



NEXUS

NEWSLETTER OF THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION INC.

Volume 15, Number 3

OCTOBER 2003

Letter from the President

Dear Colleagues

Membership drive a success

I am happy to report that numbers continue to rise and we are on track for a record membership this year. At the time of writing, TASA membership has exceeded 550. We have attracted many first-time members, which bodes well for the future of TASA and the discipline. Thanks to everyone that helped 'spread the word' and ensured the success of the membership drive.

Conference

A reminder to members to register ASAP for the conference—the early-bird rate expires at the end of October. Preparations for the conference are going well, with the LOC having received a large number of submissions for the refereed proceedings, which along with registrations to date, indicates the conference will have a significant number of delegates. For the first time, the conference web site provides access to the AGM agenda papers, which you can view or download at any time. Planning for the postgraduate workshop is also taking shape (see the conference website for details); the postgraduate conference scholarships also attracted a healthy number of applicants and these have now been finalised (see the Vice-President's report for details). A 'meet and greet' the Executive will once again be a feature of the conference morning teas. Members are also encouraged to pop by the TASA Conference Stand to 'say hello', have their questions answered, and submit feedback via the TASA suggestion box, as well as submit their 2004 membership forms.

Constitutional amendments

In this issue of Nexus, you will find a section on proposed Constitutional amendments to be put before the TASA AGM during the conference (they have also been circulated via the elist and can be found on TASAweb). While the Executive endorses the proposals and sees them as uncontroversial, we encourage members to read them and send us any feedback.

Expression of interest for JOS & Nexus editorships

This issue of Nexus also features the first call for expressions of interest from members to undertake the editorship of either the Journal of Sociology or Nexus—the editorial terms for both expire at the end of 2004. Any interested parties are welcome to contact the current editors and the TASA Office for further information. To ensure an appropriate time for hand-over, the Executive ideally aims to finalise the new editorships by mid-2004. The editorship terms run for 4 years and offer a significant opportunity for members to contribute to the profession.

Collection of demographic data

Following regular questions from members about the nature of the TASA membership, the 2004 membership form will include an expanded collection of demographic data as an optional feature for members. De-identified data will be collated and published in tabulated form. To protect members'

Contents

Letter from the President	1
<i>John Germov</i>	
Editor-in-chief's Note	2
<i>Daphne Habibis</i>	
Letter from the Vice-President	3
<i>Zlatko Skrbis</i>	
Constitutional Changes	3
Sociologists outside Academe	4
<i>Suzanne Franzway</i>	
Issues in Sociology	5
The Antipodes: Another Civilization, Between Manhattan and the Rhine?	
<i>Peter Beilharz</i>	
Interview	8
<i>Chris Cunneen</i>	
Conference Report	10
Writing Refugee Lives	
<i>Amanda Wise</i>	
TASA's Ethical Code	11
<i>Fran Collyer</i>	
Professionalisation	12
<i>Meryl Aldridge</i>	
Conference Report: AQR	13
<i>Jan Forbes</i>	
University News	14
University of Queensland	
TASA 2003 Conference	14
<i>Peter Corrigan</i>	
Postgraduate Views	15
Higher Degrees as Passages to our Higher Purposes	
<i>Karina Butera</i>	
Forthcoming Conferences	16

2004 Copy Deadlines

March Issue:	21 February
June Issue:	21 May
October Issue:	25 September

confidentiality and privacy it will not be a feature of the online directory.

Jean Martin Award (JMA) and Stephen Crook Memorial Prize (SCMP)

The first rounds of determination by the judging panels for both awards have now been completed. The JMA is awarded to the best submitted PhD thesis in sociology. This year, a record 35 entries were received, placing a significant strain on the judging panel. JMA convenor Associate Professor Daniela Stehlik is in the process of coordinating the final stage of the judging process. The inaugural SCMP for best published book in Australian sociology attracted six entries. SCMP convenor Fran Collyer is currently finalising the determination process with the judging panel. Given the onerous nature of the tasks involved, the Executive expresses its gratitude to the judging panel members (whose names will be made public after the judging process); TASA will also pay for their conference registration as a small gesture of thanks. Recipients of both awards will be announced at the TASA Conference. Details about all TASA awards can be found on TASAweb.

Update on the review of TASA's Ethical guidelines

An article by Executive member Fran Collyer, who chaired the review of TASA's Ethical Guidelines, appears in this issue. Thank you to all members who sent us their feedback and suggestions for improvement; and to Fran for handling this task so deftly. The revised guidelines will be disseminated to all members in the near future.

Online TASA elections planned for mid-2004

While the next Executive term does not begin until 2005, we are planning to hold the TASA elections by mid 2004. This is part of the Executive's drive to ensure a good handover from one Executive to the next, by allowing incumbent members to shadow existing members for the last few months of their term. A call for nominations for the 2005-2006 Executive will be issued early next year. An added development will be the option of casting your vote online via TASAweb (the original hard copy method will still be retained)—stay posted for developments.

Sociologists outside academe

Executive member Suzanne Franzway provides an update in this issue, noting that current non-academic members are being surveyed for their suggestions on how TASA can better address their needs and subsequently tap into this potential pool of members.

Higher education developments and online forum

As student protests and media attention attests, higher education reform will be a key election issue. To keep apprised of developments and to let us know your thoughts, visit the online discussion forum on TASAweb—just click the button on the homepage and follow the instructions.

40th Anniversary

The 2003 TASA Conference provides us with the opportunity to celebrate our 40th anniversary. Key conference features in this regard will be the History of Australian Sociology panel (featuring Lois Bryson, Katy Richmond, Sol Encel, John Western, and Cora Baldock), the Presidential session honouring Stephen Crook (featuring Jan Pakulski, Malcolm Waters, and myself), the announcement of the Most Influential Books in Australian Sociology and discussion of the top ten by some of the top ten authors. In addition to the presentation of TASA awards and the inaugural postgraduate workshop, there'll also be opportunities for professional development and networking. The TASA 2003 Conference promises to be an enjoyable and memorable event. See you there.

John Germov

The University of Newcastle

Editor-in-Chief's Note

Nexus is always enjoyable to put together but this edition has been especially so. This isn't just because we think you'll find the articles interesting, it's also because the feeling in TASA is pretty upbeat – and that's always pleasant to be around. As well as articles by Peter Beilharz, Judith Mudd, Suzanne Franzway, Fran Collyer, an interview with Chris Cunneen, and a reflective piece about postgraduate work by Karina Butera, this edition is packed with important information – from an update on TASA 2003 to advice about proposed Constitutional Changes.

There are also several requests for your input. These include Fran Collyer's request for your views on the role of institutional ethics committees; a request for contributions to a special edition of Nexus on teaching; a call for hosts for the TASA 2005 Conference, and expressions of interest in editorship of the Journal of Sociology and Nexus. And we can certainly recommend editing Nexus as a great way of contributing to the discipline without signing your life away.

Finally, a personal 'thank you' to Glenda Jones and Kristin Natalier for holding the fort in my absence last June and for producing the June issue so effortlessly.

Daphne Habibis

on behalf of the Editorial Collective

Notice of TASA AGM

The 2003 AGM will be held during the annual TASA conference in Armidale. All AGM documentation can be accessed from the Conference Section of TASAweb www.tasa.org.au or from the TASA Office (contact details below).

5:00pm Friday 5th December 2003
Education Building Rm 133
The University of New England, Armidale

Any agenda items should be forwarded to:

TASA Office, School of Social Science
The University of Queensland
ST LUCIA QLD 4072

OR: admin@tasa.org.au

Letter from the Vice-President

I am delighted to report that this year TASA awarded the inaugural TASA/AASR Postgraduate Scholarship Awards. The award is aimed at Postgraduate students at Masters and PhD levels who have papers accepted for the refereed conference proceedings. Fifteen applications were received in total and after some deliberation the Executive sub-committee nominated six recipients. At the time of writing, the following five recipients have accepted the award:

- Ms Katie Wright**, La Trobe University
- Mr Thomas Sinclair**, Monash University
- Ms Zuleyka Zevallos**, Swinburne University of Technology
- Ms Meg Carter**, Swinburne University of Technology
- Ms Jan Blackhouse**, Southern Cross University

TASA will continue to support postgraduate student participation at TASA Conferences and I would like to use this opportunity to encourage both current students and postgraduate supervisors to keep in mind this funding opportunity for the future.

Congratulations to all recipients of the award! We look forward to your continuing involvement in TASA.

I am also pleased to inform you that the second stage

of the Most Influential Books in Australian Sociology survey (MIBAS) is now complete and we now have the list of top 10! What better way to celebrate the 40th anniversary of our association! The top 10 will be announced at the forthcoming conference in Armidale and negotiations are currently under way with authors of these books to attend the conference. Thank you all who have nominated and ranked the books.

Finally, it is worth remembering that TASA is an institutional member of the International Sociological Association (ISA). Our membership in this international body allows us to think of ways in which national associations can be vertically integrated. A small step in this direction is a double badging of the conference stream on Ethnicity and Race at the forthcoming TASA Conference in Armidale with ISA RC05 (Research Committee on Ethnic, Race and Minority Relations of the International Sociological Association). I would encourage TASA members who play an active role in any one of ISA Research Committees to explore the benefits that may stream from integration of promotional, research and other activities across these institutional frontiers.

