# Future/Forward 2018 Day One

## Session 1: Artistic courage ignites Australian culture

Esther Anatolitis: To start us off it is my honour to introduce Ngunnawal elder Aunty Matilda House to welcome us.

Matilda House: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you so much. Very proud moment for everybody to be here today because everything's been addressed of not being ripped off. You can clap to that! (Applause). That's what it's all about. Today is about taking your own autonomy into your own hands and making sure that what you do is yours and no-one else's. That's how we've been going all through the years with white and black artists, people who are not getting their dues and recognition comes all the time just about but the dues never come and that's what it's all about as well, recognising all our - all the power that we have in making this great beautiful land of what we call Australia into a place of being and part of that is because of artists like yourselves because we all have this dream of having something and that ownership always to be there but in the worst offenders to artists are governments. You can clap to that to. (Applause). They want everybody to do something and they put a price and that's it and you're out the door before you can have an opinion about what they're going to give you. But it doesn't matter. Today's the day and tomorrow, and it's going to be addressed in a good and proper way of how it should be. Because Australia is supposed to be the land - it wasn't in the first place, was it, it was a penal colony and the colonialistic attitudes are still here. Always here. It's through the governments. I keep bagging governments all the time, but you know at the end of the day we've got to have something to know and talk about and to bag (laughter) and it doesn't matter who's in and who's out because at the end of the day they don't know either. So we're all here today to make things happen in a good and bright future for all the artists who works hard to make Australia what it is today, a very good community of helping. How many artists, you know, have gone through life and didn't have that care what we're giving out, what we're making to make sure that it's - everything will be put in place this time around. I'm a very proud Aboriginal woman, very proud black woman, and all my children, grandchildren and great grandchildren, and that's what we're all here to make sure that the generational changes that come within our lives, whether you're an artist or not, those generational changes come and will always be there for the changes that do come and our families - we all have families that will carry on that. We don't want them to carry a burden. We want them to carry on and keep fighting for the rights of what we're all here today for. You are on the land of Black Harry. My great grant father, born and bred out there on the Murrumbidgee River and always - I've kept that generation going not only with myself but with my kids as well who can do the things that need to be done. We're not here to be walked on no more because no matter what sort of an artist you are, you could be the best stand up comedian artist going but at the end of the day if you're not getting your dues something has got to be happening. I've seen people here in the audience today I've known for quite a number of years and the strong panels that will be here as well today and tomorrow to talk about the issues that are going to help artists from all around Australia to be proud and to fight for everything that we're all going to need at the end of the day, they're all fighting over something up there on the hill about emissions, you know. Let them carry on and do their emissions, carry on and make all their little things another. They're all plotting anyway so don't worry about it. But I want to say welcome here to the land, to this beautiful land. We are part of all the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander -

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander lands in Australia, of Aboriginal lands. That's what we're on today. Proud to be. Proud to be. I'm a proud Ngambri Ngunnawal woman of the languages as well. You have a great day, be safe, don't be sorry, just get on and do what you have to do and make it all happen because the footprints when you look behind you, they're still there with someone else to take up the banner and run with it. Welcome to this land of Ngambri Ngunnawal and have a great day. Thank you.

(Applause)

Nick Mitzevich: That's a tough act to follow, isn't it? Good morning and welcome to the National Gallery and thank you Aunty for that beautiful welcome full of feist which is exactly what we'd expect. My name is Nick Mitzevich and I'm the Director of the National Gallery of Australia and it is very gratifying that today can happen here at the National Gallery. We are a gallery that focuses on the 20th and 21st century and it's live and living artists that define the 20th and 21st centuries so it's gratifying to have so many living and breathing artists in the building. It's our job to amplify the work that you do and in Australia we have all these very formal institutions and they tend to get in our way and they tend to be conservative and they tend to be behind community expectations, but in the 21st century we have lots of things at our finger tips that can drive a cultural agenda and that's what I believe the National Gallery should be doing and that's what the gallery should be doing to support the lives of living artists working in Australia today. My job and the job of my colleagues here at the National Gallery is to make sure that we join the dots between you and everyone else in Australia and to quote a beautiful sentiment from Stan Grant when he launched Tarnanthi at the Art Gallery of SA last year, he said that art connects us to everything we know and everything we don't so artists have this extraordinary power in doing that and in a world full of so much static, so much partisan politics, there's one thing I actually have great confidence in and that's in 2000 years' time, we won't remember the static but we'll remember the things that artists thought about, that artists made and artists put out into the world because if we look back 2000 years from now, the things that we have and the things that we remember are only the things that artists and writers and architects made and that's quite a potent thing to remember. I hope you have a great day here and as I said it's gratifying to have you all here at the National Gallery. I hope you might have a chance to see our exhibitions and displays that are throughout the building. Unfortunately, our major exhibition is currently being installed and it opens in two weeks so I hope you might return and I look forward to spending time with you during the day and thank you very much for being here and it's my great pleasure to introduce one of Australia's leading contemporary artists that works both in Australia and around the world, the Deputy Chair of NAVA, Sally Smart.
(
Applause)

Sally Smart: Hi. It's great to be here and see so many people. It's wonderful. I haven't actually talked to anyone yet because I came up here instantly but I can see quite a few friends there and thank you, Nick. That's fabulous. Great to be here. Thank you NGA for hosting us and I would like a few thank yous and I will say a few words. Thank you also for the Copyright Agency for funding and thank you also for State Governments for supporting artists' travel to come here today and also it's going to be my great pleasure to introduce Esther Anatolitis and Penelope Benton, Esther our Executive Director of NAVA and Penelope our General Manager of NAVA. They'll be outlining Future/Forward and launching the NAVA Strategic Plan and Code revision which we see as critical for the future of artists in the country. If you think of the vision we have for NAVA and my fellow board members and the executive team

have worked hard in the last year really, starting to, I guess, redefine some of the major issues as we see it today of what's important. NAVA has had a long history and it was actually in Parliament House and gave an address a number of years ago. It was actually on the eve of the incredible funding debacle and loss that we had suffered in this country and so a lot has changed since then but I remember at that address I actually talked to the idea of the visualisation of knowledge and that the world needs more artists which I don't - I believe that. I totally believe we do need more artists. I personally have had, over 30 years working as an artist, NAVA has always been there in those authority 30 years, at times I've been a - over those 30 years, at times I've been a member, at times I have not. NAVA's Codes - NAVA has been visible and invisible but NAVA has been there and when NAVA is not there you really will start to feel the difference so it's really critical that we as a group, a culture, society, community, that we support NAVA , that we - and in fact it is you, the members of NAVA, that have kept the visibility and I think the direction for this idea of future forward and artistic courage being so manifest for us. The very fact that the members have responded so courageously about wanting to and to fight the good fight in terms of what we need in this country so it really is wonderful that you're all here today for us to have - and for the next two days to have lots of conversations, lots of very - and tell us, as NAVA and also talk to each other about what really is concerning everybody. There are a lot of issues. There's lots of work to be done. There's lots of work to be done out from you to take out to your artist communities as well because we need all of the support we can. Artists are needed more than ever and that's you. OK, so thank you and welcome, Penelope and Esther. Thank you.

(Applause)

Esther Anatolitis: We're going to grab some mics. It is so fantastic to see so many of you here. You can hear me, can't you? This sounds even better and I believe we also have a clicky thing which I'm also going to go - yes, thank you. Excellent. Go team! Oh, my goodness. I want to thank Aunty Matilda first. I'll sit near Penelope so that we're cozy. That was just awesome. What better way to set a scene. There's a lot that we want to fight for. There's a whole lot we have in common and we're here to talk about all of those things and being thank you to Nick for not just welcoming us but also to National Gallery for hosting us today and I believe we have lot of National Gallery staff here as well which is really fantastic. We are going to go to what the plan is for today. We're going to talk a bit about the Code of Practice, we're going to talk about our new Strategic Plan. I'm going to press the button and it's going to work. There's a sneak peek about the plan. But before we get into that, there's so many of us here and we are so, so grateful to see you all. First of all, artists, there are artists here from all over Australia. Thank you for coming. Oh, my goodness.

Penelope Benton: What a vision this is. This is so fantastic. I'm so excited to have this perspective. I think everybody needs a turn down here to see these beautiful faces.

Esther Anatolitis: One by one because then you can see each other. We should totally plan that. We have also got Aboriginal Art Centres, Gabriel Nodea the Chair of Warmun Art Centre and Deputy Chair of ANKAA is here, Serena Gunter Manager of Ceduna Arts, Gabrielle from the Indigenous Arts Code the CEO and the Chair of Ku Arts are here somewhere in the room a lot of ARIs so welcome to you. David Broker is here somewhere. Where is David Broker? It is so good to see you, Director of Canberra Contemporary Art Space. Thank you for more advice and support than I think you realise and also thank you to David for encouraging artists to billet other artists. As we know, to get here this week is important and impactful and it coincides with sitting week but it's not cheap so thank you. We've got Artbank here, regional arts NSW, Victoria, WA, Museums and Galleries Australia, Arts Law Australia,

governments of the ACT, NSW and Victoria. The Australia Council tomorrow but not today, Guildhouse in SA, Bundoora Homestead in Victoria and a New Approach is here, Sydney Contemporary, at least one Lord Mayoral candidate came today. Where is she? There she is. We have got regional development organisations CEOs, we've got Pam Bigelow from IACA and lot and lot of artists so super thank you for being here. I believe we have got some images here to sneak you through...but before we do that we're going to go through…

Penelope Benton: It's just gone down.

Esther Anatolitis: Has it?

Penelope Benton: You've scrolled.

Esther Anatolitis: Before we get into that we're going to talk a bit about the Code of Practice. Because this is the foundation of a contemporary arts sector that's ambitious and fair. What's the plan for our two days? So, we're going to spend an hour talking about the Code, talking about our next Strategic Plan, talking about what we're going to do together for the next few years. We're going to take a break and then Peter White and Richard Bell are going to set the scene for us with some important questions and provocations which I'll totally leave up to them. Richard's got his really excited face on. He's cooking up the trouble. This is good! We will have lunch and afterwards we're going to come back and together with Patricia Piccinini we're going to get into a great big hypothetical where we're going to try and form an ARI together. One of the things missing in the current Code of Practice is a chapter on artist-run spaces so what better way to think about what the issues and questions are than going through a hypothetical that's going to involve ARIs from around Australia. Quite looking forward to that so we can think differently and solve some problems together. Then we're going to hear from Fiona Foley and again from Nick Mitzevich on key issues around art in the public space, in particular from Fiona's point of view and you will have seen one of Fiona Foley's artworks as you came up into the space today. Then we're going to end the day with Oliver Watts from the Copyright Agency who is a board member and Senior Curator at Artbank to discuss defending our rights around copyright and a bunch of other things. That's the first day. Tomorrow we're in Parliament House. We will have some welcomes, we'll hear from the head of the collection at Parliament House, Justine van Mourik and hear from the Honourable Mitch Fifield. More about that later. We're going to, after a break, going to all play a game together thanks to PVI Collective. There she is right in the absolute centre of the space is Kelli McCluskey representing PVI and that is going to be a kind of live-action politics of policy change kind of game which we're also quite gleefully excited about. We are then going to talk about redressing inequity with Abdul Abdullah and then the afternoon some really practical politicking on how to advocate. We're going to hear from Michaela Boland who with the ABC, former Australian journalist and Nicholas Pickard, former government adviser now with APRA AMCOS and closing stuff to work out what have we come up with, what are we thinking, what are we developed these two days. These two days are about what are the issues, what needs to change, what do we need to make sure we've got in place for a contemporary arts sector that's ambitious and fair? Tomorrow is all about the politics of policy change. How we actually are going to make that happen. Before we get into the Code we've got some house rules. First of all, the really exciting things like where are the toilets? You've seen some downstairs, there's also some if you head up there and just across to the right you will see the others. There's and really quite superb sound in here which is great but when we want to ask a question, put your hand up and we'll get a mic to you and that will be really important. Now, questions, they're really different from statements (laughter) so a statement is like a thing that you say and it's really sort of flat, it might go on and on for a

while, you might find our faces start frowning and one of us interrupts you. A question, you lift your voice at the end? (laughter) like that! And you sort of phrase something like you want someone to answer. That's a question. Different from a statement. OK, also we have a photographer Zan Wimberley who is going to be wandering around. Chances are you will be photographed. If this would make you miserably unhappy or interfere for cultural or other reasons, please let us know and we will try really - no, we will absolutely not. We are live streaming. Hello. If you're near the iPad, wave at the iPad. Thank you to everyone who is on the live stream. We're live streaming session by session. The hashtag is futureforward18. We want people who are not in the room right now to be part of the discussion so please, some of you your sound is off, continue the discussion on all of the various social mediums. Also, finally, something that's so important about when we gather in one place is hospitality. We open a space for each other and we welcome everyone's really bold thinking and adventurous thinking and courageous thinking because as we know, the only way to make the things same as they were in the past is to continue the thinking that we have in the past. To make sure that we get to cover and get to hear from everyone and all the things that I just outlined, it's going to be so important that we end and start our sessions on time. So both of our - like, today and then tomorrow in Parliament House, morning and afternoon teas and lunches are not exactly next door to our room so scramble down there like it's been weeks since you've eaten and fill your pockets and have some good chats but then please come back so that we do get to start each session on time. It is the best way to make sure we get to honour everyone's commitment to come all this way and that we get to have the conversations that we need to have. What else?

Penelope Benton: That's pretty good. Also, you would have noticed we're live captioning all of the sessions today and tomorrow. If you do want to access the live captions there is a URL which I believe Claudia's put on our Facebook page. You should be able to access the link there.

Esther Anatolitis: Thanks, Claudia. Claudia, wave at us. Celia? They are hiding they knew they were next. Where is Laura? Where is Holly? Excellent. These are four/sixths of the NAVA team who is here. We are just a handful of people and actually in fact in fractions we're even fewer people than that and we are all here this week together to have these conversations. Penelope, tell us about the Code and how essential it is and what our next plans are.

Penelope Benton: Thanks, Esther. If you read Gina's article in ArtsHub the other day, the Australia Council published the company's Code for the arts in 1984. After sometime this was agreed to hand that over to industry so in the mid 1990s NAVA got together with a group of lobbyists, academics and art organisations and set up the visual arts industry guidelines research project. The Australian Research Council accepted a proposal to investigate professional, industrial and legal conditions across the whole of the Australian visual arts and craft sector and then to search both locally and internationally for examples of how cultural growth might be cultivated and sustained in the context of new technologies and within the new global economic order. The Australia Council also lent its support, as did industry partners, the National Association for the Visual Arts, the Power Institute and Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Training at the University of Sydney, the School of Economics and Financial Studies at Macquarie University, the Art Gallery of NSW, Simpson Solicitors and about 15 or more independent researchers and I've read about another 1,000 contributors in varying other capacities which is really what we're all doing again today. The visual arts industry guidelines research project began its work in 1998 and as well as producing a bunch of research papers with ideas for arts policy it also produced the

Code of Practice for the Australian Visual Arts and Crafts Sector which was launched in 2001. The Code aims to provide a detailed set of practical and ethical guidelines for the conduct of business between artists and galleries, agencies, commissioners, organisers of residencies and workshops, awards, prizes and so on. It should be endorsed and adopted across the whole of the Australian visual arts sector, addressing an otherwise lack of regulation, legislation and agreed standards that are operating currently in many parts of the sector. 17 years on, this 12-chapter document which includes recommended fees and wages not only for artists but also for arts workers continues to be NAVA's most viewed and cited resource. But the principles outlined in the Code continue to be voluntary not mandatory except in the case of copyright, moral right, taxation and equal opportunity that are covered by legislation. So, NAVA can see that thousands of people are looking at the Code regularly but we also know that not everybody is following the Code. As an artist myself, I have had the benefit of receiving commissions that come with an artist's fee or production fee and really acknowledge the impact the Code has had on my life as a practising artist. The reason - and it's the reason that I became a NAVA member. Also as a practising artist, I also recognise that the Code is not followed across the whole sector and that is the reason why I wanted to work for NAVA. We receive weekly complaints about excessive unpaid requirements for public art EOIs, breaches of copyright and intellectual property, dodgy art prize conditions and loads of other examples of bad practice happening regularly. In addition to this, NAVA conducted a sector-wide survey of art industry practices across the country in 2016. This revealed the payment of fees and wages and superannuation to artists and many arts workers varies dramatically and somewhat chaotically across the sector, in fact we found almost 60% don't pay. So at the start of last year -

Esther Anatolitis: I'm going to dwell on that for a second because every time I hear it I'm still gob-smacked. That's a phenomenally high figure, a disappointingly and alarmingly high figure.

Penelope Benton: It is, it really shook us. We had suspicions it would be a high number but having that data really pushed us at NAVA to be thinking we need to be talking about fees and wages a lot more than we have been. So at the start of last year we launched fair pay for artists which renewed NAVA’s campaign to gain recognition of a group of rights for artists and other arts professionals. As part of this campaign we conducted a series of consultations and meetings around had country which many of you may have been part of. We went to most capital cities and regional centres across the country, gathering feedback on the priority issues for artists and the industry and further informing both the direction of this campaign and indeed NAVA's work. We also approached the Australia Council and each of the State and Territory funding bodies to request that, at a minimum, the payment of artist's fees be mandated for Government-funded galleries and organisations. Unfortunately, while they were all willing to continue recommending the galleries pay, the only state willing to commit to mandating the payment of fees was Tasmania.

Esther Anatolitis: Tasmania!

(Applause)

Penelope Benton: So not being able to regulate the Code has been a huge source of frustration, I'm sure not just for our members and probably every artist in the country but also for the NAVA team. So as part of our strategic planning last year we had serious conversations about what was required to make real change. It all comes back to the Code. I'll

handover to Esther to talk us through NAVA's Strategic Plan and our plans to do collaborative work with all of you and many more, to do a complete review of the Code and get it legislated.

Esther Anatolitis: Yes, please. My goodness. There is so much good work there. Thank you so much. It is so important to hear that whole overview of where the Code has come from ask particularly to have that really important - and particularly to have that important history and list of organisations and institutions. It is absolutely enormous. Still a whole lot of really, really great work to be done and to work together to make sure that we are supporting all of that. I'm going to stand because I can't see the projector if I sit and I'll wander over here. So, what is the plan? I'm going to keep pressing this and keep clicking. There we go. It has just moved down a bit, so artistic courage is the theme of the next plan, unsurprisingly, and for important reasons. We want to see a country where artistic courage is leading not just our national conversations but the Australian culture more broadly. I'm continuing to press the button, as you can see. We're just going to refocus this so that you can hopefully see but in a couple of hours this plan will be up on our website and it starts with outlining what is our context, what is happening in Australia at the moment? What does the sector look like and what are the most pressing issues? This has come from our enormous membership survey from late last year which had the biggest response of any membership survey so thank you very much everyone who filled that out as well as, of course, our own work and research and policy and advocacy work. While more Australian artists are creating work for more audiences, best-practice standards are too often overlooked, ignored, only partially implemented. The funding environment is obviously some of the most difficult and dangerous and disruptive you've ever seen. Rate capping in local councils and the big shift in Federal funding, the lack of indexation at State funding makes it very difficult for galleries, for regional galleries, for council-owned and other city-based galleries to be able to devote funds towards everything let alone artist fees.

Penelope Benton: I'm just going in to interrupt. We're going to do a little bit of techie stuff. I just realised the slide is cropped and it is a bit hard to see. The tech guy's going to make a bit of a mess on the screen and we're just going to be cool with it. Esther will keep talking.

