New Zealand Sociology

22

2007

The Journal of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand

New Zealand Sociology 2007

Chris Brickell
Those "Other Sociologists": Social Analysis Before Sociology

Tamika Simpson
Following the Action: Using Actor-Network Theory and Conversation Analysis

Lorna Kaino
Cultural Policy Formation and the Development of Creative Industries in Australia and New Zealand: A Focus on Feature Film Industries

Paul Jewell
Competing Roles of Dogma and Humour in the Construction and Critque of Social Arragements

Joe Piggin, Steven J. Jackson and Malcom Lewis
Classify, Divide and Conquer: Shaping Physical Activity Discourse Through National Public Policy

Lincoln Dahlberg
"Do-it yourself" Digital Citizenship: A Preliminary Interrogation

Celine Wills
The Lesbian Family and the State: A Sociological Perspective on New Zealand's Regulation of Lesbian Sexuality

Peter Beilharz
Australia and New Zealand - Looking backward, Looking forward and the parting of ways

ISSN: 0112 921X

New Zealand Sociology

Volume 22 Number 2 2007

Objective: To foster a refereed journal to disseminate and promote research and thought that has, as its objective, the clarification and development of theoretically informed research in sociology and related disciplines, with a predominant, though not exclusive, concern with New Zealand.

Contributors: For information on the contribution of articles, see Instructions for Contributors at the end of this issue.

Books for review to: Book Review Editors, New Zealand Sociology, c/- School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, PO Box 756, Wellington.

Subscriptions: One Volume per year, two issues per Volume.
Per Volume: Students NZ$25; Individuals NZ$35; Institutions NZ$50.
Surcharge for overseas postage: NZ$7 per Volume.
Mail to: New Zealand Sociology (subscriptions), c/- School of Social & Cultural Studies, Victoria University, PO Box 600, Wellington, New Zealand.

The editors acknowledge the assistance provided by the School of Social & Cultural Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.

ISSN 0112 921X

The Journal is abstracted in the International Bibliography of the Social Sciences and Sociological Abstracts.

For further information about the Journal go to
http://saanz.rsnz.org/journal/index1.html

Contents

Chris Brickell 195
Those "Other Sociologists": Social Analysis Before Sociology

Tamika Simpson 219
Following the Action: Using Actor-Network Theory and Conversation Analysis

Lorna Kaino 239
Cultural Policy Formation and the Development of Creative Industries in Australia and New Zealand: A Focus on Feature Film Industries

Paul Jewell 260
Competing Roles of Dogma and Humour in the Construction and Critique of Social Arrangements

Joe Piggin, Steven J. Jackson and Malcom Lewis 274
Classify, Divide and Conquer: Shaping Physical Activity Discourse Through National Public Policy

Lincoln Dahlberg 294
"Do-it yourself" Digital Citizenship: A Preliminary Interrogation

Winner of the 2006 Postgraduate Prize for Scholarship in Sociology

Celine Wills 302

The Lesbian Family and the State: A Sociological Perspective on New Zealand's Regulation of Lesbian Sexuality

Closing plenary , SAANZ conference, University of Waikato, November 2006

Peter Beilharz 315

Australia and New Zealand - Looking backward, looking forward and the parting of ways

Reviews

Schram, S. F., & Caterino, B. (eds.) *Making political science matter: Debating knowledge, research, and method*
Reviewed by Tamika Simpson 325

Beilharz, P., & Hogan, T. (eds.) *Sociology: Place, time & division*
Reviewed by Warwick Tie 329

Bruun, H. H. *Science, values and politics in Max Weber's methodology (new expanded edition)*
Reviewed by Kevin Dew 332

Deflem, M. (ed.) *Sociologists in a global age: Biographical perspectives*
Reviewed by David Pearson 336

Instructions for Contributors 339

Editorial: Farewell

This is the last issue of *New Zealand Sociology* to be produced by the current editorial team. When we took up the editorial reigns in 2002 we indicated a desire to be in charge for a 5 year period. In stopping now at the end of 2007 we have stuck to our word. In some ways, we are sad to be giving up the editorship: it has exposed us to an interesting range of sociological work, and it has been rewarding to have some part in ensuring that our community has a quality journal to showcase this work. However, we felt that given the small number of sociologists in New Zealand it is good to have periodic transition in the control of the journal.

We wish to acknowledge the sterling work of our book review editors – Lesley Patterson and Avril Bell – and the group of associate editors. Special thanks to all those who have refereed articles submitted to the journal. Anonymity issues preclude naming referees in the journal, but you know who you are, and rest assured your work was indeed crucial to the smooth running of the journal. Thanks to the School of Social and Cultural Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, for its generous support of the journal, not in the least the excellent production process work of Monica Lichti and Adam Meers. Earlier in the piece, Alice Fisher deserves thanks, as does Roger Joyce for his design and typesetting work. Also, many thanks to Dennis Noonan from Securacopy, Wellington, for his more than efficient printing skills.

Henceforth, all articles submitted to the journal should be sent to Charles Crothers and his team at Auckland University of Technology (charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz). We are sure that the future of the journal is in good hands, and we look forward to reading new articles, not as editors, but interested sociologists.

Mike Lloyd, Chamsy el-Ojeili, Lincoln Dahlberg

Those "Other Sociologists": Social Analysis Before Sociology

Chris Brickell

Abstract

How did commentators conceive of sociological concerns before university sociology was established in New Zealand? Most of us have heard of Somerset's *Littledene* from 1938, and there has been some publicity given to the short-lived Social Science Research Bureau which existed at the same time, but what else was there? Here I argue that social analysis took form in a range of other interesting and under-appreciated locations. When we trawl through the repositories of New Zealand's cultural production, we notice that some of the key themes of sociology – social order, social change, the state, gender relations, demography and citizenship – turn up in unexpected places. Social workers, psychologists, educationalists and literary commentators had plenty to say, as did those involved in architectural criticism and the wartime Army Education and Welfare Service. This article surveys the field, and concentrates on these last two elements in particular. It argues that New Zealand was not without its "other sociologists"; those who theorized society from a diverse range of locations in our country's intellectual life.

Introduction: Sociology's Others

"Those 'Other Sociologists'" is a somewhat self-conscious allusion to the first chapter of the first volume of Foucault's *History of sexuality*. Foucault, of course, was especially interested in the production of sexual knowledges (Foucault, 1990/1976). In this article I borrow and modify his title in order to suggest knowledge of a rather different register. I am interested in considering how variously accredited knowers understood New Zealand society in the period before sociology was established in New Zealand's universities. How, I ask, was knowledge about our own society expressed and systematised up until the late 1950s?

The work that most readily comes to mind is probably Crawford Somerset's *Littledene* from 1938, a description of life in the small Canterbury town of Oxford. There has been some discussion, too, of the Social Science Research Bureau which had a brief existence at around the same time. These two moments, though, represent but two of the nodes on a network where numerous forms of social analysis abutted and overlapped. When we dig a little deeper we notice that some of the key themes of sociology – social order, social change, the state, gender relations, demography and citizenship – turn up in some unexpected places. Social workers, psychologists and literary commentators had plenty to say. Other efforts were overtly educational, that is, they took social analysis to the citizenry in the name of social and individual improvement. The likes of the Workers' Educational Association (WEA), for instance, and the Army Education Welfare Service, offered up something of a "popular sociology". Meanwhile, critical essays, student projects and research reports were destined for smaller audiences.

This piece is something of an initial survey, a preliminary attempt at recording the richness of social research in New Zealand over many decades. It suggests that *Littledene* and the Social Science Research Bureau occupied a much more extensive and interdisciplinary history of proto-sociological work. I sketch out the field, and then move on to examine in a little more detail two hitherto unexplored sites of social analysis. The Army Education Welfare Service (AEWS) raised many sociological concerns in the materials it provided for men and women in the services, and facilitated discussions in which personnel debated matters of society and citizenship. Ernst Plischke was involved in the AEWS, and along with Frederick Newman, another Austrian immigrant architect, he theorized society while planning the future spaces of antipodean modernity. I suggest, then, that the ripples of this "other sociology" spread far. Their pebble-throwers were connected to one another in various and significant ways, too, and I highlight some of these linkages along the way.

Analyzing Society: From Settler Initiatives to Systematic Surveys

Sociological matters – as we might now conceive of them – were no strangers to the early European settlers. Social knowledge was both a popular and an official concern. From 1840 the government collected statistics on population, trade and agriculture. Neil Lunt suggests that such practices served two important functions. They allowed the state to understand its citizenry, but also to portray New Zealand life in ways that would lure potential immigrants to southern shores (Lunt, 2004, p. 8). Public debate was important too. By the 1860s many colonists attended meetings at the Mechanics Institutes, where they discussed matters of political economy and political science, along with Darwin's theory of evolution (Somerset, 1938, p. 44).

Advocates and researchers also addressed aspects of contemporary society. During the 1860s and '70s, under the pen name "Polly Plum", Mary Ann Colclough argued for the rights of working women. Her newspaper columns supported women's involvement in medicine and other exclusively male professions; they were widely-read and attracted much debate (Macdonald, 1993; McLintock, 1966). The suffragists and other first wave feminist writers produced a rich material on the relations between men and women in colonial society. Those involved with *The Polynesian society*, from 1892, recorded the lives and customs of Maori (Lunt, 2004, p. 14; Craig, 1964). Around the turn of the century, Edward Tregear, the Secretary of Labour, made it his job to study housing and local labour markets (Howe, 1991). Lunt (2004, p. 10) suggests that Tregear set the stage for substantial sociological research and debate in these areas during the years that followed.

Some of these issues were grouped under the term "sociology". August Comte coined that appellation in 1839, and it made an early appearance here in 1887. James Pope's book *The state: Rudiments of New Zealand sociology* surveyed various matters of governance. Labour and capital, wages and rents, crime and punishment all received attention, as did the legal aspects of marital relationships and the social provision of prisons, hospitals and asylums. Pope even suggested that scholars of such issues were engaged in "the study of sociology" (Pope, 1887).

From the early years social analysis was closely linked to education in general, and adult education in particular. Local branches of the WEA were in place by 1915. That year the Auckland group's first three lectures covered the history of trade unionism, the industrial revolution and the old English village: class, as we would call it now, and community studies (Shuker, 1984, p. 34). As the WEA developed so did its reach. Tutors traipsed through mud and bumped their way along rutted dirt roads in order to reach forestry, road and railway construction workers. Among the audiences some showed little interest, while others greeted the visitors and their lectures with enthusiasm (Shuker, 1984, p. 130).

Church groups addressed social issues, too. The Methodists established their "Committee on Temperance and Public Morals" in 1902, and members' concerns included industrial workers' living standards, unemployment, marriage and sexuality (Dawson, 1998). The Assembly of the Presbyterian Church set up a Public Questions Committee in 1917, and over the years this would examine matters relating to wars, films, gambling, alcohol, housing, consumerism and a range of other social issues (Davidson and Lineham, 1987; Presbyterian Church, 1995).

During the 1920s, Otago University students completed the first dissertations in Preventive Medicine. Many of the topics were epidemiological, but some dovetailed with obviously sociological concerns. Tregear's interests in labour and housing were well represented. One student investigated working conditions in Dunedin's public laundries (Will, 1924), and several examined the state of Dunedin's marginal urban housing stock and the lives of those who lived in it (Frengley, 1925; Hay, 1925; Mullock, 1927). Two students conducted an industrial survey of the Hudson's chocolate factory and examined aspects of the production process, health and safety management, and gendered divisions of labour within the plant (Orchard and Porterfield, 1928). From the 1930s on, issues concerning Maori found their way onto the Otago students' research agendas too (Lunt, 2004, p. 15).

Sociology made its first academic appearance in 1921, when the University of New Zealand listed "Outlines of Sociology" as a single stage subject for the Diploma of Social Science. Oddly the subject was never taught, even though it was added to the BA degree in 1934 and remained there until 1941 (Robb, 1966, p. 3; Thompson, 1967, p. 505). A few students took the examination every year despite the lack of formal instruction. Some accepted informal assistance from teachers in other disciplines, among them Ernest Beaglehole in Psychology at Victoria University and Richard Lawson in Education at Otago (Robb, 1966, p. 4).

Littledene appeared on the booksellers' shelves in 1938. The study's author, Crawford Somerset, was the headmaster of the local school, and the project was supported by two eminent personalities: Clarence Beeby at the recently established New Zealand Council for Educational Research and James Shelley, Canterbury University's Professor of Education (Carter, 2004, p. 201). *Littledene* was inspired by Robert and Helen Lynd's American study *Middletown*, a description of social life in the Indiana town of Muncie (Lynd, 1956/1929). Somerset investigated Oxford's farms and farm livelihoods, family and home life, work and leisure, childhood and adult education.[1] Oxford's connections with the outside world came under scrutiny, too, as did the sexual mores of the inhabitants. Somerset deemed the most intimate spaces of family life worthy of comment:

> The kitchen, long and narrow, with walls of painted wood, its windows heavily curtained, its floor covered with pattern-worn linoleum, is furnished with a large table scrubbed white and chairs mostly rickety and awry [...] The kitchen is the farmer's retreat from the battle with forces over which he has no control. It is his little haven of security. Here are food and warmth, the memory of the last meal and the smell of the next one cooking. Here in the evening father reads the paper, mother makes and mends, the children pore over their lesson books. (Somerset, 1938, p. 21)

This interest in the spaces of domestic life would be taken up by several

1 Somerset's foci echo some of the Lynds': labour, making a home, leisure, community activities, and religion (on this point see Carter, 2004, p.200).

"other sociologists" in the decades ahead. Home and family, after all, were among the most intimate domains of sociability; the points at which the public and private aspects of social life intersected most intensely. Somerset concluded that Oxford's community spirit and its inhabitants' desire for education were strong, their work ethic unimpeachable, and their lodges and church clubs plentiful. On the other hand, he considered that locals greeted change with suspicion and that many villagers led inhibited emotional lives. Men and women were usually awkward in each others' company, Somerset noted, and "[p]eople in the country do not expect much from marriage" (Somerset, 1938, pp. 53, 59).

The WEA ran a summer school in Oxford for a time, and the organization went from strength to strength on the national stage too. During the depression and the war years WEA staff lectured on the "Crisis of Capitalism", and its classes on economics and contemporary social issues proved popular. In 1938 some 824 students studied courses aggregated under the heading of "sociology" (Shuker, 1984, p. 10). WEA tutors had to balance the tensions between attempting to know the world "objectively" and promoting a critical attitude. This conundrum vexed their future academic sociologist counterparts, too (Robb, 1966, p. 7). Like the sociology departments in universities later on, the WEA was not infrequently accused of a leftist bias (Shuker, 1984, passim).

Matters of politics raised their heads again in 1937, when the Labour government established the Social Science Research Bureau. D. G. Sullivan, the minister with overall responsibility, was enthusiastic. "The work of the new Bureau will include the co-ordinating of the activities of research bodies or individuals working in the fields of social sciences so that the utmost benefit will be realized for their efforts", he proclaimed (cited Thompson, 1967, p. 504). Sullivan perceived a benefit for government too: the Bureau would provide Ministers with "the necessary factual basis for policy measures of a social nature" (p. 504). There was another connection between the government and the Bureau: several of the unit's staff were active in the Labour Party.[2]

2 For instance, E. H. Langford, a member of the Bureau's General Committee, and D. A. Martin, a staffer (Robb, 1987, pp. vi-vii).

Three studies were begun under the aegis of the Bureau. The first of these enquired into the standards of living of dairy farmers and their families (Doig, 1940), while a second and a third examined the work and spending habits of boot and shoe operatives and tramway employees respectively. The dairy farmer survey was completed and published, to the disquiet of a government unwilling to admit that its policies had not addressed all of the farmers' difficulties (Robb, 1987). By the time the government closed the Bureau in 1940, the urban studies had not progressed past draft stage (Robb, 1987, ch.7). Other projects were not even begun. These included one on population trends, another on Maori wellbeing, and an investigation of the "decay of organised religion and the abandonment of conventional moral standards" (Robb, 1987, p. 31).

While the government allowed the Bureau to fall apart (for reasons of indifference and/or hostility, in an indeterminable proportion), another, related arm of the DSIR survived. During the 1940s the Industrial Psychology Division investigated labour shortages and the persistence of "class divisions" (Congalton, 1952, pp. 99-102). This was not an isolated interest in class. Athol Congalton, an educational psychologist and a graduate of the "Outlines of Sociology" paper, also investigated the issue.[3] In 1946 he researched the "social class consciousness" of male secondary school pupils, and explored the meanings boys gave to such variables as occupation, property ownership, speech habits, family sizes and entertainment preferences (Congalton, 1952). Congalton concluded from his analysis that New Zealanders did indeed perceive and express class differences, but his investigation was not uncontroversial. *Truth* attacked the research, declaring that it was "improper" to enquire into such matters. Such research, *Truth* insisted, heralded "a new snooping level in its pernicious probe into the private affairs of the people" (cited Congalton, 1952, p. 13).

3 Jim Robb recalls that Athol Congalton was the only graduate of this paper known to him: Robb to author, email, 25 November 2006.

Other forms of analytical engagement were less contentious. During the 1940s, for instance, the Department of Agriculture employed a number of "rural sociologists", many of whom were trained in Home Science at Otago University (Carter, 2004, p. 203). Dorothy Johnson, Edith McNab and others wrote numerous columns for the *New Zealand Journal of Agriculture*. These mostly addressed household concerns, among them matters of nutrition and childhood development, interior decoration, sewing tips, and notes on scientific housework and savvy consumer practices (see, for instance, Johnson, 1949; McNab, 1949; Topping, 1949). These topics echoed the domestic sections of *Littledene*, where Somerset explored matters of education, nutrition and household organization (Somerset, 1941; for more on dietetics in particular see Carter, 2004).

Across the country, and in many different cultural sites, the patterns of social life were analyzed. There were various attempts to describe New Zealand's national "character" and the popular attitudes, demographic and labour patterns that went along with it. An early example was Jim Robb's (1946) MA thesis titled "The Concept of National Character and Some Tentative Applications of this Concept to New Zealand". In 1952 the literary magazine *Landfall* published Bill Pearson's essay "Fretful Sleepers". This painted an unflattering picture of an authoritarian, anti-intellectual and conformist society. New Zealanders' "private lives and loves develop best in shared suffering – illness, loss of job, eviction, death of a child", Pearson wrote. "[S]o far as they have private joys they live them with a faint sense of guilt, of disloyalty to friends and neighbours. The New Zealander more often grins than he smiles. His most common facial expression is a sneer" (Pearson, 1952/2005, p. 72).

Pearson was primarily a literary figure rather than a social scientist, but his observations on the emotional state of New Zealanders reflected Somerset's to a degree, and also those of Leslie Lipson. Lipson was Victoria University's professor of political science, and a familiar figure in Wellington's social science circles (Robb, 1987, p. 2). In his 1948 treatise on equality and the state, Lipson noted that the downside of New Zealand's economic egalitarianism was a homogeneity and

conformity of attitude and an intolerance of difference (Lipson, 1948, ch.15). Nobody was exploited in the land of milk and honey, he added wryly, "unless it be the housewife and mother" (p. 489). Robert Chapman's "Fiction and the Social Pattern", published in 1953, was hardly less maudlin than the earlier efforts; the political scientist Chapman observed that "[t]he New Zealand pattern is of a piece" (Chapman, 1953/1999, p. 25). The visiting American commentator David Ausubel joined in at the end of the decade. His book *The fern and the tiki* criticized the authoritarianism of antipodean adults who, among other things, judged young New Zealanders to be hedonistic and amoral (Ausubel, 1960, pp. 114, 131-6).

If indeed there was such a strand to the New Zealand character, though, it provided opportunities for researchers. An interesting analytical literature engaged with ideas about the conservatism of adults and the hedonism of youth, at a time when consumer culture constituted the teenager and various commentators thought adolescents were the harbingers of post-war change and a new moral laxity (Brickell, 2006; Hall *et al*, pp. 159, 234). Dorothy Crowther's *Street society in Christchurch*, from 1956, followed hard on the heels of the government's infamous Mazengarb Report which exposed "juvenile immorality" in the Hutt Valley.[4] If *Littledene* was New Zealand's answer to the Lynds' *Middletown*, then here was our very own *Street corner society* (Whyte, 1955). Crowther's is a delightful and absorbing study in which nothing much happens. She and her students posed as curious onlookers in inner city Christchurch, watched the goings on, and asked "teddy boys", "bodgies" and "widgies" about their lives:

> One Teddy Boy (that is one youth dressed in Edwardian style clothing) was reported. Between 7.45 and 9.00pm on Friday 20th, accompanied by a youth dressed in check jacket and slacks, he wandered round the central shopping area, covering the same area several times. He twice stopped to talk for a moment to two youths, and once had several minutes conversation with a young,

4 On the "Mazengarb Report" of 1954 see Molloy (1993).

> heavily made up girl. Finally he and his friend rode away on bicycles. [...] A group of three youths are lounging outside a Milk Bar. They are dressed fairly quietly, but wearing "soft" shoes and long hair styles. A man and his wife are walking by when one youth flicks a cigarette on to the woman and it falls to the footpath. The man tells his wife to walk on; he stops and says to the boy, "I could twist your nose." The boy looks a bit sick. The man says "you know what I mean?" He lectures the boy on manners, then drags him to his wife several chains down the street and makes him apologise. Other boys from the group follow excitedly. (Crowther, 1956, pp. 5, 7)

A. E. Manning took up the delinquency theme too, in his 1958 book *The bodgie: A study in psychological abnormality.* Both Crowther and Manning evinced a degree of sympathy in their examinations of young people's experiences in a rapidly urbanising society. Manning, for instance, concluded that "[m]ischief has been mischief through all ages, and though the style changes, the impulses remain the same. There is no more immorality today than at the time of [Admiral] Nelson" (Manning, 1958, p. 89).

A School of Social Sciences was established at Victoria University in 1950.[5] This was primarily a social work department but, as Merv Hancock (1996) remembers, the courses "were full of sociological material" even though they "were not necessarily identified as sociological" (p. 318). It would be some time before the most expressly sociologically-oriented of the papers – "Contemporary Social Problems" – would be amended to include "sociology" in the title (Robb, 1966, p. 4). The school's staff and students produced a rich body of social research. "A Study of the Incidence of Accidents in a Soap Factory" and "Old People in Auckland City: A Survey" continued the older interests in labour and social welfare (Ogilvie, 1954; Marsh, 1952). In line with somewhat more recent preoccupations, however, others researched young people and deviance. Among the titles were "The Young Incorrigible" (Bardwell, 1953) and "Catholics and Delinquency" (O'Neill,

5 Barrowman (1999, ch.10) offers a good overview of the development of the social sciences at Victoria University. See also Robb (1966, p. 4); Robb and Crothers (1985, p. 464).

1950). The first was primarily a literature review, while the second conducted a statistical analysis of the variables said to contribute to "delinquency": family size, home conditions and poverty. Ralf Unger's "Some Aspects of Criminal Homosexuals in New Zealand" used other methods: interviews and the inspection of official files (Unger, 1955).

Two further areas of study developed during the 1950s. The lives of urban and rural Maori were explored in ways that moved beyond the curious bystander approach of the nineteenth century (Metge, 1958; McCreary and Rangihau, 1958; Ritchie, 1956). New Zealand's smaller towns, too, were the subject of a type of urban study that would remain popular into the 1970s. Researchers placed sawmilling and hydroelectric settlements under the microscope (Allpress, 1952; Campbell, 1957; Smith, 1953; for a brief discussion of these, see Lunt, 2004, pp. 17-18). Congalton and others, meanwhile, explored the social life of the Taranaki town of Hawera (Congalton, 1954). This particular study examined matters of child development, education, civic pride and leisure activities. It included an introductory essay by Somerset which defined sociology for the curious bystander. (The discipline involved the scientific study of the "web or tissue of human relationships", Somerset (1954) told his readers, and the sociologist was interested in how "people get along with each other in the complex process of living" (pp. 31-2).

On the Fringes: The AEWS and the Immigrant Architects

A proportion of the initiatives discussed so far have made it onto the sociological radar. Some of them, *Littledene* especially, have been acknowledged as the forerunners of modern New Zealand sociology. The remainder of my discussion focuses on two sites of social analysis that have not previously been addressed in this context. These are, first, the Army Education Welfare Service, established during the early years of the Second World War, and, second, the written work of two immigrant architects, Ernst Plischke and Frederick Newman. By examining these spaces of social analysis, I demonstrate how sociological preoccupations have turned up in surprising places. Sociology's history, then, is more diverse than we might think.

The AEWS was established in 1943 as a joint venture between

the Education Department and the New Zealand Army. Similar organizations had already been established in Great Britain, Canada, Australia and South Africa. Clarence Beeby developed the initial proposal for the New Zealand version (*Korero*, 1945, p. 7).[6] AEWS was first set up among the forces based in New Zealand, and soon a school began operation at the army headquarters in Wellington. In time, the organization spread to the Pacific and to prisoners of war, the Middle East and Italy (Taylor, 1986, p. 1147).

In many ways the AEWS was a distance taught version of the WEA. Service men and women studied vocational courses by correspondence: motor mechanics, carpentry, beekeeping, electrical engineering and needlework were just some examples. Military units received a range of other reading and discussion materials, too, and these encouraged debate on current affairs and contemporary social issues. Some of the AEWS's facilitators were schoolteachers who found themselves serving abroad, and a number of eminent figures made appearances too. Athol Congalton was a Brigade Education Officer, and as such he co-ordinated a phalanx of more junior education personnel and ran his own discussion groups (Anonymous, 1945, p. 8). Horace Belshaw, a key player in the Social Science Research Bureau, and Ian Gordon, Victoria University's English Professor, travelled to New Caledonia to lecture troops during their demobilisation (Anonymous, 1945, p. 15).

Congalton and his colleagues exhorted military personnel to think about the shape and pattern of the social world they would return to after the war, and the lectures and discussion courses covered a whole range of sociologically relevant topics: rehabilitation and the return to civilian life, housing provision, work, the future shape of towns, Maori life and aspirations, international affairs, democracy and social welfare, economic problems in a changing world, and the role of science (Anonymous, 1945, p. 15).[7] One unit was titled simply "understanding

6 Beeby was a student of James Shelley, a committee member of the Social Science Research Bureau. In 1940 Beeby became Director of Education.

7 See also the various issues of *Korero* magazine for this period.

society". "Current Affairs Bulletins" offered articles and discussion questions on social change, population, and the implications of women's war work for the years ahead. An appreciation for such matters, it was considered, would help military personnel readjust to civilian life and the demands of postwar citizenship. The AEWS's own magazine *Korero* published at least one attempt to define the unique character of New Zealand society. Like the later civilian versions it was not flattering; it suggested New Zealand was a closed, defensive society lacking in cordiality (*Korero*, 1944b).A range of ideological perspectives found expression. "Women and the War" was reasonably neutral in its tone. Its readers were encouraged to consider whether women "should retain the right to compete with men for these jobs" after the war, and to debate the merits of equal pay (NZAEWS, 1943b, p. 2). Readers of the magazine *Cue* were invited to discuss whether New Zealanders should be granted state aid for educational travel, whether "social offenders" should be sterilised, and whether juries in criminal trials might be replaced by "panels of experts" (*Cue*, 1945c, p. 20). Some questions were rather more idiosyncratic. *Cue* asked, for instance, whether there might be a "jitter-bug ban for public dance halls?" (*Cue*, 1944, p. 12).

As these examples demonstrate, moral questions were part and parcel of the discussion. Debate was always encouraged, though, even when the analysis was rather more polemic. A bulletin titled "Our Population Problem" offered some statistical analysis before expressing the view that "there are many reasons for limiting the size of the family which are called social": increasing consumerist possibilities for the childless, fewer religious exhortations to reproduce, and a growing individualism (NZAEWS, 1943a). One *Cue* author went further, expressing the view that contraception had "revolutionised the sex relations of men and women both outside marriage and within it", that the church's "moral influence" had "waned", and that "standards of sexual behaviour have deteriorated disastrously, with the result that marriage has become a more and more unstable institution" (*Cue*, 1945b, pp. 13-14). As we have seen, such comments echoed those passed between staff at the now-defunct Social Science Research Bureau.

The AEWS's adult education mode of social analysis overlapped with the activities of the architectural critics. One of the army discussion pamphlets, for instance, was titled "On Houses" and was written by Ernst Plischke who had studied and worked with the new guard of modernist architects in Vienna.[8] Plischke's writing focused on housing and community design. These issues had occupied the minds of social scientists since the 1920s. Not only had some of Otago's Preventive Medicine students conducted small-scale surveys of Otago's housing stock, but in 1935 the incoming Labour government undertook its own survey which revealed that twelve percent of New Zealand's houses fell below minimum acceptable standards of occupancy, sanitation and general robustness (Ferguson, 1994, p. 119; Firth, 1949, p. 5). The likes of the Hawera study, with its authors' interest in community planning, would in turn follow Plischke's lead.

Peter Fraser, the Labour Prime Minister, had been ambivalent towards the Social Science Research Bureau and its potentially compromising findings, and on another occasion he blocked W. B. Sutch from publishing his long (and critical) essay on social services in a government booklet series (Sinclair, 1976, pp. 208-9).[9] Fraser was more willing to sponsor a certain kind of public intellectual and social commentator, however, one whose views were more sympathetic to the government's goals. Architects were perfect in symbolic terms. Sometime recipients of government contracts, they were both implementors of, and salespeople for, government policy on housing and community development (Brickell, 2003). Their projects, especially those that were government funded, shaped family and community life and played a role in the structuring of a new social order. For those reasons, their writings dovetailed with social scientific concerns.

---

8 Plischke, a modernist with socialist sympathies and a Jewish wife, was an escapee from Nazi occupied Austria. For a discussion of his life and work see Shaw (1997, pp. 141-3) and Tyler (1986); for more on his connections with the Labour government see Brickell (2003).

9 This was eventually published by a commercial publisher – Penguin – as *The quest for security in New Zealand* (Sutch, 1942).

Plischke's lively lectures on architecture and society so impressed Fraser that the Prime Minister directed the Department of Internal Affairs to publish the architect's book *Design and living* (Heenan, 1947). This was a much expanded version of the study course pamphlet Plischke had produced for the AEWS. The revised treatise on the place of modern architecture and town planning in postwar society appeared in two editions, the first for general release, and the second to be used in an AEWS-led scheme to rehabilitate returned servicemen.

Design and living was a wide-ranging text, a manifesto for a well-ordered and socially-connected modern life. Architecture, its author insisted, was a window into the social organization of any society; houses and public buildings influenced and reflected wider patterns of social life and social change. "[T]he way we live and its realisation and expression in works of architecture", Plischke (1947) wrote, "is an integral part of the social and economic structure of our time" (p. 70). In making these arguments Plischke reflected Somerset's (1938) observation that "it is in the homes rather than the fields" that the "tapestry of life" (p. 19) is woven. Conversely, a nation's architecture would tell visitors about its essential nature. Plischke asked "What sort of opinion of us [New Zealanders] could be formed by looking at our shop windows, our houses, our public buildings?" (p. viii). Quite simply, he thought, social enhancement depended upon sound architectural practice (p. 31).[10] Good town planning, like good architecture, required the meeting of innovative design and high-minded community principles.[11]

Plischke was as much a practitioner as a theorist. His plans for community centres in Auckland and the Hutt Valley included co-operative shops, shared recreational facilities, and rooms for lectures and adult education classes (Plischke, 1947, p. 84). While the future of communities occupied much of Plischke's attention, *Design and living* also explored the social structures and urban forms that underpinned the development of towns and cities over a period of two thousand

10 Some of Plischke's contemporaries shared this view. See, for example, Firth (1949).

11 Schrader (1996) offers a discussion.

years (Plischke, 1947, pp. 48-90). This was a rather less structured account than the work of Chicago sociologists Robert Park and Ernest Burgess, and it focused more on the continuities of good architecture than on processes of organic change in urban areas (Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1967/1925). Nevertheless, Plischke did gesture towards this body of sociological scholarship. The AEWS edition of *Design and living* invited students to discuss the architectural and aesthetic aspects of community centre design as well as the social ramifications. Should social and recreational activities be coordinated, Plischke asked, or would careful planning result in regimentation? What sorts of activities should be accommodated? "Should people be free to build and live as they please? To what extent is an inartistic building infringing the rights of one's neighbours?" (p. viii).[12]

Plischke framed his interest in social order in a Durkheimian rhetoric, and he alluded strongly to Durkheim's "homo duplex" without naming the concept. On the one hand, he thought, individual and social fulfillment could truly be attained only through cultural advancement. This was exemplified by community cohesiveness and a true appreciation of rational and ordered architectural beauty (Plischke, 1947, p. 70). On the other hand, people were liable to be carried away by their inherently insatiable desires for mass production and consumption, sham architectural styles (such as art deco) and needless fripperies. From the end of the nineteenth century, Plischke complained, urbanites had been provided with various "cheap and easy means of gratifying their uninformed wants" (p. 34). The homo duplex was exemplified in spaces for living, where the need for material and aesthetic satisfaction, as well as communitarian order, jostled against a longing for excess.

