

Queensland Shows the World: Regionalism and Modernity at Brisbane's World Expo '88

Rachel Sanderson

World Expo 1988 provided a forum in which a sense of the unique character of Queensland was displayed. It was also explicitly intended to start Brisbane on a modernisation process, toward a future as a 'global' city. The conflicts between these two aspects of Expo '88 were played out in a number of ways, both on the *Expo* site itself and through the commentary and debate with which the local media (particularly the *Courier Mail*) surrounded the event. This article explores the clash between the symbols and values associated with 'Queensland' and those identified with 'Brisbane' during World Expo '88, and examines the concerns which surfaced over the role of Japan at Expo '88: concerns linked primarily to the place of Japanese investment and tourism in Queensland's modernisation.

Nation and region in the international exhibitions

The International Exhibitions, to which Brisbane's World Expo '88 was heir, were at their peak from the Great Exhibition of 1851 till the mid-twentieth century. Between 1855 and 1914, an exhibition involving more than twenty nations took place somewhere in the world every second year, on average.¹ Successful events, such as those held in Paris in 1889 and 1900, could register such astounding attendance figures as 32 and 48 million visitors respectively.² Unsuccessful events could leave cities virtually bankrupt.³ The significance of a successful exhibition for both the host city and host nation in fostering trade, boosting local and national pride, and introducing novel styles, ideas and technologies, should not be under-rated.

After re-emerging in 1958 from the lull which followed the second world war, the exhibitions continued throughout the second half of the twentieth century, although with less regularity and less extravagance than previously. This period also saw a geographical shift — the largest exhibitions had traditionally been located in France, England, and the United States — to an almost exclusive focus on the United States, Canada and Japan. While the exhibitions were, from the first, outstanding platforms for the promotion of a gospel of progress linked to national development, issues of regional status and of asserting the identity of host cities within the nation and the world would come to be increasingly important in the twentieth century.

Exhibitions have been used to demonstrate regional identities and concerns in four main ways. Firstly, they have expressed the power of the dominant metropolis and identified it with 'the nation', thus acting as a means of quashing regional or oppositional claims and promoting adherence to a particular vision of the nation. This was the case in the nineteenth-century exhibitions in London and Paris.⁴ Secondly, exhibitions have been instruments of inter-regional or inter-city disputes, as more commonly occurred in the United States, where there was no single, unassailable 'metropolis' that could claim national status.⁵ Thirdly, exhibitions have provided a forum for secessionist or quasi-secessionist claims, such as in Texas in 1939 and Montreal in 1967.⁶ Finally, exhibitions have provided a means for promoting the status and identity of peripheral cities, and have been used to brand such cities as modern and progressive on an international stage.⁷ This was the case in Seattle, Osaka and Vancouver, and was essentially the function of Expo '88 in Brisbane, Australia.

A headline in the *Courier Mail* just prior to the opening of Expo '88 read: 'Our coming of age

party: Bridging the yawning gap from a hayseed State to an urbane, international future'. The *Courier Mail* went on to claim:

World Expo 88 will have worked to our best advantage if it leaves Brisbane, and Queensland, with less insularity, more global awareness, less intolerance of people who do not look, speak or eat in quite the same way that we do, more tourist trade, and some small black numbers at the bottom of the Expo balance sheet.⁸

Expo '88, seen in this light, was not only intended to make Brisbane a better place to live by means of cultural and economic development, but was also intended to make Queenslanders 'better people'.

At the opening of Expo '88, the Mayor of Brisbane, Sally-Anne Atkinson, declared, 'Today we formally and officially become an international city'.⁹ Sir Llew Edwards, Expo organiser, was more specific in outlining his vision for post-Expo Brisbane: 'Our basic aim has been to make World Expo '88 the catalyst for a significant change in our lifestyle'.¹⁰ Edwards went on to specify extended opening hours for hotels and restaurants, and the introduction of sidewalk cafes with outdoor eating facilities as changes that would be trialled during Expo '88. He expressed the hope that their success in this period would lead to the changes being implemented by governments and councils in the longer term. In his view, Expo '88 was a 'people's event'. Expo could thus be used as a forum for Brisbane residents to attempt to influence governing bodies, changing the direction of future policy on the use and regulation of public space.¹¹

