

Australia takes an 'arts turn'

An appraisal of *Creative Australia*, Australia's new National Cultural Policy

Veronica Bullock
28 May 2013



SIGNIFICANCE
International

1. *'When culture is understood as the basis of development...the very notion of cultural policy has to be considerably broadened. Any policy for development must be profoundly sensitive to and inspired by culture itself...Defining and applying such a policy means finding factors of cohesion that hold multi-ethnic societies together, by making much better use of the realities and opportunities of pluralism. It implies promoting creativity in politics and governance, in technology, industry and business, in education and in social and community development – as well as in the arts...It implies a thoroughgoing diversification of the notion of cultural heritage in social change. With regard to the natural environment it means building better understanding of the profoundly cultural dimensions of environmental management, creating institutions that give effect to that understanding. Finally...it requires new research which pays attention to the hitherto neglected integration of culture, development, and forms of political organization.'*ⁱ
2. Unfortunately the above excerpts do not come from *Creative Australia*, Australia's new cultural policy – although it does embrace 'culture' for development purposes. These excerpts come from the landmark 1995 *Our Creative Diversity* UNESCO report. It seems reasonable to expect that the findings of this important and highly relevant consensus document would underpin all subsequent cultural policies, including those of Australia.
3. *Creative Australia* is essentially an Arts Policy for Australia's next decade.ⁱⁱ
4. The former Arts Minister Simon Crean had charge of the 'National Cultural Policy' process and cleverly secured cooperation and funds to the tune of \$AUD235million across government portfolios for arts-focused projects and funding structures in advance of its announcement.
5. Account has been taken of technological convergence, community relations, institutional and departmental roles, and creative design, thus making some sensible links with other existing or proposed Australian Government policies, strategies, programs, plans, and responsibilities.
6. Needed arts infrastructure and many thoughtful arts programs have been proposed or are already in progress.
7. The document is easy to read, if repetitive.

8. Importantly, the unique perspective of Indigenous Australians has been acknowledged and expressed more thoughtfully than elsewhere ('world's oldest living culture' full stop), with enhanced encouragements and protections being forwarded.
9. The National Arts and Culture Accord is a long overdue tool to facilitate the improved connection between the three levels of government (local, state, national) in the area of culture. The Accord represents the single most significant achievement in *Creative Australia* towards our challenging future – assuming that our current federated structure persists. We can only hope that the Accord is successfully implemented, and if so, that accords in all other areas of government emulate it. It is hoped that the 2006 COAG Agreement with the Australian Council of Local Governments on cost shifting is remembered, and that the resulting agreement is robust enough that the reformulated Cultural Ministers Council is successful in comprehending the true breadth and depth of culture in Australia. The proposed publication on arts management in our federated structure by Ms Leigh Tabrett (form Head of Arts Queensland) should be funded under this banner. ⁱⁱⁱ
10. Two allied reviews underpin the clearest directions in *Creative Australia*:
(1) the role of the Australia Council for the Arts has been confirmed, revitalised, expanded and handsomely re-funded, along with consideration of further exemptions from the 'efficiency dividend'. ^{iv} Included is increased engagement with the collections sector, which new relationship should be articulated in the proposed Act revision;
(2) the Review of Private Sector Support for the Arts proposes a 'new culture of giving, partnership and investment in Australia'.
11. Some good suggestions have been made about projecting Australia's identity internationally, although that identity is arguably better encapsulated within the broader definition of culture used in the *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*. ^v
12. Overall, the reader of *Creative Australia* is not left with a sense that politics, governance, technology, industry, business, education, or even social and community development, will be fundamentally affected by a creative arts, as distinct from a creative culture, sensibility.
13. In fact, there is a risk that by associating the term 'creative' so very strongly with the arts that many passionate and creative Australians with non-arts interests or capabilities will feel disenfranchised by this policy and hostile to many of its proposed funding allocations. Art expression is one form of human expression.
14. Germane to all contemporary cultural policy discussion is the question, 'Should culture be engineered to generate product ('output'), or should naturally arising creative expression be effectively recognised and creatively adapted to a range of settings?'
15. As a corollary to the above we could ask: 'Does an intensive arts focus in national cultural policy best serve Australia in 'The Critical Decade' ^{vi} and beyond?' Climate change scientists and others are desperately calling for

nothing less than transformational change / paradigmatic shifts in order to address the challenges of our shared future.