Such classical sociological echoes reappeared among the writings of Frederick Newman, the other Viennese immigrant architect.[13] Newman dedicated his 1944 essay "A Moral Approach to Social Order"

12 These types of questions were addressed, too, in the AEWS's discussion literature on this topic. For example see *Korero* (1944a); *Cue* (1945a).

13 On Newman's background see Leach (2003).

to his close friend Leslie Lipson, the political scientist. Although it had a somewhat Durkheimian title, the piece was undeniably Marxist in tone. Newman (2003) spoke out against the accumulation of capital, and expressed a desire to "eliminate the morally unjustified discrepancies of wealth which loom like a curse on humanity" (p. 30). He argued that the true social value of workers' activities were rarely acknowledged, and proposed that "consideration of one's fellow members in a community will be one of the most important issues in the times to come" (pp. 30-31).

In other essays Newman expanded on the relationship between design and social life. Like Plischke, Newman (2003, pp. 111-112) argued that forms of housing both expressed and precipitated social change. An "expanding society", he thought, required such new solutions as high density living. These, in turn, suggested revised family forms and more socialized types of leisure and recreation. The weekend lawn-mowing ritual would be no more, for "high blocks of flats" would "lead to a more dynamic interpretation of the new society" (p. 116). While pre-1940s housing surveys had mostly addressed the condition of existing dwellings and the lives of their inhabitants, Newman and Plischke laid out the prescriptions for an egalitarian modernist future. The architect had an important role as a socially- and politically-engaged theorist as well as a practitioner.

Newman proposed a two way relationship between architects and their compatriots. On the one hand, designers should learn about social structures from social scientists and philosophers, lest "we struggle to give [society] unsuitable buildings and spaces" (Newman, 2003, p. 150; see also pp.34; 154). Conversely, architects and planners would exert their influence on the lives of others by designing places that reflected and allowed new forms of living. Society would be transformed in the process. After all, Newman wrote, domestic design "is one of the dominant architectural expressions of social achievement" (p. 111). The architect and the sociologist, then, were involved in analysing, and intervening in, some of the same terrain.

Conclusion: These and Other Sociologies

Sociology has a rich history in New Zealand, one that transcends the use of such terms as "sociology" and "sociologist". In turn, sociological thought has transcended the officially sanctioned locations where sociology's teaching or research takes place. Our own society has long been theorized, in one way or another, from a diverse range of locations in its intellectual life. Here I have argued that the field of sociological endeavour has been somewhat fluid and multifaceted, but also that such key concerns as the state, population, community, gender, ethnicity, and citizenship have a long history of continuity as well as change. These processes have been strongly informed by an interdisciplinary interweaving of social research, political science, education and social psychology, as well as town planning and architectural criticism.

It is not always easy to trace epistemological or methodological influences with any degree of meticulousness, unfortunately, as most New Zealand social analysts and commentators did not cite their inspirations directly. Many of their books pass through page after page with nary a reference, and we can deduce their intellectual influences only by reading similarities into the texts. Congalton and Newman, for instance, did not cite Marx or Marxist writers, even though they were clearly influenced by them.

It is somewhat easier, though, to trace personnel. If New Zealand was a small society, then social science circles were even smaller. The "other sociologists", as I have suggested we call them, may not have trained in sociology, but they did help to constitute the field of forces out of which sociology eventually emerged. Education, of one sort or another, features prominently. James Shelley, *Littledene*'s instigator, had a background in community education before he took up a career in a university education department (Carter, 2004, p. 201). W. T. Doig moved in the opposite direction: he resigned from his prominent role at the Social Science Research Bureau in 1940 to take up a position at the Christchurch WEA (Robb, 1987, p. 83). *Littledene* complete, Somerset followed Shelley's lead into Education at Victoria University, although he was content to call himself a sociologist (Congalton, 1954, pp. 31-32; Robb, 1966, p. 4). Ernest Beaglehole was a psychologist, although an

ardent early supporter of sociology and a mentor to those sitting the "Outlines of Sociology" paper. The interchangeabilities go on. Horace Belshaw was employed as a WEA tutor in 1922, became a key player in the Social Science Research Bureau, moved to Victoria University's economics department, and appeared on the AEWS stage (Holmes, 2006). Athol Congalton, too, worked for the AEWS before embarking on a sociologically informed research and teaching career.

We ought not to underestimate the international influences. The Carnegie Foundation supported a number of initiatives, while immigrants – and returning graduate students – brought in new ideas. The Department of Agriculture employed E. G. Jacoby, a demographer who had trained under Ferdinand Tonnies and who wrote about rural sociology (Carter, 2004, p. 204; Jacoby, 1947), and Lipson, Ausubel, Plischke and Newman had their own contributions to make. Some New Zealand-based scholars, among them Horace Belshaw and Jim Robb, enrolled in PhDs overseas and returned afterwards.

Areas of interest overlapped, as did personnel. Questions of youth and of "delinquency" occupied the minds and the research time of psychologists, educationalists and others; nutrition interested home scientists and the rural sociologists; while the WEA, Somerset, Plischke and Newman all had something to say about taste, culture and refinement.[14] Other topics, notably political economy, community, labour and housing standards, had been surveyed and debated since the nineteenth century. Occasionally – as the title and content of James Pope's *The state: The rudiments of New Zealand sociology* from 1887 illustrates – the term "sociology" even appeared in the discussions.

In recent years sociologists have reflected on the perceived conflicts between "academic purity" on the one hand, and political engagements on the other (e.g. Wood, 2003). There is nothing especially new in this dilemma. The state has long been a sometime enabler and disabler, and a frequent target, of social analysis. During the 1930s and '40s the actions of the Labour government made this abundantly clear.

14 For further information on the WEA and Somerset on taste refer to Shuker (1984, p. 76) and Somerset (1938, p. 24).

Ministers established the Social Science Research Bureau in 1937 but they lost interest over time, and Sutch's critical polemic suffered in the hands of Peter Fraser. In contrast, Ernst Plischke and the AEWS writers offered forms of intellectualising about social order and the restraint of materialistic appetites, and these fitted the government's agenda perfectly. To an image-conscious centre-left government striving to sell its vision to an increasingly sceptical public, these "other sociologists" proved rather more reassuring.[15] They looked not at the gritty realities of contemporary social life, but toward a future of benign, state-led social reform.

From 1957 New Zealand's universities began to teach courses in sociology, and with the exception of Otago the majors were in place by 1971.[16] The university sociologists, though, did not invent the New Zealand side of their discipline anew. Instead, it had a fascinating, multifaceted and complex history. A not inconsiderable amount of sociological water had passed under the bridge by the time the first student came to enrol in a sociology degree.

Acknowledgements

The research for this article was funded by a University of Otago Research Grant. An early draft was presented at the SAANZ annual conference, Hamilton, 2006. I would like to thank those in the audience for their feedback, and also Jim Robb for the helpful leads he provided as the research progressed.

15 Brickell (2006) and Schrader (1996) explore these questions of government policy and public scepticism.

16 Undergraduate sociology courses were introduced as follows: Victoria University (1957), Canterbury (1958), Waikato (1966), Auckland (1970), Massey (1971) (Robb and Crothers, 1985, p. 465). Otago did not introduce sociology classes until 2002.

References

Allpress, James Courtney (1952). *Kaingaroa: A Survey of the Social Problems of a New Township*. DipEd thesis, Auckland University.

Anonymous (1945). Pocket history of army education & welfare services with third NZ division 2 NZEF in the Pacific. WA II 1 DAZ 160/15/1, Archives New Zealand, Wellington.

Ausubel, David (1960). *The fern and the tiki: An American view of New Zealand national character, social attitudes, and race relations*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

Bardwell, N. E. (1953). *The young incorrigible*. Diploma of Social Science report, Victoria University College.

Barrowman, Rachel (1999). *Victoria University of Wellington 1899 – 1999: A history*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Brickell, Chris (2003). Iconographies of "the house" and the political imagination in 1940s New Zealand'. *Journal of Design History, 16*(4), 291-306.

Brickell, Chris (2006). The politics of post-war consumer culture. *New Zealand Journal of History, 40*(2), 133-155.

Campbell, W. J. (1957). *Hydrotown: The social history of an industrial boom settlement*. Dunedin: University of Otago.

Carter, Ian (2004). The missing link: dietetics and rural sociology in 1930s New Zealand. *New Zealand Sociology, 19*(2), 197-219.

Chapman, Robert (1999 [1953]). Fiction and the Social Pattern. In Robert Chapman, *New Zealand politics and social patterns: Selected works*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Congalton, Athol (1952). *Social class consciousness in adolescents*. Wellington: Victoria University College Department of Psychology.

Congalton, Athol (ed) (1954). *Hawera, a social survey: A report of a community venture*. Hawera: Hawera and District Progressive Association and Hawera Star Publishing.

Craig, E. W. G. (1964). *Man of the mist: A biography of Elsdon Best*. Wellington: Reed.

Crowther, Dorothy (1956). *Street society in Christchurch*. Christchurch: Department of Psychology, Canterbury University College.

Cue (1944). What do you think?. *5*, 12.

Cue (1945a). The structure of a city. *28*, 9-12.

Cue (1945b). Hospitals for sick marriages. *32*, 13-14.

Cue (1945c). What do you think?. *10*, 20.

Davidson, Allan and Lineham, Peter (1987). *Transplanted christianity: Documents illustrating aspects of New Zealand church history*, Auckland, College Communications.

Dawson, John (1998). *Your kingdom come on earth: Methodist social concerns in New Zealand*. Christchurch: Christchurch Methodist Mission.

Doig, W.T. (1940). *A survey of the standards of life of New Zealand dairy-farmers*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Ferguson, Gail (1994). *Building the New Zealand dream*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Firth, Cedric (1949). *State housing in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Works.

Foucault, Michel (1990 [1976]). *The history of sexuality, volume 1*. London: Penguin.

Frengly, D. M. (1925). *Report on the examination of certain house and housing conditions*. Preventive Medicine Dissertation, University of Otago.

Hall, S., Critcher, Charles, Jefferson, Tony, Clark, John and Roberts, Brian (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the state and law and order*. London: MacMillan.

Hancock, Merv (1996). Reflections. *New Zealand Sociology, 11*(2), 317-323.

Harrison, Tom (1944). Public taste and private opinion. *Korero*, 2(6), 10-14.

Hay, R. T. (1925). *Report of investigation into housing conditions. (Hygiene and health in a Dunedin area)*. Preventive Medicine Dissertation, University of Otago.

Heenan, J. (1947). Memorandum, 6 February, MS-Papers-1132/200, Alexander Turnbull Library.

Holmes, Frank (2006). Horace Belshaw. *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. http://www.dnzb.govt.nz.

Howe, K. R. (1991). *Singer in a songless land: A life of Edward Tregear, 1846-1931*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Jacoby, E. G. (1947). Rural sociology in New Zealand. *Transactions of the Royal Society of New Zealand, 77*, 331-335.

Johnson, Dorothy (1949). Building a child's personality. *New Zealand Journal of Agriculture, 78*(6), 637-640.

Korero (1944a). Town planning. 2(21), 9-23.

Korero (1944b). We New Zealanders: Are we like this?. 2(11), 24-28.

Korero (1945). Education in the New Zealand army. 3(14), 7-10.

Leach, Andrew (2003). Introduction. In Frederick Newman, *Frederick H. Newman: Vienna 1900 – Wellington 1964: Lectures on architecture*, edited by Andrew Leach, Gent: A&S.

Lynd, Robert (1956/1929). *Middletown: A study in American culture*. New York: Harvest.

Lipson, Leslie (1948). *The politics of equality : New Zealand's adventures in democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lunt, Neil (2004). *Contested inheritance: The emergence of social science research in New Zealand*. PhD thesis, Massey University.

MacDonald, Charlotte (ed.). (1993). *The vote, the pill and the demon drink: A history of feminist writing in New Zealand, 1869-1993*. Wellington: Bridget Williams.

McLintock, Alexander (1966). Colclough, Mary Ann, "Polly Plum". In Alexander McLintock (ed.), *Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Manning, A. E. (1959). *The bodgie: A study in abnormal psychology*. Wellington: Reed.

McNab, Edith (1949). Order and routine in household tasks. *New Zealand Journal of Agriculture, 78*(1), 111-112.

McCreary, John and Rangihau, John (1958). *Parents and children of Ruatahuna: A report to the people*. Wellington: School of Social Science, Victoria University.

Marsh, David (1952). *Old people in Auckland city: A survey*. Diploma of Social Science report, Victoria University College.

Metge, Joan (1958). *Continuity in change: Urbanisation and modern Maori society: The structure and organisation of Maori society in an urban area and a rural community in northern New Zealand.* no publisher details available.

Molloy, Maureen (1993). Science, myth and the adolescent female: The Mazengarb report, the Parker-Hulme trial and the Adoption Act of 1955. *Women's Studies Journal, 9*(1), 1-25.

Mullock, Kenneth (1927). *An investigation into housing conditions. (In a north Dunedin block).* Preventive Medicine Dissertation, University of Otago.

Newman, Frederick (2003). *Frederick H. Newman: Vienna 1900 – Wellington 1964: Lectures on architecture,* edited by Andrew Leach, Gent: A&S.

New Zealand Army Education Welfare Service (1943a). *Our population problem.* NZ Army Current Affairs Bulletin, *1*(2).

New Zealand Army Education Welfare Service (1943b). *Women and the war.* NZ Army Current Affairs Bulletin, *1*(15).

Ogilvie, J. (1954). *A study of the incidence of accidents in a soap factory.* Diploma of Social Science report, Victoria University College.

O'Neill, D. P. (1950). *Catholics and delinquency.* Diploma of Social Science report, Victoria University College.

Orchard, D. E. and Porterfield, N. N. (1928). *An industrial survey of the chocolate factory of R. Hudson & Co. Ltd, Dunedin.* Preventive Medicine Dissertation, University of Otago.

Park, Robert, Burgess, Ernest W, and McKenzie, Roderick (1967[1925]). *The city.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pearson, W. (2005[1953]). Fretful sleepers. In Russell Brown (ed.), *Great New Zealand argument.* Auckland: Activity Press.

Plischke, Ernst (1947). *Design and living.* Wellington: Army Education Welfare Service.

Pope, James (1887). *The state: The rudiments of New Zealand sociology, for the use of beginners.* Wellington: Government Printer.

Presbyterian Church Public Questions Committee (1995). *Index of the reports of the public questions committee.* Wellington: Presbyterian Church.

Ritchie, James (1956). Human problems and educational change in a Maori community. *Journal of the Polynesian Society, 65*(1),13-34.

Robb, J. H. (1946). *The concept of national character and some tentative applications of this concept to New Zealand.* MA thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Robb, J. H. (1966). Social science and social welfare. Inaugural address, Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Robb, J. H. and Crothers, C. H. G. (1985). New Zealand. In Yogesh Atal (ed.), *Sociology and social anthropology in the South Pacific.* Paris: Wiley Eastern/UNESCO.

Robb, J. H. (1987). *The life and death of official social research in New Zealand, 1936-1940.* Wellington: Department of Sociology and Social Work, Victoria University.

Robb, Jim (1996). Some thoughts on beginnings. *New Zealand Sociology, 11*(2),323-329.

Schrader, Ben (1996). A brave new world? Ideal versus reality in postwar Naenae. *New Zealand Journal of History 30*(1), 61–79.

Shaw, Peter (1997). *A history of New Zealand architecture.* Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.

Shuker, Roy (1984). *Educating the workers? A history of the Workers' Education Association in New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Sinclair, Keith (1976). *Walter Nash.* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Smith, Mary (1953). *Some aspects of family and community life in a New Zealand saw milling village.* Diploma of Social Science thesis, Victoria University College.

Somerset, H. C. D. (1938). *Littledene: A New Zealand rural community.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Somerset, H. C. D. (1941). *Child nutrition in a rural community.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Sutch, W. B. (1942). *The quest for security in New Zealand.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Taylor, Nancy (1986). *The home front: The New Zealand people at war, Volume* 2. Wellington: Government Printer.

Taylor, Nancy (1986). *The home front: The New Zealand people at war,* volume 2. Wellington: Government Print

Thompson, Richard (1967). Sociology in New Zealand. *Sociology and Social Research 51*(4), 503-508.

Topping, Eva (1949). The "new look" in an old kitchen. *New Zealand Journal of Agriculture, 79*(3), 295-297.

Tyler, Linda (1986). *The architecture of E. A. Plischke in New Zealand.* MA thesis, University of Canterbury.

Unger, H. R. (1955). *Some aspects of criminal homosexuals in New Zealand.* Diploma of Social Science report, Victoria University College.

Whyte, William Foote (1955). *Street corner society: The social structure of an Italian slum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Will, D. A. C. (1924). *Survey of working conditions in Dunedin public laundries.* Preventive Medicine Dissertation, University of Otago.

Wood, Brennon (2003). Sociology making a difference. *New Zealand Sociology, 18*(1): 25-32.

Chris Brickell is a Senior Lecturer in Gender Studies at the University of Otago. His research on sexuality, gender, consumer culture and cultural politics has been published in several edited collections and a range of journals, including *Sexualities, Sex Education, The Sociological Review* and *Rethinking History*. He is currently researching and writing a history of gay male identity in New Zealand. Email: chris.brickell@otago.ac.nz

Following the Action: Using Actor-Network Theory and Conversation Analysis

Tamika Simpson

Abstract

This article presents two theoretical approaches useful for inquiring into how worlds are made through everyday local interactions. The combination of Bruno Latour's actor-network theory and David Silverman's conversation analysis is described as ethnomethodologically-informed, socio-technically aware ethnography employing the craft of conversation analysis. Drawing on a recently completed doctorate in sociology, the article discusses focusing on practices in fieldwork and turns of talk. An argument is put forward for partial ethnography, which is made possible by the acceptance that there are many orderings in any one field site. What is involved is deliberately choosing to closely follow only some parts of the action.

Introduction

In his review of Bruno Latour's book *Reassembling the social,* Robert McGrail (2005) asks how actor-network theory (hereafter "ANT") can be seen as having moved much beyond ethnomethodology. Daniel Neyland provides a convincing answer by including ANT in his comparison of three theoretical strategies for studying expectations of mobility (2006). Through ethnographic surveillance, ethnomethodolgy, and ANT renditions of his story, Neyland shows how ANT offers a vocabulary for representing the involvement of "technological characters", and the shifts that characterise "on-going relations" (2006, p. 373). However, Neyland (2006) does agree with McGrail (2005) that ANT is not clear about how researchers can go about grasping interactional detail.

It is the issue of what to do when faced with a wealth of recorded ethnographic material that is one of the concerns of this article. It suggests that conversation analysis (hereafter "CA") provides useful techniques for handling recorded interactional material gathered from

fieldwork, continuing David Silverman's interest in collaboration between analytic positions (1999). Having grown out of ethnomethodology, CA is an established method of closely analysing human interactions, and is used in linguistics as well as across a range of social research. Of the now many versions of CA, the work of founder Harvey Sacks as developed by Silverman (1997) and Paul Atkinson (1995) is represented here.

In addition to promoting the use of CA, this article argues for the value of the particular fieldwork practices of ANT. ANT looks at how worlds are made up from both human and nonhuman actors and practices, enabling the researcher to consider, with few distinctions or limits, what they see and hear. The ANT task is to see how an endless array of things are placed together in precise and particular ways, including phrases, conversations, material objects, spaces and bodies. In this article ANT refers especially to the work of Latour, John Law and Annemarie Mol.

This paper highlights the compatibility of ANT and CA by showing how they broadly employ a research practice of following the actors as they go about whatever it is they are doing (the action). This research is ethnomethodological in its concern with exploring how worlds are built by local members. The article focuses on what is useful in these approaches rather than their limitations.

The article contends that focusing on detail and accepting that there are many orderings in any one field site that could be described, makes fieldwork an option outside of long-term ethnographic projects. The article emphasises the lack of certainty in conducting research rather than attempting to answer calls for ANT to be explicit. It suggests that closely focusing on some of the action can provide researchers with enough certainty to carry on with their projects. Here, partial ethnography is made possible by deliberately choosing to follow parts of the action (Strathern 1991). In this argument the article is drawing on the use of ANT and CA to produce a PhD thesis (Simpson 2006). This research is described firstly in the article. Secondly ethnomethodology, ANT and CA are introduced. The third part of the article uses empirical material to illustrate the ways ANT and CA enable researchers to follow

the action. Finally, support from Law and anthropologist Marilyn Strathern for doing partial ethnography is very briefly outlined (Law 1994; Strathern 1991).

Following the Action Around the Table

The major concern of my PhD thesis was with how we might reach understandings of organisation building, action, and activities (Simpson 2006). The empirical material was generated from observing and audio-recording a series of fortnightly staff meetings in a Wellington office workplace. After this fieldwork some of the detail of interactions was analysed to explore how work gets done in the everyday processes of meetings. This research could be included as an example of the shift Law and Mol discuss "from articulating norms to studying the way they are practiced" (2002, p. 84).

I chose ANT to guide my fieldwork practice because it is an all-encompassing approach that helped me show the relations of people and objects used to accomplish work. Following Latour, my aim was to do some decent fieldwork.[1] The concern was to ask questions about how worlds are made (and made orderly); how they are put together by associating many things in particular ways, moment by moment. ANT's cornerstone is to "follow the actors" (Callon et al. 1986, p. 228). The major task was to consider what it is that holds worlds together (see methodological articles by Latour 1999; 2002; and his book 2005). Practices of making and creating in the meetings were considered by focusing on how momentum and ongoingness were achieved - when members did *what's next*. Engaging in practices of watching and following the action resulted in noticing movement and writing in those terms – like how meeting members seemed to step into the opportunities provided by other members.

In the analysis I attempted to show how CA provided the techniques for operationalising a concern with ongoingness. I chose to follow the involvement of the phrase *"out there"*; asking how some of the uses of

1 This explanation of Latour's preoccupation with fieldwork practice comes from Mike Lloyd (personal correspondence).

the phrase were involved in the meetings. The work of John Heritage, Rolland Munro and Sacks was drawn on to consider how the phrase was used as a "resource" (Heritage 2004, p. 239; Munro 1998, p. 208; Sacks 1987, p. 56). The involvement of the phrase was watched to see the ordering of the meetings, and the accomplishment of the work.

This research approach, combined with having a broad research concern with how work gets done, led to some unstartling conclusions. For example, I discussed how meeting members got work done by deciding who does what next. In many ways my PhD was an examination of divisions of labour in practice. However, in this research mode the way I described the research was somewhat different - plural, uncertain and loosely held. The challenge seemed to be to hold on just tight enough to my empirical material lest holding too tight resulted in its disintegration (like squashing a banana in one's hand) (Law 2004). So the static description "the division of labour" in this approach became "some practices of placing responsibility".

The labels ANT and CA oversimplify the resources I used in my thesis research, but they roughly describe the many theoretical and methodological resources I drew on. A description of the approach would be something like ethnomethodolgically-informed, socio-technically aware ethnography employing the craft of conversation analysis. The research outlook is presented succinctly in Silverman's suggestions for effective qualitative research: keep it simple; take advantage of what qualitative data can offer; avoid drowning in material; and avoid asking 'journalistic' questions (2005). To follow the meeting action, but without being swamped by the amount of material I had gathered, I limited my detailed analysis to meeting members' use of one particular phrase. I avoided journalistic questions by searching for practices rather than blame.

Ethnomethodology, Conversation Analysis and Actor-network Theory

Ethnomethodology is an approach concerned with inquiring into the methods of members in a setting. Ethnomethodologists ask how orderings of worlds are attempted and achieved and detail precisely

how people go about whatever they are doing for their practical purposes. For ethnomethodology founder (and CA co-founder) Harold Garfinkel there is nothing beyond the practices of members:

> Enacted local practices are not texts which symbolize 'meanings' or events. They are in detail identical with themselves, and not representative of something else. The witnessably recurrent details of ordinary everyday practices are constitutive of their own reality. They are studied in their unmediated details and not as signed enterprises. (2002, p. 97)

For ethnomethodologists the practices of members are more than enough to be concerned with.

The search for answers, problems, those responsible, and solutions is not of interest but rather seeking to understand the endless skill of the actors. An ethnomethdology-inspired researcher is not a knowing-expert, rather, it is those being observed who know what they are doing and are seen as thoroughly competent. The task for the researcher is to attempt to find out something of how members do what they do.

Attempts to make worlds involves practices of showing ourselves to each other, which is the central ethnomethodological concept of accountability. Drawing on Garfinkel's work, Munro says members' accounts involve showing that they know, or that they have "communicative competence" (2001, p. 474). Boden applies the concept specifically to organisations where "local actions must not only make sense to their participants but must be seen as reasonable and, in organizations, reasonably efficient and cost conscious as well as adaptive and accountable" (1994, p. 22).

CA grew out of ethnomethodology, keeping faith with its principles but specialising in the study of conversations. CA founder Sacks was concerned with action itself from the very beginning of his inquiries, as John Gumperz outlines with regard to a seminar series involving Garfinkel, Erving Goffman and Sacks:

> [Sacks] introduced basic theoretical notions by means of descriptive phrases such as: 'sequential ordering', 'positioning of utterances', 'the interactional job that utterances do', 'what they (i.e. speakers) need to do is exhibit understanding', 'the use

> of the performance rule'. In all of these expressions, verb constructions like 'ordering', 'positioning', 'understanding', and 'using (or for that matter also violating) rules' are consciously employed to suggest that reference is being made to acts that speakers perform by means of their talk and not to givens of language usage. (Gumperz 1982, p. 323)[2]

CA sets out to follow the "acts that speakers perform" (ibid), closely observing members' methods. Members' actions are taken to be joint achievements rather than those of a single speaker.

As local practices were for Garfinkel, for Sacks, "talk itself was the action" (Schegloff 1992, p. xviii). He was able to show us things because he was prepared to examine talk "as an object in its own right, and not merely as a screen on which are projected other processes" (Schegloff quoted by Silverman 1999, p. 417). Sacks argued that his task was "to sell what I can do, and the interestingness of my findings" (1992, p. 3). What researchers need to do is "watch conversations" (Sacks 1992, p. 5).

Silverman described his work in the early 1970s as focusing not on "a real world or on the way things 'really are' but on the routine *production* of realities" (1973, p. 66). In their 1978 article, Atkinson, Cuff and Lee treated meetings as "cultural events which members make happen" and aimed to describe "some methods and machinery involved in achieving and sustaining meetings as a social setting" (1978, p. 152). The following year, Latour and Steve Woolgar produced their book, in which they made the statement that is now widely used to explain science and technology studies (or STS) and describe Latour's work: "We do not wish to say that facts do not exist nor that there is no such thing as reality. ... Our point is that 'out-there-ness' is *the consequence of scientific work rather than its cause*" (1979, emphasis added).

In their much more recent article "Enacting the social" Law and Urry highlight ANT's concern with making when they say there are places between romantic (reality is unknowable) and scientific (an ultimate truth unreachable by social science) outlooks: "while the 'real'

2 Sacks' concerns resonate with Law's sociology of verbs, which describes a "sociology of contingent ordering" where all objects, including agency, are "relational achievements" (1994, p. 103).

is indeed 'real', it is *also* made, and that it is made within relations" (2004, p. 395). This focus is neatly encompassed in the word "enact" used by Garfinkel in ethnomethdology as quoted above (2002, p. 97), in CA by Boden when she says that "the enacted organization is *produced* through the actions and inactions of its constituent members" (1994, p. 199) and by Mol to explain how "in practices, objects are enacted" (2002, p. 33).

ANT and CA provide the means to deal with, and reveal in detail, processes of making realities. In both, researchers take it that the everyday matters of those being researched are enough to complete their projects and the main concern is with describing practices. Indeed, when using ANT and CA it is a matter of differences in the scale of focus rather than different concerns and techniques (Strathern 1991; Latour 1999). Silverman outlines Sacks' appreciation of the ethnographic concern with detail coming out of Chicago in the 1930s (1999). ANT and CA not only help researchers produce descriptions, but also to defend producing descriptions as a research aim in itself. Producing descriptions is not straightforward though - mess and uncertainty is unavoidable (Law 2004). I found that some reassurance could be gained by undertaking description using detailed analyses of action in turns of talk. Further, Latour and Silverman both argue that explanations are only possible after describing (Latour 2005; Silverman 1999). This is explanation as appearing through description. By carefully following the action and also writing about it with care, some understanding of how the making and ordering of worlds is attempted might be gained.

An ANT researcher stance is something like that of a detective who inquires and explores with the aim of discovering, albeit without the search for someone to blame. Terry Austrin and John Farnsworth have examined the detection aspects of Latour's method, outlining the variation in stances taken by ethno-investigators by contrasting research which "claims to know more than the actors it researches" with Latour's relativist sociology, which does not know "what society is made of... [but] seeks out informants who may" (2005, p. 161). As discussed, seeing informants as thoroughly competent is a core tenet of ethnomethodology, and Latour has stated that ANT was "another

way of being faithful to the insights of ethnomethodology" (1999, p. 15). In his book he explicitly claims Garfinkel (along with Gabriel Tarde) as one of the founding fathers of ANT (Latour 2005).

The strength of ANT emphasised in this article is the guidance it provides for doing fieldwork, especially with being in the field for researchers who do not claim to know more than those being researched. Indeed, ANT is an approach that suits the current era where the expertise of the researcher is problematised (Lee and Hassard 1999). ANT (and CA) helps researchers adopt the ethnomethodological stance that people know what they are doing, which in turn releases researchers from expectations of being expert. This does not raise the researched above the researcher, rather we are all working on our own projects, and have the same rights (Latour (1986a) in his review of Lynch 1985). An understanding of this equality, described as symmetry in Law's modest sociology, and a feel for the process of uncovering in ANT more generally, can best be gained from the books showing the ways ANT studies have been undertaken (Latour 1996; Law 1994; Mol 2002), rather than Law's and Latour's recent introductions (Law 2004; Latour 2005).

ANT has been criticised for not providing detailed steps for how to go about research (McGrail 2005; Neyland 2006). However, the suggestion in this article of stepping outside ANT to CA as an option should not be taken to suggest that I agree that ANT is lacking. For suggestions on how to operationalise the study of action from within ANT one could look to the principles outlined by Michel Callon in "Some elements of a sociology of translation (1986), at Latour's article "The powers of association" (1986) and his book (2005). Along with the highly-developed concept of translation, ANT provides a vocabulary for researching action, such as: enrolment, mobilization, obligatory passages and problematisation (Callon 1986).[3] However, ANT's concepts and vocabulary are only potentially useful, and cannot be

3 An accessible example of how obligatory points of passage operate can be found in Munro (1998).

applied as a strict model for conducting research (Law 1992). How and when ANT's vocabulary and concepts might be applicable depends on the research site and questions.

Following the Action

From their ethnomethdology roots, ANT and CA are interested in practices of making realities. The concern with making is operationalised through ANT's insistence on following the action, and in CA's focus on turns of talk. Making entities, like meetings, is done in association and takes more than the singular actions of people and things. ANT and CA insist that researchers stay focused on what they can see; they must follow the action.