Those people whose homes had been demolished to make way for Expo, or whose rent had increased exorbitantly in the lead-up to the event, may have had misgivings about this identification of Expo with 'the people' and the pinning on Expo of hopes for a transformation of lifestyle in Brisbane. The impetus provided by Expo for changes in the character of Brisbane, the consequences of it becoming an 'international city', did not go unquestioned in the Queensland press. Angus Innes, then leader of the Queensland Liberal Party, expressed concern about possible changes, and argued the importance of maintaining what gave Brisbane its own particular character:

Brisbane has the friendliness and identity of a large country town and it has, at the same time, world class aspects ... But let's hang onto the uniqueness of our own architectural environment; let's open the river, keep the mountains in view and the houses on the tall stumps; let's keep the human aspect of Brisbane.¹²

An editorial in the *Sunday Mail* raised another issue which would be particularly prominent during Expo, enhanced by the high level of Japanese representation:

Expo will be a great success, educationally at least, in persuading Queenslanders that we are part of a global economy, requiring us to compete in an international marketplace. The level of foreign investment in Australia, particularly Japanese, revealed last week has disturbed many Queenslanders.⁴³

Although *Expo 88* had a primarily regional focus it was, like so many International Exhibitions, inspired by a pre-eminently national occasion — the Australian bicentenary. While most large-scale events of the bicentenary were organised and managed by the Australian Bicentenary Authority (ABA), the Brisbane Exposition and South Bank Redevelopment Authority was set up specifically to take control of, and responsibility for, the running of Expo. Because of this administrative separation — as well as Expo's location in Brisbane, a peripheral capital city — the relationship between Expo and other bicentennial events became ambiguous. It was certainly considered, from as early as 1974, to be a suitable event to form an integral part of the bicentenary.¹⁴ When it seemed that it might not eventuate, the concept was heavily promoted both by Queensland business and government, and by the ABA, to the federal government.¹⁵

The ambiguity that seemed to settle around Expo was increased by its early association with the government of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Queensland's longstanding National Party premier was a pariah to the Commonwealth Labor government of the time, and was sometimes referred to in other states as 'Joh Bananas' or 'The Flying Peanut'. The perception, relayed in editorial discussions

and statements by public figures, was that Queensland was 'different' — Australia's equivalent of the Deep South — politically extreme, underdeveloped economically and culturally, rurally focused, racist and parochial.¹⁶ While cost was also a consideration, the slowness of other Australian states in deciding whether they would have pavilions at Expo — it took them two years to confirm their involvement — was almost certainly also due to its 'off-beat' location. While bicentenary organisers were grappling with the contested national past and with the promotion of some form of national unity, Expo was looking to the future of Queensland. Whereas the bicentenary necessarily touched on notions of citizenship and social responsibility, Expo presented visions of culture almost entirely divorced from any historical, political or social context.

Queensland and Australia: The pavilion at Expo'88

The most obvious means by which a sense of Queensland identity was articulated at Expo '88 was through the Queensland pavilion, which reported some of the highest attendance figures of all the pavilions of the states and nations represented. According to the *Courier Mail*.

The emphasis [in the pavilion] is on progress, life in the sun, happiness, development, technology and sun-kissed young bodies. If there are any blemishes in the Queensland lifestyle, the pavilion is hardly the place to put them on show.¹⁷

The focus of the pavilion was the Expo theme 'Leisure in the Age of Technology', a theme chosen to fit the hoped-for role of Expo — promoting Queensland as a prime tourist destination. The images presented were designed, explicitly, to appeal to tourists and potential investors, and the success of the pavilion itself was largely evaluated in terms of its economic impact.

The main feature of the pavilion was a ten 'minute ride on 'The Spirit of Queensland', which the *Courier Mail* described as an 'electrified, computerised people-mover bought from Japan'.¹⁸ The 'people-mover' carried the visitor through a tunnel, which began with a scene of industrial wasteland, into 'Paradise' — a series of panoramic 'Queensland' scenes which consisted of a combination of static sculpture or artwork and animated or audio-visual components. One of these was a traditional Queensland pub, complete with Queensland bush 'characters' (all men) leaning against the bar telling stories, while a kelpie waited patiently at their feet. As enticing tourists to explore the state was a significant aim, the ubiquitous vision of the beach lifestyle (represented primarily by young, bikini-clad women) was promoted as integral to the Sunshine State. Visitors were taken through a tropical rainforest scene, complete with animated stuffed animals and offered an underwater glimpse of the Barrier Reef. The ride ended to a reportedly stirring tune — 'Come join the spirit' — with the souvenir shop not too far away.

