons indicate an underlying nationalist ideology in which an idyllic rural colonial past is implicitly opposed to and privileged over a contemporary urban age. Both the nineteenth-century cottage and the bushman figure are characteristic features of an Australian pastoral, and the recurrence of pastoral images in picture books, and in Australian texts in general (as in the 1970s revival films), expresses an underlying nostalgia for an idealized rural past. In Australian literature and art, the pastoral takes on culturally specific forms ideologically linked with the older and established version of nationalism to which romantic images of the bush are central. These images seem to have originated in representations of the bush from the 1890s, in the verse and prose of Paterson and Lawson and in the work of such Impressionist painters as Roberts and McCubbin — though, as Richard White argues, these now "classic" visions of the bush landscape were essentially an urban production, "the city-dweller's image of the bush" (85). Turner also suggests that for writers such as Paterson and Lawson, "the bush was also the location for the romanticizing of an authentic 'natural' community, the invention of a social structure in which the positioning of the individual in the network of loyalties and responsibilities was valorized as the antithesis to the town" (National Fictions 34). As a representation, any landscape, image or idea of a place functions as a sign system. It is elaborately coded through its stylistic features and techniques and by "its location in culture generally" (Gibson 215), and is hence always inscribed with social values and meanings. Romantic constructions of the bush as opposed to the city are configurations of a primary opposition which has remained central to established versions of nationalism, that is, the opposition between nature (the bush) and culture (the city). Traditionally, nature (and the bush) is the valorized term in this opposition, and the natural country bush setting becomes the site upon which an authentic selfhood, and hence an authentic national identity, is formed. This valorized opposition underlies the narrative structure of Dan McDougall
and the Bulldozer, which plots the journey from the bush to the city and back to the bush. The text closes with ‘This is the place for you,’ said Dan McDougall; ‘and this is the place for me.’” Thus it not only implicitly valorizes the bush and Dan’s affinity with the bush, it also implies a correlation between a subjectivity and a sense of belonging both to a place and with an (albeit inanimate) other and the rural bush landscape.

As many cultural commentators have pointed out, there is a strong link between the romantic bush myth and a traditional version of nationalism which circumscribes an authentic “Australian” identity within a rural and masculine paradigm. As Turner argues, this older established version of nationalism is problematic insofar as “it still addresses a single national character and depends upon a singular version of history [and] is incapable of incorporating, and is therefore implicitly hostile to, the multiplicity of identities and histories currently competing for representation within the discourses of nationality” (Making it National 10). A major shift in the Australian picture book industry in the 1980s and 1990s has been toward the production of texts which reflect images of Australian society as multicultural. However, as with many of the more traditionally nationalistic picture books that I have so far been discussing, “multicultural” picture books are typically unreflective about the ideological implications of the multicultural agenda that they espouse, and “multicultural” elements, usually in the form of an apparent cultural diversity in characterization, are often simplistically imposed upon a pre-existing social and physical landscape already loaded with nationalistic ideologies which subsume and exclude such cultural differences. The move toward multiculturalism is, at least in part, driven by a (loosely defined) political agenda. The Multicultural Children’s Literature Awards aim “to foster books for Australian children which truly reflect our cultural diversity” and they are informed by an assumption “that all Australian children should see themselves reflected in the stories they read” (Austin 203). A fine line, however, exists between texts which “naturally” integrate multicultural issues into the plot, thereby representing “multicultural society as just a fact of life” (Austin 203), and texts which incor-
porate cultural diversity tokenistically into Anglocentric conceptions of the social landscape—as in *Mr Plunkett’s Pool* (1992), the winner of the 1993 Multicultural Picture Book Award. The architectural styles of the houses and sense of community in the street in *Mr Plunkett’s Pool* evoke traditional cultural values usually associated with semi-rural communities and hence with the older version of nationalism described by Turner. The opposition between the bush and the city is reconfigured in *Mr Plunkett’s Pool* so that the values conventionally associated with the bush are transposed onto inner-city suburbia within which the two markers of cultural diversity, Kim and Lee, are subsumed, and which are in turn opposed to the values of capitalism, commercialism, and self-interest embodied by Mr Plunkett’s garishly renovated house.

The recognition of cultural differences is integral with the development of intersubjectivity, and may be represented literally and symbolically as a process of exploring and engaging with the outside world. Thus *Bridgit was Bored* (1992), another inner-city multicultural picture book, constructs a link between place, cultural diversity, and intersubjectivity. The main character, Bridgit, is bored at the opening of the book, and the story tells of her walk around the block, a journey in which she meets a range of other people. On the last page, she meets a young boy who is moving in just around the corner; it is implied that he and Bridgit will become friends, though she has had to walk the whole way round the block to meet him. The layout of each page emphasizes the implications of this journey for Bridgit’s progress toward intersubjectivity. The four streets along which Bridgit walks are illustrated, initially as black and white line drawings, around the border of the page. The picture in the centre of the page details where Bridgit is and who she is meeting. As she walks around the block, the line drawings around the border are gradually coloured in. In this way, the layout constructs a constantly shifting viewing path which moves from centre and margin and from the inside and the outside. Symbolically, the layout schematizes the pattern of behaviour necessary for Bridgit’s move toward intersubjectivity. Furthermore, insofar as
cultural diversities, in the form of ethnic, age and sub-cultures, are mapped onto the social landscape which Bridgit explores, the move out of solipsism is represented as metonymic of wider social and cultural interrelationships.