16. Or, has the Australian Government Office for the Arts, which developed this policy, actually taken its lead from Jacques Delors' 1985 presentation to the European Parliament:

'the culture industry will tomorrow be one of the biggest industries, a creator of wealth and jobs. Under the terms of the Treaty [of Rome] we do not have the resources to implement a cultural policy: but we are going to try to tackle it along economic lines... We have to build a powerful European culture industry that will enable us to be in control of both the medium and its content, maintaining our standards of civilization, and encouraging the creative people amongst us.'^{vii}

17. The following aspects of *Creative Australia* are of further concern:

Definitions

18. In the prefaces to the document broad, anthropologically inspired definitions of culture are given. This understanding is immediately and repeatedly reduced to narrower interpretations of culture in the body of the document – as entirely equivalent to arts.

19. To make the National Cultural Policy truly Australian Indigenous concepts of 'culture' should infuse it.^{viii}

20. Terms like 'art-', 'cultur-' and 'heritage' are not consistently defined in the document – at times they are used as synonyms, and at others not.

21. To paraphrase former Queensland Arts Minister Leigh Tabrett, where is the 'interest of the [ordinary / consumer / arts-disinterested] citizen' in this policy, beyond matters of audience and access to product? Does this policy truly address 'equality of opportunity for [all] citizens?' Will all or even a majority of Australian citizens feel that this policy captures their core values?^{ix}

22. A useful reminder of the multiple meanings of culture is that given by Australians Yencken and Wilkinson:^x

'Culture can be defined in many ways. It can mean the practice of cultivating and nurturing the soil. It can mean the practice involved in producing a particular crop or the process involved in causing bacteria or tissue to grow in a prepared medium. It can mean a refinement of mind, taste and manners. It can mean the artistic and intellectual aspects of a society or civilisation. It can mean the distinctive customs achievements, products, outlook and belief systems of a particular group in society.'

23. In Australia it is important to be mindful of the findings of such career anthropologists as Elizabeth Povinelli and Francesca Merlan. Of these and her own work Tess Lea states: *'the engagement between Aboriginal people and the market state also operates in reverse. Settler Australian understandings of self, knowledge, property and nation are also impacted upon and shaped by Aboriginality.'*^{xi}

Market economy frame

24. In *Creative Australia* the material and process of art and culture are viewed as assets to be exploited under the banner of creative industries first and foremost, then as aids in community cohesion, and finally as potential resources for introverted research - towards innovation not transformational change or paradigmatic shift.
25. Beyond an assumption of increasing demand for technology and content there is no positioning in *Creative Australia* of the next decade *vis-à-vis* projections over the longer term (to mid-century and beyond) for population / demography, environmental capacity including natural resources / food security, economics or social trends.^{xii} How can the reader be sure that the proposed trajectory and accompanying bundle of spending is wise without such context?
26. Contemporary market economists sometimes now refer to diverse types of capital – usually natural, human and social. In this scenario culture is typically regarded as a subset of social capital. *Creative Australia* refers to two types of capital, economic and cultural capital. The latter is used only in the context of collecting and arts organisations building their digital capacity ‘using their existing cultural and creative capital’.^{xiii}
27. Influential Australian Professor David Throsby, an original architect of the Ecologically Sustainable Development Strategy for Australia (1992), proposed cultural capital as a necessary concept to capture cultural value, comprising both market and non-market values of the arts and culture, within a market economy frame.^{xiv}
28. Throsby also promotes cultural policy as a core government function, involving a wide range of ministries including culture, heritage, education, social welfare, trade, urban and regional development etc.
29. While placing the creative process at the centre of his concentric model of culture in the market economy, Throsby recently reiterated that robust and persistent connection of culture with all facets of government is desirable and logical.^{xv}
30. Despite working within the market economy paradigm Throsby’s work begs the question: Should our cultural policy not provide proper guidance on the validity of the concept of cultural capital? This would probably be welcomed at least by economists, statisticians and teachers.
31. It is important here to note the call for recognising the imperceptible slide of market economy into ‘market society’ identified by such thinkers as Michael Sandel. He has found abundant evidence that individuals and societies urgently want to confront issues of boundaries, ethics and values.^{xvi}
32. By now we should be ever-mindful that globalisation – the track that we are now all on and which *Creative Australia* harnesses – is known as a major cause of unprecedented and growing levels of inequality in all societies.^{xvii}