Zlatko Skrbis
University of Queensland

Proposed Constitutional Amendments for consideration at 2003 TASA AGM

The TASA Executive Committee is proposing the following amendments to the TASA Constitution. A brief description of the purpose for each amendment is provided below. Also provided is the current and proposed wording of the Constitution. In accordance with the Constitution, these items are being distributed to members via NEXUS, TASAweb and TASA e-list and will be considered at the TASA AGM, being held on Thursday 4th December 2003 at the TASA Conference in Armidale. A current copy of the full Constitution is available on TASAweb or from the TASA Office.

AMENDMENT 1

Establishment of a Postgraduate Representative position on the Executive Committee
This amendment creates a dedicated Postgraduate Representative position by converting one of the original three ordinary member positions, leaving two ordinary members on the Executive Committee, while maintaining the same total number of positions on the Executive Committee.

Point 14. Change from:

The Executive Committee, consists of the President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and three ordinary members (as voting members), and the Immediate Past President, Journal Editor and Newsletter Editor as non-voting ex officio members of the Executive Committee.

To:

The Executive Committee, consists of the President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, Postgraduate Representative and two ordinary members (as voting members), and the Immediate Past President, Journal Editor and

Newsletter Editor as non-voting ex officio members of the Executive Committee.

AMENDMENT 2

Financial updates

This amendment is to update the Constitution to reflect changes in the banking practices of the Association. With recent moves to electronic banking via online membership applications and EFTPOS processing in the TASA office, the Constitution has become outdated.

Change point 75:

Payments by Cheque

75. All payments in excess of twenty dollars must be made by cheque.

To:

Payments to TASA

75. All payments, in excess of twenty dollars, must be made by cheque, money order or credit card.

AMENDMENT 3

This amendment is to reflect the change in the signatories that are recorded on the TASA accounts.

Change point 73:

Cheque Signatories

73. All cheques except branch and section cheques, must be signed by the Treasurer and one other member of the Executive Committee.

To:

Cheque Signatories

73. All cheques except branch and section cheques, must be signed by two of the Office Bearing Executive Committee members.

SOCIOLOGISTS OUTSIDE ACADEME

TASA aims to further sociology in Australia, provide a network for sociologists, further links with other sociological associations and address issues of relevance to Australian sociologists. These aims, if achieved, should provide a strong framework for the positive development of sociology in Australia.

However, analysis of TASA membership in 2003 demonstrates significant under-representation of sociologists operating outside academic institutions, a problem identified in the TASA Membership Survey Results of December 2000. The statistics, as well as anecdotal evidence, suggest TASA does not provide enough for SOA.

A large and diverse membership base will enable TASA to be the cornerstone of a more vibrant sociological community with benefits to members and the profession overall.

The statistics suggest TASA is more effective in meeting the needs of sociologists within academe than those external to it and so an assessment of what it is that SOA want from their professional organisation is being undertaken in order to provide the services and information that will draw them towards the Association.

Current data is derived from membership information so TASA intends casting the net further with a new survey to gain information from non-members as well as members.

Issues that push sociologists away from TASA will also be addressed, such as any perception that the Association is exclusive of those sociologists not working in academic institutions.

Results from the survey should provide clear indications of issues of interest and concern to SOA in their working lives and professional development, and provide a pathway to making TASA more relevant to and inclusive of these individuals.

The survey will also assess the utility of the TASA website as a service site for members and a promotional tool for the association.

Benefits of expanding the membership, both for TASA and SOA, include expansion of the professional support network for sociologists, particularly those isolated in the private sector, NGOs or government departments; the opportunity to be part of an authoritative body that can participate in political debate; increasing community understanding of the role of sociologists and their value in society; and generating a higher public profile for sociologists and TASA.

Suzanne Franzway

University of South Australia

Visit Tasa's New Higher Education Online Forum Sociology & the Crossroads Reforms

- Find out what's happening
 - Contribute to the Debate
- <http://www.tasa.org.au>

Journal of Sociology Call for a New Editorial Team

The TASA Executive seeks to appoint a new editorial team for the Journal of Sociology, for the 4 year term 2005-2008.

The term of the current editors expires at the end of 2004, though copy for the first issue of 2005 will already be organised.

The journal receives financial and administrative assistance from TASA and from the publisher Sage.

Applicants are required to be TASA members and should ideally be located within a bonafide department of sociology or within a school/unit that offers a major sequence of sociology, including doctoral studies. It is a requirement of the application process that institutional support for the management of the journal be obtained and specified.

The application due date is 30th May 2004, to allow sufficient time for handover between editorial teams.

Selection protocols and application instructions are available from the TASA Office: admin@tasa.org.au

Further information can also be obtained from the current editors and the TASA President.

Contact details: www.tasa.org.au

NEXUS Newsletter of The Australian Sociological Association Call for a New Editorial Team

The TASA Executive seeks to appoint a new editorial team for the Association's newsletter, NEXUS, for the 4 year term 2005-2008.

The term of the current editors expires at the end of 2004. The newsletter receives financial assistance from TASA.

Applicants are required to be TASA members and should ideally be located within a bonafide department of sociology or within a school/unit that offers a major sequence of sociology, including doctoral studies. It is a requirement of the application process that institutional support for the management of the newsletter be obtained and specified.

The application due date is May 2004, to allow sufficient time for handover between editorial teams.

Selection protocols and application instructions are available from the TASA Office: admin@tasa.org.au

Further information can also be obtained from the current editors and the TASA President.

Contact details: www.tasa.org.au

The Antipodes: Another Civilization, Between Manhattan and the Rhine?

Peter Beilharz is Professor of Sociology at La Trobe University, and an editor of *Thesis Eleven*. His recent books include *Imagining the Antipodes* (1997), *Zygmunt Bauman: Dialectic of Modernity* (2000), and *The Bauman Reader* (2000). A version of this paper was delivered as the keynote speech at the SAANZ annual conference, 2001, Massey University. Who are we? Where have we come from? Where are we going?

Paul Gauguin asked these three famous questions, in the extraordinary painting which now hangs in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Australia and Aotearoa ran parallel paths through the twentieth century, beginning with enormous promise, ending in anxiety and ambivalence. We came from some similar places, travelled different paths, ending up in related binds. Yet this was, is, for me, an integral experience, in all its difference. The incapacity of Australians and New Zealanders intellectually to connect these stories is extraordinary: after the social laboratory, after Pember Reeves, there is no single work known to me which takes the antipodes as an integral experience across the twentieth century. Perhaps the closest we get is in Frank Castles' essay "The working class and welfare". This is especially striking given that these parallel paths in the antipodes are long, and yet both marked by a high degree of change since around 1980.

Today I shall talk briefly about the four keywords here: Antipodes, Civilization, Manhattan, and the Rhine; and then I shall talk especially about America and modernization, rather less about the Rhine as a possible alternative model, and offer some hints about the antipodes as a third alternative.

First term: antipodes. I follow the work of the Australian cultural historian Bernard Smith in thinking it useful to imagine the antipodes, our places, not only as places, but also as relationships. Culture comes of cultural traffic, rather than of place in itself. Antipodean cultures, like Australia and New Zealand, result from the unequal flow of cultural traffic from north to south, and back as well as sideways. Relations of cultural traffic are necessarily asymmetrical, but they are mutual, as, perhaps, in the dialectics of master and slave.

Second term: civilization. I use the word in the sense Walter Benjamin did, to register the way in which civilization rests on violence, as culture rests on power. But I am equally interested in the idea of modernity, which I think is central, provided again that we pluralize it, in the manner of arguments concerning multiple, or alternative modernities. And this is to anticipate part of my argument here: that the antipodes is, or was, an alternative modernity, given that modernity in dominant discourse often works as a password for America.

Third term: Manhattan. Manhattan is a clumsy synecdoche I have chosen for Americanism, Wall Street. I'll explain further in a moment the centrality of Americanism to this whole argument, to thinking about modernity, modernism, and the idea of the antipodes as an alternative modernity or civilization. For the present, the image of Manhattan contrasts with my fourth term, the Rhine. The contrast between America and the Rhine is associated with the 1993 work of Michel Albert, *Capitalism versus capitalism*,

where the postcommunist alternative is posed: after the fall, you can have Yankee or civilized capitalism, Manhattan or the Rhine, that's the global choice. If there are two major alternatives is it then possible that the antipodes might be or have been a third way, an alternative civilization between Manhattan and the Rhine?

So much for definitions and preliminaries; let me enter the first analytical problem, the relationship between America, Americanism and modernity, before I turn to the German model and the antipodes in turn.

Why should America be so central here? As Peter Wagner argues in a recent paper in *Thesis Eleven*, America comes to function in western culture as the image of pure modernity, modernity *ex nihilo*. It is also impure, and imperial, invasive; but it is the new world experience which becomes the central frame of global culture. American modernity remains an endlessly fascinating puzzle, not least because we love it, for all its flaws and this, I suggest, is nothing more than a cultural-historical manifestation of our deep ambivalence toward modernity itself.

