

Urban Activist Films in Melbourne 1969–1972

DAVID NICHOLS

Abstract

In the decade prior to the re-emergence of Australian feature film, Australian filmmakers in Melbourne were making a range of low-budget dramatic and short films, many of which celebrated an inner city that had emerged in the post-war years as a bohemian and multicultural space the more loved by its inhabitants for its threatened demolition. Discussing specific examples of short documentary films in the 'urban activist' sphere, this paper examines approaches, subtexts, contexts and ideals for these films as activist treatises and as cinematic art.

Keywords

Urban activism, film-making, cinematic art.

'Action was possible, it was widely believed, and produced results,' says Michael Heale of the 1960s.¹ This paper focuses on four films created during, and inspired by, the incidence of 'urban activism' in inner-city Melbourne in the late 1960s and early 1970s.² Nigel Buesst, in the very title (but also in the substance) of his 2002 documentary *Carlton + Godard = Cinema* places filmmaking at this time in the glow of the French New Wave; others may see a connection to 1960s agitprop generally; however, as will be seen, there is little in terms of form to link these films. It is, rather, a question of function. This paper shows that the films were created as different facets of activist propaganda advocating and/or representing the inner city as:

- a neglected, but/and beautiful social and built environment³;
- the location for 'alternative' (in a very broad sense of not conforming to the norm) lifestyles⁴;
- the domicile of Australia's (often recent immigrant) working-class—therefore, to many, minds 'genuine' and deserving people; and
- a valid and appropriate place for worker and/or bohemian 'activism' to conserve the above.

While questioning assumptions about the sterility and anti-intellectualism of the suburbs and 'normal' life – as discussed, and critiqued, by Hugh Stretton in his *Ideas for Australian Cities*⁵ – this paper nevertheless acknowledges the value of 1960s/70s urban activism since that time, particularly for the changes it brought to citizen involvement and grassroots change in local and even state and federal politics in Australia.

This short period of upheaval and agitation within the inner-city suburbs (those affected at this time being primarily Carlton, Parkville, South Melbourne, North Melbourne and Fitzroy) began in the mid-1960s and can, in retrospect, be seen as largely quelled by the ascension to the position of Victorian Premier by the pro-environment, 'quality of life'-oriented Rupert 'Dick' Hamer in 1972.⁶ Nevertheless, its ramifications are still being felt today, in the ongoing perception of the inner city both as the 'alternative' and, in essence, the most valid and vital area of the metropolis. The process of lobbying and protest on specifically local issues, the adaptation of new media forms to the cause and the creation of new channels to the established media were all groundbreaking at a time when grassroots and collective action were only beginning to be explored in practical terms.

Urban activism was an unusual blend of influences. The activist approach was, of course, a redirection, appropriation or at very least involved a *referencing* of the passions and approach of the anti-apartheid, anti-war and other anti-establishment campaigns of the 1960s towards very local concerns and issues. Rather than governments *per se*, political processes, war or capitalism, the enemies in this instance were the Housing Commission of Victoria (HCV), the Country Roads Board – which had been charged with the construction of freeways throughout Melbourne on a rough 'grid' that rode roughshod over the inner areas – and the private developers, who were often aided by the state government's newly enthusiastic fast-tracking of a long-mooted, and now outdated, slum clearance program. This occurred at a time when all Australian inner-city areas, having been seen for some decades as low-density, underutilized land that was responsible for urban sprawl (in comparison to the possibilities of high-rise building), were earmarked for a change involving 'Australians... mov[ing] back into their cities'.⁷

