

Literature as Multifunctional Institution: The Implications of Media Treatment of Literature and Publishing Policy

Dr Stuart Glover

School of English, Media Studies and Art History, University of Queensland

Abstract

Australian media accounts of literature and publishing policy have for more than the past decade tended to focus on controversial and glamorous areas of grants and prizes or on specific issues of interest such as the GST on books or the debate over book trade restrictions. Unlike representations of media industry policy in other areas such as televisions, media treatment of literary policy tended to be partial and issue based and rarely invoke literary or publishing policy as a single domain. Literature emerges from a reconsideration of this media treatment as a vital but uncoordinated domain where “the book” has diverse and dispersed functions across a multiplicity of sites including social, cultural, economic, and even education spheres.

An inspection of the scale of Australian government engagement with the domains of literature, publishing, and reading, reveals a surprisingly large, if *ad hoc*, system of regulation (see Glover, 2006). An audit quickly uncovers the Literature Board of the Australia Council, state government arts' funding regimes, government-funded literary prizes, the Public Lending Right and Education Lending Right schemes, the rump of the Book Industry Assistance Package initiatives, an annual library expenditure of more than \$700 million across the three levels of government, and legislative frameworks relating to defamation, obscenity and copyright. Government acts to support Australian and regional literatures, maintain a sphere of literary debate, protect the local book industry, project Australian cultural identity at home and overseas, and utilise the book in projects of civic education.

Publishing and literature are mixed domains of market, cultural, and government forces. In part, new policy development over the past decade has been a response to the transformation of the publishing sector: the continuing conglomeration of publishing and media ownership; the emergence of new book markets; structural changes in the management of trade publishing houses (including greater Australian editorial control and a shift of editorial power to the sales and marketing function of the publishing house); and the digitisation of stages in the publishing value chain (including authoring, pre-print typeset and layout, e-tailing and e-books). Government has reacted to some of the industry developments with new programs such as Visiting International Publisher (VIP) program of the Australia Council and Publish Australia—both intended to support export development. In the case of e-books and e-tailing, government has tried to pre-empt industry development. The book is both the object of a range of policy actions (publishing subsidies, library stock levels and so on) and, in other instances, an instrument of other policy goals (such as the employment of textbook subsidies within educational policy frameworks).

Despite the extent of these interventions, the conceptualisation and the operation of these policy mechanisms generally remain below the Plimsoll line of media discourse. On one count, the opacity of the relations between government and literature or publishing seems fair enough. For good reason, the literary media and salon are more concerned, day-to-day, with, for instance, *causes celebres* like Norma Khouri than with concentrated accounts of cultural policy¹. Instead, it is only moments of transformation or contest that make the relations of literature and government visible, and bring them into the public mind. Only then does the extensive system of intervention, and the procedural framing of literature and publishing, seem contingent or worthy of media comment. It is moments such as the debate over the application of the Goods and Services Tax to books, the reformation of the Australia Council in the mid 1990s, or the continued sparring over individual funding decisions of the Literature Board that stir public and media interest in literary policy matters.

The unremarked upon nature of these biases and exclusions in the media accounts of literary and publishing policy seem to indicate two things—one of which is taken up for examination in this paper. The first, which is not taken up here, is that the contemporary Australian literary media itself remains a relatively unexamined object. Perhaps the only significant account of the literary media of the 1990s was Mark Davis's *Gangland* which concentrates an attack on Peter Craven for his gate-keeping in favour of various writers from within his circle, particularly Helen Garner and Elizabeth Jolly (1999, p.123). While likely the most polemic account of literary influence in the Australian context since John Docker's

¹ Khouri seemingly faked her identity and personal history in order to valorise *Forbidden Love* her, perhaps also fabricated, memoir of an 'honour killing' in Jordan.

In a Critical Condition and *Cultural Elites*, its treatment of the performance of the literary media tends, as is typical, to be limited to specific incidents or issues—such as was evident elsewhere in the excoriation of the literary media throughout the Demidenko affair (see Jost et al, 1996). For a moment, but in a very specific way, a discussion of the shape and operation of the public literary sphere (or the literary public sphere) was visible.