Following the Action, Example 1: Use of the Phrase "*out there*"

Through a careful exploration of the involvement of the phrase "*out there*" in one particular meeting, how and for what purposes the phrase is "deployed" (Munro 1998, p. 217) is pursued in this condensed excerpt from my thesis . Despite this brevity, the intent of the analysis is to produce a description conveying how the phrase "participated", that is, by following the turns of talk (Mol 2002, p. 152-3). More broadly, the aim is to interest readers in what can be seen via close readings of interaction.

This was Sally's only use of the phrase "*out there*" in the 13 meetings from which material was analysed. This use of the phrase occurred in the last meeting attended during fieldwork. The beginning and end of the transcript of the interaction are presented and the analysis begins where Prue (a pseudonym) introduced a new topic - the review of a manual. For the sake of readability, CA's technical marks have been kept to a minimum (Atkinson 1995).[4] Following Heath (1981), and Silverman (1999), the overall structure of analysis is to start with initial observations and build towards a fuller account. At the same time it is

4 Conversation analysis transcription marks follow Atkinson (1995, p. 152) and Silverman (2001, p. 303). In this article: "=" indicates no silences between lines of talk; "[" overlapping talk; capitals increased loudness; empty brackets or "(unclear)" indicates uncertainty, or failure to transcribe.

recognised that what is being focused on will be "regarded as only ever *partially* described" (Strathern 1991, p. xiv). During the analysis, the interaction was divided into five sections and this structure used to make some initial observations about the different actions attempted and accomplished across the interaction. Further analytic comment was then made about the structure of the talk using concepts from CA, including Sacks' "misunderstanding machinery" discussed below (1987, p. 66).

Transcribed turns of talk

Section 1

Prue: ah just we talked about the the workplace assessor manual is that has that been reviewed now

Sally: no

Prue: ok [

Sally: [(unclear)

Prue: so that's still in progress

Sally: yep yep and I mean just the other day I it might have been yesterday I picked it up and I was reading through a particular section to find out some information and there was a be instead of by and a though instead of through

Prue: tut

Sally: and so it's that sort of detail that you actually have to go through

(unclear): =(unclear)=

Pat: =oh yeah and that's why I'm wondering about sending it to an editor=

Prue: =yep well we've got to get our side of it done first=

Pat: =done first but and cause there's a couple of pages that are in there twice=

56 speaking turns later in the interaction:

Sally: yeah the resource stuff needs to be which Pat and I are going to look at today needs to be updated in the manual as well cause we've got

(Susan): oh yeah=

Sally: =THREE PAGES OF STUFF NOW that we're going to check see if it actually does exist=
Pat: =yeah have we got copies of this still and you know is it current
Susan: [yep what's the new stuff
Sally: [so this
Prue: [it's the new stuff (unclear)
Pat: [and yeah
Sally: [the problem with being
(Prue): [ok
Sally: [ok what should be the priority here let's do this because (unclear) (unclear)
Sally: WE KNOW THAT THERE'S lots of those out there already but we need to get this right and in getting this right
Prue: yeah
Sally: it helps develop that
End of section 4

Final section
Prue: and I don't think I mean I don't think the core value of the manual is compromised=
Sally: =oh no no not at all
Prue: by this it's all there and it's useful
Pat: yeah
Sally: yeah
Prue: so let's not get
Sally: yeah
Prue: our knickers too much (smiling voice) in a twist about that
Sally: yep that's cool (flicking pages) just time to do that's all (flicking pages) (pause)
Prue: ok um (whiteboard noise) (Observation note: Prue: looks back at whiteboard and forwards it on) (long pause)
End of final section

What was it about this interaction that warranted its selection for analytical consideration? Prior to closely considering the talk using CA, the decision to follow this use of the phrase was based on a hunch that it was a failure of some sort regarding what should happen next. In keeping with the CA technique of identifying a deviant case or departure from some kind of talk organisation, this interaction was singled out as one where something possibly went wrong.

The interaction surrounding this use of the phrase is about 2.40 minutes long and contains 92 turns of talk, which is a tiny piece of the hours of talk transcribed. One advantage of concentrating on this small fragment is that it made it possible to allow repeated listening. For example, after many listenings I could hear that Prue had made a *"tut"* sound during Sally's talk about what she had seen while working on the manual. Listening again and again suggested that this *"tut"* may have been influential in the interaction. For instance, it may have been something that Pat used for her proposal to send the manual to an editor, and one indication Sally took that she could speak strongly and say what should be done next.

Sally used the phrase *"out there"* to forcefully make her case for *"getting this right"*. Sally also used the terms *"the problem"*, *"the priority"*, and *"let's do this"*. These are strong calls to organisational belonging and action, and as such, may have been more expected to come from Pat and Prue as the long-serving and senior members of the organisation. Indeed, it was Prue who brought the interaction to a close with Sally and Pat appearing to agree with her. In section four Prue allowed Sally to finish what she was saying (the finishing accomplished partly with the use of increased loudness indicated by capital letters). However, in closing the topic of the manual, Prue seemed to put an end to Sally and Pat's jointly-produced talk. Notice that Prue's re-entry into the talk is not combative. Starting her turn with *"and"*, it appears that Prue will continue Sally's strong statement about what needs to be done, and go on to agree with Sally. Prue also sounded like she was smiling when she said *"knickers"*. What begins looking like agreement however ends as a sanction of sorts. It is a disagreement and as such is "pushed rather deep in to the turn that it occupies" (Sacks 1987, p. 58). In return,

Sally appears to retreat from what has been throughout the interaction a confident and active stance, culminating in a forceful presentation of what should be a priority. Sally's reply to Prue can be seen as a "repair" to a misunderstanding (Schegloff 1992a, p. 1301) when she agrees with Prue's statement that she doesn't *"think the core value of the manual is compromised"*.

Does this interaction show the preference for agreement in the conversations of meetings (Sacks 1987)? Is keeping the meeting moving whilst also disagreeing part of it? The meeting perhaps needs a visible amount of agreement to continue to be a meeting. Does the continual movement explain how, during the fieldwork, these meetings appeared to be smooth-flowing? A kind of smooth momentum seemed to be created by doing harmony, of a sort, in the meetings. Sally's use of *"just"* is very like Sacks' example when he discusses the "misunderstanding machinery" (1987, p. 66):

A: You got an answer for everything so shuddup
B: I don't want to
A: I didn't ask you to, I was just kidding
B: Oh, OK (Sacks 1987, p. 69)

Prue: so let's not get
Sally: yeah
Prue: our knickers too much in a twist about that
Sally: yep that's cool (flicking pages) just time to do that's all (flicking pages) (pause)
Prue: Ok um (whiteboard noise) (Observation note: Prue looks back at whiteboard and forwards it on) (long pause)

The appearance of harmony does not come from an absence of disagreement, but rather from a constant moving on of the talk (Schegloff 1992).

Following the Action, Example 2: Involvement of the Whiteboard

As discussed, McGrail suggests that Latour's book (2005) provides "few clues" for how researchers might "leave out the *right* things" so "left defaulted to human accounts we have strayed little further than Ethnomethodology" (2005, p. 127-8). Callon and Latour have made it clear how ANT differed from ethnomethodology:

> The ethnomethodologists forget to include in their analyses the fact that ambiguity of context in human societies is partially removed by a whole gamut of tools, regulations, walls and objects of which they analyse only a part. We must now gather up what their analyses leaves out and examine with the same method the strategies which enlist bodies, materials, discourses, techniques, feelings, laws, organizations (1981, p. 284).

In imploring researchers to follow the action, Latour provides the biggest clue of all - by following the action, you will see what might be productive to pay more attention to, including the involvement of material entities. If you do the fieldwork by following with the aim of describing as Latour suggests, you will see the socio-technical processes that make up our worlds (1999; 2002; 2005).

In example 1 above, by following turns of talk involving the phrase *"out there"* I was left in no doubt of the influential involvement of the whiteboard. The whiteboard put an end to Sally's call for organisational action. I did not need to go looking for particular examples because in most of the talk I analysed, material entities were right there in front of me. I could hear the involvement of more than words in these interactions. The meetings were made in association with material things. Being there in the meeting room and later listening to the tapes I could see and hear the importance of objects, like the table and the whiteboards, to the action. While my particular focus on talk made everything else "other", the contribution of material objects could not be excluded from the accomplishments of these meetings. Here is a brief example from the closing of the interaction where an artefact is involved in achieving control:

> Prue: our knickers too much (smiling voice) in a twist about that

> Sally: yep that's cool (flicking pages) just time to do that's all (flicking pages) (pause)
> Prue: ok um (whiteboard noise) (Observation note: Prue: looks back at whiteboard and forwards it on) (long pause)

My observation note indicates that the meeting was held (silent) with the whiteboard. Perhaps this ability to hold is one reason why the moving, printing whiteboard was preferred by meeting members to the other static one screwed to the wall. With its forwarding-on noise, the whiteboard "appropriates" the hearing space of the meeting (Munro 1996, p. 248). With it Prue produced a long pause.

This pause can be seen as a turn-taking organisation of these meetings in that it was not understood by other meeting members as an "opportunity for action" for them (Heritage 2004, p. 225). Control, without the need to confront with voice or hand, was possible. Prue is "merely" keeping the meeting on track by working through the agenda, which members had had the opportunity to contribute to (on this whiteboard at the beginning of the meeting). Prue always occupied the seat directly in front of this whiteboard. As Latour says:

> 'Power' is now transferred to the many resources used to strengthen the bonds. The power of the manager may now be obtained by a long series of telephone calls, record-keeping, walls, clothes and machines. The list is open ended... the so-called social elements are simply items among many others in a much longer list. (1986, p. 276)

The whiteboard "augments" Prue as meeting facilitator and she "augments" it as a useful artefact (Munro 1996, p. 266). More recently, Latimer has discussed how chairs can magnify the boss (2004). While Prue interacted with the whiteboard, other meeting members waited. The whiteboard held the meeting silent.

The whiteboard was a resource that Prue had to hand and was an example of the involvement of material things in avoiding explicit use of authority. The whiteboard was a way to non-verbally achieve stopping in the meetings. In showing how the whiteboard was used to do "*no*" without trampling on other meeting members, and so disturbing appearances of collaboration, I am not suggesting that Prue was

manipulatively hiding her position of power, but am noting how she used what she had to hand to do her job as manager, which included keeping the meetings going along. In these meetings, which seemed to involve being concerned to appear to, and to, act collectively, members were careful when they stopped, when they refused, and when they placed responsibility for acting next with other members. One way they were careful was by doing "*no*" non-verbally. Meeting members used material things to disagree without saying "*no*". When Prue moved to the next topic in the meeting, she stopped Sally and Pat's talk carefully with the aid of the moveable whiteboard. The whiteboard noise called meeting members to attention. It was this moveable whiteboard that made authority and control possible, which perhaps explains members preference for it. Mute objects have power, but ones that speak have even more. In Latour's sense, they can "*make you do* things", like making you silent (2004, p. 243).

Discussion: Choosing From Many Orderings

Accepting there are many orderings in any one field makes it possible to do ethnography in a partial way. Law argued that there were "endless different locations in the laboratory" that was his field site and therefore many stories of orderings he could tell (1994, p. 43). From outside of ANT and CA support for describing only some of the orderings of any setting, following particular paths, or doing partial ethnography can be gained from Strathern (1991). Albeit coming from the solid base of their own long-term ethnographies, these aspects of Law's and Strathern's work provide justification for doing shorter, more contained fieldwork. Accepting that your aim is to achieve partial descriptions, because there are many stories that could be told, means observation and fieldwork are options outside long-term ethnographic projects.

In this approach, one starts in the usual ethnographic way of going to the field early with some broad questions. It is the later limiting of focus that I am arguing is valuable here in that it grants permission to tell small but detailed stories. What is involved is the deliberate choosing

of particular streams of action to follow. Conceptualising this idea of selection means envisaging a smorgasbord, where you select some things:

> Thus one might imagine *choosing* two or three elements of initiation practices for theoretical consideration, knowing that for no single case had one grasped the natural character of the entire phenomenon. Other perspectives remain. (Strathern 1991, p. xiv)

What is required is a very careful, deliberate choosing where, as McGrail says "good decisions about what to leave behind are vastly superior to the illusion of having made none" (2005, p. 128). Choosing to focus on just a few things is immensely valuable when dealing with a wealth of ethnographic material. Claims to these pieces being representative are not made, but rather some parts of the action and not others are chosen to follow. As in long-term ethnographies, the aim is to provide a feel for where you have been and what you have seen but this is achieved through close, rather than broad, descriptions.

Conclusion

In this article the adoption of an ethnomethodological stance in fieldwork and in analysing recorded interactional material was explored. Drawn on were ANT, which has added to ethnomethodolgy a concern with how objects are involved in making worlds, and CA, a specialism concerned with what is performed in turns of talk. Adding Strathern's arguments to Law's it was suggested that because there are always many orderings in front of researchers, choosing is a necessary, inevitable and valuable part of completing research projects.

ANT and CA were used to argue for mixed, middle ground empiricism. For example, with regard to the relative positioning of researchers and those researched - the aim is somewhere between being researched-focused and researcher pre-occupied. This is a pragmatic approach to research, where one uses what is to hand rather than agonizing over what might be the very best of this or that. Not some kind of third-way middle, mediocre nothingness but a deliberate, explicit choosing. The kind of analysis that results from such an approach is the uncovering of ordinary but influential world-making practices.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to the reviewers for their valuable suggestions for improving an earlier version of this paper.

References

Atkinson, M. A., Cuff, E. C., and Lee, J. R. E. (1978). The recommencement of a meeting as a member's accomplishment. In J. Schenkein (Ed.), *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction*. New York: Academic Press.

Atkinson, P. (1995). *Medical talk and medical work*. London: Sage.

Austrin, T. and J. Farnsworth (2005). Hybrid genres: Fieldwork, detection and the method of Bruno Latour. *Qualitative Research* 5(2), 147-165.

Boden, D. (1994). *The business of talk: Organisations in action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Callon, M. and B. Latour (1981). Unscrewing the big Leviathan: How actors macro-structure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. In K. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel, (Eds.), *Advances in social theory and methodology: Toward integration of micro- and macro-sociologies*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Callon, M., J. Law and A. Rip, (Eds.). (1986). *Mapping the dynamics of science and technology: Sociology of science in the real world*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press.

Garfinkel, H. (2002). *Ethnomethodology's program: Working out Durkheim's aphorism*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Gumperz, J. L. (1982). The linguistic bases of communicative competence. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*. Washington D C: Georgetown University Press.

Heath, C. (1981). The opening sequence in doctor-patient interaction. In P. Atkinson and C. Heath (Eds.), *Medical work: Realities and routines*. Farnborough, Hants: Gower.

Heritage, J. (2004). Conversation analysis and institutional talk: Analyzing data. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice*. London: Sage.

Latimer, J. (2004). Commanding materials: (Re)legitimating authority in the context of multi-disciplinary work. *Sociology*, 38(4), 757-775.

Latour, B. (1986). The powers of association. In J. Law (Ed.) *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Latour, B. (1986a). Will the last person to leave the social studies of science please turn on the tape-recorder? *Social Studies of Science*, 16, 541-548.

Latour, B. (1996). *Aramis or the love of technology*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1999). On recalling ANT. In J. Law and J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after*. Oxford: Sociological Review Monograph, Blackwell.

Latour, B. (2002). Gabriel Tarde and the end of the social. In P. Joyce (Ed)., *The social in question: New bearings in history and the social sciences*. London: Routledge.

Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry*, 30(Winter), 225-248.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*, Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. and S. Woolgar (1979). *Laboratory life. The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Law, J. (1992). Notes on the theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, strategy, and heterogeneity. *Systems Practice*, 5(4), 379-393.

Law, J. (1994). *Organizing modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. London: Routledge.

Law, J. and J. Urry (2004). Enacting the social. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 390-410.

Law, J. and A. Mol (2002). Local entanglements or utopian moves: An inquiry into train accidents. *Utopia and Organization. The Sociological Review*, 83-105.

Lee, N. and J. Hassard (1999). Organization unbound: Actor-network theory, research strategy and institutional flexibility. *Organization*, 6(3), 391-404.

Lynch, M. (1985). *Art and artifact in laboratory science: A study of shop work and shop talk in a research laboratory*. London: Routlege and Keegan Paul.

McGrail, R. (2005). Risky maps for contested territories. *New Zealand Sociology*, 20(2), 121-131.

Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Munro, R. (1996). The consumption view of self: Extension, exchange and identity. *The Sociological Review*, 248-273.

Munro, R. (1998). Belonging on the move: Market rhetoric and the future as obligatory passage. *The Sociological Review*, 208-243.

Munro, R. (2001). Calling for accounts: Numbers, monsters and membership. *The Sociological Review*, 4, 473-493.

Neyland, D. (2006). Moving images: The mobility and immobility of "kids standing still". *The Sociological Review*, 363-381.

Sacks, H. (1987). On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation. In G. Button and J. R. E. Lee (Eds.), *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Sacks, H. (1992). Second stories; "Mm hm"; Story prefaces; "Local news"; Tellability. *Lectures on conversation Volume 2*, (Fall 1968 Lecture 1). G. Jefferson (Ed.), Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Introduction. In G. Jefferson (Ed.), *Lectures on conversation Volume 1*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schegloff, E. A. (1992a). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1295-345.

Silverman, D. (1973). Getting in: The managed accomplishment of "correct" selection outcomes. In J. Child (Ed.), *Man and organization*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Silverman, D. (1997). *Discourses of counselling: HIV counselling as social interaction*. London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (1999). Warriors or collaborators: Reworking methodological controversies in the study of institutional interaction. In S. Sarangi and C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, work and the institutional order: Discourse in medical, mediation and management settings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction.* London: Sage.

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook.* London: Sage.

Simpson, T. (2006). *Workplace meetings: Following the action in making organisation around the table.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington.

Strathern, M. (1991). *Partial connections.* Maryland: Rowman and Little.

Tamika Simpson recently completed her PhD at Victoria University of Wellington. Her research interests include workplace practices, socio-technical associations and processes of accountability, responsibility and dividing labour. Email: Tamika@tonfon.to

Cultural Policy Formation and the Development of Creative Industries in Australia and New Zealand: A Focus on Feature Film Industries

Lorna Kaino

Abstract

This paper compares New Zealand and Australian creative industries within the broader contexts of their respective social, cultural, and geo-political structures. It observes that, for at least the past decade, New Zealand has established policies that encompass progressive initiatives and opportunities in the creative industries, which it highlights as one of its three industries that offer the greatest potential for economic growth (Growth and Innovation Framework, 2005). These policies, shaped under the auspices of political leadership that actively supports the creative industries, have contributed to New Zealand's stronger economic growth in its film industry.

Introduction

This paper explores cultural policy formation and creative industries in Australia and New Zealand within a broad socio-cultural context. The purpose of highlighting the social-cultural context is to impart some insights into the less tangible factors that contribute to cultural policy formation, such as socio-cultural and geo-political factors, cultural diplomacy and political leadership. Clearly, it is difficult to scope the development all of the creative industries. Instead, the paper will mainly address recent economic growth in feature film industries in both countries.

Integral to this exploration is the competitive relationship between the two countries.[1] I will explore this in relation to "policy circles and

1 For a detailed analysis of this relationship, see Given's paper on the Australia New Zealand Closer Economic Relations Trade Agreement 1983 (2005).

official representatives" of the feature film industry, and not the relationship between actors and filmmakers, who have established a more integrated approach (Given, 2005, p. 61). I will argue that the New Zealand film industry compares favourably with Australia's. My argument may present as paradoxical, because there is a perception in both countries that Australia provides more opportunities for creative producers than New Zealand. This perception is not surprising, given that Australia has five times the population base of New Zealand and that it is common for creative practitioners from New Zealand to seek opportunities in Australia. However, recently I have observed a reverse trend (see, for example, Kaino, 2005, pp. 31-43) which has provided the impetus for my investigation into the socio-cultural context of cultural policies in both countries.

I refer to economic growth in the sense outlined by Maddern (2001, p. 72), who argues that, in economic rationalist terms, the arts and cultural industries in Australia have "mediocre 'economic' impacts". Maddern refers to 'economic' as a special term because he asserts that the conventional definition of economic growth is far too narrow. He suggests that cultural policy would be better informed if cultural economists "imported broader notions of art and culture and develop[ed] a more sophisticated cultural awareness" (2001, p. 172). As it happens, Maddern's argument that cultural industries, creativity and innovation lead to economic growth are central to both Australian and New Zealand cultural policies.

The abundant recent research on the economic impact of creative industries (Florida, 2002; Landry, 2000; Leadbeater and Oakley, 1999) presents an optimistic scenario. However, quoting the British experience, Oakley (2004, p. 68) suggests that there is often an inverse relationship between the rhetoric "which continues to grow" in the creative industries and the flimsy evidence base that supports assertions of economic growth. And, while New Zealand's rhetoric, in particular, about its creative industries also "continues to grow" , I will argue that its considerable investment in this field has paid dividends. Broadly speaking, this has not been the case for Australia (Maddern, 2001, p. 179). Maddern warns that when countries fail to invest in art and creative

industries the subsequent market failure has a negative impact on the economy. In 2001 he opined that Australia's under-investment in creative industries amounted to a market failure. Little has changed since then.

My discussion on the socio-cultural context of cultural policy is informed by the definition of culture as "the ensemble of social practices by which meanings are produced, circulated and exchanged" (Thwaites, Davis and Mules, 2000, p. 1). "Circulation and exchange of meanings"[2] provides the framework for investigating ways in which New Zealand has used cultural diplomacy to identify itself closely with creative industries. Face-to-face interaction occurs at the international level during diplomatic and cultural visits. Mediated quasi-interaction, which includes exchange of digital media and film, is separated by time and space and oriented towards "an indefinite range of potential participants" (Thompson, 1995, p.78). In this context, cultural diplomacy is shaped by what is perceived by other countries as well as what a country produces.

The socio-cultural context

For decades Australians and New Zealanders have maintained a competitive relationship in which Australians have assumed dominance. Two consistent positions mark this assumption: a population drift from New Zealand to Australia that Australians[3], at best, have grudgingly accepted; and higher rates of economic growth in Australia than New Zealand. Over the past decade or so, both countries have established initiatives and opportunities in the creative industries. However, New

2 My primary point of reference for "meanings... circulated" is the web. I acknowledge that comprehensive websites (as exemplified on the New Zealand sites) are not necessarily a measure of productivity, given that they are largely an information and public relations forum. However, the efficient dissemination of information that the web provides is fundamental to producing meanings about cultural policy.

3 This population drift is often reported in the press. For example, the *New Zealander* reported that in 2006, until April, about 600 New Zealanders a week depart for Australia on a long term basis ('We must acknowledge this one-way traffic' 13.6.2006, p. 13.) However, permanent and long-term arrivals exceeded departures by 1,000 in April 2006, on a seasonally adjusted basis. (External Migration, http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services)

Zealand policy positions creative industries as one of three that offer the greatest potential for economic growth (Growth and Innovation Framework, 2005).

Australia and New Zealand have similar early 'white' histories whereby the original indigenous inhabitants were invaded by Anglo-Celtic Protestants, who then established agrarian economies. It is often noted that, when summoned to support the 'Mother Country', both countries united under the ANZAC treaty to fight in both World Wars. However, within this framework, as Denoon & Mein-Smith (2000, p. 235) suggest "[r]ivalry pervaded everything, as Australia and New Zealand competed for the titles of social laboratory and workingman's [sic] paradise." According to Denoon and Mein-Smith, Australians and New Zealanders thought it "normal and proper" that their living standards would exceed those of 'the old world'. Within this context, as Bell (1996, p. 14) notes, colonial New Zealanders aspired to a new sense of identity and difference from their European origins, achieving this through a number of labour reforms. For example, New Zealand became the first country in the world to grant women full voting rights (1893) and Australia followed soon after in 1902 (Denoon & Mein-Smith, 2000, p. 206). Both countries maintained strong ties with Britain, though more recently, Prime Minister Howard, who is a staunch monarchist (Throsby, 2005, p. 24) maintains stronger ties than Prime Minister Helen Clark.

In terms of geo-politics, both countries are highly urbanised: In 2004 85 per cent of New Zealand's 4.1 million people lived in urban centres compared with 91 per cent of Australian's population of 20 million. Both countries have a high concentration of people in their largest cities: 28.5 per cent of New Zealanders live in Auckland, and 19.4 per cent of Australians live in Sydney (Tiffen & Gittins, 2004, p. 14). Australia introduced a policy of multiculturalism in 1975, whereby immigrant and minority groups were supposed to be granted "equal rights in all spheres of society without being expected to give up their diversity" (Jupp, 2001, p. 807). In 1994 New Zealand introduced a policy of biculturalism, based on the renewed legal status given to the Treaty of Waitangi that decreed to fairly represent Maori and non-Maori interests in their operations and resources (Cultural policy in New Zealand, 2004, p. 2). In 2006

approximately 30 per cent of New Zealand Members of Parliament were women and seventeen per cent Maori (History of Parliament, 2006), whereas Australia's Federal government had twenty-one percent women and no Aborigines (Martin Lumb, Department of Public Service, email communication, 26.6.06).

Today, whereas Australia has advanced neo-liberal agendas (Frankel, 2001), Craig argues that New Zealand has taken an approach which is

> ...not simply ... market driven neo-liberalism, but a cultural-entrepreneurial liberalism which knowingly takes on whatever cultural and technical form, as it seeks to embed itself in the widest range of experience, formal elements, place, style, subjectivity. (2005, p. 36)

This distancing from a neo-liberal agenda can be seen in several ways. For example, New Zealand legislated itself a nuclear-free zone in 1987, distancing itself from Australia/USA on defence matters, and it has signed the Kyoto Protocol while Australia hasn't. More recently New Zealand has distinguished itself from Australia in its more progressive treatment of refugees. In this century the mooted introduction of a Civil Union Bill attracted controversy in both countries (Civil union; Boniface; 2004, p. 1-2). However, New Zealand passed its Civil Union Bill in 2004. That same year the Australian Capital Territory passed a Civil Union Bill but it was controversially blocked by the Howard Federal Government in June 2006. Arguably, New Zealand's progressive approach in social matters has underpinned cultural policy initiatives. For example, New Zealand voted for the UNESCO declaration of Cultural Diversity draft treaty to "strengthen cultural policy formation, promote intercultural dialogue and render assistance to poorer countries" (cited in Throsby, 2005, p. 30), whereas Australia, the USA and Israel voted *against* it. Throsby points out that Australia justified its negative stance on the basis of technical aspects, but other countries, such as New Zealand, voted for it on the basis that technical difficulties would be addressed (2005, p. 30).

According to Leadbeater and Oakley (1999) and Landry (2000), support for tolerance and cultural diversity enhances creative industries because it attracts creative workers. Florida expanded upon these ideas in *The rise of the creative class* (2002). Skilling (2005, p. 30) points out that the exceptional qualities valued by this so-called "class"- in my view a problematic term for the concept Florida has intended - reflect exclusivity rather than the inclusion that many New Zealand cultural policy documents espouse. And Volkering (2006, p. 299) argues that "Florida's theories have done little other than redescribe characteristics of the city that were already apparent and are grounded in historical circumstances", such as the foundations of its city plan, based on the theories of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, and its activist mayors, such as Fran Wilde and Mark Blumsky. These arguments notwithstanding, Florida's ideas have been adopted in policy on the development of "creative cities" in New Zealand, and Wellington, in particular, which used his principles to revitalise itself (Civic and cultural precincts, 2003, p. 4).[4]

Cultural policy formation

Australia and New Zealand constantly compete with and disparage each other. For New Zealanders "Misery is ... losing to Australia" , as when New Zealand basketballers lost to Australians at the Athens Olympics (Smith, 2004, p. 6). New Zealanders jokingly refer to Australia as the "West Island" of New Zealand,[5] and Australians never seem to miss an opportunity to volunteer New Zealand sheep jokes. Even the Tasman crossing that separates the two countries is denigrated by both countries as "the ditch"

This competitive culture is also manifest in Australia's system of governance, especially between federal and state authorities (Frankel, 2001, p. 25). In relation to creative industries, as Throsby (225, p. 17) notes, this has resulted in an uneven implementation of policy. For

4 See, for example, Kaino's discussion on Te Papa museum (2005, p 36).
5 A popular New Zealand postcard is an image of a smaller "West Island" (Australia) off New Zealand's North and South Island.

example, he argues that "the efforts of some states to espouse progressive policies for creative industry development stand in contrast to the general lack of action at the Federal level in these areas" (2005, p. 17). In contrast New Zealand has developed a more collaborative approach to policy development (albeit with tensions between the North and South Islands, and Wellington and Auckland), no doubt advantaged by having a unitary state that sits above a Local Government structure divided into regional councils, district councils and city councils. Accordingly, New Zealand has developed a whole-of-government approach and in 1994 established Creative New Zealand (CNZ) as its main instrument for developing policy and devolving funding. CNZ is the statutory organisation responsible to the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, which, in turn, was established in 2000 by Prime Minister Helen Clark, the Minister for Arts, Heritage and Culture. Clark's Ministry works closely with New Zealand Trade and Enterprise. As the key creative industries development agency, Creative New Zealand has developed links with several other organisations, including: the New Zealand Institute of Management (CNZ funds 36 organisations who get free membership to NZIM), the Department of Conservation and the Ministry of Science Research and Technology, the Major Events and the Cultural Diplomacy Co-ordinating Group, and input into cultural tourism activities. Several other schemes have been developed to enhance the skills and professional development of cultural workers: GIF (Growth and Innovation Framework) mentioned earlier; PACE (Pathways to Arts and Cultural Employment), an arts information agency that provides an online community for New Zealand's creative industries and includes links to BIZ (Business Information Zone), a small business assistance agency (PACE, 2006).

Australia has attempted to make similar links between creative industries and business through its parallel arts organisation, the Australia Council, which was established in 1973. In 1994, under the Keating Labour government, Australia's first national cultural policy, Creative Nation, was introduced with a clear mandate to invest in cultural industries in a way that responded to globalising forces, especially in communications (Creative Nation, 2006).

Part of Creative New Zealand's success can be attributed to its acuity in image making. For example, the 'branding' of Creative New Zealand is obviously a progressive shift from the previously titled Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council of New Zealand. If Australia's premiere cultural institution, the Australia Council, had re-branded itself as Creative Australia, creative industries in Australia may have taken a different path.

As stated above, cultural policy in Australia has not achieved the same level of integration that New Zealand has through Creative New Zealand. Cunningham, director of the university-based Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation, established in July 2005 and administered through the Queensland University of Technology, has acknowledged the need for better alignment between governments, creative industries, and innovation and cultural policies. He advocates "joined-up initiatives to support holistic or systematic approaches" (2006, p. 39); a position that has arguably been achieved more successfully in Queensland than other states. Cunningham attributes creative industry initiatives in Queensland to the teaming up of the state government with the Queensland University of Technology in 2004 to build a $60 million Creative Industries precinct (2006, p. 12). This is a laudable development, but it also illustrates a typical pattern of uneven state and federal development of cultural policy in Australia.

Australian Policy initiatives for skills development include CREATE Australia, the national industry training advisory board for the cultural industries. Its recent document, 'National VET [Vocational Education Planning] Plan for Industry 2003-2006/8' (CREATE Australia, 2006) calls for an urgent supply of increased support and infrastructure for industry training in audiovisual areas and better integration between industry and training providers. Cunningham (2006) concurs, and despite arguing first that "market failure" in Australia points to a need for more public investment (2006, p. 25) and, second, that Australia needs a more integrated approach to cultural development (2006, p. 42), he generally presents an optimistic view of creative industries in Australia.

However, film industry policy documents in Australia present a contrary view. For example, an inquiry into Australia's film, animation, special effects and electronic games industries identified a lack of funding to develop policy as a major contention (Standing Committee on Communications, Information Technology and the Arts, 2004: xxxii). The Committee also found a persistence of "old industry silo thinking that has thwarted attempts to make closer links between small and medium enterprises", and bemoaned the funding decisions that support film – but not digital content, animation and game sectors (Standing Committee, 2004, p. xxxiv). Gallasch (2005, pp. 34-38) concurs with this view of 'old industry silo thinking' in his analysis of closure of the New Media Arts Board, which was dispersed to the more traditional areas of the Visual Arts/Craft Board and the Music Board. Throsby (2005, p. 39) argues that Australian policy has failed to take a longer term developmental strategy that recognises that creative industries need to be founded upon a flourishing arts sector.

