This polemical discussion explores the lack of diversity of representation in Australian graphic design. It questions what it means that the image and voice of a cultural field is limited to a narrow category of individuals, especially when there is increased awareness across society of the value of opening representation to previously excluded or marginalised groups. The discussion of diversity builds on established analyses of the situation for women in graphic design. This may seem to skew the argument towards issues of gender not diversity, but the matter of women’s participation in design is an open, if unresolved, topic of discussion. The nature and extent of other groups’ participation in design remains largely unstated and undocumented due to the sensitivity of broaching issues of ethnicity and indigeneity in Australian society. The paper argues that a creative industry that lacks plurality and inclusiveness in its leadership is unlikely to provide the nuanced, receptive and well-informed responses required to communicate to a diverse Australian public. The paper does not seek to provide answers to the questions it raises. Rather, its aim is to prompt discussion about the nature of graphic design as an industry and a cultural institution.
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Introduction and background
Imagine the list of Australia’s top ten graphic designers. Perhaps make mental reference to books you have read on Australian design, or picture the designers you last saw featured at an industry event. Now compare that list to Australian society as a whole. How many of your choices were women, or individuals representing the different minority groups that comprise the Australian population? This confronting realisation met those organising New Views 2, a graphic design exhibition held in Melbourne in late 2008. On asking various designers and design academics to recommend prominent women, ethnically diverse and indigenous designers to speak at the event, most could list an assortment of Anglo-European men. However, few could name a designer outside that dominant group, raising questions relevant to this issue of Visual-Design: Scholarship, which examines graphic design’s capacity to become “a visible part of the ongoing living narrative of culture” (Woodward 2008).
Australian graphic design has flourished in recent decades as part of the business of corporations. Although graphic design has strong commercial underpinnings, it operates in essentially public ways. Increased social prominence opens graphic design to necessary scrutiny, including in reference to who represents and leads the industry. When diversity is not a visible attribute of graphic design, its potential to make a meaningful contribution to Australian culture and society is questionable. This paper discusses the situation of women graphic designers as one case where divergence from the stereotyped image of the graphic designer is not well supported in Australian industry. It makes reference to the poor recognition of African-American designers to show that the public image of graphic design is unrepresentative of the design workforce and wider society in other countries. Where the barriers to participation, advancement and representation in Australian graphic design involve ethnicity or indigeneity, issues of exclusion or marginalisation are currently too contentious to be tackled, there being no data to track the participation of ethnic, indigenous and minority designers in Australian graphic design. The sensitivity of socio-historically constructed perceptions of difference, however, does not justify the perpetuation of the situation where a narrow group of individuals are given public voice and visibility to the exclusion of others, there being a need to both question and research the social composition of the workforce at all levels of Australian graphic design.

Have Times Changed?
Criticism of a lack of equality of opportunity in the workplace is not new. Women and diverse ethnic and minority groups have struggled for decades to push back the boundaries of institutionalised exclusion and underachievement that circumscribe their careers. Debate in cultural theory has long established that perceptions of difference negatively affect individuals' life experience. Women's participation in design education and practice has increased markedly in recent decades in Australia. The issue of indigenous participation in society has been raised since the late 1960s (Dillon & Westbury 2007). Consecutive waves of immigration have been a central force shaping post-war Australian society with migrants to Australia originating from more than 100 countries (Richards 2008). The 2001 census data suggests that 21.9% of the population of Australia were born overseas with 15% speaking a language other than English at home (Missingham et al. 2006).

Diversity, however, is not just a demographic fact. Tim Soutphommasane argues that ethnically and culturally diverse societies like Australia need to both recognise the diversity of the individuals that comprise them and acknowledge “the value of the different cultural forms in and through which individuality is expressed” (2005, p. 402). The identity of exemplary practitioners and those who advocate for industry is a barometer of how diversity is valued in Australian graphic design. Women designers and those representing Australia's diverse racial and ethnic groups remain a small minority in the roll call of prominent Australian graphic designers. It is beyond question that these groups make a productive contribution to their field. The failure to acknowledge this contribution through public visibility and leadership undercuts the industry's ability to engage with the complexity of Australian society, characterised as it is by an ever-increasing multiplicity of peoples, identities, cultures and social circumstances.

