

**ZEPLIN Pamela**

**Ten Days on the Island or, Rough seas on the Trans-Tasman Crossing. ANZART-In-Hobart, May 18 – 27 1983**

**Abstract**

While New Zealanders and Australians have long ignored one another's art, there was a time of buoyant and diverse exchange 'rafts' across the Tasman. New Zealanders participated in 1970s Australian cultural events such as *Mildura Sculpture Triennial* and *Biennales of Sydney* but ANZART changed tack. This trans-Tasman event was launched in Christchurch in 1981, remained afloat until 1985 and by 1983 became "the most significant art event in the last three years".

ANZART proposed a different focus; celebrating Tasman-Pacific location and informal, experimental and socially engaged artistic structures. Based on principles of collaboration and site-specificity, it was low budget, artist-driven and a remarkably successful model of exchange. In 1983 ANZART-in-Hobart came to Tasmania and although ambitious in scale, lack of resources and major changes in prevailing VAB winds - towards professionalisation and 'curatorialism' - swamped the trans-Tasman vessel. By 1985 ANZART-Auckland '85 would reduce relations to bubbles on the Tasman, as Asian trade and US nuclear warships loomed large on the horizon.

This paper explores the scuttling of an Australasian art endeavour, with reference to ANZART-in-Hobart's role. It questions assumptions about non-indigenous cultural similarity between the art communities, what New Zealanders had to offer and whether size really matters.

**Biography**

Pamela Zeplin is a writer and artist based in Adelaide. At the University of South Australia's South Australian School of Art she holds the position of Senior Lecturer in Art History and Theory. Currently completing PhD research on "Re-orienting Australia, Art and the Asia-Pacific 1970-1993" at the College of Fine Arts, University of New South Wales, Pamela has been publishing criticism and essays, as well as presenting conference papers on contemporary art throughout the region since 1985, with a particular focus on Australian-New Zealand relations. Her teaching specialisations, including postgraduate research supervision, are Asia-Pacific Art, Aboriginal Art & Visual Culture, Arts Writing and Performance. With a deep and abiding interest in cross-cultural issues and multiculturalism, Pamela was appointed Portfolio Leader for Student Support & Equity and Internationalisation in 2001 and 2002. For a number of years she has also been working with staff and industry partners to coordinate the *Public Forums in the Visual Art* programs with Nexus Multicultural Arts Centre and the South Australian School of Art.

**Ten Days on the Island or, Rough Seas on the Trans-Tasman Crossing. ANZART-in-Hobart, May 18 – 27 1983**

*"All things considered New Zealand and Australia have quite a record for ignoring one another's art."*  
(Wystan Curnow, 1985)<sup>1</sup>

In the 1960s, while teaching at Auckland's Elam School of Fine Arts, New Zealand artist, Colin McCahon "predicted that the Pacific would become the centre of the art world"<sup>2</sup>. Even to New Zealanders, whose gaze was fixed firmly on more northerly climes, this must have seemed a "bizarre" prediction at the time; to Australians, it would have been unthinkable.

If we include in this geography Pacific Rim countries, including parts of Asia, McCahon's prediction appears more prescient - at least for the Australian mainstream art world three decades later. In the early 1990s major, non-indigenous institutions rushed to embrace the exotica of contemporary 'Oriental' art - a decade after other Australian sectors had already set sail upon prosperous trade winds from Eastern Asia. The South Pacific, however, was another matter; it remained a site of anthropology and tourism, not serious art. Within the vast watery map of Oceania, New Zealand held even less aesthetic credibility as another - smaller - pink country. In 2000 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Cultural Relations Branch Director, Gregson Edwards, remarked that New Zealand was regarded "almost like Tasmania"<sup>3</sup>, quoting Paul Keating's warning that same year to "mend our ... relations with Asia, (or) Asia would soon look at Australia like Australia looked at New Zealand."<sup>4</sup>

Against such a background this section of the Pacific was eventually 'discovered' as a minor site of art by Queensland Art Gallery's *Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art* in 1993. In 1996 for the first and only time, Pacific/New Zealand art represented twenty per cent of curatorial selection and included Australian participants under the category of "Pacific"<sup>5</sup>. Overwhelmingly, however, this new wave broke on an indigenous Pacific; Aotearoa was now being re-mapped on Australia's regional art horizon<sup>6</sup>. The pale pink Pakeha version of New Zealand has long been a foreign country, despite deeply held beliefs about a 'special', familial relationship with Australia<sup>7</sup>.