Esther Anatolitis: Exactly. Brilliant. Thanks, Penelope. Thanks, you guys. (Laughter) I don't think we need to see it to know the theme is. Exposure as a form of payment continues to be offered. This notion of fake Aboriginal-style art is still being sold in places all over Australia and we've got around things like artist contracting and copyright and so on, often the expectation and certainly technology, media technologies create this expectation that we should be able to use artists' work for free. We've also got the situation in the context of changes in the availability of public funding where in the next few years $2 to $3 billion of public and private money is going to be spent on building new spaces for contemporary art so the development in WA, Adelaide Contemporary, if that goes head which would be amazing, NGV Contemporary, the Sydney project and enormous relocation of the Powerhouse to the west, this is at one and the same time across Australia the biggest expenditure at the same time in contemporary art and contemporary culture we've seen in our lifetime. What is alongside that is to make sure in the future we can fill those spaces with your work and the work of other contemporary artists so where is the comparative investment in artists, in the creation of new work? And so we also know from the Throsby Report the recent Australia Council work that artist incomes on average are declining. You would have seen the latest report that the average income that artists earn from all art forms is $48,000, not all art forms, that's all work, all work including non-artwork. The average that artists earn from their work alone is $18,000 which is obviously below the poverty line and is a decrease on the previous study. Our history was mentioned earlier and with so many giants whose shoulders we all

stand on in working at NAVA today, Tamara Winikoff, the most obvious and my predecessor, achieved so much in had her 22 years and David Throsby, the professor at Macquarie who has been developing these studies for years now was the founding chair of NAVA and those conditions Penelope outlined at the beginning of the Code were the ones he was trying to assess and articulate 30 years ago and not seeing those improving is very disappointing. Artists' rights are increasingly under threat. Artists are working increasingly precarious conditions. We've come to give that a name, the precariat. Professional practice support is in decline unless we have nationally agreed standards that are supported and actually implemented across the country, these are the risks. So, what do we need to do? Nationally agreed consistent standards for contemporary arts sector that is ambitious and fair. It's incredibly important that that is something that we work on and commit to and is the entire framing of our strategic plan. So, this is something that we've been thinking about - we've all been thinking about for some time. Our vision for these next years but also for the future is that artistic courage can ignite Australian culture. We work hard, we all work hard, everyone in this room works hard to achieve recognition and respect for artists. We do so because - and I think Nick put it beautifully before - that the most compelling experiences that we have, that we remember today, yesterday, into the past, into the framing of our future, they have come from artists. In order to create a world that makes us proud, whose ethics we vigorously interrogate, whose public spaces are meaningful to us and create those opportunities beyond what a space might have been programmed for; in order to do that, we need to foster and support the work of artists working today. If we support the work of artists, if we, through our own professional practices, all the work that NAVA does and that we all do, if we support artists then, by extension, we're supporting the contemporary art sector. We're setting national standards that can be ambitious and fair and if we support the sector we're supporting the Australian culture more broadly, so supporting artists means that we're supporting the sector, means that we are championing an Australian culture that we can all be proud of. We do this because the voice of the artist offers Australia a deep perspective on the past, a vital perspective on today and a compelling perspective on the future. We believe that the contemporary arts offer rigorous ethical and valuable approaches to rethinking our old social, environmental and political priorities. Artist whose are valued and respected can sustain the ambitious adventurous careers that create the Australian culture. This is our focus. Our mission as an organisation of course is to lead policy, advocacy and action for a temporary arts sector that is ambitious and fair. We value bold thinking that translates into action. We respect human rights and dignity from culture diversity. We love collaboration, experimentation and openness to things. We admire resilience and sustainability over policy and convention and action over frustration. We'll work together courageously. The Code of Practice, as Penelope said, is absolutely central to all of that and over the next few years central to this plan over the next few years, we will work with legal, academic, art and other partners to revise the Code of Practice and also to pursue, to advocate the ethics, to negotiate the partnerships and secure the commitments that make the Code of Practice the enforceable standard across the contemporary arts industry. That word "enforceable" means all sorts of things. Some things are a matter of legislation. We've got some great examples from our counterpart organisation in Canada who, with thanks to a grant from the Copyright Agency I'll be visiting next month. They have the State offence the artist legislation which allows them to - status of the artist legislation which allows them to enter an enterprise bargaining arrangement on behalf of members on artist fees. There's a whole range of instruments I would love to be able to investigate and pursue for Australia but so much of the Code is also about regulation, Local Court, it's also about relationships as much as regulation and legislation. How can we come up with practices that we agree with, put those into the Code, just as we've done for the last couple of decades, and make sure that they are fair for artists, they are fair for galleries and institutions and others and that we are building a sector that is

ambitious and fair. So, the plan overall is - big reveal - as we were saying, if we focus on artists and strengthen professional practice then we are also focusing on the industry and strengthening the entire contemporary arts sector. If we do that, if artists can work in ways that are respected and supported then we are fostering Australian culture where the voice of the artist is amplified to lead the national conversation. So, through a membership, through the ways in which we support individual artists, which remains incredibly important, as well as of course our organisational members, through professional development and artistic leadership, through the Code of Practice and all the cross-sector partnerships and the ways in which we contribute to industry and public conversations through advocacy and policy work and ultimately that broader public leadership, let's get the arts on the front pages. Let's get people thinking differently about the importance of the artist to the broader civic and cultural and public conversation. Then there's a whole bunch of detail about how we're going to do that and again the Strategic Plan will be on the website soon. Bless you, I think I heard a sneeze just then. The artist focus that we strengthen artist capacity to develop and sustain their practice, our industry focus so that we're setting the national standards that promote ambitious and fair practice and amplifying the voice of the artist to enrich the national conversation. Very, very important. And so, there's a whole lot of ways we're going to do that. Future Forward, this is the beginning of a conversation. We're going to be having a lot of these conversations around the country in a lot of different places and in particular when it comes to - the pointer works this is good - advocacy, policy and action, how do we increase the visibility of Australia's contemporary arts publicly and for decision makers? We want to foster a policy-literate sector so that we are all talking in very practical and effective ways about how to make change, we're having those conversations with our local members, we understand what is happening when policy is being debated. We have an understanding of where arts and culture fits into the broader public and legislative agenda and we're actively contributing to that and with a couple of hundred of us here, there are thousands of us all over Australia. Can you imagine the combined power and confidence of these courageous voices? There's so many people we talk to, that we connect art with. One of the most important things NAVA does is to connect up artists and audiences and organises and so on from a whole range of different contexts. And so, if we can do this, if we can get this right, if we can work together, what will the future look like? First of all, to have the work of First Nations artists recognised, respected, to see arts policy or programs clearly articulated as a priority across key Government areas, to have a sense of strength and connectedness among artists so that we're having a range of conversations commonly, frequently, and also conversations with people who we don't usually talk to about the arts. Another really important one we've included in the plan is around the future of arts writing and arts journalism. This is a huge, huge issue which we'll probably touch on at different times across these couple of days but we know we have been losing arts writers and arts journalists all over Australia so we need to think creatively about how we're going to keep that arts conversation going beyond us as well. We want to support artists to confidently negotiate. It is important to have the Code of Practice. That is essential. We can't kid ourselves that it's a level playing field when an artist goes into a negotiation for a new project. We also want to make sure we are supporting artists to know about rights, to know about how to frame and position your work and what to ask for and what to know. We want to have an expert policy-literate sector. We're doing lot of things around that and ultimately we want an Australia where artistic courage truly ignites our culture for a sector that's ambitious and fair. Before we get on to the next stuff, how does that sound?

(Applause)

Penelope Benton: I heard someone yell out utopian.

Esther Anatolitis: Utopian. We don't want to be utopian then we won't get it done. But I'm glad you said that because there's utopian and then there's ambitious. We all want to live in an Australia where the voice of the artist is prominent and we talk about and have been thinking about quite a bit the last few weeks as we have been talking about Future Forward - should we sit down again? Let take a seat. It is the awesome and - you're all aware of this in the work you make and the work you see - artists and arts audiences ask questions of each other and ask questions publicly but often politicians are reluctant to or afraid to so today and tomorrow this is a sitting week in parliament, we're going to meet some MPs tomorrow, they'll pop in for lunch and we'll ask them some questions but what's being debated in the House today and tomorrow are things like the NEG, the National Energy Guarantee, we're guaranteeing energy, not protecting had it environment necessarily. There's a bunch of other bills, there's a tax package, there's one we looked at yesterday, the unexpected wealth bill.

Penelope Benton: That looks dodgy.

(Laughter)

Esther Anatolitis I'm itching to know. I've got to check in my pockets later. We started the year, earlier this year, with a conversation which we called arts agenda or #artsagenda, and that was about saying, hey, it's February, parliament is sitting again. They're coming together to look at the most important questions apparently that are being asked around Australia at the moment. What are the questions? What is on the parliamentary calendar this week? At the same time, artists are showing work across the country starting the year. What are the questions that artists are asking? It is kind of about how we're going to not just reconcile those but amplify the voice of the artist but also get really practical about understanding some of the politics of policy change. I think, though, you are probably gathering I'm a naturally optimistic person and some of us are naturally pessimistic and it is very important to have that balance but I kind of - I just want us all to feel absolutely - how do you say - entitled to contribute to the public discussion just as much as any politician.

Penelope Benton: Just because you mentioned the team, I think - I was telling Esther the other night that our most pessimistic staff member is optimistic about this plan and it's really important to me that she feels that way because we all need to be behind this. We're not going to get anywhere if we have doubts and belief that it won't happen. We really need to, yeah, feel entitled and feel confident that we can achieve this and we bloody should.

Esther Anatolitis: What are we doing? What are we doing otherwise? Everyone else, how does that sound? (Applause) more clapping! It's OK to not have questions also. It is what the whole two days is about but we totally have time. If anyone has a question or a response, Celia is grabbing a mic.

Abdul Abdullah: Who is the pessimistic staff member?

Esther Anatolitis: We're not going to identify the pessimistic staff member.

Penelope Benton: We can put bets on that later and maybe we can talk unexpected wealth, whoever is the winner.

Esther Anatolitis: That's what we should have called the Future Makers Fund. We're going to start something up called the Future Makers Fund where we have a range of conversations around Australia, kind of salon-style, and we're inviting people we're hoping are going to be

friends of the organisations and we're going to befriend them a lot and really encourage them to contribute to a fund that we're going to establish which is going to support something that we can't fund through other means and that is public conversations and campaigns so we can't apply to a government body or a philanthropic body or corporate body for a fighting fund for something that would, at a particular time we plan our campaigns, the kinds of things we want to get a big focus on this month but sometimes, as we know from the past, and as we sense from the future, we need to be responsive. We need to be able to move fast and capture national attention for issues that emerge. We can't do that without unexpected wealth. So, that is going to be - that's also an important part of this plan as is having some really great round-tables and consultations around the Code and all the specific nitty-gritty that makes that happen. As an optimist, I don't want to be down on pessimism, if that makes sense. Because we have to hear the pessimistic voices so that we know -

Penelope Benton: What we're fighting against.

Esther Anatolitis: We know what we're fighting against.  What our pitfalls are and what's in our blind spot. It's important. Has anyone else got questions or responses at this point? Gabriel.

Gabriel Nodea: This is a question. My name is Gabriel I'm from northeast Kimberley region of WA between Argyle Diamond Mine and Bungle Bungle. I like to acknowledge traditional owners of this land first. Welcome to Country. Thank you, Aunty. Our mission today is to chase the great Australian dream, the NAVA protocol. We are all here together to work out the protocol to take to parliament tomorrow. All that Code of Practice, strategic planning, yeah. I'm an artist. I sold a painting back in 2007. At the time, the galleries manager went around inviting community members to check the exhibition on a Saturday prior to the opening on the following Tuesday. I went in the afternoon to check it out and they said, "Isn't it beautiful?" I said, "No, not beautiful." "How come?" "It's not about the painting on the wall, it is this place." I worked on it all day and night over the weekend, brought it in Monday morning. I did that and hung it on the wall and now it looked beautiful. The painting was about the place, the stories how got its name. This is how it goes. He over looked the land and the kangaroo came by travelling and decided to have a rest there. The wedge-tail eagle saw the kangaroo. The kangaroo travelled towards the south into the desert, remained there never to return. Wedge-tail eagle, he owned the land, overlooked from the top and because he owned the land he named the land from the top of the hill, after his name, now pronounced woman. The language goes back to the first human who ever walked upon the land. He threw the spear at the kangaroo. The reason behind that, the kangaroo had another lore, language and culture. The wedge-tail eagle was happy with what was on the land and threw the spear at the kangaroo, meaning our language, lore and culture go back to the first human who ever walked upon this land and one final one, we are half animal and half human. We'll skip to where we are now. We are working on a protocol, Strategic Planning, Code of Practice and put it together. When I was a kid growing up I was told or pointed out that the kangaroo dreaming, the spear dreaming and wedge-tall eagle dreaming, I was told those three. They were put together like a jigsaw puzzle over the years. There's more to it. I was told only three things there. To put in strategic planning into the NAVA protocol, we are all here together, piecing bits and pieces together like a jigsaw puzzle in one day and we will put it tomorrow morning into parliament and every topic we talk about we have time for discussion and planning those bits and pieces together like a jigsaw puzzle, put it into the protocol and the duration for that time is quite slow like sand going through the hour glass and we've got to try and fit the strategic planning and Code of Practice in one day.

Esther Anatolitis: We're actually much, much luckier. We're going to spend years doing that not one day. Relax, it's thankfully, thankfully not just for today. Everything you were just saying, the big jigsaw puzzle, will take a good couple of years and tomorrow when we're at parliament it's not so much for us to tell them what things are going to be - I'm actually going to spend the whole of the next day meeting MPs one on one and we're going to keep billing this over a few years, but - building this for a few years and tomorrow it's for them to meet you and to meet you and to begin to build the conversations and relationships, the face to face, that is going to build all of the jigsaw puzzle you were just saying so today and tomorrow is first and foremost for us to be here together.

Gabriel Nodea: From my dream time story I picked up interpretation, I work on relating the insights to the NAVA protocol. There's one insight into this one. We should put all the jigsaw puzzle together and take to parliament tomorrow and parliament...it means parliament doesn't support us. That's my insight.

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you very much. First of all, thank you. (Applause) thank you. Let them try and say that to us, let them try and say that to Gabe tomorrow. This is - you know, thank you for putting it in that way because that jigsaw, those shapes, the way that the jigsaw edges fit, that is us. That is all of us. That's our conversation, it's our knowledge, it's our courage. To bring together the optimism, the pessimism, the Dreaming and the story, artistic courage is the theme of the next NAVA strategic plan. Courage isn't just optimistic, it's also pessimistic. Courage isn't just positive and sprightly, it's also painful and it comes from a place of deep energy and really deep focus. Courage is something that we might get from a contest, from a battle, from a game, it's something that we get learning and listening to elders and talking to each other and overcoming things and thinking about our health and our physical health and our mental health. Courage is honest, it's not trying to hide something that it's not taking as and reflecting as being true and honest to itself and that's why we chose that word and why it's so important to us to build in ourselves and in each other, you know, kind of think of it as a personal thing as well as an organisation thing.

Penelope Benton: That's important for us all to feel personally connected to this work.

Esther Anatolitis: Yeah, hugely.

Penelope Benton: We've got about 10 minutes to morning tea. Do we want to talk about what's in the Code or maybe we can talk about the process that you've already started to look at the Code?

Esther Anatolitis: Are reckon we should reel off the list of chapters and I'll tell you RMIT School of Art are going to be partners for this, I believe one is in the room. Is Amy Spiers here? The she is, hello. And Marnie Baton will be heading that up. She happens to have great experience of the Canadian frame work I was describing earlier. That will involve a lot of conversations and plans we will be having over that next couple of years. There's a couple of chapters that are missing. There's no ARI chapter, we're talking a lot about prioritising the public art section or chapter because as we keep saying we are just being inundated lately with issues around that and with Fiona Foley and Nick Mitzevich we'll talk about that this afternoon. What does it look like now?

Penelope Benton: Currently in the Code, we have a chapter on commercial galleries, exhibiting, selling and directing art, public institutions and events, commissioning art in the public space, special-purpose commissioner, residencies and workshops, although we had a

good chat on the weekend about all the things that are missing in that particular chapter, competitions, awards, prizes and fundraising exhibitions, fees and wages, intellectual property and other practitioner rights, issues and protocols specific to Indigenous practitioners, there's a chapter on tax, insurance and workplace health and safety. So as Esther said, we know we don't currently have a chapter on ARIs. We also know that there's a whole lot of things in each of the chapters that do exist with a whole bunch of holes in them and thank you to everybody who's called us and emailed us with comments and sessions for what is missing. We also need a chapter on galleries which aren't publicly funded and don't run like commercial galleries which is an increasing number of galleries that are operating outside I guess traditional models, that don't have representation relationships with artists but sometimes they sell work, sometimes they don't. There's a whole lot of practices that so far people have been working trial and error which is a clunky way to realise what works and what doesn't work so, yeah, the more feedback we get into all the errors that we've - that you've all experienced over however many years you've been practising, the more we can hear about those and learn from those, we can fix those in the Code.

Esther Anatolitis: Exactly so, that it really is the comprehensive thing that it needs to be. In a minute we're going to pop downstairs, have some morning tea and talk some more. We're going to break at 10:30. We're going to be back here ready to start at 11. Please fill your pockets as I was saying earlier, be ready start to at 11:00. Before you start with all the russling I'm going to introduce Peter White and Richard Bell so they can start when they come along. Peter White is a Gamilaroi, Murri man, he is a freelance cross cultural consultant who works in a range of different contexts. Peter is one of the newest members of the NAVA board. I have had a great admiration and respect for Peter's work for a long time. My previous work was in regional arts and I'm delighted he is here with us. With him, Richard Bell, who kind of needs no introduction but is going to get one anyway, is a Gamilaroi Kooma, Jiman, Gurang Gurang man and artist whose work I'm sure you all know. He has been part of 52 Artists, 52 Actions, this year was the first artist who began that this year. If you've not heard of this it is a number of galleries led by Artspace in Sydney, self-explanatory each week is an action by an artist on Instagram. That is the important point. It is on Instagram. Also in fact when I started in the role it was - I had the great honour of my first podcast interview was with Richard and I have been enjoying listening to that back so Peter and Richard are going to set the scene for us at 11:00 when we come back. Have some great conversations. See you back here at 11:00. Thank you.

(Applause).

## Session 2: Let's listen

Peter White: Hello. OK. So, as we've been introduced earlier, Peter White, I will put a disclaimer on that. I am not a freelance anymore. I've gone back to the dark side so to speak and even though it's streaming so I need to behave myself but I am here on rec leave. So I'm now the Head of Indigenous Strategy and Cultural Engagement for Sydney Living Museums for those of you who don't know or aren't up with the new branding, it's the Old Historic Houses Trust of NSW which have 12 very significant colonial properties and museums such as the site of first Government House. You could say a bit of an oxymoron of what's a fellow who likes to talk about First Nations rights working in colonial spaces. What better place to be. I would like to thank Esther and NAVA and the team for not giving us the opportunity but doing the right thing. That little thing there, first. Of course we would be first, we have always been here. Richard I would like to thank who came on an invitation to be part of this conversation, I guess, if you want to call it, about let's explore some of the First Nations issues in contemporary arts in regards to Future Forward or what I'm thinking about as future backwards because we've got some unfinished business we need to sort out. But, before I get too far into it, just like to pay my respects to Aunty Matilda. I actually left Ngunnawal Ngambri lands at the beginning of this year. I have been living here for seven years before going back to Gadigal lands. I always have a fondness, I actually started out my uni career down here in the cultural heritage field and I've always loved being down on this country and it is very important, I think Aunty shared some very strong learnings there for us all are to consider over the next two days but more importantly that focus of we are on Aboriginal land here. Even though we're in this building, that is part of a colonial structure, it is still Aboriginal land. And, with that context, I think before I get into it I'd like to just revisit what we're actually here for. Penelope and Esther gave a good coverage of that early on but Future Forward, advance rights, sustain incomes, develop practice in Australia Day to day, NAVA's new Strategic Plan and Code of Practice for professional Australian visual arts, craft and design sector, what needs to go into the updated Code, how do we make the Code enforceable? How will we create policy change, redress inequality and take action together? And the notion of this day is negotiating the institutional aspects of professional practice. So that's where those people who didn't have - so that's for people who didn't have time to read the website and are thinking why am I here? We had a quick snap chat of the Strategic Plan. I won't go into that. I'm assuming everyone here sort of agrees on that. Yeah? Show of hands. Yep. So I guess the big question is where does First Nations fit within all of that? So this opportunity today of an hour and a half of the beginning session, it's cool to listen but I actually want to use one of the words from my language winanga-li, to listen, to know, to remember. It is more a way of thinking. It is the deep listening you actually hear about with Aboriginal people. It's not just hearing things, it's listening, it's understanding, being aware of the surroundings that you exist in. The environment that you sit in, both the now, both the present, both the future. And using that for the learnings. So I'm going to give some of my reflections. I put down Richard's reflections. I don't know whether you want to call it something else. We'll wait and see. I would also like to acknowledge my First Nations brothers and sisters in the audience. I think it's important we have the opportunity to hear from them. I'm not here to speak on behalf of all First Nations people of this country. I'm sure Richard's not although he makes a good job of it sometimes in some areas.

Richard Bell: What I do is un-Aboriginal, to have an opinion and espouse it loudly is very un-Aboriginal.

Peter White: But sometimes you say it what people are thinking.

Richard Bell: Gee I hope so.

(Laughter)

Peter White: Then I think it is important to open up the floor. That's sort of setting the parameters. So who am I? I'm a Gamilaroi Murri from western NSW. I like to use the sense of north-west NSW cause my mob is from Manilla. When I say I'm a Gamilaroi Murri from Manilla they say what is he going on about? Isn't that in South East Asia? It is a little town outside of Tamworth. This is the junction of the Namoi and Manilla river. This has been one of the key areas for my mob for millennia. I grew up here even though I was born and bred in Tamworth. Swam in the river, continually fished in the river with my father. My boys who were born in Sydney have grown up in Sydney and Canberra, go back there and do the same thing. We have this connection with this river. That sort of makes up who I am and my understanding of where I sit both within my mob, my country, but also the learnings that what happened from there impacts on how I do business and also I think it is a good reflection of where a lot of First Nations people are. Because in 1901, this is reported in the evening news in Sydney, Aboriginal board, this is the Aboriginal Protection Board which I use it regularly, I call it colonial paradigm. It was stated a communication was received from the Manilla Progress Association suggesting the removal of the Aborigines camp from that place, the place that they've always been. The police reported in favour of the suggestion but said the Aborigines at the place were orderly in their habits, which is nice to know, it was decided to inquire what use the reserve at Bora was put to and whether the half castes at Manilla would go if the inducements such as erection of huts were held out to them. When I first came across this, it didn't only resonate it hit me that, shit, this is what we've been living with for so long, not only my mob but a lot of people. And three words continue to jump out at me and if you use them in the context of the Australian arts sector, the cultural sector that we all love and work - progress, removal and inducements. That's a space that we continue to be in today. I picked this up in the notes, about negotiating the institutional aspects of professional practice. Institutions are structures and mechanisms of social order, incorporation, governing the behaviour of a set of individuals. Once more the question of how does that relate to First Nations? Because I personally think we can't sit here and work out what our aspirations are, how we have courage and move forward without addressing the unfinished business and that's where First Nations people sit in society today and it's not about how we enhance an Australian culture, it's about the need to actually change and develop a whole new cultural consciousness for this country. (Applause) Addressing the issues that surround our shared history since 1788. We hear a lot in the public with Uluru Statement of the Heart, Makarata, truth telling, courage, we can't move forward from a society and the art sector can't move forward in their own little pockets without addressing these issues. So what does it take to change? And this is a lovely cartoon I came across from Mickelson. I didn't licence it, I have just taken it off the rent that is owed. (Laughter) So that maybe is one way to change but I said to Richard, "Fuck, we forgot the buckets to put up the back to collect the rent."

Richard Bell: I've got a hat!

Peter White: So I came across this bit of work and thought what a great way to establish the baseline that we need to know what the problem is, to take the blinkers off and fully understand what this Australian society is all about. This is a little bit of work a fair few years ago but still really relevant today and will probably continue to be. Bell's theorem, Aboriginal art. It's a white thing. Can everyone read that? Don't need to read it out? What really jumped

out at me is what Richard was getting at of we exist in this colonial paradigm of either paternalism or racism. Blast from the past. So we've got a bit of time so I'd like to just go through these with everyone. As I said, just set the baseline - I don't know - have we got the courage for everyone to put their hands up if they say yes or no? OK. Do you believe - and I mean really believe - Aboriginal people once owned all of Australia? Yes?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Still own all of Australia?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Still have rights to land that have not been properly negotiated?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Had a recognisable form of land tenure.

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Were civilised?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Are civilised?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Deserve to own all of Australia at any time?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Deserve to own all of Australia now?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Deserve to own any of Australia at any time?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Deserve to own any of Australia now?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Deserve to own any of the good parts of Australia? (Laughter) No-one believes that. Can manage their own affairs?

