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Abstract: An ongoing debate surrounding the use of the didjeridu is the appropriateness of women playing it. This article explores examples of the quite diverse public discourse on the didjeridu in Australia (and elsewhere) but also some of the paradoxes informing the debate. The debate is characterised herein as part of a broader process of the construction of social memory via what is remembered or forgotten when the didjeridu is discussed or used. It is argued that, although gender is one dimension of the debate, there are other pertinent issues that need to be recognised as pivotal.

Contemporary Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders in Australia have vibrant musical cultures, although the eras of European colonisation, Christianisation and assimilation devastated many aspects of Indigenous sociocultural and musical life. However, elements of pre-colonial musical traditions survived in some regions such as northern Australia.1 In recent years some aspects of Indigenous music cultures have been revitalised or reinvented within the general process of the reclamation and/or refashioning of Indigenous identity. These processes have been informed by arguments concerning legal (Janke 1997) and production-based (Langton 1993) aspects of representations of Indigeneity.

With the ongoing but at times gradual integration of Indigenous peoples into the public culture of Australia, one particular instrument—the didjeridu—has become an icon. As such it is an aural and visual marker of Aboriginality, and arguably a tool of remembering and forgetting and thus part of how a particular society configures and conceptualises social memory. The process of constructing social memory is significant because: ‘It is an implicit rule that participants in any social order must presuppose a shared memory. To the extent that their memories of a society’s past diverge, to that extent its members can share neither experiences nor assumptions’ (Connerton 1989:3). Significant within the process of iconisation and incorporation of the didjeridu as an instrument of remembering and forgetting is the ongoing debate about the disputed rights of women to use the instrument. This article explores some facets of that public discourse.

Several general perspectives help to understand how musical instruments such as the didjeridu can both reflect and contest social norms, especially when ‘old’ instruments are used in ‘new’ contexts (Neuenfeldt 1998a). Appadurai (1986) has stressed how material objects have a social life, and the potential to be used and re-used in different ways.
Thomas (1991:4) has identified how ethnographic objects have been ‘entangled’ in the processes of colonisation and commodification in the Pacific, and how material objects ‘are not what they are made to be but what they have become’. They can assume iconic primacy when embedded in the politics of culture and the invention of tradition and its links to nationalism. Qureshi (1997:4) suggested that a musical instrument offers ‘a special kind of material memory in its dual capacity of a physical body and its embodied acoustic identity’. As a cultural product and tool for articulating cultural meaning through repeated sound, it becomes a privileged site for retaining and sometimes reviving or reinvigorating cultural memory (Appadurai 1986; Babadzan 2000; Hobbsbawm & Ranger 1983; Jolly & Thomas 1992), and also one means for societies to remember—and forget (Connerton 1989).

However, in some regions of Australia much of Indigenous music culture has atrophied or been destroyed, so cultural memory and social remembering—and gendered roles—may necessarily be inferred or guessed at in processes of reinvention that as elsewhere tend to be fraught with inconsistency (Dunbar-Hall & Gibson 2004; Frith 1996; Stokes 1993). The crux of the matter is the iconicity of the instrument and not necessarily its sound or former role in musical cultures, although they are interrelated. For Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians and others, these processes of reclamation and reinvention are epitomised by the didjeridu as an iconic instrument that literally resonates with remembering and forgetting.

The derivation and dissemination of the didjeridu

The didjeridu is an aerophone fashioned from termite-bored wood or bamboo. It is played by buzzing the lips and simultaneously inhaling air through the nose and exhaling into its cylindrical but asymmetrical chamber. Vocalisations and percussive effects can further enhance complex sounds. As Moyle (1974,1981) noted, the didjeridu’s provenance is in the northern tropical regions of Australia where it has been dated in Arnhem Land (in the Northern Territory) to approximately 1000–1500 years ago (Chaloupka 1993). It was used more recently in the Kimberley region of Western Australia and the Gulf of Carpentaria and Cape York regions of Queensland. However, it was not a part of the musical tradition of the majority of Aborigines living in the southern two-thirds of the continent.

