

# Contents

p.2 Program in Brief

p. 8 Workshop outlines

p. 20 Abstracts (by author's name, alphabetical)

p.45 Presenters', authors' and convenors' email

*The two academic convenors of this conference - Paul 't Hart and Tim Rowse - would like to thank **Mary Hapel** (RSSS) for her tireless efficiency and good humour in the role of Conference Administrator*

# Governing by Looking Back

## Program in brief

**Wednesday 12 December**

**1-3 Plenary Session 1**

**MCC T3**

Opening: **I.Chubb** (VC, ANU), **R.Rhodes** (Director RSSS)

Chair: **M.Thomas** (DVC, ANU)

Speakers: **J.Olick** *On The Hermeneutics of Historical Analogy*

**C.Offe** *Transitional justice: The German and Korean experiences compared*

Discussant: **R.Goodin**

3-3.30 Afternoon tea

3.30-5 Three workshops and three panels

**Workshop 1**

**Moran G7**

*Growth and Governance in Australia*

Convenor: **G.D.Snooks**

**Workshop 2**

**Moran G8**

*Policy Evaluation and Policy Learning: Beyond Program Evaluation and Performance Audit*

Convenors: **J.Stewart** and **B.Head**

**Workshop 3**

**MCC T6**

*Under construction: Nation-building in Australia, past, present and future*

Convenors: **J.Wanna** and **J.Butcher**

**Panel 1.1**

**MCC T4** (Chair: P. 't Hart)

*Shaping and using history in leader rhetoric*

**D.Lowe** and **J.Walter** *Politicians and the Appeal to History*

**W.Errington** *Howard and Menzies: an Idol but not a Model*

**J.Curran** *'Commendable Emptiness'? The demise of empire and the patriotic void in Australian political culture*

**Panel 1.2**

**MCC T5** (Chair: R.Goodin)

***Understanding organizational memory and organizational evolution***

**J.Sutton** *Shared memories and cognitive artifacts: the entangling of personal and group remembering*

**D.Halpin** *Charting Interest Group ‘Careers’: Studying Group ‘Organisational Forms’*

**5-6 Cocktail Party**

**MCC Foyer**

6-7 Public Lecture **M. Pusey** *It’s Institutions that Matter*

**MCC T3**

Thursday December 13

9-10.30 Three workshops and four panels

**Workshop 1** continued *Growth and Governance in Australia* Moran G7

**Workshop 2** continued *Policy Evaluation and Policy Learning* Moran G8

**Workshop 3** continued *Under Construction* MCC T6

**Panel 2.1**

**MCC T4** (Chair: T.Rowse)

**Contested memories of difference**

**L.Ryan** *Remembering and Forgetting the Black War in Tasmania*

**L.Veracini** *Settler Colonial Narratives*

**D.Mayrl** *Courting history: Remembering religious pasts in Australian and American court decisions, 1945-1985*

**Panel 2.2**

**MCC T5** (Chair: N.Brown)

**Landscapes of memory: Western Australia**

**J.Sheriff** *The public management of collective memory: managing Western Australian war memorials*

**K.Gregory** *The memory-work of the National Trust of Australia (WA) in representing history*

**A.Witcomb** *Playing to a different tune: The impact of different forms of remembering on institutional practices and politics at the National Trust of Australia (WA)*

**Panel 2.3**

**Crisp 17** (Chair: J.Halligan)

**Public sector reform and organisational amnesia I**

**M.Painter** *Legacies Remembered, Lessons Forgotten: Transplanting the Regulatory State to Asia*

**A.Smullen** *Assessing symbolic convergence over time: similarities and differences in official agency accounts in The Netherlands, Sweden and Australia*

10.30-11 Morning tea

11-12.30 Three workshops and four panels

**Workshop 1** continued *Growth and Governance in Australia* Moran G7

**Workshop 2** continued *Policy Evaluation and Policy Learning* Moran G8

**Workshop 3** final *Under Construction* MCC T6

**Panel 2.4**

MCC T3 (Chair: C.Ryan)

**Environmental history and policy**

**N.Schoorlemmer, G.Verbong** *Collective memory in action: understanding Dutch river policy*

**Panel 2.5**

MCC T4 (Chair: N.Brown)

**The exemplary citizen and managed memories**

**C.Beer** *The National Capital City, Portraiture, and the Politics of Historical Recognition: The Development of Canberra's National Portrait Gallery*

**R.Stevens** *The Influence of History on Immigrant Selection Policies: A Comparative Analysis*

**Panel 2.6**

MCC T5 (Chair: T.Rowse)

**Can Government and Opposition draw on historiographies that justify their policies?**

**K.Balnave, G.Patmore** *Labour History and Public Policy*

**R. Pascoe, S. Macintyre** *New Right history in the Howard Government era, 1996–2007*

**Panel 2.7**

Crisp 17 (Chair: J.Raadschelders)

**Administrative traditions in civil service systems I**

**J. Raadschelders** *Approaches to "tradition" in public administration: theoretical explorations*

**T. Toonen, F. Van der Meer, J. Raadschelders** *Administrative traditions and civil service reforms*

**P. Weller, J. Wanna** *The Westminster legacy*

12.30-2 Lunch

2-3.30 Three workshops and two panels

**Workshop 1** final session *Growth and Governance in Australia* Moran G7

**Workshop 4** *Tracking policy through time* first session MCC T5  
Convenors A.Kay, A.McConnell

**Workshop 5** *Making Media Policy* first session MCC T6  
Convenor J.Given

**Panel 2.8**

MCC T3 (Chair: R.Goodin)

**J. Flanagan** *A Conflict in Search of a Historical Analogy: The Bush Administration's Evolving Definition of the War in Iraq.*

**B. Kent** *The use and abuse of historical analogies in the formation of foreign policy adventures: Explaining the 'Dardanelles syndrome'*

**Panel 2.9**

MCC T4 (Chair: J.Raadschelders)

**Administrative traditions in civil service systems II**

**J. Halligan** *Does reception of NPM vary with administrative tradition?*

**Nick Brown** *Inventing traditions, and discarding them: an Australian perspective*

3.30-4 Afternoon tea

**4-5.30 Plenary II**

MCC3 (Chair: A.McGrath)

**T.Taylor** *Disputed Territory: who owns history in schools?*

Discussant: **Tim Rowse**

7.30 Conference Dinner

**University House**

**Friday 14 December**

9-10.30 Two workshops and three panels

**Workshop 4** continued *Tracking policy through time* Moran G7

**Workshop 5** continued *Making Media Policy* MCC T6

### **Panel 3.1**

**MCC T3** (Chair: T.Rowse)

#### **Paths not Taken: History, Myth and the Settler Context of Indigenous Rights in Australia**

**S.Young** *Cultural 'Timelessness' and Colonial Tethers: Australian Native title in Comparative Perspective*

**H.Pedersen** *Historical Revisionism and the Conservative Dominance of Australian Indigenous Public Policy*

**L. Ford** *Australian Sovereignty and Its Historical Occlusions: the North American and Global Contexts of Sovereignty in Colonial New South Wales*

Discussant: **L. Strelein**

### **Panel 3.2**

**MCC T4** (Chair: J.Halligan)

#### **Public Sector Reform and Organisational Amnesia II**

**C.Pollitt** *Bureaucracies Remember, Post-Bureaucratic Organizations Forget?*

**R.Gregory** *Accountability and the Politics of Retrospective Story-Telling*

**P.Laegreid and T.Christensen** *Living in the Past? – Tenure, Roles and Attitudes in the Central Civil Service*

### **Panel 3.3**

**MCC T5** (Chair: K.Neumann)

#### **Migration: history and policy I**

**K.Neumann** *'A free, stable, prosperous and compassionate nation': Australian responses to refugees and the invocation of a glorious past*

**G.Tavan** *Back to the Future? What the Howard Government's citizenship reforms owe to past policies and practices – and what it can learn from this.*

**O.Kleist** *Between Pasts and Politics: Memory Policies in the Tampa Crisis*

10.30-11 Morning tea

11-12.30 Two workshops and three panels

**Workshop 4** finishing *Tracking policy through time* Moran G7

**Workshop 5** finishing *Making Media Policy* Moran MCC T6

### **Panel 3.4**

**MCC T3** (Chair: P. 't Hart)

#### **Advising the Rulers: Australian Advisory systems through time**

**A.Tiernan** *The 'deep structures' of advisory space: choices and constraints facing Australian Prime Ministers*

**M.Maley** *The development of partisan advisory structures in Australia*

**D.Connelly** *The development of bureaucratic advice systems for national security policy*

**Panel 3.5**

**MCC T4** (Chair: T.Rowse)

**Australasian trajectories: how histories inform national and regional imaginaries**

**P. Mein-Smith** *Trans-Tasman traffic: history and policy*

**A.Curthoys** *Self-government and Indigenous dispossession: Linked fates, separate histories, long shadows*

**Panel 3.6**

**MCC T5** (Chair: D.Dumaresq)

**Policy amnesia, selective memory and hidden values in the development of rural policy**

**L.Botterill** *The influence of agrarian values on Australian rural policy since the Second World War*

**D.Connell** *Policy amnesia, the Murray Darling Basin and the National Water Initiative*

**K.Proust** *Lessons learnt and unlearnt about salinity since the 19<sup>th</sup> century*

Discussant: **S. Dovers**

**12.30-1.30pm Lunch**

**1.30- 3.15pm**

**Plenary session III**

**MCC T3**

Chair: **A.MacIntyre**

Speaker: **K.Thelen** (Northwestern)

*Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*

Discussant: **J.Dryzek** (ANU)

**3.15 pm Conference Closing**

# Workshop outlines

Workshops 1,2 and 4 will be of restricted size.  
Workshops 3 and 5 are open to all registrants.  
If you wish to attend any of Workshops 1,2 and 4  
you must apply to the named convenors.

