

# The Transcultural Dilemma: Asian Australian Artists in the Asia Debate

Melissa Chiu

In spite of ten years of discussion, debate and exhibitions about Australia's relationship with Asia — defined largely by cultural exchange as a theme — the contribution of Asian Australian artists to this area has been relatively limited. Looking specifically at exhibitions, it is only in the last couple of years that touring exhibitions such as *Rose Crossing* (1999), institutional exhibitions such as *Transit* (1998) and large-scale projects such as the third *Asia-Pacific Triennial* (1999) have included significant numbers of Asian Australian artists. Reasons for these curatorial decisions revolve around complex issues of national representation and self-image, particularly when Australian identity is defined in relation to the Asia-Pacific region. The inclusion or, for that matter, exclusion of Asian Australian artists from similar exhibitions previously is not, however, the sole subject of this essay. Of particular interest is the curatorial rationale and theoretical framework underpinning such exhibitions, which in turn influences the selection of artists and work.

Perhaps the most persistent theoretical model of engagement between Australia and Asia evident in exhibitions has been one of bi-polarism. This has created a recurring problem in Australian exchanges with Asia, where the dominant Anglo-Australian culture and diverse Asian cultures are perceived in opposition to one another. The inclusion of Asian Australian artists seems to complicate this notion of dual yet irrevocable differences; because they fit into both categories, these artists are often perceived to be mediators between Australia and Asia.<sup>1</sup> The inclusion of Asian Australian artists also disrupts the notion of opposition between Australia and Asia by offering a more complex equation of difference. Yet, the idea that to simply include Asian Australian artists in exhibitions conveys a greater familiarity with Asia is similarly flawed since the majority of Asian Australian artists relate to Asia through a condition of diaspora. The following discussion demonstrates that bi-polarism remains a persistent model of engagement with Asia, evident in varying degrees in the exhibitions *Out of Asia* and the last three *Asia-Pacific Triennials*. A survey of other exhibitions such as *Here Not There, Above and Beyond* and *Transit* reveals that in spite of calls for a new culture of exchange and the nominal inclusion of some Asian Australian artists, vestiges of bi-polarism continue to resonate. Nowhere is this more evident than in the consideration and discussion of work by Asian Australian artists.

One of the most striking manifestations of bi-polarism as an exhibition strategy for considering Asia is the use of theoretical concepts of 'Otherness'. As the first major exhibition to address a relationship with Asia, *Out of Asia* featured work by ten contemporary artists: Micky Allan, Tony Clark, Matthys Gerber, Pat Hoffie, Tim Johnson, Geoff Lowe, Fiona MacDonald, Susan Norrie, Robert Owen and Gareth Sansom. The exhibition was held at the Museum of Modern Art at Heide in 1990 and later toured to Sydney and Canberra. Although there are problems associated with the curatorial framework of *Out of Asia*, the exhibition is significant

in so far as it indicates the beginning of a new consideration of Asia in the visual arts. Prior to this, exhibitions such as *The Asian Interface: Australian Artists and the Far East* at the Art Gallery of New South Wales in 1983 and *East and West: The Meeting of Asian and European Art* at the Art Gallery of South Australia in 1985 exclusively illustrated the historical context for Asian influences on Australian art. *Out of Asia* also cited Asia as a source of inspiration for the artists and works, but the exhibition differed from previous shows in so far as it focused on the impact of Asia on contemporary Australian art.<sup>2</sup> *Out of Asia* also influenced a spate of other exhibitions that referred to Asia as a wellspring of artistic inspiration including *Asian and Oceania Influence* (1995) curated by Nick Waterlow at the Ivan Dougherty Gallery in Sydney.

The curatorial focus of *Out of Asia* was devoted to exploring notions of an exoticised Other. According to the curator, Alison Carroll, the artists were selected because they all confirmed (or at least played with) that notion of an exotic Other.<sup>3</sup> This interest reinforced traditional binary divisions of East and West, an opposition based largely upon a European conception of the East as Other. In this show Asia was, clearly, conceived as Other. The majority of works in *Out of Asia* drew upon European inventions of Otherness for inspiration: for example, Susan Norrie's 'Objet d'Art' series of paintings, Pat Hoffie's interest in Tretiakov images of Asian women and Tony Clark's chinoiserie landscapes. Clark, in an interview published in the catalogue, promoted this idea further:

The concept of failure ... is important in the idea of using chinoiserie as opposed to going to the source in pure Chinese art about which personally I know nothing. If chinoiserie is interesting, it is because it is by definition a corrupt, artificial style, at a remove from its source.<sup>4</sup>

Like other artists in the exhibition, Clark's reference to Asian cultures was intended as an ironic gesture, exploring Asian cultures through a familiar Western aesthetic tradition. This practice, however, reveals a distortion of the model of engagement between Australia and Asia, conveying an Australian view of Asia through the lens of European culture. But it is not the only one.