The current commodities boom in Australia generated by the demand for its minerals, especially by China, has brought to light concerns for the sustainability of this industry and the critical shortage of skilled labour in Australia (Hewett, 2006, p. 22). Creative industries, on the other hand, are predicted to sustain economic growth; not just the industries themselves, but in the cultural milieu they create, which is conducive to further economic growth (Ellmeir, 2002, p. 156). As previously noted, New Zealand rates creative industries, along with information and communication technology and biotechnology, as one of the three industries that offer the greatest potential for economic growth (Growth Innovation Framework). While Australian communications industries also recognise the potential of creative industries, there is little evidence to suggest that it receives the same level of attention at the Federal policy level.

Feature film industries

Both countries have used film to "brand" themselves internationally. Australia did this in the 1980s with its "arthouse" films like George Miller's internationally acclaimed *Mad Max* series and 'ocker' blockbusters such

as *Crocodile Dundee* (1 & 2) and *The Man from Snowy River* (1, 2 & 3). But, with the exception of *10 Canoes* and *Happy Feet,* it has failed to achieve similar successes recently. New Zealand has outperformed Australian with *The Piano* (1993) which won three Oscars, and *The Lord of the Rings* (2004) which won eleven Oscars. The latter film trilogy brought many added benefits. In addition to the estimated 3000 jobs it created for Wellington (Harvey, 2003, p. 15-16), it boosted tourism, was the subject of a blockbuster museum exhibition that travelled internationally[6], and it created industries in software development and film merchandise. Backed by NZ Trade and Enterprise and Investment NZ, *The Lord of the Rings* also attracted other international productions to New Zealand (Newman, 2005, p. 26). The film's director, Peter Jackson, well known for his experimental films and innovative software, is one of many creative New Zealanders who have benefited from New Zealand's infrastructural support[7] and long-term development strategies. Importantly, as De Bruin (forthcoming: 2007) notes, Jackson's multiple entrepreneurial ventures in screen production, such as Wingnut Films, Weta Ltd, Three Foot Six and Park Road Post, which were "founded on and linked to the initial support of his career by the New Zealand Film Commission", have opened up opportunities for other entrepreneurs to establish "spin-off companies". Florida was effusive in his praise of Jackson's filmmaking complex:

> When I visited, I met dozens of Americans ... working alongside talented filmmakers from Europe and Asia, the Americans asserting that they were ready to relinquish their citizenship. Many had begun the process of establishing residency in New Zealand. Think about this. In the industry most symbolic of America's international economic and cultural might, film, the greatest single project in recent cinematic history was

6 This was titled *The Lord of the Rings Motion Picture Trilogy: The Exhibition.* See Kaino, (2005:37) for a discussion of how this added value to the film.

7 An example is the post-production house in Wellington, Park Road Post, which the New Zealand Government, in partnership with Wellington City Council, granted $2 million (Public Affairs and Sources of Information on New Zealand and Korea, p. 6).

> internationally funded and crafted by the best filmmakers from around the world, but not in Hollywood. (cited in Volkering 2006, p. 298)

In 2006 Jackson entered into partnership with Microsoft Game Studios to form a video game studio called Wingnut Interactive (Terdiman, 2006).

Successful film productions such as Jackson's clearly benefit from infrastructural support. Newman (2005, p. 25) notes that the New Zealand Film Council has, from 1999 to 2004, increased its level of script development support from 6.1 to 14.3 per cent of total NZFC expenditure. This, he maintains, underpins the success of its film industry. On the other hand, a survey of 106 Australian film makers has revealed that 36 per cent felt that their film needed more development, mainly in re-drafting and workshopping the script, and only 28 per cent said they had an adequate development budget (Development of feature films in Australia, 2004, p. 3, 8). New Zealand has also attributed the success of recent films funded by the New Zealand Film Commission, such as *The World's Fastest Indian, Whale Rider and Sione's Wedding* to their focus on producing commercially successful films that have audience appeal.

Cultural diplomacy and cultural leadership

Cultural diplomacy is an important means of cultural exchange, particularly if some of those means of exchange, such as film, are also key national industries. Throsby (2005, p. 43) notes that, although Australia has articulated effective cultural exchange programmes with Britain, Europe and the USA (developed in the US, he says, to the point of subservience) cultural exchange with our nearest neighbours, the Asian Pacific region, is scant. This stands in stark contrast to New Zealand, whose current priority for cultural exchange is with Asia, especially China, Japan and Korea (Cultural Diplomacy International Programme Information Sheet, 2006, p. 2). New Zealand also has long-standing cultural exchange programmes with the Pacific region where, Jalal notes,

> the New Zealanders have always appeared to be more comfortable [than Australia'] with the region and their role in it,

> and are consistently better at engaging with us. ('Australia and the South Pacific', 2006)

Both countries compete to attract film projects from Asia. To this end, Binning claims, Australia has attracted 150 joint projects with India since 1999 (2006, p. 16). Arora (2006) is more cautionary. He notes that, whereas fourteen big-budget mainstream Bollywood projects were filmed in Australia between 1998 and 2003, only one, *Salaam Namaste* has been shot since. Interestingly, he cites one producer who cancelled a shoot because "the mood of the movie did not go well with the Australian backdrop" (Arora, 2006, p. 17). This remark could be interpreted in various ways, but it lends weight to the need to develop a 'film friendly' approach, something that New Zealand has done well according to de Bruin (forthcoming, 2007). She cites by example the two key film making centres in New Zealand: Positively Wellington Business, the region's official economic development agency, which supports the Creative Cluster of multi-media companies; and Film Auckland, which has made strategic co-operative efforts with regional cities and district councils towards building regional film industry clusters. 'Branding' also helps. To this end, De Bruin notes, Wellington coined the title of 'Wellywood' (forthcoming, 2007).

Bollywood has made over 100 feature films in New Zealand since 1995 (Public Affairs and Sources of Information on New Zealand and Korea: 3), an impressive comparison with Australia's 150 given the population differences between Australia and New Zealand. Both countries are also courting the Korean film industry. New Zealand's Ambassador in Korea, David Taylor was upbeat in a film symposium in Korea where he proposed a bi-lateral co-production agreement between the two countries (Public Affairs and Sources of Information on New Zealand and Korea, 2005, p. 4). Less sanguine was Kim Dalton, The Chief Executive of the Australian Film Council, in a media forum at Seoul in 2004, when he reported that reductions in Government funding and private investment in the Australian film industry had resulted in decreased productions of feature films and television dramas (2004, p.

7). Dalton went on to state that one of the main 'challenges' of the Australian film industry was that "[c]ulture – in any form – has slipped off the mainstream political agenda in Australia" (2004, p. 8).

Clearly, political leaders are in a strong position to put culture back onto the political agenda. Since the 1980s there has been broad acceptance in both countries that creative industries[8] are integral to the arts. During this period the most enterprising cultural leaders in Australia and New Zealand have been Prime Ministers Paul Keating and Helen Clark, respectively. Both, it could be argued, set out to encourage a wide basis of support for the creative industries. However, Keating lost government in 1996 to the Howard Liberal government, now in its fourth term. And Helen Clark's Labour Government was returned for its third term in 2006.

A number of cultural leaders in Australia have expressed disappointment in Prime Minister Howard's leadership in cultural matters. For instance, Federal Labor MP Carmen Lawrence laments the omission of the arts from public debates and has "found it amazing" that John Howard offered no public gesture of welcome to Nobel prize-winning author J.M. Coetzee when he became an Australian citizen. Her acerbic comment, borrowed from journalist Mungo McCullum's suggestion that the last theatre Howard attended was to have his tonsils removed (Lawrence, 2006, p. 15), would not be lost on theatre actor and director, Robyn Nevin. In her Australia Day Address to the Nation in 2004, Nevin noted the Howard Government's disappointingly ambivalent attitude towards the arts:

> In 2004 it could be argued the arts are off the national agenda. Neutralised by absence of debate. They simply aren't talked about at the top level of Federal Government. A major new railway ... can attract the presence and the comments of the Prime Minister of Australia, but not the opening of a new theatre, the Sydney Theatre, also of national and international importance. (Nevin, 2004, p. 3)

8 Often referred to as cultural industries in the 1980s.

Nevin went on to say that whereas Australia might have thrived under the previous Prime Minister Keating's "untried creative nation" it was hard to imagine the present government supporting innovative arts activities. To illustrate this, Nevin wryly observed that during the 1998 Federal election, "the words across the TV screen screamed 'a vote for the arts is a vote for elitism'" (2004, p. 5).

Little has changed since Nevin made these statements. Throsby (2005, p. 19) notes that biographers of Howard don't record any artistic activities or interests, and that he is rarely, if ever, seen at arts events. Rather, his wife and children attend without him, reflecting his traditionalist stance that art is for women (Throsby, 2005, p. 19). Further, Throsby argues that Howard demonstrates little understanding of, and tolerance for, the role of art as a medium for social criticism (2005: 24, 34). Howard's intolerance is evident in his support for persistent enquiries into the ABC (Inglis, 2006, pp. 563-565), and the controversial appointment of three new conservative members to the ABC Board.[9] Knight (2007, p. 42) notes that "as a result of Howard's interventions, all but one of the ABC Board has links with right-wing lobby groups of the Liberal Party". These appointments resonate with what Bagnall described earlier as a "jittery climate where museum and gallery directorships are increasingly read as political appointments" (2003, p. 74). Howard's conservative and traditional positions are also reflected in his perceptions of cultural identity. For example, as Throsby observes, while strongly identifying with a masculinist, anglo-centric Australian tradition that takes pride in its (male) sporting prowess, he has pronounced that "as a nation we are all over this identity stuff' (2005, p. 19).

New Zealand, on the other hand, demonstrates a keen interest in the 'stuff' of identity. However, while "blokes and sport" (Bell, 1996, p. 183) have remained a strong part of Australian and New Zealand cultural identity, in the past decade New Zealand has re-captured the "new identity and difference" it sought in the 1860s by drawing from its traditions of "kiwi ingenuity", a term which Bell (2001, p. 155) explains,

9 These are academic, Dr Ron Brunton, journalist, Ms Janet Albrechtsen and historian, Mr Keith Windschuttle. The position for the staff representative, occupied by Ms Romona Koval, was axed in 2006.

"came to sum up the response to practical needs with limited resources; a remnant of pioneer inventiveness and respect for the ability to improvise". Bell (2001, p. 155) maintains that "kiwi ingenuity" is a "powerful reference to creativity as a readily recognised national attribute". The attributes of creativity, and progressive social positioning, mentioned earlier, are reflected in the 2006 Budget documents, which announced a national identity theme focus over the next decade where "all New Zealanders [will] be able to take pride in who and what we are through our arts, culture, film, sports and music, and our appreciation of our natural environment, our understanding of our history and our stance on international issues" (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2006, p. 37).

Whereas in recent times no Australian federal or state premiers have taken on arts portfolios, New Zealand's Prime Minister, Helen Clark, has strategically and deliberately placed herself as Minister for the Arts. An enthusiastic supporter of the arts, Clark has committed to give the arts "a degree of prominence and support they have not previously enjoyed at the top political level" (Biography: Rt. Hon Helen Clark, 2006, p. 2).

It is reasonable to posit that Clark's input into the creative industries is vital to the cultural identity of New Zealanders. This has been demonstrated to me on research visits where most New Zealanders I have spoken to associate Clark with the creative industries (see, for example, Kaino, 2005). Many can relate stories of how Clark has attended arts events, ranging from how she altered her schedule so she could open the Christchurch Art Gallery (personal communication, Tony Preston, Director, Christchurch Art Gallery, 24 Sept. 2004) to the arts exhibition she opened in Motueka, a small town in New Zealand's South Island. I would argue that, in the context of a global economy, Clark has positioned New Zealand creativity as a mark of differentiation, as a means of asserting an innovative and cosmopolitan New Zealand cultural habitus. In this sense, Clark has elevated New Zealanders to become stakeholders in the cultural "game". For the purposes of this paper, I will refer to participation in the "game" as "live culture". In this context, it is worth noting that, in 1999 when new creative initiatives were at the planning stage, of 5846 adult New Zealanders surveyed, 90

per cent stated that they go to an average of four different cultural activities over one month (Arts News, 1999, p. 1). More recently, spending on cultural goods increased 28 per cent from 2000/01 to 2003/04 (Launch of Cultural Indicators 2006 Report, p. 2). From these statistics one could infer that educating people about creative industries and making the industries accessible has been a priority in fostering cultural identity in New Zealand (see the example of Te Papa in Kaino, 2005). The success of this approach is borne out in the fact that, despite the dominance of US film, New Zealand children voted *The Lord of the Rings* over *Finding Nemo* as their favourite film (Lustyik, 2005, p. 74).

The Lord of the Rings trilogy and its synergistic creative industries are probably New Zealand's best example of what proactive cultural policies can achieve. Such a sophisticated mix of entrepreneurship, cyber information and personal leadership in the arts seems to be missing from current Australian practices. This has been noted by Throsby (2005, p. 11) when commenting on the Nugent review of performing arts, the Myer report on arts and crafts, and the Strong report on orchestras. In reference to the Australian federal scene, Throsby opines that "reactive rather than proactive policy making conveys a sense of an Arts Minister who is uninterested in the positive development of the arts, and simply waits for problems to arise before taking any action". Further, Dalton (2004, p. 8) concurs with Gallasch's view (2005, p. 39) that, in leading up to the Australian federal election in 2004, neither major party gave prominence or significance to their cultural policies. In 2007, this position remains unchanged (Budget at a Glance, 2007-08, pp. 103). Gallasch sums up the Australian creative industries' position as one of inertia, noting the "Council's ambivalent attitude to innovation in the context of the political cooling of the climate for the arts over the last decade" (2005, p. 7). In contrast, the recent growth of Creative Industries in New Zealand is underpinned by long-term cultural development initiatives that sit easily with recent socio-cultural developments.

Conclusion

While both countries have historically shared reputations as socially progressive countries, in the last decade or so, Australia has lapsed while New Zealand has continued to uphold its position. This paper has argued that, contrary to the Australian experience, New Zealand's progressive socio-cultural position and cultural leadership have provided fertile grounds for the creative industries to prosper. Feature films, which have made a significant contribution to New Zealand's economy and to its cultural development, is but one example. However, as Volkering suggests of Florida's claims, noted earlier in this paper, the claims cited in this paper about the contributions of the creative industries to the economy may be exaggerated. However, it remains a puzzle that economists tend to depict New Zealand as the "inert" country. This was the case when New Zealanders and Australians compared their 2006 budgets. Australia appears to have led the way here. The Australian budget brought income tax cuts and provisions for tax free exits for superannuants – hailed as good news for individuals, particularly older and wealthier Australians (Buffini, 2006, p. 5). Even more generous cuts were announced in 2007. By contrast, the New Zealand 2006 budget was reported in the popular press in Australian and New Zealand as "boring" (Saturday Extra, 2006), having allocated its surplus to infrastructure. However, Australia's largesse is riding on a commodities boom. New Zealand's "boring budget" and its support for the creative industries may prove to be more enduring. Meanwhile, in arguing for an Australian cultural policy that countenances aspects of social policy and identity, Throsby (2005, p. 44) intones, "There is a sense in the air that [Australia] is economically wealthy and culturally poor".

Australia may have the "stronger" economy, but New Zealand demonstrates cultural leadership through its progressive, web-accessible cultural policies, its inclusive and diverse cultural milieu and a strong sense of cultural identity. Furthermore, cultural identity is firmly linked to its progressive social positioning, as indicated in the 2006 Budget papers.

Here is a proposition. Is it conceivable for Australians and their leaders to identify with their cultural heroes in the same way as they do sporting heroes? What if, for example, Australians celebrated their cultural successes with a ticker tape parade as New Zealanders did for *The Lord of the Rings* director, Peter Jackson? Such a shift would require support for more diverse cultural milieu and stronger cultural participation by its political leaders.

Finally, given that jokes against each other are a constant in Australian and New Zealand cultural exchange, it seems fitting to conclude this paper with one cited by Bell (1996, p. 194).

"What's the difference between Australia and yoghurt?"
"Yoghurt has a live culture".[10]

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Dr John Hall's valuable editorial assistance in preparing this paper.

References

Arora, A. (2006). *Weekend Australian.* July 7-8, p. 17.

'Art news', (1999). Creative New Zealand. Retreived on the 18 June 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.creativenz.govt.nz/news

Australia and the South Pacific, (2006, 6 August) Background Briefing, Radio National, Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Retrieved 4 Sept 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.abc.net.au/rn/backgroundbriefing/

Bagnall, D. (2003). The cost of culture, *The Bulletin.* April 8, pp.74-76.

Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday myths of Pakeha identity.* London: Penguin.

Bell, C. (2001). *Sociology of everyday life in New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Binning, D. (2006). Queuing up to produce the next Blockbuster. *Australian Financial Review.* 6 July, p. 16.

Biography: Rt. Hon Helen Clark, (2006). Retrieved 7 July 2006 from the World Wide Web, http://www.beehive.govt.nz/

Boniface, L. (2004). The rebel's legacy. *The Dominion Post Magazine.* September 18, pp. 1-2.

10 Bell did point out that the joke could go either way. I have chosen the original citation.

Budget at a Glance, 2007-08. Retrieved July 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.budget.gov.au/2007-08/at_a_glance/html/index.htm

Buffini, F. (2006). At last, it's a win for the high income earners. *Australian Financial Review.* 10 May.

Civic and cultural precincts, (2003). Retrieved January 15, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ncc.nsw.gov.majorporjectrs/ccp.

Civil Unions. Retrieved August 7, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.abc.net.au/rn/lifematters/stories/2004/1051733.html.

Craig, D. (2005). Taranaki gothic and the political economy of New Zealand narrative and sensibility, *New Zealand sociology.* 20 (2) 18-40.

CREATE Australia. (2006). National VET Plan for Industry 2003-2006/8, pp. 2 – 41, Retrieved August 10, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.createaust.com.au/index

Creative nation. Retrieved from the World Wide Web August 10, 2006: http://www.nla.gov.au/creativenation/multimed.html.

Cultural policy in New Zealand. (2004) Retrieved August 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.mch.govt.nz/

Cultural diplomacy: International programme information sheet, (2006). Ministry for Culture and Heritage, Retrieved June 15, 2006 on the World Wide Web: http: //www.mch.govt.nz/projects/culture/culture-diplomacy-factsheet

Cunningham, S. (2006). What price a creative economy? *Platform Papers.* Strawberry Hills: Currency House.

Dalton, K. (2004). Australia Korea Foundation Media Forum. Seoul, October 6. Retrieved July 12, 2006 from the World Wide Web: htpp.//www.afc.gov.au/downloads/ policies/korea_australia

de Bruin, A. forthcoming, (2007). 'Building the film industry in New Zealand: An Entrepreneurship Continuum', in Henry, C. (Ed). *Entrepreneurship in the creative industries.* U.K.:Edward Elgar.

Denoon, D. & Mein-Smith, P. (2000). A history of Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific. Oxford:;Blackwell.

Development of Feature Films in Australia: A survey of producers, directors and writers 2003. Australian Film Commission. Retrieved June 7, 2006 from the World Wide Web, http//. www.afc.gov.au

Ellmeier, A. (2002). Cultural entrepreneurialism: The changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment. Paper presented at The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research. Wellington, New Zealand.

External Migration, Retrieved July 16 from the World Wide Web, http://www.stats.govt.nz/products-and-services

Frankel, B. (2001). *When the boat comes in: Transforming Australia in the age of globalisation.* Australia: Pluto Press.

Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class.* Basic Books: New York.

Gallasch, K. (2005). Art in a cold climate. *Platform Papers.* (6) Oct.

Given, J. (2005). From Wellington to Washington: Australia's Bilateral Trade Agreements and cultural policy', *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society,* Spring, 35 (1), 60-76.

Growth and Innovation Framework, (2005). Retrieved July 16, 2006 from the World Wide Web. http//.www.gif.med.govt.nz/aboutgif/taskforces-implementation

Harvey, C. (2003). Reward of the Rings, *Weekend Australian*. November 15-16, p. 14.

Hewett, J. (2006). Reformer wants to show he's super with the big bang. *Australian Financial Review*. 10 May.

Inglis, K. (2006). *Whose ABC? The Australian Broadcasting Corporation 1983-2006*. Melbourne: Black Inc.

History of Parliament, (2006). Retrieved July 17, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.parliament.nz/history

Jupp, J. (2000). *The Australian people: An encyclopaedia of the nation, its people and their origins*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaino, L. (2005). What difference does a museum make? Te Papa's contribution to the New Zealand Economy. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*. 117, November, pp 31-43.

Knight, A. (2007). Stacking the ABC. Arena Magazine 91. October - November, 42-44.

Landry, C. (2000). *The creative city*. London: Earthscan.

Launch of Cultural Indicators 2006 Report, Retrieved September 15, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.beehive.govt.nz.

Lawrence, C. (2006). The reading sickness, *Weekend Australian*. Sept 2-3.

Leadbeater, C., & Oakley, K. (1999). *The independents: London's new cultural entrepreneurs*. London: Demos.

Lumb, M. (2006). Email communication. 26 June.

Lustyik, K. (2005). Need to localise in New Zealand? Nickelodeon and the institutional logics of 'Media Superpowers'. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*. 117, November, 64-76.

Maddern, C. (2001). Using economic studies in arts and cultural advocacy: A cautionary note, *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*, 98, November, 161-78.

Ministry for Culture and Heritage, 2006, Arts, culture and heritage, B. 5 Vol 1. Retrieved June 12, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http//.www. mch.govt.nz/projects/culture

Nevin, R. (2004). Australia Day Address. Retrieved February 1, 2005 from the World Wide Web: http//.www. australiaday.com.au/robyn_nevin

Newman, D. (2005). Regions and runaways: Film assistance in New Zealand and British Columbia, 1999-2005. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*. 117, November, 11-31.

Oakley, K. (2004). Not-so-Cool Britannia, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7 (1) 67-77.

PACE, Pathways to Arts and Cultural Employment Resource Pack, 2005/2006, Retrieved June 10, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http. www.PACE. Biz.org.nz

Preston, T. (2004). Personal communication, 24 Sept.

Public Affairs and Sources of Information on New Zealand and Korea, (2005). Press Release, Retrieved June 15, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.NZembassy.com./info.cfm.

Saturday Extra, (2006). Retrieved August 3, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.abc.net.au/rn/saturdayextra/stories

Skilling, P. (2005). Trajectories of arts and culture policy in New Zealand, *Australian Journal of Public Administration,* 64(4) 20-31.

Smith, T. (2004). Misery is ... losing to Australia. *New Zealander.* Sept 1. p. 28.

Standing Committee on Communications, Information Technology and the Arts. (2004). From Reel to Unreal: Future Opportunities for Australia's film, animation, special effects and electronic games industries. Canberra: The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Terdiman, D. (2006). CNET News.com. Retrieved December 5, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://news.com.com/Microsoft,+Peter+Jackson+to+form+game+studio

Throsby, D. (2005). Does Australia need a Cultural Policy? *Platform Papers.* (7) January.

Thwaites, T., Davis, L. & Mules, W. (2002). *Introducing cultural and media studies.* Palgrave: London.

Thompson, J. (1995). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media.* London: Polity Press.

Tiffen, R. & Gittens, R. (2004). *How Australia compares.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Volkering, M. (2006). Wellington as a 'Creative City': After Florida – and before. *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management.* 4(2), pp296-306.

Lorna Kaino is a Senior Lecturer in Creative Industries at the Bunbury Campus of Edith Cowan University. Lorna lectures in cultural geography, media studies and research methods. Her research interests are in cultural policy., and more recently, backpacking. Email: l.kaino@ecu.edu.au

Competing Roles of Dogma and Humour in the Construction and Critique of Social Arrangements

Paul Jewell

Abstract

In the construction, negotiation and maintenance of social norms, communities confront a variety of alternatives. Scholars, leaders, demagogues and plain folk adopt and promote beliefs and values that underpin their favoured social arrangements. Some argue for abstract ideals, others for contextual and flexible positions. Some belief systems are dogmatic (and in the current global cultural struggles, we associate terrorism with dogmatic belief). It is the nature of dogma to be authoritative, averse to questions and intolerant of ridicule. For humourists, sardonic questions are stock in trade, and they delight in besmirching lofty ideals with irreverent vulgarities, no matter whose precious belief systems might thereby be offended. In Evolutionary Anthropology, the Social Brain Hypothesis postulates that the demands of understanding each others' beliefs provides the environmental pressure for the evolution of human intelligence. Exchanging beliefs serves the construction of cooperative communities and the avoidance of error. Both humourists and dogmatists seek to establish communities with a shared sense of identity, but fundamentally, they are averse to each other and are irreconcilable.

Mouou gela tvu zvvu avfrvpoV
Man is the only animal who laughs. Aristotle

Errare Humanum Est.
To err is human. Seneca the younger.

Quidquid Latine dictum est, altum viditur.
Whatever is said in Latin sounds profound.

Introduction: Ethics, Principles and People

It is a challenging task for people to form communities based on shared values, beliefs and goals. There are the practical difficulties of establishing social structures, identifying who are the members of the group, and how to maintain conformity to the shared beliefs. There are also choices to be made about which beliefs and values should underpin social structure and how much conformity to shared values should be expected. Is it best to have some set of abstract ideals that are universally applicable, or should social arrangements be flexible and contextual? Political philosophers such as Rousseau and Rawls have wondered how it might be possible to construct a society in the face of competing belief systems. How might scholarly work in political philosophy and ethics contribute to this challenge (Rawls 1971, 1993; Rousseau [1762] 1968)?

One highly influential thinker, both historically and contemporaneously, is Immanuel Kant, who argues for abstract and universal ideals. The notion of universal human rights can be traced to his seminal work *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*. This is a seriously humourless work, as its title suggests, and as a brief quotation will demonstrate. Its lugubrious tone has not, however, prevented its author from having a profound effect on ethical and social debate:

> Finally, there is one imperative which immediately commands a certain conduct without having as its condition any other purpose to be attained by it. This imperative is categorical. It is not concerned with the matter of the action and its intended result, but rather with the form of the action and the principle from which it follows; what is essentially good in the action consists in the mental dispositions, let the consequences be what they may. The imperative may be called that of morality. (Kant, 1981, p. 26)

Kant's conception of the autonomous individual, his emphasis on rationality, rights and responsibilities and his insistence that ethics is founded on principles, rather than compromises, negotiation, emotions or consequences, has strongly influenced Western culture, and numerous scholars. Kohlberg, for example, uses the acceptance of universal principles as the very measure of moral development.

Kohlberg is very influential in educational philosophy and educational psychology, disciplines that are concerned with the foundation of society. According to Kohlberg (1981), there are six stages of moral development.

Stage1. The Stage of Punishment and Obedience: Right is literal obedience to rules and authority, avoiding punishment, and not doing physical harm.

Stage 2. The Stage of Individual Instrumental Purpose and Exchange: Right is serving one's own or other's needs and making fair deals in terms of concrete exchange.

Stage 3. The Stage of Mutual Interpersonal Expectations, Relationships, and Conformity: The right is playing a good (nice) role, being concerned about the other people and their feelings, keeping loyalty and trust with partners, and being motivated to follow rules and expectations.

Stage 4. The Stage of Social System and Conscience Maintenance: The right is doing one's duty in society, upholding the social order, and maintaining the welfare of society or the group.

Stage 5 The Stage of Prior Rights and Social Contract or Utility:The right is upholding the basic rights, values, and legal contracts of a society, even when they conflict with the concrete rules and laws of the group.

Stage 6. The Stage of Universal Ethical Principles: This stage assumes guidance by universal ethical principles that all humanity should follow (Kohlberg, 1981, p. 409).

Kohlberg reports regretfully that few people reach the lofty heights of the sixth stage.

As with Kant, there's no humour evident in Kohlberg. The project of moral development and human fulfilment is not about conviviality, laughter, sensory pleasures, throwing great parties or hugging friends. And it is certainly not about swapping jokes.

They are not alone in this. Typically, jokes are woefully scarce in profound and influential works. A list of these might include the *Bible*; the *Koran*; their worldly competitors *Das Kapital*, or the *Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx, or Lenin's *Complete Works*; and, to be fair, the capitalist Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* or *The Fountainhead.*

As Alice (*in Wonderland)* might have complained, these are books that are lacking, not so much in conversations and pictures, but in whimsy, wit and jocularity (Carroll, 1929). Deliberations about right and wrong, about the meaning of human existence, about how to live our lives and run our societies, are serious affairs that require a strict application of rational and unswerving principle.

There are, thankfully, alternative approaches, such as those of Kant's contemporary philosophers David Hume and Jeremy Bentham, who assert that it is caring for people, rather than reasoning about principles, which is the stuff of ethics.

David Hume maintains that the foundation of ethics is that people are gregarious and feel sympathy for each other.

> It has often been asserted, that, as every man has a strong connection with society, and perceives the impossibility of his solitary subsistence, he becomes, on that account, favourable to all those habits or principles, which promote order in society, and to insure to him the quiet possession of so estimable a blessing. As much as we value our own happiness and welfare, as much must we applaud the practice of justice and humanity, by which alone the social confederacy can be maintained, and every man reap the fruits of mutual protection and assistance. (Hume, 1966, p. 215)

An unsympathetic man is indifferent to virtue, a sympathetic man shows a delicate power of drawing moral distinctions (Hume, 1966, p. 367).

Compared to say Kant or Marx, Hume's prose is a delight to read (Belgion, 1965). Here is a man of wit and humour, and a notable iconoclast. His critique of belief in miracles is both wry and devastating. If someone were to report a miracle, would it be reasonable, be asks, to accept the report as true? A miracle is, by definition, very, very unlikely, and cannot be explained away as a natural course of events. It is always more likely that a report of a miracle is false than that the miracle is true (Moore & Bruder, 1993, p. 408).

This lack of reverence was noted by his contemporaries. There is an amusing biographical anecdote that tells of an occasion when Hume became stuck in a bog. A neighbour passed by in a horse and cart.

Apparently a dour Scot, she said "Aren't you David Hume, the atheist? I'll not haul you out of the bog unless you recite the Lord's prayer". Hume, reasoning that to a non-believer, the Lord's prayer is merely a meaningless and insignificant sequence of words, cheerfully complied (Mossner, 1970).

Hume's communitarian philosophy is that ethics is derived neither from religion nor abstract principles, but from real people being sociable. People develop relations, traditions and common understandings which allow them to care for each other in practical ways. The driver of action is emotion, and the driver of moral action is sympathy (Norman, 1983).

Similarly, Jeremy Bentham insists that deliberation about right and wrong properly consists of calculating the tangible consequences of one's actions on the happiness of real people. How much pleasure and how much pain actually experienced is what counts, and let's not obscure the matter with grand notions or abstract ideas (Bentham, 1965).

Bentham's prose, it must be admitted, is excruciatingly bad, more like Kant's than Hume's. But Bentham had a bizarre sense of humour. When he died, he left his money to the University of London on condition his mummified body be wheeled into meetings and recorded as present. That is still being done, apparently, and one can currently view his body on the web site of the University (University College, 2007).

Kant sees humans as rational. Hume sees us as also gregarious and emotional. Bentham's emphasis is that we have interests. The truth of the matter is that humans combine these characteristics. The reason that we deliberate about right and wrong, how to live our lives and run our societies is not just that we are rational, but that we are convivial. We live together. We care about each other, and co-operatively satisfy our needs.

The Social Brain

This philosophical analysis is consistent with scientific observations of human characteristics. One such observation is the extraordinary size of the human brain.