For TaraBrabazon, that relationship may be familiar, but it's dysfunctional, as well, like "an old married couple who (sic) have nothing left to say"<sup>8</sup>. Extending the marine metaphor, Australia-New Zealand relations also suggests a deeply submerged - even shipwrecked - vessel. However, as in most marriages and marine endeavours, there was once a time of engagement, a period of excitement, experiment and buoyant optimism. This occurred in the 1970s and 1980s, when artists from both sides of the Tasman consciously challenged the authority of Euro-American models of art and seriously examined their shared Antipodean backyard as much more than a 'backwater'. In these heady, perhaps 'adolescent', days of post-object art, socially and/or intellectually committed artists from both countries established and maintained a number of significant encounters throughout various cities, many of them regional; Mildura, Adelaide, Sydney, Christchurch, Hobart and Auckland. This development paralleled a similar tendency in cross-Tasman popular music<sup>9</sup>.

The *ANZART* encounters of the 1980s resulted after more than a decade of informal and formal connections, representing a buoyant and diverse 'raft' of specifically trans-Tasman exchange projects, originating in Mildura in the early 1970s, officially launched in 1981 and afloat until 1985 when they sank, almost without trace in Auckland's non-Nuclear harbour. In the meantime, a vigorous, two-way flow of artistic traffic had resulted from these encounters, manifested mostly through associations between individual artists and private galleries, with substantially more New Zealand artists exhibiting and residing in Australia than vice versa.

Notwithstanding these complex artistic entanglements, this paper will attempt to salvage something of the Good Ship *ANZART*, less in terms of its aesthetic merit than its significance as an artistic marker of broader attitudes towards place and regional difference within the Tasman-Pacific. While this may no longer represent an issue for New Zealand artists, some Australian self-examination of our role in *ANZART*'s rise and demise is long overdue - as is a re-examination of the 1970s, generally, in Australian art history. WARNING: the following information may be uncomfortable.

The disappearance of trans-Tasman events from recent art narratives was partially due to their intrinsic structure; artist-driven and democratically organised, their ideological base was modest, inclusive and based on relational values of artists working with artists, rather than conventional exhibition aesthetics. Site-specific, collaborative and under-funded, these do-it-yourself events resisted institutionalisation; they were open-ended and unassuming, assuming ironically, that their acknowledged success would prove historically self-evident. In short (apart from *ANZART-in-Hobart* and its 'illegitimate', 'pirate' offspring, *ANZART-in-Edinburgh*), they were poorly documented and/or proved too daggy for a new wave of image-conscious postmodernism and professionalisation deluging Australian art by the mid 1980s.

*ANZART*'s fragile structure proved vulnerable to eventual scuttling by the rise of bureaucratic arts infrastructure in Australia, in particular by direct curatorial intervention by the Visual Arts Board (VAB) after 1983. Not surprisingly, the ebb and flow of Australia Council policy was, in turn, subject to broader political and trade currents, such as ANZCERTA (Closer Economic Relations Trade Agreement) in 1983, followed by realignment with spectacular Asia economic growth during the 1980s. During 1984 *ANZART*'s fate was sealed by both Australian and New Zealand arts council policies; the former in insisting upon rigorous curatorial control; the latter in assuming a 'hands off' approach, virtually abandoning ship as regards effective support or advice. Any values, achievements or failures on the part of the *ANZART* vessel were to be swamped on a broader diplomatic and security front in late 1984, when the New Zealand Labour government refused entry to its ports by US nuclear-powered ships; this blew the longstanding ANZUS Treaty out of the water.

Meanwhile, *ANZART-in-Hobart* in 1983 became a watershed in cultural connections between Australian and New Zealand visual art communities. Despite being an ambitious and nationally successful event, assumptions about 'special Tasman relationships', renewed in Christchurch in 1981,

remained mostly unexamined and this precipitated a distinct dive in regional art relations. Before I embark upon a non-participant's version of that story, however, it is pertinent to briefly survey some general and lingering Australian attitudes to New Zealand visual art and culture.