In areas where it was part of traditional music practice, the didjeridu was used in secular and ceremonial contexts. It was not a solo instrument but part of an ensemble along with a songman and percussionist (Toner 2005:14–20). The instrument has primary associations with male performance, but Barwick (1997) has documented various instances where women either have been recorded by field researchers or observed playing in informal contexts. She stressed that Aboriginal women have not played the instrument in public ceremonial contexts, but also noted that gendered distinctions are consistent with other traditional social practices where men and women have complementary yet separate roles. For instance, in traditional ceremonies women and men commonly use different parts of the performance space, have distinct dance and movement styles, and often use different forms of percussion accompanying to singing (Barwick 1997). Similar localised uses are also well documented by Mackinlay (2003) in her work with women in the Borroloola community on the Gulf of Carpentaria, thus reinforcing Barwick’s earlier assertion that use by women can be negotiated locally.

Since approximately the mid-1980s the didjeridu has become a primary aural and visual signifier of Aboriginality in Australian public culture (Magowan 2005; Neuenfeldt 1997b,c) and New Age discourse (Neuenfeldt 1998b,c; Welch 2002). Its uses in film soundtracks (Neuenfeldt & Kibby 1998), popular and world music (Neuenfeldt 1994, 2001), education (Neuenfeldt 1998d), and cultural tourism (Neuenfeldt 1997a) have all played a role in this quite remarkable efflorescence (Smith & Neuenfeldt 1998). Along with its inclusion in new contexts, various myths have circulated nationally and internationally between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal enthusiasts, manufacturers and retailers. A primary myth centres on purported blanket restrictions on women playing, and in some cases, even touching or hearing the didjeridu.

Barwick has demolished many aspects of this myth, pointing out how distinctions about its gendered uses are often made on a very local level in traditional areas. However, regardless of clear documentation that Aboriginal women use the didjeridu in certain contexts, the mythical taboo against women persists especially among Aborigines in south-eastern Australia. This is an area where much of Aboriginal cultural practice has been destroyed and where the didjeridu has only recently been introduced. Barwick (1997:94) has pointed out that it has often been
impossible for Aboriginal peoples to reconstruct their own traditional ceremonial practice, ‘so they have adopted and adapted music from those areas where ceremonial life still flourishes, especially Northern Australia’. This provides a timely reminder that there is no single ‘Aboriginal culture’; consequently, blanket restrictions are conjectural, albeit still relevant in the didjeridu discourse.

Examples from the ongoing debate about women playing didjeridu

Vexing questions arise from the debate about women playing didjeridu. If Aboriginal spokespersons appear to disagree among themselves, to whom do non-Aboriginal didjeridu enthusiasts, manufacturers and retailers listen (should they desire to do so)? Similarly, what constitutes informed consent to play, make or sell the instrument? What about Aboriginal community groups allowing women to use the didjeridu as a means to pursue what they consider to be positive ends?

The following three examples continue chronologically from Barwick’s pre-1997 research and Mackinlay’s pre-2002 research, and they point out that the debate is persistent and perhaps irresolvable. The first example addresses the use of didjeridu by non-Aboriginal players in general; the second addresses Aboriginal use at odds with some Aboriginal groups’ gender-based restrictions; and the third addresses online Internet discussions on women using it.

The Garma Festival Yidaki [Didjeridu] Statement (Anon. 1999) is a contemporary attempt by an Aboriginal people with a longstanding connection to the didjeridu to state a position on its overall use. It was proposed by clan elders of the Yolngu from north-eastern Arnhem Land in the Northern Territory, where the Aboriginal members of the internationally known ‘world music’ band, Yothu Yindi, are also based (Anon. n.d.b). The band has a shifting line-up and features didjeridu players and traditional dancers, plus Western instruments such as guitars and keyboards (Hayward & Neuenfeldt 1998). Given the customary separation of gender roles, it is possible that senior female clan members participated in composing the statement, which was published in the context of a festival with cultural, artistic and economic components.