> Conventional wisdom over the past 160 years in the cognitive and neurosciences has assumed that brains evolved to process factual information about the world. Most attention has therefore

> been focussed on such features as pattern recognition, colour vision, and speech perception. By extension, it was assumed that brains evolved to deal with essentially ecological problem-solving tasks.
>
> The consensus view has traditionally been that brains evolved to process information of ecological relevance. This view, however, ignores an important consideration: Brains are exceedingly expensive both to evolve and maintain. The adult human brain weighs about 2% of body weight but consumes about 20% of total energy intake. (Dunbar, 1998, p. 178)

The explanation offered for the brain's large size is the social brain hypothesis. We use our large brains to cope with the complexities of society and with each other. Our computational powers allow us third order intensionality and up to fifth or sixth. As the evolutionary anthropologist Robin Dunbar explains:

> Most vertebrates are probably capable of reflecting on their states of mind, at least in some crude sense: they know that they know. Organisms of this kind are first-order intensional. By extension, second order intensional organisms know that someone else knows something, and third order intensional organisms know that someone else knows that some one else knows something. In principle, the sequence can be extended reflexively indefinitely, although, in practice, humans rarely engage in more than fourth-order intensionality in everyday life and probably face an upper limit at sixth order .. . (Dunbar, 1998, p. 188)

The evolutionary advantages of this are obvious. I know what I'm thinking. I can figure out what you're thinking. And I can figure out that you are figuring out what I'm thinking. So I can say to you "Look, you grab your end of the log, I'll grab my end and together we can dump it in the stream. Then we'll have a dam providing both of us with reliable drinking water. Ready? Together now, 1, 2, 3..."

Errors

The demands of dealing with the physical environment, then, are not the evolutionary explanation of human intelligence. Other species deal with nature successfully. The payoff for human intelligence is meeting the demands of social interaction. Dunbar comments that third-order intensionality appears to be sufficient for this, and wonders what purpose fourth and fifth might serve, musing that religion might have something to do with it (Dunbar, 2007). I have a more mundane proposal. Dunbar's calculations have not included our capacity to hypothesize and check for error. So when I know that you know that I think we should dam the stream *there* I also know that you think there is a better place to place the log. What's more, I think you are mistaken, though I could, admittedly, be wrong.

The evolutionary advantage of allowing for error is surely crucial. Interestingly, as well as providing a survival advantage, it is this capacity for cognitive empathy that makes joke telling possible:

Why does a fireman wear red braces? To keep his trousers up.

When I tell this joke, I anticipate what is going on in your mind. I am aware that by inserting the word "red", I will bring about in your mind a particular expectation, and by providing you with the answer, I will confound that expectation and produce an experience of humour. Man is the only animal who laughs. Why? Because people are gregarious and empathetic and rational. They can reason about the world, about their beliefs of the world, about others' beliefs of the world, and about erroneous beliefs:

The university president sighed as he went over the proposed budget offered him by the head of the department of physics.

> "Why is it," he said, mournfully, "that you physicists always require so much expensive equipment? Now the department of mathematics requires nothing of me but money for paper, pencils, and erasers". He thought for a while longer and added, "And the department of philosophy is better still. It doesn't even ask for erasers". (Asimov, 1971, p. 80)

I know what is going on in my mind as I tell this story. I believe that I know what is going on in your mind. You think that what is going on in my mind is the tale of a steady progress through university departments from the mundane and material towards a lofty idealism. But I know that what you think I am thinking is not so, and I enjoy bringing the progress down with a bump. Rather than lofty idealists, philosophers are too foolish to admit to error. (Or perhaps their theorising is so lacking in practical meaning that it cannot be tested for error. The ambiguity of the joke is part of the fun.)

Which brings me to my second quotation, "Errare Humanum Est – to err is human."

Jokes do not rely merely on setting up expectations in people's minds. They rely upon those expectations being in error. The punch line reveals the mistake. Certainly humans have an evolutionary advantage by being gregarious. Add rationality to this, and they have the massive advantage in being able to share knowledge and opinions. By exchanging views, they can consider various possible futures and the comparative benefits of one course of action over another. On top of this is the incalculable benefit of recognising and allowing for mistakes. Having conscious beliefs about the world and plans for the future is one thing, but realizing their potential flaws is the way of avoiding catastrophe. If we compare views and find them disparate, we may become aware that one of us is wrong. Of course, it may be that out views converge, and yet we are both wrong. But if we tell each other jokes, write satires, invent surrealist riddles and upturn each other's expectations, we remind ourselves that certainty can be dangerous, and that to err is human.

Dogma

Checking for errors, recognising them, admitting them and adjusting to them is an uncomfortable process. Humour can ameliorate the discomfort, but not remove its root cause. Our physical survival depends upon reliable knowledge of the world and how it is likely to behave. Our

social survival depends upon people acting in predictable ways, coming to agreements about how we will treat each other, and acting according to those expectations.

Communitarianism is a rewarding, but tiresome business. We form relations with each other, feel sympathy for each other, cooperate with each other, construct traditions and social arrangements, debate laws, taxes, rights and responsibilities. It never stops. Just when we think we might be close to achieving a comfortable, stable society, it is disrupted by a new challenge. A new technology comes along and we have to figure out the rights and wrongs of, say, therapeutic cloning. Or globalisation changes our relations with our neighbours and threatens our economic arrangements. Or geopolitical events result in a cohort of migrants who apparently have evolved a raft of traditions worryingly different from the traditions we have so arduously developed here. Meanwhile, the young are rebelling, heretofore marginalised groups are clamouring for recognition and our political leaders are squabbling.

In all this clamour, a prospect of peace and certainty is enticing. What if there was just one way of doing things, to which everyone conformed? What if a single, correct set of arrangements could be revealed to us by an authority, thus relieving us of the burdens of decision and negotiation? One common set of beliefs, one set of expectations, one reliable truth, one dogma.

The certainty promised by a dogma can be very attractive. A good strong dogma can be something to die for, literally. Dogma is not to be questioned. That is its essential feature. To its adherents, a dogma is simply right. It follows that anyone who does not adhere to it, is simply wrong. A dogma is not doing its job if it tolerates doubters and dissidents. The certainty of a dogma must be protected, defended and advanced, by force if necessary. By terror, if necessary.

Humour is the antithesis of dogma. Terrorism is a tool of dogmatists. Dogma asserts, humour questions. Dogma inspires, humour mocks. Dogma offers grand ideals, authoritative pronouncements and universal truths. Humour is cynical, irritating, and wallows in the mundanities of puns, riddles, silliness, toilets, sex, and various vulgarities.

Unfortunately, humour's destructive energies are not confined to the legitimate targets of pretension, pomposity and dogma. Nothing is sacred. Humour is just as likely to persecute the weak, marginalise minorities and promote unjust stereotyping. Racists, sexists, elitists and the bearers of all sorts of appalling prejudices will find willing allies amongst humourists.

With regard to the building of communities and the establishment of fruitful social interaction, humour exhibits an intriguing dialectic. A humourist needs to establish a rapport with the audience (Jewell, 2005). Humour works through a combination of cognitive empathy and making a group of people feel good about themselves, individually and collectively (Fine & De Soucey, 2005). An easy way for a humourist to establish a collective mindset in the audience, is to mock outsiders – foreigners who do things differently, look different, or live in a different place. Hence the ubiquity of jokes about Irish/ Poles/ Russians/ Negroes or folk in another State. Interestingly, dogmatists are similar. They, too, exhort their followers to pull together against a common enemy and demand declarations of allegiance. "Are you with us or against us? Are you a believer or an infidel? Of the left or on the right?"

Perhaps this is the nature of community. Perhaps humans can only identify themselves as members of a community by recognising others who are members of it and simultaneously those who are not. Perhaps this is why Kant and Kohlberg view the pinnacle of moral development as rising above emotional ties and embracing universal obligations. Inclusion inevitably implies exclusion.

But such a dichotomy is surely mistakenly simplistic. Using the multi-order cognitive sophistication of our social brains, we can easily identify ourselves as members of myriad communities. A practical example is the payment of local taxes, state taxes, federal taxes and donations to international relief organisations.

Offence

It remains true, however, that communities are built on shared beliefs and values, and identity is connected to community. When a humourist mocks people's precious beliefs, their identity and their membership of

a community, the humour is offensive and causes distress. Indeed, much humour relies upon being offensive, ranging from children sniggering over dirty words to the movie *Borat: Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan* (Cohen 2006) (upon reflection, not a very great range. The movie could also be criticized for targeting others' cultures, rather than the producer's own.) While humour may have the beneficial effect of encouraging questions and recognition of error, humourists' intentions are frequently far from virtuous. Kant and Hume, whilst differing strongly on the foundations of ethics, agree on one thing. Intention is significant. The universal intention of humourists is "Make them laugh", not "Make them better people". It seems that any cheap and nasty trick may be pressed into serving this end.

There is much potential for humour to be virtuous. If humourists want to be ethical, they can target racists, not races. Of course, racists will thereby be offended, which might result in their reform, though this is unlikely. Humour that is cruel, oppressive and offensive seems at least as common as humour that is constructive. It may well be that humour that mocks our cherished beliefs can serve to remind us of the potential error, but mocking beliefs is, by its very nature, offensive.

So should we rein in humour? Is it better to avoid offence, rather than avoid error?

It could be argued that there is an easy way to avoid the occurrence of offence. An audience can refuse to be offended. No matter the intent of the humourist, offence cannot occur if the intended target greets the insult or attack with cheerful equanimity. Offence, of necessity, occurs in the mind of the offended.

Nonetheless we know that in practice, humour that mocks precious beliefs or questions the certainty of received dogma will result in offence, distress, and possibly retaliation. Would it be a better world, then, if humourists moderated their attacks and were careful not to belittle people's beliefs? Surely not.

The promulgation of offence may be unfortunate, but the promulgation of error might be catastrophic. The unthinking acceptance of dogma, its propagation through wars, terrorism, pogrom and

persecution, has done far more damage to people than the mere offence achievable by satire or wit, no matter how vicious. There is, of course, some middle ground. There are many people of moderate beliefs, and there are many gentle humourists, but essentially, dogma and humour can never be reconciled, and the latter is much preferable to the former.

A fine example of iconoclasm is the Noah dialogue by Bill Cosby:

Big Voice with Echo: Noah!
Noah: Somebody called?
Voice: Noah!
Noah: Who is that?
Voice: It's the Lord, Noah.
Noah: Right. Where are you? What do you want? I've been good.
Voice: I want you to build an ark.
Noah: Right. What's an ark?
Voice: Get some wood. Build it 300 cubits by 80 cubits by 40 cubits.
Noah: Right. What's a cubit?
Voice: Let's see – a cubit. I used to know what a cubit was. Well, don't worry about that Noah. When you get that done, go out into the world, collect all of the animals in the world by twos, male and female and put them into the ark.
Noah: Right. Who is this really? What's going on? How come you want me to do all these weird things?
Voice: I'm going to destroy the world.
Noah: Right. Am I on Candid Camera? How are you going to do it?
Voice: I'm going to make it rain 4000 days and drown them right out.
Noah: Right. Listen, do this. You'll save water. Let it rain for 40 days and 40 nights and wait for the sewers to back up.
Voice: Right.
(Cosby, 1995)

This lampoon is blasphemous to some and hilarious to others, but the questioning attitude it exemplifies is invaluable. The world would be a more peaceful place if every bellicose leader and fanatical follower who claimed to have god on their side responded to that divine assurance, "Who is this, really?"

Conclusion

Human beings form communities based on shared beliefs and shared values. They establish general principles of conduct, preferably without losing sight of the particular people whose interests the principles are meant to serve. This is a challenging task. People need to be able to recognize who is a member of their community and who is not, need to be able to construct agreed ways of treating each other, need to be able to sympathise with each others' positions and work towards mutually agreed goals. Humans have evolved to meet this challenge. They have the cognitive capacity to figure out not only how the world works, but also how others see it. But the task is never ending. With the best ethical will in the world, cooperation with and caring for each other present endless problems. People's beliefs about the world can be mistaken, and their social agreements misled.

The Social Brain hypothesis proposes that figuring out others' beliefs was the evolutionary driver of the development of human intelligence. The hypothesis, though, understates the challenge. It is not enough to merely recognise that there are other points of view. They need to grasp the variety of views, build on similarities and negotiate differences on order to productively cooperate. They need to establish communities. Shared understandings need to be stable enough to be reliable, but flexible enough to allow for errors and exceptions. Promoting stability are the ethical theories that champion grand universal notions, but therein lies a risk of dangerous dogma. In contrast, humourists point out errors and exceptions, but risk degenerating into silliness and offence.

Both dogma and humour can cement communal ties. Humour can promote fellow feeling by ridiculing the outsider, while dogma can use terror to discourage opponents. Humour and dogma, though, are fundamental enemies. Dogma strives for certainty. Humour cannot resist awkward questions. When dogma asserts a great truth, demanding we conform or be crushed, humour blows a raspberry. Vulgar, mundane, silly, trivial or offensive it might be, but to humans, humour is invaluable.

Acknowledgement

This paper was originally presented at the Australasian Humour Scholars Network Colloquium on Humour Studies, *Humour and Laughter in an 'Age of Terror'*. April 2007, Adelaide, Australia.

References

Asimov, I. (1971) *Treasury of Humour*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Belgion, M. (1965). *David Hume* London: Longmans, Green.

Bentham, J. ([1873] 1965). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation. In Johnson, O. *Ethics. Sections from Classical and Contemporary Writers.* (pp 202–215). USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Caroll, L. (1929). *Alice in Wonderland* London: Dent.

Cohen, S.B. (2006). Borat: *Cultural Learnings of America for Make Benefit Glorious Nation of Kazakhstan.* Dune Entertainment.

Cosby, B. (1995). *Noah: Right!* Bill Cosby is a Very Funny Fellow... Right!(Live) USA: Warner Bros. Records.

Dunbar, R. I. M. (1998). The social brain hypothesis. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 6(5), 178-189.

Dunbar R. I. M. (2003). *The Science Show* ABC Radio National. Retrieved January 7th 2007 from the World Wide Web http://www.abc.net.au/rn/scienceshow/stories/2003/975524.htm

Fine, G.A. & De Soucey, M. (2005). Joking cultures: Humor themes as social regulation in group life. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 18 (1), 1-22.

Hume, D. ([1777] 1966). *Enquiries Concerning the Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jewell, P.D. (2005). Humour in cognitive and social development: Creative artists and class clowns. *International Education Journal* 6 (2), 200-205.

Kant, I. ([1785] 1981). *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals.* Translated by J. Ellington. USA: Hackett.

Kohlberg, L (1981). *The Philosophy of Moral Development.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Moore, B. and Bruder, K. (1993). *Philosophy: the Power of Ideas.* USA: Mayfield.

Mossner, E.C. (1970). *The Life of David Hume.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 562-3. Retrieved January 7th, 2007 from the World Wide Web http://www.humesociety.org/bog-story.html

Norman, R. (1983). *The Moral Philosophers* Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice.* USA: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political Liberalism.* New York: Columbia University Press

Rousseau, J. ([1762] 1968). *The Social Contract.* UK: Penguin.

University College London (2007). Retrieved 12th January 2007 From the World Wide Web http://www.ucl.ac.uk/Library/special-coll/bentham.shtml#top accessed

Paul Jewell is a senior lecturer in Philosophy in the School of Education at Flinders University, Adelaide, Australia. He is a member of the Ethics Centre of South Australia. His research interests in Ethics and in Humour coincide from time to time, allowing for investigations into the philosophy of humour, the ethics of comedy, and the role of humourists in society. Email: Paul.Jewell@flinders.edu.au

Classify, Divide and Conquer: Shaping Physical Activity Discourse Through National Public Policy

Joe Piggin, Steven J. Jackson and Malcom Lewis

Abstract

This paper aims to draw attention to the role of public policy in shaping power relations discursively, and highlight how these power relations can be debilitating for particular groups in a public policy setting. These aims shall be accomplished by analysing the construction and implementation of a New Zealand physical activity policy which compares physical activity rates around the world. Utilising Foucauldian theorising, we show how classifying and dividing practices construct a view of New Zealand and the world which automatically and problematically favours particular nationalistic conceptions. The article concludes that Sparc's use of the term "international standards" is inherently problematic when comparing rates of physical activity, and such a policy serves to dominate by default over other nations.

Introduction

Throughout New Zealand's political history, sport, physical recreation and physical activity have been valued for a variety of reasons, many of which have contributed an iconic image of New Zealand's citizens as rugged, capable, physically hardened people. Jock Phillips (1987) wrote that as New Zealand was a relatively young nation in the late 1800s and early 1900s, the physical and disciplined nature of rugby union assisted in promoting the values essential for work, family and military service. In the 1930s there emerged a different rationale for central government promoting sport and recreation: the 1935 Labour government took a particular interest in programmes focused on recreational activities that would "help disperse post-depression gloom and apathy" (Church, 1990, p. 5). During World War 2, Bill Parry, the Minister of Internal Affairs

had a more pressing reason for promoting physical activity: "The instinct of self preservation should induce people to make themselves as fit as possible for sudden action" (p. 5).

However, throughout the past fifteen years the medical, economic and social implications of sedentary lifestyles and an increasingly overweight and obese population have contributed to government policies which seek to reinforce the image of New Zealand as a nation of active people. For instance, as well as the government money already directed to sport, recreation and health, the 2006 Labour government budget included an additional $76.1 million to fight the "obesity epidemic". Regarding the allocation of this funding, Health Minister Pete Hodgson explained that "the problem is only getting worse. If we take no action we face the very real possibility that the current generation of New Zealand children will be the first to die younger than their parents" (Johnston, 2006). The problem of physical inactivity in New Zealand is also framed such that it is receiving significant attention in the private business sector, where "corporate wellness" schemes are increasing in prevalence. While the rationale for such schemes is often framed in terms of improving "work-life balance" of employees, their logic is also heavily informed by the desire to increase productivity and profit. Other elements within the social climate have added to widespread concern about the physical capabilities of the New Zealand population. In the sporting realm (often conflated with physical activity) there was a media and public outcry at the poor performance of the New Zealand contingent at the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games. Former Olympic gold medallist John Walker attributed this result to the belief that "schools are telling kids it is alright to lose" (Coffee, 2000, p. 4). There was much public debate that New Zealanders were not as "competitive" as they should be. Thus, there is a range of social arenas where citizens are expected to consider and use their bodies in particular ways.

In 2001, a Ministerial Taskforce concluded that sport, fitness and leisure could counter obesity, as well as lead to positive economic and social effects for the nation. The Taskforce's report explained that these "sectors" had "been virtually ignored by successive governments" (Graham et al., 2001, p. 9). Following the publication of the report, the

Labour government established Sport and Recreation New Zealand (Sparc), replacing the Hillary Commission for Sport, Fitness and Leisure which had existed since 1987.

According to its website Sparc is "dedicated to getting New Zealanders moving" (Sparc, 2007). Officially launched in June 2002, Sparc produced and distributed its first strategy document named "Our Vision, Our Direction" which explained how its budget of nearly $NZ42 million dollars in its first year of operation (rising to more than $NZ70 million dollars in 2006) would be spent. To suggest that Sparc merely allocates this budget to various organisations and programmes trivialises the significant power Sparc has within the sport and recreation sector. Throughout its five year existence Sparc has explicitly dissociated the organisation from being merely a "funding body". Instead Sparc is positioned as an investor; "... going forward, funding decisions will be made on the likelihood of achieving a return on that investment. Sparc will assess returns against its mission" (Sparc, 2002, p. 10). The idea of measuring this "return" is clearly important. Summing up Sparc's philosophy, CEO Nick Hill once said "everything is measured at the end of the day" (Hill, 2002a).

One of Sparc's most conspicuous goals which forms part of their mission statement is "being the most active nation" (Sparc, 2002, p. 6).[1] Of paramount importance is not only the notion of nationalism, but of being a "world leader". The emergence of an emphasis on international comparisons of physical activity rates can be seen in the 2002 restructuring of the Hillary Commission (Sparc's predecessor) to Sparc. Juxtaposing the Hillary Commission's mission statement with Sparc's reveals this discursive shift, which was explained by Sparc chair John Wells as "a whole new way of doing business" (Sparc, 2002, p. 3). That is, the Hillary Commission had as its three goals: "*to increase the number of people involved in sport and physical leisure activities,* help people succeed

1 Two other components of Sparc's mission statement include "having New Zealand athletes and teams winning consistently in events that matter to New Zealanders" and "having the most effective sport and physical recreation systems" (2002, p. 6).

and achieve their potential, [and] improve the way sport and physical leisure services are delivered" (Hillary Commission, 2000, p. 5, italics added). Compared with Sparc's mission statement it is clear that while there is a thematic continuity with regard to the ideas of activity, sporting success and delivery "systems", there is a discontinuity regarding how the themes are articulated:

> "By 2006 be recognised as world leading in our approach to sport and physical recreation, as measured by:
>
> *Being the most active nation*
>
> Having the most effective sport and physical recreation systems
>
> Having athletes and teams winning consistently in events that matter to New Zealanders". (Sparc, 2002, p. 6, italics added)

This construal of overarching goals in line with a wider neo-liberal agenda in New Zealand has significant implications when considering how such an objective is measured and how government funding is distributed. What follows is an analysis of the discursive shaping of the "most active nation" goal. The article is divided into three sections. Firstly, it discusses the research approach. Next the article explains Foucault's conception of classifying and dividing practices, and the process of subjectivisation through bio-power. Then, these ideas are applied to Sparc policy, problematising how the aforementioned practices are used in constructing public policy. Finally, a discussion addresses some of the effects of articulating a physical activity policy in such a way.

Research approach

While there is a multitude of sources and texts available for analysing a given policy discourse, we direct our analysis toward official Sparc policy which relates specifically to the goal of "being the world's most active nation". In particular, we consider here that claims to knowledge about physical activity in public policy serve a significant discursive function. Such claims are at the heart of any analysis of discourse, as statements of "fact" in public policy both influence the legitimacy of particular claims and impact on the perceptions and behaviour of citizens.

It is important here to outline which texts were used in this research. The sites used to investigate the shaping and dissemination of the physical activity discourse primarily include, but were not confined to, Sparc policy documents spanning from June 2002 (Sparc's official launch) to June 2006 (the end date for Sparc's original mission statement). The criteria employed for selecting texts within this time frame was based on a consideration of whether they articulated or informed Sparc's mission to be the "most active nation". Three factors were taken into account while collecting the data. Firstly, the context of the various articulations of the mission was noted with regard to whom the audience for the message would likely be. Secondly, the various utterances were also considered in relation to their chronological distance from the end point of the mission. Thirdly, various annual reports and statements of intent were examined with regard to the possibility of a change to the mission statement. While the focus in this article is on formal written policy, it is acknowledged that numerous other texts such as interviews, speeches, advertisements and images are all important sites for the transmission of Sparc's policy.

Three reasons make these particular sites compelling. Firstly, "being the most active nation" comprised one of Sparc's three overarching policy goals, and as such has guided much of Sparc's subsequent policy, planning and operations. Secondly, the generally enduring nature of such an objective (a mission statement) allows the discursive strategies employed by Sparc to be investigated over a four year period. Thirdly, it is through policy documents that Sparc representatives have the ability to put across their ideas planned, edited and uninterrupted, something that is not always possible at other sites of investigation. Along with Sparc policy, other sources also proved valuable to establish an understanding about the development of the physical activity discourse studied here. These included the International Physical Activity Questionnaire and World Health Organisation sources, particularly since these were essential to Sparc's measurement of their stated goals.

It is important to note here what we mean by "discourse", since the term in used in various ways. Despite often disagreeing as to the specific uses and effects of discourse, there is a general acknowledgment that

discourses are forms of knowledge created through text, speech, imagery and everyday interactions. For this study, we follow Foucault's (1972) conception that a discourse governs the way a topic can be meaningfully talked about and reasoned about. For example, physical activity discourse, like the discourse of madness for Foucault, has been constituted by all that has been said in "all the statements that named it, divided it up, described it, explained it, traced its developments, indicated its various correlations, judged it, and possibly gave it speech by articulating, in its name, discourses that were to be taken as its own" (Foucault, 1972, p. 35). By both limiting and producing how a particular topic can be thought about and reasoned about, discourses play a powerful role in the shaping and dissemination of public policy.

Classifying and dividing practices

Foucault explained that his research focused on three facets which serve to construct our social reality: scientific classification, dividing practices and subjectivation. These practices allow a researcher to analyse how certain ways of understanding come into existence and change throughout the history of human thought. Firstly, Foucault explained classifying practices arose out of peoples' curiosity in the seventeenth century; "if not to discover the sciences of life, as least to give them a hitherto unsuspected scope and precision" (1970, p. 125). During this time, institutions developed to sustain this curiosity, such as botanical gardens and natural history collections that examined the structure of plant life. In the same way, organisations such as Sparc, the Ministry of Health and the World Health Organisation are constructed to satisfy the curiosity surrounding the ideas of "health" and "fitness". The importance of such organisations "does not lie essentially in what they make it possible to see, but in what they hide and in what, by this process of obliteration, they allow to emerge..." (Foucault, 1970, p. 137).

Following this process of classifying, dividing practices allow one to distinguish what is normal from what is abnormal, who is fit from who is unfit, as well as any number of deviations from a particular norm. For Foucault, dividing practices are an important part of cementing a particular discourse as legitimate while excluding another as illegitimate.

These dividing practices are techniques whereby "the subject is either divided inside himself or divided from others. This process objectivizes him. Examples are the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, the criminals and the 'good boys'" (2002, p. 326). Such divisions are commonly used in discourses of health, fitness and physical activity today. For instance, body mass index (BMI) calculations are used to ascertain whether one is a "normal" weight, "underweight", "overweight", or "obese". Organisations such as Sparc encourage a population to meet expectations of normality by encouraging participation in a certain number of minutes of physical exercise every day. These practices serve to maintain a particular way of understanding the body and how it can (or should) be used.

Nationalism as bio-power

Foucault explained that dividing and classifying practices are employed by institutions to make subjects out of a citizenry. Individuals are subjected "to someone else by control and dependence, and [are] tied to [their] own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge" (2002, p. 331). Foucault argues that "the health and physical well-being of populations comes to figure as a political objective that the 'police' of the social body must ensure..." (1980, p. 95). This policing of the social body is concerned with the preservation and conservation of the labour force, and traced the beginnings of measurement "demographic estimates ... the calculation of the pyramid of ages, different life expectancies and levels of mortality" (p. 95).

Foucault's concept of bio-power is useful here, since it allows for an explanation of why certain discourses of physical activity emerge while others do not. Foucault defined bio-power as the technologies used to analyse, control, and define human bodies. He argued that "numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations" were constructed by various institutions (1980, p. 140). By promoting self-regulating subjects, Foucault argued that bio-power assists capitalistic goals of production (through labour) and consumption (through purchasing goods and services to maintain a particularly constituted body). Thus, the governing of a population is

made easier, whether is it in the interests of a specific government or various corporate enterprises. It is here that we consider "nationalism" as a technology of bio-power brought into existence through neo-liberal discourses, and employed by the New Zealand government (through Sparc) to subjectivise: to encourage the population to understand physical activity and the nation in a particular way and behave accordingly. What follows is an explication of nationalism with regard to the shaping of a national consciousness, and how nationalism is utilised through public policy as a form of bio-power.

One place that the nation is actively constructed is through public policy. Kedourie (1960) notes that the "nationalism doctrine holds that humanity is naturally divided into nations, that nations are known by certain characteristics which can be ascertained, and that the only legitimate self government is national self government" (p. 12). By promoting a sense of national belonging, nationalism is a view of the world which consists of nations and one's place within it is inevitable and natural. In other words, nationalism is a "common sense"; a world without nations being "an unimaginable impossibility" (Bishop & Jawoski, 2003, p. 247).

When examining nationalism in public policy it is also useful to consider Higson's (1998) conception of a nation as both inward and outward looking. That is, nations have at once an internal history which is defined specifically by a unique development over time, as well as being defined out of difference; an understanding of "us" and "them". Thus, Finlayson (2003) argues that the idea of the "people as one nation" becomes a kind of elite. When people are part of the nation, Finlayson contends they share in something that makes them feel "chosen". These shared identifications are reinforced, according to Smith (1986), by the production of myths, collective memories, persistent traditions and shared symbols. With regard to the construction of shared identifications in New Zealand public policy, this study utilises Billig's idea of banal nationalism as a site for producing and reproducing the nation; "ideological habits which enable the established nations of the West to be reproduced" (1995, p. 6). Distinct from "hot" nationalism, which is epitomised by "a flag which is being consciously waved with fervent

passion" (p. 8), Billig argues that banal nationalism has as its metaphor "a flag hanging unnoticed on the public building" (p. 8). As such, public policy provides an intriguing site where such a banal construction of the nation may take place.

National physical activity policy is utilised as a technique of bio-power to impart a particular way of viewing the world and interacting with it. For example, Sparc's rationale for investment in physical activity policies is most often not couched in terms of intrinsic benefits such as enjoyment and healthiness of citizens, but with regard to ideas of the population's collective physical health as having a positive effect on the nation's economy. We posit here that the "health" of a nation is a form of bio-power, albeit a form of power which is exercised in a banal fashion.

Classifying in national public policy: Narrowing the range of nations in the world

Policy writers hold a powerful position in classifying what is, and what is not health. With their ability to craft statements, definitions, images, and narratives about New Zealanders, policy writers can impart a particular understanding of the nation upon individuals and groups that read and are influenced by the policy. It is through examining policy that one can see what understandings emerge as areas for concern, measurement and attention. When Sparc originally compared physical activity rates around the world in a document named "Sport Facts", a statistical chart showed New Zealand's adult physical activity rate was 68 percent (Sparc, 2003b). A cursory perusal of the chart would indicate New Zealand was the second most active nation in the world in 2003, ostensibly comparing well with other nations, behind only Finland with 70 percent. However, a further reading of this chart reveals its limitations. For instance, all of the six countries included in the comparison (New Zealand, Australia, U.S.A, Canada, United Kingdom and Finland), are developed, highly Westernised nations. As such, this measurement is limited to the extent that it conveys a narrow portrayal of global physical activity rates. No nations from Africa, South America, the Pacific region (excluding New Zealand) or Asia are included in the measurement, many of which have divergent economic, political and cultural conditions.

Sparc does note the countries listed are "similarly developed countries" (Sparc, 2003b, p. 24) yet still utilises the statistics to aid in contextualising the "most active nation" goal. The effect of this juxtaposition of physical activity rates serves most importantly to generalise across all nations.

As well as a limited range of nations used in Sparc's original analysis, the chart is particularly important in defining the boundaries of the physical activity "problem". Indeed, a number of meanings can be derived from the chart. These include; a) since other countries also struggle with physical inactivity, the problem is "global"; b) New Zealand seems close to being the most active nation on the list, and therefore, in the world; c) other nations have a desire to be compared; and d) other nations *can* be compared. Such assumptions that emerge from the construction of the table serve to delineate ways of thinking about and becoming the world's most active nation.

A reading of Sparc's explanation of measuring physical activity rates illustrates little concern for alternative understandings of physical activity in non-Western countries. For instance, the chart's associated text notes "by international standards New Zealand appears to be a physically active nation" (Sparc, 2003b, p. 24). A section entitled "Issues with Measurement of Physical Activity" bears this out further. The issues are framed around variations in questionnaire design, including concerns around what is defined as physical activity and whether the interviews are "conducted by telephone" (Sparc, 2003b, p. 25). These issues further narrow readers' conceptions of the idea of measuring physical activity. Cementing this conception is the use of the phrase "by international standards" (Sparc Facts, 2003b, p. 24). Such an articulation has the discursive effect of promoting Westernised conceptions of physical activity rates as the standard to be attained, despite anecdotal evidence which suggests that physical activity rates in developing nations are *higher* than developed countries. For example, it is commonly considered that people who live in developing nations work for more hours each week, their work is more labour intensive, and daily life is more likely to involve more exertion than populations in developed nations. Thus, as

a classifying practice, producing charts of physical activity rates around the world serves to classify all nations as being affected by, and interested in, the problem of physical inactivity.