Lack of diversity denies many graphic designers the opportunity to advocate their perspectives in public from the basis of their identity. This is a freedom that Victor
Margolin (2001a; 2001b) argues has long been denied to African-American designers. For Margolin, the failure to acknowledge the contribution of African-American designers has distorted the history of American graphic design, concealing the actual social dynamics driving its development. He challenges the US design community to consider why so many accomplished and engaged African-American designers fail to receive adequate recognition. The situation Margolin describes is not just an argument for correcting the historical record. Currently, graphic design is a broadly defined activity that depends on creative and considered responses to a diversity of situations. Internationally, the graphic design industry promotes itself as a dynamic strategic enabling agent for business, government and public organisations. A lack of plurality and inclusiveness suggests graphic design is unlikely to provide the nuanced, receptive and well-informed responses required to resolve today’s complex communication tasks.

**Matriarchy: still underground?**

This discussion of diversity of representation in graphic design necessarily opens with a consideration of the situation for women in the industry. Since the era of second-wave feminism in the 1970s, there has been ongoing discussion of the absence or under-representation of women in graphic design, much of it focused on issues of equality of opportunity, but the perceived problems of a masculinist design culture have also been raised. Sheila Levrant de Bretteville (1973; 1999) suggested early on that women’s greater participation in design—especially if negotiated on women’s terms—would expand the codes and concerns of the field. De Bretteville identified modernism’s authoritarian imperatives of visual simplification and clarity as necessary targets in opening graphic design to broader discourses and more human-centred interests and practices.

The issue of a perceived lack of participation by non-traditional groups in design has also been challenged as a matter of fact. There is an established literature, admittedly focused on Euro-American design, which shows the significant involvement of women in graphic design over its history. However, as Laurie Haycock Makela and Ellen Lupton argue in ‘Underground Matriarchy in Graphic Design’ (1997), female graphic designers have had to harness creativity and strong understanding of the mechanisms of cultural and social exclusion to circumvent the blocking effects of the “Old Boy’s Network”, which “for so long has excluded women, younger designers and others working at the margins of the professional mainstream” (p. 137). Their article gave visibility to an impressive group of designers including Sheila Levrant de Brettville, April Grieman, Katherine McCoy and Lorraine Wild, whose diverse, collaborative activities opened up new ways of thinking about graphic design. The projects of Teal Triggs, Sián Cook and Liz McQuiston at the Women’s Design Research Unit (WD+RU) have similarly investigated women designers’ efforts to create opportunities for themselves and others in graphic design, suggesting the problem is more the visibility of women designers, not their participation in graphic design.

If women’s difficulties in graphic design are poorly recognised, there is solid research in architecture into issues of gender inequality and its affect on women architect’s experience in the profession (see Whitman 2005; De Graft-Johnson, Manley & Greed 2005). A study by Sang, Dainty and Ison (2007) into British architecture shows that gender is a factor in women architects’ careers in a way that it is not for men. Using criteria of occupational health and well-being to survey male and female designers on
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issues including job satisfaction, physical health problems, work-life conflict and turnover intentions, Sang, Dainty and Ison linked poorer outcomes for women to architecture’s failure to adequately embrace diversity. The study identified women as specifically affected by gender-determined stressors such as lack of opportunity to exercise creative skills, unequal pay, poor support from superiors and a sense of a limited career path, most of which emanate from employers and superiors’ belief that women are not committed to their careers and will leave to have children. Sang, Dainty and Ison cite a range of research that reveals women architects are routinely placed in secondary, support roles that prevent them from developing the skills, track record and professional networks required for advancement, putting them at a disadvantage to male colleagues.

A field that actively researches such effects is more likely to make headway in rectifying problems than one that seems to deny issues of diversity of participation and representation. Incorporating diversity into the image of Australian graphic design will inevitably involve complex issues of signification. The prestige of officialdom or the public spotlight holds great scope for individual validation, but can reinforce exclusion and marginalisation if the gendered, ethnicised or minority characteristics of individual designers afforded prominence are regarded as exceptional rather than an unremarkable reflection of the composition of the graphic design industry and wider society. Individuals from marginalised groups are also often perceived to embody that group in a way that is never expected of individuals from dominant groups, who simply represent themselves. Sheila Jackson (2003, p. 693) argues that public women, for example, “take on the attenuated task of creating public spaces [for others] without receiving full participation or direct recognition for their role in maintaining them.” The minority of Australian woman graphic designer who speak on industry panels or act as industry office bearers—thus gaining visibility and voice—bear a paradoxical relationship to the large group of anonymous, invisible women who currently provide support to the operation of the graphic design industry.

