

The 1990s – Decade of the ‘Post-s’

Part I – 1990-1993

A history and commentary by Tony Mack

Introduction

Living in the 2010s, it's easy to underestimate the profound changes taking place in the world in the late 1980s and 1990s.

It was an era of ‘post-s’ – a world that was post-Cold War, postmodern, poststructuralist and postcolonial. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the removal of the dominant ‘capitalism versus socialism’ narrative in the post-Cold War period allowed countries the time to reflect on other narratives, such as the damaging legacies of at least 400 years of colonialism around the world. And at the 1987 ASSITEJ World Congress in Adelaide, Australian practitioners had noted that while traditional colonialist attitudes of racial or national superiority may have (largely) disappeared, sometimes they were replaced by neo-colonial attitudes of cultural superiority. Australians had also learnt an important postmodern lesson there in observing the inflexible attitudes of some Europeans of that era to artistic practice – to be sceptical of explanations that claimed to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions or races, and focus instead on the relative truths of each person or community.

This corresponded with a widespread re-examination of history and language at this time. Poststructuralist philosophers like Michel Foucault had earlier created strategies, such as reversal, discontinuity, specificity and exteriority, that allowed a new critical analysis of accepted historical narratives and language use. Often the truths discovered were painful – in Australia, not only was a new history of dispossession and brutality to its Indigenous peoples now widely accepted, many Australians also realised that the very language they spoke had to be modified to eliminate offense against gender, race, nationality, culture, religion or sexual orientation.

Even social activists were more introspective and self-analytical. As opposed to a Marxist viewpoint from previous decades, where the capitalist enemy was ‘out there’ and noisy solidarity was required to defeat it, in a postmodern world the enemy was often silently within – in the unthinking destructive assumptions and behaviours of each person.

This introspective and analytical quality was reflected in the pages of *Lowdown* in the early 1990s. One example was documented in its coverage of the tortuous process of developing a national youth arts festival, as promised by Paul Keating in the 1993 election. Much to the surprise of the country, Keating was re-elected and came good with his promise, awarding the Australia Council the contract for administration of the \$2.3 million initiative. The Australia Council managed to spend approximately \$200,000 on the consultation process over three years to ascertain what form the festival should take, with 31 public forums around the country, 50,000 surveys, focus sessions and meetings. Its committee, which included Karen Bryant, Zane Trow, Deborah Mailman and Natalie Jenkins, felt it had to redefine the terms ‘festival’ and ‘arts’ as young people didn't identify with them, and prompted public discussion on topics such as whether body-piercing was art¹. The first round of applicants for the

Executive Producer position were rejected, staff came and went, the Australia Council handballed the administration of the festival to the Foundation for Australian Cultural Development and even the name changed on a regular basis, from Festival X to Wired to Loud to Noise. By the time the Loud festival ran in late 1997, five years after the process began, there was minimal interaction with the existing youth arts sector that had created its frameworkⁱⁱ.

To an outsider reading about this era, it appears that practitioners were aware that the Zeitgeist had shifted, and knew youth arts had to respond to that change as it was inextricably connected to an evolving Australian youth culture. But again and again practitioners struggled to articulate what changes were needed, and it sometimes seemed easier to define change in the negative – to proclaim that theatre was dead, criticise the ‘traditional subsidised’ companies, state that the cutting edge of culture had moved on from ‘institutional art’ – or simply reject those viewpoints.

A key to the cultural shifts in this era, and one thing that wasn’t ‘post’ but entirely new, was the information revolution. Every year from 1987 to 2007 featured phenomenal increases in the capacity to receive, store, exchange and compute information. Culture, creativity and technology were interacting in new and exciting ways, particularly amongst young people, and the boundaries between artforms and artistic disciplines were falling down. Even the concept of art and the role of the professional artist were questioned, with new festivals featuring contemporary and digital art created in makeshift studios, backyard sheds and teenagers’ bedrooms.

This impact could be seen in the *Lowdown* office as well as in its pages. In the 1980s content was posted in, sometimes handwritten. It was edited, re-typed and, literally, cut and pasted together on a large printer’s mat in the *Lowdown* office. It was then taken by hand to the Carclew Printery some twenty metres away, to be laid out on the press and printed. By the 2000s, even content from places like Kosovo, Namibia and East Timor bounced to and fro by email, and practically all aspects of production were done electronically.