This paper teases out a second observation, that is, the peculiar logic of the partial accounts that the media have provided of the regulation of the literary sphere. It is easy to observe the media's regular concern with a category called *Australian literature* (or even just with the category of *literature*) and with the health of this category. As a category, it simultaneously refers to a body of work, a set of practitioners, a form of social interrogation and representation, a manifestation of nation, an industrial formation, and a pedagogical platform². For the media, Australian literature is more than just a scholarly abstraction. Media representations often suggest Australian literature as having essential qualities whose interests should be protected for its own and our wider good. However, despite this concern, the media discourse around literary policy is often lopsided—that is, it does not treat literature or print culture policy as a unified concern (although commentary on the Literature Board is sometimes presented as general commentary on literature and print culture policy). Instead, literature policy manifests itself in the media as a series or multiplicity of issues that are rarely presented as interconnected.

Over the past two decades there have been a number of public and industry debates about literature policy, including writers' grants, book import regulation, publishing subsidies, copyright reform, the fate of 'little' magazines, the impact of the Goods and Services Tax on books, and the need for Education Lending Right. These debates remind us of the dispersed and disparate uses of "the book" in public, industry, and governmental contexts, and something of the multiplicity of the institutional engagements of print culture. But only occasionally have these policy issues been compressed into a unified concern for the regulation of Australian literature. Instead, perhaps because of the multiple and dispersed functions of the book, literature policy has tended to be taken up in relation to a range of agendas that the book is implicated in—be they cultural nationalism, economic, aesthetic, education, or social issues. And among this multiplicity of concerns some particular issues dominate.

This paper examines two issues. Firstly, it examines shows how literature policy or print culture policy has tended to be understood in the media narrowly, as relating to questions to do with the Literature Board of the Australia Council, most usually individual funding, but often in such a way as to imply or at least with controversies over individual funding. Secondly, it examines a number of instances where literary or publishing policy issues have been refracted in the media through broader policy questions to which the book and literature are attached. In the instance of protection policy on books it is the contest between economic deregulatory program of the 1990s and the regulatory impulses of cultural nationalism. In the instance of the GST on books, it is around questions of restraints on knowledge and literature's pedagogical functions.

² This conception of Australian literature in some sense borrows from Tom O'Regan's conception of Australian National Cinema (1996, p.1)

The Literature Board and Individual Funding

Print news media interest in, or understanding of, literature policy has often focused on the writers' grant schemes, particularly those offered by the Literature Board of the Australia Council, although there is also some interest in state government literary funding decisions. For example, in 2000 journalist Brett Debritz in Brisbane's *The Sunday Mail* reported the granting of \$25,000 to novelist Venero Armanno by Arts Queensland towards the writing of a novel for young adults. Armanno was criticised for his receipt of \$155,000 in funding from the Queensland Government and the Literature Board over the previous eight years. The paper contrasted Armanno's good fortune to the struggles of Toowoomba plumber Dan Nunn. Nunn stated that his job was not at all like Armanno's: His was "dirty and ... hard work" (2000, p.5). The critical inference provoked a considerable response from Queensland's literary community, which the following weekend *The Sunday Mail* characterised as a "flurry of elitist outrage, most of it misguided and little of it constructive [...] the response of those involved in the arts—and their friends—ranged from the precious to the rabid" ("Open Book", 2000, p.97). Attacks on literary grant schemes as elitist and serving a self-selecting coterie have a considerable history. Thomas Shapcott's *The Literature Board: A Brief History* (1988)—the most substantial account of the operations of the Literature Board over the period 1973-1986, although Mark O'Connor has dismissed it as "Tom's Book of Lists" (1992, p.6)—provides evidence of early attacks in the media on literary funding from both outside and inside the literary community. Publisher Peter Ryan attacked funding as unnecessary because "those works of distinction and even competence which appeared under the Board's aegis... would have been written anyhow" (qtd. in Shapcott, 1988, p.40). Poet Max Harris attacked the Board because "the State has no business to be in the business of writing: or painting or composing" (qtd. in Shapcott, 1988, p.40). Elsewhere, Harris equates literature funding schemes with the goings on in Moscow, East Berlin and Renaissance Italy, and criticises writers accepting funding for something that should be economically and spiritually self-sustaining.