Let me remain here a moment longer, for my sense is that in Australia, at least, there has been a revival of leftwing inauthenticity regarding this condition since 9/11. It seems absolutely hypocritical to me to cast the USA as the Evil Empire, the image of negation as some seem keen to do. Whatever positions we might choose to take up on American foreign affairs, imperialism, or global questions of inequality, it seems to me that there is no way around the fact that American culture is the present world-historic frame of world culture in the best, as well as the worst sense. And then there is the attendant question - which America predominates? The Hispanic, Pacific, Asian version in the Los Angeles model? The major growth model until 9/11, in Las Vegas? The Puritan model in New England, the melting pot in Manhattan, the middling model of the middle west, the slower, so to say antipodean stream down south - New Orleans, Arkansas, Texas - the Mexican model under the border, or the stropier Canadian version above?

Recognising the rich diversity of American experience shouldn't be difficult, but it is: because the idea of America remains associated with the image of modernity, and that model is unmixed modernity. The problem with this kind of modernisation thinking is reflected in the best selling collection edited by Harrison and Huntington, *Culture matters*. Harrison and Huntington are right: culture does matter; though this axiom seems rather here to indicate that Protestantism rules, with none of the ambivalence left to us to by Max Weber. In this volume, the editorial implication is that culture rules, only culturalism here is modernism, Americanism. Harrison, in particular, claims that there are ten values which distinguish progressive cultures (North America) from static cultures (Latin America). In summary, they read as follows:

1. future time orientation
2. centrality of work
3. frugality
4. education
5. merit
6. community
7. ethical code (cf. corruption)
8. justice

9. dispersion of authority
10. secularism

The hilarious thing about lists like this, needless to say, is that viewed as party-games, North America can easily be read here as backward: to read the list backward:

10. secular, yet fundamentalist
9. power concentrated in NYC, DC, LA, Miami
8. justice racially distributed
7. corruption at City Hall, mafia
6. community – individualism
5. merit = class
4. education, cf. entrepreneurialism; class, again
3. frugality – hedonism
2. work ethic cf. play ethic
1. future orientation vs. traditionalism/foundationalism

For the point, to repeat, is that modernity is always mixed – modernism is a project rather than a condition. Yet the imperative of the politics here, presented via culture, persists: modernity in this condition looks increasingly like a module, a capsule, a pill. "Did you take your modernity today?" And while the problem of explaining and achieving levels of prosperity remains, this kind of check list seems nevertheless to conceal as much as it might reveal. The ten claimed attributes of progressive cultures seem really to reduce to one, work, or three, work work work. To invert the logic at this point, we might also want to ask, from our position in the antipodes: where, here in this list of desirable, dynamic attributes, is leisure, contemplation, re-creation? Where is democracy, or political cooperation in this model of modernity? Where is respect for the past, for nature, for the senses of limits that we might associate with both respect for history and nature in different ways? Or in the American case, where, here, is the other America? Where are the other peoples?

Second step. What, then, of the German, or Continental alternative? Certainly Europeans and Americans have traditionally followed different ways of organising capitalism, one plain source of distinction indicating the discrepancy between liberal and collectivist, capitalist and traditionalistic cultures, where it is exactly the mix of modernity and feudal tradition that separates the two models. The problem is whether these distinctions still apply, in any substantive, tendential manner. Germany, in other words, is already heading towards America.

The problem with the German model is less whether it existed, than whether it survives. Either the German model – the second way, the alternative in Michel Albert's scheme to the dominant Americanist hegemony – becomes a version of this first way, or else, viewed from different perspective, it feeds into the ideological project of a Third Way which itself is a pale imitation of Germanic corporatism. The immediate promise of social democracy, the inheritor of classical Marxism in Germany seems kaputt. Arguably this has less to do with the exigencies of political economy than with the politics of globalization as a necessitarian rhetoric where nation-states deny that the social question is their problem. Suffice to say, then, with David Coates that to "stay on the terrain of the national is to stay in the terrain of labour and the state", or to insist, together with Alain Touraine, that there is no such thing as the tsunami globalization.

Evidently social democracy becomes managerial or corporate after World War Two, and capitalised into the eighties,

finally to be processed, homogenised into the Third Way. The problem with the Third Way is not only that it is vacuous, a slogan looking or pretending to look for some values like the drunk under the lamp post somewhere off Broadway. The intellectual limit of Third Way talk is that it plugs back into notions of exclusion that are themselves vacuous, for the solution to exclusion is the culturalist hit we met before in Harrison's ten-point program: work, and more work – a necessary, but an insufficient precondition of citizenship, and in many places around the globe not even yet a guarantee of survival. The problem with the logic of inclusion is that it is open to a purely mathematical, aggregative solution – individuals get to join in the race, not to join in society. If the nineties was the decade of citizenship talk, and of the attendant politics of inclusion, the new decade will be the decade of globalization talk, which calls out a new sociology of inequality. This may be one of the clearest practical effects of what we call globalization itself, that the further globalization of capitalist relations of exploitation also brings with it the global gaze and sense of outrage and responsibility for the other, together with the globalized means of communication which expose all this. To moot a point to which I shall return, later, in closing, notwithstanding widespread senses of disciplinary weariness and despair, ours is exactly the moment which calls for a new sociology. The case for sociology has not been as compelling in a hundred years.

Let me begin the third step, towards the antipodes.

The globalization push in Australia has been perhaps best expressed, and advocated by the work of Paul Kelly, editor of the *Australian*, in his widely influential 1993 book *The end of certainty*. The end of certainty rests on the formula of what Kelly, following Hancock's anticipation in his 1930 classic *Australia*, calls the *Australian Settlement*. The *Australia Settlement* rests, in this advocacy, on five policy claims: White Australia, Arbitration, Protection, Imperial Benevolence, and State Paternalism. The last two are cultural ambits – Imperial Benevolence refers to the defence or foreign affairs aspects of the antipodean relation of dependence on, and exploitation by, first Britain and then America, while State Paternalism refers pejoratively to what sociologists might call a state-led or state-centric tradition. The other three claims are, in Kelly's interpretation, as anachronistic as these old ambits, traditions or ties. The only one of these which is relatively uncontroversial properly speaking is the obsolescence of White Australia. The hegemony of White Australia was already unsettled by mass postwar immigration from Southern Europe; these were the kind of lazy southerners who appear symbolically as the problem in those American texts from Banfield to Harrison. In Australia they worked harder than those already incumbent in the postwar strategy of construction, reconstruction and industrialization, just like the lazy Mexicans who legally or illegally hold up the US economy today. The two remaining institutions, or cultures, those involving Arbitration and Protection, remain less obviously evil than this new orthodoxy is prepared to make out. Of Protection I shall say nothing here, except to remind you of the maxim that Free Trade works to the advantage only of those already powerful, and even then in selective application. Paul Kelly evidently views Arbitration as one of a number of troglodytic impediments to Australia's economic and social progress.

Arbitration was, as Hancock already understood in 1930, part of a strategy to insulate the antipodes from the shocks of the global economy. It was, in a certain quite striking sense, an anti-capitalist or at least anti-liberal

strategy – enacted by new liberals. Where Kelly's concern here is directed to Arbitration, the greater impediment to modernization was the absence of a virile industrial bourgeoisie and the consequent happy fallback reliance on primary commodity export production. Arbitration at least worked to canvas or to establish the idea of using regulated markets as agencies of potential redistribution, or fairness.

The idea of the Australian Settlement has become a new orthodoxy in Australian political and scholarly discussion. Paul Kelly's formula neatly summarises the Keating agenda, and it continues to do so. In a more recent article in the *Australian*, derived from Kelly's Alfred Deakin Lecture (17.10.2001), Kelly connects the goals of economic liberalism and social inclusion. Most of the argument as published concerns economic liberalism. Two alternative conclusions are open to us: one, that inclusion is the result of economic liberalism; the other, that inclusion presents itself as the subsequent issue to be addressed, not by economic policy, but rather by social policy. This latter was exactly the logic of the precise Labor Decade under Keating's ascendance, 1986-1996. It remains, in principle, more muscular than New Labour's Third Way but I don't think it represents an alternative civilization. To use that word as a verb rather than a noun, the result is more like a regulated than a civilizing of capitalism.

Kelly extended his purview to include New Zealand in another article in the *Australian* (8.8.2001). Helen Clark's project here is cast as an overreaction against the earlier overreaction. He pokes fun at Clark's image of New Zealand as "the Finland of the South Pacific". Talking on CNN (26.7.2001), Clark seemed to suggest that there was an alternative, distinct civilizational path in New Zealand, that its social democratic and equalitarian aspirations ought remain points of orientation for the future. Rather than a New Zealand Settlement to parallel the Australian Settlement viewed only as an obstacle, the past century then could be a counterimage of mixed modernity.

The antipodes could then be a source for thinking forward while connecting back. With due respect to the work of Paul Kelly, my sense is that we took a wrong turning toward the embrace of the idea of Australian Settlement, the recipe of which leads too readily to a sense of before and after. It may have been better to follow the initiative of Frank Castles, where the sense of comparison and historical specificity is higher. The arguments that turned through the idea of three, or four worlds of welfare capitalism seem to remain closer to the comparative sensibilities of historical sociology, and Castles was better able to retain a sense of the mixed blessings of modernity, where gains went together with losses.