While Australian and New Zealand crafts sectors have long established vigorous two-way traffic across the Tasman<sup>10</sup>, it's as if non-indigenous visual arts relationships have generally been framed, from these shores at least, within an unspoken discourse of neo-colonialist disdain, contempt, or worse, indifference. This tends to be based on assumption rather than experience, despite Australia's legislated multiculturalism, policies of regionalism<sup>11</sup> and the presence of half a million expatriate New Zealanders living near the shores of Bondi<sup>12</sup>. Size matters and as the smaller country, New Zealand tends to be considered culturally inferior and therefore dependent on the larger country - not necessarily *different*; it remains a site of magnificent scenery, funny 'eccents' and rural jokes<sup>13</sup>.

"Proximity", "familiarity"<sup>14</sup> and shared British colonial heritage have created a relational awkwardness, a taken-for-granted-ness that for Australians is decidedly less attractive than more obvious and exotic differences of indigenous Pacific or Asian cultures. While Pakeha, Maori and Islander artists in New Zealand seem acutely aware of cultural differences between neighbouring indigenous, as well as white tribes of the Tasman-Pacific, there is little acknowledgment of Austral/Asian difference within Australian art circles - unless marked by skin colour.

As with trade routes, individual New Zealand artists, many of them expatriates, have long exhibited here, with fewer Australians showing there, but apart from the legendary McCahon, art production *per se* from that country is rarely discussed in Australian art schools or exhibited and collected in public galleries<sup>15</sup>. Pakeha New Zealand is not sexy. No-one teaches New Zealand studies; it's "not a trendy academic enterprise"<sup>16</sup>. As the only possible place of exile for Australian artists, that country hosts no Australia Council studio<sup>17</sup>, nor attracts Samstag scholars<sup>18</sup>. Paradoxically, however, any imagined inferiority on the part of New Zealanders as junior siblings is hard to find; they regularly assert independence from Australian mores and values, not only in regard to maritime, defence and asylum-seeker issues but towards women executives and art world culture, as well.

Distinctive differences were frequently noted by critics during the 1970s *Mildura Sculpture Triennials*, directed by Irish-Australian Tom McCullough, who, with renowned New Zealand artist, Jim Allen, forged dynamic and enduring trans-Tasman links, deepened through early *Biennales of Sydney*, Adelaide's Experimental Art Foundation and the Sydney College of Art, which Allen headed from 1977. Indeed major Australian art events were awash with over fifty Kiwi artists, often in collaboration with "Aussies" in site-specific work; performance, video, sound and sculptural installation. Hatched in Allen's unique 1960s and 1970s 'laboratory' of Elam School of Art in Auckland, New Zealand work was frequently considered by Australian critics as more intellectually and politically rigorous than that shown by many of their Australian colleagues<sup>19</sup>.

Then suddenly, New Zealand representation in the 1979 Biennale of Sydney: *European Dialogue* was reduced from an anticipated six artists to two<sup>20</sup>. Unlike the Australian situation, New Zealand arts infrastructure - of funding, national events, criticism and professional networks - was minimal, so during the 1970s these offshore opportunities had become nationally and internationally vital<sup>21</sup>.

Biennale Director, Nick Waterlow's curatorial decision unleashed the unexpected. An airlift of indignant, spurned Kiwis descended upon Sydney, where, supported by Australian artists, they staged an alternative Biennale, *Prime Export*. Consequently, this solidarity precipitated the magazine, *Art Network*, as well as launching *ANZART*, an initiative captained by Ian Hunter (another Irish artist, resident in New Zealand) as a strategy for remedying "the ... imbalance in (trans-Tasman) cultural exchange". "One way to educate Australians about the possibilities of the Cross-Tasman connection", he explained, was "to offer them a well structured and attractive proposition, in the form of a 1981 art encounter in Christchurch"<sup>22</sup>.