*Out of Asia* attempted to illustrate a shift in Australian contemporary art — a reorientation from a European cultural axis to an Asian one — but the focus on ideas of exotic Otherness hampered such a transition. The use of exoticism as a way of relating to Asia indicates that the debates in Australia in the early nineties were conceived in terms of a binary whereby Australia represented the West, and Asia the East. By conforming to established models of interpreting cultural difference through Otherness, *Out of Asia* illustrated a residual Australian identification with Europe that continues to underpin much of Australia's dealings with Asia. This is apparent in the discussion of the reception of Chinese culture in Australia. In the curator's catalogue essay, Carroll comments on the exclusion of Chinese representation from high art in the 1850s. This exclusion suggests, but does not state, the intolerance and increasing hostility towards the Chinese in the lead-up to Federation,<sup>5</sup> despite the adoption of Chinese influences by a number of Australian artists with a European penchant for chinoiserie. In effect, the popularity of chinoiserie confirmed Australia's cultural identification with the West since it reflected deference towards European fashion rather than any engagement with the realities of geographical location.

More recent exhibitions such as *Other Stories: Five Australian Artists* (1997) — designed to tour to different Asian cities — have also used Otherness as a theme to define Australian culture. The title of the exhibition was the conceptual starting point for the curator, again Alison Carroll, who appropriated it from an exhibition called *The Other Story*, which featured at the Hayward Gallery in London in 1989. This exhibition brought together the work of recent immigrants to Britain, setting the tone for postcolonial debates throughout the nineties. Carroll's exhibition follows this lead, suggesting an alternative view of mainstream culture, which is cast in a postcolonial framework. The curatorial premise for the exhibition was that Australia should be considered Other — that is Other to Europe — a position reinforced in part by the fact that Australia's population was not predominantly Anglo-Celtic. Yet this definition of Australian culture stood in contrast to the selection of artists, since all but one of them were from Anglo-Celtic backgrounds. There is no doubt that this was a fine exhibition with good examples of work by all five mid-career artists (Fiona Hall, Mike Parr, Hossein Valamanesh, Rosslynd Piggott and Rosalie Gasgoine) but the curatorial rationale which sought to deconstruct stereotypes of Australian culture appeared to reconfirm them. In essence, then, the exhibition was built on contradictions between Australia's cultural reality and how it wanted to project itself to the Asia-Pacific region. The positioning of Australians as Europe's Others also overlooked constructions of Otherness *within* Australia, evident in the historical marginalisation of Aboriginal people.

Australia's desire to identify and engage with the Asia-Pacific on a cultural level was developed further through the *Asia-Pacific Triennial*, established by the Queensland Art Gallery in 1993.<sup>6</sup> Over the years these exhibitions have played an enormously influential role in focusing debates on Asia, both directly, through the staging of major exhibitions, conferences and artists' talks in Brisbane, and indirectly, by providing a context for independent exhibitions, lectures and visits by Asian artists to other parts of Australia. The exhibition and conference for the first *Asia-Pacific Triennial*, for instance, provided an engagement with Asian contemporary art on an unprecedented scale, with the participation of over seventy-six artists — not to mention curators, speakers and conference delegates. The scale of the event and the long-term commitment made by the Queensland Art Gallery (a major state institution) over a period of nearly a decade makes the *Asia-Pacific Triennial* exhibitions essential to any account of the evolution of relations between Australia and Asia in the visual arts in this country.

From the first exhibition in 1993 to the most recent in 1999, the Triennial could be seen, in some ways, as a microcosmic model of the evolution of Australia's engagement with Asia. Attempts to expand the significance of the event and portray, in Asia, the sense of Australian culture as more integrated have seen the development of the idea of collaborative curatorship.<sup>7</sup> In the first Triennial exhibition a handful of Australian curators, mainly staff at the Queensland Art Gallery and members of the National Committee, selected the work. In contrast, the second exhibition (1996) was heralded as employing a new curatorial model of 'multiple curatorship' that comprised a series of committees with various national representatives from participating countries as co-curators. These included Oscar Ho King Kay from Hong Kong, T K Sabapathy from Singapore, Kamala Kapoor from India and Fumio Nanjo from Japan. Building on this idea, the selection of work for the third Triennial (1999) was carried out by a number of curatorial teams organised according to

regions within the Asia-Pacific. One of the most remarkable features of this system of curatorship was the sheer number of curators involved: increasing from fifteen in the first Triennial, thirty-eight in the second, to forty-eight in the third exhibition. Although the involvement of curators from different countries did signal a different approach — an evolution from committees of Australian selectors to a series of regional teams with representatives from different countries — the terms under which they participated were far from collaborative.