Dividing in national public policy: Constructing a global physical activity discourse

As a dividing practice, the discourse of positivist, scientific measurement is well ingrained in Western societies. Regarding physical activity in particular, the growing significance of obesity has meant scientific measurements of health and fitness are ubiquitous in Westernised nations. Thus, to have a physical activity rate measurement applied to the whole nation (and ostensibly, to every nation) is not surprising. However, combining this scientific discourse with the explicit goal of being the "most active nation" is novel to the extent that no other nation has attempted this in the past. While successive New Zealand governments have taken much pride in the nation's sporting performances, and have used such performances as an exemplar of the strength of the nation, the comparison of national physical activity rates is only a very recent phenomenon. In a Sparc document called *Trends in Participation in Sport and Active Leisure 1997 - 2001*, there was no reference to comparing physical activity rates between countries (Sparc, 2004b). That is, the discourse of international physical activity rate comparison did not exist in official policy as recently as 2001.

It is important here to distinguish between the colloquial usage of "world's most" and the use of the term in a policy document. One way of construing the term "most active nation" is a colloquial sense. Thus it is possible to understand Sparc's mission of "being the world's most active nation" as solely a rousing, emotive goal with no pretence of statistical measurement. For instance, in the lead up to Sparc's official launch event, CEO Nick Hill stated these goals were not necessarily being imposed by Sparc, but belonged to the nation; "New Zealanders want to win, we want to be healthy and we want to be known as the most active nation in the world" (Hill, 2002b). However, as a Crown agency, Sparc is heavily influenced by ideas such as rationalisation (Sam, 2003; Sam and Jackson, 2004). This is exemplified by references to "setting priorities"

and "target[ing] funding and resources" (Sparc, 2002, p. 10). As such, there is an expectation that achievements are quantified through statistics and rankings. In a press release Nick Hill once commented that "We're asking others to be accountable, and so we need to set a high standard for ourselves too" (Hill, 2002b, p. 1). As such, "being the world's most active nation" transforms the non-specific rhetoric of the Hillary Commission into an ostensibly measurable objective. By making the goal a measurable one, Sparc's policy echoes Foucault's explanation of the essence of dividing practices. Populations appear as "the bearer of new variables ... between the more or less utilizable, more or less amenable to profitable investment, those with greater of lesser prospects of survival, death and illness, and with more or less capacity to be usefully trained" (2002, p. 95-6). New Zealand citizens automatically become bearers of these new physical activity variables, by which they are measured and assessed.

Conquering: Sparc's use of the International Physical Activity Questionnaire

From this context of the classifying and dividing practices of national public policy, we now problematise Sparc's discursive strategies used to instigate and cement a discursive dominance over nations from this original framing. Sparc's original tool for measuring progress to become the world's most active nation was the New Zealand Health Survey (Sparc, 2003a, p. 14). However, this would only serve as a temporary measurement until Sparc could "Establish the International Physical Activity Questionnaire (IPAQ) baseline" (Sparc, 2003a, p. 14). From 2003 onwards, Sparc documents make numerous references to the central measurement tool being the IPAQ, with policy documents from this point on articulating the mission as New Zealand being "the most active nation as measured by the International Physical Activity Questionnaire" (Sparc, 2005, p. 13).2 It is important to note here that the

2 Since historically, comparisons of physical activity rates between countries between countries have not been measured, and no empirical measurement system has been available to compare physical activity rates, the production of the IPAQ makes the discourse possible.

IPAQ researchers had no previous formal affiliation with Sparc specifically.

The IPAQ researchers explained the purpose of the questionnaire was to "provide a set of well-developed instruments that can be used internationally to obtain comparable estimates of physical activity" (IPAQ website, 2005a).[3] According to the international research group undertaking the project, the rationale was based on the fact that "the public health burden of a sedentary lifestyle has been recognized globally, but until recently, the prevalence and impact of the problem has not been studied in a uniform and systematic fashion" (IPAQ website, 2005b). The resounding discourse employed by the IPAQ researchers is thus couched in the realm of public health spending (an economic "burden") and identifies the problem of "sedentary lifestyles." To be clear, it is apparent the IPAQ researchers do not purport the questionnaire to be applicable to every nation, and highlight this limitation in an explanation on "cultural adaptation". They note that "in developing countries, occupational activities and transportation may involve more activity than in more developed countries" (IPAQ website, 2005c). The implication is that since developing countries "may" have higher rates of physical activity, results would not be comparable to populations with "sedentary lifestyles". It is here that Sparc's use of the term "world's most" becomes limited to the point of being immeasurable; since the IPAQ researchers themselves are assuming that physical activity rates may be higher in developing nations than developed nations, then Sparc's use of the IPAQ to make its grand declaration of world dominance is inherently flawed.

Various other sources bear this out. World Health Organisation (WHO) statistics from the 2003 World Health Survey indicate that the physical activity prevalence in some sub-Saharan nations would surpass New Zealand's physical activity prevalence. Among those aged

3 The countries originally involved in the first international prevalence study included Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Czech Rep, Hong Kong, India, Japan, Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden and the United States of America.

18 to 69 in Ethiopia for instance, those classified as "inactive" made up only 12.7 percent, while those who were minimally active constituted only 11 percent (WHO, 2004a). These relatively low rates of inactivity, implying high rates of physical activity, were similar for Kenya; 9.8 and 12.1 percent respectively (WHO, 2004b) and Malawi; 11.4 and 18.1 percent respectively (WHO, 2004c). These WHO measurements employed the same scales as the IPAQ, thus suggesting that rates of physical activity are far higher in these nations than in many developed nations. Consequently, the notion of "international standards" of physical activity is paradoxical in a policy setting. That is, for a Westernised, sedentary population, the physical activity "standard" which might be considered a goal may indeed be physical activity rates of *developing* nations.

Sparc's statistics are juxtaposed too, with nations that face major long term health threats such as Swaziland (52.3 percent and 9 percent respectively) and Namibia (39.8 percent and 20.4 percent). The specific disparities between developing and developed nations at the time Sparc launched its goals can be seen in a WHO description of health risks in developing nations around the world:

> "The need to view such risks in their local context is obvious when analysing perceptions of risk in [developing] countries, especially when risk factors are considered alongside life-threatening diseases such as tuberculosis, malaria and HIV/AIDS. There are also other daily threats, such as poverty, food insecurity and lack of income. In addition, families may face many other important 'external' risks, such as political instability, violence, natural disasters and wars". (WHO, 2002, p. 50)[4]

Thus, the notion of measuring physical activity rates in various developing nations pales in comparison to other health concerns. Despite policy documents that purport to measure a range of socio-geographic nations, Sparc policy elides comparison with countries in which physical inactivity is not perceived as a major health risk due to an acutely disparate set of conditions. The World Health Organisation describe

4 The authors appreciate that the WHO also communicate through particular discourses, which could also be the subject of a discourse analysis.

this disparity as "the global gap between the haves and the have-nots" (WHO, 2002, p. 7).

We argue here that policies related to measuring rates of physical activity are only currently in the discursive domain of developed countries. As such, inferring that a nation could hold the title of "world's most active nation" illustrates an instance of dominance by default over many developing nations which are excluded from measurement. Asante (2006) refers to Europeans maintaining both a "chauvinistic nationalism," since they are "so different from the rest of the world that they define issues, ideas, civilisation and how one approaches reality" (p. 5) and a "ruthless culturalism; the promotion of the European-American political ideal as the most correct form of human society" which is defended by "numerous machinations of science, politics, statistics and literature" (p. 6). Asante also argues ruthless culturalists maintain their hegemonic imposition by creating symbolic, economic and cultural domination in most sectors of society. For the present study, considered mainly in terms of the "banality" of the transmission of nationalism, the term ruthless may seem overly bombastic. However, it may be an apt description of a reading of the policy by those being discursively dominated. The writing of banal, nationalistic policy at once actively attempts to construct a sense of where New Zealand sits in the imagined world ranking of physical activity statistics, and constructs a view that this construction is both normal and valuable.

In Sparc's 2006 Annual Report, by which time Sparc's mission proclaimed that it aimed to be "the world's most active nation", a "*Statement of Service Performance*" (Sparc, 2006b) reported on the result of Sparc's four year mission. The report espoused the outcome measure had been "partially achieved" (2006b, p. 7), and that "preliminary results from the International Physical Activity Questionnaire show New Zealand is among the top three active nations along with the Czech Republic and the United States" (p. 7). Sparc also offered statistics around physical activity promotion which seemingly detract from Sparc's apparent (partial) success in their goal. As recently as Sparc's *Statement of Intent 2006-2009*, Nick Hill stated that "at least half the adult population is insufficiently active to protect health" (Sparc, 2006a, p. 7) while three

months later Sparc's mission of being the most active nation is reported as being "partially achieved" (Sparc, 2006b, p. 7). The idea of a nation in which the majority of adults do not meet recommended levels of physical activity, yet is also "among the top three most active nations" (Sparc, 2006b, p. 7) highlights a discursive disparity which is not reconciled within Sparc's policy.

Discussion

Foucault insists that power never achieves what it sets out to accomplish. He believed there is not a single dominating discourse that authorises truth. Thus, despite Sparc's attempts at constructing both the nation and the world in terms of a particular physical activity discourse, this understanding is not given free reign over citizens' consciousness. This is because of the multitude of other discourses governing conceptions of the world, not only regarding "physical activity", but also other understandings of a nation's place in the globalised world, such as discourses concerning living standards, gross domestic product, safety (with regard to the discourse of terrorism) and traditional discourses of New Zealand as a "clean and green" nation.

Regarding the dissemination of such a problematic discourse, Sparc's policy is debilitating for particular groups (or entire nations) inasmuch as the usage of this phrase in various mainstream media, promotions and policy documents, without a limiting caveat, serves to insinuate that all nations know about, are interested in and involved in such a measurement. While we propose that this dominance by default exists in New Zealand's physical activity policy, it is not necessarily borne out of a conscious decision by policy writers. We consider it is useful here to consider Stone's (2002) assertion that "people aspire to convince others that their interpretation best fulfils the spirit of the larger concept to which everyone is presumed to subscribe" (p. 37). With this in mind however, it is still possible to follow Chalip's (1996) lead and analyse, challenge and resist debilitating policy assumptions, or, as Foucault suggested, encourage power relations to be formed with a minimum of domination

Regarding measuring physical rates in countries without a history of doing so, namely developing nations, one might consider the ethical limitations of undertaking such research. In comparative instances such as these, policy makers might consider the basis for framing a country as the world's most active nation when others face many far greater health risks than the onset of diseases linked with overweight and obesity.

The discursive production of "the world" has implications beyond the issue of international physical activity comparisons. Any type of public policy that employs ostensibly measurable goals can be questioned, namely with regard to who is included, who is excluded, and what assumptions and values lie beneath particular policy positions. Future research might investigate various articulations of "the world" in public health policy, as well as critique the underlying assumptions of public health programmes that purport to measure various factors around the world. Also, the implementation, measurement and effects on citizens of these subjectivising policies would be worthy of further inquiry.

Further analysis of Sparc's policy might question at which point such a policy would be resisted by groups that are excluded from participation (through measurement) while being discursively included by the colloquial dissemination of the goals. It is posited here that due to the "default" nature of the policy (that is, those populations excluded from measurement are both non-participants and most likely *unknowing* of the policy), any resistance attempting to question the validity and legitimacy of Sparc's measurement practices is currently limited to analyses such as this current study.

References

Asante, M. (2006). The rhetoric of globalisation: The Europeanisation of human ideas. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 1*(2), 152-158.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Bishop, H. and Jaworski, A. (2003). 'We beat 'em': nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity in the British press reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000. *Discourse & Society, 14*(3), 243–271.

Chalip, L. (1996). Critical policy analysis: The illustrative case of New Zealand sport policy development, *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 310-324.

Church, A. (1990). *Community development: A history of the involvement of the Department of Internal Affairs in community development*. Wellington:Department of Internal Affairs.

Coffee, J. (2000, February 26). Fair suck of the sav, mate! Why can't we beat the Aussies? *The Press*, p. 4.

Finlayson, A. (2003). Nationalism. In R. Eccleshall, A. Finlayson, V. Geoghegan, M. Kenny, M. Lloyd, I. MacKensie, and R. Wilford (Eds.), *Political ideologies: An introduction*. (3rd ed.). Great Britain: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*.London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1971). *Madness and civilisation: A history of insanity in the age of reason*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1980). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1: The will to knowledge*. Great Britain: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (2002). The subject and power, in J. Faubion (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power, Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984, Vol. 3*. (pp. 326-348) London: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1988). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom: An interview with Michel Foucault on January 20, 1984. In J. Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Graham, J., Collins, D., Devoy, S., Mackay, J., Palmer, F., Simmonds, M. and Turner, G. (2001). *Getting set for an active nation: Report of the sport, fitness and leisure ministerial taskforce*. Wellington.

Higson, A. (1998). Nationality: National Identity and the Media, in A. Briggs and P. Cobley (Eds), *The media: An introduction*. London: Longman.

Hill, N. (2002a). Interview. *Radio Sport, 1332AM*, 15 June.

Hill, N. (2002b). *Sparc Strategy Launch press release*. Retrieved 10 November 2002 from www.sparc.org.nz

Hill, N. (2003). Interview. *Radio Sport, 1332AM*, 29 March.

Hillary Commission for Sport, Fitness and Leisure (2000). *Funding community sport and active leisure, Guidelines for Local Authority Assessment Committees and Administrators*. Wellington: Hillary Commission.

International Physical Activity Questionnaire website (2005a). *Questionnaire purpose*. Retrieved 15 March, 2006 from http://www.ipaq.ki.se

International Physical Activity Questionnaire website (2005b). *Questionnaire rationale*. Retrieved 15 March, 2006 from http://www.ipaq.ki.se

International Physical Activity Questionnaire website (2005c). *Cultural adaptation*. Retrieved 15 March, 2006 from http://www.ipaq.ki.se

Johnston, M. (2006, May 19) Obesity campaign gets $76.1m over four years. *The New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved May 20, 2006 from www.nzherald.co.nz

Kedourie, E. (1960). *Nationalism*. London: Hutchinson.

Parsons, D.W. (1995). *Public policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis*. United Kingdom: Aldershot.

Phillips, J. (1996). *A man's country? The image of the Pakeha male, A history*, Auckland. New Zealand: Penguin.

Sam, M. P. (2003). What's the big idea? Reading the rhetoric of a national sport policy process. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 20* (3), 189-213.

Sam, M. P. & Jackson, S. J. (2004). Sport Policy Development in New Zealand: Paradoxes of an Integrative Paradigm. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 39* (2), 205-222.

Smith, A. (1986). The myth of the 'modern nation' and the myths of nations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 11*, 1-26.

Sobngwi, E., Mbanya, J. C., Unwin, N. C., Aspray T. J. & Alberti K. (2001). Development and validation of a questionnaire for the assessment of physical activity in epidemiological studies in Sub-Saharan Africa. International Journal of Epidemiology, *30*. 1361-1368.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2002). *Our vision, our direction, Strategies for success through 2006.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2003a). *Sparc Statement of Intent, 2003-2004.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2003b). *Sparc Facts, 2003.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2004a). *Sparc Statement of Intent, 2004-2005.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2004b). *Sparc trends.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2005). *Sparc Statement of Intent, 2005-2006.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2006a). *Sparc Statement of Intent, 2006-2009.* Wellington.

Sport and Recreation New Zealand (2006b). *Sparc Annual Report, 2006.* Wellington.

Stone, D. A. (2002). *Policy paradox: the art of political decision making.* New York: W.W. Norton.

World Health Organisation. (2002). *Reducing Risks, Promoting Healthy Life, The World Health Report.* Retrieved May 20, 2006 from http://www.who.int/

World Health Organisation (2004a). Physical Inactivity Prevalence; Ethiopia. *World Health Survey 2003.* Retrieved November 20, 2006 from www.who.int

World Health Organisation (2004b). Physical Inactivity Prevalence; Kenya. *World Health Survey 2003.* Retrieved November 20, 2006 from www.who.int

World Health Organisation (2004c). Physical Inactivity Prevalence; Malawi. *World Health Survey 2003.* Retrieved November 20, 2006 from www.who.int

World Health Organisation (2004d). Physical Inactivity Prevalence; Swaziland. *World Health Survey 2003.* Retrieved November 20, 2006 from www.who.int

World Health Organisation (2004e). Physical Inactivity Prevalence; Namibia. *World Health Survey 2003.* Retrieved November 20, 2006 from www.who.int

Joe Piggin is a lecturer at the Unitec School of Sport, teaching in the areas of sport marketing and sport management. He completed his Masters degree at the School of Physical Education, University of Otago, and is currently completing his PhD in the area of public policy discourse. Email: jpiggin@unitec.ac.nz

Steven J. Jackson is a Professor specialising in the socio-cultural analysis of sport. In addition to his post at Otago Steve has served as a Visiting Professor at the University of Jyvaskyla (Finland), the University of British Columbia (Canada) and the National Taiwan Normal University. He has previously served on the editorial board of the *Sociology of Sport Journal* and currently serves on the editorial boards of the *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* and the *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*. Steve is the General Secretary for the International Sociology of Sport Association (ISSA)

Malcolm Lewis teaches organisation theory and strategic management from a sociological perspective. Originally trained in electronics, which he later taught in both the UK and NZ, he subsequently studied and taught social science subjects in NZ, Australia, the UK and South Africa. Malcolm has a number of research interests that include strategy, management theory, critical management studies, business ethics and issues in modernism and postmodernism. He has been a consultant to large and small organisations both in New Zealand and overseas.

"Do-it yourself" Digital Citizenship: A Preliminary Interrogation

Lincoln Dahlberg

The libertarian digital citizen

At the 2006 Association of Internet Researchers Conference in Brisbane, John Hartley (2006) sang the praises of new forms of digital interactivity for supporting the development of a "do-it-yourself" digital citizenship free of old politics and old nation-state legal institutions.[1] Here, becoming a digital citizen means becoming an autonomous and "creative" digital producer/consumer (or "prosumer"). Hartley's rhetoric exemplifies a digital libertarian discourse that can be found in recent discussions about the civic potentialities of "next generation" digital communication technology: interactive-television, advanced mobile telephone networks, digital recording and storage systems, and particularly new online collaborative and social networking platforms (Anderson & Gillespie, 2006; Mangu-Ward, 2007; The Reality Club, 2006; Twist, 2006).[2]

Digital technology is here seen as affording, to deploy Isaiah Berlin's (1969) distinction, both negative and positive liberties. In terms of negative liberty, digital media allow us to sidestep the limits of geographically based paternalistic authority and homogeneous mass mediated public spheres to make our own choices unheeded. In contrast to embodied nation-state based citizenship regulated by passport controls, top-down communication and limited rights, global digital communication is believed to allow for a sphere of self-regulation that

1 Hartley's discussion of "do-it-yourself"'digital citizenship is an extension of his previous "democratainment" arguments developed with reference to television – see Hartley (1999, 2004).

2 This libertarian digital citizenship discourse to some extent revives, in a more cautious way, cyber-libertarian discourse of the mid-1990s, which lost popularity after the dot com market collapse in the early 2000s and the failure of cyber-communications to "route around regulation". For exemplary 1990s cyber-libertarian rhetoric see Barlow (1996), Dyson et al., (1994), and Grossman (1995).

transcends nation-state borders and controls. Digital technology is also understood within the digital libertarian discourse as bestowing positive liberties on those who enter the cyber-city, empowering users to undertake creative self-expression, production, and consumption.

This discourse invokes a liberal individualist subject. The digital citizen is an individualized, self-actualizer who knows their own best interests and finds creative ways through the digital sphere to pursue their choices. Digital networking largely refers to organizing with others to achieve one's privatized needs and interests, whether such networking is focused on identity construction and promotion, the development and sharing of digital and non-digital resources, or intimate communication. "Individual choice" operates as a central organizing signifier leading to a neat equivalence between the "citizen" and the "prosumer", which collapse into one identity, the citizen-prosumer or "interactive citizen-consumer" (Hartley, 2005; 2006).[3]

Politics here is individualized, instrumentalized, and privatized. We go beyond the old antagonistic politics of party solidarities and ideological conflict, to a personal "do-it-yourself citizenship" (Hartley, 2006). This is really a post-political citizenship. The vision Hartley gives is of a conflict free arena, harmonized efficiently (instrumentally) through networked private interactions, exchanges, and transactions. Democracy in turn becomes equated with prosumer culture: individual choices are seen as democratically expressed and aggregated through the self-regulating networks of digital self-production and consumption. Strengthening democracy is then simply a matter of advancing this prosumerist activity, thus promoting the digital communications technologies that are seen to help realize such.

A critique of the digital libertarian discourse

So, what is wrong with this libertarian discourse? The central problem is that it deploys, without reflection or acknowledgement, a narrow understanding of democratic citizenship that supports a celebratory

3 Hartley tends to fall back into simply referring to the "citizen-consumer", following on from his long time insistence upon the democratic value of media consumption (or reception).

reading of digital technology. In the process, it obscures the limits to how digital communications might realize stronger versions of democratic citizenship. To identify some of these limits, and show how they come to be obscured, I will undertake a very brief and preliminary examination of digital communication in relation to a much more expansive conception of democratic citizenship, that which aims for the maximization of liberty, equality, and reflexive-reciprocal political interaction (the demos) (Mouffe, 2000). I will examine these three elements in turn.

Liberty is central to the libertarian digital-citizen discourse. However, because "liberty" here means prosumer liberty free of state regulation, which market capitalism also supports, the discourse overlooks the limits to liberty that arise from the embedding of "do-it-yourself" practice within corporate communication systems. Digital prosumerism now largely takes place through corporate owned platforms. The owners see the individualist-instrumentalist networks of "next generation" digital communication technology as complementing their strategic plans. More specifically, these digital communication networks are being developed for increased data mining and targeted advertising (Wark, 2007). Overall, the potential for liberty through the digital sphere is being threatened by corporate design and control, with the marginalization of more democratically structured decentralized peer-to-peer networking practices (see, Kleiner and Wryrick, 2007; Lowenthal, 2007; Wark and Patelis, 2007).

In terms of equality, it is clear that the digital sphere is currently far from fully inclusive or egalitarian. However, digital libertarianism generally assumes that inclusion and equality will be taken care of by rapidly decreasing costs and technological innovations (see, for example, Rossetto, 1998). The result of this technological/market determinism is that the discourse fails to recognize the social embedding of subjects and digital technologies, and the systemic limits to equality of participation within the digital sphere. As a result, significant inequalities are simply ignored, inequalities that lead to what some name the "digital divide". On the one hand, there are those who could be described as libertarian digital citizens, including the young, educated, neo-capitalist

classes, those who have done alright, thank you, under capitalist globalization, those who indeed have some "choice". On the other hand, there are the majority of the world's population who do not have the resources to participate, let alone participate equally, within the digital media sphere, and yet whose labours in the world's fields, factories, cities and homes, are essential to the existence of this sphere, including the very life of the prosumer. Like Athens, digital citizenship involves the empowerment of the few, those who have passports to the digital city and the cultural capital required to navigate the digital streets, suburbs and institutions, and who rely on a large population of excluded and exploited non-citizens.

What then of the idea of a reflexive-reciprocal demos? The libertarian digital citizenship discourse places emphasis on the liberties of prosumers attempting to achieve individual interests through private networks. This focus reduces political community to the aggregate of the instrumentally-oriented interactions of individual utility maximizers – a post-political democracy that many digital libertarians celebrate as replicating the Hayekian market-democratic model of spontaneous and smooth (conflict free) ordering and decision making (see Mangu-Ward, 2007; and contributors in The Reality Club, 2006). However, following upon strong understandings of democratic citizenship ranging from Habermas (1996) to Mouffe (2000), it is clear that to democratically deal with common, geographically located problems of living together with difference, from health care to immigration to war, those affected must engage in reflexive-reciprocal debate and struggle through difficult issues. This is very much a *political* process, and one that calls for and constitutes critical citizens (c.f. instrumental prosumers) committed to undertaking the ongoing scrutiny of power and oversight of formal decision making.

These failures to identify limits on liberty, equality, and the demos, stem from a more general failure to account for structural power relations. All these failures in turn result from, and are masked by, the libertarian discourse's cool techno-instrumentalist celebration of a narrowly defined democratic citizenship. The discourse celebrates the

technologically enabled autonomy and resourcefulness of "do-it-yourself" citizen-prosumers whose digital networking constitutes an egalitarian, conflict free post-political realm. Adherents see this "do-it-yourself" digital prosumer as radical, pointing to the evolution of new social practices and the possibility of transcending existing political conditions. Yet, by obscuring structural power relations (and the resulting domination, inequalities, and failures to form community) and promoting an instrumental-individual prosumer culture, the discourse provides ideological support for neo-liberal consumer-capitalism and associated social hierarchies.

Re-evaluating digital citizenship

In order to more adequately evaluate digital communication in relation to democratic citizenship we need to strengthen our analysis both empirically and normatively. First, empirically, we need to fully take into account the social contexts and power relations within which the subject and political community are constituted and digital technologies developed, distributed, and deployed. Second, normatively, we must start with a more robust conception of democratic citizenship. Following on from my earlier analysis, I suggest drawing from the democratic tradition that seeks the expansion of liberty, equality, and reflexive-reciprocal community. However, we should also be aware, following Derrida, that democracy is always "to come". As such, we should accept normative fallibility rather than dogmatically seek an impossible closure.

Once we have theorized our understanding of democratic citizenship, and ensured to fully account for structural power relations, we can then (re-)examine the democratic value of those forms of interactivity celebrated by the libertarian digital-citizen discourse. In looking at digital networks we see not only a medium that affords new and exciting possibilities and actualities of communication and interaction supporting a radically democratic political orientation, but also a sphere strongly structured by power differentials and instrumental action (Dahlberg, 2005; Dean, 2007; Salter, 2005; Myerson, 2001). For extending democratic citizenship via digital technology, we need to promote those examples of digital communication that advance autonomous communication,

equality of participation, and reflexive-reciprocal communication (e.g. Indymedia.org). We can also look to digital activisms contesting hegemonic relations including state and corporate colonization of communication (see examples in Fenton, 2006; McCaughey and Ayers, 2003), and projects resourcing marginalized groups (see the work of The Association of Progressive Communications).

Furthermore, we must acknowledge that the online world relies on offline embodied experiences and institutions. As well as accepting the always already connectedness of digital citizenship to everyday offline experiences, we must also theorize the normative role of (local and global) formal democratic institutions of regulation and decision making; we need legal protections of digital communication and we need institutions that can translate concerns expressed online into social change. The libertarian dream of escaping from institutions of formal governance via digital networks is an ideological fantasy that works to obscure and extend power hierarchies. There are indeed, as Hartley reminds us, ongoing and fundamental problems with citizenship linked to the nation-state. However, as I have argued here, embracing a libertarian vision of geographically transcendent and instrumental citizenship will not provide a democratic solution. Rather, as Habermas (2001) asserts, we must work to reinvent *post-national* democratic institutions (civil society, law, parliaments) that can reign in market and government power and provide for universal political, social, and cultural citizenship.

References

Anderson, C. & Gillespie, N. (2006, November). Welcome to Niche Nation, *ReasonOnline*, http://www.reason.com/news/show/38385.html

Barlow, J. P. (1996). *A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace.*

Accessed 4 May 2007 from http://homes.eff.org/~barlow/Declaration-Final.html

Berlin, I. (1969). *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dean, J. 2007. Feminism, Communicative Capitalism, and the Inadequacies of Radical Democracy. In L. Dahlberg & E. Siapera (Eds.), *Radical Democracy and the Interent: Interrogating Theory and Practice.* (pp. 226-245). London: Palgrave.

Fenton, N. (2006, 6-8 Septermber). *Mediating Hope: New Media, Politics and Resistance.* Paper presented at the Media Change and Social Theory Conference, CRESC, Oxford.

Dahlberg, L. (2005) The Corporate Colonization of Online Attention and the Marginalization of Critical Communication? Journal of Communication Inquiry 29 (2):1-21.

Dyson, E., Gilder, G., Keyworth, G., & Toffler, A. (1994). *A Magna Carta for the Knowledge Age*. The Progress and Freedom Foundation. Accessed 19 September 2007 from http://www.pff.org/issues-pubs/futureinsights/fi1.2magnacarta.html

Grossman, L. K. (1995). *The Electronic Republic*. New York: Viking - Penguin.

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy* (Rehg, William, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (2001). *The Postnational Constellation* (Max Pensky, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hartley, J. (1999). *Uses of Television*. London: Routledge.

Hartley, J. (2004). "Republic of Letters" to "Television Republic"? Citizen Readers in the Era of Broadcast Television. In L. Spigel & J. Olsson (Eds.), *Television after TV: Essays on a Medium in Transition* (pp. 386-417). Durham, NC & London: Duke University Press.

Hartley, J. (2005). Creative Industries. In J. Hartley (Ed.), *Creative Industries* (pp. 1-40). Malden: MA: Blackwell.

Hartley, J. (2006, September 28-30). *Uses of Creativity: Creative Content and the Creative Citizen*. Paper presented at the Association of Internet Researchers Conference 6.0, Brisbane.

Kleiner, D., & Wyrick, B. (2007). Info-Enclosure 2.0. *Mute: Culture and Politics after the Net, 2*(4). Accessed 25 Sept 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/InfoEnclosure-2.0

Lowenthal, A. (2007). Free Beer vs Free Media. In F. da Rimini (Ed.), *A Handbook for Coding Cultures*. Sydney: d/Lux/MediaArts. Accessed 6 September 2007 from http://www.dlux.org.au/codingcultures/handbook.html

Mangu-Ward, K. (2007). Wikipedia and Beyond: Jimmy Wale's sprawling vision. *Reason Magazine*, (June). Accessed 19 September 2007 from http://www.reason.com/news/show/119689.html

McCaughey, M., & Ayers, M. D. (Eds.). (2003). *Cyberactivism: Online Activism in Theory and Practice*: Routledge.

Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.

Myerson, G. (2001). *Heidegger, Habermas, and the Mobile Phone*. Duxford: Icon Books.

Rossetto, L. (1998). Rebuttal of the California Ideology. *Almut: Bastion of Peace and Information*. Accessed 6 September 2007 from http://www.alamut.com/subj/ideologies/pessimism/califIdeo_II.html

Salter, L. (2005). Colonization tendencies in the development of the World Wide Web. *New Media and Society, 7*(3): 291-309.

The Reality Club. (2006, June 15). Responses to "Digital Maoism". *Edge, 185*. Accessed 6 June 2007 from http://www.edge.org/discourse/digital_maoism.html

Twist, J. (2006, 2 January 2006,). The Year of the Digital Citizen. *BBC News International Online Version*. Accessed 6 May 2007 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/4566712.stm

Wark, M. (2007). Information wants to be free (but is everywhere in chains). *Cultural Studies, 20*(2-3), 164-183.

Wark, M., & Patelis, K. (2007, 16 April). McKenzie Wark: Gamer theory for Collaborative knowledge production, an interview with Korinna Patelis. Accessed 6 May 2007 from *Re-public*.http://www.re-public.gr/en/wp-print.php?p=132

Lincoln Dahlberg is currently based in the School of Journalism and Communication, University of Queensland. He teaches and researches in the areas of media politics, critical theory, and digital democracy, and has recently co-edited *Radical Democracy and the Internet* (Palgrave, 2007). Email: l.dahlberg@uq.edu.au

Winner of the 2006 Postgraduate Prize for Scholarship in Sociology

The Lesbian Family and the State: A Sociological Perspective on New Zealand's Regulation of Lesbian Sexuality

Celine Wills

Introduction

Historically, the state has intervened in many areas of sexuality, such as incest, adultery, rape, and homosexuality to name only a few. Even today, there are a plethora of laws that mark off "acceptable" and "unacceptable" forms of sexual behaviour. In America for example, as Gayle (1993) Rubin points out, the only sexual behaviour which is legal in every state is heterosexual sex in wedlock. The state itself has in the past acted as if the nuclear family were the only kind of family in existence, and it can be argued that part of its investment in controlling sexuality can be read as an attempt to reproduce this structure. This paper will focus on the state's regulation of lesbian sexuality in New Zealand today. I will show that although lesbian couples have gained the same relationship rights as heterosexual couples through legislation such as Civil Union Act (2004) and the Relationship (Statutory References) Act (2005), these rights have yet to be fully extended to the "family" realm. Lesbian couples are disadvantaged over heterosexual couples in terms of their rights regarding adoption, fertility services, and child custody. This paper will focus on the state, as it is reflected in law and social policy. My analysis then, will not address all the areas in which the state is active, such as lobbying. I will look at the effect that the differences in rights have had on lesbian women drawing on data from The "Lavender Islands" Survey (2005) and the New Zealand Census. Overall, it is claimed that this discrepancy of rights reflects the fact that state law and social policy is still based on a heterosexualised and largely nuclear definition of what constitutes a family.