Leisure in the age of technology was, in the Queensland pavilion, leisure as escape from technology and into natural environments — the beach and the rainforest — and 'authentic' experiences like the 'true-blue' bush pub. The experience of the pavilion — itself a form of leisure — was an experience of technology. The pace at which the presentation was viewed was determined not by the visitor, but by the electronic people-mover, and the audio-visual technology was utilised in a self-conscious way, brought to the foreground of the display, with the content itself taking a back seat, as is evident in the *Courier Mail's* review of the pavilion:

Nevertheless, the effect is startling. With the aid of cunningly placed mirrors, a montage of Queensland scenes surrounds the traveller ... The rainforest section is peaceful and traditional — even to the spectacle of a mock croc opening its jaws and snarling. A snake writhes overhead, owls blink, cockatoos ruffle their crests. They are all worked by animation and were created in Australia — except for the cockatoo's innards which needed American attention ... the Spirit passes the old Queensland pub ... and four bush characters chatting away. These are state-of-the-art — their heads are seen on a screen which sits on their bodies, which are there, as it were, in the wax.¹⁹

The pavilion was designed to provide a technological experience for Queenslanders and a series of 'wish you were here' snapshots for visitors. While its inauthenticity was assumed (in contrast to the

continual focus on the 'authenticity' of objects displayed by participants of less technologically advanced nations such as Pakistan, Nepal or the Pacific Islands), its means of presentation was intended to mark the displayer, Queensland, as modern.

The content of the pavilion, as an enunciation of Queensland identity, provided little more than a surface show. Its primary intended audience — overseas tourists and potential investors — were predominantly Americans and Japanese, and the highest-tech wizardry that carried the burden of signifying the modernity of 'Queensland' was also made in America and Japan. The pavilion reflected the ambiguity of Queensland's identity, status and future within a shifting global context. Queensland was explicitly promoted as a place to be consumed — through tourism and through investment — by the foreigner. Nonetheless, the popularity of the Queensland pavilion with the overwhelmingly local audience suggests that such a construction of Queensland was not viewed as being fundamentally negative or neglectful of some underlying cultural identity.

City and country

Expo was given the role of catalyst for cultural 'progress' in Brisbane. This notwithstanding, expressions of 'Queenslandness' on the site drew predominantly on rural images and themes. The emphasis was on the quality of rural life and the values it produced — independence, inventiveness, individuality, and respect for tradition. There was also a focus on what were viewed as traditional rural/Queensland skills — telling a yarn, playing a tune on a gumleaf, cracking a whip — as a form of entertainment and spectacle. As presented during Expo, they were skills divorced from the context in which they arose, and were encountered as a form of child-like, unsophisticated play.

While rural skills and values were celebrated as the epitome of what it meant to be a Queenslander, they were also clearly regarded as foreign to the lives of most urban Queensland visitors. This foreignness was implicated both by the geographical separation of bush and city, and by the sense that such skills were in some way anachronistic in the modern world that Expo represented, just as the video-screened heads sat strangely on the bodies of the old men in the old Queensland pub.

Another way in which the significance of Expo for rural-urban relations was played out was through the *Courier Mail's* representation of the 'Ekka', the annual 'Brisbane Exhibition', an agricultural show which ran for ten days concurrently with Expo. While Expo's focus was on technology on the global stage, the Ekka was, in the words of its organisers, a portrayal of the 'real Queensland' with wood-chopping and sheep shearing contests, displays of the heritage skill of stonemasonry, precision driving exhibitions, sheep dog trials, and displays of livestock. The 'real Queensland' was rurally-based, founded in tradition and male dominated in the public sphere. The *Courier Mail* reported that:

'You can have an Expo anywhere in the world,' said a moleskinned north-west Queenslander as the Droughtmasters were being judged in the main ring. 'But you couldn't have the Ekka anywhere but here, in Brisbane.'²⁰

For many people, the comfortable, small-town Brisbane linked to rural values and identity was past; the international ideals represented by Expo '88 provided a vision of the city's future.