The contribution of Asian and Pacific curators in the second and third Triennials was limited in a number of subtle yet significant ways. Not least of these was via the concept of national contexts or national representation. Caroline Turner, Deputy Director of the Queensland Art Gallery, stated in the first Triennial catalogue that ‘national contexts’ were one of the most important considerations in the selection of artists.<sup>8</sup> While the definition of identity in terms of location and language provides a neat bureaucratic explanation, it also masks the complexities of identity formation, thereby limiting its ability to convey difference. In the first Triennial, national contexts were conveyed in two main ways: the artists’ works were grouped together in the hanging of the exhibition, as well as in the exhibition catalogue, according to their nationality. Although the idea of national contexts was denied as a determining factor in the second exhibition, the artists were organised according to regions such as East-Asia and South-East Asia in the exhibition catalogue. This reliance on a cartographic means of classification is not far removed from national definitions. Interestingly, the third exhibition catalogue was not unlike the first, with artists grouped together, again, according to their county of origin.

Not only was the idea of national representation apparent in the organisation of the exhibition, it also had a significant bearing on the selection of artists. What is not publicly acknowledged in any of the literature surrounding the Triennial is that there is a quota system that determines the number of artists from each of the participating countries. Supporters of this quota system argue that it is the only way of ensuring that more marginal countries such as Sri Lanka and Pakistan are included, but another more troubling aspect to this issue is the question of how these quotas are determined in the first place. What criteria, for example, are applied to the final selection of work? And, perhaps more importantly, who determines the number of artists representing a country? The issue here is not so much that there is a quota system in place but the fact that it is not stated anywhere in the extensive essays and commentary about the curatorial process of selection. The quota system has the potential to skew selection thereby affecting the quality of the work presented. Who is to say, for example, that India and China produce the most interesting artists? Yet this is what one would assume from their dominant representation in the exhibitions. While the determining factors of each quota remain a mystery, one can only speculate on the confluence between the high numbers of artists selected from countries that are also Australia’s significant trading partners: China, Japan and Korea.

The consultant curators from different countries worked within the confines of this quota system, applying it to their selection of artists. But it was not only a quota system that limited their participation in the Triennial. With the exception of the ‘Crossing Borders’ committee in the third Triennial (which was designed to accommodate Asian artists living outside their ‘homelands’), each consulting curator was nominated as a national representative in a manner not unlike that of participating artists. This idea of national representative curators was based on the framework

of national contexts and had the effect of restricting the curator's participation within the exhibition to only providing information and advice about their home country. In contrast to the Australian curators who were accorded cultural flexibility and permitted to curate a range of work from different countries, the Asian and Pacific curators were not allowed to work beyond their national boundaries. The effect of this rigidity positions Asian and Pacific curators as 'guides' to their cultures, evoking Gayatri Spivak's notion of a 'Third World Informant'.<sup>9</sup> In fact, the increased involvement of curators from different countries in the Triennials did little more than obfuscate their marginalisation within the larger bureaucracy of the event.

The lack of involvement of Asian Australian writers, curators and artists in the *Asia-Pacific Triennials* is one of the most striking examples of a contradiction in Australia's cultural engagement with Asia. On the one hand, the *Asia-Pacific Triennial* was a declaration that Australia wanted to play a more active role in the region, coinciding with foreign trade priorities embodied in a heavy investment in the success of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). On the other hand, the representation of Australia in the Triennial was characterised by strong references to European and American painting and sculptural traditions, notwithstanding the contributions made by Aborigines. The first Australian artist of Asian descent included in the Triennial was Guan Wei, who participated in the third exhibition. It is also worth noting that Guan Wei had worked before with the Triennial as a co-curator of work from China in the second exhibition, so he was already familiar to the organisers. Other Asian Australian artists such as Simryn Gill and Ah Xian were included in the 'Crossing Borders' section rather than the 'Australian' section of the third exhibition. The representation of Australia within the Triennials highlights a psychological separation between Australia and Asia, with Australia promoted as a culture dominated by European and American reference points despite trying to re-imagine itself as Asian. Not unlike the example of *Other Stories*, the Triennials register a discrepancy between (white) Australia's ongoing cultural allegiances to Europe and its desire to be recognised as a part of Asia.