Hunter's strategy envisaged a sustained, long-term relationship, not "an Australian art invasion". An 'outsider' like McCullough, he acknowledged the significance of regional differences, having experienced these in Northern Ireland, where, he asserted: 'You have on the surface people who are much the same but just underneath you have differences that stem from religious convictions. Those differences run very deep.'<sup>23</sup>

With this concept firmly in place, forty artists from Australia and New Zealand were thus brought together within a highly productive model of exchange, *ANZART*, which was praised for its low budget, high attendances, community involvement, hospitality, artists responsive to vicissitudes of site and weather, and minimal administration<sup>24</sup>. For predominantly white artists against a background of racial conflict during Springbok demonstrations across New Zealand during 1981, this situation further highlighted cultural differences in indigenous issues between and within both countries.

Thereafter *ANZART* went biennial. By 1982, however, there was no longer an Australian counterpart to Hunter, like McCullough, with longstanding commitment to forging links with New Zealand's art world. Nevertheless, after Hunter's crossings to the island of Tasmania, an enthusiastic Australian committee, led by Leigh Hobba, took the helm of *ANZART-in-Hobart* (a.k.a *Tasart*), May 19 to June 12, 1983<sup>25</sup>. Hunter and his committee would steer New Zealand's curatorial course to maintain an even keel with 'Aussie' developments.

By 1983 *ANZART* had become "the most significant art event in the last three years"<sup>26</sup>, while New Zealand Foreign Affairs acknowledged its diplomatic value in culturally lubricating wider "trans-Tasman links" of politics and trade<sup>27</sup>. Indeed these artist initiatives from the 1970s dramatically increased the flow of government and privately funded "trans-Tasman art traffic"<sup>28</sup>. *ANZART-in-Hobart's* status - "the most exciting thing to happen in Tasmanian art so far"<sup>29</sup> - was evident at an illustrious opening in May by vice regal and cultural officials; this "compared more than favourably"<sup>30</sup>, according to Daniel Thomas, to that of *Australian Perspecta*, recently opened in Sydney.

Strongly supported by the Tasmanian government and the School of Art, *ANZART/Tasart* continued its 'experimental' and site-specific focus of performance, video, photography and installation adding painting, film and a major sound festival to the program. In other respects however, the organisation diverged radically from Hunter's model, creating a much larger event on a D.I.Y. scale funding and administrative base. Unlike Christchurch, this event was faced with a space crisis and subsequent bureaucratic obstruction, rendering its structure (with five coordinators) vulnerable to unexpected media hostility and public indifference<sup>31</sup>, despite extensive information campaigns. One local wit advertised:

DURING ANZART, before and after, George Richardson is staying in the bush painting for his Exhibit at Devonport Gallery ...<sup>32</sup>

Dominated by Experimental Art Foundation-organised *Open Sandwich*, the first national conference of alternative (subsequently re-named "contemporary") *Australian* art spaces, *ANZART-in-Hobart* succeeded as a major national event by galvanising *Australian* artists' concerns<sup>33</sup>. New Zealanders, however, were virtually unrepresented here, an imbalance that continued throughout the entire event. With an established system of funded art spaces in place around Australia by the early 1980s, considerable national lobbying had been brought to bear upon the VAB. to improve working conditions - economic lifeboats - for art workers. Gender politics were beginning to steer artistic agendas in both countries, the notion of artists' legal and industrial rights taking a clear and militant course in Australia, although this was not the case in New Zealand. In fact, as early as 1979, such activism was identified as an 'Aussie' tendency and decried by more independently-based New Zealand artists/administrators such as Nick Spill, who viewed the notion of an artist's union as "a dangerous development ...involv(ing) "political power plays"<sup>34</sup>. Following *Open Sandwich*, Australians, too, like Alan Vizents, noted with concern: "It is entirely possible that without realising, we are ... (creating) an alternative art establishment."<sup>35</sup>

*ANZART-in-Hobart* therefore was constructed as a *nationally* inclusive event, "representing the wide range of work evident in contemporary Australian art today"<sup>36</sup>. Selection was devolved to art spaces throughout the various states, creating a further semi-bureaucratic infrastructure. In addition, *ANZART's* significance on the marginalised Tasmanian cultural calendar ensured that local artists were also "very much involved"<sup>37</sup>. Thus *ANZART* swelled to double the previous event's size.

