

Creating a profile: reworking ‘community’ at Footscray Community Arts Centre

Rimi Khan

Abstract

The recent history of Footscray Community Arts Centre, based in Melbourne, Australia, reveals a significant shift in focus: from its traditional emphasis on engaging with local ‘community’, to addressing the ‘community’ of the professional artsworld. In trying to lift its organisational profile, FCAC has reconstituted the sorts of community arts activities it undertakes – namely, by privileging ‘artistic outcomes of excellence’, and narrowing the sorts of ‘community engagement’ it facilitates. This is partially a response to arts policy changes in the last decade, but is also due to the problematic nature of community arts itself – particularly, the expansive nature of the term ‘community’, and the resultant need to limit the types of community arts activity the organisation oversees. These dual imperatives – to engage with the ‘local community’, and to build an organisational profile within the arts sector – situate FCAC in a difficult conceptual and practical space.

Keywords: community arts; community; Footscray; ‘quality arts’; arts policy.

Introduction

‘Community’ and ‘culture’ are totally contested words. ‘Art’ is also a contested word, and so is ‘development’. So you always have to deal with that. My personal belief is that a community arts or CCD organisation sits in a really difficult place ... [I]t’s always in a really dodgy area between all these words and their definitions. This makes it the most interesting area too. You can’t get away with not having to deal with any of those words, because you’re actually dealing with stuff that’s happening on the ground with real people’.¹

In the future, our focus will continue to be on that ever-evasive word ‘community’ while contributing to wider arts practice through initiating, developing and presenting the best possible work within this context.²

This paper examines the difficulties in pursuing a community arts agenda via an analysis of recent organisational changes that have taken place at Footscray Community Arts Centre (FCAC), based in Melbourne, Australia. Interviews with current and past staff and board members of the organisation, as well as reviews of annual reports and other program documentation, have helped to construct a partial history of the Centre. This has revealed much about the Centre's changing approaches to community arts practice, the shifting agendas and priorities informing its work, and the terms in which these changes are justified by the Centre's decision-makers.

In the last fifteen or so years, FCAC has shifted its focus from an emphasis on engagement with the 'community' of Melbourne's western suburbs, its traditional constituency, to a different kind of 'community' – that of professional artists and arts policymakers. While its stated mission is to lift the region's profile by working 'with the communities of Melbourne's West'³, this frequently amounts to lifting the profile of *the organisation* in the context of the broader arts sector.

It is this latter imperative which motivates much of the cultural practice that the Centre facilitates. In trying to improve its organisational positioning FCAC has controversially reconstituted the sorts of community arts activities it undertakes – namely, by privileging art and 'artistic outcomes of excellence' over other kinds of cultural practice, narrowing the breadth of 'community' with which it engages, and limiting the sorts of autonomy that community participants are granted. It is argued that this is partially a response to policy changes in the Australian community cultural development (CCD) sector in the last decade. However, it is also due to the problematic nature of the notion of community arts itself. In particular, it is a result of the dilemmas raised by the expansive nature of the term 'community', and the resultant need to draw parameters around the community-based arts practice the organisation sees itself as responsible for. These dual imperatives – to engage with the 'local community', and to build an organisational profile within the arts sector – situate FCAC in a difficult conceptual and practical space.

From 'culture' to 'art': contextualising community arts

In accounting for the changes that have taken place at FCAC it is worth thinking about the terms in which community arts has traditionally been defined. Gay Hawkins' *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras* provides a useful history of the development of community arts in Australia, particularly as a policy formation of the Federal government.⁴ The Community Arts Board (which went on to become the Community Cultural Development Board) of the Australia Council, Australia's peak arts funding body, was responsible for setting the terms on which community arts projects were funded and evaluated, and has also, historically, been FCAC's biggest funder. In a review of projects commissioned by the CCD Board of the Australia Council, Mills and Brown describe community cultural development as: 'the

collaborative and empowering processes by which participants engage with creative activity'.⁵ Importantly, these processes are participatory, and Mills and Brown, in their discussion of some of the impacts of CCD, emphasise the potential of these processes to achieve 'active citizenship' and 'to foster the greater involvement of citizens in government processes'.⁶ These processes are also envisaged as collaborative ones – the relationship between the community participant and the artist is seen as 'a partnership rather than the "expert" sharing with the "amateur"'.⁷