The symbols and images associated with Queensland, though displayed throughout Expo, rarely drew comment. The imagery associated with Queensland took second place to the symbolism of Expo itself. Expo '88 was portrayed by the organisers, local politicians and by the press as epitomising global ideals of cultural modernity and technological progress. The role of images of 'Queensland' within Expo was largely to tie the state directly to those ideals. This involved a contradiction when Queensland character was most often depicted in terms of a sense of regional distinctiveness comprised of old-fashioned rural skills and values.

The dangers perceived as inherent in globalisation — loss of regional distinctiveness and loss of control over the identity and future of the city and region — were embodied in the image of Japan during Expo '88. While Japanese investment, cultural and technological exchange and the

economic benefits of Japanese tourism promised to act as the desired modernising force on Queensland and Brisbane, fears of dependence on and subservience to an 'alien' culture, deepened by the historical experiences of the second world war, undercut the Expo ideals of friendship and opportunity. The identification of Japan not only with images of ancient tradition, but also with the future, disrupted the notion of modernity as being an exclusive property of western nations, and undermined the confidence of Brisbane and Queensland in their own modern status.

Japan: 'They like Australia, they love Queensland'²¹

Tony Bennett suggests that the experience of Expo '88 involved the laying out of a 'modernising' task.²² One aspect of the task was that Australians in general, and Queenslanders in particular, should learn about Japanese culture and the Japanese way of doing things in order to facilitate cultural and economic ties between the two nations, primarily with the aim of strengthening Japanese investment and tourism in Queensland. As part of the modernisation project this reflected a fundamental shift in the embodiment of modernity, which was historically represented by western nations to be learned and imitated by the rest. The Japanese attempts at directing this process of cultural education were presented in the *Courier Mail* as being at once quaint and sinister.

According to public relations manager for the Japanese government pavilion, Andrew Swanton: 'The Japanese see this Expo as the perfect opportunity to help the world understand them better. Their image is terribly important to them':

[Japan] ... is represented by three pavilions: one government, one incorporating private companies, Kobe City, and Saitama Prefecture, and one mounted by the giant Fujitsu company. Not only is the \$26-million government pavilion regarded as the most expensive on the Expo site, but... the Techno-Plaza has a budget of \$10 . million and Fujitsu's entry cost \$14 million — a total investment of \$50 million.²³

The notion that the Japanese were using Expo '88 to undertake a carefully formulated public relations stunt (as was every other participant) reverberated through much of the *Courier Mail's* coverage. A headline read 'Japan set to wow us with \$2m show', and continued: 'Who other than the Japanese would spend \$2m on entertainment in just one week?'²⁴ Another article entitled 'Japan puts on a \$1/2m super-television show' began by reiterating that: The three-day international high-definition television broadcast to the Japanese pavilion at Expo cost an estimated \$500,000'.²⁵ Another headline read: 'Japanese band raises \$1/2m for day at Expo'. The continual highlighting of the sums of money being spent by the Japanese on presenting a 'good face' at Expo reflected an implicit sense of uneasiness which was not apparent in the coverage of other participants. The Japanese contribution to Expo can be considered as falling under three main categories: displays represented as purely traditional and aesthetic; the post-and ultra-modern; and the superlatively high-tech. The most noted high-tech contribution to Expo '88 was a presentation of HDTV (high definition television) which was exhibited at the Japanese pavilion in the form of three HDTV screens, each 3 metres wide and 1.7 metres high, which were used to show images of Japanese scenery changing over four seasons. If 'modern' status at pavilions was to be attained through the technology of display, the Japanese won hands down. HDTV was described as 'the visual medium of the future' and was expected to be available in Japanese homes within two years, 'but Australia is likely to be about eight years behind'.²⁶

The two faces of Japan

The *Courier Mail* presented a number of images or descriptions of Japanese people identifying themselves with Australian symbols and icons — the Japanese prime minister wearing an Akubra hat and a Japanese children's musical group playing 'Waltzing Matilda' are two examples.²⁷ The contrast between the 'two faces of Japan' (Figure 1) with the larger, intimidating image of the 'traditional martial arts expert' staring from behind a barred mask and the smaller, smiling snapshot of the Japanese prime minister donning the Akubra evoked a clear sense of threat and suspicion.



Figure 1: 'If the hat fits the Japanese let it go to their heads'. *Courier Mail*, 3 July 1988. Used with permission.