Organised as a response to the exclusion of Asian Australian artists from the first *Asia-Pacific Triennial*, *Here Not There* (1993) was one of the first exhibitions to feature Asian Australian artists as integral to debates about Asia. Curated by Hiram To and Nicholas Tsoutas at the Institute of Modern Art in Brisbane, *Here Not There* sought to provide an alternative to the discourse of exotic Otherness that had previously dominated discussions of Asia in Australia. This exhibition offered an exploration of our relationship with Asia through the work of Asian Australian artists, proposing that their work had the potential to articulate a new model for engagement with Asia. The inclusion of Asian Australian artists did raise new questions about cultural engagements with Asia, but the fact that the artists were exclusively Asian Australian raised an alternative set of conceptual difficulties. A complication inherent in exhibitions such as *Here Not There* — and it is an issue for all exhibitions organised on the basis of ethnicity — is that the identity of the artist could be seen as of greater significance than the content of their work. In *Here Not There*, few of the works dealt directly with ideas of Asia or even the artist's experience of being Asian Australian. For example, Simryn Gill's sandblasted glass fragments with random words etched into them, Maria Cruz's gestural yet abstract paintings, and Felicia Kan's monochromatic paintings paired with photographs did not seem to suggest specific cultural or personal histories. In contrast to these minimal works,

however, most of the artists' blurbs addressed issues related to their cultural identity. Simryn Gill for instance, commented that, 'I can still remember back to the time when I was so sure that I was, simply, Indian', while Robert Nery stated, 'I would never have described myself as Asian if I had not come to Australia'.<sup>10</sup> One reason for the discrepancy between the artists' statements and the content of their artworks may be that a number of the artists did not want their work to be immediately associated with an exploration of their identity as they perceived this to be a form of marginalisation in mainstream art practices. Hence, Hiram To argued that their decision to be artists should be seen as more important than whether they considered themselves to be "Asian" or "Australian".<sup>11</sup> On the one hand, these artists were selected precisely because they were Asian Australian, but, on the other hand, To maintained that their cultural identity was of secondary importance. Yet, in spite of this kind of conceptual contradiction, *Here Not There* remains an important exhibition because it diverted the discussion away from the interpretation of historical and exotic Asian influences on Australian culture towards a consideration of Australia's engagement with Asia through Asian Australian artists.

*Here Not There* also had an impact on other exhibitions, largely because it provided a curatorial methodology that addressed difference without referring to conventional ideas of Otherness. Within such a curatorial structure, Asian Australian artists came to embody identification with Asia. This connection was evident in *Transcultural Painting* (1994), an exhibition (designed to travel to Asia) that included Asian Australian artists Lindy Lee and John Young alongside artists such as Tony Clark and Linda Marrinon, who were inspired by Asian influences. Another exhibition, *Above and Beyond: Austral/Asian Interactions*, embarked on a national Australian tour in 1996. The curators, Clare Williamson from the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art and Michael Snelling from the Institute of Modern Art, selected Asian Australian artists and Anglo-Australian artists who had travelled or had some experience in Asia. They argued that the number of events, exhibitions and policy changes involving Asia over the last decade created a new space in Australian cultural practice. Evidence of this could be seen in the activities of the *Asia-Pacific Triennial*, Australia Council policy directives towards Asia, touring exhibitions initiated and managed by Asialink, and the Perth-Based *Artists Regional Exchange* (ARX). The Australia Council's projection from this period provides the best example of this shift in priorities with 12.5% of its budget for international programs devoted to Asian- or Pacific-oriented projects in 1990-91, while in 1991-92 the target was 25% and in 1992-93, 50%.<sup>12</sup> In fact, this new cultural space was very much a part of what Ien Ang and Jon Stratton have called 'The Asian Turn', a political shift reflecting 'a clear desire amongst the national leadership [of Australia] to bring about not only an economic "Asianisation", but also a *cultural* "Asianisation" of sorts'.<sup>13</sup> However, *Above and Beyond* resisted any acknowledgement of economic or foreign policy ties to a cultural interest in Asia, despite the fact that the exhibition could be identified with a general process of cultural Asianisation.