But what about New Zealand? Where was this country situated on *ANZART'S* Australian agenda? Despite a lack of debate about Australia-New Zealand relations at the *Nationalism and Culture* forum<sup>38</sup>, the women's *Art Now* forum specifically identified trans-Tasman as well as Australian differences between artists. New Zealand women's work was considered more introspective than the

(largely) theoretically informed Australians. A number of other significant exchanges did take place, among them the Scott/Dadson/Anstee<sup>39</sup> nightly radio performances and a Drummond/Turpie/Rose<sup>40</sup> tree-healing collaboration on the Hobart waterfront - for Daniel Thomas, the latter was “the most beautiful piece ... (he) saw.”<sup>41</sup>

Following *ANZART* fourteen New Zealand artists toured Australian galleries and art schools, gaining work and recognition, as well as strengthening their own national networks. New Zealand officials basked in the achievements of their compatriots, who, while strongly acknowledging *ANZART*'s potential value, critiqued its scale, foci and organisation. John Hurrell noted a “lack of curatorial presence”, creating an “unwieldy and unfocused” event. In the Mail Exchange building (“a cold empty barn whose floors were covered in leaves and pigeon shit” and transformed in five days into a “considerably cleaner and visually striking exhibition venue”<sup>42</sup>), he considered most Australian work was “brash and shoddily prepared”, “like a half hearted attempt at an agricultural fair ... filled with artists and their groups lobbying for support from visiting funding administrators”<sup>43</sup>. Opportunities to engage cross-Tasman perspectives on the looming Tasmanian dams issue, indigenous land rights, even ‘island experience’ were swamped within a diffuse program concerned, above all, with size. *ANZART* had become rudderless.

Adelaide magazine, *Artlink* attempted to capsize *ANZART*'s real benefits to artists, wrongly accusing the event of political censorship by the Tasmanian government<sup>44</sup>. Thomas' summation, however, is more considered. Taking account of *ANZART*'s difficulties' he pronounced it “(a) historic event”. “... (O)f great value”, he explained:

was the educational stimulus ... caused by the coming together, for a few days, of the many experimental artists, young and old, from Tasmania and the mainland, and from New Zealand and Europe. *ANZART* was conceived ... as an ‘artists’ encounter’ and that, triumphantly, is what seems to have been achieved.<sup>45</sup>

For the relatively few New Zealanders attending, it was a rough passage - which Australians barely noticed because opportunities for serious trans-Tasman debate had not been factored in. This was not ten days that shook the world; not even a tremor registering on the Australian art seismograph. Although Kiwi artists felt marginalised and “almost intrusive”<sup>46</sup> within a culture newly professionalised, as Pacific seafarers used to instability, they believed such problems could be interrogated, re-negotiated, re-navigated. But the Australian gaze was no longer looking out to sea; it was fixed on more solid horizons - like the old married couple looking past each other.

During these days on the island of Tasmania the VAB had already set its next *ANZART* sights, not in the Antipodes but in Edinburgh. Turning its back on New Zealand, *ANZART*'s ethos and artists, it would re-invent *ANZART* as a highly polished national export commodity, *Meaning and Excellence*, an exhibition entirely separated from the New Zealand component of *ANZART: Australian and New Zealand artists in Edinburgh*. Indeed by privileging a narrow geographical and stylistic focus for the Australian component, the VAB also turned its back on the broader constituency of contemporary national art practice<sup>47</sup>. Ironically, the New Zealand work gained considerable kudos at the Edinburgh festival, while Australians fared badly. In one of the great art debacles in Australian history, this corporatised cargo would start taking in water, to be shipwrecked a year later at the final encounter, *ANZART Auckland '85*.

Now oil slicks on the Tasman, sadly, what remains of these trans-Tasman journeys is flotsam and jetsam. But they are part of our regional history and patient salvage is required to reclaim these lost treasures, even if their reclamation reveals uncomfortable aspects of self-knowledge. Singaporean historian, Kanaga Sapabathy explains:

(S)uch endeavours can also prise open divergences which register differences and intense localisation within the region. In embarking upon these endeavours the writing of history and criticism of art can be moved to deeper, reflexive levels, leading to the provision of art historiographies which can assume contending or competing status with historiographies that are esteemed to be dominant and emanating invariably from the West.<sup>48</sup>

For Australia and New Zealand read Northern Hemisphere. McCahon's Pacific – non-indigenous and indigenous – may yet be within sight.