The ready availability of offset printing in Australia from the mid-1960s was revolutionary for student and radical newspapers, at least in terms of the ability to make a comprehensible, professional product, suitable for mass consumption, quickly – though the production changes inherent in producing camera-ready art also altered the product.⁸ Similarly, the greater affordability of film stock in the 1960s, and the production of the hand-held Bolex camera, was to the advantage particularly of short film makers operating in low-key 'independent' forums of their peers. Melbourne filmmakers in the 1960s and 70s with an interest in promoting inner-city conservation could look to international contemporaries (for instance, Lawrence Ravitz, whose *How Will They Know It's Us without Our Past* from 1968⁹ put forward the case for sympathetic restoration and use of old buildings in the USA) or to interstate filmmakers such as Tom Zubrycki in Sydney whose films – combining history with documentation of contemporary activism – were in some ways more realized, though at the same time more

strident, than Melbourne filmmakers and which were seen by some viewers as serving to 'inspire and give courage to those who must embark now or in the future on a campaign to save our environment'.¹⁰ For Zubrycki, documentary was instantaneous, not only in rallying locals who, in the case of his Balmain film, 'sat with rapt attention watching themselves and their friends debate the issue' on a big screen, but also in effecting change at state government level.¹¹ The urban activists were all groundbreaking at a time when grassroots and collective action was only beginning to be explored in practical terms. The urban activist filmmakers were also responding to short propaganda films such as the Housing Commission of Victoria's *The City Speaks* (1965) and *150 to the Acre* (1971), which – having been produced by television production bodies – may well have been shown on television as educational material.¹²

Perhaps unusually for an Australian society which remained, by present-day standards, beholden to its Commonwealth obligations and allegiances, American thought held strong sway amongst the anti-development activists of this time. Jane Jacobs' *Death and Life of Great American Cities*¹³, a case for the retention of older, adaptable streetscapes and neighbourhoods and for the rejection of proscriptive zoning, was a must-read at this time. For many, the work of veteran Chicago activist Saul Alinsky (particularly his *Rules for Radicals*)¹⁴ provided a sound moral basis for protest and many practical suggestions towards outcomes. Jim Spigelman, writing in *Australian Quarterly* in 1969, discussed a Canadian documentary series on Alinsky and the application both of this and radical filmmaking for Australians.¹⁵ Alinsky's writing was particularly influential on young Methodist minister Brian Howe, who had returned from time spent in Chicago in the late 1960s to teach sociology at Swinburne College of Technology. Howe was, of course, to become a key player in the Hawke and Keating Governments; a very early exploration of political action saw him co-found the Fitzroy Residents' Association (FRA) in 1970. According to Peter Dodds, director of the first film discussed herein, Howe had a direct influence on the subject matter and approach of *Fitzroy Coming Up for Air*.¹⁶

Fitzroy: Coming up for Air (dir. Peter Dodds, 1969)

A film about Fitzroy, made by the Brotherhood of St Laurence in the 1930s, brought the appalling living conditions of many in this notorious slum area to the attention of Melbourne's middle class. The Brotherhood's shock tactics and the keen awareness of its founder, Father Tucker, of the value of radical action and visceral publicity – of which the 1930s film is a brilliant example – were instrumental in the creation of the Housing Commission of Victoria in 1937. War and its after-effects delayed the Commission's activities, and when large-scale clearance began in Fitzroy in the mid-1960s, the situation had changed. Although the worst slums still remained in the block which today contains the high-rise Atherton Gardens estate, much of Fitzroy had become desirable real estate for new professionals and other 'colonizers'. The HCV had become powerful and committed to the demolition of much of the area. *Fitzroy: Coming up for Air* documents the tensions of late-1960s Fitzroy.

Peter Dodds, now the producer of Australia's longest-running exploration of middle-class suburban community, *Neighbours*, told an interviewer for

Erinsborough.com that:

I was a (very) early graduate of what was then the Swinburne Film and Television School (now Victorian College of the Arts) in Melbourne. In those days back in the late sixties, everyone was a novice, including the academic staff, and we spent a huge amount of time just looking at film after film. All the old classics, from Eisenstein to Fritz Lang and pretty much everything afterwards. It was a fantastic thing to have done, because you never get the chance to spend three years watching movies so intensely ever again.¹⁷