This, I suggest, is the problem we face, in both of our antipodes. How do we shift forward without subscribing to the monomaniacal lists of the modernizers, where work, performance, and aspiration rendered as individual, liberal values take some to Nirvana – or Manhattan – while the devil takes the hindmost? How can we save, or at least learn from the best achievements of the social laboratory while engaging new futures for ourselves and our children? The least one can say here is that we should be well advised to move with caution, else we all end up in the utopia of work work work, some with abundant material rewards, as global tourists, others as vagabonds, or as mere locals, the locals who hold up the world of the globals. Arbitration, let us remember, in places like the antipodes, went together with the masculinist and skilled but universalisable slogan, 8/8/8, equal daily shares of work,

sleep and recreation. We need to reclaim our right to mixed and alternative modernities, where values like the right to work, the need to work, are counterbalanced by others, freedom by dependence, innovation by reverence, initiative by loyalty, progress by traditions. Only in this kind of scenario is it possible even to imagine the time or space for contemplation and argument which would be the precondition of the possibility of reinventing politics.

A sociology of Australia, better, of the antipodes as an alternative modernity, and recognizing here the limits of my own knowledge, would need to begin by registering its peculiarities. In comparison to the American model of modernity, its most striking attributes remain apparent: the centrality, into the twentieth century, of labour, the state, and an absence of the myths of foundation and mission which help hold up the American idea, the American dream. Australian civilization has no telos, after the collapse of the utopia of independent Australian Britons: we simply are, and it is not clear that this is altogether a bad thing.

If there is, however, no national-social telos, this has not meant that there are no social goals or values or institutions to embed them. Indeed, the early twentieth century labour movements in the antipodes valued time, and valued the time outside paid work, as leisure, but also as the realm of social self-development. Perhaps this opening has been filled in the meantime by the Americanization of leisure; but in that case, we need also to reclaim it, just as we might need or perhaps choose to claim a new sociology. Most strikingly, the historical process called globalization coincides with the rise of the ideology of neoliberalism. Economic growth accelerates at the same time as inequality expands. Solidarity is under attack, just as Marx, Weber and Durkheim sensed in different ways that it was a hundred years ago. New forms of solidarity have yet to emerge. The scholarly imperative here is to reappropriate, to reinterpret the past outside the frame of the orthodoxy of Australian Settlement, which distances the twentieth century unnecessarily, by infantilising it. This means, for me, to renegotiate critical theory and historical sociology, for a new/old sociology needs to be regional, comparative, historicist. It seems to me that we need the edge of critical theory, or a weberian-marxism, to keep open the capacity to interpret culture in the face of power. If there were to be a new sociology, the imperative would be to balance the idea of solidarity with the critique of exploitation, the latter understood relationally, which claims to inclusion avoid.

Last, a personal note. Where might our intellectual responsibilities lie, in all this? Differently rendered they must be; each of us has to tell our truth, and to go our own way. As Bernard Smith observed on the occasion of the 1956, Melbourne Olympics, antipodean intellectuals are migratory birds. We are, all of us, cultural messengers. We keep moving, and our capacity to think and to innovate also comes of this movement. The famous distinction indicated by Arthur Hirschmann suggested three political alternatives, which transpose readily into the question of what we, as antipodean intellectuals, ought do: give voice, declare loyalty, or exit. My own, strong personal sense is that antipodean intellectuals need to keep moving: we need to do all three at the same time, and our condition, itself, avails this. We should follow all these circuits – exit, voice, and loyalty – in order that we can earn the traditions we inherit, in order to innovate upon them, out of them, connecting old worlds to new, and on to better worlds, beyond.

Peter Beilharz
La Trobe University

Chris Cunneen

Chris Cunneen is Director of the Institute of Criminology at the University of Sydney. He has published extensively on the relationship between Indigenous people and the law and on juvenile justice. He has also worked as a research consultant with a number of National and State Inquiries, including the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody (RCADC) and the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children (NISATSIC).

What led you to work in the field of criminology?

I was working as a youth worker with homeless young people in Blacktown and Fairfield in the Western suburbs of Sydney and it was really as a result of my work with them and contact with the police that I developed an interest in that area. My academic background was in history and sociology – I was actually doing a Masters in South East Asian history.

A lot of your work has been in the field of Aboriginal issues, did this relate to your background as a youth worker?

To an extent. We used to get quite a few Aboriginal kids coming and staying at the youth refuge, particularly in Blacktown. But when a friend of mine who was a youth worker went to work in Burke, in north-western NSW in the early 1980s I visited him a few times. That was really the first contact I had with Aboriginal people. A lot of the issues there were to do with policing. They were similar to what was happening in the Western suburbs of Sydney but far more intense. I remember going out at night with a group of Aboriginal people, walking down the street and a police paddy wagon pulled up alongside and put a spotlight on us. For me that was something exceptional, even though I grew up in the Western suburbs. So my interest in criminology and policing and its effect on Aboriginal people came out of the experiences I had in the early 1980s.

You've done an enormous amount of work in the field of Aboriginal relations with the police and Aboriginal issues in general, can you reflect on what you think has been achieved since you first began to work in the area?

I think over the last fifteen to twenty years there's been a much clearer articulation of Indigenous rights. This is partly a reflection of the growth of Aboriginal NGOs, Land Councils, Aboriginal Legal Services, Medical Services – they have provided the framework for an articulation and demands around Indigenous rights. It's also been strongly assisted by ATSIC. The political terrain around Aboriginal rights has changed quite fundamentally.

Another major area has been around the Mabo decision. Mabo didn't open up the door completely, but it did open up a crack in the door in terms of the Anglo Australian legal system, because it provided Commonwealth recognition of pre-existing land rights. Post Mabo, the political-legal system has tried to close that crack in the door in terms of trying to circumscribe Aboriginal rights, but I think once the Commonwealth recognition is there – even though it was limited to recognition of native rights on land it opens up the avenues for exploring other areas. If Aboriginal law exists in relation to land then where else does it continue to exist?

The other thing has been the political, intellectual and

social effects of the major Inquiries of the 1990s – Aboriginal Deaths in Custody which reported in 1991 and the Stolen Generations Inquiry which reported in 1997. I think both those Inquiries had a profound effect on non-Indigenous Australia in terms of people owning and understanding colonial policy but more importantly the impact of colonial policy on the contemporary situation. For instance, Keating's speech at Redfern Park in the early 1990s is really unimaginable without the background of the RCADC and the stories that it told and the history that unfolded. Obviously, the Sorry Day march over the Sydney Harbour Bridge during the latter part of the 1990s was also inconceivable without the National Inquiry into the Stolen Generation. Although the conservative government has certainly attempted to roll back the effects of those Inquiries and the revisionist, Black Armband view of history that's being promoted by the conservatives, I don't think they've been successful. I think there has been a change in understanding as a result of those Inquiries and the conservative backlash hasn't been successful, not the least because it's been so intellectually bankrupt and bereft of ideas.

Could you comment further on the prospects for reconciliation?

It's easy to be negative about the prospects for reconciliation, given the lack of recognition by the Federal government but I'm reasonably positive about it. Reconciliation can have different meanings. One meaning is for non-Aboriginal Australians to reconcile with their own history and own their own past and the injustices and the dispossession and the racism. I think there's been some movement in that direction, despite the conservative backlash.

In terms of the reconciliation of Aboriginal people with non-Aboriginal people: I think there's some movement in that direction but the biggest problem is still the need for non-Aboriginal people to understand that reconciliation can only be achieved on the terms of Aboriginal people.

When I went on the Sorry Day March, I marched with the Public Interest Advocacy Centre who were supporting some of the Stolen Generation litigants and the t-shirt that that group had on was No Reconciliation without Reparation. Reconciliation really does have to be on the terms of the Aboriginal people – they're the group that were dispossessed and delegitimised in terms of their own laws and customs. I think we've got much more ground to cover in that area than of non-Aboriginal people reconciling with their own past.

What aspects of your work have given you greatest satisfaction?

Far and away the fact that I've been able to work with community based associations. It's about bringing to research and to work issues of social justice: being able to tie in intellectual work with community groups. One piece of research work that I did with Julie Stubbs in the Law School was in relation to Filipino women. It was research work that was directly tied to community activism. A group of Filipino women had gone to the Human Rights Commission concerned about the apparently high levels of homicide among Filipino women. The Commission asked Julie and I to do some work with that community group. It was quite clear the women's concerns were well founded. We found that Filipino women were about five times more likely to be victims of homicide than the general population of women in Australia. We looked at the reasons and found that it

related to the immigration patterns of Filipino women coming to Australia and marrying non-Filipino men and the relationship that was around that. We ended up going to Manila at the invitation of some of the NGOs in Manila and they did a launch of our monograph on it. That was incredibly satisfying to me – to know that the sort of intellectual work I was doing actually had some connection with people's issues.

What do you feel about the war on terror and the effects it's had on government surveillance of private citizens. What implications do you think this has for the future of democracy and social justice?

From a background in criminology it brings together issues of terrorism, refugees and long-standing issues around crime. The war on terror has really united the punitive domestic law and order politics which have developed over the last two decades, with this notion of an external threat, which has been quite clearly tied to refugees as well as actual terrorism. It's really bringing together the internal threat of crime and disorder with the external threat of terrorism. The danger is that it does, and it has, changed the relationship between citizens and the State. Prior to the war on terror we'd seen quite a significant growth in police powers in relation to law and order issues through the 1990s. With the war on terror we've got added to that a substantial increase in policing powers, either in relation to ASIO or the AFP or State Police services in relation to surveillance and anti-terrorism. Part of what we've seen is the removal of things like judicial review, greater roles for mandatory detention, and an overlap as well with some of the issues around refugees. One clear example of that is the issue of prison privatisation. As the States and Territories moved away from prison privatisation in the latter half of the 1990s the corporations have really moved into the detention of refugees and asylum seekers. There's a very clear overlap now, not just in terms of changes around things like mandatory detention, but actually changes in the operation of facilities by private organisations like ACM, and the movement of personnel from State prisons to immigration detention centres. A lot of things - not just in terms of the operation of the system but also in terms of the law - have changed quite significantly as a result of that perceived external threat, either in relation to terrorism or as embodied in refugees and asylum seekers. The other aspect of it that I think is extraordinarily dangerous is that it's clearly founded on racism.