The statement uses the local term yidaki for the didjeridu, and also refers to non-Aboriginal persons by the term Balanda, meaning ‘European’ from the word for ‘Hollanders’ in the former Dutch East Indies. It seeks ‘to explore an ethical place in global culture’ for the instrument, mentioning an ‘emerging ethical relationship’ between senior clan elders and non-Aboriginal ‘guests’ attending a master class (Anon. 1999). It asserts the clan elders’ custodianship of the yidaki as including ‘the right to permit the use and teaching’ of it, and it seeks to find ‘ways that Yolngu and Balanda worlds can coexist on the basis of mutual respect, shared rituals, and reciprocal obligations’. Further concerns are expressed (Anon. 1999):

Yet Yolngu people are concerned that the emergence of a global culture and the commercialisation of the Yidaki have the potential to separate the Yidaki from its origins in the sacred stories which are at the heart of the songs. Ritual leaders of northeast Arnhem Land are calling for a new relationship with Balanda which recognises the centrality of the Yidaki to the Aboriginal groups who by right and tradition have the Yidaki as one of the instruments of cultural expression.

The statement identifies five principles ‘to guide the developing relationship between Yolngu custodians of the Yidaki and the Balanda people who use the instrument’ (Anon. 1999):

- **Respect** The basis of a new relationship is respect for the origins and significance of the Yidaki to Aboriginal people of northern Australia.
- **Aboriginal Law** Aboriginal law protects the Yidaki and establishes ritual exchange processes and reciprocal obligations between those elders with the authority to collect, make, perform and teach the yidaki, and those people—Yolngu and Balanda—who desire to learn about the instrument.
- **Permission** Yolngu law has always regulated the production and use of the Yidaki in Yolngu society. It is wrong for Yidaki to be produced without reference to, and respect for, these laws. Permission from the custodians of these laws is required.
- **Yothu Yindi** The Yolngu concept of Yothu Yindi [a kinship term meaning ‘child/mother’], which recognises duality and fosters balance where there is difference, is a guiding Yolngu philosophy that applies to this new relationship.
- **Ethical relationship** The basis of a new relationship will be mutual respect, goodwill, and a commitment to working together to define and evolve an ethical place for the Yidaki in world culture. With this statement, the Yolngu elders of northeast Arnhem Land open their hearts to a new relationship for the Yidaki in global culture. (Copyright 1999 Yothu Yindi Foundation)
Such a statement is designed to stake a cultural claim by a particular Aboriginal group and does not mention women’s use per se. Enforceability is problematic because of the transnational nature of the didjeridu industry, and also because other Aboriginal groups might have different views, arguing that the Yolngu initiative presupposes to speak for them without permission to do so. The text might be viewed as a purely local statement, with national and international exposure due to the ability of some Yolngu to make skilled use of media to disseminate their particular perspective. It could also be interpreted as an attempt to stake some kind of ambit claim to cultural copyright vis-a-vis both Aborigines and non-Aborigines using, making and selling the instrument. However, regardless of possible criticisms, the statement is important because it does encapsulate the main aspects of the debate.

Regarding gender issues, the statement is silent. Its general tenor is consistent with a previous statement by Mandawuy Yunupingu (1997), an important media spokesman for his clan, who like many Yolngu men plays didjeridu on occasion:

Yolngu understand the Yidaki has become an Australian icon and accept that non-Yolngu people throughout the world now use it for informal purposes and enjoyment. Be aware, however, that its origins are sacred and secret to Yolngu men. Those stories cannot be told here, can only be shared with initiated men. The Yidaki is a male-orientated instrument. In Yolngu society women are forbidden to play it, as its origins are sacred to men.

Thus, among some Yolngu, there is an acceptance that the didjeridu is now circulating in an uncontrollable manner in a global marketplace, but they also express the desire that some aspects of its origins should be recognised and respected.

Other complexities are evident in some Aboriginal women’s use of the didjeridu in contexts far removed from those common in traditional areas such as Arnhem Land. A good example is an Aboriginal supervised arts program for female inmates of Emu Plains and Mulawa prisons in New South Wales, an area where didjeridu was not played as a part of traditional musical culture. It is important to note that in Australia the Aboriginal prison population is disproportionately high (35%, within 2% of the general population—Johnston 1991). Arts programs are viewed as a constructive way of keeping prisoners occupied and imparting potentially useful skills. This particular program aimed to acquaint Aboriginal women with their cultural heritage as part of learning respect ‘for each other and themselves’; it focused on a range of Aboriginal cultural practices and artefacts, with the goal of building confidence to break ‘the re-offending behaviour of inmates’ (Ellicott 2000).