Dodds was also, however, required to do some coursework in other fields. Students at the Film and Television School took more general subjects and, in Dodds' case, this included Sociology, taught by Howe, who suggested that – rather than submit an essay on urban issues – Dodds make a film. The frenetic, seven-minute *Fitzroy Coming up for Air* was the result: a series of interview snippets and scenes from the 'rundown' backstreets of Fitzroy set to blaring hurdy-gurdy music. Those interviewed included Sister Rita of St Marks, local librarian E. Harridence, Peter Hollingworth of the Brotherhood of St Laurence, Sister Payne of Fitzroy Day Nursery, Fitzroy's Town Clerk John James, the Housing Commission's Bert Bennett, FRA member/co-founder Louise Elliot, who is not credited, and a number of other uncredited, and in some cases unseen, individuals. Dodds says that he also interviewed Howe – 'when Brian was wearing a collar' – but that this footage was excised due to time constraints.¹⁸

Views expressed in the film include the opinion that the worst slums are now cleared (so a slum clearance program is no longer necessary), and relief is expressed that Fitzroy has 'escaped being really fashionable' like East Melbourne and, 'even worse', Paddington in Sydney.¹⁹ The film concludes with informants giving personal definitions of 'quality of life', a concept that was to become a cornerstone of the Hamer government less than three years later.

Howe clearly recognized the value of the film as propaganda and/or as a rallying point for activism in Fitzroy. It was shown at a FRA 'festival' in 1970 alongside a Canadian film about collective action instituting street closures in Montreal.²⁰ For a Fitzroy just a few years before Helen Garner's rhapsodising novel *Monkey Grip*²¹, it was an early celebration of the extraordinary blend and diversity of the area, and as such it put its case for preservation of the built environment and, as importantly, of *community* with charm and good humour.

Parkville (dir. Don Featherstone, 1970)

To walk from Fitzroy to Parkville – a pleasant stroll across the campus of the University of Melbourne, a source of employment for many professionals moving to these two areas in the 1960s and 70s – takes about fifteen minutes. Both are 19th-century inner-city regions with origins as dormitory suburbs for city workers. The difference between the two areas is, however, very marked: with no notable retail or industrial areas, the three sections of Parkville (South, North and West) had become gracious, if somewhat faded, residential stock by the late 1960s. South Parkville was the first area of Melbourne to receive heritage status from the National Trust, largely as a result of lobbying from the Parkville Association. This organization had been formed in 1967 as a result of local residents' fears over the University's plans for expansion into the area.²²

Whereas the Fitzroy Residents' Association saw its role as multifaceted and inclusive of all members of the Fitzroy community, the Parkville Association – its avowed purpose of increasing communication amongst residents notwithstanding – was primarily concerned with retention of the built environment. With this in mind, key Association member Eric Benjamin – later to have his greatest triumph as a central figure in the campaign to save Victoria Market from redevelopment – contacted Don Featherstone, a lecturer in film at RMIT (and not to be confused with a veteran amateur filmmaker of the same name).²³ Featherstone shot and edited a short film, *Parkville*, with RMIT students²⁴, and then asked Melbourne writer and poet Ken Taylor to compose and recite a poem to synchronize with his visuals. Taylor, a fervent admirer of 'the Melbourneness of Melbourne'²⁵, sought here to identify ascertain 'Parkvilleness'.

Viewed in the context of the gentrification of this and other areas of inner-city Melbourne, the cynical yet restrained tone of Taylor's words may well grate on the contemporary viewer. His poetry emphasizes the antiquity and elegance of the built environment, and a perceived timelessness of suburban life (almost suggesting that it does not matter who lives in particular houses, that the houses themselves create the lifestyle). At some moments that do not fit his discourse, as when a young black man – evidence presumably of the University's residences' impact on the changing faces of Parkville – walks past the terraces, Taylor's silence says more than his words.

Low-key, 'tasteful' music and some impressionistic as well as non-synchronized incidental soundtrack (conversation, clocks ticking) add to the cosiness of the overall production. Taylor's concluding lines, extemporized to unusual footage of young hotel clientele, one of whom is playing a lute(!), reinforce the film's primary aim. This is to insist on a Parkville in perpetuity: 'There was a girl at that party waiting for life to begin. This girl, this boy, waiting with time, with Parkville'.