Criticism of the Australia Council was weaker in the 1990s than in the 1980s, with the exception of a sustained and organised attack on the Literature Board and the Australia Council (more broadly) in the early 1990s by poets Les Murray and Mark O'Connor. The attacks followed several rejections by the Literature Board of O'Connor's applications for funding over the previous decade and the rejection of an application from Murray despite him securing more than \$500,000 in support over the previous 20 years (Evans, 2004). Most of O'Connor and Murray's criticisms turned on questions of process, such as assessment by literary cliques rather than literary peers, inadequate record-keeping of assessment, and extreme time limitations in decision-making. But there was also general hostility towards the Literature Board including accusations of deviousness, defensiveness, "impropriety and patches of corruption" (Stevens, 1994, p.1). These attacks were made over a number of years concentrated in the period 1992 to 1994. Murray and O'Connor went to the effort of establishing the Australia Council Reform Association, which corresponded with other artists, made public statements, and made releases to the media about the performance and processes of the Australia Council. By 1994, the criticisms had extended to the view that the Australia Council had "shifted away from being about the arts in Australia" but instead was "there to fund the clients of the left-wing of the Australian Labor Party [...] to fund political correctness and to punish deviation" (Murray qtd. in Armitage, 1994, p.3).

These accusations gained significant but divided media responses. The Literature Board through its members and officers staged numerous public defences. Chair Marion Halligan

claimed ACRA had its facts wrong (Corby, 1994, p.3). Stevens suggested “determined ignorance” (1994, p.1) on ACRA’s part. The external media, ostensibly less invested, was divided but maintained by strong views. In 1993 P.P. McGuinness weighed in, seeing Murray’s claims as support for his view that Australian writers, actors, book publishers and book sellers were a “shabby lot” and self-serving in their opposition to a goods and services tax on books (1993, p.13). A year on, a *Sydney Morning Herald* editorial countered that “Les Murray’s criticism of the Australia Council is wrong on virtually every ground” (“Les Murray’s Poetic Licence”, 1993, p.32). Poet and intellectual Geoff Dutton suggested Murray was “completely out of touch... Les is always blowing this stupid trumpet... I have the deepest respect for him as a poet and critic, but when he gets onto this subject he loses the plot altogether” (qtd in Jinman, 1994, p.2).

As Jane Sullivan observed in April 2000 in *The Sunday Age* (2000, p.12), by the close of the decade the debate around the structure and performance of the Literature Board was largely extinguished. Sullivan slyly notes that Mark O’Connor’s attacks on the Board have ended following his receipt of a \$80,000 fellowship, but she more astutely suggests that reform of the Australia Council in the mid-1990s may have changed the focus of media interest in arts and cultural policy and outcomes. Previous to the reforms of 1995 and 1996, each artform board had its own well-developed policy regime, specific granting programs and a degree of autonomy from the parent council. Council Chairperson Hilary McPhee’s reforms introduced generic funding categories and mechanisms across the council. The policy responsibilities of the artform boards were trimmed by turning them into funds, with policy functions moving to the council itself.