The breadth of the notion of 'cultural development' is significant here. It means that the sorts of activities brought together under the rubric of community cultural development are wide-ranging, involving 'visual arts, film and video, writing, oral history and storytelling ... public art to festivals, theatre and dance performances, exhibitions, publications and seminars'.⁸ There is also much speculation on the scope of CCD's outcomes – both in Australian and international discussions of community arts – which are believed to include artistic, social, economic, psychological, educational, and environmental benefits.⁹ It is these impacts of community-based arts, particularly in the context of a perceived 'loss' of 'community' in an increasingly globalised world, which informs influential texts such as Adams and Goldbard's edited collection, *Community, culture and globalization*.

In Jon Hawkes' influential work, *The fourth pillar of sustainability*, it is the ubiquity of the term 'culture' that makes it strategic to policy development: 'it brings together a range of concepts and issues that have, thus far, developed in parallel: wellbeing, cohesion, capacity, engagement, belonging, distinctiveness'.¹⁰ Yet, he argues, cultural policy development in Australia has tended to be limited to arts policy and 'the main focus has been on the role the arts can play'.¹¹ This slippage between 'culture' and 'arts' is important and, as we will see, it has historically enabled, yet complicated, the work of FCAC. It is also this tension between community arts' traditionally broad social agenda and the practical necessity of setting limits that informs the current dilemmas facing FCAC.

Expanding community arts at Footscray

Footscray Community Arts Centre was established in 1974 by the secretary of the local meatworkers' union, and it was oriented, largely, towards bringing the arts to working people. The Centre set out to service Melbourne's western suburbs, so 'community' was defined geographically; however, this eventually expanded to servicing other 'communities' that were defined in terms of their perceived cultural marginality. As Hawkins points out, in policy terms, 'community implied diversity', and one of the effects of the Australia Council's Community Arts Program was to generate 'a proliferation of new constituencies', ultimately compelling a recognition of cultural difference.¹² Throughout the 1980s the Centre worked with young people, women, disabled people and, with the appointment of one

of Australia's first 'ethnic arts officers', it began working with some of Footscray's diverse ethnic communities. One staff member describes this time as an experimental period – both for FCAC and for arts policymakers. The main aims of the Centre were, he says, 'what we now call community development'.¹³ But at the time:

We had to work out a philosophy on where we fitted because it was all changing so quickly ... We didn't have the vocabulary. Because it was all being made up. And the thing was, from the funding authorities' point of view, we were useful as a place to experiment.¹⁴

Such an extensive scope gave FCAC the flexibility to work with a range of groups in a variety of contexts – both at the Centre and in the form of outreach work.

Many of those associated with FCAC during those years believe that one of the strengths of this ad hoc approach was that it gave the Centre a certain flexibility and responsiveness. The Centre's artsworkers were granted a significant degree of autonomy. Over time, and into the 1990s, the organisation developed an artform-based structure – where a coordinator was given responsibility for visual arts, music, ethnic or multicultural arts, writing, or theatre – and the Centre developed according to the personal agendas, interests and expertise of each of these coordinators. They brought with them a fairly loose definition of who their constituency was and it depended largely on the relationships people had, or developed, with particular groups in the area. One person suggested that this organic approach meant that, 'people actually came to us and said, I've got this good idea, does it work? Can it fit in here? So people were actually coming to us with ideas'.¹⁵ So groups came in and set their own agendas, and the Centre was able to respond to these demands in various ways.

By the early 1990s FCAC was growing at an unprecedented rate. In the Centre's own view they were regarded 'as a major organisation by State and Federal funding bodies', and were offered triennial funding from Arts Victoria.¹⁶ The 1994 *Annual report* outlines ten aims for the Centre, including facilitating a 'diverse and vital Australian culture', providing access and enhancing people's 'appreciation of the arts', encouraging group participation and autonomy, artistic excellence, and driving social change.¹⁷ There was a sense that these varied goals were in fact quite commensurable – they reflected the conceptual frame implied by the definitions of community arts referred to above – and it was felt that the Centre was appropriately positioned to pursue them.