The Destruction of St. Patricks College (dir. Nigel Buesst, 1971)

Nigel Buesst was a seasoned film maker by the early 1970s, acknowledged as one of the ambitious 'free spirits of Carlton in the 1960s'.²⁶ He had already made the locally successful feature *The Rise and Fall of Squizzy Taylor* (1969)²⁷ and a number of shorter films, many of which (similarly to *Squizzy Taylor*) challenged the viewer's assumptions of documentary reality with a blend of authentic and scripted or improvised testimony.²⁸ He had also made a very witty critique of inner-city bohemia, *Bonjour Balwyn* (1968).²⁹ The film which was closest in spirit, though very different in form, to *The Destruction of St Patricks College*³⁰ was his 1962 short *Fun Radio*.³¹ In the earlier film, Buesst clashed footage of Melbournians' lust for consumer culture, rock 'n' roll and violent sport with a soundtrack of high-tension DJ banter and surf music.³²

St Patrick's College was scheduled for demolition in 1970. The building was the subject of a concerted push for preservation from notable and eloquent citizens, though their pleas for its preservation fell on deaf ears.³³ The trustees of St Patrick's Cathedral argued, with a logic no longer comprehensible thirty years later, that the College building impeded the proper appreciation of the Cathedral

itself. The National Trust, which deplored the demolition, was powerless to prevent it and the conservative state government was, at this time, a year away from the transfer of power from Henry Bolte to Rupert Hamer – who has since claimed that he would have preferred to save the building but was, it is to be assumed, unable to do so under Bolte.

Buesst had worked for much of the 1960s as a 'stringer' for ABC news; his *Destruction* (filmed by Buesst and Tom Cowan) is a visually dispassionate documentation of the act of levelling a fine old bluestone building. Buesst has said that his motivation for making the film was simple:

Reading that it was going to be destroyed that week and being aware of these two magnificent Italian towers, it seemed like something that should be filmed. So I took an old Bolex over there and just filmed it.³⁴

Buesst created the film from this raw footage by adding a soundtrack of slowed-down rock 'n' roll music – intended to indicate the indignity felt by the building as it was destroyed – and a 'found' narration by C. Hartley Grattan, a American commentator on Australian culture and society since the 1930s. Buesst recalls:

Later I heard this talk on *Guest of Honour*, a regular ABC radio show on a Sunday night, this visiting American professor, [recorded it] and just put the two together ... It was like a little artwork.

Though Grattan did not give his consent to be featured in the film – which acknowledges him in a humorous credit reading 'With Professor Hartley Gratten from Texas University and Whelan the Wrecker who made it all possible' – the juxtaposition of Grattan's commentary could not be more apposite. 'Australia desperately needs a vision of the possible today,' he intones, adding that the Australian attitude to history 'seems to be, "let the dead past bury its own deadness"'.

Though it seems unlikely that Los Angeles was a port of call for many Australians in the 1960s or 1970s, the city's ready willingness to erase its own past for the sake of modernity and/or efficiency³⁵ was often accepted as a worst-case scenario that some elements of Melbourne's bureaucracies were embracing with alacrity. The powers-that-were's eagerness to convert inner Melbourne into a cunningly zoned melange of high-rise (for both rich and poor), industrial areas (despite the fact that industry had already expressed a preference for outer area development) and freeways was, unsurprisingly, a source of much conflict and contention at this time. A prime example of this was documented in Dale Masterson and Peter Baroutis's *Struggle*.

***Struggle* (dirs. Dale Masterson and Peter Baroutis, 1971)**

The twenty-minute *Struggle*³⁶, directed by Dale Masterson and Peter Baroutis over two years, was itself born out of an unusual arrangement. It was begun by Masterson (using black and white film stock) and finished by Baroutis (in colour). Though Baroutis acknowledges Masterson as the 'ostensible creator' of the project, it passed into his hands after a hiatus and was funded by the Builders Laborers Federation (BLF) itself. It was then – in an unusual example of 'grass roots' distribution – shown at building sites after which a hat was passed around to cover costs of production.³⁷