Audience: Yes.

Peter White: Should be thankful for everything you have done for us?

Audience: No (laughter).

Peter White: And should be thankful for some things you have done for us.

Audience: No.

Peter White: And then Richard states ask yourself what you believe and what you think the average punter believes and don't bullshit. And I think just with that, I think we all know where Australia's actually standing. For me, the big question is this: Are you a good person? Very simple. Very easy way to move forward. Don't just palm it off. We've got to actually enact what that means. I guess instead of trying to reinvent the wheel, because there's been lots of fantastic work over the years, how many people know of the United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous people? How many articles are there? 46. So we know of it but don't know it all that well. I will read this out. The declaration on the right of Indigenous peoples, the declaration affirms the minimum standards for the survival, dignity, security and wellbeing of Indigenous peoples worldwide and enshrines Indigenous people's' rights to be different. The declaration was adopted by the general assembly of the United Nations in September 2007. This was the culmination of more than 20 years of negotiation between Indigenous peoples and governments of the world. The Australian Government announced its support for the declaration in 2009. The declaration is particularly significant because Indigenous peoples, including the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, the First People of this land, were involved in its drafting. So you'd be a bit of a fool to just ignore that. That's a strong body of work and sets the parameters about, well, maybe this is some of the things that we need to actually listen to. I'll just quickly go through a few of them then move on a bit because I believe that these instruments can form the base of moving forward, not just knowing about them but enacting on them and empowering them and owning them in all of the way we do business. Article 1. We have the right to the full enjoyment of the collective or individuals of all human right and fundamental freedoms as recognised in the chart of the United Nations. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and International Human Rights. I think this is a - of course it's article 1 but it is a great starting point particularly for black fellas in this country because very simply it's just stating "treat us like humans." We are human. You can't get in a four-wheel drive and go and run over a young boy and treat him worse than a dog. And this is the system we're living in. This is the system we work in. This is what it needs to go back to, acknowledging that we are in fact human. Indigenous peoples and individuals are equal to other individuals and have the right to be free from any kind of discrimination in the exercise of their rights and in particular that based on their Indigenous origin or identity. When I read that, particularly standing in an organisation like this and many other cultural institutions I have made my career in, it just goes to show how far away we are, whether it's institutional discrimination, indifference, which leads to discrimination, or just an overall sense of apathy towards us. Article 15, Indigenous peoples have the right to their dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations which shall be appropriately reflected in education and public information. States shall take effective measures in consultation and cooperation with the Indigenous peoples concerned to combat prejudice and eliminate discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among Indigenous peoples and all other segments of society. I'll throw that one open to the audience. Has anyone seen an effective measure of that happening that we can build on? We might revisit that towards the end. That's a very simple statement, I think, that we can actually achieve. Once more, the key word there is "effective". I think there's lots of measures get thrown about, particularly by Government, particularly by well-meaning organisations or individuals but are they really effective and are they coming from a connection or being led by First Nations people? Article

18. Indigenous peoples have the right to participate in decision making in matters which would affect their rights through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures as well as to maintain and develop their own Indigenous decision-making institutions. Another pop quiz, seeing as I don't want to be picking on the National Gallery of Australia.

Richard Bell: Why not?

Peter White: I suppose that's a good point. I don't know. I've been in the museum gallery world for a long time but does anyone know the Indigenous or First Nations board member or trustee who sat on the National Gallery of Australia's board? I see lots of Aboriginal art, First Nations art all around but I don't know, I'm not being pedantic here, I don't know. I haven't had the time to go through all the annual reports before I came down. I have been a bit busy. That's a simple point there of this is an institution, a very august institution that's actually leading the way, many people say, but where is the representation in the decision making? Another thing I'd like to add is it's 2018, what are our expectations in this year?

Richard Bell: It's like that Bob Marley song, you know "everything's gonna be all white now."

(Laughter)

Peter White: We're getting towards the end. As I said, there's 46 of these recommendations from the Human Rights Commission. I suggest everyone here go and have a look and maybe even develop a little personal charter of how you can address a lot of these or whether you actually agree with them. That's a good starting point. As I said, we need to establish a base line here of where we can grow upon. States shall consult - no, I've read that one out. Indigenous people have right the to maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems or institutions - we were talking about institutions earlier, what that means - to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development and to engage freely in all their traditional and other economic activities. Indigenous peoples deprived of their means of subsistence and development are entitled to just and fair redress. I think that might be a really good point to put in the Code of Practice and develop some effective measures around that. And article 34. Indigenous peoples have the right to promote, develop and maintain their institutional structures and their distinctive customs, spirituality, traditions, procedures, practices and, in the cases where they exist, judicial systems or customs in accordance with international human rights standards. Once more, very pertinent to the questions around developing a Code of Practice. So what role can you play? Understand the problem, own the problem. Is there a problem?

Richard Bell: There's no black problem. There is a white problem though.

Peter White: That's everyone, whether you work in organisations, whether you're a practising artist, whether your part of Government. I think these are the fundamental starting points. There's a number of initiatives happening around - that had been happening around the country. 1973, a certain Prime Minister established the Aboriginal Arts Board I think in that media release saying full control and decision-making for Aboriginal arts would be handed over to Aboriginal people. We're still not really there. I guess it's only 1973 so we've still got a bit of a way to go. Things around the National Indigenous Arts and Cultural Authority have been asked about, have been talked about, have been planned, have had business plans around asserting our rights, advocacy for those rights, developing that voice. They're works still in progress. In this particularly we have the Indigenous Art Code doing great work but is

it being allowed to be as effective as what it should be? What's that question? Why isn't it? Is it? Why isn't it? Is it about support? Is there an issue around apathy towards that? We have a Parliamentary Inquiry into fake art. It's come up again. I go back to that question: It's 2018, what's our expectations in this day? Other campaigns like arts funds First Peoples first, if you're developing the right frameworks, these are the things that people need to be aware of to educate yourself, to understand what the problem is and to own it. Probably from trying to set the scene, I'll hand over to Richard who's got all the answers.

(Laughter)

Richard Bell: Fuck me! That's a lie, that's a lie, that's a goddamn lie. I don't have the answers. That's an image of the Australian pavilion in Venice and this was my proposal for that - I proposed to wrap the Australian pavilion in chains, big chains, like ship's anchor chains of all different sizes and all different states of repair and disrepair. There was a big fuss about the Venice selection procedure and the Australia Council got itself into a bit of a tangle by not talking to the oligarchs about their role in it and what actually happened was that the Venice biennale wrote to the Australia Council expressing their displeasure at the incidence of Australia allowing oligarchs, the rich folks, to be the commissioners of the Venice Biennale and with them, amazingly, having artists in their collections be selected for Venice. They wanted that to change and they expressed their design to have an independent - somebody from within the Australia Council be the commissioner of the Venice Biennale in the future. There was then this very short period of time, maybe about a month or so, where they changed the process, where they once again invited artists to put forward proposals for Venice and I decided to put in a proposal about 48 hours from the deadline. I was in Montreal actually when I did it with a friend, really good at writing applications and that sort of thing, so we put together this thing. It was initially called "I don't really need this" and that was me telling the Australia Council I'm submitting a proposal - where's that thing, the pointer thing? I made it very clear to them that - you see the concept. I thought I'll let these people know exactly what this is about in the sentence. It says, "This proposal is an offer from the Australia Council to participate in the newest and most ambitious installment of Embassy 2012 ongoing at the Venice Biennale 2019. Embassy blah, blah, blah" but it was an opportunity for them to participate in it, not to funking project manage me, not to tell me what to do, not to fuck up my program like they do every other artist. I made it very hard for them to actually give me the gig. This is this courage you're talking about, like you want a few lessons in how to be courageous, come and hang out with us up in Brisbane, there's a whole heap of us up there doing shit like that. Anyway, it goes on, I proposed to turn the Australian pavilion into a massive sculpture. Wrapping the Australian pavilion in chains, the irony is this is so delicious. In them not giving it to me, my intention was always to go and always to a Tent Embassy to discuss the issues that this sculpture proposals, so, like, as a comment on the treatment of Indigenous peoples. It's a critique of colonial history including its monuments as a disavow of the nationalism upon which settler education is based - what the fuck does it say - including global representation vis-a-vis the Venice Biennale, as a comment on restrictions of freedom placed upon Aboriginal communities, for example, the intervention, the basics card. This is available online. The whole process was so messed up. So secretive. We had to sign a non-disclosure agreement which I was always going to break. (Laughter) I told everybody. Anybody listening, said, "Richard, you doing anything for the Venice thing?" Fuckin' oath, mate. Look at this. I showed it to everybody who came within proximity of me. (Laughter) five days after they awarded it to - can you hear me? I got my sexy voice on or what? Where was I? What was I talking about?

Peter White: Your sexy voice.

Audience: Five days later.

Richard Bell: Five days later, I published my proposal in an art exhibition. I dared the Australia Council to sue me for showing an artwork and I got the curator of the next Venice Biennale, he came through, took a photo of the work that I exhibited, put it on his Instagram. (laughter) fingers crossed I might get into the Venice Biennale but anyway, I'm still going to Venice, I'm fundraising at the moment. I've got a Go Fund Me page at the moment - a bit of advertisement here - and I've got an exhibition coming up. If any rich folks in here want to come up, all the paintings are for sale. Also, I'll be doing some sort of incentive where people who give a certain amount of money can stay with us because I'm getting a couple of palazzos and if I can't get the palazzos we can get villas on the water, make sure we get a water taxi. We can party all fuckin' night. I've got this program, big program going and there's a party as well. We've got Hannah Bronte with the show where we can take nine people, we can do those things, $5 a week, no problem. We'll take anything. $1, $2, $3 for this program. I'm building a team to have this happen where I've got a team in Venice, one who's looking at the accommodation for us and also the party venue and the other is looking for venues to stage Embassy and also the person I have on the ground to do that is also an architect and he's going to build a replica of the Australian pavilion and I'm gonna wrap that mother fucker in chains! I'm going to put on a barge and send it up and down past the Biennale. (Laughter) (Applause) (Sings) I need a dollar, dollar, dollar is what I need. That's courage. I think. I hope this inspires you. When a door closes, you know, kick that mother fucker off the hinges and go through that door and keep following your dreams, your aspirations. Don't let people kill them off. I don't know what happened in the room but this is the best idea I've ever had, I've never had another idea this strong, I guess. For me waiting to get picked for Venice, I'm statistically dead. I should have been dead at 57 or some shit. I'm way past that so I'm not waiting, I'm taking my idea and I'm going to put it there. I just saw Fred Leone yesterday walking my dog - beautiful dog too - saw Fred and he's a very strong cultural man and pretty good rapper too and I spoke with him about bringing some dancers over to Venice and Fred's really smart and connected so he said he could raise money for him to bring those. We're going to have a really deadly time. You're all invited. Come over there. Fuck it, I'm gonna leave it at that!

(Applause)

Peter White: So (laughter) when I was talking to Richard a couple of weeks ago saying I've got this gig on and he gave me the spiel that you just heard and it's like -

Richard Bell: This is much more dramatic, this one.

Peter White: It just hit home. This is one of the ways - we talk about self-determination, non-reliance on Government. We all know that the policy dearth that we are actually sitting in but also particularly in the First Nations history, people in the visual arts side of things, people probably look at all the investment that happens in so-called Indigenous visual arts programs of the Commonwealth and the States and the Government funding guidelines and if you actually - and I guess I've been in those spaces as well - if you actually sit and pick through them, they're about just funding the now, to be seen. There's no growth, there's no development. I think we're experiencing what's been happening in the last four years in terms of funding shortages or even just trying to understand how much is in the bucket, how the decisions get made.

Richard Bell: Don't Australian Ballet and Australian Opera get something like 80% of the budget? We should get together and make a magnificent offer to the Government like that we would support absolutely the policy to give the Australian Opera and the Australian Ballet 30% of the Australian arts budget. There's a few other things we could do. The musicians, whenever a song's played on the radio, they get some money out of that, like when our paintings are hung on these walls, we get nothing. That's got to change. You fellas here, you've got to change this shit up because - and while I'm at it, while I'm giving free advice...(laughter) I'm looking at this thing and NAVA is driving this thing but it's a national body and you left out the chapter on the grassroots. You're driving this thing without having grass-roots support. Good luck with that. I think you should be looking at having some national and regional discussions in places not named Sydney and Melbourne. Something like that. The rest of the conversation, I'm sending you a bill. My art dealer will anyway.

(Laughter)

Peter White: Ok, so we've got, by my reckoning, 45 minutes which gives us a lot of time to have a chat, discuss things. These are the benefits of bringing everyone together and sharing viewpoints and that. But first, because it is First Peoples, First Nations, is there -

Richard Bell: Have you finished reading that?

Peter White: Would any of the First Nations reps here like to add anything to what's been said already, their views of where we're going, where we've come from, what we need?

Gabriel Nodea: I'm also in my position back home for Melbourne University Centre for Material Conservation (inaudible) they took over the land all the way to 1967 and giving us the right to use it and introducing money and alcohol and all the way to now, one decade of each. Look at all the policy and Government changes our people have been going through and the harsh time. Look at the positive side of what they're doing for us all the way to now and then push it forward. Talking about the negative. Thanks.

Peter White: I think that's why we're here now, to build on those positives as well. Because that's the way we're really going to move forward.

Richard Bell: In the 1950s there was the UN declaration on the right to self-determination for not only Indigenous peoples but for the African nations, like what happened there, like self-determination took a long time to take hold in Australia. It didn't change in Australia. What we had, the policy was assimilation before the policy of determination. And we've had tremendous struggles all over this country dealing with the effects of colonialism, of having our lands taken. Having not only our lands taken but our culture. Many of our stories as well. There has been tremendous loss all over the country in that regard and not just loss of life and we have to find our way forward, like the Waman is one of the leading organisations where Aboriginal people have gotten together and are moving forward in this modern world and they're talking about post-modernism, we're still in modernism. This is the reality that we have. I support the Code you have but encourage you to look at grass roots, the Waman is one of those groups. Proper now that I'm a member of, it is one of those groups. There's lots of great organisations out there that had been around for decades, some of them. I think it would be wise to reach out to those. All free advice.

Damien Shen: I'm Damian from Adelaide. I'm Ngarrindjeri and Chinese My mum was born on the Rukkan mission, the church pictured on the $50 note. That's where my family came from. I have been practising as an artist for about four and a half years now. Came in quite late and in that time had some great experiences as well as probably in the last - since November I'm the Treasurer on the board of Tandanya, which is the Aboriginal gallery in SA and also work as an assessor on the Arts SA grants assessment group. In a short period I have been able to observe a lot of things relating to the arts. I guess one of the big things I find - and you've already mentioned it, especially from a Government perspective, is funding support for artists within the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sector. There's just not enough money in the grant rounds to support great projects that are coming through then when you look at the projects there's so much other stuff that can be worked on as well which is the development of artists with regards to how they apply themselves and development of applications because we see all kinds of stuff coming through. As an artist for myself, I think there's one issue that I think we all face especially as we get older and as we develop and have families and children and all that sort of stuff, is time. I find that within, I guess, my area of experience there's not a lot of capacity or people with the type of capacity that we require to run organisations all the time. We're accessing people from interstate or getting people in but most people are pretty well have their capacity taken up by many things so the last seven months has been hugely distracting for my practice but I probably, for that period of experience, wouldn't have had it any other way because Tandanya is coming up to 30 years as an institution which is important for SA and other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artists, emerging artists coming through the State. We face all these issues and I don't know what the answer is to be honest with you. I have a lot of sleepless nights trying to work out how we're working through everything. Also as an artist, for a lot of emerging artists, especially metro artists - I'm classed as an urban artist - it's very difficult to - unless you're geared in a certain way too, get lot of connections on the east which is probably where most of the action happens, and I thought it's really important for me to be here because I have been pretty dormant for about six months dealing with administrative stuff, to get back out there and meet people and a young artist wrote to me on Instagram and said, "I'd love to meet. Someone introduced you." So things like this are so important about networking and I said to him just before the morning tea, it's like you never know the opportunities that come out of just having a coffee with someone, an artist or curator who could give you an opportunity to show in an ARI. The first time I showed interstate was like Black Dot in Melbourne which open up doors for me. At any given point we really have to look to those other sites for that assistance but also understand that everyone is under an incredible amount of pressure just to keep the doors open as administrators as well so it's just - we live in just such a difficult time and that's why I really like Esther's positivity and this optimism.

Richard Bell: Kick the door down.

Damien Shen: Yeah, and I love spending time with the guys I've met over the years like Richard and Vernon and guys who are like mentors to me now and, yeah, I see NAVA as really important.

Richard Bell: Go to a rich neighbourhood and burn their cars.

(Laughter)

Damien Shen: It is really important to understand too. My mum is from the era of a very political activism. My mum has, I think, some photo in this collection. She was like a street photographer back in the late '80s, '90s. It was a very different fight to some degree, the way I

talk nowadays and my sister does, but that's my observation in a relatively short four years or so and I think we just have to keep fighting and -

Richard Bell: Kick some doors down.

Damien Shen: Kick doors down. The times where we get really tired, sometimes it's - just get your energy back, think about your personal safety and your energy and be around the people who care about you, get your energy back and come back out for round 20 or whatever it's going to be but it's never going to end and we, as artists, have got to keep making and as people with capacity got to keep administrating and assisting those who are coming through too.

Richard Bell: We've got an unregulated industry. This industry, the creative industries - I did a little bit of research and I discovered that the mining industry contributes something like 7.2% of GDP. The creative industries, our industry, does 7.1. The mining industry has 1.2 million jobs in the boom. Boom or no boom, we have 1.3 or 1.5 million workers. We're paying tax. The mining industry isn't. Why is the Government is giving all this money to the mining industry? There's nothing coming back from them. From us, we're giving. We need people advocating to them who can speak in this neo-Liberal language that they talk, you know, this economic financial mumbo jumbo that they go on about. We need people in there and they need to be - God damn it, they need to be door knocking. Come on. This country's obsessed with sport. You look back 200 years ago, who was the greatest footballer? Who was the greatest cricketer? No-one knows. Nobody gives a fuck. They don't care about the sport and that sort of thing. People do care about the arts. We need to get out there. We need to have a 1 minute 30 second version, a 30-second version, a 2.5-minute version of why art is so great, why we need it in our lives. (Applause) I'm available!

(Laughter)

Peter White: Thanks, Richard. Just before I move it on and open it up, I'm mindful that I'm just thinking back to this year's NAIDOC theme, Because of Her We Can. We've got some First Nations sisters in the room. Would any of you like to share your views, thoughts, observations, reflections?

Richard Bell: Come on.

Peter White: Thank you.

Speaker: I just wanted to say, Richard, I bless you with the unexpected windfall to make your project happen. I want to be there. And I just come back from Darwin in a curator's forum and I think it's really important in terms of NAVA, the protocols and the Code of Practice, that major institutions get behind setting up cultural councils or elders to oversee cultural integrity of the programs they're delivering.

Richard Bell: To put Aboriginal people on the boards, Sally?

Sally Smart: Yes.

Richard Bell: Deputy Director of the board here?

Esther Anatolitis: We are proud to have two Indigenous board members on our board, Peter White and Amala Groom, very proud.

Richard Bell: Ok. (Laughter) Is that all?

(Laughter)

Esther Anatolitis: But we also have Richard Bell on tap.

Richard Bell: But I'm easy. And cheap.

Speaker: Thank you. Good luck with your project too, Richard.

Richard Bell: Thanks.

Peter White: Anyone else? No?

Rohin Kickett: My name is Rohin Kickett from Perth and this is a very important seminar for us. In WA, we have a lot of different Aboriginal art centres right across the State. In Perth, we don't actually have one for our people and it proves we don't have the same opportunities that the other art centres get because the art centres have those relationships with the galleries and they have their shows and they put on these fantastic shows.

Richard Bell: Fight for it.

Rohin Kickett: The funding isn't there because we're not regional and we don't have the support. We see a lot of funding going into helping artists do projects but there's no actual funding for teaching and for that - for teaching the next generation of artists coming through and that's how you build that foundation for the future. You look at the younger generation and help them to come through but at the moment it's just basically a way of them showing, oh, we care, we're funding this project, we're funding that project, but it is really only funding for the now and there's nothing for the future and that's one of the biggest problems that I see in WA.

Richard Bell: You're going to have to do it yourself, mate. In Brisbane, we didn't get that funding either. That funding always went to the rural areas. We set up a group in the '80s called Camp Fire Group and in the early naughties we set up a group called ProppaNow. We have never had Government funding. We have been paid to go to the Cairns Indigenous Art Fair but we refused to make an application for funding. We said, no, we're a business, we'll send you an invoice. That's essentially the only Government money that we've had. We did it hard but we actually came out of that much stronger, busier. We set it up to promote ourselves as individuals and now we were so successful and working, we hardly have time to meet and to have shows anymore. I'd encourage you to talk to other brothers and sisters over there. Talk to Francine Kickett. I have spoken to her about this before and there's other people there in Perth that you should be talking with, like just - even just having those discussions. That can start things off. We have a degree course in contemporary Aboriginal art at Griffith University and we pushed for it back in the '80s, which became a reality I think in about '95 or '96, maybe '94. When was it?

Speaker: '94.

Richard Bell: '94. There you go. So we laid the groundwork and that's what you're going to have to do, brother. Papa Richie.

Peter White: 25 minutes to go. I might open it up. Oh sorry.

Bianca Beetson: I just wanted to - this is something that's been really a bugbear for me for quite a while and this is more for the curators and the institutions. I'm really tired of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artists being put in the Reconciliation Action Plan and the NAIDOC budget. It's the two busiest weeks for of the year for us all but it's ridiculous, they need to be programming our work because it's god damn worthwhile and world class other than them saying, "We've only got money to show Aboriginal stuff during these weeks," or trot out our little black fellas as little trophies and we make them look like they're doing good things. We need to be first and foremost in everything they do. We need to be always first at the table, always thought about rather than just these two weeks of the we're when they showcase us like these little - dust off their little trophies.

(Applause)

Richard Bell: I can say that I made a career out of darkies corner, I've been an artist included at the last moment. There have been so many shows like that. They realise they needed some diversity. I'd get the worst space in the whole gallery. It's great because you get the worst space and do something that's really good in there and you take it away from all the other fuckers.