## Workshop One: Growth and Governance in Australia

**Convened by Graeme Snooks**, Global Dynamic Systems Centre (GDSC),  
Research School of Social Sciences, ANU [Graeme.Snooks@anu.edu.au](mailto:Graeme.Snooks@anu.edu.au) .  
From Wednesday 3.30pm until Thursday 3.30 pm, four 90 minutes  
sessions. All sessions in **Moran G7**

### **Session 1: Wednesday 12, 3.30–5.00 – Telling it like it is – the role of historical economics**

3.30–3.45 – **Graeme Snooks** (GDSC, RSSS, ANU)

*Exploding political myths about Australia's  
economic past*

3.45–4.45 – **Alex Millmow** (University of Ballarat)

*Does academic economic opinion matter any more?*

7.00 – **Dinner** (city restaurant)

### *Session 2: Thursday 13, 9.00–10.30 – Long-run perspectives*

9.00–9.45 – **Glenn Withers** (Universities Australia & ANU)

*A new narrative for Australia*

9.45–10.30 – **Graeme Snooks** (GDSC, RSSS, ANU)

*Australia's long-run economic strategy,  
performance, and policy*

### **Session 3: Thursday 13, 11.00–12.30 – Fluctuations and monetary policy**

11.00–11.45 – **John Edwards** (HSBC Investment Bank)

*Australia's turbulent half century – since the 1950s*

11.45–12.30 – **Selwyn Cornish** (Faculties, ANU)

*Central banking in Australia – the formative years,  
1920–1970*

### **Session 4: Thursday 13, 2.00–3.30 – Australia in Eastern Asia**

2.00–2.45 – **Huw McKay** (Westpac)

*Asia's finite economic strategy: Japanese  
experience, Chinese prospects, and the Australian response*

2.45–3.30 – **Gary Magee** (La Trobe)

*Australian growth and governance evaluated*

## Workshop 2: Policy evaluation and policy learning: beyond program evaluation and performance audit

Convenors: **J.Stewart** [Jenny.Stewart@canberra.edu.au](mailto:Jenny.Stewart@canberra.edu.au) (University of Canberra) and **B.Head** (University of Queensland) [brian.head@uq.edu.au](mailto:brian.head@uq.edu.au). From Wednesday 3.30pm until Thursday 12.30 pm, three 90 minutes sessions. All sessions in **Moran G8**

Although Australian governments at all levels have embraced the measuring and monitoring of program performance, the true potential of policy evaluation is often lost in the relentless drama of party-political competition on the one hand, and the day-to-day requirements of budgetary and organisational management on the other. Significant potential for policy learning remains undeveloped as a result. Theory contains as many complications as practice. While evaluative techniques have blossomed, the theory of evaluation has, arguably, failed to develop sufficiently to comprehend and shape a rapidly-changing world of policy, participation and management. In addition, tools are needed for longer-term reflection on policy, and for developing the approaches and techniques needed to understand, critique and learn from past experience. In short, we need to re-invent policy evaluation. The workshop focuses on three complementary aspects of the problem: processes; decision-making; and policy in the long-run. Discussants will address both the analytical and prospective aspects of each paper (that is, research gaps and opportunities), with a view to developing a suite of papers for journal publication as a symposium.

### Session 1: Wednesday 12, 3:30–5:00

#### **Brian Head and Jenny Stewart** *Evaluating policy processes*

Good outcomes are assumed to be dependent in important ways on good processes. These processes are arguably crucial for all elements of policy development and program review. Yet the political and administrative spheres, in their understandable focus on achieving results, often seem to pay insufficient attention to such processes. Despite the plethora of performance information gathered in many programs and agencies, a fundamental issue remains as to whether we lack appropriate ways of evaluating relationships in policy making. What kind of bottom-up and top-down processes are needed? What are

the pros and cons of utilising networks? What do we know about the effectiveness of partnership approaches? Have we created conditions under which policy improvement and policy learning can flourish?

Discussants: Meredith Edwards, Hal Colebatch, Andrew Podger

### **Session 2 Thursday 13, 9–10:30**

**Paul 't Hart** (ANU) and **Adrian Kay** (Griffith)

*Evaluating government performance in Australia: Reconnecting policy and politics*

This paper aims, firstly, to provide a robust and realistic analytical toolkit for comparative policy evaluation that bridges the gap between 'policy' and 'political' logics of assessing government performance. Secondly, it lays the groundwork for applying this toolkit to assess Australian federal and state government performance, comparatively across three policy sectors, and over time.

Discussants: Alan Fenna; Brian Head

### **Session 3 Thursday, 11:00–12:30**

**Will Sanders** (ANU) *Ideology, Moralising and Learning in Australian Indigenous Affairs*

This paper will reflect on events in Australian Indigenous affairs in 2006 and 2007. It will note the very prominent role of ideology and moralising in these events and ask what consequence this has for policy learning. The paper will argue that learning in Indigenous affairs cannot escape the prominence of ideology and moralising, but that it might be possibly be enhanced by self-conscious attention to their prominent presence.

Discussants: Jane Robbins (Flinders), David Martin (ANU)

**Ciaran O'Faircheallaigh** (Griffith University) *Evaluating Negotiated Agreements in Aboriginal Australia*

Agreement making has become the dominant mode of resolving conflicts and potential conflicts around resource development on Aboriginal land in Australia, and indeed agreements are now negotiated for virtually all new major resource projects. These agreements pave the way for projects that involve billions of dollars of investment, can result in extensive environmental and social impacts, and have the potential to generate considerable economic and social benefits. How can agreement making and agreements be evaluated? Multiple

evaluative criteria and methodologies are required, given that agreements can be viewed from a range of perspectives and that agreement outcomes can be defined in a series of different ways, for instance as the cultural and social impacts arising from the process of agreement making; as the contents of the agreements themselves; and as the ultimate impacts resulting from those agreements as they are put into effect. This paper considers how these different dimensions of agreements can be evaluated, and in the process considers more general methodological and theoretical issues that arise in evaluating processes and outcomes in contexts that are complex and contested.

Discussant: Toni Bauman AIATSIS

## Workshop 3: Australia Under Construction Nation-building in Australia

Convenors: John Wanna (ANU) [john.wanna@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.wanna@anu.edu.au)  
and John Butcher (ANU) [john.butcher@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.butcher@anu.edu.au)

From Wednesday 3.30pm until Thursday 12.30pm: three 90 minute sessions. All sessions in Manning Clark Centre **Theatre 6**

Speakers will explore past and emerging discourses on nation-building in Australia, focussing on its historical context; its national symbolism and political rhetoric; and its continuing relevance as a framework for public policy. The workshop will comprise three sessions:

**Session 1: Wednesday 12, 3:30–5:00, Building Australia** will examine the historical traditions of nation-building by examining the rhetoric and reality of past nation-building initiatives and extrapolating possible lessons for contemporary policy-makers: Don **Aitkin** (former Vice Chancellor of the University of Canberra – Discussant), Dr Anna **Clark** (Monash University), Dr Richard **Evans** (co-author of *Constructing Australia*) and Dr Robert **Wooding** (University of Tasmania).

**Session 2: Thursday 13, 9:00–10:30, Reflections on contemporary nation-building** will examine contemporary approaches to ‘visioning’ and ‘delivering’ nationally significant social and physical infrastructure and explore the political and practical dimensions of directive/interventionist versus facilitative/leveraging approaches to nation-building: Fred **Argy** AM OBE, Paul **Kelly** (Editor-at-large of *The Australian* – Discussant) and Lindsay **Neilson** (Department of Premier and Cabinet, Victoria).

**Session 3: Thursday 13, 11:00–12:30, Building the Future** will focus on current and future challenges for nation-builders, seek to identify issues of strategic national interest that call for a resurgence of nation-building effort and speculate about the structural, systemic and political challenges facing nation-builders of the future: Andrew **Leigh** (Australian National University – Discussant), Ian **Marsh** (University of Sydney) and Anthony Shepherd, Board Chairman, Transfield Services Ltd. Frank **Stilwell** (University of Sydney) will offer closing remarks at the end of the final session of the Workshop.

‘Australia under construction’ will conclude with a Keynote Address that is open to the public: Professor Michael **Pusey** (University of New South Wales) on Wednesday, 12 December, at 6:00 pm (Manning Clark Centre, Theatre 3).

## Workshop 4: Tracking policy through time: Beyond the stability–change dualism

Convenors: Adrian Kay (Griffith University) [a.kay@griffith.edu.au](mailto:a.kay@griffith.edu.au), Allan McConnell (University of Sydney) [a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au)

Three 90 minute sessions. The first session (Thursday 2–3.30) is in Manning Clark Centre **Theatre Five**, the second (Friday 9–10.30) and third (Friday 11–12.30) in **Moran G7**.