Imagining the State

To begin, it is important to problematise the notion of the "state". We could argue that the state is a fluid entity, subject to pressure from particular interest groups as well as popular ideas. The state itself is also only one part of a larger system of power. As Foucault (1990) argues, power exists not only in law but also in the defining of identities, feelings and acts as "normal" and "deviant". Pritchard (2005) argues with regard to Foucault's work, "To conceive of power as something exercised solely by the state is to forget the role of other social phenomena such as language, custom, morality, and pedagogy in the process of normalisation and marginalisation"(p. 80). When looking at the role of the state in the regulation of lesbian sexuality, it is important to consider external forces which shape and maintain state law and policy. Ideas about sexuality are not determined solely by the state, though the state may play a significant role in shaping ideas.

The control of sexuality by the State

Many theorists look at historical trends to explain the development and control of sexuality by the state. Connell (1990) and Morgain (2004) map the state's control of sexuality through the rise of industrialism (Connell 1990, Morgain, 2004), while Weeks (1981) explores the impact of nineteenth century Victorian morality on twentieth century sexual laws (Weeks, 1981). The state has always controlled sexuality but the rationale for doing so has changed significantly over time. For example, societies from Ancient Greece to the Middle Ages believed sexual deviance to be a manifestation of evil (Anleu, 1999). Similarly, American colonial law criminalised such acts as adultery, bestiality, and homosexuality on the basis that they were "grave sins" (Jenkins, 1998). However, with the increasing medicalisation and urbanisation of society, views on sexually deviant behaviour changed from being understood as evil, mad, and against God to being seen as sick or pathological. Gradually, the rationale for regulating sexuality through law changed from preventing people from committing acts "against God" (under the influence of the Devil), to the premise that they are protecting others from this potentially harmful behaviour.

The state however, is not just involved in regulating sexuality but is also a creative force in the discourse of sexuality. Connell (1990) argues that the state-backed medical profession marked off "the homosexual man" as a distinct social category; something that had previously been a much more fluid expression of sexuality. By criminalising a sexual act, the state lends legitimacy to certain views about sexuality. I would argue that in the case of homosexuality, the fact that it was criminal (coupled with the fact that homosexual sex does not lead to reproduction) contributed to an understanding of homosexuality as "sick" or "unnatural".

Social control and the reproduction of the nuclear family

Some theorists argue that the notion of "family" is central to understanding the state's control of sexuality. From a Marxist perspective, the nuclear family produces and maintains a productive labour force. The male is expected to go out into the world and work, while the women is supposed to work at home and nurture and raise the next generation of workers. More specifically, Brake (1976) argues that:

> The heterosexual nuclear family assists a system like capitalism because it produces and socializes the young in certain natures. The maintenance of the nuclear family with its role specific behaviour creates an apparent consensus concerning sexual normality. (p. 180)

The state then concerns itself with the control of sexuality within the family because it is useful for capitalism and, as Brake argues, the family itself reproduces ideas about sexuality. Connell (1992) asserts that most of the regulation of sexuality by the state can be read as an attempt to promote a form of sexuality in the nuclear family against a whole series of tendencies in other directions. Adultery, incest, and homosexuality are three examples of such tendencies which the state has actively tried to discourage. The family unit is also something that the state has actively sought to restructure and control, for instance, by creating "population policies". In Australia during the early twentieth century, contraception was banned and the state introduced "baby bonus"

payments to increase the population. We can see the complete opposite now in China, where the state attempts to limit population growth by only allowing a family to have two children.

Lesbianism and the "Nuclear Family"

Taking a less hard-line approach, we could argue that historically the nuclear family has been constructed as the norm by the state. In the past, government benefits were designed to assist families rather than single individuals or unmarried couples. This is also evidenced by the fact that until 1960 in New Zealand, no laws prohibited women from being paid less than men because presumably, women did not need money because they were supposed to stay at home and have children.

It can be argued that the state's promotion of the heterosexual nuclear family has linked homosexuality to ideas about social decay as well as reinforcing the idea that gays and lesbians are unnatural, selfish, and unfit to care for children (Morgain, 2004). Lesbians can be seen as a threat towards the established order because they cannot create a family of this kind. Most lesbians do not wish to have sex with a man in order to have a child, and certainly do not want to be married to a man. This might shed some light onto why it is that family rights are lacking in New Zealand law for lesbians. The residue of older understandings of what constitutes a family is still enshrined in the law. For example "The Status of Children Act" (1969, as amended by 1987 and 2004) does not allow a sperm donor to be on a child's birth certificate even if he plays an active role in the child's life (because he did not have sex with the mother), and in the adoption policy, which only allows legally married couples and single people to adopt. The state still reflects the idea that a child is best raised in a heterosexual family, and further, that a child may be harmed if they are not. Most studies that have been done on gay and lesbian families have shown no notable difference between children raised in gay and lesbian families and children raised in heterosexual families. As Stacey and Biblarz (2001) state, the majority of this research has found "lesbigay parents to be as competent and effective as heterosexual parents" (p. 160).

The case of New Zealand

In New Zealand, homosexual sex between men was illegal until 1986. While sex between women has never been illegal, lesbians and bisexual women have been restricted in terms of the recognition of lesbian relationships by the state, for example through the court. Recently, gay and lesbians have gained many rights in New Zealand through statutes such as the Civil Union Act 2004 which allows same-sex couple relationships to be recognized by the state, and the Relationship (Statutory References) Act 2005 which gives the same relationship rights as married couples. Similarly, both same-sex and non-married heterosexual couples who have been together for three years have the same property rights as married couples should they separate. There are also non-discrimination policies in areas such as employment, housing, accommodation, medical and social services, and education (Daniels, 1994). What is lacking in my view is not the state's recognition of two lesbian individuals in a relationship together, but the state's recognition of a lesbian couple as a family unit. As I have argued, the nature of the lesbian family challenges the notion of the traditional nuclear family and is still constrained in some areas by the state. In reality, most people do not live in a nuclear family. In New Zealand the percentage of people living in a nuclear family dropped from 62% in 1976 to 45% in 1996 (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). In the next section, I will examine some of the options as well as the restrictions for starting a family with regard to adoption, foster care, fertility services, and child custody.

Engaging with the statistics

It is a fairly challenging endeavour to begin analysing gay and lesbian families in New Zealand considering it is impossible to calculate how many gay and lesbian parents actually exist. The best sources we have in this country is Census data collected by Statistics New Zealand and the recently completed "Lavender Island" survey of gay, lesbian, and bi-sexual people in New Zealand (Henrickson, 2005).

1996 marks the first year that same sex couples with children were counted in the New Zealand census, with 684 couples identifying as such (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). In 2001, it was reported as 1,356. The discrepancy between 1996 and 2001 may not signify an enormous growth in these families, but rather that more people have chosen to identify themselves as a gay and lesbian family. This is a clear indication that these statistics are unreliable. As Hyman points out, in the 2001 New Zealand Census form there was no opportunity to explicitly state that one is in a same-sex relationship, but rather one must answer four different questions that together show you are in a same-sex relationship. She also argues that this confusing process has the effect of skewing the statistics (Hyman, 2003). This was not amended in the 2006 Census. There is also no information in the Census or "Lavender Island" data that indicates the origin of the children from these gay and lesbian relationships. It is unclear whether the couple's children are from previous relationships, conceived from a donor insemination, are foster children, or the result of any other types of union. In the Census, data on single, gay, lesbian, and bisexual people with children, and those whose partner is not living with them is missing entirely. Of the 1,846 people that responded to a question about children in the "Lavender Island" survey, 35.1% of women and 11.8% of men report having some kind of parenting relationship with a child or children (Henrickson, 2005). Though these statistics may not be completely reliable, they do highlight the fact that many New Zealand lesbians have a non-conventional family relationship. Undoubtedly, state laws and policies pertaining to familial relationships will affect them. At this juncture I want to discuss a range of rights in relation to children and child bearing that are denied lesbian couples.

Adoption

I will begin examining family rights for lesbians by looking at the state policy on adoption. In New Zealand, while single lesbian (and heterosexual) women are able to adopt children, same-sex couples as well as de-facto couples are unable to adopt. The Adoption Act 1955 stipulates that *only* married couples and single people are permitted to

adopt. This means that even if the birth parents wish a lesbian couple to adopt, or even if it be proven to be in the best interests of the child, the law will not allow them. Civil unions under this law remain distinct from marriage. Similarly, in Australia most states and territories prevent same-sex couples from adopting children. In New South Wales for example, gay and lesbian couples cannot adopt and if a partner is co-parenting, he or she cannot adopt the child without the biological parent losing their legal recognition as a parent (Elliot, 2005). Same-sex couples are able to foster care, meaning they are able to care for children if their natural parents are unable to do so, but in this way they do not have the same rights. The original parents are able to take the child back if the court rules they are fit to do so. Adoption in contrast, is a legal transfer of all the rights and responsibilities of a child to their parent/s until the child turns eighteen. This law implies that only married couples are well-suited to care for children. I would add that it reaffirms the notion that lesbianism is antithetical to the "family". In practice, it means that lesbian women may feel they must hide their relationships with women from state institutions so that they may adopt a child.

Recently, this adoption policy has been challenged. The New Zealand Law Commission recommended in 2000 that same-sex couples should be considered for adoption based on their merits using the same criteria as married couples, rather than just prohibiting all same-sex couples. It concludes that "there is not sufficient evidence to establish that adoption by same-sex adopters cannot be in the best interests of the child so as to justify disqualifying same-sex couples from being eligible to apply" (New Zealand Law Commission, 1999, p. 37). While the government has not yet introduced any legislation, this year Green MP Metiria Turei drafted a member's bill (Adoption (Equity) Amendment Bill) with the aim of allowing gay and lesbians couples to adopt (Berry, 2006). It has not been drawn as yet. In Australia, the government of Australia Capital Territory ruled in support of a bill to offer same-sex couples the right to adopt. This was met later by opposition from Prime Minister John Howard who subsequently introduced legislation banning same-sex marriage, as well as legislation that prevented same-sex couples from Australia adopting children abroad. This does not impact on their ability to adopt,

because adoption falls under state jurisdiction (Mason and Selman, n.d.).

Artificial insemination

In New Zealand, lesbian couples have the right to receive treatment from clinics for artificial insemination. This is based on the Human Rights Act introduced in 1993, which made it unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of disability, sexual orientation, and family status (Daniels, 1994). However, lesbians are still unable to qualify for state-funded assisted reproductive technologies unless they are infertile. This stance is very much in line with popular opinion. In a 1995 Listener survey, only 24% of the participants were in favour of free access for lesbian couples (*Fertility Clinics for Lesbians*, n.d.). This is compared with 17% for postmenopausal women, and 31% for single women. This means two things: firstly, that women have to be relatively well-off to afford expensive fertility treatment which costs anywhere between $7,500 and $15,000 per cycle (As reported in *The New Zealand Herald* on May 21, 2006) and secondly, that lesbians are more likely to opt for a "low tech" home insemination. One consequence of this is that some people are embarking on pregnancy without having been screened for sexually transmitted or hereditary diseases (*Fertility Clinics for Lesbians*, n.d.). In the case of artificial insemination, the rights of heterosexual couples are favoured over and above the rights of same-sex couples. It is reasonable (if one is to accept lesbian sexuality) that a gay woman would not want to have sex with a man in order to conceive a child. For the state to grant two cycles of treatment to infertile women and not to gay women, is to identify infertility as a more "worthy cause". In an abstract sense, it also negates the identity of lesbian women and places obstacles in the way of them having a family.

The issue of the gay donor

Lesbians are faced with another problem if they wish to have a shared parenting arrangement with a donor: sometimes a lesbian couple may decide to form a family by using a gay male as a donor, where they have an agreement that this man will play an active role in the child's

life. Though the child/children may spend half the time with the man or the man and his partner, (and may call him/them "dad") the father would not have the legal rights or responsibilities of a father. This is because according to the Status of Children Act (1969), donors are not legally allowed to be named on the birth certificate. One consequence of this for lesbian parents is that if the father has a change of heart and decides after a period that he will no longer care for the child, child support cannot be enforced. Again, we see an example of New Zealand Law failing to be able to cope with a non-conventional family structure. The Status of Children Act (1969) does allow a same-sex partner of a surrogate mother to be a legal parent, but this seems to mirror the nuclear family structure in its imperative that only two individuals can be named as parents. The Law Commission has recommended to the government that known donors should have the right to become legal parents in a court process. These changes have not yet been made (Young, 2005)

Child custody

Another way that a lesbian couple may have children is when one parent gains custody from a previous relationship. Theorists argue that lesbians are discriminated against by the courts in custody hearings (Bennet & Abbit, 1992; Duran-Aydintug & Causey, 2001). In New Zealand, there are laws against discrimination based on sexual orientation in court, but this is not to say that no indirect discrimination happens in practice rather than in the law. Inequalities may be embedded not only in law, but in procedure, which is the state's way of functioning. In America, statistics show that a lesbian mother's likelihood of success is no more than 50% compared with the standard maternal custody award of 90% (Duran-Aydintug & Causey, 2001). As Bennet and Abbit (1992) argue, "since judges are most often white, older, middle-aged, straight men enforcing their own value system, a lesbian goes into court two strikes against her before anyone says a word" (p. 94). Similarly, Boyd (1992) has noted that in custody cases, judges often focus on women's sexual behaviour rather than on issues of the welfare or primary care of the child. Often the peer group argument is brought up in hearings. This

argument is that children may be discriminated against because of their parent's sexuality (for example in school), and therefore it may not be best for the child to live with that parent. In the "Lavender Island" survey, 23.6% of respondents with children said there had been problems at school directly related to their sexuality, 8.2% reported problems at clubs or sport, and 5.8% reported problems with health care providers (Henrickson, 2005). In an Australian study, 27% of lesbian and gay parents reported negative experiences with their children's healthcare that relate back to their own sexuality (McNair, 2003).While this evidence can be seen as a disadvantage to the child/children, as Boyd argues, this is a case of allowing one discriminatory act to condone another. Discrimination in the public sphere is used to justify not allowing child custody to a gay or lesbian parent (Boyd, 1992). Here, the traditional family structure is implied as the better and healthier environment for a child.

This logic pervades the legal system in my view. We can note that in the New Zealand Law Commission report, which recommended adoption rights for lesbians, stated, "The way in which gay or lesbian people plan to take account of their sexual orientation when raising the child - for example, whether they plan to provide appropriate models - would be an extra element for a social worker to consider" (New Zealand Law Commission, 1999, para. 188). The language of this report implies that lesbian identity is an obstacle that lesbians must "deal with" with caution, and further, that lesbian couples are less likely than heterosexual couples to exhibit appropriate behaviour presumably in relation to gender.

State policy in practice

Finally, I would like to take one last look at the New Zealand Census data in order to show how these inequalities manifest themselves in reality. Despite the relatively small number of people that are identified as same-sex couples with children, one obvious difference between same-sex couples and heterosexual sexual couples that does show up is that the majority of same-sex couples have one child. In 1996, of the 684 couples with children, 50.9% had one child, compared with 34.4% of heterosexual couples, and in 2001, 44.4% had one child compared with

35.3% of heterosexual couples. We can also note the majority of people in same-sex relationships that have children have a relatively high income with the majority of families with a household income of over $40,000 per year, and the most number of families in the $50-70,000 range (Statistics New Zealand, 2001). What these figures point to is that same-sex couples are more likely to be in a position of relative privilege before starting a family is an option for them, and that when they do, they only have one child. Though we cannot point to state policy alone to explain these differences, I think it is safe to say that it would be a contributing factor. The state prevents lesbians from adopting, which might be a viable option for many if it were possible, and it also prevents free access to fertility treatment which means lesbians must be wealthy enough to pay for treatment. If these inequalities are to even out, a beginning step would be to change state policy.

The lesbian family and the state

The focus of this paper has been on the way in which the New Zealand state restricts a lesbian's ability to have a family. I have argued that the discrepancy of rights between heterosexual (especially married) couples and lesbian couples reflect an ideology embedded in state law and jurisdiction that the heterosexual, nuclear family is "normal" and "healthy". While thinking has changed significantly in recent times about lesbian identity, and the state has reflected this change through policy reform such as the Civil Union bill, and a myriad of anti-discrimination laws, it is still "catching up" in terms of family law. This is characteristic of the way that state law in general usually lags behind actual family practices. As we have seen, in the areas of adoption, artificial insemination, and child custody, lesbian women are significantly disadvantaged in relation to heterosexual women. In the area of adoption, lesbian couples are by law unable to adopt. Similarly, I have noted the way in which lesbian women have been discriminated against in the courtroom. The inequality in the law is only part of a larger pattern of the discrimination against lesbian families, but state law is the area where lesbians are overtly discriminated against.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Maureen Baker and Vivienne Elizabeth for their encouragement and support.

References

Anleu, S. (1999). *Deviance, conformity and control.* Melbourne: Longman.

Bennett, R., & Abbit, D. (1992). On being a lesbian mother. In B. Burzon (Ed.), *Positively gay: New approaches to gay and lesbian life.* (pp. 93-101). Berkeley, CA: Celestial Arts Main Library.

Berry, R. (2006, July 11). Government may update law on gay adoptions. *The New Zealand Herald*, p. A3.

Brake, M. (1976). I may be queer, but at least I am a man: Male hegemony and ascribed versus achieved gender. In D. L. Barker & S. Allen (Eds.), *Sexual divisions and society: Process and change* (pp.174-198). London: Tavistock.

Boyd, S. B. (1992, March). What is a 'normal' family? C v C (A Minor) (Custody: Appeal). *The modern law review, 55* (2), 269-278.

Connell, R.W. (1990, October). The state, gender, and sexual politics: Theory and appraisal. *Theory and society*, 19 (5), 507-544.

Daniels, K. (1994, September). Review of the New Zealand government report into assisted reproduction (AHR). *Eubios ethics institute newsletter*, 4, 58-59.

Duran-Aydintug, C., & Causey, K. (2001). Child custody determination: Implications for lesbian mothers. In J. Lehman (Ed.), *The gay and lesbian marriage and family reader* (pp. 47-64). New York: Richard Altschuler & Associates Inc.

Elliot, D. (2005). Australia and gay and lesbian rights. *Peace review: A journal of social justice, 27*, 137-142.

Foucault, M. (1990). *History of sexuality: Volume one: The will to knowledge* (Robert Hurley, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Family types. (2004). Statistics New Zealand. Retrieved April 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.stats.govt.nz/analytical-reports/looking-past-20th-century/changes-in-society/family-types.htm

Fertility clinic for lesbians. (n.d.). Retrieved April 1, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.gaylawnet.com/news/2002/iv02.htm

Henrickson, M. (2005). Lavender parents. *Social policy journal of New Zealand, 26*, 68-83.

Hyman, P. (2003). Lesbians and gay men flirting with/disengaging from vital statistics: Same sex relationships and the NZ census 1971/2001. *Hecate, 29* (2), 248-261.

Jenkins, P. (1998). *Moral panic: Changing concepts of the child molester in modern America.* New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.

Mason, K., & Selman, P. (n.d.). Adoption: better choices for our children: Annex B. research on same-Sex parenting. *Scottish executive publications.* Retrieved May 15, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2005/06/27140607/07123

Morgain, R. (2004, October). Sexual liberation: fighting lesbian and gay oppression. *Class and struggle in Australia seminar series*, Australian National University (Conference paper), 1-12.

McNair, R. P. (2003). Lesbian health inequalities: A cultural minority issue for health professionals. *The medical journal of Australia, 178* (12), 643-645.

New Zealand Law Commission (1999). *Adoption: Options for reform: A discussion paper*, NZLC PP38, Wellington, New Zealand pp. 1-198

Pritchard, C. (2005). The discourses of homosexual law reform. In A. Kirkman, & P. Moloney (Eds.), *Sexuality down under: Social and historical perspectives* (pp. 67-76). Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.

Rubin, G. (1993). Thinking sex: Notes of radical theory of the politics of sexuality. In H, Abelove, M. Barale, & D. Halperin (Eds.), *The lesbian and gay studies reader* (pp.3-44). New York: Routledge.

Stacey, J., & Biblarz, T. J. (2001 April). (How) Does the sexual orientation of parent's matter? *American sociological review, 66*, 159-183.

Statistics New Zealand (2001). Table 11: Same-sex couples with child(ren) in private occupied dwellings, 1996 and 2001 (1) Retrieved March 10, 2006, from Statistics New Zealand Database

Weeks, J. (1981). *Sex, politics and society: The regulation of sexuality since 1880.* New York: Wesley Langman Inc.

Young, D.W. (2005, April 30). Birth rights: Are gay families really so different from other New Zealand families. *The Listener, 198* (3390) 14-19.

Celine Wills recently graduated MA (Hons) in Sociology from the University of Auckland.

Closing Plenary, SAANZ conference, University of Waikato, November 2006

Australia and New Zealand - looking backward, looking forward and the parting of ways

Peter Beilharz

Abstract

This is a revised version of the closing plenary given to the SAANZ Conference in Waikato, November 2006. I opened and closed the event with music, with a Rockwiz segment using two Australian classics from 1971, which the audience were asked unsuccessfully to identify – not a surprising outcome, as these were apparently one-sided. The first was "Gonna see my baby tonight", the La De Das, b. Auckland and biracial. The second was Healing Force, "Golden miles", formed in Australia, but a similar composition, including the legendary Charlie Tumahai. The point is evident: some of the greatest achievements of Oz rock are in fact trans-Tasman, in the fullest sense. I concluded by asking the audience to raise their invisible glasses to the spirit of Charlie Tumahai, and to the prospect of our collaboration in Auckland for the 2007 event.

The trans-Tasman world used to be one story, or at least two stories that were interconnected. Somewhere after the Second World War there was a parting of ways. The national, and nationalist narratives which expanded then elsewhere characterised Australasia as well. This parting includes a fascinating story about sociology as a nationalist form, a parting of ways across the Tasman and their tentative reconnection, the latter symbolised not least in the 2007 New Zealand/Aotearoa-Australia combined Sociology Conference.

My cue to look back, before looking forward, is Edward Bellamy's famous book of that title published in 1888. Its full title was *Looking backward from the year 2000*, so it sets up the optic nicely in terms of past and future. *Looking backward* takes the form of the classic sleeper wakes

utopia. Its subject is transported into the socialist future in Boston as a garden city in the year 2000. Bellamy's book is of far greater sociological than literary import. It became the second biggest selling novel in nineteenth century America, after *Uncle Tom's cabin*. There were 165 Bellamy Clubs established across the United States in the nineteenth century. The book was also widely influential across the Tasman. *Looking Backward* was important to the thinking of the younger William Pember Reeves. He discussed it in his 1890 Pharos pamphlet on utopia, after he had summarised it in the *Lyttleton Times* in the same year. *Looking backward* sold like hotcakes in New Zealand. At least two separate editions of Bellamy's book were published in the South Island alone, and immediately, one by James Horsborough in Dunedin, 1891, one by Whitcombe and Tombs in Christchurch, 1890 (Roth, 1962, p. 232; Kumar, 1987). The New Zealand response was breathless.

> "Sold out again of *Looking Backward*", announced bookseller W. Wildman [!] in the *Auckland Star* of April 19 [1890]. "Fresh supply of 500 copies will be here in a few days" ... In the Dunedin *Evening Star* of April 17, 1890, Joseph Braithwaite, of Braithwaite's Book Arcade, announced: "I have sold about 5000 copies of this marvellous Socialistic book since I reviewed it in the *Star* about six months ago." Another thousand copies from England were to arrive at Braithwaite's on April 23. They sold out within two days; but fortunately, another thousand copies were expected on April 20. (Roth, 1962, p. 232)

In Australia, Bellamy's initial influence was northern, in Brisbane, and connected to William Lane. Bellamyism was a kind of period equivalent to Fabianism, popular to the point of radical ubiquity. In Australia, this influence likely peaked into the 1890s. In New Zealand, Bellamyism was presenced at the same time, and indicated, and then revived into the thirties, in Bellamy Clubs via the influence of Alexander Scott. A stronger twentieth century impulse was then subsumed into the politics of the Savage Government (Bowman, 1962).

Plainly Australia, and perhaps especially New Zealand, saw itself in utopia (Fairburn, 1989; Sargisson and Tower Sargent, 2004). This fitted period sensibilities – motifs of experiment, new beginning, social

laboratory, and especially in New Zealand, the utopia of climate and landform, the dream of the green and pleasant land. In New Zealand, as Miles Fairburn shows, it coincides with claims to both natural and moral superiority of New Zealand and New Zealanders over others. This connects to the symbolic significance in Bellamy of the garden city, and its associated themes of harmony, order and leisure built upon a substrate of material sufficiency (*Thesis Eleven*, 2008). More vitally, it signals the period optimism for the possibility of social alternatives, the potential plasticity of social arrangements, relations and institutions, the possibility of social change and the fluidity of conceptual time, where "back" might be "forwards" and movement forwards might also include significant components of the past. Contrary to the claim of William Morris, Edward Bellamy was not an "unmixed modernist" (Beilharz, 2004; cf Beilharz, 1992).

Whatever the case, utopianism was a vital trans-Tasman symbol of cultural traffic across the world system and oceans. Then, as now, there was a transnational flow of ideas, people, print, institutions and alliances. Everybody knows different examples of these processes of trans-Tasman traffic. In music, they are obvious – from Johnny Devlin to Split Enz, Crowded House, via Dinah Lee, The La de das, Compulsion, Dragon, Sharon O'Neill, Jenny Morris and the Datsuns. Max Merritt did no less than introduce soul music to Australia, and New Zealanders have done better than Australians in cataloguing this, as in the major study by John Dix, *Stranded in paradise* (Dix, 2005).

In politics, the case of Mickey Savage stands out. Born in the Mallee, in northwestern Victoria in 1872, he became New Zealand Prime Minister in 1935, leading a cabinet which included six Australians, five New Zealanders, an Englishman and a Scot. What's remarkable about this is that it was unremarkable – there was no fuss about Aussie invasion, for personnel from either side of the Tasman in this period were viewed as practically interchangeable.

Make your own list: Tom Mann; Truby-King; R.F. Irvine, who returns to our concerns later; Lloyd Ross. The writers, then the actors. Add as you like. Phar Lap; Joh Bjelke Petersen; Fred Dagg; *Suburban Mayhem*; more historians, Freddie Wood, Peter Hempenstall, Pat Grimshaw,

sociologists like Mick Borrie. More politicians: between 1893 and 1912 two more New Zealand Prime Ministers, Seddon and Ward, came from or via Australia, while Australia's first Labor Prime Minister, Watson, had spent the previous twenty years of his life in New Zealand. Watson was briefly Prime Minister of Australia in 1904, at the same time as an Australian was PM of New Zealand. Etcetera.

As to institutions, Wakefield settlement was common not only to Christchurch and Dunedin, but also to Adelaide via Perth. Arbitration, as contested in its identity as the pavlova, was established by Pember Reeves in New Zealand in 1894, Higgins in Australia 1904, influenced by the experience of wages boards in Victoria, Wise's experience in NSW and Kingston's experience in Adelaide. As Philippa Mein Smith argues, this indicates that what Paul Kelly called Australian was in fact an Australasian Settlement (Mein Smith, 2005). The Maritime Strike, of course, was intercolonial, in this sense Australasian, as was the potential ambit of Australian Federation. This was a whole Trans-Tasman world, which we have lost, replayed fast forward finally into the 1980s by the matched process of the transformation of Labour parties.

How, then, are we to name or make sense of this process? As Philippa Mein-Smith puts it, Australia and New Zealand are two sovereign states with a shared past but separate memories. The latter observation can be read in two ways – that there are two sets of stories, or two sets of historians and historiographies. The idea of *Australasia* captures something of the larger story. Plainly it is also a *Pacific* story, a useful, postwar term that includes the influence of the USA and includes water, and others, but marginalises Western Australia in a tandem process to the way New Zealand is usually marginalised by the predominance of the Australian east coast. *Oceania* perhaps captures New Zealand broadly better than Australia, though both have in common the culture of largely English-speaking maritime pacific cities, this again at the expense of the Australian north and west. We could refer back to the image of the social laboratory, or *Two New Britannias*, or two provincial modernisms to connect the experiences. We could call them both *Neo-Europes*, after Alfred Crosby's idea of ecological imperialism. We could think of this in older fashioned terms, as *imperial, commonwealth* or *colonial*

history or histories – in Australia, at least, contemporary history is still profoundly colonial, city-based or regional. Or we could call all this *transnational*, though I'm not sure that captures it.

There is a long tradition of established work, like Fry and Olsen's *Common cause* (1986), which reaches through Sinclair's *Tasman relations* (1988) to the work of Denoon, Mein-Smith and others, and exemplary comparative labour analysis like that of James Bennett in *Rats and revolutionaries – Labour movements in Australia and New Zealand 1890-1940* (2004). In general, it seems that transnationalism is stronger in literature and perhaps history than it is in social sciences. Sometimes transnationalism feels like cultural studies in the weak, culturalist sense, which privileges the text over the state or simply leaves states out.

This process could also, alternatively be called *antipodean*, which has been my ambit claim over the last ten years. Following the example of the cultural historian Bernard Smith, my book *Imagining the antipodes* follows two core claims: that the antipodes is a relationship rather than a place (opening a paradox: which antipodes? whose antipodes?); and that culture is mediated by traffic rather than emanating from place (Beilharz, 1997). The idea of the antipodes has received a new fillip from the revived enthusiasm of J. G. A. Pocock for the idea in his collection *The discovery of islands*, though this is a usage independent of Bernard Smith (Pocock, 2005). It also results in David Pearson's enthusiasm for the idea in his essay, "Connecting the antipodes" (Pearson, 2005).

This curiosity regarding the antipodes overlaps with the case for settler colonialism, settler capitalism, colonialism and provincialism (Beilharz, 2007; Beilharz and Cox, 2007). It connects to earlier curiosities regarding the social laboratory into the twentieth century, this revived as the Great Experiment into the 1980s. It parallels, or complements, the trans-Tasman version of the exceptionalist argument in policy studies (Castles, Gerritsen and Vowles, 1996), where Australasia is both different and sometimes leads, in this case with Labour anticipating Blair. It complements the idea of the Australasian Settlement. The point is to connect, or to see the connections and interactions, to recognise but work with and perhaps against the stronger ethnographic tradition – in New Zealand, in Littledene, Caversham, Johnsonville, in Australia, in

the community studies tradition, to open up to comparison, to work against academic and methodological nationalism. As Jock Phillips put it, writing about verandahs and fish and chips in 1990, and here addressing historians, we need to understand subcultures, but also supercultures: "To get beyond the national framework may be the next challenge for cultural historians in New Zealand" (Phillips, 2001, p. 336) – and Australia too, sociologists included.

The question then arises, how did the stories that connected the Tasman become separated in the first place? For this does indeed seem to be the case, that a century ago they were connected or told both separately and together. In Pember Reeves' classics, *Aotearoa The long white cloud* (1898) and *State experiments in Australia and New Zealand* (1902) the stories were told both ways, as narrative and as policy innovation. Albert Metin routinely covered both in *Le Socialisme sous Doctrines* (1901), as did Victor S. Clark in *The labor movement in Australasia* (1906). Clark's opening lines made the co-constitution clear:

> The term Australasia is used to include the Commonwealth of Australia and the Colony of New Zealand, lands separated by 1200 miles of water, but intimately connected in social and industrial development .... (Clark, 1906, p. 1)

– co-constituted as producers, labour markets and labour movements, fields of ideas, traditions and innovations, but also combined by empire, masculinism, and racism, through together to Gallipoli.