Peter White: We might open it up to any other questions, comments about what's been said, going back to that, I think it's all over the branding, artistic courage. Sometimes that's all it takes, a bit of courage. I always say from what I was talking about at the beginning of this presentation to how do we need to - understanding what the problem is and the need to change things in a simplistic, it is a change-management process. The key element of that change management - because not many people enjoy change. Everyone's afraid of it or scared, you know, it's a bit uncomfortable. That's when change is actually happening and we need to build in resilience. There's lots of theories and that that go round that and part of that is having spaces like this to actually have those conversations in and bring it out and actually either agree or disagree. After one has an opinion but we can't move forward - I think one of the other underlying elements from what I said - put up about the newspaper article to what Bianca just said, it always goes back to, for me, this amazing movie I think in the '80s, uncle Bob knows it and Auntie Justine Saunders, called the Fringe Dwellers, that's what we still are in a lot of cases, we're kept on the fringes, darkies corner is a bit better description.

Richard Bell: If you want to see how empire works, have a look at the history of Aboriginal organisations. Like you will see every tactic that the Government uses and to be forewarned is to be forearmed so I think it is really important you look at the history of contact between Aboriginal people and Governments and the way that they deal with them because they will deal with you the way that they deal with us. You're recalcitrant little children. That's how you'll be treated. So you need to start developing strategies to counter those sorts of tactics. Present a united front and demanding national visual arts conferences. Let get serious. Let's talk about the issues at the heart of this thing. We're going back to the black fella thing, I'll be honest with you, Aboriginal art is about five times, maybe 10 times bigger than the rest of Australian art, ok. And in terms of sales, in terms of numbers of sales and in terms of value of sales. So, it's time for the tail to stop wagging the dog. Be the fuckin' dog. Be the big dog. We

need to be seen and respected for why - why do you think Aboriginal artists are so much bigger? You've got to start thinking, start questioning what is it about Aboriginal art that the rest of the world finds so interesting? You'll find those answers within yourselves. Where's that soapbox?

(Applause)

Peter White: I think there was a hand up over here. Yep.

Speaker: Hello. Thank you. This is very interesting. I'm interested in what Richard said that art is an unregulated industry. I have question to anybody, to you two, what do you think a regulated industry would look like and do we want one?

Richard Bell: It would look very different to what we have now. For instance, I see down here I'd find my way here. Any other business, the person who invited me here would be at the airport picking me up or if they couldn't do that they'd send an underling to pick me up or, worst-case scenario, someone with a note 14 or iPad or tablet saying, "Richie, come here." This is basic manners. Do we have to teach you people manners and how to interact with each other? Come on. You've got to grow up. You've got to start acting like adults. That's what a regulated industry would look like because we would behave as adults. We would not be trying to cut people down and saying, "The exposure will be great." And expect that to be the payment. That's what a regulated industry would look like. We wouldn't need to do ramping where you get three collectors collecting an artwork of A, B and C artists. One of the collectors sells their work to one of these other guys for 30 grand and the next guy sells his to another one of them for 30 grand and the guy who bought the first one sells his thing for 30 grand and all of a sudden the work that was worth $5,000 is worth $30,000 on the market. That's how ramping works. You can't do that in any other industry. Those Colombian brothers who own 80% of the Warhols, that's illegal. You can't own more than 10% of an industry, like the copper industry or the blah, blah, blah, you know. This is what regulation looks like. I would much rather have some kind of regulation than to have the free-fall that we have now. I'm available for talks after but it will cost you drinks.

Kelli McCluskey: Hi, my name is Kelli McCluskey, I'm based in Perth. I had a question about tomorrow actually and that all of us are going to be - just you mentioning about Government and our collective responsibility and we're all going to be inside the beast at Parliament House tomorrow and have the to be hobnobbing with politicians.

Richard Bell: They're going to be hobnobbing with us.

Kelli McCluskey: Is there a collective mantra or what should we be saying? How can we form a collective voice that's going to serve a good purpose?

Peter White: I'll hand that over to Esther.

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you and thanks to everyone so far. We're going to have our last session at the end of the day and talk about exactly that, that we can draw all the conversation in to that. Good question and we will talk about exactly that at the end of the day.

Richard Bell: Next.

Peter White: Another hand.

Kaspar Schmidt Mumm: Hello. I came to Australia when I was 10 years old from Europe but I guess when I write a grant I usually tick the multilingual culturally diverse box but I am really interested in how - I spend a lot of time in Canada because my mum's Canadian. They've a really strong policy for first nations and I remember being in Labrador and parts of Quebec and all of the signs in the street, like in Labrador, being translated into English, French, Inu and Inui which are two of the native languages and I'm interested in what kind of movement would have to happen in the arts or in Australia for something like that to happen here because I have no idea how they did it in Canada. I would love to research that but, yeah, on a grass-roots level, how we can give non-Indigenous Australians language and teach them the language rights that this country should have.

Richard Bell: I think you'll find that that instance of the language would result from treaties. We have no treaties here whatsoever so it would be very difficult to do it outside. But then, it could be quite simple. The local council could deem it necessary that there be research done into the local Aboriginal community. They may see their way to finding language. There's an old Aboriginal saying, "Ask and you shall receive".

Peter White: Just to answer from my perspective, I think part of the solution of that is what I was talking about earlier about defining what a new cultural consciousness is. I think what we've just seen in terms of marriage equality in this country went to about seven years of everyone knowing it was going to happen, it just needed to have that time for the politicians to get on board and what was driving that is public pressure and that comes from a particular form of consciousness. That goes back to basic human rights. A simple thing of love is love. Black fellas are human. That's what I was getting at. So things like language - there's a big language reclamation being supported by Government through funding - we need to empower that and enact that. The same as what I say about reconciliation, you know, that's a flawed concept to me because reconcile, to go back to when something was good, well, it's never been good. So we have actually got to invest in the conciliation which in one part is what the Uluru statements of the heart is, in another part that's what treaties are. Treaties are agreements between two parties, or mainly sovereign States, on how to work together but you can drive that through a change of consciousness so I think that's the starting point for me. We had one here, one up the back and then one back. We've got 10 minutes.

Alex Marsden: Hi. I'm Alex Marsden. A couple of things. First up, next year is international year of Indigenous languages and that's a great opportunity to do some stuff and I know I have just been talking with the Australia's national commissioner for UNESCO and they're real a crying out for ideas about what to do. I'm throwing in ideas and I suggest everyone does as well. The second thing is we've been working on a road map for change, a 10-year road map for change. Peter's one of the people on our advisory group for that, Terri Janke's been looking at that and it is how to increase not only Indigenous employment, pathways in museums and galleries around the country, also better ways of participation and representation and that's been a huge undertaking for us and picking up Peter's theme of change management, that's what it's all about, co-working together on change management for the next 10 years. There's a special website on that, we've had a range of workshops and discussions and consultation surveys around the country. Please get on board with that as well. Thanks.

Peter White: We might just go next door but the hand up the back. You got the mic?

Harry: I just wanted to - hi, my name is Harry and I live in this area. I have lived here about 15 years and moved from Sydney. I just wanted to say thank you, really, to the Indigenous owners who have, I guess, given back to me in the sense that I've been able to have the words of Welcome to Country in my mind as something that as a non-Indigenous Australian gives me a route back into Australia so when I've travelled recently and I've gone to somewhere sacred, they're sort of the words now that come to me, those ideas of Welcome to Country that I don't have in my own language of my little, you know, German family origin, it's the Welcome to Country that gives me meaning and gives me an idea about who I am as an Australian so I guess I just wanted to say thank you to that because those words, I guess, give me some sort of insight into being here and you being generous with your country with us.

Peter White: Thanks.

Patricia: Thank you for giving me the microphone. My name is Patricia, I am Italian and I am going to say something which might be a little bit controversial but I'm used to it because I am Italian. I am intrigued by your idea of regulation, the need for regulation in the art market. So my question to you is:  Are you really sure you want greater regulation?  Because, to my understanding, art has got this huge potential to undermine accepted social norms by the very idea that it is unregulated so, to my view - and I could be wrong - if you ask for greater regulation, that regulation can only happen through the institutions, right, through the hierarchy of institutions, which then becomes even more politicised than it is and then you risk encountering even more the kind of problem that you've encountered when you wanted to do that kind of work in the Venice Biennale. To my view, that problem you had is because of the regulation of the institutions so do we really want regulation or perhaps should we look at art asserting itself as an industry in its own right?

Richard Bell: Regulation, in the way that I imagine - I would want to regulate against ramping and things like that. I'd want galleries that charge 50% now because they go to art fairs, they charge every artist in their stable 50% instead of 40%. Not every artist gets to show in the art fairs. To me, I would want that to be illegal and that sort of thing. And if the regulation - I'd be working against it anyway. (Laughter) which ever Government's in, I don't care if it's Labor or Liberal, they're all assholes so I'm going to go for 'em. I don't discriminate. Any Government will do.

Patricia: Thank you.

Peter White: In terms of regulation, there's also the other element of pre-existing regulation that was touched on in the Code of Practice with Workplace Health and Safety. It's an issue that's sort of coming up in the museum and gallery field, the public museum and galleries first and foremost but I think it's applicable right throughout. We're continually hearing over the last five or more years the need for culturally safe spaces, for not only First Nations staff that work within these organisations but people that engage with them, particularly in the museum field that hold very sensitive materials, actually hold our old people's remains still in them, sacred objects, and in terms of why bring up the issue around regulation, workplace health and safety, the new change - well, the not so new changes now that, you know, your workplace has to be safe from not only physical harm but psychological harm and Aboriginal wellbeing in that space I feel can be constituted as psychological harm just by the very nature of the colonial base that organisations sit in, also how you engage with artists, whether you contract them in to do shows, curators, and that's a space - there's all these elements out there that are regulated but they're not applied because, oh, well, who really cares about

Aboriginal sensitivities in these spaces. But if you talk to some of the curators, some of the people that have worked in these spaces and what they've had to deal with by just being able to walk through the door, that's psychological harm that's been in place. There's legislation there. It hasn't had a case taken up against it yet. I'm assuming it will. So there are also, when you talk about regulations, there's existing legislation in place, Acts, regulations that are applicable that aren't just in the remit. There was a hand up. 3 minutes. Sorry, that's a bit dark over there.

Ben Tupas: G'day, my name is Ben Tupas, I'm from Toowoomba, representing regional Queensland. I suppose combining, Richard, the business of kicking those doors down and Esther's optimism, what is your one take-away for being able to do that when some of the gatekeepers and decision makers are behind the door and we have to interact with them in our communities.

Richard Bell: Well I'd be setting them free.

(Laughter)

Peter White: We're just about to hit 12:30. Quick one. Then we can - that's the great thing about having long breaks, we can continue this in the breaks as well.

Alex: Great. Hi, my name is Alex, I'm an arts worker from Tasmania. You're talking about courage in funding before and your work, Richard, as well, just putting the chains around the Australian pavilion and how kind of artistically courageous that act is and I just wanted to make a comment about the Federal Government has shown that there is money around to spend on works that show our shared history. There's $50 million that is potentially going towards the reinvigoration of a statue of Captain Cook and some kind of weird cross-cultural hut centre that it's both to build. I just wanted to make a comment about the spaces in which artistic courage can be shown. Your work's really great but I guess reality is that that work is shown in a contemporary art setting for contemporary art audiences like this space is filled with like-minded people and there will probably be back-patting in the next two days. My question is broad -

Richard Bell: I can tread on your toes if you like.

Alex Hullah: Two things for you. One simple one. It is fair to say the Federal Government lacks courage in how it supports the arts in this country. The second thing is what are we going to do as a group to try and break down the circle jerks basically?

Richard Bell: These people are our representatives, our parliamentary representatives. 40,000 years ago I worked in the public service. One of the things I learned was that there was this thing, this procedure called - that they call the Ministerial. That's where when a member of the public writes a letter of plaint to the Minister of the Crown, the Minister of the - a letter of complaint to the Minister of the Crown, the Minister of the Crown is required, by law, to answer you within 14 days. If every one of us here picked a Minister and started to write letters of complaint about various issues, they have to respond to you. They have to send you a letter, not an email, they have to send you a letter and a letter costs you a dollar, don't it? Huh? Let's make these fuckers spend their postal budget and I tell you, if one branch gets 100 letters from somebody about one issue, that issue is what they're talking about and then they ring up the guys next door, "What the hell is going on?" OK. This is how we can do it, by a simple act of writing a letter, spending a dollar. Each of us spending a dollar. A dollar a

week. That's 52 letters a year. It will scare the shit out of these people. Just say by that the way we want you to replace your arts funding, better still, let's quadruple arts funding and shit like that, OK. That's the last free advice I'm giving!

(Laughter)

Peter White: Thank you.

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you, Richard Bell, thank you Peter White. (Applause) We have got so much to talk about together. That last question is really pertinent because obviously our two days are about exactly that but in our last session tomorrow we're going to look at some very, very practical ways that we engage with the political process. It could be - we're going to look at the Australia Council's electoral profiles where you can go to the Australia Council website and look at all the data we have been putting in from our reports and research and you can choose by electorate some very specific information. Seriously, it is one of the most political things the Australia Council has ever done, to put all of that information in our hands that when we talk to our MPs and write to them and invite them to our openings and keep talking to them we've got all the stuff we need to get them talking about what their re-election relies upon. Now, it is lunchtime. We're going to come back at 1:30 where we will talk about ARIs and the fact that over the last 20 years or more of the Code there's plenty in there for ARI but no ARI chapter so the whole next session is about artist-run initiatives. Please come back ready to go at 1:30. There's plenty of lunch. Enjoy it. Fill your pockets and please continue to have these conversations with each other and if you haven't met any of the various First Nations artists and people working in the Aboriginal arts centres and so on across the country then make a special point of having a look at their name tag, going up and saying high and continuing the conversation. Thank you very much to you two.

(Applause)

# Session 3: Let’s form an ARI

Esther Anatolitis: Welcome back from lunch. Grab your seats and we're going to go into our next session soon which is called let's form an ARI. After this session we are going to have a break and then have a session on work in the public space with Fiona Foley and Nick Mitzevich and after that go straight to our final session on let's defend our rights. At 5:30 we'll end the day with drinks down stairs and the drinks will be to give us the chance to catch up on what happened today. It is also a chance for us to toast a drink and welcome Nick Mitzevich as the new director of the NGA. We've got this session and them a break and two sessions with a bit of break in between and the end the day with some drinks which will be really, really fantastic. This session is all about artist-run initiatives and something we were talking about in the previous session. We have seen much around structures and frameworks, Codes and regulation, what if there is a Code, what if there isn't one, what if there is regulation, what if there isn't. A really important thing to say is you can't regulate artistic practice, the making of work, the development of ideas and why would anybody want to do that, but when it comes to the point where an artist is presenting themselves for something that is going to involve a negotiation, payment a, a contract, then they are exactly the kinds of situation where we want the Codes that frame that transaction to be Codes that have come from artists, from artists and galleries and others talking together so we're not asking the question whose ambition is it, whose fairness is it?  As I said in the morning, it is not - let's overly optimistic of us to imagine there's a level playing field when we enter into a new negotiation and something that is incredibly important in that sense, that openness where everyone does have equal power, where everyone is starting out and creating a new project, a new initiative, is the artist-run initiative or what we call, I guess, self-organisation, artist self-organisation more broadly from the grass-roots to new collective strengths. So what is the future for artist-led spaces?  How can we understand all the issues that are involved in creating and sustaining an artist-run initiative and what does NAVA need to know to make sure the Code of Practice will include useful guidelines because as was pointed out in the morning in going through what is in the Code of Practice, every chapter addresses how artists and how ARIs work but we strongly believe that in the next iteration of the Code of Practice there should be a chapter specifically on ARIs. So, we're going to do some real-time collaboration. We're going to embark on a hypothetical where the ARI leaders, artists from ARIs from all over Australia are going to ask questions that are going to scaffold on top of each other so that we test and solve problems together. We can agree and disagree and fight and make up and then imagine what the ARI of the future might look like. Those ARIs we have been given a question, I've got a feeling I've been a bit overly ambitious and that there's too many questions so some of you may not get to ask your question so this is my personal apology to you but what I would like to do afterwards is publish them because it's quite a fun little scenario. I mean, you know, it's a bit chilling as well but it's sobering but also quite inspiring. Those who are comfy over there, if you're comfy that is cool, there's also lot of seats so those using the elbow rests - I do love the elbow rests, it is good for the posture, sitting down all day is also not good. If anyone wants to shift at any time there are chairs, if you'd rather stand that is also good up the back. Before we get into the hypothetical, Patricia Piccinini is an artist who I have long admired through her work but I have also less long, in the time we've got to know each other personally, I have felt so grateful for your generosity in opening up your studio to take me through so we could have - we had some huge conversations that day, really big conversations, and then Patricia kindly invited me to be part of a really important symposium that she curated with the team at the University of Melbourne where she is a professor. Patricia will give the fuller context that I am broadly brushing on now but I want to point out it is little known to many of us that Patricia - we can

tell many stories about how one starts out but one of the when Patricia started out stories is leading the Basement project, a really pivotal and influential artist-run space in Melbourne in the '90s. As she says, she didn't get to Venice overnight. I hope everyone gets a chance to see Curious Affection which was showing the other weekend. It was not only a phenomenal show in terms of the way Patricia's work inspires us to think so critically radically different about the limits of our own bodies and our own humanity and monstrosity and what we're implicit in, what we're complicit in, what the potential future is. It wasn't just deliciously thrilling in that sense it was also pretty amazing that one of our major galleries, as part of their winter blockbuster show, was showing a living female Australian artist. (Applause) In particular, this living Australian artist. I really hope that that starts to raise the bar for our major galleries across Australia to be thinking about what happens when we position leading mid-career established artists in ways that tell a national cultural story because of what we're programming at particular times. Incredibly important. So we're going to hear from Patricia first off and then launch into our hypothetical after she has set the scene. Please welcome Patricia Piccinini.

(Applause)

Patricia Piccinini: Hi. Thank you so much for having me. I've written something and I'm going to deliver it because there are some important points that I wanted to make and I thought that this would be the best way to get them across. It will only take 10 minutes. I thought you might have to indulge me in that. I know that there are 10 artist-run initiatives here so I hope you don't find it a bit patronising or you might already know what I'm going to say but I thought it might be interesting because this happens - I ran this space 25 years ago and it was a really important part of my development, maybe not so much in art history, Australian art history, but in my development it was and I think that there's some interesting conclusions that I would love to share with you. So, there's a very strong idea in the art world that only one in 100 artists can survive. I hate the implications of this idea, the culture it implies and the self-defeating nature of it. It sets up a world where artists are divided, a me or you game where success can only be achieved at the expense of everybody else's failure. It's rooted in an idea about the world based on toxic competition and rivalry, where only some people can endure it and thrive. A kind of art world Hunger Games. You might argue that, like it or not, this is what the art world is like. It's not a fair place. It's not a meritocracy. I mean, I've taught heaps of wonderful artists and they haven't gone anywhere. What I can tell you is that I am in the incredibly fortunate position of being able to make my living as an artist and I didn't get to that position by defeating my peers or working alone or by being the anointed one. I didn't work alone until I was discovered by a famous curator and propelled to prominence and fortune. Far from it. I'm here because I've always worked together with other people and often for other people. I'm here because I did a bunch of small things that gradually got bigger. This is 1991 - check out the leather jackets. This is the show I had at Lyndon while I was a 3rd-year. These are my peers at VCA and together with them we set up the Basement. I'm here because I did seek out and find other people who I could connect with and I kept looking for ways to make my work. I'm here because when people told me that they weren't interested in my work - and they still do - I took it as a challenge to work out why and to come back to them with something more compelling. You're always - even 30 years down the track - people are always saying no to you and I'm not complaining, it's just the way it is. You have to accept it. Find another way to go forward, another way to get there. And sometimes you just won't reach people, you have to go, "Forget it." That's David Rifitski, he ran an artist-run space as well, First Floor. When I left art school, no-one would give me a solo show, no commercial gallery would look at me, no curators would visit my studio and no public gallery would accept a proposal and I realised that if I wanted to be an artist I needed

to show my work so I needed somewhere to show it. There were only a couple of artist-run spaces in Melbourne at the time, I knew there was Temple and David's space and Store 5, it was just closing down. They had their own culture so I thought I'd make my own place. It was '91, the beginning of The Resignation, we found a place and the rent was $173 a week. It was fantastic. Nobody wanted it. It was a binding lease. Anyway, we found this cheap place in the city for Peter Hennessy, my partner, and I, we organised everything and got another 10 other artists, mostly from VCA, and we set about making the space. Christopher Langton, the work I showed before, he had the first show and he actually found lights in the dumpster of the National Gallery of Victoria. (Laughter) VCA is very close to the gallery and we were just rummaging. He found them and brought them to the Basement and this was the first show we had. It was entirely self-funded and we did everything ourselves. We had no grants at all. My sister used to send me $20 so I could have cappuccinos but at that time they did actually just cost $1.20, not like $5.80. So this is Ross Moore's work. Fabulous. Amazing artist. He was very interested in anality so we had six exhibitions over three years and Peter and I were responsible for the commercial lease on the space. This meant if someone didn't pay we were liable and I was a waitress and Peter was a student but mostly everybody - in fact, we didn't lose any shows because ours was still the cheapest space in town but that's a bit of a - that's not quite true. We were also very committed. People didn't really give up their spaces. This is Peter Hennessy's work. He did architecture. We had quite a few architectural shows and this is Dennis Chapman's work. He's a Bendigo artist. We were making art in our city. We didn't sell anything and some days I'd be there the whole day and five people would turn up but we were part of a community that showed art. Every show was vitally important to us. It was also a social centre of our world, our friends were there and we were all working towards the shared goal of making and showing art. This is Dennis Chapman's work as well. We had some amazing - this is Mimi Denman' work. We had amazing shows. My best education was sitting in the gallery for three days a week for every single show. And sitting in the gallery gave me the chance to connect to all the other artists. I got to see how they installed their work y got to see what their work was about. I got to listen to them. I got to be with them and this was a great privilege for me and when they weren't there because the gallery was open for five days and I sat three and they did two, I had to tell people about the work and that was a big responsibility for me. I learned a lot about how to speak to people about art. This is Louise Fong's work, a New Zealand artist. That's important. I learned who came to artist-run spaces. This is George Gianopolis's work. Mostly, not many people came. Not many. And they're usually in the art community. Sometimes ordinary folk did come because they saw something in 'The Age' or something like that but that was actually quite rare. This is another show by Chris Langton. I learned how people relate to art which is not actually very easily. Art's not self-evident. It can be hard and so related to idiosyncrasies and individuals and even particular cultures. I had a lot of time to think about why we make art and why I was making art or what art-making means to me. I didn't like having these - this is Penelope Lee, fantastic artist - I didn't like having all these amazing shows by fantastic artists and having them seen by very few people. I thought it was a big waste of potential. This is Marion Harper's work. All of this fell into the sort of artist I am today. I wanted to make art that people can connect to and I see art as a catalyst for conversation about ideas that are important for our time. The ideas do come from me but I have to find a way to connect beyond myself, to make work that is relevant to all sorts of people. I don't expect every artist to be that way, I really don't, but that's the artist I am and it's because of this experience. We had some fantastic shows and it breaks my heart that many of these artists that I'm showing you aren't big names in our art culture because they were great. They are great. But it does make me enormously happy that a bunch of them are still practising as artists. Far more than the one in 100. And some have gone on to bigger and better things outside of the art world. This is my show that I had. That's the first sculpture I made. Made out of pig' skin. And the Basement

ran for three years and that was part of our original idea. We didn't want to start an institution. We wanted something more femoral and that presented us at that moment. We did some crazy things. We had fires down there. Alison Weaver made this big copper tank, she put petrol in it and she lit it in a Basement. We had this New Zealand artist come over and he'd smuggled these things in his body. It was intense and it was great. It was fantastic.