This workshop will address the following questions: How can we identify the basic unit(s) of analysis for tracking policy through time? How can we identify the appropriate length of time for tracking policy through time? How can we operationalise policy change? Is it possible to produce a generalisable descriptive–analytical framework of policy change through time? Is it better to think in terms of trends, tendencies at different scales and speeds rather than temporally static judgements of stability and change?

**Adrian Kay** *Persistence and Change in Complex Policies: The case of the Common Agricultural Policy*

The concept of path dependency is salient within the burgeoning literature on the temporal analysis of policy. Current applications of path dependency to policy development tend to use a single composite variable for policy change following a unique path. This category of policy change has significant analytical limitations, creating a binary view of policy as either changing or unchanging, at any given point in

time. We propose a fine-grained perspective on policy change that it is capable of identifying the coexistence of stability and change in complex policies. The benefits of this analytical development are illustrated clearly in the second part of the paper; in particular, it allows us to reveal a key dynamic in a path dependent CAP that would not otherwise be observed: the remarkable stability in member states' CAP spending shares over time despite significant reform episodes.

**Allan McConnell** *Unravelling the Enigma of Policy Change*

Policy change is much written about but infrequently operationalised. This paper draws primarily on public policy literature in an attempt to develop a framework which is usable by researchers and practitioners to identify the existence and forms of policy change, taking into account the stability/change relationship and temporal dimensions, as well as broader issues of ontology and epistemology.

**Paul Cairney** *How does the political science literature conceptualise change?*

This paper presents a critical review of a range of political science literatures focusing on policy change and stability. It outlines a 'multiple lenses' approach to suggest that attention to a number of aspects of these models (including punctuated equilibrium, the advocacy coalition framework, multiple streams analysis and multi-level governance) may be more fruitful than the selection of one model followed by attempts to confirm its value through case study analysis.

**Richard Eccleston** *Taxing Reforms: The complex dynamics of tax policy change in Australia and the United States*

Tax policy is highly contested and proposals for policy change invariably meet fierce political resistance. Given these constraints conventional explanations of tax reform have followed a punctuated equilibrium model in which periodic economic and political crises result in rapid policy change among protracted periods of relative stability. This paper challenges the stability v change dualism implicit in such accounts and, using recent tax reforms in Australia and the United States as a reference, argues that the dynamics of tax policy change are more complex. The paper argues that while exogenous shocks central to historical institutionalist theories of policy change influence the timing of reform proposals, they provide few insights into direction and magnitude of policy change. To this end it is necessary to focus on the micro level and nature of societal resistance to policy change. To this end policy entrepreneurs as key agents in interest group action and learning and make a significant contribution to the complex process of tax policy change.

**Melanie Nolan** *Gendered Path Dependency and explaining recent Australia and New Zealand Policy Divergence*

In the attempt to explain surprising or seemingly irrational forms of 'persistence' of social phenomena (organizations; public policies and social conditions) economists and policy analysts have, on occasion, used path dependency. Historians are more inclined to invoke 'contingency' in their discussions of causality but they are in many ways examining the same problem. The aim of this paper is to consider a particular public policy puzzle: why do highly gendered work forces persist in Australasia, despite a flurry of policy rhetoric and programs over decades trying to alter this situation? The strength of the male breadwinner ethos in Australasian public policy for most of the twentieth century is not in question. Moreover, the puzzle is not that it has persisted despite equal pay legislation (1959–1972) Childcare subsidization (1973–74) Maternity Leave (1973 and 1980) paid parental leave and baby bonuses. Australia and New Zealand have similar rates of women's participation in the workforce and birth rates. At some level a gendered path dependency is operating. However in Australia the Howard Liberal government made raising the fertility rate a major government objective with the country's Treasurer Peter Costello famously exhorting Australians to have 'one for the father, one for the mother and one for the country'. The sex Discrimination Commissioner has targeted the impact of housework on the birth rate and childlessness. However the issue of the effect of childcare on workplace participation is more prominent in New Zealand. In January 2005 New Zealand's Prime Minister Helen Clark announced that she wanted to lift female participation in the workforce. New Zealand's women's participation in the workforce was below the average for developed countries and economic productivity would rise if the rate was lifted and announced a number of childcare initiatives. In this paper I will unpick a complex historical causality in the varying policy configurations.

**Willem Trommel** *The potential richness of path-dependency analysis*

This paper will discuss the historicist bias in path dependency analysis, in order to provide insights that may help to overcome the explanatory gap in current path dependency studies. Therefore, the main question is: To what extent does path dependency analysis suffer from historicism, how does this bias produce shortcomings in explaining (radical) policy change and how can path dependency arguments be improved at this particular point? The structure of the paper is as follows. After having introduced our central theme, we shortly discuss Popper's ideas on historicism. Next we discuss the central propositions

in path dependency theory, followed by a critical analysis of its historicist bias. In this analysis we will present a number of empirical examples which demonstrate how historicism narrows the scope of policy analysis to conclusions that are tautological rather than explanatory. The paper concludes with some suggestions for improving the quality of path dependency arguments by sketching a framework for the study of ‘initial conditions’ and ‘negative feed-back mechanisms’.

**J. Ballard** *Why Melbourne Does It Best: Innovation in Public Health Policy*

Having conducted research on Australian policy development on HIV, blood and tobacco over the past two decades, I have been intrigued by the fact that Melbourne has been the primary centre for innovation in all three areas, not only for Australia, but internationally. This has also been true in relation to the introduction of compulsory seat belts and perhaps some other cases. I explore innovation in public health policy in these areas, speculating on the extent to which the history and culture of Melbourne and the politics of Victoria have contributed to innovation and drawing contrasts with Sydney and New South Wales.

## Workshop 5: Making Media Policy: Looking Forward, Looking Back

Convenor Jock Given, Swinburne University of Technology  
[jgiven@swin.edu.au](mailto:jgiven@swin.edu.au)

From Thursday 2pm until Friday 12.30: three 90 minute sessions in Manning Clark Centre **Theatre Six**

This workshop will explore continuities and discontinuities between the past and the future of media policy. Papers will examine contemporary media policy questions by analysing historical incidents and issues. It is hoped that this will help understand what is new and what is familiar about current and likely future policy challenges, and how emerging possibilities might be shaped by past decisions. The past influences the future of media policy through many kinds of incumbency—technical (spectrum allocations; ownership of strategic infrastructure like the local loop; the installed base of consumer devices and software that might be made redundant), commercial (long-term contracts between producers of premium content and distributors), legal (licences, especially for TV and radio, allocated with an expectation of renewal) and personal (relationships with politicians). Some ideas acquire a

kind of mythic incumbency in the minds of policy makers, like the reasons a particular policy was adopted, or why it failed or succeeded, or how Australians always enthuse about any new technology. Papers will focus on contemporary policy issues, examining the past not for its own sake but as a tool for understanding the future.

### Session 1: Thursday 13, 2–3.30

**Trevor Barr** (Professor of Media and Communications, Swinburne University and Program Manager, Smart Internet Technology Co-operative Research Centre)

*Government as Good Guy: lessons for broadband investment*

Future investment in communications networks; from Charles Todd, to NASA satellites to the early Internet showing telecoms' forgotten history of successful government R&D investment

**Gerard Goggin** (Professor of Digital Communication and Deputy Director, Centre for Social Research in Journalism and Communication, UNSW)

*Stories about Mobiles: histories of new technology and the shaping of Australian media governance*

Future telecoms technology choices and market structures: eg. OPEL WiMAX network; CDMA shut down; allocating vacated analogue TV spectrum for unlicensed wireless use – 'spectrum commons'

**Jock Given** (Professor of Media and Communications, Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University)

*A 50/50 Proposition: Public Private Partnerships in Australian communications*

ALP plan for PPP to build & operate fibre-to-the-node broadband network, drawing especially on the experience of AWA as a PPP from 1922–51

### Session 2: Friday 14, 9–10.30

**Ien Ang** (ARC Professorial Fellow and founding Director, Centre for Cultural Research, University of Western Sydney)

*Rethinking SBS: institutional change and the limits of legacy*

Multiculturalism and public service broadcasting

**Sam Ricketson** (Professor of Law, University of Melbourne)

*Copyright's response to new technologies: 1968 and the future (and what came in between)*

Regulating new forms of content and distribution

**Julian Thomas** (Professor of Media and Communications and Director, Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University)

*Digital transitions, past and present*

Policy futures for digital TV: drawing on TV's domestic transformations in the 1970s

### **Session 3: Friday 14, 11–12.30**

**Ellie Rennie** (Research Fellow, Institute for Social Research, Swinburne University)

*Too Late for Old Media: Indigenous television and community solutions*

Indigenous community TV and the National Indigenous TV Service drawing on the history of remote area Indigenous production and broadcasting

**Daniel Featherstone** (Media Coordinator, Ngaanyatjarra Media, Wingellina Community & postgrad student, Murdoch University)

*Indigenous community television*

Indigenous community TV and the National Indigenous TV Service drawing on the history of remote area Indigenous production and broadcasting

*Contributors to Workshop Five*

#### **Ien Ang**

Current understandings of SBS and the challenges it faces suffer from a lack of appropriate historical reasoning about how it came about. One could see SBS as a confluence of three areas of politics/policy: social policy (multiculturalism), media policy (public service broadcasting) and cultural policy (representations of Australian culture). There is very little understanding of the complex and shifting interrelations between these three policy strands, which have impinged on the directions SBS has taken. Then there is the economic imperative of SBS being a 'hybrid' organisation, deriving part of its revenue from advertising. This has an interesting history as well as intense contemporary relevance, following the introduction of in-program advertising.