Could you talk a bit about what you see as the direction of theory in criminology. It's been such a positivist/modernist discipline but recently it has been influenced by postmodernism.

I think it still is dominated by positivism, without a doubt. As a discipline it is extraordinarily eclectic. To some extent that may be a strength but the dominant paradigm is clearly dominated by psychological discourses. You can see it in cognitive behaviour training which is the paramount approach and it's very individualising. It's built on notions of deficit and so forth. I think that's quite dangerous. While we've had the influence of postmodernism in terms of the development of criminological theory it's by no means the dominant theory. We've just had the three day Australian and New Zealand Conference on criminology in Sydney and you can see the various strands but certainly the dominant strand in terms of what people call administrative criminology is one that's built on psychological discourses.

In terms of critical criminology, it is certainly alive and well, even if it doesn't control the politics. There are

post Marxist critiques around risk in particular, Foucauldian work on governmentality and feminism which has had a really sustained influence on criminology over the last twenty years. Feminism has provided both a theoretical critique but it also provides a critique in terms of practice. The major gap, which is very slowly being filled, is the failure of criminology as a discipline to understand its own imperial and colonial underpinnings. Very little work has been done in relation to post-colonial criminology. From my point of view that relates to Indigenous issues, but it has much broader possibilities. There are certainly some people working on genocide issues. As many people have pointed out, it's somewhat ironic that the study of crime has neglected the greatest crime of all but that in itself is reflective of failure to theorize the imperial and colonial connections with the development of criminology as a discipline.

Finally, can you outline your current research interests and projects?

I've got a large ARC grant on reparations issues. My interest came from the Stolen Generations work that I've done – working on the Inquiry and the Report. I'm interested in looking at the issue of reparations more broadly than the Stolen Generations. There are issues that are happening at the moment in relation to litigation, stolen wages, missing trust funds, litigation in Queensland. There's been no attempt to even think about an Australian provision of reparations for some of the massacres that occurred in the 20th Century. In the US there has been reparation for particular anti-Black riots and massacres that occurred during the 1920s. We haven't really begun to think about that clearly. So although what I'm doing is linked to the Stolen Generations it's really an attempt to think more broadly about reparations for the effect of colonial policy.

Interviewed by Daphne Habibis

University of Tasmania

Journal of Sociology Volume 40, No 1 March 2004

Business in action:

Framing and overflowing in the logistics of an Australian company.

Robert White and Matt Bradshaw

Constructing the global in two rural communities in Australia and Japan.

Jackie Hogan

Collective agency, non-human causality and environmental social movements: a case study of the Australian 'landcare movement'.

Stewart Lockie

A Subcultural Study of Recreational Ecstasy Use.

Michelle Gourley

Research report:

Day surgery in Australia:

Qualitative research report

Milica Markovic, Mridula Bandyopadhyay, Lenore Manderson, Pascale Allotey, Sally Murray, Trang Vu

Writing Refugee Lives: Cultural Research and Refugees Workshop

Dr Amanda Wise (Centre for Cross-Cultural Research, ANU) and Dr Greg Gow (Centre for Cultural Research at UWS) co-convended a workshop in Sydney to explore how contemporary cultural research might be useful in researching refugee communities. The organisers had noticed an emerging group of young researchers doing interdisciplinary ethnographic work with refugee communities in Australia with a particular focus on cultural issues. The aim of the day was to present some examples of this work and to consider the methodological, practical and policy implications of it. For that reason a good interdisciplinary mix of academic researchers and practitioners were invited to attend which resulted in some useful debate and post-workshop-networking.

The speakers included Amanda Wise, who spoke on the idea of 'Embodying Exile' in relation to the East Timorese in Australia. Her paper looked at the performative dimensions (protests, church rituals, singing and dancing) of the Timorese diaspora's political campaign for East Timor's independence. The paper considered how the bodily dimensions of this protest movement contributed to certain formations of identity, belonging and exile and explored how these performative strategies have created a context for 're-traumatising' bodies and memories, channelling them into a political 'community of suffering'. The second speaker, Greg Gow, spoke about the ethical and methodological dilemmas he faced as a researcher working with the Oromo (of Ethiopia) refugee community in Melbourne. The case study highlighted the difficulties of conducting ethnographic research with refugee communities and the tension between what he called being an 'ethnographer' and being a 'person' in the research process. He was followed by Ian Nichol, a trauma counsellor working with the NSW Service for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Torture and Trauma Survivors (STARTTS). Ian spoke about the religious and cultural aspects of his counselling work with Sri Lankan refugees in Australia. His paper looked at how Tamil cultural practice gets incorporated into dealing with their traumatisation. The final speaker

was Diana Glazebrook whose paper proposed a framework for ethnographic research among asylum seekers from Afghanistan in terms of suffering and dwelling in a situation of temporary protection in Australia.

The workshop was formatted around these four papers, each followed by a ten minute discussion with respondents who included Dr Kalpana Ram, Dr Greg Noble, Dr Katherine Gibson and Dr Sharon Chalmers. The day was topped off by a panel discussion and presentations reflecting on the issue. On the panel were Professor Pnina Werbner, a prominent social anthropologist in the UK who has worked especially with the Pakistani diaspora in Manchester, Professor Ien Ang, a well known cultural studies scholar, and Dr Khalid Koser, a cultural geographer from the UK who has recently completed research on transnational movements among Eritrean and Bosnian refugees in Europe. The panel discussion was followed by an open audience discussion, which was perhaps the most challenging aspect of the day. As with any interdisciplinary discussion, it was a challenge to find some sophisticated 'common ground' to advance the ideas under debate. However the feedback from academics and practitioners alike was overwhelmingly positive, many saying what a dire lack of academic debate there has been on refugee issues in Australia. They commented especially on the need for more of the kind of detailed ethnographic studies (rather than 'illness' issues) that were presented on the day. Many also expressed an interest in future interdisciplinary workshops with a focus on issues of reception and 'border politics'.

The organisers have been asked to co-edit a special issue of the journal *Social Analysis: The International Journal of Cultural & Social Practice* based on the papers and discussion resulting from the workshop which will hopefully appear sometime in 2004.

Amanda Wise
Australian National University

Health Sociology Review Call for papers E.O.Wright, Democracy & Water

Sociologists, political scientists; public policymakers, public health professionals, social and community development workers; economists, civil engineers and social ecologists; all are welcome to try this challenge:

Following Erik Olin Wright's (Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin - Madison) recent visit to Adelaide, there is considerable interest in applying his ideas on democracy* to the problem of safe water supply.

How might Wright's framework for imagining democracy work when tested against real case studies of contested interests such as those over water supply? How might people in rural and urban environments get good public policy for safe and useful water?

A symposium on this topic is planned for volume 14 (1) of *Health Sociology Review*.

The deadline for submission of original articles to the symposium is 30 October, 2004.

Articles should be around 4000 words and follow the guidelines for the *Journal of Sociology* with the exception of reference guidelines listed below. *Journal of Sociology* guidelines can be found on the following web site by scrolling down to *Journal of Sociology*:
<http://www.newcastle.edu.au/departments/so/tasa/>

Reference format

- The full first names of all authors should be listed. Use capitals where these are unknown.
- For titles of articles, books and journals, please use upper case for the first word only (except for proper names).

Eileen Willis
Eileen.willis@flinders.edu.au
Phone (08) 82013110

*E.O.Wright discussed his ideas on democracy at the Adelaide Festival of Ideas (18-20 July, 2003), University of South Australia (Magill) (22 July), Flinders University, Sociology Department (23 July).

For source material, see especially: *Deepening Democracy: institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance* (Verso 2003) and Wright's overview of *The Real Utopias Project* with list of publications on the website:
<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/>

TASA's Ethical Code for Research

As one of my contributions to the TASA executive, I have spent the past few months reviewing our ethical code for research. This has not been an onerous task, but it has provoked some concerns. Perhaps this is not surprising given the nature and history of the code: for it has not had an entirely smooth ride since its inception a decade ago. And after all, few individuals would be comfortable updating a document that seeks to speak for a heterogeneous 'community' of sociologists: individuals with different occupations and experiences, diverse views of the world and most certainly, of our place within it.

Thus, as a reviewer, I have had the rather humbling role of trying to 'second guess' the views and aspirations of the membership. Yes, I have had indications of the views of our members and of the (somewhat wider) group of sociologists toward whom this code is directed. Foremost amongst these has been the professionalisation debate: a debate which has offered an insight into some of the ways our members view their role as researchers and shapers of Australian society. Several TASA conferences during the 1990s were enlivened by brave sociologists (such as the tenacious Jake Najman) taking the floor to present a new, more 'professional' direction for the membership. These sessions provoked fast and furious debate, but little change to our constitution or ethical code. For some sociologists, the very idea of a code of ethical practice was problematic; for others the difficulty lay in the purpose and use of the code. Should it remain a voluntary system, largely innocuous and possibly ignored, or should it be used to shape practices, to cement the soft and open boundaries around the community of sociologists? If the latter, should it prescribe procedures for the accreditation of practicing members? Should it be used to guide the hiring of new staff and the promotions process? Should it contain procedures to sanction errant members?