1990-1993: Changeless Change

The first half of the 1990s was a period of constant personnel change for *Lowdown*. Apart from changes to office staff, the magazine had no less than five editors in four years – Anna Dollard, Deborah Heithersay, Rachel Healy, Leigh Elliott and Darrelyn Gunzburg – before it found some stability later in the decadeⁱⁱⁱ. It is a credit to these editors that so much was achieved during this time.

After Jo Shearer's departure at the end of 1989, Anna Dollard edited the magazine for the first issue of 1990 before Deborah Heithersay came on board as Editor. With a background in public relations and journalism, Heithersay was also expected to design the magazine. This heavy workload of an Editor / General Manager / Designer position was to last for most of the 1990s, and was one example of the strong financial constraints imposed by the South Australian Youth Arts Board (SAYAB) after its review late in the last decade. Another immediate outcome of this review was the introduction of over-the-counter sales of *Lowdown* around the country at venues such as Carclew (SA), St Martins Youth Arts Centre (Vic), Contact Youth Theatre (Qld), Press Press Magazine (Tas), Toe Truck Theatre (NSW), Corrugated Iron Youth Theatre (NT) and Jigsaw Theatre Company (ACT)^{iv}.

Another young youth arts veteran, Rachel Healy, joined *Lowdown* in the next issue. Healy had been theatre editor and a contributor for the University of Adelaide newspaper *On Dit*, as well a performer with SA youth theatres for eight years. With the advent of this pair the magazine, which had appeared to be somewhat adrift, began to show indications of a feistiness it hadn't shown since Helen Rickards in the early 1980s.

Mark Radvan's article on the 1990 YAPA Conference in Maroochydore, Queensland was a nuanced piece that highlighted a divide between the adult youth arts practitioners and younger participants. Among other things he reported that young people 'were sick of social issues and wanted more consultation in project design, and more involvement in youth theatre governance'. Wesley Enoch, at that time from Contact Youth Theatre in Brisbane, made 'an impassioned plea for youth theatres to work much harder at involving young aboriginals as participants and trainee tutors'. This led to a wider discussion about the need to develop access to youth arts for 'people or communities disadvantaged by geography, race, physical or intellectual disability, sexual preference or gender, and by using familiar forms like music and electronic media'^v.

Radvan's last paragraph in the article asserted that there was only one resolution from the conference – where to meet next time – and that 'future conferences need to ward off the overriding feelings of irresolution that plagued this year'. A letter in the following issue clarified that he had not in fact written the acerbic last paragraph^{vi}. It had been added during the editing process, to give the story more 'bite'.

Another attempt to give the magazine more bite met with a strong response when controversial South Australian reviewer Peter Goers^{vii} was brought back to review a Canadian production, *Jest in Time*. Goers had penned a blistering review of a Gepps Cross Girls High School production in the 1989 Come Out Festival, and this review began with, 'The trouble with a lot of children's theatre is the children'^{viii}. The next issue included three letters objecting to his association with the magazine, prompting a combined editorial on the matter from Heithersay and Healy citing freedom of speech.

This *Lowdown* also included an influential article tackling an issue that had been all but ignored in issue-based youth arts. Young gay people until then had almost been invisible in youth theatre productions, despite depictions of gay characters in mainstream media (such as Don in the TV soap *Number 96*) as far back as the 1970s. Peter Wood, in *When Silence is Not Golden*, tackled the 'ubiquitous assumption that everyone is heterosexual', and interviewed a range of youth theatre artistic directors around the country about their views^{ix}. *Lowdown* continued to monitor developments and responses to productions exploring gay issues such as Corrugated Iron Youth Theatre's *Swimmers* in NT and the Adelaide production of *Spilt Milk*.

Under Heithersay and later Healy, *Lowdown* also pursued the issue of youth theatre funding cuts vigorously from the time of the 1990 Drama Council Blue Paper to the storming of Australia's Parliament House in mid-1991 to a successful outcome in 1992. In late October 1990 the 'announcement by the Australia Council that it no longer intends to provide youth theatre companies with annual grants funding...sent shockwaves through the industry'^x. Unable to cope with the amount of high quality youth theatre applications and unwilling to acknowledge that youth theatre was a growing artform in need of more resources, the Performing Arts Board made the decision to preserve the 23% of its budget for youth arts as a cap and make the ten annually funded youth theatres compete for project funding with other applications.