It might be suggested that the development of the Centre at this time took place in a somewhat unstructured way. In addition to the Centre's main organisational goals, each artform department also had its own set of aims, and the relationship between these specific objectives and the Centre's overall vision was never clearly articulated. The aims of the multicultural

arts department and gallery included developing a base for multicultural arts in 'the West', providing access for 'Non-English Speaking Background'¹⁸ people to the arts, and promoting cultural exchange; the goals of the theatre department encompassed exploring a diversity of community theatre models, responding to issues of social justice, and creating high-standard theatrical works; the music department aimed to 'challenge populist views of music', to encourage music appreciation and participation and develop cross-artform exchanges.¹⁹ There were also writing, visual arts, adult training and women's circus programs, each with their own aims and agendas.

As well as the ambitiousness of its conceptual scope, the Centre also spread its resources broadly – in 1994, 27 resident art groups and 57 other arts and community groups used their facilities regularly.²⁰ As their funding base grew over the next few years, so too did the numbers of groups and projects they became involved with. By 1998 the organisation reported that 93,000 people had visited the Centre as participants or observers of events or classes in that year.²¹ By 2002 the expansion of Centre's activities meant that it struggled to contain operations within its budget, and it started to face financial difficulties. Finally, in 2003 the Centre was put 'on notice' by the Australia Council, who stated their intention to terminate the triennial funding they had been awarding the Centre since 1997. By this stage, funding from the CCD Board of the Australia Council amounted to almost \$200,000 per annum²²; losing this funding meant that the Centre would have to do without a critical component of its operational and programming budget. The Centre was in crisis and was forced to undergo a difficult process of overhaul and restructure, including the redundancies of a number of long-term program staff.

Addressing the crisis: responding to policy

Some of those involved with the Centre at the time provide a number of insights into how this situation came about, and the effect of this crisis on the subsequent development of the Centre. To some extent, it is argued, the process of upheaval that was forced upon the Centre was a necessary result of broader policy changes and trends. I will also suggest, however, that the redefinition of the Centre's priorities that took place was a response to the problematic nature of community arts itself, and how it had traditionally been put into practice throughout much of the Centre's history.

In 2004, as mentioned, Footscray Community Arts Centre lost its core triennial funding from the CCD Board of the Australia Council. While the reasons for this were never made completely explicit, it was obvious that the Centre had become dependent on funding from a body whose basic funding criteria they were perceived to be no longer meeting. There is a general sense among Centre staff that, in pursuing its ideal vision of community arts, the Centre did not have a clear sense of its own purpose, and so could not make itself accountable. A major renovation and building project, which had been a focus of the Centre's efforts for the last four or five years, and

for which the Centre had raised over one million dollars²³, had also been forcibly abandoned, leaving the Centre looking directionless and ineffectual. As a consequence of the funding crisis, an internal organisational review was conducted, resulting in 59 recommendations to streamline the Centre's financial processes, restructure the board and management, and to develop a coherent business plan, artistic vision and more unified 'corporate image'.

These changes were largely prompted by broader policy shifts of the time. A month after the Centre lost its funding, the CCD Board of the Australia Council was also defunded, and it was clear that the language of community cultural development, at least in the context of federal arts policy, had fallen out of favour. In Australia, debates in the arts have been caught between economic and humanistic rationales, at least since the mid 1970s.²⁴ Lisanne Gibson offers a useful description of government's gradual withdrawal from direct funding, and the 'attendant pressure on cultural organisations to develop practices which will enable them to be economically self-sustaining'.²⁵ It could be speculated that community arts, as it was traditionally envisaged and practiced by FCAC, did not meet the expectations of professionalism and accountability that were being increasingly required.