Over the past decade, the benefits and weaknesses of each approach were intermittently raised, with some favouring the professional model of the psychological associations, and others more comfortable with the 'open', more inclusive system to which TASA had traditionally aspired. What can we read into the fact that the debate has lost its fervour? Is it the case that the membership is no longer polarised and that a compromise position has been reached? Or is it that its relative importance has fallen amidst the funding cuts, the destruction of our working conditions, the endangering of academic standards, the endless lectures, tutorials and writing of

(often) unfunded grant applications, and the corrosive effect of education and research politics?

Given the lack of answers to such weighty questions, the process of reviewing the code has had to proceed with a second set of indicators: individual emails and telephone calls from members. These arrived over several months in response to the draft code of ethics posted on the web and accompanied by an invitation to comment. There was no avalanche of responses, but it did yield a few carefully crafted and extremely helpful suggestions for revision of the code. All contributors urged a tightening of the code; a greater precision of language; a need for greater consistency between statements; for more comprehensiveness and inclusion (to acknowledge the way our endeavours impact not just on researcher and participant, but on sponsors, clients and whole communities); and/or for enhanced protection for the researchers themselves (particularly given the increase in sponsored and contract research). Interestingly, none argued against the principle of a code of ethics, and none suggested the code be less regulatory or prescriptive. Can this be taken as a further indication of consensus, or is it another sign of weariness and resignation?

The new code of ethics, to be put before the members at the next TASA conference, has taken these suggestions and comments into account. Several changes have been made. The main ones address problems arising from the addition of new statements. Many of these created duplications and inconsistencies. For example, one statement asked for ethical issues to be discussed with participants before the research began, but logically, any discussion with participants should signal that the research process has already begun! Hopefully the new document should have greater integrity and coherency, and with a more logical ordering of statements within each section.

There have also been a few new inclusions. For instance, we have acknowledged the use made of other ethical guidelines from various national and international institutions (of which, the NH&MRC was very useful in its focus on the rights of participants), and there is a now a stronger statement about the need to modify our approaches and methods when research includes participants, such as children, who are particularly vulnerable to manipulation by the researcher during interviews or focus groups.

There have also been a few changes to clarify the lines of responsibility: for

instance, we indicate that students have ultimate responsibility for their own actions, but as supervisors or course conveners, we have a responsibility to ensure our students are aware of the ethical principles involved, and to satisfy ourselves that they are not placing themselves in danger during their research. Other changes have been to strengthen statements about who should be given the highest level of protection in our research: is it the members of the organisations who participate in our studies, or the organisations or communities to which they belong?

The review has highlighted changes in the research environment which increasingly impact on our research. Of these, one of the most pressing is the issue of contract research for external clients or sponsors. The new code offers advice to assist researchers in this process: such as the negotiation and clarification of intellectual property prior to undertaking the research.

A second issue is yet to be addressed within the code: that of ethics committees. Given that most of us work in institutions, many of which have their own ethics committees, there is a surprising paucity of information about the 'fit' between these and our own code of ethical practice. At this time it is not known whether there are institutional barriers that prevent sociologists from conducting research according to our professional ideals, paradigms, and principles. Nor the extent to which institutional procedures might distort our research, forcing us to conform to the paradigms of other disciplines or to second (or third) best practice. Anecdotally, it appears this may be the case. But despite my interest and research in this area, the systematic evidence is scarce. Is there a need for a national or sectoral review? Do members believe there is a need for a review of the effect of institutional ethics committees on sociological practice? Is there a need for reform? The executive is interested in your comments on

- (a) whether this is important; and, if yes,
- (b) whether there is a role for the TASA executive in facilitating research in this area; and, if yes,
- (c) how the association might best proceed in this endeavour.

Members of TASA are invited to send their views and suggestions on these questions by email to Fran.Collyer@arts.usyd.edu.au before November.

Fran. Collyer
University of Sydney

Professionalism?

Meryl Aldridge is the immediate past Chair of the British Sociological Association. This article was written in response to Nexus' request for an article about how the BSA was handling the issue of professionalisation.

How many of us give 'sociologist' as the occupation in our passport? Almost none I imagine. Yet there will certainly be psychologists who call themselves that - and possibly some historians, geographers and physicists too. Our French colleagues happily talk about being sociologues (maybe because they have a longer historic claim, to say nothing of being part of the culturally respected field of social commentator).

When we were asked by the Australian Sociological Association (TASA) to write something for their newsletter about 'how the BSA is handling the issue of professionalisation' my immediate response was a wry smile. The reason was not just pragmatic - that getting our organizational affairs straight and balancing the books have kept the Executive Committee busy for several years. It was rather that suggesting that the BSA should initiate a 'professional project' through mechanisms like accreditation is now almost unthinkable. Yet the BSA publishes (and has recently updated) a widely-used code of ethics and most of us would respond with pleasure to being described as being 'professional' in our work.

In her recently-published history of the BSA, Jennifer Platt reports that the last serious consideration of the issue was over 30 years ago and concludes (2003: 165): 'the interest in "professionalism" as a term either of praise or abuse seems to have died away in general discussion within the association'. But this was not a natural death. During the 1970s and 1980s theory and practice conspired together to kill it. Part of the radicalization of sociology in the 1970s included the demystification of the traditional professions as a deservedly privileged and distinctive social formation. Among the most notable suspects were, in the UK, Johnson (1972) (in a BSA-sponsored book series) and Parkin (1972), and Larson (1977) in the US. Only very recently have sociologists started to re-examine the presumption then established that seeking occupational self-government is an entirely exclusionary and self-interested enterprise.

For a decently reflexive sociologist the weight of academic debate might have been enough but, as Platt also shows (2003: ch. 7), the 1970s were also a period when the BSA was preoccupied with responding to the spillover from wider political conflicts: dismissals; failures to appoint; allegations of politically biased syllabuses and teachers. As the history also reminds us both these actions and the reactions tended to be male-dominated, which provided further impetus to the Women's Caucus, set up in 1974 (See Platt 2003 ch. 6.).

In a further sociological irony the fierce controversy and high emotion within the sociological community was dampened by external threat: the first round of cuts to the central government funding of UK higher education came in 1981. The pressure on budgets has never eased and has, since 1988 for research, and the early 1990s for teaching, been accompanied by a heavy regulatory régime with impacts upon both departments and individuals. Becoming more 'professional' in the conventional sense is thus not the first thing on most UK sociologists' minds, even as we grind our teeth when, yet again, a psychologist is chosen as a media

talking-head to explain a social issue with a manifestly social structural aetiology.

This very regulatory régime has, though, caused the BSA to be treated more as a professional association by other players in the policy arena. When the Quality Assurance Agency (for England and Wales higher education) needed disciplinary 'benchmarks' for sociology, it was to the BSA that it turned for practitioners to develop them. As the Economic and Social Research Council's importance as a funder of research contracts and research students has further increased, so has the frequency of its consultations and calls for nominations as advisers, referees and so on. Again, the BSA is seen as acting for sociology. Very recently the BSA protested jointly with twelve other UK groups representing academic disciplines at the likely effect of the latest adjustments to the research audit mechanisms upon educational opportunities and the quality of scholarship.

So the BSA is not now - even if it ever has been or should have been - simply a learned society. Nevertheless, even if the description does not fit with the self-image of many members, a learned society is what we are. During the process of reorganization referred to above, the Executive Committee identified the three priority areas of activity as: publication (two directly-owned journals, two published in association with the BSA, another association planned), the annual conference, and the study groups - all immaculately scholarly endeavours. (More details on the study groups and the conference can be found at www.britsoc.org.uk).

Reading the 2001 Professionalisation Working Party report from TASA it is, though, clear that we have much common ground. The event discussed is a workshop on 'Sociology Beyond the Academy' at which 'a strong view emerge[ed] that TASA should not go down the accreditation path'. On the other hand, there was 'strong endorsement for greater collaboration and communication between practising and academic sociologists' because TASA had become 'a narrow organisation representing sociologists within academic institutions ... by default'. Which sounds very like the BSA. Attracting more sociologists from non-academic research to BSA annual conferences and to study groups would surely be mutually enlightening and enlivening. As the TASA meeting also suggested, we would also benefit from trying to interest sociology graduates who have gone into research posts in becoming members. Both lines of action might help to strengthen our idea of ourselves as a community that is more than a sub-division of the higher education workforce. With that might come the confidence - demonstrably lacking at the moment if attendance at the media workshop at the April 2003 York conference is anything to go by - to demand our place as legitimate social commentators. (Surely we should be doing more to resist the relentless march of individualist epistemologies?). Perhaps even, as individuals, to respond to the standard question from the interested taxi-driver 'What do you do then?' not with 'I, er, teach at the university', but 'I am a sociologist'.