Articulation with other areas

33. No attempt is made in *Creative Australia* to overtly link learnings from artistic explorations with our serious and clearly defined national research agendas and university funding systems i.e. the National Research Priorities, Australian Research Council National Competitive Grants Program.
34. Significantly, even the one National Research Priority that relates to culture, 'Understanding Cultures and Communities' (in the *2011 Strategic Roadmap for Australian Research Infrastructure*), is not mentioned.
35. David Throsby's position is echoed by the 'Agenda 21 for Culture' group, which advocates for 'a cultural dimension in all public policies'.^{xviii}
36. Although connections have been made to other government portfolio areas in *Creative Australia*, sometimes with accompanying funding, are the policies of those areas reciprocally changing to reflect the role of culture (as exemplified in the *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*)?^{xix}
37. Diversity is naively supported for its creative potential in *Creative Australia* despite evidence that it can also lead to community fracturing.^{xx}

Sustainability

38. The term 'sustainab-' is used when 'persistent' or 'ongoing' (within the existing market economy paradigm) would be more accurate to the intended meaning in most cases in the document. (Making entities persist is not sustainable unless those entities are periodically tested for relevance, morality, efficiency, and effectiveness.)
39. In *Creative Australia* there are references to arts / culture as a 'fourth' 'pillar of Australian society' in the 21st century.^{xxi} If the intention is to embrace culture as the fourth pillar of sustainability^{xxii} then the other three pillars are ecology, economy, and society (the 'triple bottom line') – thus making the reference to Australian society redundant. The use of the term 'pillar' in *Creative Australia* is therefore either glib or misleading.
40. Foundation advocate for culture as a fourth pillar of sustainability, and former Victorian arts administrator Jonathan Hawkes supports Professor David Yencken in warning against reduction of culture to arts in policy making.^{xxiii}
41. For culture to be truly embraced all reporting structures, including those outlined in the Tracking and Targeting section of *Creative Australia*, would have to be revised.
42. Deeper meanings in a number of cited examples are not explored for their potential value in repositioning Australia for a complex future. For example, from the context it seems obvious that once defined 'Traditional Cultural Expressions' will then be harvested for economic gain. Whereas, the Indigenous concept of cultural landscape may be used to reshape our bureaucratic landscape, which is clearly limiting fields such as heritage.^{xxiv}

43. Similarly, embracing emerging knowledge (content and formats) would free up university research (currently delimited by Field of Research codes),^{xxv} thereby indirectly contributing to more sustainable research and outcomes.
44. At least it should be possible to establish 'cultural heritage corridors' in Australia.^{xxvi} The corridor concept has won support in the Environment Division of the same department in which heritage is located.