The *Courier Mail* presented a number of images or descriptions of Japanese people identifying themselves with Australian symbols and icons — the Japanese prime minister wearing an Akubra hat and a Japanese children's musical group playing 'Waltzing Matilda' are two examples.²⁷ The contrast between the 'two faces of Japan' (Figure 1) with the larger, intimidating image of the 'traditional martial arts expert' staring from behind a barred mask and the smaller, smiling snapshot of the Japanese prime minister donning the Akubra evoked a clear sense of threat and suspicion.

The implicit (or perhaps explicit) message was that however hard the Japanese try to convey an appreciation of our customs and culture, their true nature and intentions — militaristic, inscrutable and untrustworthy — must not be forgotten. The article to which the photographs were attached reported that Mr Ahern had told the Japanese prime minister that 'Queensland would continue to open its arms to Japanese and other overseas investors'.²⁸

Similarly, the *Courier Mail's* report of Japanese treatment of koalas in the Children's Zoo in Saitama prefecture, which 'live in a \$2.3 million home, have 20 servants and can sleep all day',²⁹ contrasted sharply with public recollections of Japanese treatment of Australian prisoners of war during the second world war, which, as well as being a topic for letters to the editor, was also the subject of a play performed during Expo.

On 14 May 1988 there was an enactment of the traditional Hakata Yamasaka parade, a commemoration of the purification of the city of Hakata by a Buddhist priest in 1241. The parade involved groups of Japanese men carrying a float through the city streets of Brisbane while being doused with water by members of the public. The move from a 'static' display of culture in the enclosed space of Expo to an interactive event in the streets of the city itself provided the catalyst for the expression of public discomfort with the Japanese presence.

The immediate response was in the form of two letters to the editor. The first noted that 14 May

was also the anniversary of the 1943 Japanese bombing of an Australian hospital ship in which 260 lives were lost.³⁰ The second compared the public's applause of the Japanese parade in the streets of Brisbane to the author's experience of taking part in a sports relay in Hiroshima to Japanese cheers during the Allied occupation of Japan.³¹ The author implied that what had occurred in the streets of Brisbane symbolised a reversal of historic roles, with Japan this time the victor and Queensland an occupied territory.

The letters articulated two familiar strands of explicit anti-Japanese views of the time. Firstly, the people with whom 'we' (whether Australia or, more specifically, Queensland) were undertaking to build cultural and economic relations were the same people who had committed cruel wartime atrocities against Australian servicemen and women, implying that those atrocities reflected a fundamental and unchanging characteristic of the Japanese culture and psyche. Secondly, the investment of Japanese individuals and corporations in Australia, and the rapidly increasing numbers of Japanese tourists choosing to visit the country, were accomplishing by stealth what had not been accomplished by force during the war — the takeover of Australian land and resources, and the subordination of Australian culture and identity to Japanese norms and expectations.

By leaving the confines of Expo for the streets of Brisbane, the Japanese participants stepped into a wider debate which was occurring with regards to 'Japanese' (whether corporate or individual was rarely mentioned) investment in Queensland. The sensitivity of the issues involved, a consequence both of high emotions on the part of veterans and their families, and the economic importance of maintaining good relations with Japan, was reflected in the *Courier Mail's* subsequent treatment of the issue. Following a public protest meeting on the Gold Coast, the newspaper published an article sourced from 'Japan's best-selling newspaper, the *Yomiuri Shimbun*'. The Japanese reporter had likened the public protest to 'an anti-Japanese rally in a country at war with Japan', but also stated that:

one feels rather ashamed when walking through the central area of the Gold Coast to have a local point out all the buildings that are owned by Japanese. The fact that Japanese investors are uninterested in the local area also appears to have caused aversion amongst the general people.³²

The publication of this article had the multiple effects of demonstrating that the form and content of the debate was not going unnoticed in Japan, and enabling the *Courier Mail* to present opinions about the debate without having to be held responsible for them.