#### **Trevor Barr**

There is widespread concern that Australia is not building broadband networks as quickly as many other countries. This paper will examine policy 'bottlenecks' that appear to be prime causes of delay and question several development parallels about notions of efficiency. One justification for privatising Telstra was that public ownership tends to be risk averse. The new privatised organisation, however, has embarked on an investment strike rather than build the networks

needed for the future. The deregulation of July 1997 can now be seen to have created a market mainly of cost-cutting re-sellers rather than a vibrant competitive industry out of which many new broadband players could emerge. The paper will test the hypothesis that Australia would by now have a thriving broadband industry in the top ten of OECD countries if many of the pre-1997 legislative frameworks and industry rules had remained in place.

### **Jock Given**

The ALP's plan to invest in a public private partnership (PPP) to build a high-speed broadband network is the latest dramatisation of the constantly shifting positions of private and public organisations as providers of communications services. Over the last century-and-a-half, the sector has been a constant source of new institutional models. As former public monopolies have been privatised since the 1980s, PPPs have come into vogue in other sectors of the economy and social policy. This paper will examine the experience of Australia's main wireless company, AWA, as a PPP created to develop a new communications capability. The company was reconstructed as a public/private enterprise in 1922 to establish direct wireless telegraph services between Australia and Britain and North America, remaining in 50/50 public/private ownership until 1951. The tensions it confronted also seem likely to afflict any 21<sup>st</sup> century broadband partnership.

### **Gerard Goggin**

This paper reviews the development of mobile phones. Firstly, it considers the technology choices made by Federal government in the 1980s, especially the decision to mandate the second generation Global Standard for Mobiles (GSM) digital standard. It also examines the structuring of the mobiles market with three initial licence holders, and the implications as mobiles developed through the 1990s. Secondly, it considers the histories marshalled in policy debates about 3G mobiles from the mid-1990s to the early 2000s. With 3G, the mobile phone became a focus for narratives around the future of media, communication, and culture. Unlike 2G perhaps, 3G began to be talked about as a failure, which had important implications for media governance. The paper concludes with some observations about how such critical examination of history can open up policy vistas about 'media after media', and about the limits to this recuperation of history, especially in confronting genuinely unfamiliar and disorienting change.

### **Ellie Rennie**

In 2006 the Australian government allocated \$90 million to Indigenous communications under the Backing Indigenous Ability scheme (BIA).

BIA is now being carved-up to appease competing needs: the pressure for an Indigenous-run national broadcasting service on the one hand and the urgency of getting broadband into remote communities on the other. With 'post-broadcast' media dominating global communication debates, there is good reason to review the decentralised model of Indigenous media which was implemented in the 1980s. That history indicates that socially responsive, robust, local media organisations are a key factor in the success of emerging distributed media models. However, it also raises significant questions as to whether new media is capable of providing the levels of leadership and national unity achieved by public service broadcasters during the broadcast era. How can Indigenous media play a greater role in the public sphere? Can locally-controlled media be made to articulate into national narratives?

### **Sam Ricketson**

This paper will explore current tensions in rebalancing the intellectual property rights of creators and users in response to new technologies, drawing on the debates about the same issues that informed the major overhaul of Australian intellectual property law expressed in the *Copyright Act* of 1968.

### **Julian Thomas**

The transition from analogue to digital television broadcasting remains fraught with difficulty and uncertainty. What seems to be a technical matter conceals a range of complex social, economic and cultural policy decisions. One is control over the content of television broadcasts. This paper aims to illuminate this contemporary problem through the prism of an earlier, and often overlooked, digital transformation of television, namely the consumer-driven uptake of what can be called the 'new television technologies' of the 1970s. In that decade a wave of new devices for household entertainment began to appear in Australian living rooms, including remote controls, teletext decoders, games consoles, home computers, video cassette recorders, laserdisc players, and other exotica. Many of these devices are now forgotten, but some have had considerable impact. Without much in the way of policy sanction or debate, these technologies substantially increased the amount and variety of information available through a TV set, and began the slow detachment of television from broadcasting. This paper suggests that the history of the new home entertainment technologies of the recent past could point towards some alternative futures for Australian television.

## Abstracts, by author

(This is not a complete list of presentations that will be made at the conference.)

**Ang, Ien** (University of Western Sydney) Workshop 5

[i.ang@uws.edu.au](mailto:i.ang@uws.edu.au)

*The SBS – Connecting social, media and cultural policy in the 1980s*

Current understandings of SBS and the challenges it faces suffer from a lack of appropriate historical reasoning about how it came about. One could see SBS as a confluence of three areas of politics/policy: social policy (multiculturalism), media policy (public service broadcasting) and cultural policy (representations of Australian culture). There is very little understanding of the complex and shifting interrelations between these three policy strands, which have impinged on the directions SBS has taken. Then there is the economic imperative of SBS being a ‘hybrid’ organisation, deriving part of its revenue from advertising. This has an interesting history as well as intense contemporary relevance, following the introduction of in-program advertising.

**Argy, Fred** Workshop 3

[fargy@ozemail.com.au](mailto:fargy@ozemail.com.au)

*Nation-building in shackles: the neglect of public debt as a method of financing long-term infrastructure*

State governments are finally waking up to the need to get more actively involved in financing of public infrastructure. But at the Federal level, with the current commitment of Coalition and Labor to zero net borrowing over the economic cycle, the public debt straightjacket is becoming even more entrenched. The notion that, over the medium/long term, all general government investment should be financed out of current revenue or through the private sector is plain silly. It is impeding the Government’s capacity to meet the nation’s infrastructure needs and forcing it to adopt financing options that are economically less efficient than borrowing. It is also contributing to the run down of social capital and denying Australians a genuine, well informed choice on the appropriate balance between public and private goods. The policy needs a rethink.

**Ballard, John** (Australian National University) Workshop 4

[john.ballard@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.ballard@anu.edu.au)

*Why Melbourne Does It Best: Innovation in Public Health Policy*

Having conducted research on Australian policy development on HIV, blood and tobacco over the past two decades, I have been intrigued by the fact that Melbourne has been the primary centre for innovation in all three areas, not only for Australia, but internationally. This has also been true in relation to the introduction of compulsory seat belts and perhaps some other cases. I explore innovation in public health policy in these areas, speculating on the extent to which the history and culture of Melbourne and the politics of Victoria have contributed to innovation and drawing contrasts with Sydney and New South Wales.

**Balnave, Nikola** (University of Western Sydney) Panel 2.6

[n.balnave@uws.edu.au](mailto:n.balnave@uws.edu.au)

(with G. Patmore) *Challenging Public Policy Amnesia: Labor’s Industrial Relations Agenda*  
Employers, workers and unions in Australia are facing a period of uncertainty as the major political parties push different industrial relations agendas. While the historiography of Australia is largely unsuited to the ideological and pragmatic needs of the Howard Government, can Labor’s approach be justified through historiography, or do both parties struggle with public policy amnesia? This paper examines Labor’s shift toward deregulation during the 1990s, and its current re-examination of arbitration in response to Howard’s industrial relations policies. Labor’s approach is analysed in light of early twentieth century

experimentation with different forms of industrial regulation. It is argued that some of the 'new' initiatives of Labor ignore lessons from the past, in particular the failure of voluntary arbitration. Such past experiments, and the conditions surrounding their failure, should not be overlooked by Labor in current policy formulation.

**Barr, Trevor** (Swinburne University of Technology) Workshop 5

[tbarr@swin.edu.au](mailto:tbarr@swin.edu.au)

*Investment in communications networks – deregulating telecommunications in the 1990s*

There is widespread concern that Australia is not building broadband networks as quickly as many other countries. This paper will examine policy 'bottlenecks' that appear to be prime causes of delay and question several development parallels about notions of efficiency. One justification for privatising Telstra was that public ownership tends to be risk averse. The new privatised organisation, however, has embarked on an investment strike rather than build the networks needed for the future. The deregulation of July 1997 can now be seen to have created a market mainly of cost-cutting re-sellers rather than a vibrant competitive industry out of which many new broadband players could emerge. The paper will test the hypothesis that Australia would by now have a thriving broadband industry in the top ten of OECD countries if many of the pre-1997 legislative frameworks and industry rules had remained in place.

**Beer, Chris** (Australian National University) Panel 2.5

[chris.beer@anu.edu.au](mailto:chris.beer@anu.edu.au)

*The National Capital City, Portraiture, and the Politics of Historical Recognition: The Development of Canberra's National Portrait Gallery*

This paper explores nation-making at the intersection of the imagination and practice of national capital cities, portraiture, and the politics of recognition. Specifically examining Canberra's National Portrait Gallery as a national cultural institution, I seek to account for the development of the Gallery as a place of portraiture and the Australian national politics of historical recognition. After situating the Gallery generally in the context of the development of national cultural institutions as a practice of national capital city and nation-state production and reproduction, I then briefly examine the role of particular contingencies and the specific imagination of national portrait galleries in the Anglosphere in producing the Gallery. I subsequently then explore the development of the Gallery as a visual-material national centre through its built accommodation and its discursive framing, and its practice in the field of portraiture intersecting with the building of Australian national history through the recognition of individuals. The paper concludes by emphasising that while the Gallery does contribute and is shaped by the production of Canberra as a national capital city through its built accommodations and seeking to be a national centre of portraiture, its practice is strongly formed by particular liberal concerns in the recognition and forgetting of individuals in the nation's past, present, and future.