The place of heritage in culture

45. Cultural heritage is mentioned in *Creative Australia* as an element of culture.
46. What is heritage? Material heritage comprises three parts: natural, place-based, and movable. *Creative Australia* addresses movable cultural heritage or 'collections'.^{xxvii}
- 'Heritage is not history at all; while it borrows from and enlivens historical study, heritage is not an inquiry into the past but a celebration of it'... 'History and heritage are both here to stay, despite recurrent forecasts of their demise and crusades to expunge them from public life'... 'What makes heritage so crucial in a world beset by poverty and hunger, enmity and strife? We seek comfort in past bequests partly to allay these griefs.'*^{xxviii}
47. It is likely that true understandings of intangible cultural heritage and culture (and heritage) as process lies at the heart of getting culture policy settings right.^{xxix}
48. With movable cultural heritage now excised from *Australia: State of the Environment* reporting,^{xxx} arguably its only national foothold in Australia today might be the proposed National Heritage Strategy (NHS) (notwithstanding the handful of Nationally funded collecting institutions). Given the tangential status of heritage with the Australia Council for the Arts, can Australians be confident that the NHS will understand and represent the important role of heritage in our rapidly changing world?
49. For a second time under the current Labor administration of Australia arts and heritage come into the same minister's portfolio – The Honourable Tony Burke. Can we reasonably expect more to come of this alignment than last time, in the National Heritage Strategy?
50. While remembering the broad meanings of culture given at earlier points, an example of a limited interpretation of culture comes from the Netherlands, which nevertheless includes three equivalent parts in its 'culture' gamut: (1) cultural heritage; (2) media, literature and libraries; (3) the arts.^{xxxi}

Movable cultural heritage

51. Although movable cultural heritage has been remembered in the National Cultural Policy (unlike the preceding Discussion Paper), its potential to solve fundamental problems, now and in the future, has not been understood in *Creative Australia*.

52. Regarding collecting institutions the Australian Government is only responsible for the National institutions, mainly located in Canberra. *Creative Australia* has not presented a reliable mechanism for making digital content available from the Distributed National Collection held in small to medium collecting organisations around the country, or for connecting with the arguably deeper and more valuable State collections - and yet *Creative Australia* claims national coverage with regard to collections. ^{xxxii}
53. The Distributed National Collection should be developed as one aspect of the National Accord in order to make the Australian content available 'truly national'. ^{xxxiii}
54. The function of the *Protection of Movable Cultural Heritage Act 1986* (and *Regulations 1987*) is described as 'ensuring that the most significant items are kept within Australia'. ^{xxxiv} This comment displays a misunderstanding of how this Act operates. It is often only if items are officially nominated for export that they come to light – the Control Lists, which attempt to identify Australia's most significant items before transfers are proposed, are very short and much disputed. Australia has not seriously embarked upon a campaign of determining which items across Australia are most significant (N.B. these are not necessarily held in the National collecting institutions), despite a clearly defined and very successful methodology being available (*Significance 2.0*). The PMCH Act must be complemented by a thoroughgoing program of significance assessment before it can truthfully be said that Australia's most significant items are being kept here.
55. It is thus logical to ask: Can the concept of excellence in the arts, vindicated in *Creative Australia*, be applied to collections?
56. In the Tracking and Targeting section *Creative Australia* states that growth in the cultural value of the cultural sector will be shown by increases in four indicators, of which one is 'holdings of heritage collections'. ^{xxxv} As in all other countries, Australian collecting organisations hold vast numbers of objects which tell no story i.e. their provenance has been lost through lack of good documentation practice. ^{xxxvi} Simply adding to this count is irresponsible to current and future generations. Existing and future collection additions must be rigorously reviewed using the Australian significance assessment approach.
57. The idea of collecting organisations hosting more internships is a good one, but only if specifically funded and supported by additional specialist staff. These organisations have typically had to further divide reducing 'efficiency dividend' budgets to cater to increased demand for on the job training by universities etc. Where specialised staff remain in collecting institutions after repeated rounds of redundancies their skills are at risk of declining substantially due to reducing practice in favour of increased teaching loads.
58. The description of Trove as a newspaper repository only in a case study is inaccurate ^{xxxvii}, and contradicts other correct descriptions of Trove in the document as a search engine for all Australian documentary heritage. This may well confuse readers.