One aspect of the program involved women making and painting didjeridus. The paradox is that some Aboriginal groups may restrict women’s access to the instrument, although other groups may allow them to paint them. Thus the goal of building self-esteem and cultural awareness for some Aboriginal persons is balanced against prohibitions that might exist for others. Programs for a prison in an area where more inmates were from traditional communities would probably require a different scenario.

A final example of the complexity of the ongoing debate is illustrated in general discussions on the Internet, an increasingly important site for circulating information and dis-information (Kibby 1999). The specific theme noted here is women’s use of the didjeridu (Anon. n.d.a). One intriguing comment is: ‘I am woman. Hear me drone!’; perhaps a parody of Helen Reddy’s 1970s anthem ‘I am Woman’ (co-written by Ray Burton) which has the lyrics: ‘I am woman, hear me roar’. Another lengthier comment is:

There is an unproven allegation of an Aboriginal tradition that it is disrespectful or dangerous for a woman to play, own or even touch a didjeridu. This taboo may certainly exist in some, but not all Aboriginal communities. It may also apply only to Aboriginal women, not women in general. In retrospect, some Aboriginal women explained that it isn’t that they are disallowed to play, but that it is their choice not to. Whether male or female, out of sheer respect for the culture, if you are in the presence of an Aboriginal person, it would be best to ask if there are any objections prior to playing. Otherwise play to your heart’s content!

An article entitled ‘Women and the didjeridu’ is also of interest (Anon. 1998). Under the heading ‘The myth’, it states:

Ever since I have been playing the didjeridu, I have been told stories by women players who have been confronted by people (none of them Aboriginals) who claim that their playing is everything from disrespectful to potentially dangerous to them. I’ve also heard various rationalizations on the part of some women who even believe such taboos do exist.

Having researched the subject of female didjeridu players, the author of the above quotation points out...
that there was ‘no authoritative evidence’ to indicate a specific taboo precluding a female from touching, owning or playing the instrument under any circumstances other than ceremonial playing. The author cites the ‘famous’ example of US singer Tracy Chapman learning to play the didjeridu in Alice Springs at the School of the Aboriginal Art and Culture Centre, which was ‘Aboriginal owned and operated’ and seemed to have ‘no problem’ about teaching women the didjeridu. The author concluded:

In spite of all the claims that women playing the didjeridu is a sign of disrespect, I’ve never heard of an instance where a female was not allowed to buy a didjeridu from any vendor, Aboriginal or otherwise. If there is a strong taboo, money overcomes it. As far as stories about women not being allowed to even touch the instrument, most didjeridus made for the tourist industry are painted by Aboriginal women. It would seem that taboos against women players, if they exist at all, are greatly misunderstood if not grossly overstated. Obviously, there are times when it is not appropriate for any non-Aboriginal person to play the didjeridu. Respect for tradition is a valid concern and respect for the beliefs of others is paramount in cases where certain behaviors are discouraged.

These opinionated yet basically measured comments are one aspect of the on-line debate.

On a related theme, the same website published an interview with a US woman player who stated (Anon. 1998):

As far as the gender taboos go, I’ve found that most of what I’ve encountered has come from within myself and my own fears. A recent conversation [with an Aboriginal didjeriduist] really changed my perception on women playing the didjeridu. He told me that Aboriginal women in Australia do not play the didjeridu because they do not want to. They choose not to. All the time growing up it was his aunties telling him that women do not play the didjeridu, not the men. Then I realized that it was a choice. I looked down deep inside me and said, ‘Well what do you want to do’ and everything that I am answered back: PLAY. So once reconciled inside myself, my outward reality seems to reflect back to that I am playing the didj, that I can play and what’s more that I should.

Finally, she also notes her recent involvement with an all-women event, the first annual ‘Chicks with Sticks’ didjeridu gathering. When a mailing list member described it as a ‘Sexist Gathering’ she was taken by surprise, but she does not propose a female separatist stance.

All the examples detailed above provide rich data for discussion as facets of the public discourse on women playing didjeridu.

Discussion

Strands of remembering and forgetting are woven throughout the three examples. To deal with the last example first, in the Internet-based debate what is forgotten generally surpasses what is remembered. The majority of participants in (and readers of) discussion groups are not Australian and very rarely Aboriginal, and there is therefore no social memory of what Aborigines experienced and still experience in an arguably persistently racist Australian society. There is also no understanding of how a cultural artefact such as the didjeridu may be one of the few remnants of pre-colonial sociocultural and musical life. Such artefacts may increase in symbolic importance in inverse proportion to their original geographical distribution, so their symbolic value may easily surpass their musical value.