**Botterill, Linda** (Australian National University) Panel 3.6

[linda.botterill@anu.edu.au](mailto:linda.botterill@anu.edu.au)

*The influence of agrarian values on Australian rural policy since the second world war*

This paper will discuss the influence of agrarianism on Australian rural policy since the 1940s and track the apparent rise and decline of agrarian sentiment as an important factor in rural policy settings. It will consider the role of values in policy development and suggest that, in spite of the strong focus on structural adjustment in recent decades, older, more deeply entrenched cultural values about farming continue to influence rural policy debate – arguably to the detriment of consistent, equitable policy outcomes.

**Brown, Nicholas** (Australian National University) Panel 2.9

[Nicholas.brown@anu.edu.au](mailto:Nicholas.brown@anu.edu.au)

*Inventing traditions, and discarding them: an Australian perspective*

Once proclaimed a social laboratory of the world, Australia has a tendency to cast itself as initiating new modes of policy and practice to meet the imperatives of state-building and national development. But how adequate is this perspective as a way of understanding the forms and reforms of government adapted over time, and particularly for claiming legitimacy for them? This paper will assess elements of 'invented tradition' in Australian public administration through the second half of the twentieth century, both as internal processes of capacity-building and adaptation and in externally-oriented assessments of comparative accountability and performance.

**Christensen, Tom** (University of Oslo) Panel 3.2

[tom.christensen@stv.uio.no](mailto:tom.christensen@stv.uio.no)

(with Per **Læg Reid**) [Per.Lag Reid@aorg.uib.no](mailto:Per.Lag Reid@aorg.uib.no)

*Living in the Past? – Tenure, Roles and Attitudes in the Central Civil Service*

The development of the central civil service in many countries has during the last two-three decades been ever changing and turbulent. This may be seen as different development phases – first the “old Weberian public administration”, then NPM and recently post-NPM. Some see these as phases of dominance, where reforms push aside the main features of the former generation and install the new main administrative features. Another view, and the one we attend to, is that each phase represent a rebalancing of the mix of different features - former generations and features will still exist; partly new forms. This creates an ever increasing complexity in structural and cultural features. This “archaeology” of the civil service is important to study. The tenure of the civil servants seems to be a potential important variable to focus on in this respect. People with many years in the civil service will be the carriers of the history of institutions – their living memory – and will transfer the history, and cultural norms and values to coming generations. So they are important for the “regeneration” aspects and the ideal is that there is a gradual turn-over so that enough old civil servants are still there to socialize and train the young ones. But civil servants with long tenure are of course important also in other respects, since they naturally are over-represented among the leaders. The crucial question in this paper is whether civil servants with long tenure in central public administration are actually living in the past. Are they characterized by having tasks that are more related to “old public administration” – like tasks related to laws, rules, single cases, etc. – than civil servants with shorter tenure having more “modern” tasks related to planning, policy development, organizational development, regulation, result measuring, etc. Are they having attitudes and views towards their roles and tasks that are more old-fashion? Or is the relative significance of tenure weaker in these respects than other independent variables like position/hierarchical level, gender, education, etc.? The data used in the analysis of the main research questions are from a large survey in the Norwegian ministries in 2006.

**Clark, Anna** (Monash University) Workshop 3

[Anna.clark@education.monash.edu.au](mailto:Anna.clark@education.monash.edu.au)

When Prime Minister John Howard gave his speech to the National Press Club on the eve of Australia Day in 2006 he called for a ‘root and branch renewal’ of history teaching in our schools. ‘In the end,’ he said, ‘young people are at risk of being disinherited from their community if that community lacks the courage and confidence to teach its history’. Nation-building is often conceived in very tangible forms—engineering marvels, wars, and even national institutions can claim credit for helping to define the nation’s legacy. Teaching the nation’s history in schools also raises questions of national definition. But what story of Australia do we want to teach in schools? This paper examines recent public debates over Australian history teaching and argues that meaningful nation-building won’t arise from an simplistic promotion of Australian nationalism, but by encouraging genuine critical engagement with the past.

**Connell, Daniel** (the Australian National University) Panel 3.6

[Daniel.connell@anu.edu.au](mailto:Daniel.connell@anu.edu.au)

*Policy amnesia, the Murray Darling Basin and the National Water Initiative*

In the Murray-Darling Basin the past is both a limiting factor and a good source of future policy. It is possible to make policy without knowing about the past but not to avoid the past shaping its fate. This presentation outlines a number of examples where a nuanced knowledge of the relevant history in the MDB would assist policy makers. Also to be discussed will be the reasons why perceptions of the past are so selective and, frequently, self serving.

**Connery, David** (The Australian National University) Panel 3.4

[david.connery@anu.edu.au](mailto:david.connery@anu.edu.au)

*The development of bureaucratic advice systems for national security policy*

This paper examines how Australian bureaucratic systems for providing national security advice in crises changed during the period 1960-1999 (a focus on the change from Defence Committee to SCONS in the policy domain and from Joint Planning Committee to staffs and ad hoc task forces in the administrative domain). The paper argues that the system evolved in response to three factors: the preferences of political leaders, the contingent nature of crisis and the acquisition of policy authority by new (bureaucratic) actors.

**Cornish, Selwyn** (Official Reserve Bank Historian & Associate Professor of Economic History, Faculties, ANU) Workshop 1

[selwyn.Cornish@anu.edu.au](mailto:selwyn.Cornish@anu.edu.au)

*Central Banking in Australia – the formative years, 1920-1970*

Writing devoted to the development of central banking has attached special significance to contemporary events and problems. L.F.Giblin, for instance, wrote that ‘The story of the development of central banking in Australia must be set against the contemporary political and economic background.’ H.C.Coombs asserted that ‘a central bank cannot be created merely by legislative fiat. It must grow like a living organism within the environment provided by the financial and economic system in which it exists; its practices and structure must evolve in response to the needs and demands of that system.’ Ian Macfarlane has argued that ‘Looking back at the evolution of monetary and financial affairs over the past century shows that all policy frameworks have had to be adjusted when they failed to cope with the emergence of a major problem...The lightly regulated framework in the first two decades of the twentieth century was discredited by the Depression and replaced by a heavily regulated one accompanied by discretionary fiscal and monetary policy. This in turn was discredited by the great inflation of the 1970s and was replaced by another lightly regulated one’. This paper highlights the development of central banking in Australia by emphasizing the pivotal contributions made by six men: Sir John Garvan (member of the Australian Notes Board and first chairman of the board of the Commonwealth Bank); Sir Robert Gibson (the second chairman of the board of the Commonwealth Bank); E.G. Theodore (Treasurer of Australia); Sir Leslie Melville (the Commonwealth Bank’s first Economist); J.B. Chifley (Treasurer and Prime Minister of Australia); and H.C. Coombs (Governor of the Commonwealth Bank and the Reserve Bank of Australia). The paper argues that their responses to contemporary issues and problems led to fundamental changes in the nature and governance of central banking in Australia.

**Curran, James** (University of Sydney) Panel 1.2

[james.curran@arts.usyd.edu.au](mailto:james.curran@arts.usyd.edu.au)

*‘Commendable Emptiness’? The demise of empire and the patriotic void in Australian political culture*

Since the demise of British race patriotism in Australia in the mid-1960s an intense and often highly charged political debate has raged over the meaning and content of national identity and the telling of the national story. But up until recently very little attention has been given to the reactions of politicians, policy-makers and public intellectuals to that precise period when the idea of Britishness was beginning to unravel in Australian national life. At that

moment Australia's political and intellectual elite could look neither back nor forward. If they looked back it was onto a past that they were trying quickly and quietly to escape – that of a monolithic, oppressive Britishness which they recognized was no longer relevant or credible in the new times. And in looking forward they groped uneasily at a new definition of national community and a new way of coming to terms with the countries and cultures of Asia. The dismantling of this once seemingly impregnable British idea left some Australians confused and confounded. Speaking of the new problems that his government had to face in dealing with the world during this era of uncertainty, Harold Holt confessed to an audience of university students in 1966 that 'we can't offer you a tremendous amount by way of guidance because a precedent hasn't been able to serve us for the kind of situations we now face'. The past in this instance could neither instruct nor guide. Similarly the historian Geoffrey Serle observed in 1967 that 'There has been such a vacuum since the decline of standard imperial patriotic rhetoric that it is difficult to make any sure statement'. And in his early assessment of John Gorton, Donald Horne noted that 'There is a commendable emptiness in Australians about their place in the world, the need for a new rhetoric, a new approach, as if Australia were beginning all over again'. In effect, Horne was challenging Gorton to redefine the nation. This paper looks at the efforts of Australian elites in trying to come to terms with the collapse of Britishness and critically assesses how each of them tried to fill the perceived patriotic void in Australia.