59. It is pleasing to see that the time of a National Network for museums and galleries has arrived, ^{xxxviii} after the 2009 proposals to build a 'CollectionsCare Network' ^{xxxix} via the Collections Council of Australia (CCA) (2005-2010), and enhanced digital services through the Collections Australia Network (CAN) for all Australian collecting organisations (including libraries and archives) were not supported. However, no clear budget is stated for this new activity.
60. It is hoped that the new National Network articulates well with the proposed super portal of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Populations and Communities (now difficult to find on the Your Community Heritage web pages), and with the legacy resources on the CAN, CCA and Australian Government Culture Portal websites.

Beware the digital fetish ^{xi}

61. It is heartening to see a good connection being made between the National Broadband Network and the content held by collecting organisations. ^{xii}
62. And that the 'digital deluge' all collecting organisations face has been recognised in recent funding allocations – to the National institutions in Canberra (plus the Australian National Maritime Museum in Sydney). ^{xiii}
63. However, the repeated phrase 'better leverage existing...collections' ^{xiiii} assumes that those collections will naturally persist. We have seen that there is real risk of original materials being neglected once rapid-fire digital processing begins.
64. As a corollary to this it is vitally important that archivists and librarians lead the design of 'trusted digital repositories'.
65. A salutary lesson from European cultural funding comes from Collections Trust (UK) CEO Nick Poole in a recent official blog post:

'If the last generation of EU funding for culture was about digitisation, access and intercultural dialogue, the next generation seems set to focus on research, knowledge, innovation and the quality of life.'

Gathering relevant and reliable information about culture and monitoring the results of the new policy

66. Although the Australian Bureau of Statistics continues to try to successfully capture cultural activity, there are still many areas for improvement, even regarding collecting organisations. ^{xiv}
67. For example, assumptions such as 'Growth in the cultural value of the sector, as shown by an increase in...holdings of heritage collections' (see also Point 56) are fallacious.
68. Why are there no costings for the effective evaluation of the suite of programs and initiatives outlined in the *Creative Australia*, and why are there no collaborative enabling governance arrangements – as in the *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper*? Should not a mid-term review be conducted so that the Australian taxpayer can see that specific initiatives are achieving their

intended outputs, outcomes, and, if possible, impacts? Note: this is a separate proposition to the approach proposed in the Tracking and Targeting section.

69. The Tracking and Targeting section aims to continue measuring what has been measured in the past, including indicators which can most readily be measured. It may be important that this activity continues, but it embodies biases e.g. economic outcomes (tourism, goods, value of cultural exports, financial support, expenditure), 'arts' education only, volunteering (when traditional forms of employment are changing in response to many of the innovations described in the policy in detail e.g. digital innovation). The 'Measuring Public Value' section references recent international work in this area which once again is based on commodified expressions of culture in the 'creative industries'.^{xiv}
70. Can Australians rely upon the National Data Collection to identify the true gaps in data gathering about cultural activity, and can that data represent flows and ideas, such as:
- a. rate of origination and transfer of creative ideas and approaches from heritage research collections;
 - b. contribution of heritage collection research to solving social, economic, ecological and cultural (sustainability) problems;
 - c. degree of translation of distinctively Australian (especially Indigenous) perceptions / interpretations into broader societal, creative and institutional policies and fabric?
71. It would be wise to ask the same questions of this policy that Tess Lea does of Indigenous health policy in northern Australia: *'What exactly is failure? What is success? Instead, notions of success and failure are measured against a yardstick of under-conceptualised and idealised western cultural abstractions. Such is the case in the imagining of what a good life is and what it takes for an Aboriginal person to have one.'*^{xlv}