Internationally, designers such as de Brettville, Grieman, McCoy and Wild are now familiar names, making it all the more disconcerting that Australian graphic design lacks a cohort of prominent women designers who can be called on to contribute to public events. But this paper is not about the battle of the sexes. Neither does it seek to untangle the gender and identity-based factors that limit individual opportunity in Australian graphic design. Explaining who achieves visibility in Australian graphic design requires sustained research and discussion beyond the scope of this paper. There is no single factor that explains the lack of diversity of representation in any given context and there are different reasons for the experience in industry of different groups. However, the idea that a male/female binary governs participation and career advancement in design suggests that other, less openly commented on lines of difference and otherness influence the boundary between those who unconditionally fit the image of the Australian graphic designer and those who do not. Where factors such as ethnic, racial and social identity or disability lead to exclusion or marginalisation, their social sensitivity makes them more difficult to address than the acknowledged, if unresolved, issue of women’s participation in design, though fixed and narrow ideas of the graphic designer are likely to have the same inhibiting role in each case. Opening graphic design to contestation on such standpoints may cause friction, but could ultimately lead to an airing of concerns, a productive exchange of perspectives and progress toward addressing the mechanisms of exclusion.
Indeed, tackling Australian graphic design’s representation problem may enable it to make a greater contribution to the complex challenges facing Australian society.

**Australia, one among many?**

A lack of diversity in the public image of graphic design flares up intermittently in various countries, with the focus being on the exclusion of women. Australia’s representative design bodies, such as the Australian Graphic Design Association (AGDA) have long overlooked the lack of diversity in their leadership and events. Historically, AGDA has conveyed the impression of being a ‘Boy’s Club’, with Anglo-European, mid-career men holding most positions at national and state level (AGDA 2008). Lately a few, younger female designers have been drafted into prominent roles within AGDA, a shift seemingly prompted in Victoria by public comment on the absence of women speakers at industry events like the Melbourne graphic design forum Character 2 (2005). When an audience member questioned the lack of women designers on the panel, the inability of panel members and event organisers to respond underlined the assumptions of masculinity behind the seemingly gender-neutral concept of the graphic designer. Character 2 was a catalyst for Michaela Webb’s appointment as vice-president of Victoria’s AGDA council in 2005, showing that women can be key contributors to graphic design, but it has yet to lead to any significant shift to the recognition of minority groups within the council.

The situation in Australia echoes conditions overseas. In 2006, Michael Bierut posted the short essay ‘The Graphic Glass Ceiling’ on Design Observer. It addressed entrenched sexism in North American graphic design, being prompted by an audience challenge to the all-male panel at the 2006 New York forum The Art of the Book: Behind the Covers. Bierut’s text argued there were no plausible reasons to explain why few women attain the profile and acclaim of certain male ‘superstar’ graphic designers. Where a number of respondents to Bierut’s post attributed women’s lack of prominence to female inadequacy, Bierut argued it was not ability, accomplishment, ambition, dedication or even lack of time that stopped women designers from achieving public recognition. Rather, he accepted that in the United States men are given the bulk of the opportunities for public engagement and prominence, creating a real problem for the sector.

Inequality of opportunity is a self-perpetuating cycle, often reproduced by organisations that should be highly attuned to the dynamics of institutionalised exclusion. William Drenttel (2008) points to Adbusters’s use of a panel of all-white-Western-male jurors to assess their One Flag design competition, the selection of Jonathan Barnbrook, Michael Bierut, Vince Frost, Steven Heller, Kalle Lasn, Rick Poynor and Dmitri Siegel representing a list of very familiar names. Drenttel argues that the panel’s restricted membership was made worse by the competition being based on the issue of global citizenship and Adbusters’s international reputation for mounting campaigns against the economic and social monopoly of white, masculinist corporations. That Adbusters could overlook the need for diversity stresses the entrenched, masculinised image of the designer. For Drenttel, “organizations [need] to encourage diversity as a part of developing new ideas, excellence and a richness in the future of design ... an increased focus on multiculturalism, gender equality and globalism [being] more than appropriate in these times (unpaginated)”. Ensuing discussion on the Design Observer website elicited polarized positions on the inequalities and power divisions inherent in Western societies, but the episode underscores how a lack of diversity perpetuates a lack of diversity,
indicating the need for active circuit breaking to interrupt the cycle.