Esther Anatolitis: What kind of things?

Patricia Piccinini: Illicit things (Laughter) Now I've got a thousand million photographs of me but this was the only image I had of me in those three years. 'The Age' took it. The only one. This is us. So, yeah, I wore the same pair of jeans for three years. We never went out to dinner. A treat was a cheese and vegetable roll but we had a gallery and we showed art. We lived the life. Like, I have big shows now and I don't get as excited as I did back then. It was amazing. So, what have I learned from the Basement? Hang on, OK, so why am I showing you this picture? Because that's Matt, Dennis, me and Peter and so with the confidence that came from running the Basement Peter and I then went to set up a small design business, this was the late '90s, early 2000s, and we did this because we wanted to create a structure that would sustain our art practices without having a real job and to start with those jobs did subsidise our art but then as we went on we didn't have to do those jobs and that was good because they were really tough. We worked for arts organisations and they're really demanding. So that was great that we could sell art and live off art. Then we set up a studio. Peter, Dennis and me have a studio in Collingwood and it's focused on making art and I run the studio very much as we did the gallery. Every cent goes back into making art and I can take risks with very ambitious works because I have the structure to support me. This is some of the stuff we do in the studio. This is my room. This is our team. 8 people work there. It's big. So what did I learn? I learned that being an artist is as much about showing art as it is about making it. You might make the best art in the world but if it can't be seen, it just doesn't exist. And no-one's going to come looking for it. I've learned to get really comfortable talking about artwork with people and as I've moved forward in my practice I've realised that that's a really big part of my job. I've learned to lose. You're not going to win every prize or get every sale or get every grant or meet every curator or get every show and you're going to miss out on plenty of opportunities but that's OK. You need to have a thick skin and you have to keep coming back and keep asking or applying. Like I said, the art world is not always fair but it does actually recognise persistence. But most importantly, I've learned to value my peers and my audience. These connections are the most important ones we'll ever make. I still work with the same artists and curators I met 25 years ago in the Basement and those people move up with you and these are the people that will come to your openings and like you on social media now and organise group shows with you and commiserate with you when you don't get things and celebrate when you do. And I think really I've learned that you don't enter the art world; you have to build it out of the people around you. And so I guess when it comes to creating a Code of conduct for an artist-run space, I guess I'm interested in the idea that I'm wondering how much we should prescribe because each group - what I've shown you today is not relevant today. We didn't have the Internet, we didn't have a website, so things change very rapidly and personalities change. This is one of the things I learned from my group and from watching artists come in and out of my gallery, was that the artists who gave are still around today. The artist whose came into my space and kind of came in and conquered it and left are not around today because that doesn't work. Like, people like me go, "Yeah, you don't care about this space. You don't care about these people. You're just here for yourself. You expect me to be interested in you?" That will last a bit but the politics of care are really important. Like, art is not just about art, it's about people. Each group is different. In my group, there are a couple of really intense people that I learned a lot from, like

yeah, good and bad. You know, psychopaths. (Laughter) I'm not kidding. Also, very, very generous, giving, caring people who really care about art. That's just one personal reflection.

Esther Anatolitis: And a very rich and deep one. Thank you, Patricia. (Applause) I'm specially struck by the sense that you don't enter the art world, you build it. I think that's an incredibly important observation and manifesto really. Let try and move through some of the steps of building this. Like I said, we're not going to get through all 10 questions. We're going to start to expand out. First of all, we'll run through a few questions and see how, together, we start to raise all the different issues and problems involved in working through with the generosity Patricia has just prescribed. Go ahead, you guys.

Patrick Lamour: Hi. It's the 1990s, the recession we had to have has hit Australians. Interest rates for home loans are peaking at 17.5% while commercial properties are vacant in cities and towns all over the country. What does this make possible for artists and how is it different to today?

Esther Anatolitis: Before Patricia might reflect on that, I believe you've got something to tell us about Tributary? Patrick.

Patrick Lamour: We've got opening hours extended for today and tomorrow if you guys want to go and have a look.

Esther Anatolitis: Where is Tributary project?

Patrick Lamour: In Fyshwick, not far from here. A couple of suburbs over. Drive a car. You can't catch the bus.

Esther Anatolitis: So after the drinks tonight, head that way. So it was that recession time and as Patricia said, you think about how much the space cost to rent that week. What makes today so incredibly different, not just in terms of those rents, in terms of if you were just starting an ARI today, what do you think one of the biggest challenges would be?

Patricia Piccinini: First of all, I don't think you would get the real estate. People weren't buying art but we had access to real estate so that's a big deal. Secondly, I don't think people go to these kinds of spaces as much as they did before because they don't need to. They see them on their phone. People came to our space because it was a social space. We saw each other there. You don't need to now. People do go to galleries like this with their families and so on but I don't think - I think it's much harder for people to see work in the flesh, much, much harder and that's difficult for artists because most art needs to be experienced in the flesh. It really does. I used to say when I ran an organisation called Express Media at a time when blogs were starting to eclipse zines and we thought people aren't going to hand-make anymore and you'd go to zine fairs, and you can today, and you'll see more hand-stitched and hand-crafted things than ever before. You'd want to hope Instagram gets you into more galleries but of course it means the work is easier to see in other formats.

Esther Anatolitis: Let's get to the second and third question.

Llewellyn Millhouse: My question is we've been showing our own work for a while now and we're starting to get interest from people we don't know. How are we going to decide who can show in our space? I've got couple of things I would like to say about this question.

Esther Anatolitis: These are all questions for all of us.

Llewellyn Millhouse: I think firstly there's an assumption there that artist had run spaces have more of a problem with nepotism and I would say from my experience, at all levels of the arts industry nepotism is an industry. I think that's something I would like to put out there. The second thing is looking at the artist-run spaces that have come up in the last 10 years, there's very few spaces being created that aren't straight away looking for the exhibition of art from outside of their peer group.

Esther Anatolitis: Absolutely and as soon as you start to identify who's in your peer group and who's out of it, how do you decide who actually show s? Does the group sit down and work out artistic criteria? Do you look at groups you're interested in in terms of cultural groups? How do you actually decide who shows?

Llewellyn Millhouse: I was thinking about this, I think you have a director or curator approach and that's the kind of approach that we inherit from large cultural institutions, so one person decides what's applicable for the gallery to show. Then we have a model where you have a democratic process of artists deciding, you know like from the proposal call-out a group of artists talk about the merit of each proposal and then the programming is done from that process. There's also a third kind of way where a kind of external board or advisory group are asked to come on and do the programming. All three of those procedures are happening in artist-run spaces but I think there's clear benefit from each of those procedures.

Esther Anatolitis: Totally. We've beaten the recession, we're showing work, we've decided in a sense how we're going to show work. What's the next question?

Theia Connell: This question I was given says, "The economy has picked up, we're transitioning from the recession we had to have to the longest period of economic growth the world has ever seen. Property values are rising and we can no longer afford to keep covering the rent out of our own pockets. How are we going to fund our ARI?

Esther Anatolitis: How are we going to fund it? Do you want to answer?

Theia Connell: I guess there's a bunch of different ways. There's traditional Governmental funding from Federal, through State to local, fundraising, philanthropy, matched fundraising. At the space I run with Grace, we run our space via the bar which we are lucky to have been able to do because we can rent cheap space in Hobart. That's changing so this question about property values rising is very pertinent in Hobart right now. It's becoming harder to do those things, to self-organise at that level, so it's a question I'm asking as well, how do we do it?

Esther Anatolitis: Patricia?

Patricia Piccinini: We have to be creative. There's a space in Melbourne that was vacant for 20 years and so a group came in and they said, "Can we have it?" They're using it as an exhibition space but they have to give it back in two years. They could have it for three years for nothing. I think there are opportunities like that where developers are waiting to start work but you have two or one year and the Children's Gallery in Brisbane, they got their space because they're going to renovate that area but not for two years so they have that space for three now. I think it is much harder to find space but perhaps there are

opportunities like that and you have to ask for them. You have to find them and ask for them. I have fantasies of doing that still, just for shows.

Esther Anatolitis: Let's skip to the next question. We'll see if we can get through and have a broad discussion all together.

Zoya Godoroja-Prieckaerts: Hi, we didn't get to briefly chat earlier. Hello, nice to see you. My question is we have to form a company so we have a legal status. How are we going to do that? What sort of organisation will we become? How will we make decisions? I can kind of answer bit of that.

Esther Anatolitis: It is a big turning point when you actually have to become a company.

Zoya Godoroja-Prieckaerts: Our space has been around for 25 years, I obviously didn't start it, but we are an incorporated association and that's obviously one of the ways that you can become legal and that's been really good for us so far. It means we have to have a board and I guess that goes back to the question of how are we going to make decisions? You need to have a minimum of three people on the board. We currently have seven and they're amazing and they are huge drivers for all the decisions we make. One of our board members is here. Where's Beth? The biggest thing for us that we've really needed to focus on and can be really, really aware of in the past year because we had a lot of - some really big issues especially with space, we had to leave our space very suddenly and move into a new space and because we're based in Alice Springs, there aren't many opportunities that are in major cities where there's going to a space - I mean, there are lots of spaces people aren't using but they're illegal and things like what just happened to us happens. It is really important for boards to be aware of the legal responsibilities that they have as board members. That became a really big part of our process last year, of finding a new space and because we had to negotiate the lease and that was a huge thing especially for a lot of us who are under - I guess under 37 - you know, don't own houses and all these things, but getting legal advice from other people was really amazing and, yep, and then I guess another thing is what sort of organisation will we become? This is another issue we've had in the recent years. We're an artist-run initiative, that's the sort of organisation we want to stay and our funding body always gets on our back about these things of bureaucracy and administration and it is actually just so important to say, no, we are still artist-run and we had all these issues with, "You have too many artists on your board," but we're an artist-run initiative so that's really important and Beth was really amazing through that process of always sticking to that point and saying, "No, this is who we are and it's ridiculous for us to just try and get lawyers and doctors and all these people who have obviously great skillsets we as artists might struggle with but we have still moved and we have an amazing space now and we did it with no lawyers."

(Applause)

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you. You've just touched on so many of the reasons why we need an ARI chapter in the Code because it's not a Code of conduct it is a Code of Practice and to be able to have all that written down, everyone's experience and the various regulation things to be able to draw upon that, you just convinced me why we need to really focus on this. Thank you very much. We are super duper running out of time so, with apologies, we're going to skip to Rebecca Gallo in Parramatta NSW to ask the next question. She's waving. Keep waving. The mic will come to you. Pass the parcel. Thank you, Rebecca.

Rebecca Gallo: Hello. Sorry, that was unexpected because I'm number 8, no, number 9. It is opening night and we've got the fullest house ever. Over the years, some of us have earned national reputations for our work. It all started here and now we're big. Suddenly, the police arrive. Turns out we don't have a valid permit to hold events and serve alcohol and the one we do have is only for events on Tuesday afternoons. We applied for it years ago and nobody thought to pass that information on. What are we going to do?

Esther Anatolitis: What are we going to do, Rebecca?

Rebecca Gallo: It's like you were there.

Esther Anatolitis: I have to thank Penelope for this one.

Rebecca Gallo: Interesting, I was just chatting to a former Archive codirector who works at the NGA now and his response to this was - oh, no, it was really good. Really sharp and snappy. "You should steal a bike and then pray for forgiveness rather than praying for the bike." I think we did have a sort of not dissimilar scenario play out at Archive. I have written some notes. I mean, I suppose there seemed to be these legal grey areas where if you're hosting a private event and giving alcohol to your invited guests then alcohol regulations shouldn't be an issue so if you can talk that story with the police and prove that case then you're fine. Our issue was mainly a complaining neighbour who, despite living in between two inner west pubs, would complain about our monthly openings. Go figure. So, I think following receiving this scenario, I had a look and it does seem that it is possible to apply for - in NSW for a liquor licence as an incorporated association which Archive space at the time wasn't but Pari, which I'm working with, a group of really amazing artists and curators to set up in Parramatta, is incorporated so that's something I guess having that status as an organisation or as an ARI can allow you access to those sorts of licences but then you pay for the licence and can have to pay to get your DA to have that licence altered to allow you to have the lice scpns that depends on the owner of the property you are occupying, proving the use of the space. It becomes this bureaucratic nightmare really quickly so, I mean, the easiest thing would generally be to host your private events, your openings and maybe have alcohol by donation which seems to be what a lot of ARIs do to manage this situation. One of the conversations we had at Archive space was could we do openings without alcohol? Could we do openings that were on a Saturday afternoon? I know a lot of galleries do Saturday afternoon openings for example. It was really interesting and quite revealing for us to reflect on the role that alcohol plays in the sort of social aspect of an ARI and the fact that getting together and celebrating and having a drink - we didn't feel like we could give that up. Which is kind of problematic and I think it is interesting to think about who gets left out when that's so much part of the culture.

Esther Anatolitis: That's right and tomorrow afternoon after our day at Parliament House at 5:30 we will all get to go to an exhibition opening at Parliament House called Facade and no alcohol will be served at that one for all sorts of cultural reasons but it is such a great point you make that there's so many different aspects and connecting it back with what Patricia was saying about people coming and people being there and that being your world, that you may not intend to create the space that is going to be so socially and culturally important to ever a one but in fact that's what the ARI becomes and then what are all those other considerations, decision making, corporation, applying for grants, these are all vital for keeping things safe and clear and above board but then you've actually established something culturally vital and that is so important to talk about as a group during it, before it, after it. We've got a question now from Channon Goodwin from All Conference the national

group of ARIs. We are going to bring the mic back to Channon. I will continue to chat in the meantime. It is incredibly - like, it's a big point that you just made, like, what is each ARI and ARIs don't emerge expecting to be around forever and we talk about past ones and what they meant to us at the time and just, yeah, how incredibly important and pivotal that was for our thinking. Channon.

Channon Goodwin: Thanks, Esther. Appreciate it. So I was just going to my question. A vocal faction of the board want us to rethink our entire model. What's our ethic? Why are we doing this? Why are we in a physical space at all? How can we work to rethink the ARI and can think instead about being self-organised? What's the most important things we could be doing instead to show work and strengthen that factor? How can we work together differently to transform the arts?

Esther Anatolitis: The big next question: What is the future of artist self-organisation. You guys have been thinking about this a lot. What are your thoughts, Channon?

Channon Goodwin: We think - this was kind of my answer, right. So, when I set up organisations - artist-run organisations that have had permanence and tended to be bricks and mortar rooms where art is shown and communities develop around but I guess recognising the fallibilities of that model if you remain passive within it. Bus was becoming more and more institutionalised in a way it was gathering resources. For me, the question was how best to use those resources and how to strengthen the sector around me because I knew that that was a potentially temporary situation so Bus could be - it was relying on a certain kind of old-fashioned model that was discussed, gathering Government funding, structuring that into local, State, Federal, and that could be taken away. We invested time in starting a conversation that resulted in the formation of an organising network involving professional organisations and name checked them because some missed out on asking a question, so Alaska Projects, Blindside, Box Copy, Bus Projects, C3, Constance, FELTspace, Firstdraft, Kings, Moana, now called contemporary exist as well, there is an interesting Western Australian-ish, Liquid Architecture, Runway, Seventh, Trocadero, un Projects, many organisations have gone through the presumed temporariness of organisations and for me that created a great space to discuss the efficacy, the ethics of the spaces, what they meant for artists' agency, how they kind of continue to be, I guess, sites for questioning and radicality and these things that potentially are some of the most important answers to some questions.

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you. Let's start then where Channon left off. We've got just under 10 minutes, 7 minutes for some discussion with everyone. How can we, through the way that artists support each other, through the ways that NAVA can support artists' self-organisation, how are we going to keep thinking about those platforms that aren't just the bricks and mortar, as you say, that aren't just the ways we're thinking of right now and other projects other are working on that you'd like to share in exactly that area including some of the ARIs we didn't get to hear from, my apologies. Yes, gentleman with the hand up and also the glasses.

Arie Glorie: My name is Arie, I'm the program - (Laughter) I know! I'm the Program Director of Testing Grounds which is a temporary infrastructure project in Melbourne.

Patricia Piccinini: Sorry, I forgot your name. So sorry. Great place.

Arie Glorie: It is really interesting to listen to this because we can't call ourselves an ARI because of the structure project that's leveraging different types of money but we, in every sense, we are an ARI in every single other sense and I think there's some really interesting thing that people have been talking about that we try to explore because we come from an architectural practice so it is very much about not just the physical space but the structures of how you're doing applications and things. The application one is one that I think about the most which is we do rolling applications so when you're not - that's really about time because when you sit down with an application you have to think of ways to say no to people but when you're doing rolling applications and spend half an hour on it every week you are finding ways to say yes instead that. It's been really dramatic that shows a lot of courage and risk taking and being a very open-door policy, yeah.

Esther Anatolitis: Arie, thank you. I like that. We've got the gentleman in the white shirt who's got his hand up a couple of rows behind and then we have the lady down here and then that's probably all we'll have time for. I like the idea of just read nothing to what Ari was saying about you've got a particular space or a platform or you come from a different kind of background, be a architectural and then it's like, how can we think tactically as well as just what are the resources or infrastructures we have. Thank you. Up the back.

Liam James: G'day, I'm Liam from Constance ARI in Hobart. I think one of the things that come out of a lot of these discussions and is actually something toot ties back a discussion from earlier today is going forward, what we need, like Richard talked about how the arts sector is seen, is we need to see artist-run spaces are not the children of the arts sector and that we shouldn't be talked about like that or treated like that just because it's lower funded or represents a younger sector a lot of the time that it is an important structural part of an entire community and should be treated like so and even though it functions in heaps of different ways, it's how we focus our energy on it collectively.

(Applause)

Esther Anatolitis: Yes, absolutely. Because, this is the arts. What artists are doing and leading and the structures that become ARIs or other things, that actually is the arts in Australia and institutions like this, institutions like universities are there to learn and respond to what artists are leading so well said. Yes.

Vasiliki Nihas: Actually follows on exactly from that. I'm wondering whether we have any real data because ARIs aren't always ARIs, they're morphing into all sorts of things. I mean, M16, which I chair, has been around for 32 years and we've gone from kind of being in factory spaces and freebies and cold, draughty corridors and got knows what and we now have 27 purpose-built studios, two gallery spaces, we turn around exhibitions on a 3-week basis which is killing us all - yeah, exactly.

Esther Anatolitis: Why?

Vasiliki Nihas: Because we actually still have to pay our rent. There are imperatives especially when one part of Government funds you for an artistic component, another funds you for the land you're using and the space you're in. What I would really like is - I don't know whether it's benchmarking but something that describes what the landscape is like because you keep just coming up with new problems every time you morph into a different entity. Yes, we've got a board and we've got the issue someone else said that you can't have too many artists on your board because it creates conflict of interest or potential for it. Irrespective of whether

you've built conflict of interest components into your board et cetera, issues flow out of whatever the next iteration is and what I would like to know is what does the landscape currently look like before we address it?

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you. There has been a couple of big rounds of ARI research done over the years and I'm sure Channon knows better than I do but it's also something that we need to do, that NAVA needs to do, in working with ARIs to put together that chapter and so we will get some - there will have to be some good focused research that brings together stuff that is stuff being researched elsewhere so we're not replicating things as well. We have just about run out of time for this session and we're going to take a break and come back at 3:00 on the dot where we are going to go straight into Let's Work with Public Space with Fiona Foley and Nick Mitzevich. It we have obviously only just scratched the surface of the ARI discussion so please keep talking about it in the break. I hope everyone joining in the online discussion is going to be able to keep talking about it as well and obviously NAVA will be leading conversations about this across the country but please join me whole-heartedly in thanking Patricia. I'm so in awe of your work and where you are.  (Applause) See you all here at 3 on the dot for our next discussion.

# Session 4: Let's work the public space

Esther Anatolitis: Hello everyone, let's take a seat and make a start. We're running just teensy bit late now. This is our session on let's work the public space. And as I said at the beginning in looking at the Code of Practice and looking at what NAVA needs to set the standards that are ambitious and fair, work in the public space is something - it's become something of an extreme FAQ, something we are hearing repeatedly at NAVA that we really have to look at national - a national approach to some consistent regulations around this, some of us in the room may be involved in conversations around the Melbourne Metro EOI process, a lot of us have got examples of working with Local Government, with developers, with a whole range of authorities, regulators of public space, people who either in an ambitious and foresightful way want to tell the story of a place through a work or they want to create a public space in a space that was previously not public and by public space, we mean somewhere where thinking and accidental, incidental encounters can occur, something can happen, something can emerge from that space that exceeds and that is beyond what that space was designed for. A public space is where you are celebrate and mourn and protest and meet someone and just kind of hang out and not feel like you have to consume or pay for something. But a public space is also somewhere where we talk to and we meet people and we negotiate, I guess, those shared or not shared ethics and values that make us who we are so it is a priority for NAVA when we think about the Code to look at national priorities and national protocols that can be consistent around public art and public space. In this session, let's talk about how we can overcome the colonial mindset that still pervades decision-making about art in the public space and why is there still so much resistance to telling the stories, the particular stories and the difficult and sometimes painful stories about particular places. So, we've got Fiona Foley here, we've got Nick Mitzevich here. Fiona Foley, as I only slightly told an ABC broadcaster bet the other morning who should have known better, she's one of Australia's leading artists. You have seen coming up the escalator the big work Dispossessed.