Prior to the reforms, the Literature Board was often the focus of public debate about the efficacy of the overall Australia Council and the nation’s cultural policy. This may have followed on from the close links between the writing community and the print media, but the reforms and the shift in policy focus to the nation-making strategies of *Creative Nation* seemed to decentre the Literature Board (Literature Fund) from public and arts industry concern. Peter Craven, with his chauvinism for writers and literature and support for them as privileged categories, responded to *Creative Nation* with concern that it was “by no means clear that there [was] more money for writers in Keating’s package” (1994, p.24). I have argued elsewhere that *Creative Nation*, the reform of Australia Council and the broader cultural policy moment, was a signal of the decline of literature as a category of aesthetic and representational production (Glover, 1996, p.54-58). At the beginning of the decade, subsequent to lengthy statements in the *Australian Author* throughout the 1980s, the major political parties could still issue blueprints for national literature policy as Chris Puplick did in the *Adelaide Review* in January 1990 (p.16-17). Literature was employed at the centre of cultural life and cultural policy debate. By the close of the decade cultural policy debate was focused on different issues such as the review of the major performing arts companies, Australia Council cost-effectiveness, audience development strategies, and policy development for the knowledge economy following on from *Creative Nation*. Despite an expansion of the book industry throughout the 1990s and a growing profile for Australian writing within that sector, literature was no longer a central or representative policy concern by the beginning of the new decade.

The funding of *The Australian’s Review of Books* (which happened alongside the decline in funding for ‘little’ literary magazines) was representative of the shift in the focus of the Australia Council towards audience development, industry partnering and cultural industry development. The establishment of *The Australian’s Review of Books* in 1996 as an

antipodean mirror to the *Times Literary Supplement* or the *New York Times Book Review* was supported by a grant for \$176,000 to the newspaper. The funds, which were earmarked for expenditure on contributions, came from the Australia Council's Audience Development Fund, following submission of an application from *The Australian*. Unfortunately for the Council the decision followed a number of years of acrimony over the Literature Board's funding policies and decisions regarding 'little' magazines. Understandably, debate about funding was largely taken up in the pages and editorials of those very magazines (see Denholm, 1997, p.5; Roberts, 1997, p.6; and Duwell and Hergenhan, 1997, p.21). Only rarely, however, as in the case of the reaction to a cut in funding for *Meanjin*, did debate break out into the wider news media. Peter Craven, in a newspaper article entitled "Stabbed in the Heart Again", reported how the shift in policy and funding underlined "how much the Australia Council under Hilary McPhee, former small publisher and former board member of *Meanjin*, has appeared to be on the side of the big battalions" (1997, p.34).

There were few defenders of the grant to *The Australian's Review of Books* from within the literary community. There was some support for the larger readership and better payments for writers that the deal might bring, but this was negated by a concern for doing business with a global media company like News Ltd, and a concomitant fear of curtailed independence. Cassandra Pybus, who was in favour of partnerships with commercial media to promote Australian writing, balked at the nature and scale of the support for the *Review of Books*. She had suggested *Vogue*, *HQ* and *Who Weekly* as possible sites for essays or short stories, but to her eye, there was an objectionable covert quality to the deal between the Council and News Ltd and the level of support was way beyond what any other magazines had ever been able to scrounge (1996, p.3). Dianna Simmonds, in *The Bulletin*, described the reaction of the literary community as a "deafening hush of outrage, confusion, incredulity and petrified—if understandable—self-interest" (1996, p.89). She believed there were strong reasons to question the commercial advantage handed to News Ltd by the deal, and to question the need for a reviews publication that promised one dollar per word for 5000 rather than 500 word reviews. But despite these concerns, she claimed that the Australian writing community was hushed into silence by the prospect of future employment. P.P. McGuinness (2001, p.16) writing an obituary for *The Australian's Review of Books*, five years later in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, praised Murdoch for the experiment. He estimated that Murdoch had put \$1 million per year into the publication, dwarfing the all up contribution of the Australia Council of \$176,000. McGuinness felt that the size of the market and a lack of intellectual, as distinct from financial, investment, sunk the publication. In a customary swipe at the "intellectual-literary-artistic scene in Australia", he attacked it for its domination by "politics and partisan hatreds, as well as irrational obsessions with figures like Murdoch". For him, *The Australian's Review of Books* only served to "recycle the usual suspects of the Australian literary world, paying... [them] a bit more than they could usually command, but not demanding from them a corresponding improvement in the concentration and quality of their work". As well as lashing these self-serving coteries for joining the bandwagon, McGuinness lashed them for their "stultifying conformism". Defending his own iconoclasm, he noted that those standing aside from such conformism are "condemned and vilified" and finally "boycotted" (2001, p.16).