The two stories here are always connected, as in the Nineteenth Century Series, where R.F. Irvine and O.T.J. Alpers offer *The progress of New Zealand in the nineteenth century* (1902) and T.A. Coghlan and T.T. Ewing survey *The progress of Australasia in the nineteenth century* (1903). Here there are two statistical bases for measuring progress, but related stories of social experiment and advance. Coghlan followed with *Australia and New Zealand 1903-4*. Irvine was a proverbial antipodean – born in the Shetland Islands 1858, educated in New Zealand, migrating from New Zealand in 1891, later to become Professor of Economics at Sydney University. Australia and New Zealand are still connected in the standard Cambridge History of the Empire. Separation, posited by Australian federation in 1901, emerges more clearly especially with World War Two.

In 1940 E.H. McCormick published *Letters and art in New Zealand* (McCormick, 1940). It was part of those thirteen russet coloured volumes that made up the New Zealand Centennial Series – a most valuable period source auspiced by the Department of Internal Affairs, especially when read together with the two illustrated volumes of *Making New Zealand, 1939-40*. McCormick viewed the colonial spirit as the national spirit. The motif of the parting of ways, however, was not new. McCormick traced the emergence of national spirit from the 1890s – only here the separation was more from Britain than Australia. According to McCormick, the national spirit revives in the '30s, after the earlier revival of Anglo enthusiasm in World War One. The period parallel in Australia is to be found in Bernard Smith's *Place, taste and tradition* in 1945. Smith's project was to establish the national, but not nationalist style and history of Australian painting. This led later to his writing of the *Antipodean manifesto* in 1960 (Smith, 1945; Beilharz, 1997).

McCormick and Smith's earlier works were both shadowed by world affairs, in the war against fascism. This was the same period in which significant journals like *Meanjin* (1942) and *Landfall* (1947) were established. After World War Two the struggle for a national canon becomes more evident, in both cases, in literature, art, later film. It is also apparent in nationalist historiography, in the quest for national identity or character, in Australia, in the work of Manning Clark (6 volumes, 1962-1987) and Russell Ward's *Australian legend* (1958). In New Zealand, the project was carried by Oliver and Sinclair, until the seismic shift engineered by Jamie Belich. The irony of the postwar process of national canon construction is that it has premodern roots, as in Herder, but comes to fruition after Hitler, where culture is read as place – a dangerous view, as fascism showed. Modernism, on the other hand, leads to abstract international style and empty cosmopolitanism, though its sidestreams turn back to provincialism and regional style. Provincialism triumphs, in some ways, on both sides of the Tasman, as the combination of a false sense of superiority with a heightened anxiety about always missing out on the impulse of real life in the metropoles. Twentieth century nationalism, in other words, is also a response to the different waves of globalization.

A further emergent contrast here can be seen in two more comparison volumes from 1947. Hartley Grattan edited the *Australia* volume for the Cambridge University and University of California series. One clear theme here is the coincidence of nationalism and nation-building via the specific instance of Canberra, the city that never dug in because it was not a colony or a port city. Here we are reminded that proposed names for Canberra included Wattle City – Empire City – Aryan City – and Utopia! The general concern in Grattan's volume is with the emergence of national style in art and writing, this dominated by place, literally environment in contrast to the British metropolis. Geography, not traffic, is now presumed to form culture (Grattan, 1947).

Belshaw's tandem volume on *New Zealand* follows the same shift from geography to culture, and includes the same self-deprecation of local culture as philistine. It connects pioneer culture to loneliness, nostalgia, romanticism. Place is central, here, and so is place writing. As in Australia, momentarily, the Labour Party is viewed as the nation-builder:

> According to the political slogan adopted by the Labor Party after 1935, New Zealanders were to set about building a nation. To the Labour Party, with its strong anti rural bias, this meant industrialization. (Fairburn, 1989, p. 248)

– though in culture, place still rules. Perhaps, given this, we should not be surprised to discover that neither of these two books refers to the other. Place now rules. What is really striking about both these books is that they show the co-constitutive relationship between internationalism and nationalism. Commissioned by the United Nations, they show how clearly internationalism depends on a prior nationalism. Thus, by 1947, the two stories are mutually exclusive – these are two distinct worlds, two different cultures.

And now? I shall not discuss Belich's two volumes here, partly because the obvious parallel is with Manning Clark in the Australian literature. These two massive projects become some kind of new orthodoxy, partly, again, because of their sheer volume and magisterial extent. Moving towards a conclusion, let me instead compare two smaller

books, of modest compass, and more difficult task – the single volume Cambridge concise histories of Australia and New Zealand by Stuart Macintyre and Philippa Mein Smith. Macintyre's short history of Australia includes New Zealand in index and in text. Macintyre is a frequent visitor to New Zealand, an Australian scholar who takes the connection seriously. His book is the result of the previous waves in historiography, history from below, where the cast of social actors expands in the direction of popular inclusivity, and federation nationalism is read as racially constructed and gender-bound, while there is also a newer horizon, modernity, beyond capitalism (Macintyre, 1999). Mein Smith's book is riding a new wave, for it is also built within family biography and the Tasman World Marsden project which begins with, or corresponds to transnationalism (Mein Smith, 2005). This also raises the question, especially on the New Zealand side, of asymetrical relations across the Tasman. Australians more routinely overlook New Zealand, though they also overlook their own peripheries north, south and west. Yet there are so many stories that can be told together, either because they are inseparable or else because the contrast and comparison is enlightening.

I began this survey here in company with Edward Bellamy, looking backward, looking forward. The point about utopia is that it persists, as an orienting device, even after the collapse of communism and social democracy and the absolute pervasion of postmodern irony and consumerist defeatism. We know we can do better, and we know we can do better across the Tasman.

Sociology is impossible without the idea of utopia, understood not as a state of affairs to be realised but as a persistent impulse to reform, towards the goal of the good life as the widely distributed prerequisite of the good polity. The added, antipodean dimension follows – that if to look backward is also to look forward, and vice-versa, then we also need again now to look sideways, at each other, and not only northward.

References

Beilharz, P. (1992). *Labour's utopias – Bolshevism, fabianism, social democracy*, London: Routledge.

Beilharz, P. (1997). *Imagining the antipodes – Culture, theory and the visual in the work of Bernard Smith.* Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Beilharz, P. (2004). Looking back: Marx and Bellamy. *The European Legacy*, 9/5.

Beilharz, P. (2006). Two new Britannias – Modernism and modernity across the antipodes. *Journal of Australian Cultural History*, 25.

Beilharz, P. and Cox, L. (2007). Settler capitalism revisited. *Thesis Eleven*, 88.

Belshaw, H. (ed.) (1947). *New Zealand*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bennett, J. (2004). *Rats and revolutionaries – The labour movement in Australia and New Zealand 1890-1940*. Otago: University of Otago Press.

Bowman, S. (ed.) (1962). *Edward Bellamy abroad: An American prophet's influence*. New York: Twayne.

Castles, F. R. Gerritsen and J. Vowles (1996). *The great experiment*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Clark, V. S. (1906). *The labor movement in Australasia*. New York: Burt Franklin.

Dix, J. (2005). *Stranded in paradise. New Zealand rock and roll 1955 to the modern era*. Ringwood: Penguin.

Fairburn, A. R. P. (1962). Literature and the arts. In H. Belshaw (ed.), *New Zealand*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fairburn, M. (1989). *The ideal society and its enemies*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Fry, E. (ed.) (1986). *Common cause – Essays on Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Grattan, H. (ed.) (1947). *Australia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kumar, K. (1987). *Utopia and anti-utopia in modern times*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Macintyre, S. (1999). *A concise history of Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

McCormick, E. H. (1940). *Letters and art in New Zealand*. Wellington: Department of Internal Affairs.

Mein Smith, P. (2005). *A concise history of New Zealand*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, P. (2005). Reconnecting the antipodes, *Thesis Eleven*, 82.

Phillips, J. (2000). Of verandahs and fish and chips. In J. Binney (ed.). *The shaping of history*. Wellington: Bridget Williams.

Pocock, J. G. A. (2005). *The discovery of islands – Essays in British history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roth, H. (1962). Bellamy societies of ... New Zealand. In S. Bowman (ed.). *Edward Bellamy abroad*. New York: Twayne.

Sargisson, L. and L. Tower Sargent (2004). *Living in utopia – New Zealand's intentional communities*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Sinclair, K. (ed.) (1988). *Tasman relations – New Zealand and Australia, 1788-1988*, Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Smith, B. (1945). *Place, taste and tradition*. Sydney: Ure Smith.

Thesis Eleven (2008). Number 92: Special issue on New Zealand modernity.

Peter Beilharz is Professor of Sociology and Director of the Thesis Eleven Centre for Critical Theory at La Trobe University, Australia. He is author of many books, including *Imagining the Antipodes* (1997). He was Chief Investigator of the ARC project Social Division and the Pursuit of Harmony in the Antipodes across the Twentieth Century, which includes trans-Tasman analysis by Lloyd Cox and a doctoral dissertation on William Pember Reeves by Darrell Bennetts. He is planning a new project on the history of rock music in Australia with Trevor Hogan and Clinton Walker.

Making political science matter: Debating knowledge, research, and method
Schram, S. F., & Caterino, B. (eds.) (2006). New York: New York University Press.

Reviewed by Tamika Simpson

This collection uses the debate about Bent Flyvbjerg's (2001) book *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again,* to continue a conversation about rejuvenating political science. In the papers republished from the journal *Politics & Society* David Laitin and Flyvbjerg accuse each other of misunderstanding and lack of innovation as they present opposing views of how political science should be done. Against Laitin's suggestion that phronesis (a concept on which much of the collection is focused) be incorporated with statistics and formal modelling, Flyvbjerg defends his vision for phronetic social science, partly by arguing that mainstream political science produces knowledge for its own sake. Drawing on Aristotle, Nietzsche, Foucault, Bourdieu and others, a major part of Flyvbjerg's argument is that social science should stop trying to emulate what the natural sciences do.

According to the editors of this collection, Flyvbjerg urges "phronetic social science" for the following interrelated reasons:

- Because human interaction is contingent, social inquiry is best suited to the critical assessment of values, norms, power structures, dominance and questions of what we should do;
- Because social inquiry comes from practical (rather than theoretical) reason and involvement with social life, it entails a context-dependent view which rests on judgement;
- Because the social world is historical and narrative, understanding cannot be grasped analytically;
- Because understanding is subjective, researchers need to be in dialogue with participants (p. 9).

Overall, Flyvbjerg "promotes problem-driven research that uses multiple methods as necessary to address problems in ways that can inform and empower the people being studied" (p. 11).

Repeated themes, in the four previously published papers and 10 new chapters by mostly United States-based authors, include: the necessity of dialogue and engagement amongst political scientists and between political scientists and political actors; the need to study what politics means to people; creating room for more diverse forms of political science and mixed methodologies; seeing things in an "and" rather than "or" kind of way; situated practical understandings versus predictive theory; the ability of interpretive work to produce explanations as well as descriptions; success being measured in the contribution and use by political actors of the research; and, recognition that there are many and varied projects.

At a broad level much of the collection pivots on who does and who does not support the Perestroikan movement (provided fuel by Flyvbjerg's book) and its efforts to make political science "more relevant in understanding not just the problems political scientists address in their studies but also the problems actors confront in the field of political struggle" (p. 2). The proffered vision is of civic-minded scholarship which challenges power and improves society (p.8). Included with the supporters is Steward Clegg, whose account is developed from his 1989 book *Frameworks of power.* Beyond this high-level positioning, authors on both sides variously suggest that Flyvbjerg is unaware of work already underway and therefore is not especially innovative, is too narrow, too broad, and misconstrues and misuses the theorists he calls on. Most authors then go on in the standard way to present their own ideas about what should be done in the discipline. Though this format aids clarity, it is pretty dull and as it is utilised in this collection by both those for and those against the Perestroikans, it makes the collection a pretty dry read when tackled from beginning to end.

This problem of lack of vitality is exacerbated because authors show their knowledge of this or that theorist in a detached way, perhaps indicating a struggle to meet the word limit. At times I wondered whether they were responding to Flyvbjerg at all given his absence in the texts (although, it is noted in a number of places that his books act as recent material entities for the debate rather than being at its core). At other times I was frustrated with yet another Flyvbjerg overview without

dealing with any of his ideas in particular. The editorial decision to include many authors does show the people involved in the debate and is useful for seeing a variety of ideas in one place (see for example Brian Caterino's chapter "Power and interpretation"), which can then be followed up if they happen to appeal, but these clipped papers have not produced convincing arguments, let-alone inspiring ones for what might count as good political science.

Some detailed analysis using empirical material to illustrate what is being proposed rather than occasional undeveloped examples and many examinations of Aristotle's phronesis, would have added some liveliness to the arguments presented. One partial attempt is from Corey Shdaimah and Roland Stahl who reflect on doing phronetic social science using their study of home ownership politics in Philadelphia. Even here however I was left with the feeling of not being provided with something to really get to grips with as the study was designed as participatory action research, and the authors "leave for future discussion the exact relationship between AR and phronetic research" (p.113). Though Shdaimah and Stahl note the tensions between them as researchers and the political activists in their close involvement during the research, the specifics were left out. Flyvbjerg and many of the authors here call for more dialogue in general, but the lack of real-world research shown in this collection does not walk the talk of the call for engagement with political actors in their attempts to make a good world.

The absence of real-world research in the collection is surprising given that one of the reasons for Flyvbjerg's high profile was his combination of theory and practice in his 1998 book *Rationality and power: Democracy in practice,* which reports his study of town planning in the Danish city of Aarlborg. This absence is also interesting given that Flyvbjerg argues that doing social research requires judgement and experience - researchers need to be out in the world (see Leslie Thiele's chapter). While it is totally unfair to compare a whole book dedicated to a long-term study to a collection of short papers from many authors, more visibility for the type of empirical work these authors advocate could perhaps have attracted more supporters to the Perestroikan movement.

One reason those outside of political science might seek out this collection would be to help them reflect on what they currently feel about these kinds of debates and divides. Sanford Schram provides a useful list of the "hierarchy of assumptions" the Perestroikans are attempting to challenge in political science, which could be applied to any number of research fields and academic departments (pp. 18-19). Reflection on our own situations is made most easy by Gregory Kasza who addresses a number of questions directly to graduate students. This is a welcome change to the standard format, and while this chapter slips into sweeping assertions and away from supported argument, it indicates to those unfamiliar with this debate as it is being played out in political science, the extant anger (as do Laitin's and Flyvbjerg's), particularly in regard to the practical matters of publishing, teaching curriculums and the possibilities for what might be considered a doctoral thesis. It was seeing this anger and frustration underway somewhere else that held my interest. I suggest you dip in and out of the collection to avoid being left feeling frustrated, which does a disservice to many of the ideas and arguments presented and the efforts of those mounting the challenge.

Sociology: Place, time & division.
Beilharz, P., & Hogan, T. (eds.). (2006). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Reviewed by Warwick Tie

"These are my principles", instructed Groucho Marx, "and if you don't like them ... well I have others". This same sense of inventive pragmatism reflects the position on contemporary sociology taken by sociologists Peter Beilharz and Trevor Hogan in their recently edited, entry-level text for Australian students *Sociology: Place, time & division.* Sociology's public image is fast approaching crisis point, they suggest, so indistinguishable has it become from "miserablism", from a missionary-like position that skeptically dismisses its audiences' popular cultures as sites of false consciousness, pathetic ploys to re-enchant the life-world, and so on. In mantra-like mode, introductory courses then instruct students that "everything they believe in or find interesting is rubbish". And we wonder why we get invited to so few parties. In the vacuum which thereafter opens up in students' minds, lecturers then bedazzle with bold tales of exotic theories confirmed and of complicated research methodologies staking out new frontiers of knowledge.

How far contemporary critical sociology has strayed from its activist roots! In the heyday of 1960s social ferment, sociology was public property. The critique of social formations was largely propelled not by professionals speaking highly elaborated codes but by social activists wrestling with direct experiences of exploitation and domination. How might something of that populism be rekindled? How might sociology be reformed such that it can "meet everyday life" rather than "trash it"? What would this mean for the engagement of students in entry-level sociology courses? Such are the questions that animate *Sociology.*

The text makes three responses. The first appears in the style by which the various contributors present their insights on Australian society. That style comprises short, self-consciously partial "slices" of thought on topics as wide as Australasian/Pacific Rim cities, Australian history, cultural entities (such as work, food, film, sport, cars, and backyards), social divisions and their trajectories, and so forth. The

contributors follow the model of refreshing unpretentiousness displayed in the editors' own entries, expressing themselves as essayists rather than as practitioners of finely-graded exegesis, following the maxim that such texts "should invite, not inoculate".

Second, the primary pedagogical goal with entry-level students is to incite them to speak, "to tell their own stories, now", not at some future point when they feel they have enough theory and methodology under their belts to legitimate their narratives. A recurring issue in the presentation of sociology has turned upon this matter of legitimacy, on the auspices upon which accounts of the study of social life might stand. The discipline is at risk of asserting its own auspices, this text suggests, through the act of silencing those to whom it speaks. Unless we're in the deliberate business of creating clones, *Sociology* suggests, this strategy is untenable. Instead, "(O)ur purpose is to promote thinking, expression, criticism, problem-solving, do-it-yourself".

Third, the text creates an explicit alliance between sociology, history and geography. This suggests the development of a strategic block to challenge the prevailing hegemony of media and cultural studies. A cunning plan, perhaps. History and geography provide the conceptual ground and academic legitimacy for explorations of time and place, respectively, to which sociology adds its classical concerns with social division. Might this herald a new Trinity capable of rekindling lapsed devotion?

I find much of value in this attempt to construct a sociology that entices its audiences to speak from the outset, of a sociology that demonstrates itself to be both in and of the world rather than a sceptical outsider. Perhaps, however, the end to which it incites students to speak, that is, to "tell their stories, now", might have a conserving rather than illuminating effect. The instruction to talk doesn't necessarily enable those instructed to tell their stories any differently from the tales of good intentions gone bad that characterize popular discourse. While the text invites us to climb into bed with historians and geographers in order to narrate our lives in alternative ways, we might find some new students, in their underdeveloped abilities to discriminate well, seeking pleasure with the cadaver-cold rational-choice economist that they've

happened to slip between our sheets. C. Wright-Mills has much to offer with regard to avoiding this unsavoury scenario. Under the influence of his "sociological imagination", the art of good story-telling involves the making of new connections between dimensions of social life, between the likes of personal life and society, local experience and globalisation, personal differences and social divisions, and so on. In a thoroughly Marxian manner, his approach might offer a principled addition to *Sociology's* most laudable suggestions about how we might introduce new newcomers to the art of thinking sociologically, and one that is not so grand as to make them choke.

Science, values and politics in Max Weber's methodology (new expanded edition)
Bruun, H. H. (2007). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Reviewed by Kevin Dew

If you are interested in the politics of research, the foundations of methodological traditions in sociology, the paradoxes of social inquiry or Max Weber, this may be a good book for you. However, you will have to work through Bruun's rather repetitive style and deal with some quite obscure debates on the way. This is a text in the "rethinking classical sociology" series, which assumes that "each generation feels compelled to re-examine its sociological heritage" (xv). A theme running through the book is the contradictory and paradoxical nature of Weber's thought, but Bruun argues that this is not a result of poor scholarship but a genuine reflection of the contradictions and paradoxes embedded in social inquiry that Weber refused to resile from. As you journey through the book you will come across asides that provide some fascinating insight into the life and times of Weber, for example, Weber describing one of his contemporaries as a "sticky insect" and "slimy entity" (59).

The introduction is perhaps the least accessible part of the book, much of it is taken up with the extent of convergence between Weber's work and that of Rickert. Chapter one explores aspects of Weber's demand for the value freedom of scientific inquiry and Bruun argues that Weber was the first to think through the implications of value freedom for the social sciences. For Weber: "To mix up prescriptive demands with scientific questions is the work of the Devil" (62). The "is" and the "ought" cannot be scientifically linked because the sphere of science and the sphere of values "are logically absolutely different" (63). Weber does not deny that science itself is the product of, and based on, a set of values. The value of scientific truth is "not given to us by nature" (72), and may change across time and across cultures. However, Weber describes scientific truth as "objective" – hence avoiding the dreaded nihilistic relativism. Science alone has certain features that cannot be offered by other forms of truth – namely "concepts and judgements

that allow...[empirical] reality to be *ordered intellectually* in a valid manner" (72). Bruun does not clearly tease out what a "valid manner" might mean here, but one gets a flavour of what this might mean throughout the book.

Chapter 2 on "values as a precondition of scientific inquiry" is a particularly interesting one, outlining the nineteenth century debates between historicism and positivism, including debates about inductivist and theoretically informed approaches to research and the nomothetic (what is common) and idiographic (what is special) disciplines. Weber saw empirical reality as an "infinite multiplicity" (116), and that to surmount this infinity concepts were needed, and these concepts needed to be precise. In addition we must inevitably select from this complex reality certain phenomena – and we do this on the basis of what is "worthy of" interest (119). Hence the important role of the scientist's values in selecting phenomena for study – referred to by Weber as value relation. For Weber "the idea of the inexhaustibility of reality in its immediate aspect implies the existence of an equal, or perhaps even greater, infinity of potential causal explanations" (127). A "science of reality" or Wirklichkeitswissenschaft (isn't German wonderful), selects material from that reality. In the midst of this discussion Bruun cites Weber's delightful definition of culture as "a finite section of the meaningless infinity of events in the world, endowed with meaning and significance from the standpoint of human beings" (cited 132). In the cultural sciences the object of investigation is determined by "the value ideas which govern the investigator and are dominant in his age" (cited in 141). But once an object of investigation is chosen "questions of empirical fact and of causal connections must, and can...be answered by reference to 'objective' reality" (158). But how are we to determine a fact or causal connection?:

> We "get knowledge" of the intensive infinity of hist[orical] relationships by again and again introducing "thoughts" into it...by again and again conscientiously testing, on the basis of the material, whether these thoughts represent an "adequate" picture, or which form of thought and combination of thoughts, among several imaginable ones, represents the most adequate picture of the event that is at all possible." (159)

Chapter 3 looks at values as an object of scientific inquiry. Here we see Weber as an early advocate of reflexivity when he "strongly stresses the importance of being fully conscious of all the implications of one's own valuational standpoint" (169). This consciousness has two components – an axiological analysis which informs us of any inconsistencies in the values we hold, and a teleological analysis that informs us of the possible conflicts of action in the real world. Weber's concept of unintended consequences is introduced, where it is impossible to predict the precise direction of the results of action (188). Weber's response to this state of affairs is that it is a tragedy in which all action is enmeshed.

Chapter 4 deals with Weber's concept of the ideal type – the unreal but internally consistent mental image. Ideal types are categories that social scientists inevitably use to characterise some significant aspect of reality. Here Weber rejects an inductive approach to understanding reality as inductive theory "is based on the assumption that it is possible to reproduce the whole of reality in a concept" (210), implying a fundamental critique of Grounded Theory and phenomenological approaches to research. Whereas an inductive approach might see a concept as the end of the inquiry, Weber sees ideal types as an instrument of inquiry. The paradox and tension is apparent in Weber's thinking in that "In order to understand the real causal connections, we construct unreal ones" (cited in 216).

The final chapter argues that the concepts of conflict and power, which are central to Weber's view of politics, can be framed in relation to his methodological reflections. Weber's characterization of politics, according to Bruun, is "action whose intended consequences include, or are conditional on, the behaviour of other persons than the acting person himself" (240). Given Weber's view of the eternal conflict of values any chance of political harmony is dismissed. Politics then may involve compromise, but Weber insists that the scholar may not cover up these compromises. This is an important point in my current disciplinary site of public health, which demands action to improve the health of the population. The politician and the scholar are one, and as such, scholarly work itself is open to the compromise of politicians. Public health has

not separated the sphere of values and the sphere of scientific inquiry. If we take this further and consider Weber's position that the acceptance of political power "implies the acceptance of the risk of having to use violence" (247) – this throws a discipline like public health into an interesting light – as to continue with a Weberian analysis – there is "a fundamental axiological conflict between the political and the ethical sphere" (251). For Weber this relates to the ethics of conviction and the ethics of consequences (or Weber's term – the ethics of responsibility) debate – where someone who is committed to the former "will always sacrifice the goal in order to preserve the ethically correct character of his conduct" (251). Goal-oriented politics is therefore inherently unethical, something the scholar should not hide. In his discussion of politics Weber is again attending to potentially irreconcilable tensions between conviction and responsibility, and for Weber "it is immensely moving when a mature person (whether old or young) who actually feels with his whole soul the responsibility he bears for the consequences of his actions, and who acts on the basis of an ethic of responsibility, at some point says, "Here I stand, I can do no other"" (cited in 272).

Overall this is a very engaging but repetitive, difficult but enlightening, historical but surprisingly relevant book. Although it is quite a densely written text, it is thought provoking and provides a good source for reflections on methodological stances and the politics of the academy.

Sociologists in a global age: Biographical perspectives
Deflem, M. (ed.) (2007). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Reviewed by David Pearson

How many of us go to international conferences to see in person a sociologist whose work has achieved fame or notoriety, or wondered what the author of this book or article we are reading is really like? Perhaps we will protest that we are only interested in the text and its arguments or information, and to admit to a kind of mild voyeurism is superficial and inappropriate. Yet, if, as most first year sociology texts still assert, much of the sociological imagination ties back to Wright Mills' equation of private troubles and public issues, greater understanding of the background of our practitioners should aid our grasp of their perspectives.

I confess I opened this book with some anticipation, since, with very few exceptions, many of the contributors to this anthology (Albrow, Sassen, Munch, Morawska, Sztompka, Tiryakian, for example), were very familiar to me, but I knew nothing about what they looked like and their biographical backgrounds; or they were entirely new names and faces that I looked forward to reading about. In this sense, Mathieu Deflem's project succeeded in whetting my appetite, but fell short of providing a full menu.

The editor's aim was to bring together a variety of sociologists from across the world and request them to write about their personal journeys along the paths that brought them to their discipline and guided them through their careers. The contributors were asked to provide details about their autobiography and how this shaped their entry and continuance within their profession and to reflect on significant others and events that impacted on their lives and sociological work. They were also required to write about how their theoretical and/or methodological orientations related back to the social and intellectual contexts they found themselves in and to comment on how they saw their futures. This is a big ask, and few of the contributors really succeed in conveying all these aspects in a lively and accessible fashion; although

in some instances, I suspect an opportunity to relay their thoughts in their first language would have added more texture to their personal expression.

Deflem admits to not having any explicit plan to construct a particular sample of individuals, nor did he attempt to provide a gender or ethnic balance. He also concedes that his contributors, whilst coming from varying European and non-European backgrounds, tended to have some United States connection. Five of the seventeen contributors are female, and three are working in Japan (and USA), China and South Korea, with another of Egyptian birth who moved to England as a child, but ended up in the States. All the others are men of American or European ancestry. Does this matter? In one sense no, because all these sociologists have moved between countries, their work expands beyond the confines of their upbringings, and they, would rightly, deny any attempt to pigeonhole them into essentialist compartments. Yet reading this in Aotearoa, I felt disappointed that so many parts of the globe, including our own, are missing in this collection.

Who are the standouts in an anthology that runs the gamut from fairly dull place and name dropping, through undisguised grandstanding, to essays that succeed in capturing the delights and anxieties of doing sociology – with the added bonus of literary merit and humour? Karin Knorr-Cetina beautifully conveys the interlacing of the local and global in her life and work in a chapter that stamps her personality on its pages, and Ewa Morawska, traversing a life lived in Poland, America and now England, neatly shows us how her own research on migration flowed out of her personal experience. Whilst shifting from Cairo to post-War London, and ending up in Tacoma, Leon Grunberg evocatively relates how he stumbled into sociology through literary and political interests that many of us can empathize with. Plus a nice, wry piece from Piotr Szompka, who sticks closely to his editor's recommendations and provides his own useful prescriptions for how to succeed and survive in our discipline.

So who will read this book? Researchers seeking a more personal slant on colleagues whose work they have found illuminating, and students looking for ways to ground the often abstract words and worlds

their teachers try and get them to enter. More hopefully, perhaps anyone who's reading of these essays encourages them to find other pages these people have written – and make sociology part of their own lives. This volume only partly fulfills its promise, but it might inspire someone else to stretch the academic and geographical boundaries a little further. Whatever their origins, the editor and his contributors should be thanked for allowing us to see who they were, are, and might be, as sociologists in their own local and global settings.

Instructions for Contributors

Submission of manuscripts: All manuscripts submitted will be considered for publication, on the understanding that they are original material and are not being considered for publication elsewhere. Please submit only finished manuscripts.

Manuscripts should not exceed 8,000 words, and files should be submitted to the managing editor as an attachment, preferably in Microsoft Word rich text format. If you are unable to attach a file to an e-mail message, please contact the managing editor to find another means of transmission.

The author's name(s), departmental or institutional affiliations, snail-mail and e-mail addresses, and a short biography of each author should appear on the first page of the paper. A short (100 word) abstract of the paper should be included.

Specifications for manuscripts: Authors should consult articles in current issues of *New Zealand Sociology* on general matters of editorial style, e.g. titles and headings, indentation of paragraphs, form of referencing, etc. Do **not** underline any words in the text. Please ensure that your text conforms to UK spelling rather than American.

Graphics: Type each table on a separate sheet with as few lines as possible, and indicate the placing of the table in the text. Use wide spacing in tables. Tables should be numbered in Arabic figures with a clear legend to identify the table. Drawings (graphs, figures, etc.) should be on good quality white paper and on separate sheets.

Footnotes and references: Footnotes are to be reserved for substantive commentary. Number them from 1 upwards. The location of each footnote in the text must be indicated by the appropriate superscript numeral. Footnotes will appear at the foot of the page where they are located.

Citations: These must conform to the style set out in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association,* 1994, (4th Ed.). Citations in the text should be indicated in parentheses, e.g., "It has been argued (Smith, 1995, p. 47) that..."; It has been argued by Smith (1995, p. 47) that...

References. A reference list consisting only of those references cited in the text should be arranged alphabetically using the following American Psychological Association style:

Book: Roper, B. (2005). *Prosperity for all? Economic, social and political change in New Zealand since 1935.* Melbourne: Thompson/Dunmore Press.

Edited Collection: Goode, L., & Nabeel, Z. (Eds.). (2004). *Media studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Auckland: Pearson.

Book Chapter: Perry, N. (2003). On forging identities. In V. Grace, H. Worth, & L. Simmons (Eds.), *Baudrillard west of the dateline* (pp 102-115). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Journal Article: Rosenberg, B. (2002). News media ownership: How New Zealand is foreign dominated. *Pacific Journalism Review, 8*(1), 59-95.

Conference Paper: Wood, B. (2004). The cloning of hybridity and the imperial significance of the United States in New Zealand television. Paper presented at the Cultural Studies Association (USA) annual conference, 6 May, Northeastern University, Boston, USA.

Internet reference: Tanczos, N. (2000, February 10). Maiden speech to parliament. Retrieved June 24, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.greens.org.nz/docs/speeches/000210nt-maiden.htm

Thesis: McMillan, K.A. (2001). *Citizenship under neo-liberalism: Immigrant minorities in New Zealand 1990-1999.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Auckland.

Refereeing: *New Zealand Sociology* is a fully refereed journal. Following editorial review, manuscripts will be sent to referees for blind review. To facilitate this process, after the first page with author's details, the title only should appear on the manuscript.

Manuscripts will be acknowledged by the Editors upon receipt. Authors can expect to hear from the editors upon completion of the reviewing process.

Preliminary consultation with the editors about the suitability of an article does not necessarily guarantee its publication. The editors reserve the right to make minor editorial alterations or deletions to articles without consulting the author(s), so long as such changes do not affect the substance of the article. Authors will receive a copy of the issue in which their article appears.

Proofs will be sent to authors and they should be corrected and returned to the managing editor within three days. Major alterations to the text cannot be accepted at this stage.