Fiona Foley: Dispresed.

Esther Anatolitis: Dispersed. Mindset. Public art. You have seen her work in a range of places and I'm sure you've heard or seen her speak in a range of different contexts. Please welcome Fiona Foley. (Applause) And Nick Mitzevich has very kindly welcomed us this morning. The new Director of the National Gallery of Australia, Nick Mitzevich. (Applause) We've joked we are going to milk being new as long as we possibly can. Both equally ambitious about the role of the artist in leading the national cultural agenda. Incredibly important for the country that we want to make and live in and see into the future. When we started talking about this, Fiona mentioned three case studies around three particular works of hers and what it was like working on those, having the conversations and the negotiations so we're going to frame our conversation around that, hear from Fiona about each one, talk a bit about what this means for art in the public space and also these two have got some back story in working on at least one of these so I'm really keen to hear from both Fiona and Nick. The first case we talked about was the Brisbane Magistrates Court work. Tell us about that one.

Fiona Foley: First of all, I'd like to say that I bring a counternarrative to the historical lens. Not many people are doing that in public space. So, by nature, I am a deep thinker and I do still believe that we suffer in this country from a cultural cringe and if you look at the public artwork that is destined to go up in Sydney called Cloud Arch worth $11.3 million, that's an example of cultural cringe we have in this country where we can't take onboard an Australian artist and allocate $11.3 million for public work in Sydney. Clouds in nature do it very well. We

don't need to replicate that. (Laughter) (Applause) So I'm a believer in having robust discussions. I don't like polite conversation. So, the three examples I'm presenting this afternoon, two of them are in Queensland, Mackay and Brisbane, the other space is Sydney's Redfern Park. So, I have to remain silent about the concepts behind a work I did outside Brisbane Magistrates Court. In Queensland at that particular time, the State Government was Labor and we did have an Arts Minister whose name was Matt Foley. They had 2% policy of every Government building that went up in the state had to have an arts budget. It was probably the most prosperous time for artists in Queensland and one of the things I'd like to propose for your Code of Practice, Esther, is that we see a 2% policy national for public art in this country and that's where a lot of artists (Applause) in this country could get a foot in the door and sustain a career. So when I was talking on radio -

Esther Anatolitis: Let's talk about that for a sec.

Fiona Foley: When I was talking on radio about that earlier last week, the David Throsby report 2006 was in an upper echelon in this country and there was a statistic he quoted, 6%. I was in that bracket where I could make an income as an artist. Today, I can't. I have just completed a PhD in December and I'm transitioning out of the arts because I can no longer sustain myself and my dependents, which are two dogs, and I'm moving into the academy because I'm just sick of busting a gut to just try and pull a wage and pay the bills. I don't lead an extravagant life like Patricia speaking before. I can afford a copy now and again. It's hard and I have two commercial galleries. I show one in Melbourne and one in Brisbane and then you get a speaking engagement here and there or you might get to be in a group show but going back to Magistrates Court, what I find is that Australians are afraid to acknowledge the history that took place in this country even though I might have landed the public art commission, I had to maintain a 2-year secrecy about what that work was really about outside Brisbane Magistrates Court which was 94 massacre sites in the state of Queensland that are on the public record. I had a researcher work on the project with me who I asked to remain silent about the research she was doing. She did that. I worked largely with a company called Urban Art Projects, they worked with me on all of my major projects in Australia. The two directors, Matthew and Daniel Tobin, I didn't divulge to them what the work was about. The list of names in the pavement was about bushfires and floods in Queensland towns. At some stage, I switched the list that I gave to the committee and I had the place names that my researcher had put together which was 94. So we were talking about the word "courage" earlier today. To have courage also has other things attributed to it so people see me as being brave, a courageous artist, but it comes at a price and that price is my career so if you are a vocal person, which I tend to be if I see an injustice, I will say something and that recently happened a month or so ago in Melbourne at the State Library of Melbourne when I saw injustice occurring where my work was not being acknowledged in a national discussion ARC grant that was taking place at this particular moment and I've had the opportunity to write about it in Arts Hub if you're interested in the background information. So being courageous does cost you and it's much suffer in this country to shut up, remain silent, get on and get the work rolling in.

Esther Anatolitis: How are we going to make sure because that's not the case when we work with artists?

Nick Mitzevich: A couple of things. We have to remember most public art is commissioned by very conservative, formal institutions that aren't as progressive as the communities themselves. I think that's a big challenge. Governments and they are of all persuasions and all levels, they're generally less progressive than the communities they represent. Just to labour

that point a little, I think it's important - when you think about the same-sex debate that happened in Australia, it was quite an interesting debate and many Australians were quite concerned where that debate would go. Some sides of politics wanted it to be killed off, others said it was a no-through road, but guess what happened? The Australian public were much more progressive than our politicians. The Australian public saw that acceptance, diversity and embracing difference was really important and what that really showed me was that people in our community, people that are close to us, the people that we interact with, are much more progressive than the formal elements of Government and governance and so we just have to remember that. Unfortunately, the people that are commissioning public art in Australia aren't as progressive as the general community so that's the first thing but we shouldn't let that get in our way. The fact that those institutions want to commission public art is this great opportunity for us. I use the word "us" to embrace the arts community. I don't ever think of myself as being creative. I think of myself as being a part of what you all do. And what working with those institutions does is give us an opportunity to show what tolerance, what acceptance, what diversity looks like and it's kind of a hard road but I think that very few of these organisations - and I'm mainly talking about State capital authority or Local Government authorities who build stuff, they rarely have a chance to have an ongoing dialogue with the arts community so if a public artwork is getting on the blocks, they're going to look at it through their lens which is mitigate risk, mitigate any commentary, mitigate any offence. So we start with the lowest common denominator but as the arts community we're totally resilient and it's our job to infect them that difference, that acceptance, that a diversity of opinion is actually what the rest of the community is interested in and there's no simple answer but just remembering from the very beginning, from the starting blocks, that's our role in the community and we always have to think about the fact we're encountering an organisation that doesn't know their way through it. So Fiona's extraordinary projects, over a couple of decades, have demonstrated that she is fearless in leading people and leading the debate and I think the organisations that have worked with Fiona are actually a little more open to difference because they've had contact with an artist. The bottom line is we're not going to change those institutions from the outside, we're actually going to change them from the inside so the more we're involved in these projects, the more that the envelope is pushed, the greater likelihood in playing the long game and that's affecting the cultural scene of Australia and that's why I think these sorts of projects we're discussing today can actually push how institutions see things.

Esther Anatolitis: I'm still thinking about the word "infectious" that Nick used about how we change the cultures. We need to put in the Code of Practice, we need to provide some kind of infectious format. It needs to be like a virus that gets into the various council databases and back ends and just changes the way that documents connect to one another and so on and I only mean that in a partly jokey way because at the moment the Code of Practice exists with a set of chapters and things but what if it was more tactical, a kind of how-to. This is how you navigate different departments of local council in order to work through a public-space project. It is something that really strikes me in Fiona's experience and in the conversations we had about it before, is you've got - you're an artist commissioned to do something in particular and as Nick says, yes, absolutely by definition the people who are doing the commissioning are more conservative than the artist who they're commissioning and the community who's going to respond to and enjoy that work. Yet, they want to commission a work that convoys a truth and so when I think about the second of the case studies which is working in Redfern Park to actually inscribe Paul Keating's words into the ground and you think, OK, that seems fairly straight forward we've all heard this speech, we are see it on YouTube and Fiona was met with resistance even then. Tell us about that one.

Fiona Foley: After Brisbane Magistrates Court I thought I'd never get an opportunity to work in public art again and I did have an exit strategy if it all did go pear shaped and I had to seriously think about this 2005, where would I go and live? I thought I'd go and live in New Zealand.

Nick Mitzevich: There is South Australia!

(Laughter)

Fiona Foley: Two years later, I had forgotten I was a part of a tender package and the architects rang me and said, "Our project has got up. Redfern park." And I thought this was an opportunity to highlight Paul Keating's famous Redfern speech in that actual park in the pavement. And I thought the Sydney City Council would be supportive of that but it raised the ire of some people on the committee who debated it back and forth and I only wanted a section of Paul Keating's speech, the one where we remember as a nation, we took the children. We took the land, we did the murdering, we brought the alcohol. That repetitiveness of that aspect was very potent, inscribed in to the pavement. Because the council took so long in deliberating whether they would allow that to happen or not, they actually backed themselves in to a corner because time had run out. They had allocated the funds for the public artwork so just by chance that work did go ahead but it was because they took so long deliberating over that aspect of Keating's speech that that work went ahead. So that was another example, so working on these public art projects, you never know where the dissension will come from, what quarter, for what reasons, and when it does hit you - and it did hit you - then you have to have a counternarrative to work through that process to say, "Listen, this is important because of these reasons," and argue the case back. So, some of these public art projects that I've been invited on to do have been fraught with difficulty because people's conservative nature exists on these committees and that's what you're really challenging - and I think you will be challenging down the track - is changing people's attitudes.

Nick Mitzevich: I think it's important to just remember that generally the people that are assessing these public art projects and commenting on them actually have no art background. I think it's important to gravitate to people that do have it, that can provide an anchor point, and a lot of Australians were taught a very clean and pale version of history, that Captain Cook landed here and discovered Australia. I still hear this rhetoric even in the most sophisticated quarters of Australia, that a very intelligent person from parliament said to me last week, "What are you doing to celebrate Captain Cook's discovery of Australia?" It's very hard to fight against that ingrained education and I know that comment had no direct implication of racism but there's this underlying suppression of truth and that's been something that has so subtly but so potently transformed Australian society so I think I come back to that point, it's our jobs to actually challenge that and so many artists in the audience that I know and Fiona here are committed to envisioning history back to fact, back to reality, back to respecting the truths of history. We have such a big job to do to undo and then - my favourite quote relates to this point of history, "I do, I undo and then I redo," so I think that just relates to so many things but when it relates to Australian history, it's so important and such a clear thing we need to do and it's the undo and redo is really important and many artists that work in undoing truths and are doing them, it's very comfortable to do that in a gallery space but it's so uncomfortable everywhere else and public art is a most uncomfortable space because you've got so many hurdles to jump in the public-art arena which is all about mitigating any risk - reputation, ideological risk, safety, long-term maintenance, cost. That's the starting point in public art. Let just mitigate all of those risks.

Forget about the idea. The idea might come last. So it's important to invert that and talk about the idea and the power of the idea then overcomes that and obviously with Fiona's idea about Paul Keating's very poignant, repetitive words, it's like a poem actually. I read it not so long ago and it doesn't feel like a speech, it feels like a poem and that's what its potency is, but the idea of that speech was so powerful that, yes, they did run out of time, but the idea was so powerful that no-one could mitigate that.

Esther Anatolitis: I love that it got - that in this instance that work got made because the bureaucratic process exhausted itself and there was no next step and suddenly it wasn't about a bureaucratic next step it was about then the risk of "we're all going to lose face if nothing happens." I think about the risk management framework Nick is describing, the whole point of risk management is supposed to be so that here we all are, the conservatives deciding the work that will happen and here is the outspoken artist saying, "Here's the idea, this is what I'm thinking, take you through it. Here it is," and we are all supposed to say, "Isn't it great that the team at risk management have put all those spread sheets together with all these - there's a whole matrix about low and high risk and the whole point of those frameworks was not to minimise the risk t was supposed to be to be able to uphold the artistic intent even better. It was supposed to be to say, alright, we get that if we do this work in this way that's going to be the risk and then we've got this whole team of experts whose job it is to make sure that we can still make the outstanding work and actually do something about those risks."

Nick Mitzevich: One of the major things is if a young artist or an artist that hasn't worked in the public-art area encounters this, it's somewhat overwhelming. It doesn't matter how intelligent or sophisticated you are, it's actually just having the tricks to be able to push that and there's a number of artists in Australia that would be amazing mentors for younger artists in terms of providing support and advice and as an industry we don't necessarily do that very well. In the performing arts there seems to be a greater propensity to support and mentor people and that's probably because the performing art, there's a notion of collaboration in the structure of performing art but I'm just looking around, Fiona's done some extraordinary public artworks, I'm just seeing Sally Smart, she has worked so closely with architects and builders and so there's so many people that have done extraordinary projects and amazing places of knowledge and wisdom because if you're approaching this and there was a big bad council or a developer you're working with, it's kind of overwhelming so I'd love if NAVA thought about how we could support artists that haven't actually - that have a gig in the public-art arena but don't have the experience, not with the work but with the bureaucracy with making their way through all those layers. How they could be supported. I think that's really important. Fiona and Sally and many others that have had experience have done it via the school of hard knocks and they've got a really tough scheme now and they themselves are kind of resilient to this and that resilience hasn't stopped them throwing themselves into the next project.

Esther Anatolitis: We are incorporating that into the Code because artist whose have extraordinary ideas for work in the public space are not able to get gigs if they don't already have a project in the public space for all the reasons we've just described. Let's go to Fiona's third case study and then open the conversation more broadly. This a complex one the Mackay regional project. Us about that.

Fiona Foley: It was a huge budget, $1.5 million, we didn't get to use all of it. We put aside $400,000 for contingency. It was for the Pioneer River, in the end I did six major works but I'll only talk about one of the works which relates to the South Sea Islander history of Mackay.

When you visit Mackay there is a large population of South Sea Islander people but when I first went there, there was a very important regional gallery director, Robert Heather, was working there. He took me down to the Pioneer River and there was a tiny plaque, it must have been as big as this piece of paper. The plaque was stuck in the ground about this high. The Leichhardt tree, an Indigenous rainforest tree, had been vandalised and half burned, it was half dead, but that site was the point where they would bring South Sea Islander human cargo from the island, they would ship - the boats would anchor in the Pioneer River, they would bring them across at low tide to that Leichhardt tree and then Customs House was just from here to the back of the room here. Each one of those people would be thumb printed and then they would be taken out to the various sugarcane plantations. I had the opportunity to speak with an elder, South Sea Island woman, Rowena, at the library there in Mackay. She retold the story of when she was a young girl and she remembered seeing the indentations on her grandmother's ankles and she cried and I had a few tears. I remember I couldn't walk away from her story. Her grandmother escaped from the sugarcane plantation, was chased on horseback, brought back to the plantation, they put anklets around her ankles so she wouldn't run away again. Those chains on her ankles were too tight and she had those indentations on both her ankles for the rest of her life. That was the story that was being retold to me. I wanted to do a significant memorial in the CBD of Mackay. I worked with the South Sea Islander community there, they had an organisation and it was matriarchal, this organisation, so I was a little bit fearful of them, being a younger woman at the time. One of those meetings Matt Tobin attended with me and they took a shine to Matt and we explained the project. I wanted to do seven pillars based on the dimensions of sugar cubes but I wanted to engage the local community and have them put their thumb print on the aluminum boxes and also their initials so if they took the children or grandchildren to that site they could say, "There's my thumb print there," and point to it, so it was an educational experience for everyone in the community. I had to fight with the Mackay Council. There was a change, there was a Left-leaning Mackay Council and when I got to do the project it was very much a conservative Right-leaning local council. It was the time of Barack Obama came into presidency in the USA. I remember that. And I had to argue at this full council meeting why it was important to tell this story and I was up against a group of non-Indigenous men. Their angle or their tactics they used with me was that they wanted me to also include the ships that came across that didn't have human cargo and I had to identify the names of those boats on this memorial as well. I remember walking away and saying, "You're only getting two boats like that and the rest will be the human cargo boats." I ended up doing seven of theirs just to keep the peace but these were some of the idiotic conversations you have with local council in this particular case but what was rewarding, I didn't know how many thumbprint I would get from the local South Sea Islander community and some of these staff from UAP went up there and collected the thumbprints which I was very grateful for, but we ended up getting 213 thumbprints from the local community. I went back several times - I was reluctant to go back to Mackay. I find it a racist town to the point where the names of the boats engraved on the sugar cube sculpture has been etched out. UAP invited a local sign writer to fill the black ink back in those sugar cubes. The local sign writer refused to do that. They had to fly someone up from Brisbane to do that. This is the idiot nature that - the intellects you have to deal with sometimes in regional areas.

Esther Anatolitis: There's no shortage in urban areas too.

Fiona Foley: These are some things that unfold you're not prepared for. There are some pluses and some minuses but once again you're up against individual attitudes and sometimes these projects can be smooth sailing and you have the full support like I did at the State Library of Queensland for another important work called Black Opium and that was a magical

project to work on but it just depends on the types of attitudes you will encounter on these project.

Esther Anatolitis: When we talk about some of the more personal things we've covered indirectly but in our session so far about resilience, about understanding our own ethics and how we articulate them and being in the situations where we do expect or where we don't expect to come across such a viscerally different kind of response and one that just would absolutely hit you in the gut, I mean, how did you - I'm asking now kind of, you know, as you as a person, as a black fella, as a lady, as an artist, as all of those things, when a council says, " We also want you to name the other boats as well," to go, "Can we also name the ones that weren't racist or weren't part of," like, as though there is a complicity and there are others outside of it and we can save this situation if we could just name those boats. How do you respond personally? Because that to me just seems gut wrenching.

Fiona Foley: I did have a plan. It didn't go to plan. I thought, OK, I need to be quite cool, calm and collected in this council meeting which was a very large meeting. I tried to imbibe Barack Obama's diplomacy. Well, I didn't get very far because the Irish side of my nature came out. I got fired up but the person who was next to me, Matt Tobin, was much more cool, calm and collected and helped navigate through that situation so my personality type is that I'm not placid, I will say things when I think it's warranted, and I did fire up at that particular meeting and it was like a red rag to a bull. Rightly so.

Esther Anatolitis: Nick, we find ourselves often in fancy-pants circumstances - Nick's pants are very fancy, I've got to say, admiring those cuffs, those is some quality pants - but there are times when we're in situations where, as you were saying before, where we're speaking to maybe elected members or advisers or heads of committees where we need to influence change and we need to influence change by having a conversation that is partly in their language otherwise we won't get to the next step.

Nick Mitzevich: The fancy pants are just part of the armour to convince them I'm just like them, but I'm just a gay wog from a little farming town and you just sometimes have to work from within. I have always thought it was important I played the game from inside and it's better to be inside the tent and pick your marks and over the years I have lived in a society that at times judges you but my experience is like not even- doesn't compare to the things Fiona has lived. Us wogs look quite Caucasian so we pass under the radar most of the time and Australia has become a much more interesting country but when I hear the stories my parents told me when they got here in the '50s and the kind of discrimination they had, it sort of is unfathomable but when I think about being a young gay man growing up in little regional town, you know, I felt the fear y felt the discrimination, I felt the judgment and I kind of worked out that I needed to play the game from inside out and I kind of needed to sound and look like the people I was trying to work with but holding on to the values that I had which were quite different and those values are very much about nurturing Australia that celebrates difference, that celebrates the fact that we are such a unique cultural mix and knowing that and taking responsibility that it was my job to actually try - and I use the word "try" because you don't always succeed - trying to influence an agenda. I have worked in Local Government, Newcastle City Council, worked in the university world which is kind of like working for the royal family, and I've worked in State Government for the last 8 years which is like a Local Government on steroids and I've just entered the phase of working for the Federal Government. They're all the same. They're all structures of Government that are conservative by nature and I know that it's important that you are consistent and that you continue to push a cultural agenda and that could take lots of different forms and I think that

having responsibility for the National Collection at the moment, which is my remit for the term of my natural life, it's really important the National Collection be used to drive a cultural agenda that's about a progressive Australia, that bridges the gap between black and white Australia, that uses the voice of artists to talk about the fact that we're a very diverse and dynamic country that owes more to Indigenous Australia and Asia than we do to Europe or America and I think it's my job to make sure I constantly keep driving that point of view because as the National Gallery, it's important that we champion the voice of artists in our society and we make sure that we keep going even though we might trip up or even though we might have hit a brick wall. It's easier for us than artists because we're not being judged by the work we do.

Esther Anatolitis: That's a good point to open up to questions if anyone has got a question for Fiona or for Nick, for anything that we have just discussed. I know my mind is bouncing with a lot of ideas. The lady right up the back who is raising her hand in the red. Excellent, thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. I am just reflecting on what both of you have been talking about and thinking about another artist who was commissioned to do some work in the public space here in Canberra quite some years ago and I'm sure it's been hard, particularly for you, Fiona, and I think it's been for every artist I have ever worked with, about every piece of work being an experiment and that you do your research and you've got your idea and your concept but there's also something about the materials and the way they will or won't work in particular spaces and things that happen and so when we come back to those conservative thinking about the 12-month period of making good on something that doesn't work or something, despite all of the thinking that you've done, it comes back to what do you do about preparing people and the mentoring so that artists are prepared for having to think through those things and to do it themselves.

Esther Anatolitis: I'm not sure what your question was. It was kind of a comment but, yes, there are lots of things we have to think about.

Penelope Benton: Sorry, that sounds so loud. I took from that that sometimes when artists are working on public art projects the way they're fabricated, the materials are really important to the artists and often their commissioner doesn't appreciate that that particular material is totally crucial to the finish, to the look too, the intention of the work and often public art commissions will consider a public art piece the same way they might put out a tender for a public toilet or bench seat and then when they're thinking about the way that's fabricated it will be down to cost and aesthetics to what the builder is making and not what the artist is intending so I'm wondering if - I know Peter Day is here and there's a few other public-art practitioners, maybe Sally would like to speak to, I guess, the issue with fabrication. We've got someone here.