Meryl Aldridge

- Johnson, T.J. (1972) *Professions and Power*. London: Macmillan.
 Larson, M.S. (1977) *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
 Parkin, F. (1972) *Class Inequality and Political Order*. London: Paladin.
 Platt, J. (2003) *The British Sociological Association; A Sociological History*. Durham: sociologypress.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Creating Spaces for Understanding Association of Qualitative Research (AQR) Conference Sydney 2003

The third international conference of the Association of Qualitative Research (AQR) was held in Sydney at the Crown Plaza Hotel, Coojee Beach, 16th to 19th July. The AQR formed in 1997 and has members from around twenty countries; about half were represented.

The main theme, "Creating Spaces for Understanding", was a fitting umbrella for three days of presentations at the forefront of current thinking. Three parallel sessions addressed the main theme, plus additional themes of "Blurring the Boundaries Between Lands and People" and "Creating Healthy People Spaces". Space and place were recurring themes. Presentations focused on trans-disciplinary issues such as policy and ethical practice, marginalised perspectives, dealing with difference and opening the way for multiple understandings.

The main lesson was that qualitative researchers need to suspend judgement and open the way for a diversity of perspectives and methods. Successful qualitative research and getting on with others appear to have a lot in common. It's no surprise therefore that qualitative research contributes to personal growth, or as Supriya Singh, 2002/03 AQR President said: At its most elemental,

qualitative research allows you to see the world through another person's eyes. In the end it changes you.

With less than twenty percent males, the conference was dominated by women's perspectives. The spirit was warm, egalitarian and people-oriented. Experienced researchers mingled with attendees outside sessions, encouraging and supporting newcomers.

There was a sense that qualitative research is achieving legitimacy. The strengths of the cases put, and the enthusiasm for qualitative methods was so overwhelming I needed to remind myself that there's still a place for statistics in social research.

In the opening keynote address Annette Street and Lyn Richards presented in an informal conversational style "The Seven Dilemmas of Qualitative Research", seeking through alternative readings of texts to address issues generally not addressed in the literature eg. Dilemma 1: You must have a research design but you must not pre-empt what's being asked.

Some presentations used privileged concepts like ontology, phenomenology, epistemology and hermeneutics,

however Angie Titchen, speaking on conceptual frameworks for authentic researchers, had her audience spellbound with simple language. Her colourful presentation dealt with the concepts of being, doing, knowing and becoming.

Stuart Hill, self-confessed reformed positivist, in presenting social ecology as a framework for qualitative research, railed against symptom-based problem solving and called for rethinking systems and coming up with new designs that work, as opposed to trying to fix old ones that don't work.

The AQR Conference demonstrated that social research has come a long way since the 1980's when as a psychology undergraduate it was not "PC" to quote Maslow because there was no statistical evidence for his assertions about the hierarchy of needs. I'm glad this did not deter my interest in that basic human need, shelter, or my growing interest in qualitative approaches - interests that brought me to this watershed Conference and that set some bold new directions for the meaning and acquisition of knowledge in the new millennium.

Jan Forbes
University of Tasmania

Special Teaching Issue of Nexus June 2004 Call for Contributions

Contributions are invited to a special issue of Nexus to be published in June 2004. This issue will focus on the theme of Teaching Sociology and will be organised around the following topics:

- Sociology and the 'generic attributes' agenda
- First year teaching: content and pedagogy
- Teaching sociological theory
- What is a major in sociology?
- Honours programs
- Postgraduate supervision: Students' and supervisors' views
- Identifying and responding to plagiarism

Contributions should be between 500 and 2000 words and either formal or informal in style.

Submission deadline: 21 May 2004

For further information please contact:
Daphne Habibis: d.habibis@utas.edu.au
(03) 6324 3236

TASA 2005 Conference Call for Expressions of Interest

The TASA Executive seeks expressions of interest in hosting the TASA 2005 conference.

Hosting information is available on TASAweb: www.tasa.org.au in the Conference section.

Further information can also be obtained from the the TASA Office: admin@tasa.org.au

Past Conference Hosts

- 2004: La Trobe University
- 2003: UNE, Armidale
- 2002: University of QLD & QUT, Brisbane
- 2001: University of Sydney, Sydney
- 2000: Flinders University, Adelaide
- 1999: Monash University, Clayton
- 1998: QUT, Brisbane
- 1997: University of Wollongong, Wollongong
- 1996: University of Tasmania, Hobart
- 1995: University of Newcastle, Callaghan
- 1994: Deakin University, Geelong

The University of Queensland School of Social Science

In late July 2003, Christine Bond commenced a position as Lecturer in Criminology at the School of Social Science. Christine returns to sunny Brisbane after pursuing doctoral studies in rainy Seattle at the Department of Sociology, University of Washington. She previously worked as a Research Officer for the Queensland Criminal Justice Commission (now the Criminal Misconduct Commission). Her current work focuses on the influence of youths' gender on probation officers' sentencing recommendations in juvenile courts. Her research interests include decision-making within criminal justice and other legal institutions, as well as youth offending.

Geoff Lawrence and Lynda Herbert-Cheshire presented a paper entitled 'Regional Restructuring, Neoliberalism, Individualisation and Community: the Recent Australian Experience' at the European Society for Rural Sociology Congress, Ireland, 18-23 August 2003. The paper is available from the authors by email. The address is g.lawrence@uq.edu.au

Geoff Lawrence also presented the

paper 'The Regional Promise', at the 'Community-based Regional Natural Resource Management Planning - Are We Getting it Right?' forum held by the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand, Brisbane, September 2003.

Co-authored with John Bradley, Franca Tamisari presented the paper entitled "To Have and Give the Law: Animal Names, Place and Event" at the International Conference on ethnoclassification, "Animal Names", held at the Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti and The University of Venice, Venice, 2-4 October 2003.

Franca Tamisari also presented the paper entitled "Dancing With Words: the Interweaving of Politics and Aesthetics in Yolngu Dance-Events" at the National Workshop of the Musicological Society of Australia, The University of Queensland, 27- 28 September (the paper will be delivered in a audio-visual power point presentation which has been previously recorded).

Franca has recently published an article entitled "Saggezza del Dreaming e visione moderna: la micropolitica del genere in una comunita' indigena australiana", in

a special issue of an Italian journal, (La ricerca folklorica no. 46:51-59, 2003) dedicated to the issues of gender, sexuality and the body.

Michael Barr and Zlatko Skrbis have received a contract for a book titled *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and the Nation-building Project*. The book will be published by the NIAS Press (Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, based in Copenhagen, Denmark). The book will pay particular attention to the period of the first twenty years of nation-building in Singapore up to 1985.

The School's honours coordinator (Zlatko Skrbis) is also happy to report the blossoming of the sociology/criminology honours program here at UQ: we currently have over 20 students enrolled across the two areas.

There will also be a strong contingent of both staff and postgraduates students from the School at this year's TASA conference. The papers under consideration represent the breadth of research in the School and we look forward to sharing this with our colleagues in Armidale.

Geoff Lawrence
The University of Queensland

TASA 2003: New Times, New Worlds, New Ideas: Sociology Today and Tomorrow

University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351 4-6 December 2003 tasa2003@pobox.une.edu.au

TASA 2003 is shaping up very well – the enthusiasm of the membership came through in the almost one hundred papers submitted for the refereed section alone, and plenty more are piling in for the non-refereed area. The leading category in terms of numbers of submissions at the moment is Social Theory, which suggests that sociologists are again in a period when thinking hard about how we understand and approach the meaning of the world in the most fundamental ways has become a leading preoccupation. Close behind are the categories Work and Political Sociology, followed by Family and Life Course, Gender, Class and Stratification, and Health. Theory, Work, Politics: are we really entering a new era with different points of focus? Is Class making a comeback? And are we neo, retro or novo socios? Armidale may provide the answers...

If the submitted paper sessions are the place for those with similar interests to meet, display, exchange and plot for the next ARC grant, the invited speakers are there to focus our reflections more directly on the conference theme. Michael Pusey and Judith Stacey will open the conference with provocative presentations on the theme New Times, New Social Divisions?, and John

Carroll and Vicki Kirby will front the final day by addressing the topic Humanism, Posthumanism and the Sociological Enterprise (yes, that's "Sociological", not "Starship"...). In between, we should have Kath Albury and David Plummer on The Future of Sexualities, Jane Haggis and Aileen Moreton-Robinson on New Blackness, New Whiteness, and Geoffrey Lawrence, Rick Farley and Jan FitzGerald addressing the Public Forum on The End of The Rural? There will also be a special session on teaching sociology.

The traditional Health Day will take place on 3 December, as will the not-so-traditional Postgraduate Workshop.

Other events include the revelation of the Most Influential Books in Australian Sociology (a perfect place for an argument), a session on the History of Australian Sociology (written by ...the winners?), the presentation of the Stephen Crook Memorial Prize, the Jean Martin Award, the award for the best paper in the Journal of Sociology, and the TASA Award for Service to Australian Sociology. Then there's the Conference Dinner. In the Art Museum. Unmissable.

See you in Armidale. Country hospitality with a city edge!

Peter Corrigan Chair, Local Organising Committee, TASA 2003

Higher Degrees as Passages to our Higher Purposes

Last week marked the seventh month into my PhD, and I was seriously considering throwing it all in. There are so many things going on in my life at the moment, many opportunities coming towards me that are far more exciting than sitting alone at my computer and reading heavy text books all day. In discussions with other postgraduate students, I am learning that what I experienced is as common to the higher degree process as blood noses are to boxers! To get to this level of study, we have all journeyed a minimum of four years of study, most of us though, have been at it for far longer than that. We begin to feel jaded, isolated and disillusioned. We also become tired of dealing with friends and families who have no real idea exactly what it is that we do, and accuse us of being academic junkies hiding away from the 'real world'.