**Curthoys, Ann** (Australian National University) Panel 3.5

[ann.curthoys@anu.edu.au](mailto:ann.curthoys@anu.edu.au)

*The Idea of Liberty in an Australian Colonial Context: Democracy, Dispossession, and Disappearance*

Australian historical consciousness about the gaining of self-government (in so far as there is one) focuses on a story of struggle for democracy, the end of convictism, the scorning of any pretension to establish an English-style hereditary upper house, and the smoothness of the transition from British to settler control. It is a story that is seen to have no connection to another story that occupies Australian historical consciousness, if in a troubled and fitful way, that of the dispossession and displacement of the indigenous peoples of the country. In this paper I suggest that these two stories, though not connected in public or indeed in professional historical imagination, can be seen as two aspects of a larger historical process. I ask why the Australian colonies gained self-government so easily, and what the consequences of this easy transition were for the particular colonial democracies (and ultimately the nation) that emerged. I suggest that perhaps if we understand why the colonies gained such total control over Indigenous peoples when they did, we might be able to better explain the nature of the Indigenous policies which followed, and in many cases their continuing failure to the present day. In attempting to address these questions, I stress the importance of considering Australian colonial history in a broad imperial and transcolonial context. In particular, an approach which connects and contrasts the New Zealand and Australian cases can be illuminating.

**Edwards, John** (Chief Economist, HSBC Investment Bank) Workshop 1

[john.k.Edwards@hsbc.com.au](mailto:john.k.Edwards@hsbc.com.au)

*Australia's turbulent half century*

From the late nineteen sixties the Australian economy moved abruptly from apparently untroubled prosperity underpinned by rapid output growth to two decades of deteriorating performance and wrenching changes in the policy framework. It then entered a new and more sustained period of prosperity, now in its seventeenth year. Other advanced economies have followed a similar path, but in some respects the Australian experience has been unusual. This paper looks at the major trends over the period, seeking to separate the unique characteristics from those widely shared.

**Errington, Wayne** (Australian National University) Panel 1.2

[wayne.errington@anu.edu.au](mailto:wayne.errington@anu.edu.au)

*Howard and Menzies: an Idol but not a Model*

John Howard was born into a family of Menzies admirers. A member of the Liberal Party since 1958, Howard undoubtedly valued what he considered to be the prosperity and social stability of the Menzies era. He also noted the strategies used by Menzies in taking votes from traditional Australian Labor Party constituencies, as in the case of the State Aid to Catholic Schools issue. Menzies and Howard were both skilful users of the medium of radio. Yet, Malcolm Fraser arguably had a greater influence on Howard's political style than did Menzies. Howard has had to find his own constituencies, both in the Liberal Party and in the electorate. While he idolises the founder of his party, he does not romanticise the policies of the 1950s. His 'comfortable and relaxed' rhetoric during the campaign for the 1996 election was recognition that many of his fellow Australians had been wearied by the constant economic and social change of recent decades. Howard's government, though, has continued much of that reform program. Menzies might be an idol for Howard but in few cases has he been a model for policy. Indeed, Howard's critics have taken to comparing him unfavourably with his idol on such issues as civil liberties and industrial relations.

**Evans, Richard** Workshop 3

[revans@vicnet.net.au](mailto:revans@vicnet.net.au)

*A passion for white elephants: some lessons from Australia's experience of nation building*

A 'white elephant' is a magnificent, high-status possession which is not particularly productive, costs a lot to maintain, and which you cannot get rid of. Since colonial times, Australians have had a weakness for white elephants. Traditionally, these were massive, debt-funded public works schemes which were economically, environmentally or socially dubious. In recent years, our white elephants have taken on different guises, but the ruinous expense and misdirected effort remain the same. This paper explores some of the reasons for our society's historic enthusiasm for white elephants, and suggests some remedies.

**Featherstone, Daniel** Workshop 5

[media@ngaanyatjarra.org.au](mailto:media@ngaanyatjarra.org.au)

*Indigenous community television*

This paper will explore the recent history of Indigenous Community Television in Australia and the establishment of a different model of Indigenous Television, the National Indigenous Television Service, in 2007.

**Flanagan, Jason** Panel 2.8

[jasoncflanagan@bigpond.com](mailto:jasoncflanagan@bigpond.com)

*A Conflict in Search of a Historical Analogy: The Bush Administration's Evolving Definition of the War in Iraq.*

In defining the first Gulf War, George H. W. Bush effectively utilized the World War II analogy and explicitly rejected the competing Vietnam analogy. Historical analogies, however, have been more problematic for the administration of George W. Bush. This paper will examine the Bush administration's use of historical analogies in its definition and justification of the war in Iraq. The Bush administration has utilized a variety of historical analogies, implicitly and explicitly comparing the situation in Iraq to, amongst other things, World War II, the American Revolution, events in the Philippines following the Spanish-American War and the Hungarian Revolution. The use of such historical analogies, rather than building support for the war, often provoked immediate challenges and criticism. Such analogies were often rejected or reinterpreted, with comparisons to World War II and the American Revolution providing fuel for critics of the administration's Iraq policy. Critics not only challenged the administration's application and interpretation of historical analogies, but also the basic historical facts being presented. Condoleezza Rice and Donald Rumsfeld's comparisons of Iraqi insurgents to Nazi "werewolves" were quickly characterized as more fiction than fact. More significantly, as Coalition forces became bogged down in "postwar"

counterinsurgency operations and sectarian violence, the Vietnam analogy became increasingly problematic for the administration.

**Ford, Lisa** (Macquarie University) Panel 3.1

[lisa.ford@law.mq.edu.au](mailto:lisa.ford@law.mq.edu.au)

*Australian Sovereignty and its Historical Occlusions: the North American & Global Contexts of Sovereignty in Colonial New South Wales*

The Australian government and Australian courts have defined Indigenous legal status in accordance with a flawed understanding of the history of sovereignty. They assume incorrectly that New South Wales was an exceptional colonial project, predicated on the absence of Indigenous rights and, on this basis, have refused to acknowledge inherent Indigenous sovereignty and Indigenous jurisdiction. However, in fact, fluid global discourses of sovereignty and North American practice converged in New South Wales to preserve a plural mode of empire which made space for Indigenous political and legal independence until the 1830s, when all Anglophone settler polities acted at the same time to define settler sovereignty as the capacity to exercise jurisdiction over Indigenous crime. This paper suggests that an understanding of legal pluralism in New South Wales' history could lead to very different models of contemporary law and governance. The paper recovers the unfamiliar plurality of British sovereignty in colonial New South Wales and shows its deep continuities with nineteenth-century debates over Indigenous legal status in the United States. It argues that, if contemporary policy makers unpack the myth of inviolable, territorial settler sovereignty, and recognize that it is neither timeless nor a "skeletal" principle of any settler project, they might recognize the relevance of North American models of shared sovereignty in contemporary Australia.

**Given, Jock** (Swinburne University of Technology) Workshop 5

[jgiven@swin.edu.au](mailto:jgiven@swin.edu.au)

*Public Private Partnerships in communications – Amalgamated Wireless (Australasia), 1922-51*

The ALP's plan to invest in a public private partnership (PPP) to build a high-speed broadband network is the latest dramatisation of the constantly shifting positions of private and public organisations as providers of communications services. Over the last century-and-a-half, the sector has been a constant source of new institutional models. As former public monopolies have been privatised since the 1980s, PPPs have come into vogue in other sectors of the economy and social policy. This paper will examine the experience of Australia's main wireless company, AWA, as a PPP created to develop a new communications capability. The company was reconstructed as a public/private enterprise in 1922 to establish direct wireless telegraph services between Australia and Britain and North America, remaining in 50/50 public/private ownership until 1951. The tensions it confronted also seem likely to afflict any 21<sup>st</sup> century broadband partnership.

**Goggin, Gerard** (University of Sydney) Workshop 5

[gerard.goggin@arts.usyd.edu.au](mailto:gerard.goggin@arts.usyd.edu.au)

*Technology choices and market structures - cellular mobile communications in the 1990s*

This paper reviews the development of mobile phones. Firstly, it considers the technology choices made by Federal government in the 1980s, especially the decision to mandate the second generation Global Standard for Mobiles (GSM) digital standard. It also examines the structuring of the mobiles market with three initial licence holders, and the implications as mobiles developed through the 1990s. Secondly, it considers the histories marshalled in policy debates about 3G mobiles from the mid-1990s to the early 2000s. With 3G, the mobile phone became a focus for narratives around the future of media, communication, and culture. Unlike 2G perhaps, 3G began to be talked about as a failure, which had important implications for media governance. The paper concludes with some observations about how such critical examination of history can open up policy vistas about 'media after media', and

about the limits to this recuperation of history, especially in confronting genuinely unfamiliar and disorienting change.