In June 1991 *Lowdown* published the Carclew Consensus, a national youth theatre initiative created and unanimously endorsed by a representative gathering of Australian youth theatres. A sharp, intelligent, concise response to the Blue Paper, it contained clear proposals for:

- A young people's theatre funding policy
- Protected funds
- Key personnel grants
- Defining a project
- Council staff and peer assessment
- Application forms and
- Lobbying^{xi}.

Youth theatres then followed up with a superb piece of direct action, as *Lowdown* reported from on top of Parliament House in October 1991. Representatives of Australia's youth theatre community trudged up the grassy mounds to the flagpole on top of Australia's Parliament House and Roland Manderson, Artistic Director of Canberra Youth Theatre, claimed the site as a youth arts facility on behalf of youth arts practitioners throughout the nation. Over 200 theatrical protesters were then invited inside by the Minister for the Arts for a series of short performances in the Great Hall. The culmination of the moving dance by Linda Johnson and Robyn Rigney, a Murri and white member of Brisbane's Contact Youth Theatre, stunned politicians and bureaucrats as over 200 people joined them in a single series of movements signifying reconciliation and hope.

George Mannix, in 'The Fruits of Our Labour'^{xii}, reported on the successful outcomes for these actions in February 1992. The Drama Committee had met and responded positively to most of the proposals in the Carclew Consensus, acknowledging the

'contribution those who created the Carclew Consensus have made to the discussion and review of current Youth Theatre Policy'. This included protecting the Young People's Theatre budget at 25% of all theatre funding, or \$566,672 in 1991/1992.

The unexpected promise of a \$2 million national youth arts festival in the 1993 election campaign was quite possibly another result from this brilliant national advocacy and lobbying campaign.

When faced with a negative view of Theatre in Education (TIE) in the 1991 Australia Council Drama Committee Policy Review, the meeting of Theatre for Young People (TYP) Artistic Directors in 1992 managed a less satisfactory response. The review was critical of a number of aspects of TIE and stated a 'strong belief that too much reliance on issue-based material can result in tedious and oversimplified theatre'. Over the next two years, in 1992-1993, funding by the Australia Council for issue-based TIE would be almost completely phased out, according to later research based on listings in *Lowdown's* What's On Guide^{xiii}.

Yet when faced with the effective exclusion from federal funding of the most popular form of Theatre for Young People in the 1980s, the Artistic Directors of Theatre for Young People companies struggled to respond during a meeting in Sydney in mid-1992. They neither united to defend the choice of a director to create issue based theatre, nor united to articulate a coherent vision of what commonality or aspirations Theatre for Young People could have in the 1990s, except to state that they wanted to produce 'hot' theatre. As opposed to the interaction with youth theatres, this inability to meaningfully respond to the 1991 Blue Paper meant that it was the last Australia Council document on Theatre for Young People until the TYP review more than a decade later.

The *Lowdown* Editor at the time, Rachel Healy, was withering:

'When terms as fundamentally meaningless as "hot" are used to characterise the objectives of any group, let alone professional creative people, then I seriously wonder about the true nature of the common ground...If there is a consensus that Theatre in Education – or "didactic" theatre – has failed, the logical conclusion is that its disappearance will leave a vacuum that needs to be filled. It is disappointing that the only perceived way to fill this vacuum is to use a term as silly and vague as "hot"^{xiv}.'

Heathersay had left *Lowdown* in early 1991 to take on the role of Marketing Program coordinator at the Adelaide Festival of Arts. This time the transition of editors was seamless, with Healy merely moving from the Assistant Editor's chair to that of the Editor. While her tenure was not long, it was extremely influential. By August 1991 she was managing a massive expansion of the magazine when, as part of a 12-month pilot program, *Lowdown* was sent free to the drama departments of every high school in the country. She also sought to open up the magazine up to other groups, such as university theatre groups, theatresports enthusiasts and people working in arts and education. The magazine received public acclaim later in the year when Andrew Joyner, a 22 year old cartoonist who had been drawing cartoons for *Lowdown*, was awarded a Stanley – the cartoonists' version of a Logie or AFI Award – at *The Bulletin* 1991 Black and White Artists' Awards in Sydney.