The Centre went on to remodel itself before new funding criteria had been set for it by the (then yet to be formed) Community Partnerships Program of the Australia Council. Over the next two or three years, the recommendations of the Centre's internal review were put in to place, and there was a complete turnover of the board. The Centre eventually became one of only two arts organisations in Victoria to return to triennial funding from the Australia Council, and named as one of eleven 'key producers' of the Community Partnerships Program – suggesting that it had, in some respects, preempted the Committee's new funding priorities. These changes, as I will go on to explain, had significant implications for the parameters the Centre set around its work and, ultimately, its conceptualisation of 'community arts'.

Re-evaluating (the arts) 'community'

Historically, FCAC had given community members relatively free rein over use of the Centre's space, with a view to affording these participants a sense of ownership over the Centre's activities. By the late 1990s some of the groups involved with the Centre were developing a significant local reputation. Groups such as the Women's Circus and Vietnamese Youth Media were considered a success not only because they produced dynamic, locally relevant art but, for many at the Centre, they exemplified one of FCAC's key objectives at the time: to 'encourage democracy, self-sufficiency and eventual independence' of community groups.²⁶ These groups demonstrated the potential of community arts as it was traditionally envisioned – as a space for authentic and empowering community engagement.

Over time, however, this also presented the Centre with a significant dilemma. As some staff members reported, it meant that the space was being used for objectives that were not being defined or determined by the organisation. The Centre became bound by its pre-existing obligations to these groups, preventing them from establishing new relationships or directions. Negotiating these relationships was also time- and resource-consuming, and all of this had the effect of limiting other possibilities for the Centre. Some at the Centre believed that in trying to be all things to all people, it had lost a sense of its own artistic objectives and was no longer able to set its own agenda. According to one past staff member:

The centre ... evolved without a clear vision of a whole ... I think that it was a great thing, in some ways, and there were some great people [working there], and fantastic things happened but I think in terms of being an identity that had a vision and basically could compete in ... the current funding and social sort of climate, it just needed to be better at articulating a unified vision.²⁷

He goes on to say that while the old model of community engagement practiced at FCAC meant that 'brilliant things happened', it was ultimately 'not sustainable'.²⁸

Throughout much of FCAC's history there have been two forms of 'community' underpinning its agenda, and to whom the Centre's activities were targeted. One 'community' was the people of the western suburbs of Melbourne, who comprised the participants and audience members of the Centre's programs (including, of course, smaller sub-groups, defined along lines of ethnicity, gender, age or ability, that made up this larger community). The other was the arts sector itself – that is, the 'community' of professional artists and policymakers who were involved in the programs themselves, as funders or as artists, and who provided an ongoing point of reference for the development of the Centre's vision.²⁹ As the organisation's Chair states in the 1999 *Annual report*, the Centre had a role 'in the delivering of creative opportunities within our immediate community and throughout the community arts movement nationally'.³⁰ What this demonstrates is an awareness of the context of reception of the Centre's activity – that it worked not just to meet the local community's needs but also sought the continual affirmation of the wider community arts sector.

It is possible to read the crisis at FCAC, then, as a partial result of the Centre's historical privileging of the needs of the local community of arts participants over the 'needs' of the arts sector. In addressing this crisis, one of FCAC's key strategies was to redress this balance by improving its standing within the broader arts establishment. The dissolution of the Australia Council's CCD Board also cleared a space for FCAC to recast itself as an *arts* organisation, rather than as a community cultural development organisation. This has had a number of continuing impacts on the Centre's work: it has meant a shift away from local priorities and a narrowing of

its participant base within the community. It has also entailed a renewed emphasis on the production of artistic 'excellence', which has ultimately limited the autonomy of program participants.

From community art to 'quality' art

With the name 'Footscray' in its title, and having received more or less continuous program funding from the City of Maribyrnong local council, the Centre has always defined its constituency geographically, as Melbourne's western suburbs. 'The West' has historically been seen as culturally 'disadvantaged', or at least 'marginal', and one of the aims of the Centre was to bring opportunities for creative expression and participation to these communities, reducing its sense of isolation from what it perceived as the cultural mainstream. More recently, however, there has been a discernible move away from the local. Several ex-staff and board members commented that during the period of upheaval five or so years ago, there was some discussion over whether to even keep 'Footscray' in the Centre's name. It was thought by some that the Centre's association with the western suburbs no longer brought the Centre credibility, and would not help it to build a strong regional and national profile.