In contrast to presenting Asia as Other, *Above and Beyond* chose to engage with Asia through postcolonial ideas of travel, identity and migration. The trouble was that different levels of engagement with Asia emerged between the Asian Australian and Anglo-Australian artists. An Asian diasporic experience, sometimes portrayed by the inclusion of signifiers of a specific cultural heritage, was set in contrast to Anglo-Australian artists whose works were largely based on travel

encounters. The diversity of cultural backgrounds for the selection of Asian Australian artists could be seen in the representation of the Chinese diaspora, including Hong Kong-born John Young and Kate Beynon, Australian-born Lindy Lee, mainland Chinese artists Guan Wei and Ah Xian, and Malaysian-born Emil Goh. A number of the Anglo-Australian artists including Joan Grounds, Pat Hoffie and Kevin Todd, had migrated from Ireland, the United Kingdom and the United States to Australia. In spite of this shared history of migration, differences between the discussion of Asian Australian artist's work and Anglo-Australian artists were apparent. Work by Asian Australian artists was characterised by a pronounced emphasis on cultural origins. The curator's introduction of John Young's work is a good example: 'Young Ze Runge or John Young was born in Hong Kong in 1956 and sent to Australia in 1967 to complete his education at the time of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution'.<sup>14</sup> This can be contrasted to the description of Pat Hoffie's practice: 'Pat Hoffie has an ongoing, diverse relationship with neighbouring countries as artist, writer and speaker'.<sup>15</sup> These descriptions may not appear so totally divergent, yet to account for Asian Australian artists work solely in terms of an explanation of cultural heritage hinders its capacity for commenting upon anything beyond cultural experience. This is an effective way of confining the relevance of Asian Australian artists to identity issues. The interpretation of Asian Australian artists' work in terms of their cultural heritage in *Above and Beyond* also reflects an expectation that they produce work about their cultural heritage. Asian American art critic Alice Yang has argued that such an expectation 'perform[s] a special operation — a kind of ethnographic work in which the contemporary artist becomes an artifact of difference'.<sup>16</sup> Regardless of the curators' good intentions, the emphasis on identity and cultural heritage in a reading of work by Asian Australian artists in *Above and Beyond* constructed them as 'artifacts of difference'. This is further reinforced by the selection of Asian Australian artists whose work displayed recognisable cultural signifiers of their 'Asianness'. It is worth noting, for instance, that a number of Asian Australian artists not included in *Above and Beyond* produce work that is not visibly influenced by their cultural background. The installation artist Bill Seeto and photographer and painter Felicia Kan are obvious cases.

The expectation that Asian Australian artists produce work about their cultural difference highlights the inconsistency of Australia's perception of itself in relation to Asia. While the inclusion of Anglo-Australian artists alongside Asian Australian artists in *Above and Beyond* was a positive step towards developing new models of engagement with Asia, the differences in the approaches towards the art works reveal a persistent theoretical shortcoming. Moreover, leaving the history of Anglo-Australians unexplored meant that they became invisible cultural reference points, not unlike the representation of Australia in the *Asia-Pacific Triennials*. This absence within the exhibition maintained a distinction between Anglo-Australians and Asian Australians, which itself paralleled the distinction between Australia and Asia.

Asian Australian artists were also the focus of *Transit*, staged at the Art Gallery of New South Wales in 1998. This exhibition, organised by in-house curator Anthony Bond, focused on issues of 'identity and cross cultural reference'.<sup>17</sup> While some of the artworks, such as Xiao Ping Liang's calligraphy, Hou Leong's scroll paintings and John Young's quotation of the Chinese court painter Castiglione, explored identity issues, others did not. In Bill Seeto's installation, for example, cross-cultural references were at best obscure. Titled 'Nocturne' (1998), the installation was a

site-specific work constructed out of glass, mirror and perspex to create a visual illusion of infinite space. Akio Makigawa's onyx sculpture and Savanhdary Vongpoothorn's labour-intensive perforated paintings did not actively engage with a sense of identity either, or at least not to this viewer. The expectation that Asian Australian artists produce work related to their cultural heritage — an assumption pervading the selection of work for *Above and Beyond* — was not present in *Transit*. But this does not mean that *Transit* offered a more sensitive representation of cultural difference, allowing for aesthetic consideration. A closer inspection reveals that Asian Australian artists were included on the basis of their ethnicity rather than the work they produced: their ethnicity stood in for a thematic reference to identity. *Transit* differed from previous exhibitions because it did not profess to be about cultural exchange with Asia; rather, it was an exhibition about Australia. Bond states that each of the artists 'responds differently to the diasporic nature of Australian life and to the region as a whole'.<sup>18</sup> By making the subject of the exhibition Australian culture rather than exchange, Bond knowingly or not makes a significant transition in the consideration of Asian Australian artists. These artists are no longer positioned as mediators of a broader cultural debate.