While deeply sympathetic to the work of youth performing arts companies, Healy also believed that providing rigorous critical feedback was a vital function of the

magazine. Apart from encouraging that rigour in reviews, she also commissioned a range of articles exploring current issues. Francis Greenslade wrote 'Form and Function: percolating ideology in youth theatre', a funny and highly intelligent critique of issue based youth theatre^{xv}. Two issues later she published 'TIE Me Up', an article by Brian Joyce, Artistic Director of Freewheels Theatre Company. In it he passionately defended issue based Theatre in Education, pointing to an increase in standards and audiences from the days of performers in coloured overalls and a set comprised of 'two ladders and a plank'^{xvi}. In June 1992 *Lowdown* featured an interview with Michael Billington, the iconic theatre critic of *The Guardian* in the UK. Healy quoted him later in the 21st birthday issue of *Lowdown*, as she urged the magazine to embrace its critical role:

'Firstly, you are analysing and interpreting work to a reader. Secondly, you're fighting for the health of the art you're describing. You're fighting for standards... as critics we should be constantly campaigning for a better theatre.'^{xvii}

One of the most influential debates that occurred in the pages of *Lowdown* during Healy's tenure was a debate on the nature of youth arts in the 1990s. It was sparked by Jane Woollard's article on the 1992 Next Wave festival in Melbourne, and Festival Director Zane Trow's response to it two issues later.

Next Wave was a youth arts festival, like Come Out in Adelaide, that had a tremendous impact in Melbourne in 1990 in its third outing. The grand opening event, Planet Earth, involved about 10,000 young people, 3,000 percussionists and hundreds of dancers, acrobats and performers. Opened by the Premier, John Cain, the festival took over the city square for two weeks as well as more than 40 inner city venues^{xviii}.

The 1992 Next Wave was radically different. Under Director Zane Trow and Assistant Director Linda Sproul the festival began to turn away from its traditional schools audience and toward emerging artists. Woollard reported that the large visual arts component seemed geared for an older audience and the festival lacked a centre or sense of cohesion. Possibly thinking of the visibility of Next Wave in 1990 within Melbourne, she yearned for the festival to create a hub and take over a major venue like the Arts Centre. She also queried the lack of young theatre artists. 'The visual arts side of the showed a liveliness amongst emerging painters, but where were the avant-garde of the theatre craft?'^{xix}

Two issues later Zane Trow answered her question:

'A dead question using dead terminology. I think that very few of the "young avant-garde" have any interest in theatre at all. Why should they? The majority of theatre for young people still has adults playing teenagers, singing bad rap songs, desperately trying to compete with the video camera by claiming some kind of "pure experience"... Young people now have very high standards when it comes to production values, so how could they be impressed by the '70s theatre culture that is paraded in front of them at school?'^{xx}

For Trow, the 'technological developments in performance art, multi-media work, video and film, music and the visual arts have come about through dedicated experiments of artists who seek to push forward and use new tools'^{xxi}. Trow viewed the festival as a chance to profile these artists on the edge of technology, before their work was 'pirated' and 'absorbed into commercial culture'. Moreover, the fusion of information based technology tools with performance practice and youth culture

offered opportunities and new pathways that, in Trow's view, too many youth arts companies were ignoring.

Woollard's article reflected a concern from some Victorian youth arts practitioners that the artistic infrastructure and resources built up for children and young people had been appropriated by an older age group, emerging artists. (This complaint was to feature in the 2000s too, in Tasmania, when a similar transition occurred as Salamanca Theatre Company changed to 'is theatre limited'.)

Yet leaving aside the important issue of access to age-appropriate arts experiences and looking back to Mark Radvan's 1980 Youth Theatre Manifesto, it's clear that Zane Trow's argument takes Radvan's principles to a logical conclusion. For over 10 years Australian youth performing arts had engaged with an evolving Australian youth culture using developmental philosophies, and as that youth culture began to explore new directions in multi-media, video and film, music and visual arts, it was inevitable that youth arts events such as the Next Wave Festival would respond. A multi-arts organisation like Carclew could easily adapt to these new directions but for youth theatres, rooted in one artform, it was problematic. It is understandable, therefore, that some youth theatres would seek to become multi-arts organisations over the coming decades.