'Japan Week' at Expo was the catalyst for the *Courier Mail's* running of a feature section 'Focus on Japan', which moved beyond the details of Japanese involvement in Expo to a discussion of Japanese-Australian relations and broader aspects of Japanese culture. The dominant image presented was that of a work and performance-obsessed, uniformly conformist, nationalistic culture. The growth of Japanese tourism in Australia, which might seem to contradict the work-obsessed, leisure-deprived image, was presented as a means by which the Japanese aimed to gain an understanding of other lifestyles, beliefs, and cultures, and by which Japan hoped to ensure its people were 'accepted by the world'³³ — a world in which it was a fierce competitor. 'They have caught up — and in most cases passed other Western nations — and today want to enjoy the *fruit* of their labors'.³⁴

The headlines of the two articles which dealt explicitly with Japanese tourism in Australia focused on conflict and discord: 'Goals differ on tourism influx' and 'Huge potential, but also huge problems.' The first article discussed the Japanese government's '10 million program', by which it intended to increase the number of Japanese tourists visiting Australia to 1.5 million per year by 1992: 15 per cent of the total number of Japanese tourists hoped to be taking international holidays annually. The Australian tourism industry, on the other hand, 'has set its sights on one million Japanese visitors by the year 2000'.³⁵ The article stressed the need for greater training of Australians working in the tourism industry both in Japanese language and in hospitality: that they should be given an understanding of Japanese culture in order to meet visitors' expectations.

The second article discussed the infrastructural requirements of the increasing numbers of tourists — particularly with regards to the limited number of flights between Australia and Japan and inadequacies in the quality and quantity of accommodation available. The 'huge problems' seem to have been difficulties of simply keeping up with a quickly growing demand. The slant given to both articles by their titles, however, presented the prospect of large numbers of Japanese tourists flocking to Australia as in some unspecified sense intrinsically problematic. It was characteristic of the ambiguous blend of welcome, based to a large extent on Queensland's hoped-for economic gain, and mistrust which surrounded representations of Japan at Expo '88 by the *Courier Mail*.

While the hierarchical ordering of nations and cultures was no longer made explicit at international exhibitions in the late twentieth century, the Japanese place in such orderings has historically proved problematic, and was no less so at Expo '88:

If the future is technological, and if technology has become 'Japanised', then the syllogism would suggest that the future is now Japanese too. In so far as a nation's sense of identity has become confused with its technological capability, these developments have, of course, had profoundly disturbing and destabilising consequences.³⁶

At Expo '88, not only was the future 'Japanised' as a consequence of that country's technological capabilities, but the future of Queensland was also closely linked to, and even dependent on, a strong relationship with Japan. A growing fluency in Japanese cultural norms, which for many signified a subordination of a 'Queensland' or 'Australian' identity, was required in order to sustain Queensland's position as favoured tourist destination. Add to this high levels of Japanese investment and land ownership, and the lingering scars of Australian wartime experiences, and it is not surprising that the ideals of friendship and unity espoused by the International Exhibitions were not sufficient to contain the underlying conflicts, fears, and prejudices surrounding Japanese involvement in Expo.

Conclusion

Jennifer Craik argues that the role of Expo '88 and other expositions as:

pawns in growth machine politics far outweighs their role as signs of modernity ... Expositions have been marked by basic motives and grubby politics — opportunism and a potential real estate bonanza.³⁷

Undoubtedly, 'basic motives and grubby politics' have played a significant part in determining the occurrence, location, and timing of many — if not all — international exhibitions, and this has perhaps been understated by commentators, who often give greater attention to idealistic rhetoric than practical motives. Craik argues that Expo '88, being staged more for reasons of greed and political opportunism than any stated idealism, is no exception. However, there is no reason to suppose that mercenary economic and political motivations might not give rise to an event with significance beyond such foundations. The history of international exhibitions is a history of events that, in a certain limited sense, act as momentary barometers for the values, aspirations and fears of the time and place in which they are held.³⁸ They reflect tensions between the nation and the host city and region. They provide a blinkered and optimistic 'summing up' of the world, one which is subject to explicit and implicit contradictions.

World Expo '88 involved both the enunciation of symbols and values associated with Queensland and Brisbane, and, as suggested by Tony Bennett, a 'practice' for a projected future. The event was intended to place 'Queensland' within an international hierarchy determined by notions of modernity and progress, notions which were linked to technological development and globalised modes of consumption. It is in this sense that Expo was seen as a 'coming of age' for Queensland and, more particularly, Brisbane, the conflict between a sense of Queensland

distinctiveness historically based on rural characteristics and values, and the increasingly global aspirations espoused for the future of the city of Brisbane, was present throughout Expo '88. It is a conflict that is probably common to regionalism in many such 'peripheral' locations. While modernity and its benefits beckon, the source of regional sentiments is often a sense of distinctiveness based primarily on a perceived historical deviation from such ideals. As offering both a means to bind the region and host-city tighter to the ideal of international modernity, and a format in which the uniqueness of the region and host city can be foregrounded, the international exhibition provides an ideal vehicle for the public expression of such ambiguous regionalism.