---

<sup>1</sup> Curnow, Wystan, "New Zealand at Mildura 1964-1975, 7<sup>th</sup> Mildura Sculpture Triennial, 1978" in Hunter, Ian, "The Trans Tasman Connection", *Art Network*, No 2, Spring 1980, p. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Mane-Wheoke, Jonathan, "A Recentered World: Post-European/Pro-Indigenous Art from Aotearoa/New Zealand and Te Moananui-a-Kiwa/The South Pacific" in Turner, Caroline, Devenport, Rhana (eds) *The Second Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art Brisbane Australia 1996*, Queensland Art Gallery, Brisbane, 1996, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Edwards, Gregson, Interview with author, Canberra, November 16 2000.

<sup>4</sup> Keating, Paul., *Financial Review*, Unidentified press clipping, n.d., n.p. (2000?).

<sup>5</sup> See Turner, Caroline, Devenport, Rhana (eds), pp. 143-149.

Under the title "Pacific" artists/collaborative exhibits included René Boutin, Micheline Néporon, Denise Tiavouane (New Caledonia); Campfire Group, Richard Joeban Harry, Destiny Deacon, Fiona Hall, Lin Onus, Luke Roberts, Kathy Temin, (Australia); Wendy Choulai (Papua New Guinea/Australia); Tom Deko, Kaibel Ka'a, Michael Mel, Anna Mel, (Papua New Guinea); Eric Natuoiivi (Vanuatu); Men's Waka (John Pule, Brett Graham, Chris Booth, Ben Webb, Peter Robinson) Women's Waka (Bronwynne Cornish, Ani O'Neill, Yuk King Tam, Judy Millar, Lisa Reihana, Marie Shannon) (New Zealand).

<sup>6</sup> See also, for example, The Performance Space's biennial, Sydney-based *Pacific Wave Festivals* (1998 - ) and the short-lived Djamu Gallery of Contemporary Pacific Arts (1997 – 2001), also in Sydney. Predominantly, the work exhibited or performed has been by indigenous Maori and Pacific Island artists.

<sup>7</sup> See Morrell, Timothy, Neale, Margo, "New Zealand: An overview", in (ed) Webb, Jennifer, *Beyond the Future: The Third Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art*. Brisbane: Queensland Art Gallery, 1999, pp. 96-97. "... a useful reminder (particularly for Australians) (is) that Aotearoa/New Zealand is a foreign country and it produces distinctive art. To the rest of the world, New Zealand and Australia may seem very similar, and they are, in the same way that Canada and the United States are similar. In other words there are immense differences between them". p. 96.

<sup>8</sup> Brabazon, Tara, *Tracking the Jack: A retracing of the Antipodes*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2000, p. 33.

<sup>9</sup> The 1970s and 1980s witnessed the phenomenon of trans-Tasman popular music, examples of which were the rock bands, Split Enz, Dragon, Crowded House and songwriter/performers, Neil and Tin Finn. See Brabazon, "Chapter 4: The limits of an endless ocean: Popular music and writing a memory", pp. 95-112.

<sup>10</sup> Cochrane, Grace, Interview with author, March 28 2003. Although no definitive study has been undertaken in this field, there has been a longstanding history of exchange between Australian and New Zealand craft practitioners in the fields of glass, ceramics, textiles and jewellery.

<sup>11</sup> Brabazon, Tara, p. 40. In 1984 an Australia New Zealand Foundation survey monitoring attitudes of 1000 New Zealanders and 1200 Australians found 74% of Australians and 47% of New Zealanders had never crossed the Tasman. "New Zealanders are far more conscious of Australia and its importance to them than vice versa".

<sup>12</sup> Dobell, Graham, *Australia finds home: The choices and chances of an Asia Pacific journey*. Sydney: ABC Books, 2000, pp. 117 ff. Dobell notes that approximately 400,000 New Zealanders (or about 13% of New Zealand's population became Australian residents by the end of the century, with "half a million visits each way each year". Proportionate numbers of Australian residents in New Zealand remain significantly less.

<sup>13</sup> See Grant, Ian F., *The other side of the ditch: A cartoon century in the New Zealand-Australia relationship*. Auckland: New Zealand Cartoon Archive & Tandem Press, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> *Report on the visit to New Zealand, Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia – Joint Committee of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade* (1988), p.5. Cited in Brabazon, Tara, p. 34, n. 87.