The interest in the debate about the funding for *The Australian's Review of Books* and for little magazines lies partly in questions about who controls the public discourse about Australian literature. The small magazines, dominated by academics and freelance writers, can play an important role but only with the support of funding bodies. Calls for additional funds towards the small magazines came at time when the most likely funding bodies had

moved the other way—not sealing off the sphere of letters from commercial and market forces, but instead seeking to make partnerships within the commercial cultural sector and to generate greater audiences (readership) for funded products and services. The community of writers and editors gathered around the little magazines resisted the equation of the market (or market-derived media enterprises) with a libertarian sphere of ideas. Instead the existence of the market and capital here equated with a circumscription of the free circulation of ideas.

For McGuinness, and other critics on the right, the converse is maintained. Here, it is the will and propensity of the “intellectual-literary-artistic” elites to generate conformist and foreshortened debate within their media outlets, such as the little magazines, that circumscribes the flow of ideas. It is a critical question for our notion of the public sphere whether market freedom also equates to intellectual freedom. A simple notion of freedom needs to be put aside for a more complex question about which interests are free to speak when there is no government intervention in the market. How does the mix of voices differ under a market-sponsored sphere of letters, from those whom are promoted within a government-sponsored sphere of letters? More complex still is the way different interactions between the market and government shape the public sphere of letters. Who gets to speak and who is denied when government funds are applied to different discourse instruments? What is different in the mix of voices promoted through funding *The Australian’s Review of Books* as against funding the *Australian Book Review*—and how might they speak differently in these different publications.

Book Protectionism and the GST on Books

In my second example, debate in the 1990s about the funding and regulation of the publishing industry was taken up in specialist media around a number of specific issues of wider provenance: overseas-ownership and control of Australian publishing; governmental and regulatory responses; protection of the Australian book trade from overseas markets through territorial rights provisions and parallel import regulations; book bounty provisions; and the effect of the Goods and Services Tax. There was, however, a changed visibility and emphasis to these debates. In the 1970s and 1980s foreign ownership of the local book industry was a common issue within the book media, the *Australian Bookseller and Publisher* magazine, *Australian Author* magazine, and the mainstream media. This was not the case in the 1990s, where ownership of the Australian publishing industry—while often contended—receded from being a dominant concern. If anything, in the 1990s the focus of the foreign ownership debates within the cultural industries turned instead to the music industry and compact disk imports. This decline in media interest in the ownership of Australian publishing happened despite the industry remaining significantly overseas-owned throughout the 1990s. There seem to be a couple of reasons for this.

First, is the decline in the centrality of literature to cultural nation building, and its replacement by the music and film industries in these tasks (Turner, 1998). Second, it may be that the success and prominence of Australian-authored books disarmed nationalist critique about publishing ownership. In 1948 the Australian book sales comprised 15% of the market (Curtain, 1993, p.110). By 1987 they comprised 50% of all sales (p.113) and by 1999/2000 they comprised 61% (“On the Up: Publisher Statistics Released”, 2001, p.1). This was a dramatic change over the preceding 50 years, which accelerated after 1975. The penetration of Australian books in domestic markets was not uniform across all categories. In textbook markets Australian-sourced books secured 65% by 1999/2001, but in fiction and general

publishing the figure was less than 50%. Many Australian-authored books, however, were still published by the major foreign-owned houses that dominate the sector. The definition of an Australian book under Australian Bureau of Statistics figures is based on where the book is published, and does not account for ownership of the means of production or sources of capital in the publication of these books.