There are now, also, fewer locally based people on the organisation's board, and while the Centre continues to work with schools, there is substantially less outreach work undertaken with some of the further reaches of the West. One past board member believes that the organisation does not, 'interact with the local community terribly well. If you ask a cross-section of people, even a mile from here, many of them would not know where the arts centre is'.³¹ Also, while there is considerable focus on the changing cultural diversity of the area, there is less acknowledgment of the socio-economic disadvantages of the region. The Centre was originally founded to bring art to the working classes but some staff suspect that the Centre's arts workshops and school holiday programs are now priced out of reach for many.

Significantly, the new focus of the Centre, rather than being about servicing cultural 'needs' or 'disadvantage', is about being an arts producer. As a recent Operations Manager explains:

From an artistic point of view what we did was we set in place a curatorial framework, so we said, well, what can we do and what can't we do. Because I think there was an expectation that the organisation would be all things to all people ... I suppose we moved towards more emphasis on producing our own work and working with quality artists in a community context ... and making decisions about what we would support, and wouldn't support, so that it gave our artistic profile, and the things that we were creatively producing, a greater level of rigour, artistic rigour. It allowed us to stand up, rather than to be pigeonholed as a community arts organisation.³²

Maintaining this level of rigour, or artistic quality, requires the Centre to establish criteria for inclusion and exclusion. And it follows that some at FCAC believe that this means narrowing the Centre's participant base. As one past board member said:

To work in a community centre, you have to have some skills to be able to do that. You have to be able to work with other people; it's not a drop-in centre, you have to be motivated to work as a group. So there's probably a lot of misconception about what the Centre does. A lot more people could be using the Centre, but on the other hand there's a limit to how many people can.³³

The need for the Centre to set limits to who participates in its programs, and to reassert the terms on which people actually do participate, has been a significant aspect of the Centre's restructure.

Debates about the place of artistic quality or 'excellence' in community arts are not new. A number of commentators have pointed out the elitist tendencies of the funding category of 'artistic excellence', particularly in an Australian context.³⁴ Whether or not the Centre actually achieves the standard of 'excellence' it sets out to is, of course, a contentious one, and an issue that is not within the scope of this paper to consider. What is worth noting here is the Centre's rationale for aspiring to artistic 'excellence'. It is suggested that the Centre's main motivation here is a desire to move away from instrumentalisation of community arts, which are seen to compromise its more intangible and 'intrinsic' value. However, what tends to go unacknowledged in this renewed emphasis on 'intrinsic' value, is that even this rationale has an instrumental aspect – in this case, to raise the profile of the organisation, including the professional profile of Centre staff, and improve its standing among the wider arts establishment.

Contemporary policy debates about the value of art tend to swing between intrinsic and instrumental justifications for its existence.³⁵ Rationales for community arts have tended towards the latter, but this has had the effect of at times overstating the 'outcomes' of community arts – for example, in enhancing community wellbeing, or promoting social inclusion. Mulligan et al., in their review on literature on the impacts of the arts, demonstrate the difficulty of establishing a clear correlation between arts and community wellbeing, and question the credibility of a number of apparently 'evidence-based' accounts of these connections.³⁶ They suggest that the outcomes of community arts may, in fact, be more modest. Art, they argue, enables people to 'develop narratives of meaning', which in turn might help them to make sense of their world and hopefully provide them with some agency.³⁷ Community arts can still claim to have tangible outcomes – which may be 'multiple, deep and enduring'³⁸ – but it may need to circumscribe the sorts of claims it makes for itself, and acknowledge the complexities of what it can realistically achieve. Emphasising 'the instrumental value of the arts', they argue, 'leaves out a host of more intrinsic values that simply cannot

be understood instrumentally'.³⁹ It is this thinking that seems to underpin FCAC's new emphasis on 'quality arts', and its apparent shift away from its previous 'community cultural development' agenda.