Rachel Healy left *Lowdown* in October 1992 to take on the role of Administrative Officer for Magpie Theatre. After one issue edited by Assistant Editor Leigh Elliott, playwright Darrelyn Gunzburg took over as Editor. A significant feature of Gunzburg's short time at *Lowdown* was her focus on artists and craft. There were interviews with Augusto Boal, Cristina Castrillo, Morris Gleitzman, Dorinda Hafner and Mary McMenamin, among others. A series of focus issues on dance, Indigenous arts, music and puppetry featured national snapshots of practice and in-depth exploration of processes. Gunzburg's approach to professional development in the youth arts sector was less about critical debate and more about the coverage of best practice – a different but equally valid way of encouraging better artistic outcomes.

A four-page feature in December 1992 on the Freewheels Theatre in Education Company production of *Property of the Clan*, by Nick Enright and directed by Brian Joyce, proved that TIE wasn't yet dead. Oddly enough, it was at this time that Australian TIE produced one of its best works, later adapted as a mainstage play and feature film called *Blackrock*, featuring a young Heath Ledger.

Gunzburg also managed to capture two Indigenous companies at seminal points in their history in 1993. Over in WA, Acting Out's (later Barking Gecko Theatre Company) Aboriginal Youth Theatre Project was taking shape, and would soon become Yirra Yaakin Noongar Theatre. *Lowdown* also revealed that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Program of Contact Youth Theatre in Brisbane was becoming a separate company, Kooemba Jdarra.

Throughout this entire period, from 1990 to 1993, ASSITEJ Australia under its Director Michael FitzGerald had been busy, and *Lowdown* continued to cover it and international events.

FitzGerald came within one vote of gaining the Presidency of ASSITEJ, the International Association of Theatre for Children and Young People, at its World Congress in Stockholm, Sweden in 1990. (And, at the General Assembly of ASSITEJ Centres there representing over 40 countries, there was resounding applause when a copy of *Lowdown* was held up.) He was then elected Vice-

President, and Australian delegate Angela Chaplin was voted on to the Artistic Commission. Other Australian delegates included Steven Gratton, Mary Morris, Pamela Payne, Michael and Ludmila Doneman, Lafe Charlton and Christine Campbell. The Congress also marked the beginning of Michael Ramlose's time as Secretary General, replacing long-time French Secretary General Rose Marie Moudoues. Ramlose, from Denmark, was a key individual in the revitalisation of the organisation, and the Nordic countries were to hold the position of ASSITEJ Secretary General for the next 18 years.

The National Association of Drama in Education (NADIE) was also involved in the development of a new international association for drama in education at this time. Jenny Simmons from NADIE was with NADIE President Kate Donelan at a British conference in Birmingham in October 1989 when the idea was floated and suggested the name 'IDEA' as a working title for the inaugural national conference^{xxii}. The name stuck and IDEA lived on past its first conference in Lisbon, Portugal in 1992. In 2012 IDEA had centres in approximately 90 countries.

The ASSITEJ Asian Oceanic Regional meeting took place in Adelaide in May 1991, at the same time as the Come Out 91 festival and the Youth and Performing Arts Conference (YAPA). Set up by Michael FitzGerald and coordinated by Penny Ramsay, it followed on from three regional meetings held in Japan in the 1980s. Eleven theatre directors from eleven countries took part in a diverse program that included practical workshops. The countries were Japan, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand and Vietnam.

In 1992 the South Australian Youth Arts Board (SAYAB) revisited the decade-long arrangement whereby ASSITEJ Australia was run as a project of Carclew. As stated previously, the Australian Youth Performing Arts Association (AYPAA) had dissolved in May 1982. Carclew had then, at the request of AYPAA, taken on the role of national centre of ASSITEJ Australia. It continued to publish the AYPAA magazine, *Lowdown*, and all subscribers of *Lowdown* automatically became members of ASSITEJ Australia. For a decade, South Australia had been paying most of the costs and wages for ASSITEJ Australia – the Director of ASSITEJ Australia had been a Carclew staff position during that time – and SAYAB felt as early as 1988 that it was time for greater financial support at a national level.

In the first *Lowdown* for 1992, Michael FitzGerald proposed a future separate from Carclew and began a discussion on how that national organisation would be structured and funded^{xxiii}. Later in the year the Performing Arts Board of the Australia Council responded with a \$20,000 grant towards the operating costs of ASSITEJ Australia, and a national ASSITEJ committee was formed to develop the new national organisation^{xxiv}. By the end of 1993, a new constitution had been finalised as well as a membership structure for implementation in the coming year. After 12 years of the curious practice of members joining ASSITEJ Australia by subscribing to *Lowdown*, ASSITEJ Australia would finally have a separate membership base.