It seems that in the policy debates of the 1990s the balance of interest shifted from questions about the level of foreign ownership of the Australian publishing industry—which had been the prevalent debate of the 1970s and 1980s—to questions about the level of protection (provided by territorial copyright regimes) for Australian-authored books from cheaper imported books. The cultural nationalism questions remained, but the focus shifted from the institution of publishing to the interests of the consumer. Consumer interest was of two counterpoised types: i) concern to ensure access to Australian-authored books which was regulated by territorial copyright provisions and some supply support for the Australian publisher; and ii) a broader concern of price-mediated access to books, again regulated by territorial copyright provisions—but most marked at the close of the decade in the debate on the effects of the goods and services tax on book prices. In assessing these concerns it is not evident that the processes of globalisation and media conglomeration underway since the 1970s—which have transformed the structure of Australian and international publishing—have had obvious detrimental effects to Australian consumer interests. Nor, for that matter, have the forces of conglomeration obviously harmed the interests of Australian authors or Australian literature.

There remains, however, within the literary and policy media divergent views about publishing subsidies for overseas-owned and Australian-owned publishing houses. The Australia Council in their magazine, *Artforce*, crept around the issue, publishing a survey of positive responses to the Board's publishing program from publishers in receipt of those funds (1996, p.6). In the article, Michael Heyward from Text, Bryony Cosgrove from Penguin, Chris Newman from Fremantle Arts Centre Press and Bruce Sims from Magabala Books—each very different types of publishers—spoke in support of the scheme. For Heyward, the publishing schemes allowed risk taking; for Cosgrove, subsidy was integral to the transformation of local publishing since Whitlam; for Sims, it allowed innovation and for Newman it ensured competitiveness. None of the occasional critics of the Literature Board's preparedness to fund overseas-owned publishers—such as Craig Munro from University of Queensland Press, which receives significant funding under the program, or Robert Kenny, who attacked the Board in the 1980s for editorial control (Kenny, 1994, p.322-23)—were interviewed for the article. Likewise, no uniform position or corresponding advocacy has emerged from the Australian Publishers Association (APA, formerly Australian Book Publishers Association, ABPA)—which represents both local and overseas camps—on the issue.

There has not, however, been the same silence from the APA, from the Australian Society of Authors (ASA) and from the Australian Booksellers Association (ABA) on the issue of a goods and services tax on books, or in relation to parallel import regulations. The ABA, APA and ASA have been of the same clarion voice in opposition to the GST. This debate has been concentrated in the industry outlets such as the *Australian Author*, *Australian Bookseller and Publisher*, and the *Weekly Book Newsletter*, but also broke out into mainstream media. The book media coverage of the GST campaign turned on technical economic questions of the price elasticity of demand for Australian books—the effect on demand of changes in the price. The APA, ABA and ASA argued that the increase in the cost of supply would reduce

demand significantly. But these were complex issues difficult to treat in the mainstream media.

For the mainstream media the campaign against the GST was reduced to a campaign against a “tax on knowledge”(“Keep Books Tax Free”, 1999, p.4)— a tax that would constitute an impediment to the free flow of ideas. Morris West offered that “a tax on knowledge is the first step towards tyranny”, while Paul Jennings attacked the proposed GST on the grounds that “a tax on books means attacks on children” (both in “Keep Books Tax Free”). As John Curtain has observed, it is most people’s sense, in relation to literature, that government should encourage rather than discourage free circulation of books (1993, p.108). There are few cases for limiting the publication of books and it was easy for the book industry to connect the GST’s potential effect on the cost of supply, with a consequent decline in demand, and a dangerous limiting of intellectual, cultural and educational freedom. While not preventing the imposition of the GST on books, this last factor was a powerful and emotive argument in helping secure a \$240 million book industry assistance package as compensation, including text book subsidy, school library purchases, research into reading and promotion of Australian books.