The most troubling aspect of the public reproduction of fixed and deterministic categories of designerhood is that this is only recognised after the fact by others, suggesting it is normalised during the selection of panels, jurors or industry advocates. Jason Grant (2008) raises the related problem of the closed-door processes bound up in graphic design awards and competitions. For Grant, the lack of transparency in selecting award winners reinforces the ideological power and momentum competitions exert in the bureaucratic fixing of dominant design values. These values can relate to stereotypes of concept, craft and style, but they can also link divisions of labour and merit to factors of gender and identity. These are a complex set of interrelated distinctions that have a direct impact on individual career paths, creative opportunities and remuneration, determining who is able to participate in graphic design and achieve public prominence.

Diversity of participation and representation in Australian graphic design is unlikely to arise when the image of the industry is formed around a narrow group of prominent male designers. A recent AGDA survey (Ashton & Pidgon 2008) of 45 Australian design studios and a few overseas ones indicates that the gender balance in the graphic design workforce is almost equal. However, it was mostly men who completed the survey, suggesting they hold the power in studios just as they dominate the public face of the industry. The AGDA survey only provides a partial image of what is happening in industry. It does not include data on the participation of designers from indigenous or ethnic backgrounds. A lack of basic information was Victor Margolin’s (2001a: 2001b) principal obstacle when investigating the contribution of African-American graphic designers to US design. Margolin explains that the history of American graphic design is dominated by the work of white, middle-class men and a few white, middle-class women, black designers being almost wholly absent from publications and exhibitions about American graphic design. From the information he has been able to glean, Margolin identifies a troubling effect of a lack of diversity in graphic design, noting the marked difference in the portrayal of black people by black and white designers in US publications in the 1920s. The caricatures created by white designers compared poorly with the “much more dignified” appearance of African-Americans when depicted by black illustrators (2001a, p. 2).

Australian graphic design’s failure to diversify its ranks and provide a sympathetic work environment for designers from underrepresented groups is illustrated by the effort to find indigenous designers to participate in the New Views 2 event. Contacting various indigenous and graphic design organisations, including Icograda’s Indigenous Design Network INDIGO, produced not a single name of an indigenous graphic designer. Eventually, organisers found Gilimbaa, an indigenous graphic design agency that creates communication materials for indigenous communities in Queensland. Gilimbaa is uniquely positioned to offer culturally informed and sensitive design services to indigenous groups. The visible participation of more indigenous designers would contribute important strengths to graphic design in Australia, extending its creative, cultural and social range. Obliviousness to the unrepresentativeness of Australian graphic design makes the industry look insular and outdated. That there is no way to track the diversity of the Australian graphic design workforce does not help here.
A question of identity: who are our role models?

When the dominant image of the graphic designer is fixed and narrow, it raises the issue of how individual graphic designers from marginalised groups negotiate their identity and aspirations as designers. An immediate question in this respect is the career prospects and work experience of graphic design graduates. Both authors teach at prominent Melbourne design schools where the student body reflects a diversity of racial and ethnic backgrounds. The number of international students and those with parents born overseas constitute nearly half of students at each year level. Neither institution publishes data on the variegated ethnicity of student cohorts, past and present, but their statistics show that female students have been in the majority in graphic design for a significant time (Swinburne Statistics Book 1997: 2007), suggesting there is a pool of trained, ethnically diverse designers and a high percentage of women designers available to the Australian graphic design industry. Conversely, no indigenous student has enrolled in the communication design program at RMIT University in the past eight years (B Clarke [Program Co-ordinator Communication Design, RMIT University] 2008, pers. comm., 24 Sept).