**Gregory, Kate** (Deakin University) Panel 2.2

[kategregory@gmail.com](mailto:kategregory@gmail.com)

*The memory-work of the National Trust of Australia (WA) in representing history*

This paper examines how the National Trust of Australia (WA) creates and manages Western Australian ‘memory’ through representations of the past in Trust properties and through the classification of significant places. As a public agency established with the express purpose of preserving Western Australian heritage, it holds considerable moral reach in terms of creating a ‘memory-map’ of place for Western Australians. But rarely has the Trust’s classification and representation of ‘public memory’ been questioned or investigated. Why has the Trust identified certain aspects of the past worthy of remembering, and others not? To what extent has the Trust constructed Western Australian ‘memory’ and what are the processes by which memory is maintained and protected, forgotten or transformed? How does the Trust create and seek to represent ‘common memory’? Using the Trust’s institutional archives and oral histories undertaken with Trust members, it is possible to explore these questions. It becomes clear that the individual memories of Trust volunteers and members, shaped by personal experience and collective mythology, have informed the Trust’s identification of preservable past – what the Trust considered to be significant and exemplary Western Australian places. But memory is notoriously fallible. What was forgotten and left out of the picture of place represented by the Trust through the 60s, 70s and 80s has become a source of renewed interest in current practice within the Trust. In fact the ‘forgotten’ past is now frequently used as the starting point for the Trust’s current representation of history, in what could be understood as a retrieval of memory that redefines ‘public’ memory in Western Australia. This paper is based on research conducted as part of an ARC Linkage with the National Trust of Australia (WA) entitled “*Place Taste and Tradition: a history of ideas about heritage in Western Australia*”

**Gregory, Robert** (Victoria University of Wellington) Panel 3.2

[Bob.Gregory@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Bob.Gregory@vuw.ac.nz)

*Accountability and the Politics of Retrospective Story-Telling*

The idea of ‘accountability’ in governmental systems has generated much debate, in both conceptual and practical terms. This paper focuses on the relationships between political accountability, on the one hand, and managerial accountability, on the other. It argues that when a vindictive public calls for ‘accountability’ following some malign political or administrative outcome, accountability as answerability involves not so much a forensic search for the ‘truth’ but a process of emergent and contestable story-telling. In a Westminster Parliamentary democracy this is crucial in shaping and modifying the meaning of such a foundational doctrine as ‘ministerial responsibility’ and associated conventions. It is a major component of the risk and blame games that are played out in the public domain. In this politically expedient and pragmatic process, the maintenance of institutional legitimacy may rest ultimately on the willingness and ability of principals to act with honour. The paper illustrates its arguments with particular reference to two recent controversial cases involving ministerial responsibility in New Zealand.

**Halligan, John** (University of Canberra) Panel 2.9

[john.halligan@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.halligan@anu.edu.au)

*Reform capacity and administrative tradition*

Does reception of New Public Management and other types of reform vary with different administrative traditions? The paper will examine the extent to which reform capacity continues to reflect different types of tradition, as argued by some observers. This will be undertaken from the vantage point of two decades of reform internationally thereby allowing consideration of late starters, and the significance of variations within administrative traditions.

**Halpin, Darren** (The Robert Gordon University) Panel 1.3

[d.r.halpin@rgu.ac.uk](mailto:d.r.halpin@rgu.ac.uk)

*Charting Interest Group 'Careers': Studying Group 'Organisational Forms'*

The study of interest groups has hitherto largely focussed on examining the public-policy influence activities of groups or, alternatively, explaining why people join groups. A more holistic view of group life is something key scholars argue is necessary. This paper seeks to work towards developing a holistic view. It views groups as *organisations* changing over time in order to *survive* in the face of environmental challenges. Building on the work of organisational ecology, and its application to the study of parties and social movements, this paper develops an approach to analysing 'group careers'. Emphasis is not simply on whether groups survive challenging circumstances, but *how* they survive. What *organisational forms* are struck? And what revised *organisational practices* do they trigger? The interpretations and organisational frames of the group leadership, it is argued, are crucial to make sense of the direction of group development. Using examples of a range of groups, the paper argues that historical case study analysis of changing group 'organisational forms' is a useful way to make sense of group life.

**'t Hart, Paul** (Australian National University) Workshop 2, with A.Kay

[hart@coombs.anu.edu.au](mailto:hart@coombs.anu.edu.au)

*Evaluating government performance in Australia: Reconnecting policy and politics*

This paper aims, firstly, to provide a robust and realistic analytical toolkit for comparative policy evaluation that bridges the gap between 'policy' and 'political' logics of assessing government performance. Secondly, it lays the groundwork for applying this toolkit to assess Australian federal and state government performance, comparatively across three policy sectors, and over time.

**Head, Brian** (University of Queensland) Workshop 2, with J.Stewart

[brian.head@uq.edu.au](mailto:brian.head@uq.edu.au)

*Evaluating policy processes*

Good outcomes are assumed to be dependent in important ways on good processes. These processes are arguably crucial for all elements of policy development and program review. Yet the political and administrative spheres, in their understandable focus on achieving results, often seem to pay insufficient attention to such processes. Despite the plethora of performance information gathered in many programs and agencies, a fundamental issue remains as to whether we lack appropriate ways of evaluating relationships in policy making. What kind of bottom-up and top-down processes are needed? What are the pros and cons of utilising networks? What do we know about the effectiveness of partnership approaches? Have we created conditions under which policy improvement and policy learning can flourish?

**Kay, Adrian** (Griffith University) Workshop 4

[a.kay@griffith.edu.au](mailto:a.kay@griffith.edu.au)

*Persistence and Change in Complex Policies: The case of the Common Agricultural Policy*

The concept of path dependency is salient within the burgeoning literature on the temporal analysis of policy. Current applications of path dependency to policy development tend to use a single composite variable for policy change following a unique path. This category of policy change has significant analytical limitations, creating a binary view of policy as either changing or unchanging, at any given point in time. We propose a fine-grained perspective on policy change that it is capable of identifying the coexistence of stability and change in complex policies. The benefits of this analytical development are illustrated clearly in the second part of the paper; in particular, it allows us to reveal a key dynamic in a path dependent CAP that would not otherwise be observed: the remarkable stability in member states' CAP spending shares over time despite significant reform episodes. (And see under 't Hart.)

**Kent, Bruce** (The Australian National University) Panel 2.8

[Bruce.Kent@anu.edu.au](mailto:Bruce.Kent@anu.edu.au)

*The use and abuse of historical analogies in the formation of foreign policy adventures: Explaining the 'Dardanelles syndrome'*

The Western behaviour which helped to precipitate the Cold War in the 1940s and is now jeopardising relations with the Muslim world has been fuelled by the inappropriate invocation of the Manichaean rhetoric of World War II. I label the general propensity of populist Western leaders for misguided strategic adventurism as the 'Dardanelles syndrome', to which the stripling Winston Churchill so famously succumbed with his quixotic attempt to oust the Ottoman Empire from the Middle East by 'forcing' the Straits with a naval bombardment in 1915.

**Kleist, Olaf** (Free University of Berlin/Swinburne University) Panel 3.3

[okleist@swin.edu.au](mailto:okleist@swin.edu.au)

*Between Pasts and Politics: Memory Policies in the Tampa Crisis*

When the Norwegian merchant vessel Tampa with 438 rescued people on board set course towards the Australian territory of Christmas Island in August 2001 Australian politics steered towards crisis. On the one hand this crisis was humanitarian, while on the other it was one of Australian sovereignty. Compassion for the plight of refugees was pitted against necessities of border protection. The question of how to deal with this crisis in specific, and with boat people in general, sparked one of Australia's biggest public discussions about refugees. Unlike equally fundamental debates about Australian politics and Australia's self-image during the History Wars, references to the past were rarely made in the course of the Tampa dispute. This paper asks which role memory did play in this debate, how does it relate to the political process of dealing with this crisis and why was it so seldom used in the debate. The main conflicts between different political stances and their policies during the Tampa crisis were modelled on legal arguments. Despite taking contrasting positions of either protecting the state's borders from illegal entry and keeping boat people out or respecting the rights of refugees and those rescued at sea under international and Australian law, both sides agreed on the state as political sovereign. First, I will analyse how arguments without references to the past were made for certain policies in parliament, in newspapers and in journals, concentrating on political interests in relation to the state's sovereignty. Secondly, I examine the rare references to the past to assess how they refer to specific versions of the past as rational arguments for particular interests. I argue that despite their particularity these memories in politics are presented as shared and common. I pay special attention to the question how those 'memory policies' (Marie-Claire Lavabre) of the Tampa crisis produce the impression of common belonging while being partial. Both forms of arguments are political and historical, but in different ways. While the political enforcement of refugee legislation reproduces the national polity, memory policies reproduce sentiments of belonging in reference to refugee and immigration politics. I suggest that those two forms of argument relate socially. Both, memory policies and legal arguments are fixated on the political process, thus driving social change. Memory, I argue, provides the mediation between the political and the social. Refugees can, per definition, not claim to social belonging, thus their interests can not be included in memory policies towards the state. In fact, they appeal to the state, the legal sovereign, for protection and not as migrants to belong to society. I show how these problems of refugee politics are reflected in the arguments of memory policies during the Tampa crisis. In this sense, feeling compassionate about refugees while defending politics for their exclusion does not have to be an incongruity.

**Laegreid, Per** Panel 3.2

[per.lagreid@aorg.uib.no](mailto:per.lagreid@aorg.uib.no)

See under **Christensen**

**Leigh, Andrew** (The Australian National University) Workshop 3

[Andrew.leigh@anu.edu.au](mailto:Andrew.leigh@anu.edu.au)

*Clever countries, smart states and studious suburbs: education as Nation-Building*

The modern Australian nation-building project is not about large infrastructure developments. In this twenty-first century, a new type of nation-building is called for. Laying the foundations for a rich Australian future demands investing in our people. Less immediate and tangible than audacious engineering feats, it is human investments that will prepare Australia for the challenges of tomorrow. In an increasingly knowledge-based economy, a highly educated society is essential to sustain economic growth, to maintain a socially cohesive nation, and to enrich our cultural and intellectual life. This means finding smart ways of investing in early childhood education, improving the performance of our schools, and helping our higher education sector grow to meet the demands of a changing economy.