The film, part of which is presented as a television news or current affairs report might be, depicts the 1971 conflict between a builder, Rayner Nominees, which attempted unsuccessfully to build a warehouse for Kimberley Clark on railway land which had escaped normal zoning. Disturbed by the prospect of a large industrial facility at its northern boundary in a suburb lacking much open space, the Carlton Association had requested of BLF secretary Norm Gallagher that his union prevent the construction of the warehouse: Gallagher announces in the film that he has 'declared construction black' – that is, blackbanned work on the site. Though Jack Munday's 'green bans' are, today, far better known – Munday persuaded his members to take industrial action to conserve heritage buildings and other facilities for the greater good of society – the BLF in Victoria, under Gallagher, executed a number of 'black bans' which saved, amongst other things, the Regent Theatre and the City Baths from demolition in the early 70s.

Once again, hindsight makes *Struggle's* insistence on the importance of retaining the railway land as recreational space for Carlton's working class unintentionally ironic, if not extraordinary. The actions of the Carlton Association and the BLF in this instance were some of many that have ultimately contributed to the area becoming some of the most sought-after real estate in Melbourne, notwithstanding the continued existence of some Ministry of Housing (former HCV) low-rise in the immediate area.

What is perhaps most unusual, and delightful, about *Struggle* as a film is the presentation of both Rayner's and the Union's side of the argument. It is possible that in context the filmmakers and producers assumed that Rayner would condemn himself with his blithe remarks about the higher pay for his non-union labour in constructing the warehouse. The film also presents a *fait accompli*: the warehouse was not built, and Gallagher clearly has the moral high ground in *Struggle* not least because of the two-week jail term he spent after a physical altercation with some of Rayner's workers on the Carlton site.

Conclusion

The understanding of the suburbs, inner city, community, and 'lifestyle' that pervades the early 'urban activist' films discussed here is still pertinent for film directors – and presumably audiences – in the present day. A recent example is the 2004 film *Tom White*, which depicts White, an architectural draftsman, suffering a nervous breakdown during (and perhaps because of) his involvement in the design of a new housing estate, Clearwater Springs.³⁸ Whereas White's family believes he is hard at work on drawings for the prestigious new development, he is in fact recreating the new apartments as the habitat for sinister, black bird skeletons. Abandoning his family to their new home at the apparently sterile Beacon Cove – a celebrated and popular 1990s development in Port Melbourne – he instead disappears into the labyrinths of the decaying inner-city where a man can get lost and, in a limited sense, free. The film engages with Australia's urban dilemma in exactly the language that would have been entirely familiar to the activists of the 1960s.

While depicting the 1960s as a heady time of great change is tantamount to wallowing in hollow cliché, it is true that this decade changed Australian

society to the degree that the 1950s and before seem today almost like a foreign country—even for those who were alive at the time.

A decade ago James Walter said that popular culture is ‘always dependent upon particular technologies of reproduction, representation and dissemination [however] who has access, how they are deployed, and who benefits are matters of choice and negotiation’.³⁹ Unions, residents associations, individuals and students produced the films cited above, utilising a variety of financial resources for production and a range of unusual techniques for screening—proof of a genuine ‘grass roots’ protest movement in the inner city which did not depend on moneyed ‘gentrifiers’ or dilettantes. The particular films under discussion here were made at a moment of confluence for new techniques and technology that emerged at the same time as a very visceral and, seemingly, very understandable lobbying for change. People could make non sequitur and/or political films because filmmaking had become affordable.

Yet the activist films are important for a number of reasons beyond merely their historical and/or entertainment value, not least of which is that they crystallize a unique moment in Australian history *and* the global history of twentieth-century grassroots politics. Along with the ‘Carlton’ films memorialized in Buesst’s 2002 documentary *Carlton + Godard = Cinema*, these films were an early opportunity for urban Australians to see themselves and their locales not only on a moving picture screen, but also taken seriously—in a way that *Division 4* car chases, which were also often shot in Richmond, Collingwood and Fitzroy, did not allow.