In reorienting itself as an arts producer, the Centre aims to reposition community-based arts in relation to the rest of the arts establishment; to lessen the divide between 'community' arts producers, spaces, and audiences, and 'mainstream' ones. It is believed that this can be achieved by producing 'outstanding art', and by recasting the Centre as an innovative 'contemporary community-based arts producer'.⁴⁰ It was hoped, by the Centre's director at the time of the restructure, that this approach would also transform FCAC's reputation into an organisation that is regarded as desirable for professional artists to work with, and hopefully present new possibilities for the politics of contemporary art. The case could certainly be made that contemporary art is itself on a trajectory where it is calling itself into question, and thus more open to a diversity of forms and themes. While previously, as one artsworker said, 'the snobs wouldn't come near us'⁴¹, the Centre now seeks to encourage an openness to 'community-based art' among the arts establishment; and this might help to shift the class politics of art that have historically positioned community arts on the margins.

Those in the Centre responsible for this new emphasis on producing 'quality art' do not see it as conflicting with their obligations as a community arts organisation. FCAC staff frequently cite *The Go Show* as an example of how the two agendas might be reconciled. The project—a partnership with the Western Bulldogs football team—was structured around a 'cultural tour' of Footscray, and is described as follows in its program:

Welcome to *The GO Show*, a suburb-sized performance around and about the inner West, celebrating the way a shared activity can unite us, inspire us and reveal something significant about us ... As you jump on our *GO Show* bus and venture to Whitten Oval (home of the Western Bulldogs Football Club), Maddern Square (a public space in the Footscray CBD) and Footscray Community Arts Centre (the heart of the arts in the West) you'll be meeting actors, video artists, sound designers, musicians, hip hoppers, cover bands, krumpers, Vovinam practitioners, umpires, historians, sports experts, boat captains, Western Bulldogs fans, professional artists, enthusiastic amateurs and everything in between.⁴²

The show was promoted under the monikers of both 'community' and mainstream contemporary art; it first ran in 2006 and, in 2008, was included as part of the Melbourne International Arts Festival, attracting sell-out audiences. Jerril Rechter, who was director of the Centre during this period, states that one of the 'challenges' of the show was to 'lift' the standard of performance and elevate it from a mere community arts project to something with broader appeal.⁴³ Although there were some participants for whom the show instigated a positive and ongoing involvement with the Centre, this

was not an explicit objective of the program. Rather, the main outcome of the project was the show itself, and the ways in which the performance might shape audience's perceptions of Footscray and, importantly, of the Centre.

The direction of the show entailed the careful management of its diverse performers, including the level and type of their participation. For example, while the program documentation states that the project was 'purposefully inclusive', artists were approached who 'embodied a very specific politic', or 'brought a sensibility appropriate to pushing the work's context and how we engage with artistic experiences'.⁴⁴ While the contributions of *The Go Show's* many participants were allowed to develop with a degree of flexibility, the Centre also had a very specific artistic vision for the show. Rechter states that the conventional belief, that community participants should be able to work with the Centre on their own terms was naïve and 'really problematic' – particularly so, she says, for 'an arts organisation'.⁴⁵ That is, traditional ideas about community participation are considered incompatible with FCAC's contemporary organisational identity. Letting 'the community' set the agenda resulted in a 'passive' mode of community engagement, rather than the more 'proactive' one Rechter regards the Centre to have taken in recent years, and exemplified by the artistic direction of *The Go Show*.⁴⁶

The Centre's key focus at the present moment is the construction of a new performing arts centre at its current Footscray site – and it is somewhat unclear whether this new space is aimed at providing local people with their own dedicated performing arts hub, or whether it is more concerned with attracting people from other parts of the city to the West. It could certainly be argued that the building project is a timely attempt to capitalise on the recent gentrification of some of the western suburbs, and perhaps part of a strategy for building new local and non-local audiences. At the same time, such an initiative, along with the Centre's recent collaborations with the Melbourne International Arts Festival, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, and other non-community arts organisations, are directed at bridging the divide between the city's centre and the West, and between the arts establishment and its margins. It is in this way that the Centre is working to lift the profile and 'esteem' of the people of the western suburbs, while also enhancing its own organisational profile in the context of the broader arts sector.