*Transit* represents the culmination of over a decade of debates about Asia, which have gone hand in hand with discussions of the role of Asian Australian artists. This recent history saw an initial resistance to the inclusion of Asian Australian artists in discussions of cultural exchange, most obviously in *Out of Asia* and the first two *Asia-Pacific Triennials*. These early-nineties projects described cultural exchange in terms of an Anglo-Australian response to Asian cultures. Later projects such as *Here Not There*, *Above and Beyond* and *Transit* illustrated a greater emphasis on Asian identity and sensibilities with the inclusion of Asian Australian artists. The more recent exhibitions expose their own particular limitations, not least of which was the preoccupation with travel, displacement and location as a defining condition of engagement with Asia. This is revealed most succinctly in the romanticised exhibition titles, a throwback to exoticist associations. Asian Australian artists complicate the oppositional conception of Asia and Australia that had previously dominated discussions, but perhaps their most important contribution has been to Australian culture as a whole, proposing more complex, challenging and up-to-date ideas of Australian identity.

**The Transcultural Dilemma: Asian Australian Artists in the Asia Debate**  
**Melissa Chiu**

- 1 Sneja Gunew, 'Arts for a multicultural Australia: redefining the culture', in Sneja Gunew and Fazal Rizvi (eds), *Culture, Difference and the Arts*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1994, p 8.
- 2 One of the most important texts published in the nineties on Australia's cultural interaction with Asia was Alison Broinowski, *The Yellow Lady: Australian Impressions of Asia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1992. Over the years there have been numerous critiques of its somewhat colonial stance; see, for example, Foong Ling Kong, 'Postcards from a yellow lady', in Suvendrini Perera (ed.), *Asian and Pacific Inscriptions: Identities, Ethnicities, Nationalities*, Meridian Books, Melbourne, 1995, pp 83-97.
- 3 Alison Carroll, 'Out of Asia', *Out of Asia*, exhibition catalogue, Heide Park and Art Gallery, Melbourne, 1990, p 11.
- 4 Tony Clark, interviewed by Alison Carroll, *ibid.*, p 14.
- 5 For a historical account of the Chinese in Australia, see Eric Rolls, *Citizens: Flowers and the Wide Sea*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1996.
- 6 The precursor for the *Asia-Pacific Triennial* was in many ways the *Artists Regional Exchange* in Perth, which began in the eighties.
- 7 This idea of collaboration was also adopted in cultural exchange exhibitions managed by Asialink in Melbourne. Most notable of these were *Rapport* (1996), a collaboration between curators from Monash University Gallery and the Singapore Art Museum; and *Fire and Life* (1997), comprising collaborations between Indian and Australian curators and artists.
- 8 Caroline Turner, 'Introduction: from extraregionalism to intraregionalism?', *The first Asia-Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art*, exhibition catalogue, 1993, p 8.
- 9 Gayatri Spivak, 'The problem of self-representation', in Sarah Harasym (ed.), *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, Routledge, New York, 1990, p 57.
- 10 Simryn Gill and Robert Nery, *Here Not There*, exhibition catalogue, Institute of Modern Art, Brisbane, 1993, n.p.

*Notes to pp 181–191*

- 11 Hiram To, 'Orient (no national address)', *Here Not There*, exhibition catalogue, Institute of Modern Art, Brisbane, 1993, n.p.
- 12 Catharine Lumby, 'Oiling the Asian waters', *Art + Text*, no 43, September 1992, p 17.
- 13 Ien Ang and Jon Stratton, 'The Asian turn', *Art + Text*, no 50, January 1995, p 28.
- 14 Clare Williamson and Michael Snelling, 'Austral/Asian interactions', *Above and Beyond: Austral/Asian Interactions*, exhibition catalogue, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, 1996, p 7.
- 15 *ibid.*, p 8.
- 16 Alice Yang, 'Asian American exhibitions reconsidered', in Jonathan Hay and Mimi Young (eds), *Why Asia? Contemporary Asian and Asian American Art*, New York University Press, New York, 1998, p 97.
- 17 Anthony Bond, 'Introduction', *Transit*, exhibition brochure, Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney, 1998, n.p.
- 18 *ibid.*