Overall queries and a request to the Minister

72. What does *Creative Australia* aim to have Australian's think and do, and how much true reciprocity and open-mindedness is engendered in the policy?
73. Culture is an iterative creation. Does *Creative Australia* encourage iteration beyond grass-roots exchanges within a market economy paradigm?
74. The Australian Heritage Strategy is due for release now. Delayed release of this Strategy is recommended (similar to that enjoyed by the National Cultural Policy). It is hoped that this will lead to greater accuracy in apprehension and description of elements of existing Australian society and heritage, as well as boldness in filling the gaps left by *Creative Australia*, *vis-à-vis* our increasingly uncertain future.

Endnotes

- ⁱ C. Gordon and S. Mundy 2001 *European Perspectives on Cultural Policy* UNESCO, Paris, p. 5.
- ⁱⁱ Similarly, the current City of Sydney Cultural Policy Discussion Paper 'Creative City' equates culture fully with the arts: <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/explore/arts-and-culture/cultural-policy>.
- ⁱⁱⁱ L. Tabrett et. al. 2013 'It's art, stupid: a critical conversation on the state of arts funding in Australia' at the launch on 14 March 2013 of L. Tabrett 'It's arts, stupid. Reflections of an arts bureaucrat' Currency House, Sydney: <http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/bigideas/it27s-culture2c-stupid/4618608>
- ^{iv} See the last paragraph and footnote 2 in this Significance International news item from June 2011 'Efficiency Dividend put to the vote' on the favourable treatment of the Australia Council for the Arts vis-à-vis the National collecting organisations regarding the Efficiency Dividend (an annual funding reduction for the same level of output).
- ^v Commonwealth of Australia 2012 *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper* Available at: <http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/>.
- ^{vi} The Australian Climate Commission uses the term 'The Critical Decade' to convey the high importance of making the right decisions now to control climate change impacts on future generations: <http://climatecommission.gov.au/the-critical-decade-key-messages/>. It is crucial to note that climate change is only one of the seven 'interlocking crises' of sustainability. S.R. Dovers 1997 Sustainability: Demands on policy *Journal of Public Policy* Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 303-318.
- ^{vii} C. Shore and S. Wright 1997 *Anthropology of Policy: critical perspectives on governance and power* Routledge, London, p.170.
- ^{viii} Establishment of the Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Education at Charles Darwin University, and the preservation of Indigenous languages (expressing different worldviews that may open the minds of non-speakers), should promote this, towards a more holistic definition of Australian culture in the future – although it is worrying that these initiatives are listed under the (exploitative) Theme: 'Connect to a National Life for a Social and Economic Dividend': Australian Government 2013 *Creative Australia: National Cultural Policy*, Canberra, pp. 47 and 85: <http://creativeaustralia.arts.gov.au/>.
- ^{ix} Care must be taken to be honest and yet distinctive. For example, Chris Shore in 'Governing Europe: European Union audiovisual policy and the politics of identity' in C. Shore and S. Wright 1997 *Op. cit.*, pp. 176-177, reports that the term 'European culture-area' has been characterised by some European policy makers, social scientists and academics by the following core values – 'democracy', 'rule of law', 'military will to defend pluralism', 'consensus building practices', 'parliamentary institutions', 'private property' and 'the market', while ignoring 'the darker side of European modernity', most notably Europe's legacy of slavery and colonialism, fascism, the holocaust, anti-semitism, imperialism and religious bigotry.' Shore goes on to observe that even the positive terms fail to 'specify in what ways these 'European values' differ from so-called 'American values', or from those harmful imported values which are supposedly threatening European culture. According to this interpretation, globalisation is an alien invention which has nothing to do with European culture, commerce or institutions.' Are the asserted values of 'respect, understanding and inclusion' listed in the *Australia in the Asian Century White Paper* the whole story for Australians? Commonwealth of Australia 2012 p. 252. Philosopher Michael Sandel believes that contemporary western society is aching to have such discussions, partly in order to deal with the 'market societies' they find themselves caught up in. M. Sandel 2012 *What money can't buy: the moral limits of markets* Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, New York.
- ^x D. Yencken and D. Wilkinson 2000 *Resetting the Compass: Australia's Journey Towards Sustainability* CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, p. 351.
- ^{xi} T. Lea 2008 *Bureaucrats & Bleeding Hearts: Indigenous health in northern Australia* University of New South Wales Press, Sydney, p. 7.
- ^{xii} Many such projections exist, not least amongst government departments. These reports are routinely created by scientists and social scientists. For example, Professor Ross Garnaut's *Climate Change Review* reports of 2008 and 2010: <http://www.garnautreview.org.au/>.
- ^{xiii} Australian Government 2013 *Creative Australia: National Cultural Policy*, Canberra, p. 111.
- ^{xiv} D. Throsby 2001 *Economics and Culture* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- ^{xv} D. Throsby 2012 'Valuation and the Cultural Sector: current issues and future directions' Presentation to the Culture and Economy Conference, Temple Bar, Dublin, 9 May 2012: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MnsZ3_bulqI.
- ^{xvi} M. Sandel 2012 *What money can't buy: the moral limits of markets* Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, New York.
- ^{xvii} F. Bourignon 2012 *The globalisation of inequality* European University Institute, San Domenico di Fiesole, Italy.