<sup>15</sup> An exception to this pattern was the 1992 exhibition of contemporary New Zealand art, *Headlands: Thinking through New Zealand art* at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Sydney. It did not tour to other Australian cities.

<sup>16</sup> Brabazon, Tara, p. 34.

<sup>17</sup> Although a Visual Arts/Crafts Board studio for Australian artists is yet to be established in New Zealand, an Auckland studio was proposed and mapped by Australia Council International staff in the early 1990s. Interview: Ian Were, Sydney, November 30 2002. Unpublished map ("Wishlist -2000"), n.d., n. p., Australia Council Archives.

<sup>18</sup> The Anne & Gordon Samstag International Visual Arts Scholarship program is a prestigious award available for international study to recently graduated Australian art students.

- <sup>19</sup> At the 1975 *Mildura Sculpture Triennial*, Daniel Thomas pronounced the New Zealand work “the most professional avant-garde pieces”. Thomas, Daniel. Cited in Gardiner, P., “Godzone in Ozone”, *New Zealand Listener*, June 21, 1975. See also Lynn, Elwyn, who stated that New Zealand art works were in general “more creative and intellectual ... than their Australian counterparts”. Lynn, Elwyn, Cited in Gardiner (above).
- <sup>20</sup> Hunter, Ian, “The Trans Tasman Connection” *Art Network*, No 2, Spring 1980, p. 20.
- <sup>21</sup> Spill, Nicholas, “New Zealand Proposals for an Art Network”, *start*, No 1, November 1979, p. 4. In this articles Spill notes that “(t)he year 77/78 saw the allocation of 5.6 per cent of the total Arts Council budget to the visual arts. The lowest proportion of funds to one of the highest and most vital sectors of the arts. Without adequate funding individual and group projects will not be sustained and creative work, already underfinanced and undersupported, (sic) will be further weakened ...”.
- <sup>22</sup> Hunter, Ian, Correspondence: Michael Volkerling, 12 November 1980, p. 1.
- <sup>23</sup> Hunter, Ian, in Beanland, Karren, “Trans Tasman art ‘encounter’ and the man in the middle”, *The Press* (“Features”), August 1, 1981, n.d., n.p., clipping from ANZART File, Fine Arts Library, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- <sup>24</sup> Berriman, Ann, “ANZART: An account of an encounter” *Art Network*, No 5, Summer/Autumn 1982, p. 65. “Artists worked together, talked together and manifest a sizeable show that involved not only visual artists, but musicians, writers, poets and the public generally. ANZART has provided a solid foundation for future exchanges”.
- <sup>25</sup> Holmes notes: “The substance of the Anzart encounter was crammed into a ten-day period, beginning 18 May ... and ending on 27 May”. See Holmes, Jonathan, “The Anzart-in-Hobart Art Encounter, Hobart, May 1983: An Introduction” in “Anzart Hobart, 1983: A Survey”, p. 3.
- <sup>26</sup> Hunter, Ian, Correspondence: John McCormack, February 16, 1983.
- <sup>27</sup> Volkerling, Michael, Correspondence: Rod Parry, February 21, 1983. “In common with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Council views opportunities for cultural exchange with Australia to be of particular importance, so much so in fact, that even in times of limited funding we have managed to strengthen trans-Tasman links through the support of events such as ANZART, the Sydney Biennale, and a number of sculpture triennales (sic) ...”.
- <sup>28</sup> Curnow, Wylan, “Chronicling the trans-Tasman Connection: 1974-1984”, *Artlink (Anzart/New Zealand)*, Vol 5, Nos 3&4, August/September 1985, p. 4.
- <sup>29</sup> Bingham, The Hon. Mr., Cited in “Anzart: Three weeks of artistic energy” (“The Arts”) *The Mercury*, May 7, 1983, n.p. (Clipping from ANZART File, Creative New Zealand/QE11 Arts Council Archives).
- <sup>30</sup> Thomas, Daniel, “The Scope of Anzart: Observations” in “Anzart Hobart, 1983: A Survey”, p. 7.
- <sup>31</sup> “Anzart seeks an audience” *The Mercury*, May 27, 1983, n.p., clipping from Q.E. 11 Arts Council, ANZART File. Adrienne Boag of Sydney’s Hardened Arteries, complained “We’re getting sick of artists watching artists. It’s getting really boring. The problem is nobody seems to be really interested”, although another member added: “There is plenty to see down there, sculpture, paintings, us”. In a plea to the public, Boag “hoped Hobartians would at least make an effort to see them ...”.
- <sup>32</sup> “Amusements” *The Mercury* (?) n.d., n.p. (Unidentified clipping from ANZART File)
- <sup>33</sup> Tamara Winikoff noted *Open Sandwich* resembled “an odd mixture of Harvard Business School psychology and flower-power nostalgia”. See Winikoff, Tamara, “La Nouvelle Cuisine: The Open Sandwich Conference” in “Anzart Hobart, 1983: A Survey”, p. 17.
- <sup>34</sup> Spill, Nick, “New Zealand Proposals for an Art Network”, *start*, No. 1, November 1979, p. 4.
- <sup>35</sup> Vizents, Alan, Media Space, (Perth) “in an open letter to its nine members, 2<sup>nd</sup> May, 1983”. Cited in Van den Bosch, Annette, “ANZART-in-Hobart”, *Art Network*, No 10, 1983, p. 18. See also Hurrell, John, “The New Zealand Presence in Tasmania” *Art New Zealand*, No 28, 1983, p. 21. “It is interesting to note that Australia, unlike New Zealand, has a long history of collectives – the inevitable result of its large population and the high turnover of visitors bringing in outside ideas. The proliferation of art colleges turning out graduates, the unemployment situation, and greater economic extremes naturally results in more individuals who need to share resources and ideologies.”
- <sup>36</sup> “ANZART/Tasart Tasart”, Council paper, Queen Elizabeth 11 Arts Council of New Zealand, QE/83/1, Item no: 6 (a) XIV, 1983, p. 1.
- <sup>37</sup> “ANZART/Tasart”, Council paper, 1983, p. 1.
- <sup>38</sup> The speakers were Terry Smith, Adrian Martin and Wylan Curnow. For transcripts and commentary, see Carter, Mick, “An Introduction: A Sense of Place”, in “Anzart Hobart, 1983: A Survey”, pp.19ff.
- <sup>39</sup> Jill Scott, Philip Dadson, Colleen Anstey.
- <sup>40</sup> Andrew Drummond, Steven Turpie, Jon Rose.