Felicity Collins and Therese Davis’ *Australian Cinema after Mabo*⁴⁰—which views recent local feature films from the perspective of an Australia forced to reassess itself in the light of new understandings of the legitimacy of non-indigenous Australians’ claim to own and belong to their land—is important in this context. Like the fictional Kerrigan family of *The Castle*—explored in some detail in Collins and Davis’ chapter on urban Australia⁴¹—the late-1960s years of urban activism brought debates about ownership, entitlement, belonging and habitus in inner-city Melbourne to the fore. However, the urban activist films have another value in addition to the above. All four of the above discussed films, in different ways, are multifaceted and—while clearly presented from a point of view that supports the perceived underdog in inner-city battles for conservation of both community and environment—employ approaches that acknowledge the tension between narrator, narrative, visual imagery and audience perception. In this, the urban activist films are valuable viewing for activists, historians and present-day filmmakers alike.

Endnotes

¹ M.J. Heale, *The Sixties in America: History, Politics and Protest*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 2001, p. 11.

² This paper draws on research undertaken for an Australian Research Council-funded project entitled ‘Community and Governance: Urban Activism in Melbourne in the 1960s and Beyond’ under the aegis of Deakin

and Monash Universities, Melbourne.

³ Numerous examples cited in D. Nichols, 'A fresco that can be lived', in S. O'Hanlon and T. Luckens, eds, *Go! Melbourne in the Sixties*, Circa, Melbourne, 2005.

⁴ See for instance Anon (Helen Garner), 'Melbourne: Learning What Children Can Teach', *The Digger*, July 28 - August 11 1973, p. 7; H. Garner, 'The End of a Collective', *The Digger*, November 10 - December 8 1973, p. 4 (the second of these articles makes it clear that Garner was author of the first).

⁵ H. Stretton, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, 2nd edn, Georgian House, Middle Park, 1975, pp. 27-29, p. 10.

⁶ See for instance I. Baker, 'Doing it softly-softly; Dick hears murmurs', *The Review*, 30 July 1971, p. 1184.

⁷ B. Hoad, 'How to Beat the Suburban Sprawl', *The Bulletin*, 10 February 1968, pp. 44-45.

⁸ See D. Nichols, "'Boiling in Anger": Activist Local Newspapers of the 1960s and 1970s', *History Australia*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2005. DOI: 10.2104/ha/050041.

⁹ Lawrence Ravitz, dir., *How Will They Know It's Us without Our Past*, 1968.

¹⁰ F. McDonald, 'Bulldozed: Three Films about Unwelcome Developments', *Tharunka*, vol. 27, no. 4, 12 April 1981, p. 25. See also T. Zubrycki, 'Documentary: a Personal View' in R. Caputo and G. Burton, eds, *Second Take: Australian Filmmakers Talk*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, 1999, pp. 178-192, p. 180.

¹¹ T. Zubrycki, 'Documentary', p. 179.

¹² *The City Speaks*, Crawford Productions, 1965; *150 to the Acre*, ABC TV, 1971.

¹³ J. Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities: The Failure of Town Planning*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1962.

¹⁴ S.D. Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals: a Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals* Random House, New York, 1971.

¹⁵ J. Spigelman, 'Film as Social Action Tool', *Australian Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 1, March 1969, pp. 74-80, p. 74. See also B. Ryan, 'They Shoot Students, Don't They?', *Australian Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 3, September 1970, pp. 10-23.

¹⁶ P. Dodds, dir., *Fitzroy Coming up for Air* (Swinburne Film and Television School) 1969. Available for viewing at ACMI Lending Collection, South Melbourne.

¹⁷ 'Glenn' interview with Peter Dodds, *Erinsborough.com*, <<http://www.erinsborough.com/interviews/index.php?page=peterdodds>>' accessed 11 December 2004.

¹⁸ P. Dodds, pers. comm.

¹⁹ Uncredited interviewee in P. Dodds, dir., *Fitzroy: Coming Up For Air*, 1969.

²⁰ 'Come to the Fitzroy Festival Saturday 5 December at 3.30 pm', *Fitzroy Residents Association Bulletin*, no. 6, December 1970, p. 1.