Earlier in 1993, there had been some momentous news. Australia's Michael FitzGerald had been elected President of ASSITEJ at the 1993 ASSITEJ World Congress in Havana, Cuba. A strong 10-person delegation attended, including Wesley Enoch, Angela Chaplin, Grahame Gavin, Mary Morris, Colin Schumaker, Gabriela Cabral, Fille Dusseljee, Steven Gratton, and Maggie Miles. Member countries voted to the ruling Executive Committee for the period 1993-96 were Australia (President), Canada (Vice President), Cuba (Vice President), France (Vice

President), Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Norway, Russia, Slovakia and Vietnam. It was the first time three Asian countries had been voted on to the Executive Committee.

The Australia delegation was ever-present throughout the Congress, facilitating networking and connections between countries. Angela Chaplin moderated discussions on artistic matters, Wesley Enoch was a keynote speaker on minority cultures and Mary Morris was one of only three playwrights invited to speak about her work. For Fitzgerald, 'the delegation truly represented Australia in all its creativity, diversity of practice, multiculturalism, Aboriginality and gender equality'^{xxv}.

Back in Australia, the *Lowdown* staff were on the move once more. At the end of 1993 Darrelyn Gunzburg left the magazine to return to her creative work as a writer. *Lowdown*, after many changes, was about to get a stable team that would last for the next six years.

ⁱ Richard Lawrance, 'Wired', *Lowdown* V.17.2, p10-12. Adelaide: Carclew, 1995.

ⁱⁱ 'Loud', *Lowdown* V.19.6, p8-11. Adelaide: Carclew, 1997

ⁱⁱⁱ Anna Dollard and Leigh Elliott edited issues in between the appointment of full-time Editors.

^{iv} *Lowdown* V.12.2, p4. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^v Mark Radvan, 'YAPA and the Art of Conferencing', *Lowdown* V.12.3, p27. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{vi} Mark Radvan, 'Letters', *Lowdown* V.12.4, p4. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{vii} Goers was later invited on to the South Australian Youth Arts Board, and was a passionate advocate for youth arts.

^{viii} Peter Goers, *Lowdown* V.12.4, p53. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{ix} Peter Wood, 'When Silence is not Golden', *Lowdown* V.12.4, p13-17. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^x Peter Wood, 'Youth Theatre Blues', *Lowdown* V.12.6, p8-12. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{xi} 'The Carclew Consensus', *Lowdown* V.13.3, p21. Adelaide: Carclew, 1991.

^{xii} George Mannix, 'The Fruits of Our Labour', *Lowdown* V.14.1, p24-26. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xiii} Tony Mack, *To Delight and Profit*, p41. Adelaide: University of Adelaide, 1994.

^{xiv} Rachel Healy, 'Editorial'. *Lowdown* V.14.3, p4. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xv} Francis Greenslade, 'Form and Function: percolating ideology in youth theatre', *Lowdown* V.13.4, p19-22. Adelaide: Carclew, 1991.

^{xvi} Brian Joyce, 'TIE Me Up'. *Lowdown* V.13.6, p18-21. Adelaide: Carclew, 1991.

^{xvii} 'Lowdown – A Forum for Debate'. *Lowdown* V.22.3, p5. Adelaide: Carclew, 2000.

^{xviii} Amanda Clark, 'The Third Encounter of the Next Wave'. *Lowdown* V.12.3, p8-12. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{xix} Jane Woollard, 'New Wave'. *Lowdown* V.14.3, p9. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xx} Zane Trow, 'An Artist in the Machine'. *Lowdown* V.14.5, p7-11. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xxi} Zane Trow, 'An Artist in the Machine'. *Lowdown* V.14.5, p7. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xxii} Pamela Payne, 'An Inspired Idea'. *Lowdown* V.12.6, p8. Adelaide: Carclew, 1990.

^{xxiii} Michael FitzGerald, 'Future Prospects'. *Lowdown* V.14.1, p12-15. Adelaide: Carclew, 1992.

^{xxiv} The Committee was comprised of Ludmila Doneman, Sue Beal, Zane Trow, Mary Hickson, Roland Manderson, Steven Gration, Maggie Miles, Grahame Gavin, Judy MacIver (Potter) and Angela Chaplin.

^{xxv} 'The Man Who Would Be King', *Lowdown* V.15.2, p3-4. Adelaide: Carclew, 1993.