Graham Charlcroft: I suppose we're moving into a bit of statement territory here but it is really interesting one of your closing comments about the whole construction thing because that is one of the really big areas, I think, for the whole contractual side of the public art that I think really needs to be investigated because I certainly find with a lot of the developers I work with they often want to put your contract under the building construction contract and that creates a lot of issues and such a big uphill battle trying to get all the copyright issues in there and just keeping the quality control when you're dealing with a builder who really just wants to knock the job out. I also want - one thing I've got to say, the procurement process for public art is getting really difficult. The amount of time you put in, having to put in a concept

and then your description and particularly when some of the projects the brief upfront States we want this to be an artwork development for the community yet they ask you to put your concept up front which is absurd then you've got a whole litany of having to fill out what your environmental health policy is for your company or your business and you're a sole trader but one thing that gives me such satisfaction, I've got to say, if there's one thing you can alter with ease it is when it comes to insurances and having the NAVA insurance policy or the public liability, the accident insurance, all that coverage is the one thing you can tick and you know you've got one thing right and it just get through the whole process.

Esther Anatolitis: Like I said before, come for the insurance, stay for the services we offer. If we don't have these national approaches and protocols then public art can be shunted into public works, regulated like a public toilet block kind of thing. There's a well-known example in Melbourne of where an artist works, must be 10, 15 years ago, the work was fabricated in steel and 5 years later was cleaned up. It was turned into a whole other work altogether. So it is those things about how is the material honoured as part of the work, how is the work actually being recorded within council? Is it sitting on the asset register? Is it fully articulated in terms of what constitutes that work of art? So much to take into consideration. Other questions for these guys or contributions from public artists? There is a lady here with her hand up.

Di Taylor: Hi, I'm Di from WA. I wanted to comment on the art scheme we have in WA and you suggested we should have it nationally. The per cent for art scheme has worked to a point where the boom period took over and the architects decide they could put it in their budget and most architectural installations are designed by architects and the funding goes into their funds now. They also pay Councils so they don't have to do the artwork. Very little of the per cent for art scheme gets to an artist.

Esther Anatolitis: Important cautionary tale, thank you.

Di Taylor: It is mass produced in China.

Nick Mitzevich: Of course there are architects who are China and create artworks with communities or in response to commissions but those internal kinds of shiftings costing commissions absolutely need to be looked at. The gentleman with the beard and then Gabe rail after the man whose name I don't know. We'll get the microphone to you.

Peter Day: I'm Peter from Sydney. I would like to endorse what Graham said about the insurance provided by NAVA but also something I've found in the same situation is that developers and builders just don't believe that we are real and I very often have been able to use the example of the Code of Practice from our national bodies, professional body, and they go, "What? Really? Huh?" Then they start to take us seriously and instead of something like 140-page contract, they'll mitigate that to a minor works contract of 40 pages and instead of asking us for $10,000 a day mitigated liability insurance and stuff like that, they might then come down to $500. So it's a matter of our national professional body providing that sort of bullet-proof back-up that will help us enormously to go forward so thank you.

Esther Anatolitis: Thank you. That raises the bar for us to get it right. The Code needs to be bullet-proof, I'm making that. Nick and then Gabrielle.

Nick Mitzevich: One of the reasons I think Fiona's been very successful is she has a great partnership with a fabricator. That's taken a couple of decades to develop but in some ways

that partnership makes her bullet proof because they are a forcefield and forming those sorts of relationships with fabricators and architects is a great way of adding another bit of armour to your defences. Would you agree, Fiona? That relationship you have with Dan and Matt is kind of letting you sing a bit louder.

Fiona Foley: They did really protect me with that Mackay project. They didn't tell me a lot of things that were going on until a year or two years down the track. So they did really assist in me not having to deal with that frontal attack from that township.

Esther Anatolitis: Also, Penelope, we have a podcast we recorded earlier this year with Chris Fox and the work is at Wynyard and it is called Interloop which possibly you can picture in your mind's eye. It is the work at Wynyard station, Sydney, which was made from the former wooden escalator which Chris Fox has turned into this kind of Mobius-driven infinity kind of - it's extraordinary. I was part of the podcast conversation with him earlier this year t is on the website and he deals with these issues as well. It is quite insightful.

Gabrielle de Vietri: Hi, I'm Gabrielle, I have a question about something that Fiona, you brought up early on in what you were saying and that's been echoing as I've been listening to everything else you've been talking about and the problems you've encountered, the ways you've overcome them, or sometimes not, and that's that you announced at the beginning that you are defecting from art.

Fiona Foley: Thank you for picking that up.

Gabrielle de Vietri: It is such a weighty statement to make and it's very serious that the person that we announced as one of Australia's most important artists is defecting because it's no longer working and I wanted to ask is that the only option? Is that where we're at? Is there anything else that can happen?

Fiona Foley: I had a conversation with John Cattapan earlier this year because I applied for a job at Melbourne University and he said to me - and I think along the same lines - it started to economically affect Australian artists in 2008 and that's certainly when I noticed sales were dropping from galleries and I think in the last - let say since 2014 I've had to rethink my position as an artist and so that's why I've entered into getting a PhD and transitioning out of the arts so that I can start to have some normalcy in my life and not be begging from my relatives for some sort of income. For the past 8 months of this year I have been largely unemployed and it's hand to mouth. I don't know how other people are surviving in this country. I can't anymore as a living, practising artist. The last show I had with Andrew Baker in December I put $20,000 of my own money into that. I lost half my income. The sales that came through the door were $10,000. So that says to me this is a mug's game. You've got to get smart about this and transition where the money is and I think the money is in academia and landing one of these lecturing positions, if you can get one of them, and tat's some sort of security.

Esther Anatolitis: Is it about, though, finding the money to have that security, which is obviously important for everyone, because I think that one of the underlying questions of Gabriel and I have been thinking since we were on ABC recently and as I was indicating earlier, having to emphasise to the present who Fiona was because the presenter asked a question which he took to be something we commonly understand, that we take as absolutely given, that of course a mid-career or established artist should expect to have some kind of lull, should expect to be suddenly unsuccessful, not able to develop next projects and

first of all I was affronted by the fact that he articulated that as a given to a public ABC audience and secondly I was affronted because he was saying this to Fiona Foley and thirdly I was affronted because what he makes is an expectation that artistic practice or being an artist is the only choice of life trajectory that you should be given to expect there's going to this stop or lull at the height of your powers and so I wonder whether is it about regrouping, is it about finding those different ways to sustain yourself because you're stopping or pausing your artistic practice but then how do you stop being an artist and thinking as an artist?

Fiona Foley: Quite easily, believe you me. (Laughter) It ain't all that. I did want to say something really important though and it's a quote from Richard Flanagan from the Garma Festival that was published in 'The Guardian'. I think we need to ponder this as an Australian society, cultural people that we are. If we here in Australia do not re-imagine ourselves, we will undo - we will be undone too. We should use this as an opportunity to think things afresh and I take on board the lady from WA that you have a 1% policy. I believe it is 1%.

Speaker: 10%

Fiona Foley: Well there you go.

Speaker: It’s one.

Fiona Foley: A 1% policy with the public art in WA and I do think that NAVA need to be at the forefront for artists who are public art practitioners in this country and if we could push a 2% policy nationally in Australia for public artists then we will gather some momentum but we have to work as a collective and I know this from the early days, Boomali Aboriginal Artists was formed in 1987, that didn't get a mention here but we were the forefront of breaking doors down and part of the breaking the doors down was getting Aboriginal artists who lived in city environments into State institutions, commercial gallery shows. They have been running in this country for 30 years and I just think that we will have much more success if we are a collective rather than individual artists knocking at doors so I want to just say that, that we have to re-imagine ourselves because no-one else is going to do it for us.

Nick Mitzevich: If I can add to that as well, architects by their nature are very well organised and if there is an architect competition, for example, the fraternity would not accept a competition to select an architect if the architect were not being paid a fee, for example. Those sorts of things are really important, like no-one should be asked to do a public-art submission if they're not being paid. The architecture fraternity's nailed it. That's why any conceptual work, any suggestion to be in an exhibition, the NAVA guidelines are really important and they probably need more beefing up because all those things add up to an income, same as copyright royalties and so on. All of those things are really important as an industry to keep lobbying, keep pushing because the people that actually run those public-art competitions, reproduce works, generally they're not involved in art but it's our job to remind them that artists have a very important role to play in the same way that an architect has a really important place in projects. No-one ever debates the fact that an architect should be paid 10 to 13% of the construction costs of a project. That's never debated. But to pay an artist a $50,000 artist's fee, oh, gosh, that's extravagant. I don't know how many times when I worked in Local Government that I heard someone say to me, "Gosh, that's so extravagant. Aren't we paying the artist too much?" But no-one would ever say that for the engineer or the architect, the quantity surveyor. No-one would ever make those assumptions but it's just important as an industry that we keep pushing that artists have a very important place and that those fees are so critical to the livelihood of artists.

Fiona Foley: Nick, that's exactly right.

(Applause)

Esther Anatolitis: And something we have been talking about a lot in the NAVA office is the very example of the Australian institute of architects. You cannot run a public procurement process, a public competition without using the institute's rules and without it being absolutely clear. You certainly can't practice as an architect unless you're a member of the institute which are the different kinds of - like, doctors have the AMA and accountants and so on, it's that level, as we were saying in the morning when Penelope and I were talk about the Code and Strategic Plan more broadly, one of the ways in which we infect, we infiltrate, we make sure aspects of the Code are the accepted practice, some of those are about law as we're going to touch on in a second as we go into copyright and other ways of defending our rights but some are actually about the partnerships that we continue to build and maintain with Government, with Local Government, and so on to make sure that when those processes and decisions are being made the Code is the authoritative tool and as Peter was saying earlier, as an artist when you go into a negotiation, you're able to say this is actually national best practice. So we need to revise that Code so it's good and strong and then we actually need to make it the standard. I'm going to thank these two in a sec. After this we will have a bit of a wriggle break as we get into the next session immediately afterwards but this was - I want to touch on the bit about the past and future of Fiona's practice because when we admire someone's work we want to keep them in the arts and when we are here at different stages and career stages and so on we want to look to our peers, our elders, the people we admire and think, you know, actually you're the hero of one of my staff.

Fiona Foley: Am I?

Esther Anatolitis: Yes. We want to think about that is someone whose work we emulate but it is also like it's OK to opt out as well because being an artist is really hard and it is something that we rely - we're going to continue to rely on each other and on the massive strength of our community all over Australia to sustain us the way we do all the time when we hit on some kind of problem and we want to celebrate a success in our work and we've all got that choice throughout our lives when we practice publicly, when we don't, when we pursue careers going in one direction or another and we've got supporters and admirers and critics and friends everywhere and so in admiring your work, we also know that we can't keep you in a certain kind of practice forever and we also know that academia is enriched by your contribution. We know, those of us who work and have worked in academia, it is hardly a wonderland of secure employment either and this is the group of people who are inspiring our future, researching with that depth of rigour and helping to create our future. So, please join me very, very heartily in thanking Fiona Foley and Nick Mitzevich.

(Applause)

# Session 5: Let's Defend our rights

Esther Anatolitis: I'm going to call up Oliver Watts but have a stretch and a little wriggle and we'll start again in 10 minutes or something. We are going to make a start in just a sec. We have one last session to get through this afternoon and then we're going to go and have some drinks at 5:30 downstairs which will be a very, very wonderful way to end the day, especially because it gets to the drinks to be able to welcome Nick Mitzevich but also to be able to continue our conversation so this is going to be one where we've got people still trickling in and trickling out but we will make a start because we're also on a real time line here today because the NGA are using this space after us this evening so we have no capacity to run late. This session is called "let's defend our rights." It is about a range of things. It is about copyright. We have Oliver Watts here who is a board member of Copyright Agency and head curator at Artbank. Welcome, Oliver Watts.

(Applause)

Oliver Watts: Thank you.

Esther Anatolitis: What are our rights as practising artists? How do you defend them? Who's looking out for you? We're going to have a session now where we're not going to offer legal advice, because we can't, we're not lawyers. We're going to touch on all the different things that are really essential to think about and to champion and to make sure that we as NAVA are hearing about what needs to go in to that revised Code so this next session is going to involve some sitting and standing and stretching. First of all, everybody stand up and have a very good stretch. Find the ceiling with your fingers. Find the walls. Good. Good, good, good. Some bouncing. People have done this before. We're seeing some stretching patterns. This is good. Now sit down if you've never been paid for work that you've created. Sit down if you've never been paid for work that you've created. Sit down if you were paid, at minimum, the NAVA rate for that work. If you don't know what the NAVA rate is, you probably weren't paid it. Sit down if you were paid, at minimum, the NAVA rate for the work. Looking good so far. If you were paid at a minimum the NAVA rate. Sit down - I'm going to sit down at this point to be comfy - sit down if you feel that you were paid fairly for your work. It's slim pickings. Now sit down if it you don't want to be asked a question about that experience that you had. (laughter) Someone's got to keep standing! There is a lady up the back. Alright, so I'm going to ask you the question. We're going to bring a microphone to you. Was there a particular experience that you had in mind through all of that, a particular experience of being paid for something fairly?

Speaker: No, it's actually probably across the board. So I've had fewer experiences of being paid properly and usually that is in the instance where I set the price for my work, than I have where I've been paid adequately or fairly for the work that I've done and I've had a few experiences with residencies, with commissions, where fees are negotiated and that sort of thing. And I have actually been out of the industry for some time and only recently came back in to the industry.

Esther Anatolitis: Welcome.

Speaker: I'm concluding a PhD.

Esther Anatolitis: Nothing wrong with that.

Speaker: To join academia as Fiona did. Bad move. (laughter) So I'm finding that things are much, much worse now than they have been in the past and they were pretty dire in the past so it's been - it's quite a wake-up call for me at the moment.

Esther Anatolitis: Right. Well, that sounds pretty shit. Let's maintain that momentum into our next session and then we're going to have some discussions. Thank you very much for sharing that. Everyone, stand. Have a stretch again. Enjoying the stretching. Sit down if you've never shared an image online. Sit down if you've attributed that image every time. Every single time.

Oliver Watts: Sydney Art Fair sat down.

(Laughter)

Esther Anatolitis: Some good sitting there Barry. Sit down if you feel comfortable about how to attribute images and seek permissions.

Oliver Watts: Oh ok.

Esther Anatolitis: You have to.

Oliver Watts: I know I have to.

Esther Anatolitis: Sit down if you've never had a bad experience in sharing another artist's work. Remain standing or sit down if you don't want to be asked a question right now about that. You guys, tell us about that. Was there something in particular you were thinking about? You were standing because you have had a bad experience or a learning experience in sharing someone else's work and thinking about the attribution of images. Thinking about your own and other people sharing your own and not attributing. Tell us about that.

Speaker: Mine was more not so much online, it was actually more of - funnily enough, I was sitting on an architectural review board as an artist because I do a lot of projects in sustainability and it is for a new sustainability centre being built. The architects rocked up, started presenting the work of the landscape architect which was actually a public artwork I had done and it was being attributed to the landscape architect. Luckily enough, someone on the sustainability committee turned around and looked at me because he recognised my portfolio of work and said, "Isn't that your project?" I've also just discovered another public art project I did for draft designs for, for a developer, for the DA, and I went and looked at the development which is now up and I found both of the artworks designed and fabricated so there's going to a few conversations. I will be calm and collected and in a mindful way.

Esther Anatolitis: That is so deeply painful.

Oliver Watts: This session is really going to come on from what Nick and Fiona were talking about. I was going to say really that once we've got the Code and once we do have laws, we as a community really have to try and change the culture around those laws which is some form of cultural right or human rights around culture, some broader discussion about the community as art and where Australia is in our culture which is really what Fiona was talking about through Richard Flanagan's quote. For example, with attribution, we've only had that

law since 2001 and I remember that because we were fighting for it very strongly at the Arts Law when I was there in your building and I remember the phone calls to Canberra to get that up so we've only had that since 2001 which, is that a long time or not a long time? But it's not a long enough time for that to become an Australian industry standard and there hasn't been, to my knowledge, any precedent set. No-one's taken them to court over those - two cases already?

Esther Anatolitis: Robyn let's hear about those cases. We have the Executive Director of the Arts Law Centre.

Oliver Watts: Sorry, Robyn, I would have deferred to you.

Robyn Ayres: That's OK. Law was 2000, at least two cases and the thing I would say to artists whose rights have been infringed, for God sake contact Arts Law and get advice and actually do something about defending your rights because in a lot of these instance there is something you can do. There's one message I can leave you with in this session is, defend your rights. No-one's going to do it and we're your friends on your side. We talk to artists every day.

Oliver Watts: I agree.

Robyn Ayres: Two cases, one involved an artist whose work was reproduced in the Women's Day and he was - there was a portrait of Princess Mary and the wrong artist was attributed and that case took 12 months of the family wrote to the artist and the son wrote letter after letter to the Woman's Day just to get the correct attribution. Finally, it went to court and the damages were - there were damages awarded to the artist but they didn't really see it as being that significant. The artist ended up getting a payment of about $10,000. The other case actually involved music and incorrect -

Oliver Watts: That's great but, I'm not just defending my lack of knowledge but it is interesting that those cases haven't filtered down maybe to a lot of people or that - or, again, to industry. If they have filtered down then they've filtered down to maybe the publishing arm or music which are better - you know, they deal with copyright cases more at a higher level, I think, than the visual arts in general but it is a very interesting problem. It is just whether we have to prosecute those things. Who was the artist? Was it a royal portrait, no? My point is we really have to fight for these rights otherwise they sit there quite fragile. For example, another thing would be the royalty scheme which - from 2010 which I don't know if you guys know we've gathered around $6 million since that time for the visual arts. The thing is if we let that slip and if you guys don't go into that scheme by becoming members of the Copyright Agency then that was looking quite fragile. For starting in 2010, we could have lost that royalty scheme because of dealers and other machinations, we could have lost that in 2012/2013 very easily but now that it's got a pool of around $6 million, that's now looking a little bit more solid and that's because of the community of visual artists and members who have backed that scheme. Another scheme that came out in 2016 is the image royalty scheme which I think is connected but it's raised in the last two years $2 million for visual artists that have been handed out to the Copyright Agency members so, again, I really ask everybody to become involved in those schemes because the more people we have involved in those schemes, the stronger the schemes are as an arts eco system. It will be the same when the Code of Practice is finished and finalised. We have to back the scheme that NAVA's creating by going to Arts Law, by using our advocacy bodies, by using community, by petitioning the Local Government if it needs LEP with a proper attribution clause or the

1% we have been talking about, we have to tell Local Government we insist on the 1%. I think that's are our job really- tell Local Government. Once the job is set, it's the artist's job to activate the laws and make sure the rights are part of the culture.

Esther Anatolitis: These royalty schemes Oli's been talking about, does anyone know what they are?

Oliver Watts: Can we do a show of hands? It would be interesting to know how many members are here.

Esther Anatolitis: Who is a member of the Copyright Agency? Not many of us.

Oliver Watts: Who's received royalty payments this year?

Esther Anatolitis: Good work.

Oliver Watts: Do you want to talk about that, the people who had their hands up there? Or that's just self-explanatory?

Abdul Abdullah: That was surprising new wealth, is that what we were talking about before? We've got to advocate for the Copyright Agency because that's money that is ours and the only way to access the money is join thus organisation. When I heard about it I was a bit iffy they would take something that's mine but it is money I didn't know was there and didn't have access to otherwise it is fantastic and I'm telling every artist I know to get on board and claim what's yours.

Oliver Watts: Because somebody's already used your copyrighted material. For example, if you have done a landscape or public art project, think of how many Council fliers or magazines published it or real estate agent used it as part of their sales pitch. The image has been used and it is in the public domain, used in education, in planning courses and you have to access the money through statutory licensing.

Esther Anatolitis: Basically, when an image is used like that it does need to be licensed because it is owned by somebody. Somebody owns the copyright. The Copyright Agency is the organisation that gives advice.

Oliver Watts: Zan Wimberley is having a conniption because she didn't realise and think about how many places her photos would be.

Esther Anatolitis: We'll get you a microphone for everyone on the live stream can hear.

Zan Wimberley: If I photograph an artist's work and I'm paid for that by an artist or gallery, I have to own the copyright unless they have bought that from me so how does that work? If it's a real estate agency.

Oliver Watts: Depends on the photo. I'm not giving legal advice but - no, that's a complicated one but for the example - the use in the Herald, let's say one of your portraits of an artist went in the Herald, you got paid for that job but other people have used that image for educational purposes or governmental purposes so you can get payment through the licensing scheme for that image again.

Zan Wimberley: Yep, but it's when it's the artwork that I think it gets complicated because I don't feel like I should have - I mean, I think I had something where NAVA in fact used one of my photographs for an annual report and you wanted to pay me for the copyright of that and I ended up splitting it 50-50 with the artist. It was a really complicated thing and I don't know if it there is any -

Oliver Watts: Maybe Robyn could answer. There are co-authorships as well.

Robyn Ayres: It's not that complicated. There are two copyrights. The artist has a copyright in their work they've created, they own the copyright, then the photographer, they have a copyright in the photograph they've taken. The photographer can't use the work without the permission of the artist and of course the artist, if they want, they'll pay the photographer for the photograph and they have to both set out the terms in which they can use the other person's work. It's not that complicated.

Oliver Watts: In our form you can put in co-authorship. Would it be a form of co-authorship?

Robyn Ayres: No, because the artist has the copyright in the underlying work at that the photographer - they could come to an agreement. You can always change the basics of copyright through an agreement. The photographer could agree with the underlying creator and there are some examples of that. I can think of some examples where we've given advice and the artists have come up with a shared copyright agreement. Basic would be copyright in the photograph, copyright in the underlying artwork and you both need permission to use the other's work.

Zan Wimberley: This isn't about me using it, it is about someone else using it and the royalties going there, so if I own the copyright on the photograph and the photograph is being used in the Herald.

Robyn Ayres: You'd have to an agreement with the artist for the work to be used in whatever way it's being used and I'm not going to give advice because I'm in exactly the same position as Oliver but this is exactly the sort of question Arts Law would give you advice on.

Zan Wimberley: It's often not the artist who is commissioning me.

Esther Anatolitis: We're going to have to move along. It goes into something when you're showing your work at a gallery and that gallery brings on a photographer to photograph the work but also the opening then of course the gallery will enter into an agreement with the photographer and also with the artist knowing that, yes, your work will be photographed. These are all the things that we'll need to get in writing, have an agreement on but also to know what our rights are in those particular situations. We will talk about a number of things now, the right to your own work, the context in which it's used in the future, the fact that when it's used in particular contexts, because of the licensing and the associated royalties you have got the right and the opportunity to access that money which can contribute to your income and I think it's a really important thing to try and get our heads around.