²¹ See discussion in J. Chesterman, *Poverty Law and Social Change: The Story of the Fitzroy Legal Service*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, 1996, pp. 47–8.

²² See Parkville Association 2004/667, Melbourne University Archives.

²³ <http://secure.heritageonline.com.au/aboutHeritage/featherstone_filmCatalogue.cfm>

²⁴ Norah Killip interviewed by J. Yule, Parkville, 10 January 2003. The film's credits read: 'A film by Donald Featherstone, Jack Endacott, Ivan Hexter, Greg Dee: Poetry: Ken Taylor'. Don Featherstone (and others), dir., *Parkville*, Parkville Association, 1970. Available for viewing at ACMI Lending Collection, South Melbourne.

²⁵ K. Taylor, ed., *Melbourne on My Mind*, ABC Books, Sydney, 1976, p. 19.

²⁶ T. Robertson, *The Pram Factory: the Australian Performing Group Recollected*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, 2001 p. 3.

²⁷ N. Buesst, dir., *The Rise and Fall of Squizzy Taylor*, 1969. Available for viewing at Screen Sound Australia, South Melbourne.

²⁸ See 'Batman's Melbourne: But, Will Squizzy's Re-run Be a Long Run?', *The Bulletin*, 10 May 1969, p. 4; D. Nichols, "'Nobody Interesting Lives East of Glenferrie Road'": Melbourne in the films of Nigel Buesst and Richard Lowenstein', in C. Long, C. Merlo and K. Shaw, eds, *Suburban Fantasies: Melbourne Unmasked*, Australian Scholarly Publishing, Melbourne, 2005, pp. 156–173.

²⁹ N. Buesst, dir., *Bonjour Balwyn*, 1968. Available for viewing at Screen Sound Australia, South Melbourne.

³⁰ N. Buesst, dir., *The Destruction of St Patricks College in 1971*, 1971. Available for viewing at ACMI Lending Collection, South Melbourne or on DVD from Sunrise Picture Company, Carlton.

³¹ N. Buesst, dir., *Fun Radio*, 1962. Available for viewing at ACMI Lending Collection, South Melbourne or on DVD from Sunrise Picture Company, Carlton.

³² Buesst discusses *Fun Radio* in detail in 'Nigel Buesst's Fun Radio', *Cantrill's Filmnotes*, 49–50, April 1986, pp. 32–34.

³³ Numerous examples can be found in the letters pages of *The Age* in January, 1970, for instance: A.B. Purbrick, 'Preserving our past history'; J. Hennessy, 'National Trust and St Patrick's College', *The Age*, 3 January 1970, p. 10; and M. Dolan, 'Keep wreckers off St. Patrick's College', *The Age*, 8 January 1970, p. 7.

³⁴ Nigel Buesst interviewed by D. Nichols, Carlton, 7 October 2003.

³⁵ See N.M. Klein, *The History of Forgetting: Los Angeles and the Erasure of Memory*, Verso, London, 1997, particularly chapter 6, 'Two Neighbourhoods', pp. 123–146.

³⁶ D. Masterson and P. Baroutis, eds, *Struggle*, Eureka Films, 1971. Available for viewing at ACMI Lending Collection, South Melbourne.

³⁷ Peter Baroutis, pers. comm.

³⁸ A. Tsilimidos (dir.), *Tom White*, 2004.

³⁹ J. Walter, 'Popular Culture and the "Mass Media"', in I. Craven with M. Gray and G. Stoneham, eds, *Australian Popular Culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 66–78.

⁴⁰ F. Collins and T. Davis, *Australian Cinema after Mabo*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

⁴¹ 'Coming from the City in *The Castle*, *Vacant Possession* and *Radiance*', in F. Collins and T. Davis, *Australian Cinema after Mabo*, pp. 112–132.

David Nichols lectures in Australian studies at Deakin University. He has recently published on community consultation in 1920s Melbourne, urban activist newspapers in 1960s Melbourne, and the businessman C.J. De Garis. His book The Go-Betweens (1997) was reissued in updated edition by Verse Chorus Press (Portland, Oregon) in 2003.