Curiously, while the anti-GST campaign was effective in securing compensation for the book industry, there was no media discussion of how these policy initiatives connected to existing policy instruments that regulated the book industry and the literary sphere. The ASA, ABA and APA failed to, or did not seek to, connect it to their arguments for the continued regulation of the book market (including the protection of the local market from American imports), and the Literature Board failed to connect it to their case for additional literary funding. As well as the fragmentation of the literature policy domain, this may reflect the diversity of views within the industry about these issues. The ABA has been in favour of deregulation of the market in order to push down consumer prices. By contrast, the APA has mounted in the media both cultural nationalist and economic nationalist arguments in efforts to maintain the current 30/90-day provisions. The APA position to the review of intellectual property legislation in 2000 was quite technical, arguing that the current regime provided “the right balance of competition and protection” and that “the development of Australia as a separate territory for copyright purposes gave the major international publishers the confidence to invest in the development of local publishing infrastructure(s)” (Australia. IPCRC, 2000, p.52-53).

Conclusion

Obviously, these issues are only a fraction of those relating to book policy (and to regulation of literary institutions) that are of interest to the media. Just as easily this paper could have, for example, examined the exponential growth in the media coverage of government-funded literary events, prizes, and programs staged by writers’ festivals, writers’ centres and other community and industry agents. The mainstream and specialist media attention dedicated to these areas seems related to complex changes in the marketing strategies of publishing houses, the rise of celebrity-focused marketing and publishing, the development of strong regional literary markets and regionalised content within national literary markets, the investment by government in the professionalisation of writers, a new cosmopolitanisation in Australian urban life, the employment of writers by media and government as a trope of a new cosmopolitanism, and so on. It is impossible here to tease out these forces. But in conclusion, it might be useful to contrast the fragmented media commentary around literature

policy with the more coherently organised commentary on print and broadcast policy. While literature continues to luxuriate in mass media coverage of its books and of its authors, coverage of its policy framework, or more correctly the multiplicity of its somewhat uncoordinated policy elements, is usually fragmented and often shaped by wider discourses in which literature it is often implicated. In contrast, the print and broadcast sectors, while also receiving ubiquitous coverage in the media, such as in the weekly *Media Section* in the *Australian* newspaper or on ABC Radio National's *Media Report*, are often treated as coherent policy domains. Literature and Print culture is everywhere. Its penetration of the culture is so complete that it is no longer one thing but many.