A picture book which thematizes the interrelationships between individual and cultural identity more overtly is *The Bunyip of Berkeley's Creek* (1973). This is in part a parody of the bush ballad genre, as well as a more serious examination of the relations between individual and cultural identity. The story concerns the Bunyip’s quest for identity and for a friend (someone like himself), and parodic references to bush ballads and other cultural icons construct a cultural background against which the Bunyip’s individual quest for inter-subjectivity is set. The title is an implicit reference to the eighteenth-century philosopher George Berkeley, who maintained that physical objects cannot exist unperceived, and hence that to exist is to be perceived. This idea intersects with contemporary thought about subjectivity: namely that concepts of selfhood are formed intersubjectively, that is, through a relationship with an other and through a process of mutual recognition. A sense of personal identity is dependent on another's recognition and acknowledgment of one's self.

The Bunyip’s quest occurs within a cultural and a social context. The cultural context, which is specifically Australian, is constructed parodically, in features like the quotation of the Australian coat of arms on the front cover in which the Bunyip is placed at the centre between the Emu and the Kangaroo (Bunbury and Tabbert 103), and the implicit references to "Waltzing Matilda" in the Bunyip’s carrying a “swag,” camping by a billabong, and putting his “billy on to boil” (20-21). The Bunyip character is a borrowing from Aboriginal Dreamtime narratives, though it has been romanticized by Wagner and Brooks through its appropriation into an Anglo-Australian cultural tradition. The placement of the Bunyip, a mythical creature, at the centre of the Australian coat of arms suggests a range of meanings: the centrality of myth to the construction of an Australian identity, the ambivalent position of Aboriginal culture
in relation to non-aboriginal Australian culture, or the mythic status of an “Australian” identity or culture.

The Bunyip’s quest also occurs within a social context, and the narrative shape of this quest and the manner of its resolution impinge on questions about an Australian cultural identity. During his quest the Bunyip meets a Wallaby, an Emu, and a man; he asks each of these characters what Bunyips look like. The Wallaby and the Emu both describe Bunyips in antithesis to themselves: the Wallaby describes them as having “horrible feathers” (11-12); the Emu describes them as having “horrible fur” and “horrible tails” (15). Thus both see the Bunyip as not like themselves. The stance adopted by both the Wallaby and the Emu represents a form of solipsism which denies the selfhood of the other (the bunyip). The response of the man goes a step further than this. He replies that “Bunyips don’t look like anything” because “Bunyips don’t exist” (19). By denying the Bunyip’s existence, he refuses the Bunyip a subject position at all. This episode also inverts the logic of Berkeley’s conundrum: to not be perceived is to not exist. Both of these positions have negative social implications because both deny the possibility of social interaction between radically different social groups and individuals.

The Bunyip’s quest is resolved when he meets another bunyip whom he recognizes as being like himself. The illustration depicting the Bunyip gazing in the mirror implicitly affirms a Lacanian view of subjectivity: by first recognizing himself in the mirror he is then able to recognize the other as another self like himself. However, while this implies that personal identity is formed intersubjectively, it also has rather ambivalent implications for the possibility of cultural interaction within a society. We might read the relationships between the Bunyip, the Wallaby, the Emu, and the man as representing relationships between different social groups. On a larger social scale, the idea that personal identity is possible only through a relationship with an other like oneself implies that subjectivity (and by analogy cultural identity) is possible only within a homogenous social context. This position clearly poses problems for the notion of a national identity within a multicultural society.
The conception of a cultural identity that is both multicultural and nationalistic is dependent on the ways in which relationships between place and subjectivity are represented. Any construction of a national identity is going to be grounded by specific images of place and of the interrelationships between place and the human subject. Traditional versions of nationalism in Australia have tended to depict individual subjectivity as shaped within a physical landscape—the social landscape is important but it is conceived of in limited and culturally homogeneous terms as an essentially rural, colonial, and masculine world that is an extension of the "natural" physical landscape. However, insofar as the recognition of cultural diversity is dependent on the development of intersubjectivity, contemporary "multicultural" versions of nationalism stress the intersubjective construction of selfhood. In this sense, older forms of nationalism construct a cultural identity, inherently solipsistic, centred in on itself—as the image of the mythical Bunyip gazing at his own reflection in the centre of the Australian coat-of-arms on the cover of The Bunyip of Berkeley's Creek implies. The recurring images, symbols, myths, and ideologies that constitute the picture book genre in Australia intersect with larger cultural forces and reflect shifting discourses about nationalism and multiculturalism. The picture book genre also has an important role in the process of cultural production in that it also represents a nexus in which the issues of nationalism and multiculturalism are given a particular ideological nuance and focus as these issues interact with concerns specific to literature for children—namely the development out of solipsism and the formation of subjectivity. These concerns shape the particular images of nationalism and multiculturation depicted in picture books—children's texts always at least implicitly seek to educate their readers, so thematic concerns with subjectivity always have an enculturating function. At the same time, however, the ways in which subjectivity is conceived of in picture books are shaped by a continuing dialogue between different conceptions of multicultural and nationalist identities. The extent to which Australian picture books engage positively in this dialogue is dependent on the implicit ideological shaping of images of place and subjectivity.
NOTES

1 The separate picture book award was established in 1952, but was awarded only four times prior to 1970.

2 See, for example, Cotton 247; Saxby, The Proof of the Puddin’ 77, 104-05; and Muir 128.

3 The “swag” carried by the Bunyip in the illustrations is, however, an English/American swag (a bundle on a stick) rather than an Australian swag (a rolled blanket worn across the back).
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