The good news is, I'm back on track, and I'm even more committed to earning my doctorate today than I was when I started. Fortunately, my time of flunking about only lasted a few days, but many students do not find it so easy to get back on track when hitting the skids. Many take years longer than expected to finish their degrees, and still more drop out all together. I am lucky enough to have a background in life coaching, so I have a battery of strategies I use to propel me towards the goals I have set myself. Because of this, I have been asked to share some of these ideas with other students in hope that they too will have access to the tools and motivation they need to see their dream of a post graduate qualification come to fruition.

Therefore, I am honoured to provide a few thoughts on how to not just survive the post graduate experience, but how to totally thrive through it! Please bear in mind, as you read this, that some of these ideas may not resonate for you. That's fine, some of the strategies I suggest will work for some, others will work for many; you decide what will work best for you. You will notice I am going to ask you a lot of questions. There is a good reason for this; there is no point telling you what I think you should do -

to state the obvious, I am not you! What I am going to do here is give you a bunch of questions to ask yourself, a written coaching session of sorts, so you can build your very own strategies, which will be so much more effective than anything I could ever tell you. So grab a pen and paper and let's get started.

What's your big picture? Do you have a vision for your life? Do you even remember why you started to study in the first place?

Take a moment to think back to that time. We all have secret dreams about what we want to do in life, who we want to be and how we want to shape the world around us in our own ways. How does your study work in with this plan? I already know what I want to do, and the study I'm doing, whilst very interesting, has little relevance to my 'big picture'. However, I realise that to achieve what I want to achieve, having a higher degree will give creditability to my name and make marketing myself so much easier (and let's face it, in this world of increased contractual work rather than permanent paid work, we all need to be marketable). You might be in a similar position, or it may be that what you are studying is directly needed in order for you to gain employment in the area you want.

If neither of these positions is true for you, why are you studying?

Are you living someone else's dream? Ask yourself the tough question here, are you brave enough to change track now in order to get back onto the path to achieving what you really want to do? If you truly don't have a vision for yourself, there is no doubt in my mind that you have trouble sticking to anything. Not to have a vision, any vision (and visions can change, that's fine, but you have to have some sort of image for yourself) is to set yourself up for a depressing and unfulfilling life of mediocrity! I don't want to appear melodramatic here but, without a 'big picture', you are having a crisis of the soul, and really need to stop everything you are doing right now and learn what it is you want to do. If you have trouble with this, get yourself a life coach, or some self-help books (email me, I can rattle off any number which would be

useful) and work on getting a vision for yourself!

Make it permeable

At this point, I'm going to assume that you do have a dream, and you can see in the big picture how your studies are an important step in achieving this. Where is your dream? Is it in your head? Do you have it written in a journal? How often do you visit it? In order to stay motivated, focussed, committed and on target, you must be able to constantly visualize your future. It should be the hologram through which you view everything you see in daily life. I cannot emphasise this enough: this isn't about visiting your dream once a month, once a week, or even on a daily basis, it's about having it become part of every waking moment. Whether it's tucked away in the back of your mind, or in the corners, your big picture needs to become the filter through which you see, hear and feel everything!

If you're not already doing this, start working on making it permeable. What can you do right now to lock in your big picture? Can you make a collage with cuttings, pictures and keywords that represent where you want to be, to stick next to your computer? Do you have spiritual practices, such as meditation, in which you can incorporate visualizing and building your big picture? Can you write a little rhyme about your vision and sing it over and over in your head (this is a wonderful practice for anyone who jogs or walks)? Can you decide on one single future event to be the cue to your dream - it may be accepting your doctorate on graduation day, or giving a lecture in a full auditorium, or walking into your brand new office at the job you will get once you've finished your degree, or giving a speech at the opening of your new business? It doesn't matter what you decide to do, you know within yourself what would work best for you, as long as you have a clear and detailed picture of exactly where you want to be in the future that is firmly planted in your psyche.

Once you have this in your mind ... you are in an incredibly strong position from a motivational point of view. Whenever you start to doubt what you're doing, whenever you have writers' block, whenever

you are so sick of the library that the smell of books makes you feel like puking, whenever you get presented with yet another ethics approval re-write, pull forth your image. Just sit for a minute or two, breath deeply, close your eyes if you need to, and draw forth your big picture. Remind yourself that the slog you are doing now is an intricate part of living your dream. When you can bring forth that image your whole perspective will change. In a mere moment, what had totally daunted you will become another step towards making your vision your reality.

There are many other things you can do to stay energized and motivated through your postgraduate years, such as being well organised, setting

priorities, eating well and exercising, creating balance through spending time in other areas of your life, seeking out and spending time with other students who are studying similar topics, creating an uplifting and supportive physical work environment, learning how to clear the clutter and when to say 'no', developing a strong relationship with your supervisors and developing a strong personal image of yourself. Each of these topics is a whole essay within itself, but what I have given you in this short piece is a foundation on which to build everything else. Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote, 'The great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving.' Without your big picture deeply etched in your heart and

mind, and a belief that you are willing and able to make that your reality, you become directionless; you will wander aimlessly around in a desert of missed deadlines, unidentified opportunities and lethargy.

So if ever you're feeling despondent about your studies, remind yourself of the importance they play in your big picture - the vision you have sketched out, refined and nurtured until it permeates your thinking, seeing and feeling. Breathe in, breathe out, and allow the excitement of the journey to give you buoyancy through the tough times.

With best wishes for the ride of your life!

Karina Butera

kjbut@deakin.edu.au

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

November 9-11, 2003

University House, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, Youth in Transition 2003 Annual Symposium, Cunningham Lecture and Annual General Meeting.

<http://www.assa.edu.au/Conferences/details/symp2003.htm>

November 17-22, 2003

Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.

School of Public Health, Exploring New Horizons in Public Health - Ninth International Health Summer School.

http://www.hlth.qut.edu.au/ph/international/summer_school.jsp

November 24-26, 2003

Adelaide Convention Centre, Adelaide, Australia.

South Australian Department of Human Services and the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Housing Futures: Third National Housing Conference.

<http://www.nationalhousingconference.org.au>

December 1-2, 2003

Citigate Sebel Hotel, Sydney, Australia.

Australian Institute of Criminology and the Department of Juvenile Justice, New South Wales, Juvenile Justice: From the Lessons of the Past to a Road Map for the Future.

<http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/2003-juvenile/>

December 3, 2003

Marnie Yeates Room, Mary White College, University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

TASA Annual Postgraduate Workshop.

<http://www.tasa.org.au/index.html>

December 4 - 6, 2003

University of New England, Armidale, Australia.

TASA 2003 Annual Conference, New Times, New Worlds, New Ideas: Sociology Today and Tomorrow.

<http://www.une.edu.au/arts/Sociology/index.htm>

December 10-12, 2003

University of Newcastle, Australia.

Centre of Full Employment and Equity, The University of Newcastle, 5th Path to Full Employment Conference and 10th National Conference on Unemployment.

<http://e1.newcastle.edu.au/coffee/conferences/2003/index.cfm>

April 12-13, 2004

University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia.

University of Melbourne, Centre for Public Policy, The Australian Electronic Governance Conference 2004.

<http://www.public-policy.unimelb.edu.au/egovernance/index2.html>

April 15-16, 2004

Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorne Campus, Australia.

Institute for Social Research, Compromise and the Academy. Ethics and the Governance of Universities in a Commercial Era.

Abstracts due: December 1, 2003

<http://www.sisr.net/compromise/>

April 26-30, 2004

Melbourne, Australia.

International Union for Health Promotion and Education, 18th World Conference on Health Promotion and Health Education.

Abstracts due: October 31st, 2003

<http://www.health2004.com.au/default.asp>

July 9-11, 2004

Brisbane, Australia

Law and Literature Association of Australia, 12th Conference, Traumas of Law: Juridical, Aesthetic, Therapeutic.

Abstracts due: Please contact Ms Pamela Adams, Administrative

Office, Socio-Legal Research Centre, Griffith University.

Email: P.Adams@griffith.edu.au

http://www.gu.edu.au:80/school/law/slrc/traumas_of_law/content02.html

September 15-17, 2004

Canberra, Australia.

Australian Population Association 12th Biennial Conference: Population and Society: Issues, Research, Policy.

Further information: Program Convenor, Dr Ann Evans, Centre for Social Research, RSSS, ANU, Acton ACT 0200.

Tel: (02) 6125 0133

Email: Ann.Evans@anu.edu.au

Editor-in-chief: Daphne Habibis Editorial collective: Glenda Jones, Kristin Natalier

Contributions appearing in NEXUS do not necessarily reflect the views of TASA.

Contributions to NEXUS are welcome and should be sent to:

NEXUS School of Sociology and Social Work, University of Tasmania, Locked Bag 1340G, Launceston, Tasmania 7250

Telephone (03) 6324 3946 Fax (03) 6324 3652

Email: nexus@utas.edu.au Website: <http://www.tasa.org.au>

Registered Australia Post PP 762005/10034 ISSN No 0728-1595 Printed on recycled Paper