References

- Armitage, C. (1994). Poets Push for Change at 'Cliques' Aust Council. *Sydney Morning Herald* 6 July (p.3).
- Australia. Australia Council. (1999). *Australia Council Annual Report 1998-99*. Sydney: Australia Council.
- Australia. Australia Council. (1992). *Australia Council for the Arts Annual Report 1991-1992*. Sydney: Australia Council.
- Australia. Australia Council. (1996). Book Publishing Subsidies: What the Publishers Say. *Artforce* 91 (p.6).
- Australia. Commonwealth of Australia. (1994). *Creative Nation*. Canberra: Department of Communications and the Arts, 1994.
- Australia. IPCRC. (2000). *Review of Intellectual Property Legislation under the Competition Principles Agreement*. Canberra: Intellectual Property and Competition Review Committee.
- Keep Books Tax Free. (1999, May 21). *Australian* (p.4).
- Les Murray's Poetic Licence. (1994, July 9). *Sydney Morning Herald* (p.32).
- Australia. Literature Board. Lindsay, E. (1995). *Individual Writers' Grants Programs Evaluation of Results, 1990-1993*. Redfern, NSW: Literature Board.
- Australian Publishers Association. (2003, July 8). *Who We Are*. Available: www.publishers.asn.au/about_us.cfm.
- Bentley, D. (1995, June 2). The Hand That Won the Franklin. *Courier-Mail* (p.1)
- Bentley, D. (1995, August 19). Questions Posed on the Author's Past. *Courier-Mail* (p.1)
- Corby, S. (1994, October 4). Literary Grants Process 'Unfair'. *Canberra Times* (p.3)
- Craven, P. (1996, December 11). Stabbed in the Heart Again. *Australian*, sec. Higher Education (p.34)
- Craven, P. (1994, October 26). Writers Lose in Cultural Sweepstakes. *Australian* (p.24)
- Curtain, J. (1993). Book Publishing. *The Media in Australia: Industries, Texts, Audiences*. Cunningham, S. & Turner, G. (Ed) (p.102-18). St Leonards: Allen & Unwin,
- Curtain Raised on Arts Debate. (2004, August 9). Editorial. *Courier-Mail*. (Features p.12)
- Davis, M. (1999). *Gangland: Cultural Elites and the New Generationalism*. St Leonards: Allen & Unwin.
- Debritz, B. (2000, December 5). Words Worth! *Sunday Mail* (p.5)
- Denholm, M. (1997, October). From Michael Denholm. *Australian Book Review* (p.5)
- Docker, J. (1974). *Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne*. Sydney: Angus & Robertson.
- Docker, J. (1984). *In a Critical Condition*. Ringwood: Penguin.
- Donoughue, P. (2001, August). Dingoes in Suburbia: In Defence of the ABA. *Australian Booksellers and Publishers* (p.11)
- Duwell, M. & Hergenhan, L. (1997). Editorial. *Australian Literary Studies* 18.1 (p.3)
- Duwell, M. & Hergenhan, L. (1997). Editorial. *Australian Literary Studies* 18.2 (p.115).
- Finally It's Over (2003, April 2). *Weekly Book Newsletter* 1-2.
- Evans, N. (2004). Interview. Glover, S. (Ed) Brisbane: unpublished.
- Glover, S. (1995). Creative Nation: Where Now for Publishing and Literature Policy? *Imago* 7(1) 54-58.
- Glover, S. (2006). Literature and the State in Munro, C. & Sheahan-Bright, R. (Ed) *Paper Empires* (pp. 162-71) St Lucia, Qld: UQP.
- Jinman, R. (1994, August, 7). Murray Savaged by Poetic Peers. *Australian* (p.2).
- Jost, J., Totaro, G., & Tyshing, G. (Eds) (1996). *The Demidenko File*. Ringwood Penguin.
- Kenny, R. (1984). Robert Kenny Replies. *Meanjin* 43(2) 322-323.
- "Les Murray's Poetic Licence." (1994, July 9). *Sydney Morning Herald* (p.32).
- McGuinness, P. (2001, June 24). RIP, Brave Little Magazine, Doomed from the Start. *Sydney Morning Herald*, p.16.
- McGuinness, P. (1993, February 25). Scroungers Who Claim to Be Artists. *Australian* (p.13).
- O'Connor, M. (1992, September). Rejoinder. *Quadrant*, 6-7.
- "On the Up: Publisher Statistics Released." (2001, August 15). *Weekly Book Newsletter*. (p.1).
- "Open Book." (2000, December 17). *Sunday Mail* (p.97).
- O'Regan, T. (1996). *Australian National Cinema*. London: Routledge
- Puplick, C. (1990). Literature Policy and Funding under a Coalition Government. *Adelaide Review* 71, 16-17.
- Pybus, C. (1996, September). From Cassandra Pybus. *Australian Book Review* (p.3).
- Ross, G. (1997, November 8). Writing Off the Myth of Bias. *Courier-Mail*. sec. Weekend, (p.8).
- Shapcott, T. (1988). *The Literature Board: A Brief History*. St Lucia: UQP.
- Simmonds, D (1996, September 24). Look Who's Hogging the Literary Trough. *The Bulletin*, (p.89).
- Stevens, I. (2000). *History of the Literature Fund 1986-2000* (Draft) Sydney: Literature Board
- Stevens, I. (1994). Letter to David Kelly. Sydney: Literature Board Papers.
- Sullivan, J. (2000, April 16). Be the Last Writer Standing. *Sunday Age*, sec. Agenda (A:12).
- Thomson, C.A. (1997). Editorial. *Meanjin* 56.3-4 , 454-57.

Turner, G. (1998). Film, Television and Literature: Competing for the Nation. *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*. Bennett, B. & Strauss, J. (Ed) Melbourne: Oxford UP.