There is also a kind of selective amnesia about the European colonial process and its dispossession of the lands and cultures of Indigenous peoples worldwide. Somehow the romanticisation of Aboriginal culture may assuage a North American or European person’s historical complicity in their own colonial histories, and the broader processes of appropriation of artefacts may also apply for other instruments and artefacts. Another aspect of forgetting is the privileging of commercial concerns over cultural ones. This is illustrated in arguments about women readily buying didjeridus from Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal vendors or about Aboriginal women painting them. The example cited of US singer Tracy Chapman learning to play at an Aboriginal organisation in the central Desert region fails to note that the didjeridu as it is currently made and used was not and is not an intrinsic part of the traditional culture of that general area (although there was a small aerophone, ulubura), and that the organisation could only claim to represent its own constituency.

The example of women making didjeridus in a prison program also raises issues of remembering and forgetting. It causes Aboriginal organisers and inmates to remember that Aboriginal culture is worthy of celebration. Programs presenting affirmative aspects of Aboriginality are to be encouraged, yet the process of
celebration is problematic when institutional racism, economic and educational disadvantage, and deplorable health statistics have all affected Aboriginal life chances vis-a-vis the general population, and continue to have a profoundly negative impact.

The factor of commercialisation complicates the issue. Arguably the cultural and creative value of creating didjeridus and Aboriginal artwork in the prison context is paramount. But these products do also have commercial value. The Aboriginal artefact and art industry is an area of considerable economic potential for Aborigines, even if it raises questions about authenticity and appropriation. Learning to make and paint didjeridus is a potentially useful skill for women outside the prison. Yet some Aboriginal groups maintain that the didjeridu is an instrument for sole use by men and could logically seek to preclude women from benefiting in such ways.

The Yothu Yindi Foundation’s Yidaki Statement is another example of occasionally paradoxical remembering and forgetting. It primarily remembers how some Aboriginal groups have an extant tradition linking them directly to the didjeridu. The Yolngu’s particular engagement with ‘mainstream’ society is anomalous, and arises from a skilfully articulated public profile developed from at least the early 1970s during land-rights disputes and more recently on the international stage via the ‘world music’ band Yothu Yindi (Hayward & Neuenfeldt 1998). Readers of the Statement might forget the reality that such traditions are not extant in all Aboriginal groups across Australia, so the notion of the didjeridu as an emergent pan-Aboriginal tradition is directly related to intra-Aboriginal politics, noted for its particularism and often fractiousness.

The use of the word *yidaki* in the Statement is also complicated because it is a local name, which could imply a restricted application. Didjeridu enthusiasts might also mistake Yolngu ‘permission’ as an inclusive permission, but it only applies to places where Yolngu are entitled to speak. The Statement is also not pan-Aboriginal in scope or intent; it elides how other Aboriginal peoples’ use—and women’s use—fit within its mandate. It is significant because it codifies the feelings of one group, thus providing a starting point for cross-cultural contact, negotiation, and potential collaboration. However, its silence on the specific subject of women’s use contrasts with the earlier more outspoken statement that the *yidaki* is ‘a male-oriented instrument’ forbidden to women in Yolngu society.

Overall, in all three examples the main aspect of forgetting and remembering is the imagining of a singular, and often essentialistic, ‘Aboriginal culture’. Gendered issues are sometimes a part of this, but intra-cultural differences among Aborigines are particularly important. An Aboriginal individual or group such as the Yolngu may give (or deny) their ‘permission’ or express an ‘opinion’ on uses of the didjeridu, but this does not mean they have the right to speak on behalf of anyone else. Calls for ‘respect’ and ‘awareness’ show that cultural issues do matter and that societies predicated on unbridled consumption of cultural entities rarely reflect on how those entities are acquired or used.