Oliver Watts: Yep, and my major point was really we're already - we already known the right to that work. For example, you already had moral rights in that landscaping work that you did. I mean, those rights exist and it's just up to us to make sure that we activate those rights when we can or when we want to but obviously it's not easy. Sometimes we will need help, advocacy bodies like Arts Law which is a national body. Of course, if we all went to Arts Law

they would have bigger offices or more people, wouldn't they? We're all part of this eco system and if we all actually used it then we would make a healthier system. It also goes to what you were saying about the architect institute. I know a lot of architects that don't think that advocacy is strong enough in the face of developers and procurement as well. Nick suggested that that was a perfect case study but I think a lot of the culture is being affected by whatever way you want to put it, the big end of town, let's say, and we need to get together really as the community to see what we're going to do there. But - and I can see lot of people in the room - there are a lot of people that could lead that. There are people here from the larger galleries and are they paying for the digital image rights, for example, or do they need to or how have they organised that? Like, how did they attribute the work? How do university lecturers attribute the work in their PowerPoints do they? Don't they? I have failed at this. When I was lecturing, I don't know if I always attributed. I wasn't aware of it. Only once I was on the board of Copyright Agency did I know about these statutory licences. It was quite recent, it has only been the last few years so I can be forgiven and you guys can be forgiven and absolved as well but we do have to take them on and say come on.

Esther Anatolitis: Exactly. I would love to hear some questions from ARIs particularly because we didn't get to hear from a lot of ARIs in the previous discussion. I particularly want to hear questions from ARIs about something we often talk about at NAVA is that people who are actively involved in ARIs tend to be the ones who are up holding artists' right more strongly and clearly than other institutions and its partly because you're artists, partly because you're wanting to, as we said earlier, the structures and frameworks and tactics that actually push and develop the idea. Are there any ARIs here who want to ask a question or give us an example of challenging or fighting or defending artists' rights in the way that you've set up your decision making or your structures? Or even some recent examples of lately. Anyone from any ARI? Yes, just over there.

Alex Hullah: This is a very particular example without talking about some of the more complex stuff of what's important in an ARI and how they see copyright but the arts organisations I have worked with, not necessarily the high-end ones, are worse in trying to convince that following these processes - remembering to follow these processes are useful. Last year I was involved in an ARI space and when you're involved in an ARI space you're generally involved in a number of community spaces and there's a local festival that runs every year in Alice Springs and last year when I went back I realised they'd taken - I previously developed a concept for the festival and it would be used just for that particular festival. Last year I went up and they'd taken that image and reused it from the back catalogue without attribution and I guess trying to tie this back into what might be important for an artist that works in an artist-run space or with those processes when perhaps you're not necessarily motivated by the commercial gains you might get in establishing these relationships, which I wasn't but I was disenfranchised from the decision making around that image by an arts organisation that made it starkly clear there was dysfunction within the eco system. I was trying to convince someone in council that these were important rights to adhere to. I also noticed this year that particular organisation is struggling to attribute images to artists during that particular festival. When I noticed this on Instagram last week, I wrote to them from Art Law, from an ARI perspective of a young artist, I'm still a little bit unsure as to what NAVA and Arts Law can do to us. I think it's fledgling at the moment and quite hopeful. I feel quite empowered in referring this organisation to look at something and say, "This is the standard," it isn't just me complaining because I don't want money, I just want some power in decision making.

Oliver Watts: Yeah, and recognition, yeah.

Alex Hullah: Maybe not even recognition because I think there's something about making work, particularly in public spaces, that artists refer to other artists' work that might tap into a cultural Commons which is, I think, not really about commercial gains.

Oliver Watts: I meant more broadly. More cultural recognition, but yeah.

Esther Anatolitis: I think you've touched on a number of really important points, in particular when - even though we might not know the full - you know, the letter of the law about something, when we feel that something is wrong, that our rights have been infringed, something has been reused and misattributed et cetera and we have the gut instinct feeling, chances are it's wrong and there are people to get on the phone with, have the conversation and be able to have us speak to whoever it was and make sure that that can change but I think that, in essence, is the great importance of a national network and membership-based organisation because we can't all know every aspect of the Code of Practice. We can't all necessarily be in that position of being our best advocate and defender especially in situations where we're in smaller places and we all know each other, we're worried about misunderstanding and so on and especially when we see ourselves in that position of, oh, they're going to think I'm complaining. These aren't personal things. These are the basics of our rights and all of those basics build to that critical mass that makes a way of working that's fair for everyone. So important. Thank you for raising that example. There's another one that was down here.

Di Taylor: Hi. Di Taylor again from WA. I came specifically all the way from Perth to try and bring something out of 45 years worth of practice as a professional artist to the Code of ethics and in the practice that I have across Australia as well as US, I find that the biggest thing we have to protect ourselves from - and Oliver, you might be able to help with this - is can we put into the Code of ethics something that defines for the consumer what is an original work in any genre of the arts, what is an original work and what isn't? It is becoming, with the digital work, an increasing part of the market and reproductions in China, a bigger confusion. The secondary market will fail because of it if we don't be careful in the next couple of years because it will become obvious in the secondary market because of instability of unarchival work, if we don't do something to protect the authenticity of an original piece, a one-off piece of original artwork and maybe put something that defines that into our systems as a Code of Practice, our industry is going to suffer more and more.

Oliver Watts: There's a lot of - what I would just say is that there are lots of rights and lots of ways of looking at that ethics. One of them is legal but we are talking about the legal a lot but it's not the only set of rights that we have. There is like a common-sense thing of, you know, not telling you when your work was being done, like, yes, that's against our legal right but also just not a very kind thing to do.

Esther Anatolitis: Like Peter White showed on the slide earlier, just be a good person, then we also need frameworks to support being a good person. Some people need guidance in being good.

Oliver Watts: The legal answer to that is there's legal case law on what constitutes an original work and all over the world -

Di Taylor: Can we put it in a Code of ethics?

Oliver Watts: Well -

Penelope Benton: This actually came up as a dispute in another office last year when someone called, there was a print-making - no, there was an art competition, art prize, and print-making was excluded because it was considered to not be original. We were looking for a definition of what is a print and how to define a print when a print is an original and when a print is a reproduction. We have had conversations and noted that is something to address in the Code.

Oliver Watts: OK.

Esther Anatolitis: That's pretty interesting.

Oliver Watts: I just would be wary where people tell you to waive things. That's something I want to - like when we all go in to art prizes that say, "By the way, we're going to use this for advertising," but does then advertising mean advertising the prize or mean you can be used on the sponsor's wine? Because that's also part of the advertising of the prize. These are the sorts of things we need to be really vigilant around and just look where the usage is Something with moral rights and reproducibility, for example, if somebody puts something on a tea towel or on a coffee cup, obviously that printing is not going to be at such a high level as if it's done as a proper print and is that - for you, is that going to be against your moral rights or not? Is that something you're willing to live with, to have it on a coffee cup, or is that going to destroy the quality and essence of your artwork? They're the sorts of questions - and I think they are legal questions or in Australia and in the West they're framed as legal questions but they're also just questions for the arts community in general but there's never a straight answer and as I think we've mentioned before, we don't all the money to pursue the case. The question was: What can Arts Law and NAVA do? Well, they can't pursue every precedent in a case. I don't know what the figures are but not every case can be pursued and then cases that are pursued sometimes you get nominal damages and you don't get that money back. There's a risk in all of these things. I think the answer is probably something that's extra legal which is just to make sure the culture and the ecosystem are very strong and robust so that we don't actually have to take things to court, so that we can turn around and say, "Here's the Code of ethics. If you want to talk to Arts Law about it you can. Can we come to some compromise without going to court, really?" That's where we want to be.

Esther Anatolitis: Gabrielle from Indigenous Art has a question. While we're getting the microphone to you, we need strong Codes of question so that artists don't have to run around defending cases because we don't even get to that point, we try and prevent getting to that point. I think one of the big issues - Robyn is nodding - one of the big issues also goes to Di's question and as Holly and Penelope clarified around prints - the Code of Practice has got specific chapters about where transactions take place, about where a work is used, about the particular contract that an artist is getting into. Just as I was saying before, and the question about we can't, and we're not going to regulate, how a work of art is defined. We're not purporting to regulate the way artistic practice works but we certainly want to strengthen the way in which artists exchange, transact, get into contracts and so on. So that question of what constitutes on original work we have to make sure that what an artist is contracted for whatever purpose, particularly when it's about commissioning, particularly when it's about entering a competition, that the work is clearly defined. This leads on from the question around public art. This is the work now, how is it going to be maintained and claimed into the future? If it's about a print, if it's about a work that's being commissioned that doesn't yet exist, how do we define it so the artistic intent is maintained throughout the making

process so we get to the end and the commissioner doesn't say, "That's not what I wanted." It is in the context where right are upheld or otherwise that we have to be able to act. Gabrielle's got a point. There might have been another one down here. The lady who's stand standing.

Gabrielle Sullivan: I think you both covered it. It is about being preventative. Since launching the fake art campaign with Copyright Agency and Arts Law, the number of issues brought about fake art, they're about appalling licensing arrangements that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander artists have entered into and I think what we've learned from that is just because something's legal doesn't mean it's fair.

Oliver Watts: That's right.

Gabrielle Sullivan: The law can't always fix that and there are so many Indigenous artists that are in the most appalling licensing arrangements but they entered into agreements and it's very hard, even with the best legal advice that money doesn't even need to buy, with Arts Law's assistance, there isn't a lot they can always do about it and then what that does to the supply chain for all of us knowing that there are these products and merchandise and other things out there that there is a legal agreement that the artist - the arrangement is terrible and there's not a whole lot that can be done short of me getting scared of defamation every day for maybe saying things about particular businesses that aren't doing the right thing. So be preventative. Takes a lot less time to go to Arts Law in the first instance, or Copyright Agency, than to end up with something shocking that you might not be able to do anything about.

Esther Anatolitis: Hear, hear! Thank you. We have got a question here. Then we have a question there.

Speaker: Just something practical because this has made me decide the next board meeting we're going to have a review of our copyright practices and maybe talk to our artists or maybe try to get a workshop organised so that they're far more aware of what their rights are. At just a very, very basic level, one of the things for me that just is problematic from what you've been raising is we have an opening, I will go round and talk to the artists and I might take pictures and ask them if it's OK to post them on Instagram in terms of our site and they will be attributed but sometimes it is an extract rather than the full image, for instance. OK, so far that sounds like it's OK because they're agreeing but what happens then once that is on Instagram and what occurs with the transference of an image after that process because then there's no control over it whatsoever, surely.

Oliver Watts: It is the choice of - obviously, a lot of artists use Instagram. I use Instagram. We have sort of given over some of that control but we haven't given over our copyright and it's up to us - there's lots of examples but Instagram changed their policy recently, years ago.

Robyn Ayres: Richard Prince is in America remember, we don’t want that in Australia.

Esther Anatolitis: It’s an example of where an artist's work was repurposed.

Oliver Watts: Taken off Instagram straight away.

Esther Anatolitis: In a way that the artist would in no way approve of, did not approve of, because in the US they have the so-called fair-use approach, courts deemed that was appropriate. Google - what was the name of the work?

Oliver Watts: There was a number.

Esther Anatolitis: A whole series and it involved First Nations people and the conditions in which they had been photographed. This is not good.

Robyn Ayres: They are different cases, one was the Instagram case and then taking a photograher's work and Richard Prince blew them up and put fluro guitars. Both of those cases were under fair use and they were ok, but that couldn't happen in Australia because we don't have fair use and we don't want fair use.

Esther Anatolitis: Absolutely. Thank you, Robyn. Another question.

Zoya Godoroja-Prieckaerts: Mine is not a question. I am going to make a statement.

Esther Anatolitis: Remember, if you lift your voice at the end it becomes a question.

Zoya Godoroja-Prieckaerts: This is a shout out to ARIs in terms of the preventative side of things. We've recently done a bunch of policies and procedures and found they're incredibly helpful despite how horrible they are to write and I guess I wanted to say to all the ARIs and anyone wanting to start an ARI I'm more than happy to share them and as people have done for me and I think that's just good to know, that we can work together.

Esther Anatolitis: So great because once you've gone through that process - and you're right, I is not the easiest, most fun thing in the world, because you really want to get it right. You can imagine the years of work that went into the Code in the first place and we are going to put years of work into the revision but you want it to be the best use to so many people so thank you for offering that. That is really fantastic. Olly, were you going to say - no. We have time for maybe one more question and the lady who had her hand up earlier.

Speaker: Hi. I'm thinking about -

Esther Anatolitis: Put the microphone really close to your mouth.

Speaker: I'm think about the two things. One, the photography case, the Hope image, which was so instrumental in garnering support during Obama's campaign and there was a huge court case in America and my understanding is that it was sampled from the Internet or appropriated, and that the artist who used the photograph didn't attribute and had to pay a huge - when it was discovered, had to pay a huge damage bill so it looks like there is some redress in the US over this taking of images from the Internet. The other thing is, as a sometimes print-maker, I have a real problem with the word "lithography" because photographic lithography means you can get everything from Picassos and all sorts of things that are so-called lithographs that the public is having the wool pulled over their eyes. They think this has come off a press, has been pulled by the artist et cetera and they're getting prices tat for original and contemporary print-makers are not able to attract. One of my lithographs the other day, I put it in a bath of water and because the quality of the ink and the process, that was fine. It was in a complete bath of water. You take it out, make sure you put something heavy on it and it's still fine. The photographic lithographic crap that is being sold

on the Internet for huge sums of money, I think it's an issue that - what's happening is poor old printers are getting a bad reputation because of the shonky practitioners. It's just something that, you know, this definition of what is an art print, what is just crap needs to be done.

Oliver Watts: I think that is less a legal question. It is a question for us as a community to explain that.

Speaker: The problem is because there are so many of these crappy things out there now, in about five years people who have - I'm thinking back to the 2000 Olympics, OK, I saw in Sydney a huge shop of photographs that were signed, limited edition photograph print of artwork. People bought these limited-edition prints thinking, "This has got some quality." If you look at these prints now, as I have, they're all purple and blue and they're crap. So what will happen is in 10 years what's been bought today will deteriorate and the reputation of artists per se will go down the toilet. We have to keep up our standards and I'm really sick of going to markets where people are selling photographic prints as art prints because they're wrecking the reputation of many of us.

Oliver Watts: I agree with that. I think what the whole point of this session really is, is that we can use whatever mechanism we have, whether they're legal mechanisms, cultural mechanisms, Government policy mechanisms to leverage the respect and understanding of the art community to the best we can. I think my point is really that all of us here have to use all are those mechanisms at our disposal, make ourselves aware of what the mechanisms are so that we can use them, Arts Law is waiting for our call, NAVA's waiting to help us with the Code of Practice and we all have to make sure that we're part of that system.

Esther Anatolitis: I think also something that you touched on which a lot of us have had a lot of different conversations about over the years and particularly I'm thinking of some years ago I used to run Craft Victoria, a place with a gallery and a shop and also does support professional services for makers and designers and because up until that time the most time I had spent in a shop where I could find the work of a maker was as a buyer and not as a seller, I was just not used to, not ready for the number of conversations my colleagues and I were having every day with people who walked in and said, "Why is that so expensive?" I can get this from main mass-produced shops and supermarkets for this price. At first it can be, you know, your heart sinks a little but they haven't quite understood what this work actually is. You inhale, take the deep breath and go this is an opportunity to talk to someone about what craft practice is, what it means to make something, what it means to ask a question about where the material comes from, what's the longevity of the object, what's the role of objects in our lives in cultural practice or think about the fake art campaign mentioned earlier. All the questions we need to ask when we're buying the work that says it is Aboriginal or Aboriginal style, who made it? In what conditions? Were they connected with an Aboriginal arts centre? Did the artists sign a contract in a language they understood? What's the connection between the person selling you this and the place, the context in which the work was made for the first time? All of these questions are not just about all of us and our livelihoods and careers, they're about our past and the future of our nation. How do we make things? Why do we make things? Why do we make work? How do we create meaning through the way that we practice our culture, our art form, the rigour we develop through our practice, through university? These are all the conversations that if we're engaged in them every day that's actually how we - not just how we create the future but how we change the world. So, of course we're going to be exasperated having those conversations and that's where we draw on one another, but the more we have exactly those conversations , the better

advocates we are about the broader ethics of what those objects underlie. Why are we not protecting the environment by thinking about the objects we're making and throwing every day? Why are we not understanding that we're sitting on land whose sovereignty was never ceded? All of this is why we're here and why we're in this together. It's why we need a Code to support the transactions but it is also why we need the confidence of ourselves and each other to have these conversations about our rights. We're going to thank Oli in a sec but there's a lot I've got to tell you about this afternoon and tomorrow. Some of it's a bit boring but it is really important. So, first of all I'll cut to the fun part. We're going to have drinks at 5:30 downstairs which will be really fantastic. I want to thank the Copyright Agency really explicitly because if it wasn't for them and their investment in these two days it really couldn't have happened. A big round of applause for the Copyright Agency. (Applause) Thank you so, so very much. Tomorrow we're going to be at Parliament House. Parliament House, for those who remember Old Parliament House and new Parliament House, Old Parliament House, as I can remember with the amnesia that settles in at just over my age, was that wonderland where you could just walk in, you'd run into politicians, have a chat because the two Houses faced each other but now you've got this other thing with new Parliament House and with the wall that's gone up, there's renovations happening, there is a massive security palaver to get into Parliament House in the first place. We have had to, as we let you know in the emails, we've had to provide everyone's names ahead of time tomorrow. There is a security check to go through which is basically like going through the X-ray thing at the airport. To get your pass to get in, you will need photo ID so please have that, find that, when you go through the thing have it ready because it is going to take us ages to get in and we want to be able to start on time. There's going to be tea and coffee served from 8:00 in the morning which is fantastic and we want to start on time at 9 so please imagine you're getting on some really exciting international flight, you're going to get there early, show your ID and get in and then we will get to start because we've got such a great day tomorrow. We're going to start summing up about today. We've covered so much today and Penelope and I are going to give a bit of a summary of what we talked about. We're going to hear from Justine van Mourik who is the curator of the Parliament House collection, to hear about the role of visual cart in Parliament House. She said something really - of visual art in Parliament House, and she said something fantastic and I hope she says it tomorrow, we've got almost an unfair advantage in the visual arts and contemporary arts when it comes to Parliament House in that we are in everyone's offices and no other art form is. They have to go through a process of deciding, requesting which works they request from the collection, there are also MPs who've got the works from their own collection in their offices. Of course there is the work that is around parliament and at the end of the day tomorrow with thanks to Parliament House, they're bringing forward the opening of an exhibition called Facade so we can be part of the opening and Facade is an exhibition where the artists are responding to the Parliament House, the building that is Parliament House itself.

Penelope Benton: I have been requested to mention it is not an opening, it is a preview.

Esther Anatolitis: It is not an opening at all. (Laughter) no, no, no, it is a preview which, as we know, is even better. They're going to have a sneak exclusive wonderful fantastic preview of this exhibition Facade which is tomorrow which in no way is going to detract from the actual opening which we will totally go to if we possibly can. That is a preview - thank you, Penelope - at 5:30 tomorrow so bring your ID. Have some kind of photo ID to get in. From 8:00 in the morning, we want to start at 9:00. Now I'm going to ask you a personal favour about tomorrow. Minister Fifield is going to come and have a chat with us about 10, basically welcome us into Parliament House. It is a sitting day tomorrow so there are going to be other MPs who will pop in at lunchtime, we'll get to say hello and Senator Fifield being obviously

the leader of the House in the Senate can't exactly be specific about what time he's going to be able to come so he's saying 10:00 but he might pop in at another time and it's really great he's doing that because we need him to be engaged with the most important national conversations that are happening in the arts and the fact that, as far as we know, there's not been this many artists at Parliament House for some time, not for the reason we're gathering. My personal favour is a number of times Minister Fifield has attended things recently, as soon as he's turned up he's been booed. I think we've got a boo-er in the audience. We're frustrate would policies and we want to express that but what we really want to do with our Minister for the arts tomorrow is raise the bar. We want him to be in this space and know with absolute confidence that these are the people, these are the artists I want to be speaking to and learning from. 3 the people I want to be having - these are the people I want to be having conversations with to inform the next arts policy or program or funding. These are the people who I want to say to my fellow MPs in their electorates, hey, did you know so and so has got a show opening soon? Did you know this artist-run space has been in your electorate for the past two decades. We want to, regardless of our legitimate frustrations with where funding has gone, we want this Minister to be empowered to seek us out and get our advice and understand this is where the expertise in the sector lies. My personal favour is don't boo him and think about the impression that we want him to have and the relationship that NAVA needs to be able to build so that we can have exactly the conversations we have been talking about all day and we'll talk about tomorrow in thinking about the politics of policy change let's raise the bar for everyone who sin a position of decision-making authority to take the arts seriously and to do more than that, to make it their responsibility and their legacy to do something really, really substantial in the arts. So, from 8am tomorrow - thank you (Applause) We're all in this together. Tea and coffee from 8 in the morning. We have got a good - really great actually - set of speakers tomorrow but not only that, Kelli McCluskey from pvi collective who has been indicated through the pointing of fingers over there is going to lead us through a big participatory live-action board game that is going to involve five players who are still secret but they're in this room, also going to involve all of us so that in that way, in us playing a game together we get a sense of the real practicalities of the politics of policy change, not just policy but the media and issues as they arise and being in the Government or opposition and having to engage and having to think fast and think on our feet. So that's going to be tomorrow after we've heard from Justine van Mourik about the collection. We are then going to have lunch, talk to MPs who'll visit. Then Abdul Abdullah and I are going to have a chat that involves all of you about how to redress inequity, how we really make practical changes and ear we're going to end with a really practical set of tools about navigating the political structures and also the media. We're going to hear from Michaela Boland who is an ABC journalist formerly with 'The Australian' and from Nicholas Pickard who is a former Government adviser, has formerly worked with the Copyright Agency and is now with APRA AMCOS and some really hands-on stuff there about how we can implement a lot of the things we have been talking about and then we will do some summing up at the end. Thank you, everyone, for coming, for being here, for being generous enough to participate so far. I know we've had a lot of conversations that in the interests of the time we have had to cut short so please pick those up again now over a good drink together and we will make sure that we continue them tomorrow. Thank you to everyone who has spoken today and thank you again to Oli. See you downstairs for a drink and tomorrow 8am at Parliament House.

(Applause)