While the Centre builds its reputation as an 'artistic producer', it continues to negotiate its traditional community cultural development agenda. This is particularly the case because it is still influenced by the assessment criteria of its key funders – not just the Australia Council and Arts Victoria, but non-arts organisations such as Department of Human Services, VicHealth, the City of Maribyrnong, and Adult Community and Further Education. The Centre has to justify its work, and the art it produces, in line with the agendas of these disparate organisations, and this complicates its efforts

to produce 'quality', 'excellent', or 'rigorous' artistic work. One past board member summarises the Centre's predicament:

Look, they haven't changed in one sense, not dramatically. I mean we still want to produce arts, we want to be inclusive, we want to react to our multicultural community, we want to involve as many people as we can, reaching out into the community. I think the change has been that they want to be a little bit more than just a Footscray arts centre. That's my view. They want to be seen as an organisation, certainly in the West, but reaching beyond its current parameters.⁴⁷

It is this dilemma – between 'reaching out into the community' and wanting 'to be seen' as more than a community arts centre – that continues to inform the work of FCAC. In its pursuit to set limits to the type of community engagement it undertakes, the Centre has set itself a new challenge: to be both a community arts centre, and an arts producer of excellence; to be an organisation with local connections and relevance, but also one with a national profile. It remains to be seen how successfully the Centre mediates between these often-conflicting imperatives, and how it goes on to incorporate these agendas into its redefinition of community arts.

Rimi Khan is a PhD candidate in the School of Culture and Communication at the University of Melbourne. She is currently researching the relationship between community and government – specifically, the instrumentalisation of community-based and multicultural arts.

Endnotes

1. D. Everist, personal communication, 26 May 2009.
2. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, Footscray Community Arts Centre, Melbourne, 2003, p.3.
3. Footscray Community Arts Centre, <<http://www.footscrayarts.com/centre/about>>, accessed 26 July 2009.
4. G. Hawkins, *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras: constructing community arts*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993.
5. D. Mills and P. Brown, *Art and wellbeing*, Australia Council for the Arts, Sydney, 2004, p. 6.
6. *ibid*, p. 88.
7. *ibid*, p. 6.
8. *ibid*.
9. See, for example, D. Williams, *Creating social capital: a study of the long-term benefits from community-based arts funding*, Community Arts Network of South Australia, Adelaide, 1996; F. Matarasso, *Use or ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*, Comedia, Stroud, 1997; J. Barraket and A. Kaiser,

Evaluating the mental health and wellbeing impacts of community-based festivals: Awakenings Festival and Braybrook's Big Day Out, VicHealth, Melbourne, 2007; D. Adams and A. Goldbard, eds. *Community, culture and globalization*, Rockefeller Foundation, New York, 2002.

10. J. Hawkes, *The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning*, Common Ground Publishing, Melbourne, 2001, p. 1.
11. *ibid*, p. 7.
12. G. Hawkins, *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras*, p. 23.
13. R. McCracken, personal communication, 27 April 2009.
14. *ibid*.
15. *ibid*.
16. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 1994, p. 5.
17. *ibid*, p. 2.
18. This was a term used in policy discourse to refer to migrants of non-Anglo-Celtic background. It has since been displaced, in an Australian context, by the descriptor 'Culturally and Linguistically Diverse', although they are, arguably, used to refer to the same constituency. See W. McLennan, *Standards for statistics on cultural and language diversity*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, 1999.
19. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, p. 20.
20. *ibid*, p. 34.
21. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 1998, p. 1.
22. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 2003, p. 23.
23. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual Report*, 1999, p. 26.
24. See G. Hawkins for an account of the ways in which the CCD Board had been somewhat institutionally isolated within the Australia Council, primarily because it was not aligned with the agenda of artistic 'excellence' that defined the organisation.
25. L. Gibson, 'Creative industries and cultural development: still the Janus face?', *Media International Australia*, vol. 102, 2002, p. 26.
26. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 1994, p. 5.
27. D. Everist, personal communication, 26 May 2009.
28. *ibid*.
29. See M. Banks, *The politics of cultural work*, Palgrave MacMillan, Houndmills, 2007, p. 106, for an interesting discussion of these associated personnel as 'cultural intermediaries', after Bourdieu, and their role in 'brokering' and negotiating notions of cultural value.
30. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 1999, p. 2 (my emphasis).
31. B. Horrocks, personal communication, 5 May 2009.
32. S. Masters, personal communication, 29 April 2009.
33. C. Brack, personal communication, 20 May 2009.