Design education is a place where women and minority designers have more often been able to gain a foothold, providing young designers with different perspectives on graphic design and a greater range of designer role models. In 1994, Haycock Makela and Lupton surmised that women were able to be visible and influential in academia due to better structures for advancement and support for a critical perspectives on the social and cultural politics of graphic design. Teaching is often seen as peripheral to design practice, but it can exert a strong influence over students’ future pathways and perspectives, encouraging young designers’ sense of possibility in design (Calhoun 2006). Promoting diversity through social dynamics, pedagogical practices and a critically-engaged curricula are effective and enduring ways to effect affirmative action, promote understanding difference and support diversity (Anthony 2002). Academics need to be vigilant in maintaining the sphere of education as a forum for open participation in design, but the whole graphic design industry needs to develop a better understanding of the social dimensions of design if diversity and difference are to be valued. Similarly, only the inclusion of the broadest possible range of designers in discussions about the nature and purpose of design will ensure that a full range of design issues is addressed and that discussions intersect with issues in wider society. Embracing diversity may interrupt graphic design’s current preoccupation with visual identity and brand management in the service of corporate needs, but it may also clear a path to a broader public mission for graphic design that shows greater concern for individuals, societies and the environment.

The future shape of the graphic design industry?

Much recent debate in organisational management favours models that foster collaboration, inclusiveness and plurality, reflecting changes in workforce demographics and the greater interconnectedness of cultures and societies brought about by globalisation and new technology (Glynn et al. 2000). A 2006 study of best practices in 230 global companies concluded that the most highly regarded and successful corporations offer “an environment that encourages openness, trust and challenge” (Keith et al. 2006, p. 3), where traditional command-and-control leadership is the least effective in motivating employee performance and loyalty. Such values reflect masculine cultures, whereas
"cultivating instead of conquering, nurturing instead of self-promotion" (Makela & Lupton 1997, p. 137) are values traditionally associated with feminine culture. Yet the motivation to nurture, support and enable fits poorly with the quest for individual recognition and competitive advantage currently required for advancement in graphic design and which are an effect of the economic organisation of the sector.

The outward perception of the design industry often belies the reality of working conditions within it. Neff, Wissinger and Zukin (2005) argue that many are attracted to work in culture industries by the autonomy, excitement, perceptions of cool-ness and self-gratifying creative work offered, but the price for such assumed benefits can be low job security and pay, long work hours, shortened careers and constant portfolio evaluation. The shift away from full-time, permanent employment characterises many areas of the economy today. For service industries like design that are closely tied to the economic cycle and the vagaries of client and public sentiment, the flexible organisation of employment is a primary way in which businesses manage economic uncertainty (Neff et. al. p. 308). With its proliferation of small and micro businesses and tradition of freelance work, graphic design is subject to varied, non-standard work arrangements. Neff, Wissinger and Zukin argue that workers in culture industries will “accept more risk and greater responsibility” as way of staying connected to a desirable industry, even when it is “marked by a winner-take-all inequity in both income and status” (p. 308).

The current industrial circumstances of graphic design tend to pit designers against each other, promoting an aggressive, ego-led culture and public image. Many designers are encouraged to develop a facility for business, but often have an inadequate grasp of designing for society or the environment (Fuad-Luke 2007). Re-examining the nature, purpose and processes of graphic design is critical to its future and should involve the proposition of mutual learning in a multi-stakeholder environment. Pluralistic, collaborative and inclusive modes of design are being modelled through the theory and practice of participatory, human-centred and co-design, where designers seek to create a relationship with those they design for. Inevitably, the alternate ethical, artistic and social positions driving such approaches challenge the alliance of culture and commerce in mainstream design and its outcome-orientated values. Nelson and Stolterman (cited in Wolford-Ulrich 2004), for example, stress the importance of creating and maintaining a symbiotic relationship between designers and their stakeholders through empathy. An alternative model for the graphic design industry would de-emphasise hierarchy in favour of egalitarian relations with clients and audiences and between designers. It would promote a plurality and complexity of values, perspectives and forms, rejecting the idea that designers can dictate what the world should be through design.

An authoritarian, narrow perspective on design contributed to the rejection of design modernism, where the discourse of universality concealed the moral and aesthetic biases of particular social groupings. For Makela and Lupton (1997), it was the powerful underground matriarchy of renegades like Greiman, de Bretteville, Wild and McCoy who in the 1980s and early 1990s showed that modernism’s formal constraints could be subverted by taking a more personal approach to design and seeing its practice as open to diverse forms of engagement and expression. A narrow image of the designer comes at a cost to both design and Australian society. When Australia’s leading designers are called on to advise governments and other organisations on economic, sustainability and accessibility issues, who represents the field of graphic design? Sylvia Harris Woodard, a
prominent African-American graphic designer known for her work in inclusive design and design research, was among the group of 23 leading architects, designers, urban planners and educators that President Clinton called on to frame a design strategy to restore American economic leadership and rebuild the nation's cities (Pearlman 1993). These designers embraced the role of advocacy for the public, not the design industry. The new design standards contained in their report were central to the Clinton administration's efforts to improve citizen's access to government, to remove barriers to social participation and to remake American towns and cities as sustainable communities.