---

<sup>41</sup> Thomas, Daniel, pp. 7/8.

<sup>42</sup> Holmes, Jonathan, p. 3.

<sup>43</sup> Hurrell, John, p. 21.

<sup>44</sup> Britton, Stephanie, "Mixing it Anzart-style", *Artlink*, Vol 3, No 3, July-August, 1983, p. 4. Accusations of political censorship by Stephanie Britton and others were sharply corrected by *Tasart* participant, Anne Marsh and *ANZART-in-Hobart* Committee Chair, Grace Cochrane. See letter by Anne Marsh, "Letter to the Editor": *Artlink*, Vol 3, No 4, September 1983 (Unpublished letter insert). Cochrane, Grace, "Anzart-in-Hobart", "Letters", *Artlink*, Vol 3, No 4, September/October 1983, p. 13. *Artlink* characterised *ANZART-in-Hobart* as: "a club of about a hundred people who had travelled there for the purpose" (p. 4.).

<sup>45</sup> Thomas, Daniel, p. 7.

<sup>46</sup> Hurrell, John, p. 21.

<sup>47</sup> *Meaning and Excellence* (the Australian Component of *ANZART: Australian and New Zealand artists in Edinburgh*), was curated by Denise Robinson, and included artists predominantly based in Melbourne and associated with the 'Popism/Art & Text' movement of the early 1980s (Lyndal Jones, Howard Arkley, Robert Rooney, John Lethbridge, Vivienne Sharke-LeWitt, Linda Marinon, Peter Tyndall and Geoff Lowe).

<sup>48</sup> Sabapathy, T.K., "Developing Regionalist Perspectives in South-East Art Historiography" in Turner, Caroline, Devenport, Rhana (eds), p. 17.