-
- ^{xviii} J. Pascual 2013 *Rio+20 and culture: advocating for culture as a pillar of sustainability* Agenda 21 for Culture / United Cities and Local Governments, Barcelona, p. 7.
- ^{xix} Commonwealth of Australia 2013 *Australia in the Asian Century Implementation Plan*, Canberra: <http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/news-media/blog/implementation-plan>.
- ^{xx} A. Leigh 2010 *Disconnected* University of New South Wales Press, Sydney; R. D. Putnam 2000 *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* Simon and Schuster, New York.
- ^{xxi} Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, pp. 106 and 121. It is important to note here that arts is usually not mentioned in regard to the quadruple bottom line as culture is deemed to encapsulate it.
- ^{xxii} D. Yencken and D. Wilkinson 2000 *Op. cit.*, p. 343ff; J. Hawkes 2001 *The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning* Victorian Cultural Development Network / Common Ground, Melbourne: <http://www.fourthpillar.biz/about/fourth-pillar/>; Agenda 21 for Culture: <http://www.agenda21culture.net/index.php?lang=en>.
- ^{xxiii} Hawkes 2001 *Op. cit.*, pp. 7 and 36.
- ^{xxiv} See the Significance International submission to the Australian National Heritage Strategy, which references certain commissioned essays for the consultation and goes further: <http://www.significanceinternational.com/tabid/67/newsid394/36/Have-your-say-by-June-15/Default.aspx>. See also the Significance International submission to the National Cultural Policy consultation: <http://www.significanceinternational.com/tabid/67/newsid394/22/Have-your-say-in-Australias-future/Default.aspx>.
- ^{xxv} See the Collections Council of Australia submission to the 2007 Review of the Australian Standard Research Classification: (archived site) <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/56747/20110418-0000/www.collectionscouncil.com.au/collections,+keywords+and+the+asrc+codes.html>
- ^{xxvi} This concept is well used in the United States to present Indigenous and non-Indigenous elements of heritage e.g. The Gullah / Geechee Cultural Corridor: <http://www.nps.gov/guge/index.htm>. For a description of cultural heritage corridors, scroll down on this page: <http://www.nps.gov/blac/parkmgmt/whats-a-corridor.htm>. An example of an Australian environmental conservation corridor is that for the Great Eastern Ranges: www.environment.nsw.gov.au/resources/nature/ccandger.pdf. Read about the various scientific definitions of corridors on pages 15 and 16.
- ^{xxvii} Cultural collections include scientific collections, as science is an activity of a human community.
- ^{xxviii} D. Lowenthal 1998 *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, x, xi, xiii.
- ^{xxix} 'Intangible cultural heritage' is argued by some to be the true essence of all heritage (L. Smith 2006 *Uses of Heritage* Routledge, London), and has been a category recognised by UNESCO since 2001.
- ^{xxx} See Significance International news item from January 2012: <http://www.significanceinternational.com/tabid/67/newsid394/27/Out-in-the-cold---again/Default.aspx>.
- ^{xxxi} I. v. Hamersveld (ed) 2009 *Cultural Policy in the Netherlands* Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, and Boekman Studies, Amsterdam.
- ^{xxxii} The National collecting institutions are listed as: (1) The Australian National Maritime Museum (in Sydney) (2) National Gallery of Australia (3) National Museum of Australia (4) National Library of Australia (5) National Archives of Australia (6) National Film and Sound Archive of Australia (7) Bundanon Trust (at Bundanon, NSW) (8) National Portrait Gallery of Australia, and (9) the Museum of Australian Democracy at the Old Parliament House. The (10) Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies is described as comprising 'cultural research and collections'. Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, p. 98. The fact that the nine listed institutions are not also perceived as agencies for research clearly limits the extent to which their staff can use their collections to actively create new knowledge themselves – collecting organisations appear to be regarded primarily as passive, secure, holding pens. By contrast there are around 30 other large collecting organisations in Australia which are not funded by the Australian Government, and therefore are not classified as National. On a practical note it would help the reader if a convention were used in all government publications regarding the word national, in which an upper case 'N' is used when referring to federally funded institutions and responsibilities, and a lower case 'n' is used when referring to everything else.
- ^{xxxiii} Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, p.100.
- ^{xxxiv} Australian Government 2013 *Op.cit.*, p. 99.
- ^{xxxv} Australian Government 2013 *Op.cit.*, p.120.
- ^{xxxvi} A possible alternative to this is 'typological' collecting in which huge numbers of physical objects become valuable in defining types, sometimes in the absence of background information.
- ^{xxxvii} Australian Government 2013 *Op.cit.*, p. 101.
- ^{xxxviii} Australian Government 2013 *Op.cit.*, pp. 13, 22, 66, 100.