Australian graphic design is currently bound up in the quest for economic benefit. Questions of over-consumption, the environment, deepening social divisions, indigenous rights, an ageing population, inequalities of education, employment and healthcare, and disability rights are rarely addressed at public graphic design events. Instead, what is celebrated is graphic design's role in the promulgation of mass consumer culture through its strong affiliations with business, as well as the output and success of a few, select designers. Although film and television are usually the focus of struggles over diversity in the public representation of Australian society (Hogan 2005), graphic design cannot be absolved from responsibility for negative representations of Australian culture and identity. Graphic design should not be dismissed as a set of ephemeral material outputs, insignificant to cultural and social meaning. Rather, graphic design is the site of a chain of important social transactions extending from the privacy of the boardroom and studio to the spheres of production and on to public realm. Design is an important source of contemporary public culture, shaping the ideas, experiences and behaviours of people (Frascara 1995). Its sociality is undeniable. Opening up the public representation of graphic design would harness the varied cultural capital and socio-cultural specificity of the individual designers that comprise the sector.

Conclusion
This paper has discussed the tendency for a limited range of Australian graphic designers to gain public voice and visibility, misrepresenting the collectivity of the sector. It has argued that the lack of diversity in the public representation of graphic design reinforces the conflation of Anglo-European masculinity with a normative design identity. The paper's aim is to initiate a discussion on issues of diversity and difference in graphic design, encouraging professional bodies, academic institutions and individual design studios to consider the concerns it raises. The paper has not provided a definition of diversity or a model of what this should look like, since many separate issues inform what diversity means for graphic design. It is not motivated by politically correct agendas. It does not seek to suggest that a tokenistic, pick-and-mix spread of ethnicities should be applied to graphic design or that implementing legislative approaches similar to that of Equal Opportunities law or Affirmative Action programs is a solution to the activation and reflection of diversity. Discussing the entrenched lack of diversity in architecture, Kathryn Anthony (2002) argues that valuing difference and managing diversity entails a paradigm shift that can fundamentally change corporate cultures. She calls for new management models and consistent, consolidated effort according to which organisations take responsibility “for creating an environment in which diversity not only survives, but thrives” (p. 260). For Anthony, promoting diversity through the design education system is also a key way to transform the workplace. No future design student, she argues, should
graduate without “exposure at all to diversity issues” (p. 263).

Diversity of representation and participation is good. It reflects the society that Australian graphic design works for. But the variegated composition of the design workforce remains invisible to those outside it and even to many within the industry. The shift to a more diverse public representation of the field could begin to erode entrenched assumptions about graphic design, including the exclusionary mechanisms that impede the full participation of women and diverse identity-based groups in the industry. A more diverse public image has the potential to change graphic design’s relationship to Australian society, showing that graphic design is simultaneously an aesthetic, commercial and social enterprise. Embracing and empowering the diversity of graphic design practitioners could influence the representation of gender, ethnicity and identity in Australian culture, the work of differentiation being after all at the heart of graphic design. Most importantly, presenting a strong and effective face for Australian graphic design does not depend on uniformity of representation. Effective representation is possible while supporting the variation in aims, values and perspectives that comes with diversity in gender, identity and social background. Reflecting the implicit diversity of the graphic design industry would provide a better link to the hybridisation of groups, lifestyles and identities in contemporary Australia, protecting the industry from seeing such change as merely the emergence of new niche markets to exploit. The irony is that those who participate in Australian graphic design do reflect diversity of age, gender, and social and cultural background, each bringing a wide range of experiences, opinions, perspectives, prejudices, skills, talents and values to the practice of design. Australian cultural diversity, which truly exists within Australian graphic design, should be revealed, promoted and celebrated at every opportunity as one of design’s best assets.
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