34. See T. Rowse, *Arguing the arts: the funding of the arts in Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1985; G. Hawkins, *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras*; C. Grostal and G. Harrison, 'Community arts and its relation to multicultural arts', in S. Gunew and F. Rizvi, eds., *Culture, difference and the arts*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1994, pp. 147-64.
35. See E. Belfiore and O. Bennett, *The social impact of the arts: an intellectual history*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, 2008; M. Mulligan, et al., *Creating community: celebrations, arts and wellbeing within and across local communities*, Globalism Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne, 2006.
36. Mulligan, Martin, et al., *Creating community*. See also P. Merli, 'Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities: a critical review of Francois Matarasso's "Use or ornament?"', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2002, pp. 107-118.
37. *ibid*, p. 148.
38. *ibid*, p. 10.
39. *ibid*, p. 30.
40. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, 2006, p. 2.
41. R. McCracken, personal communication, 27 April 2009.
42. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Footscray Community Arts Centre: The Go Show*, Melbourne International Arts Festival, Melbourne, 2008.
43. J. Rechter, personal communication, 22 September 2009.
44. Footscray Community Arts Centre, *The Go Show 2008: artistic report*, Footscray Community Arts Centre, Melbourne, 2008, pp. 1-2.
45. J. Rechter, personal communication, 22 September 2009.
46. *ibid*.
47. B. Horrocks, personal communication, 5 May 2009.

Bibliography

- Adams, D. and A. Goldbard, eds. *Community, culture and globalization*, Rockefeller Foundation, New York, 2002.
- Banks, M., *The politics of cultural work*, Palgrave MacMillan, Houndmills, 2007.
- Barraket, J., and A. Kaiser, *Evaluating the mental health and wellbeing impacts of community-based festivals: Awakenings Festival and Braybrook's Big Day Out*, VicHealth, Melbourne, 2007.
- Belfiore, E. and O. Bennett, *The social impact of the arts: an intellectual history*, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke, 2008.
- Footscray Community Arts Centre, *Annual report*, Footscray Community Arts Centre, Melbourne, 2003.
- Gibson, L., 'Creative industries and cultural development: still the Janus face?', *Media International Australia*, vol. 102, 2002.

- Grostal, C. and G. Harrison, 'Community arts and its relation to multicultural arts', in S. Gunew and F. Rizvi, eds., *Culture, difference and the arts*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1994.
- Hawkes, J., *The fourth pillar of sustainability: culture's essential role in public planning*, Common Ground Publishing, Melbourne, 2001.
- Hawkins, G., *From Nimbin to Mardi Gras: constructing community arts*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993.
- McLennan, W., *Standards for statistics on cultural and language diversity*, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, 1999.
- Matarasso, F., *Use or ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts*, Comedia, Stroud, 1997.
- Merli, P., 'Evaluating the social impact of participation in arts activities: a critical review of Francois Matarasso's "Use or ornament?"', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2002, pp. 107-118.
- Mills, D. and P. Brown, *Art and wellbeing*, Australia Council for the Arts, Sydney, 2004.
- Mulligan, M. et al., *Creating community: celebrations, arts and wellbeing within and across local communities*, Globalism Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne, 2006.
- Rowse, T., *Arguing the arts: the funding of the arts in Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1985.
- Williams, D., *Creating social capital: a study of the long-term benefits from community-based arts funding*, Community Arts Network of South Australia, Adelaide, 1996.