One noteworthy paradox is how contemporary Western ‘alternative’ or New Age philosophies operate in consumer societies. They choose to remember the basic musicality of humans but expediently forget to differentiate degrees of cultural connection to specific instruments. They celebrate the didjeridu’s inherent musicality and may gain cultural capital—mainly within their own cultures, subcultures or societies—from a superficial awareness of or purported interest for Aboriginal sociocultural issues embodied in and by it. However, for the majority, awareness and concern remain superficial and egocentric, as exemplified by the Internet quotation from the woman didjeriduist who looked ‘deep inside herself’ for permission to play.

**Conclusion**

In an Australian context, issues raised via the didjeridu are of special interest to contemporary Indigeneity, adding further intricacy to an already complicated and sometimes volatile mix of culture, politics and, in some instances, commercialisation. Because so much of Aboriginal musical culture has been lost in particular areas, some Aborigines are keen to preserve and revere what remains, or is reclaimable or replicable. Therefore they may assert a kind of indirect titular custodianship of the didjeridu, based on its iconisation from survivals of earlier eras and earlier ways of expressing Aboriginal culture through music and musical instruments.

The examples cited from the ongoing debate on women’s use of didjeridu are consistent with Bawrwick’s and Mackinlay’s earlier research and comment on it. Gender seems to serve as a point of disputation with particular relevance for non-Aborigines. They see it as a threat to their ‘right’ as consumers to use the didjeridu.
as they choose. They also see their involvement as a mark of their ‘respect’ for Aboriginal tradition, even if some of those traditions are emergent. The situation for Aboriginal women is also complex, and in some contexts and cases open to continuing negotiation.

Women are obviously capable of making the sounds and learning the background to the didjeridu, but gender rules are contingent on a wide range of factors. The debate remains simultaneously localised and transnational, consistently inconsistent, and fundamentally paradoxical. This is understandable given the sociocultural complexities informing the issues, and the general lack of interest and knowledge of Aboriginal views or of Australian historical, political and economic contexts. Gender is certainly part of the debate but not necessarily the main focus. Barwick (1997:97) noted insightfully one positive outcome of the debate: ‘If nothing else, the clamour of conflicting voices about the use of didjeridu by women and by outsiders has drawn attention to the potential for international exploitation and appropriation of traditional music and other Aboriginal cultural property’.

This voicing of conflicts serves the purpose of keeping audible the real underlying key question, that arguably transcends gender: what is being remembered and/or forgotten when Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal persons do or do not play the didjeridu?
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NOTES


2. The Yothu Yindi Foundation has set up structures for supplying ‘authentic yidaki to the world market’ (as stated in their 1999 Newsletter). Corr (1999) has discussed the didjeridu as a site of economic contestation.

3. ‘Yothu yindi’ is a kinship term in the Matha Aboriginal languages of north-eastern Arnhem Land. The mother/child idea relates to lineage descent. Yolngu is the term for ‘human being’.

4. A side effect of successful artwork programs has involved accusations that some Australian prisons may be ‘fake art factories’. Additional problems about intellectual property rights have occurred when non-Aboriginal prisoners made didjeridus and other artefacts (Kearney 2000).

5. The author has observed some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women (and non-Indigenous women) painting didjeridus in Australia, both as a part of cottage industries and as larger scale operations. Anecdotally, the women said it was primarily either a way of making money or using their artistic skills.

6. Ongoing concerns about ‘rip-offs’ and fraud in the Aboriginal art industry, of which didjeridus are a sizeable component, have led to another government investigation. In the latest case, 2006, the Coalition government’s Arts Minister, Rod Kemp, is exploring the vexing challenges underlying the production and sale of Aboriginal art (Wilson 2006).

REFERENCES


Chaloupka, G 1993, Journey in time, Reed, Sydney.


Dunbar-Hall, P & Gibson, C 2004, Deadly sounds, deadly places: contemporary Aboriginal music in Australia, University of New South Wales Press, Sydney.

Elliot, J 2000, ‘Offenders healed the traditional way’, Australian, 18 April, p. 7.


Johnston, E 1991, Royal commission into Aboriginal deaths in custody, AGPS, Canberra.


Langton, M 1993, Well, I heard it on the radio and I saw it on the television, Australian Film Commission, Canberra.


Karl Neuenfeldt trained in anthropology in Canada and in cultural studies in Australia, and is active as a music researcher, producer and performer. He is currently Associate Professor in Contemporary Communication at Central Queensland University, Bundaberg campus.

<k.neuenfeldt@cqu.edu.au>