Rachel Sanderson completed her BA majoring in philosophy at Flinders University. She undertook honours in history at James Cook University, where she is currently a PhD candidate. Her research interests include exploring the connections between imperialism, colonial society and environmental history, with a focus on North Queensland rainforest environments.

Notes

- 1 Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*, Manchester, 1988, p 15.
- 2 *ibid.*, p 37.
- 3 *ibid.*, p 41.
- 4 *ibid.*, p 27; see also p 29, where Greenhalgh notes that 1848, the year that planning for the Great Exhibition began, was notable for the levels of revolutionary activity occurring throughout Europe.
- 5 E Wachtel, 'Expo 86 and the world's fairs', R Anderson and E Wachtel (eds), *The Expo Story*, Madeira Park, British Columbia, 1986, pp 24-5.
- 6 Greenhalgh, *op. cit.*, p 78. During Montreal's *Expo 67* the visiting French President, Charles De Gaulle, gave an address to a huge crowd in Montreal which he concluded, before a live television audience of millions of Canadians, by crying "Vive Montreal! Vive le Quebec! Vive le Quebec libre!" See J M Bumsted, *The Peoples of Canada: A Post-Confederation History*, Toronto, 1992, P329
- 7 Wachtel, *op. cit.*, p 25.
- 8 *Courier Mail*, 24 April 1988.
- 9 *Courier Mail*, 1 May 1988.
- 10 *Courier Mail*, 24 April 1988.
- 11 J Caulfield and J Wanna (eds), *Power and Politics in the City: Brisbane in Transition*, Melbourne, 1995, p 44. Caulfield and Wanna argue that Edwards' intentions for *Expo '88* were largely successful in this regard. Concerns about the future directions of public life in Brisbane became particularly prominent in the debate surrounding the post-Expo re-development of the Southbank site.
- 12 *Courier Mail*, 29 April 1988.
- 13 *Sunday Mail*, 1 May 1988.
- 14 P Carroll, 'The origins of Expo', *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, vol 48, no 1, 1989, p.43
- 15 *ibid.*, pp 44-6.
- 16 See, for example, the discussion in Ross Fitzgerald, *A History of Queensland: From 1915 to the Early 1980s*, Brisbane, 1984, pp 250-2 and Humphrey McQueen, 'Queensland: A state of mind', *Meanjin*, vol 38, no 1, 1979, pp 41-51. For an alternative viewpoint see Denis Murphy, 'Queensland's image and Australian nationalism', *Australian Quarterly*, vol 50, no 2, 1978, pp 77-91.
- 17 *Courier Mail*, 6 June 1988.
- 18 *ibid.*
- 19 *ibid.*
- 20 *Courier Mail*, 12 August 1988.
- 21 *Courier Mail*, 6 July 1988.
- 22 Tony Bennett, 'The shaping of things to come: Expo 88', T Bennett, P Buckridge, D Carter and C Mercer (eds), *Celebrating the Nation: A Critical Study of Australia's Bicentenary*, St. Leonards, NSW, 1992, p 128
- 23 *Courier Mail*, 4 July 1988.
- 24 *Courier Mail*, 6 My 1988
- 25 *Courier Mail*, 11 July 1988.
- 26 *Courier Mail*, 27 June 1988.
- 27 *Courier Mail*, 24 August 1988.

28 *Courier Mail*, 3 July 1988.

29 *Courier Mail*, 6 My 1988.

30 *Courier Mail*, 24 May 1988.

31 *ibid.*

32 *Courier Mail*, 14 June 1988.

33 *Courier Mail*, 6 July 1988.

34 *ibid.*

35 *ibid.*

36 David Morley and Kevin Robins, *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes, Cultural Boundaries*, London, 1995, p 168.

37 Jennifer Craik, 'Expo 88: Fashions of sight and politics of site', *Celebrating the Nation*, p 142.

38 See, for example, Greenhalgh's examination of the history of the exhibitions as gauges for changes in attitudes towards empire between 1851 and 1940, *op. cit.*, p 57.