^{xxix} Collections Council of Australia 'CollectionsCare' proposal: (archived site)

<http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/56747/20110418-0000/www.collectionscouncil.com.au/Defaulta486.html?tabid=737>

^{xi} While being aware of the benefits of collection digitisation as evidenced by such reports as S. Tanner and M. Deegan 2011 *Inspiring Research, Inspiring Scholarship: the value and benefits of digitized resources for learning, teaching, research and enjoyment* Higher Education Funding Council for England: <http://www.kdcs.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/inspiring.html>.

^{xii} This was another main point of advocacy by the Collections Council of Australia following its 2006 Digital Collections Summit - notably in its submissions to various government enquiries on behalf of all archives, galleries, libraries and museums across the country.

^{xiii} Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, pp. 20 and 22.

^{xiii} Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, e.g. p. 56.

^{xiv} The Collections Council of Australia liaised with the National Centre for Culture and Recreation Statistics of the Australian Bureau of Statistics over several years in an effort to convey the disparities in the standard statistical conceptualisations in this area: (archived site)

<http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/56747/20110418-0000/www.collectionscouncil.com.au/review+of+service+industries+surveys.html>.

^{xv} Australian Government 2013 *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

^{xvi} T. Lea 2008 *Op. cit.*, p. xi. More generally, social researcher Hugh Mackay argues in his newly released book *The Good Life: what makes a life worth living?* (2013 Pan Australia) that 'A good life is not measured by security, wealth, status, achievement or levels of happiness. A good life is determined by our capacity for selflessness and our willingness to connect with those around us in a meaningful and useful way.': http://billboard.anu.edu.au/event_view.asp?id=100927.