**Lowe, David** (Deakin University) Panel 1.2

[arts-head-shhs@deakin.edu.au](mailto:arts-head-shhs@deakin.edu.au), [dlowe@deakin.edu.au](mailto:dlowe@deakin.edu.au)

*Politicians and the Appeal to History*

This paper considers the role of rhetoric and leadership for politicians, focusing especially on the significance of history in political speech. Drawing on Australian political speeches from different periods since federation, including recent examples, we provide a historical overview and explore trends and patterns in Australian politicians' appeals to history.

**McConnell, Allan** (University of Sydney) Workshop 4

[a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au)

*Unravelling the Enigma of Policy Change*

Policy change is much written about but infrequently operationalised. This paper draws primarily on public policy literature in an attempt to develop a framework which is usable by researchers and practitioners to identify the existence and forms of policy change, taking into account the stability/change relationship and temporal dimensions, as well as broader issues of ontology and epistemology.

**McKay, Huw** (Senior International Economist, Westpac) Workshop 1

[hmckay@westpac.com.au](mailto:hmckay@westpac.com.au)

*Asia's finite economic strategy: Japanese experience and Chinese prospects with a memorandum on the Australian response*

This essay considers East Asia's historical economic performance in the second half of the twentieth century and debates prospects for the first half of the twenty-first. The discussion takes place in the context of dynamic strategy theory. "Developmental states" across East Asia have adopted broadly similar but distinct export-oriented industrialisation strategies. As a group these strategies are depicted as finite and imitative in the long run, rather than auto-catalyzing. Asia's largest economies, Japan and China, are the focal point of debate. Japan's experience of strategic exhaustion in the 1980s is articulated to illustrate the finite nature of the model pursued by the region's strategic pioneer. China's own export-oriented strategy, which is currently stimulating rapid economic growth and differs in some important respects from Japan's, is then discussed in an attempt to estimate its future exhaustion point. China's prospects for adapting an alternative strategy prior to exhaustion are then considered. The conclusion is that it is reasonable to expect China's strategic leadership to attempt to transition from export-orientation to a sub-strategy that continues to sponsor industrialization through exploitation of the mass internal market. However, the risks are of consequence. On balance, prospects for a successful transition are sound but not overwhelming. An Asian-facing resource rich economy such as Australia should hedge the risks of unsuccessful transition. Australia must develop a leadership that is able to facilitate a strategically informed distribution of the benefits of the contemporary terms of trade shock.

**Macintyre**, Stuart (University of Melbourne) Panel 2.6

[s.macintyre@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:s.macintyre@unimelb.edu.au)

(with R.Pascoe) *New Right history in the Howard Government era, 1996–2007*

The importance of Keith Windschuttle's revisionist account of frontier conflict in colonial Australia is well understood. Windschuttle's argument is, however, only one aspect of a much larger New Right agenda for re-writing Australian History. The New Right is now arguably in the ascendant in the mainstream media. In our present study of 'Social scientists and the making of post-war Australia', we are examining the work of several historians who are sampled on the basis that they are or were Fellows of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia. Some of these historians are members of the New Right, or (of the deceased) held views that would now be acceptable to the New Right. The great majority of the historians in our sample, however, formulated positions on the key debates in the national historiography that are now subject to New Right critique (and sometimes ridicule). What are the New Right positions? How do their arguments in their totality amount to a coherent heterodoxy? How did the New Right re-reading of the Australian past serve the interests of the Howard Government?

**Maley**, Maria (The Australian National University) Panel 3.4

[maria.maley@anu.edu.au](mailto:maria.maley@anu.edu.au)

*The development of partisan advisory structures in Australia*

This paper explores the development of partisan advisory structures in Australia, looking particularly at the drivers behind the growth and institutionalisation of partisan staff, compared to other countries. There are two historical aspects to this which are of interest in terms of the distinctive characteristics of the Australian developments. First, how did the historical experience of ministers working with public servants in the 1950s-70s become a 'driver' of these developments? Second, how did the historically based attitude towards the public service and neutrality impact on the way the structures developed in Australia? The paper explores the acceptance of the concept of partisan staff and its establishment outside of public service structures.

**Marsh**, Ian (University of Sydney) Workshop 3

[i.marsh@gsg.usyd.edu.au](mailto:i.marsh@gsg.usyd.edu.au)

*Re-imagining the Australian State: preparing the political bed rock for Nation-Building*

Can the State reasonably pursue the task of nation-building if governments are not prepared to adapt the machinery of State in step with the evolving nature of society and emerging challenges? Australia's present political system was conceived in, and designed for, the very different social conditions that existed in the early nineteenth century. At that time, the two major parties broadly articulated a real social divide and developed organisational machinery that effectively mobilised the surrounding society: that provided opportunities for debate of emerging issues, engaging activists and providing cues to their followers about how to judge issues. Now the social base of the political system has been transfigured. Domestically, the community is pluralised and differentiated, class identity has decomposed and variety of new issues has undermined both the older collectivist identities and the autonomy of domestic politics. Consequently, the public agenda has expanded, differentiated and become more complex. Over this same period, the party organisational machinery that formerly mediated citizen and activist mobilisation and engagement has been jettisoned but without the compensating development of alternative institutional arrangements to mediate the public conversation about major emerging issues policy making structures. How, then, can governments hope to chart a path for nation-building? What institutions will we require to support a truly 'national' dialogue about the meaning of 'nation' and the kind of society we're trying to create? I argue that a reconfigured Parliament might engage citizens and interest groups in 'government by discussion'. For that to occur public disaffection will doubtless need to attain new heights, and new political entrepreneurs will be needed to champion the message that there is another way.

**Mayrl, Damon** (University of California, Berkeley) Panel 2.1

[mayrl@berkeley.edu](mailto:mayrl@berkeley.edu)

*Courting History: Remembering Religious Past in Australian and American Court Decisions, 1945-1985*

During the last half of the twentieth century, courts in Australia and the United States were called upon to adjudicate controversies about the proper relationship between religious groups and the government in the field of education. American courts frequently struck down laws mandating prayer and religious instruction in public schools, as well as laws permitting government funding of religious schools. By contrast, Australian courts upheld similar laws. In this paper, I argue that Australian and American courts drew very different lessons from history in the course of reaching their decisions. American courts were frequently preoccupied with the history of conflict between religious groups, and used this history as an important justification for drawing an increasingly strict boundary between church and state. Australian courts, by contrast, paid almost no attention to the history of religious conflict, suggesting its irrelevance to the church-state boundary in education. I argue that these different readings of history, while not a complete explanation for this divergent jurisprudence, were important in shaping the courts' ultimate decisions about how the state and religious groups should relate in the future.

**Mein Smith, Philippa** (University of Canterbury) Panel 3.5

[philippa.meinSmith@canterbury.ac.nz](mailto:philippa.meinSmith@canterbury.ac.nz)

*Trans-Tasman traffic: history and policy*

In the ideal world, historical perspectives help make better policy. Yet there is a mismatch between Australian and New Zealand historiographies and the requirements of 'governing by looking back'. This paper considers how it makes a difference to contemporary understandings of Australia and New Zealand whether we frame them as separate national histories; as parts of 'Australasia' (a world south of Asia); or as a shared history of trans-Tasman interactions. The processes of trans-Tasman policy transfer, learning and innovation - as manifest in CER, the TTMRA, and New Zealand's participation in COAG - are ill-served by separate national histories with their emphases on identity and exceptionalism rather than on common culture. The paper examines how and why the third option of a trans-Tasman history best explains trajectories of Tasman relations since the late nineteenth century. But it also questions why and where options one and two matter.

**Millmow, Alex** (University of Ballarat) Workshop 1

[a.millmow@ballarat.edu.au](mailto:a.millmow@ballarat.edu.au)

*Does academic economic opinion matter any more?*

This paper analyses and speculates upon an interesting but unsettling development within the Australian economic profession. While there has historically been a problematic relationship between the federal government and university economists upon the shaping of economic policy the latter now assume a fairly lower profile. This is partly because the great economic issues of our time have been resolved, but also because of the subsequent stellar economic performance of the Australian economy, together with the systemic and sociological forces operating within the profession itself. This paper briefly tracks the interaction between the Commonwealth and academic economists over several important policy decisions during the twentieth century. While sometimes the advice of university economist was heeded they were usually accorded more blame than adulation from the electorate. Apart from more stakeholders contributing to the making of public policy the paper also contends that there is a schism within the economics profession, especially, when it comes to providing economic commentary to the media. Market economists dominate the media when it comes to providing commentary on contemporary economic matters. While this has partly to do with the very liberalisation of markets that academic economists campaigned for, it does have implications for the acceptance of economic policy since market economists and other players are apt to uphold the interests of certain sectors of the economy. For a number of reasons academic economists suffer from a lack of recognition and status in the media, which biases the

promulgation of economic policy options in the broader community. Some evidence is presented showing that today's generation of academic economists, in contrast to previous generations, has become reticent on matters of public policy.

**Neilson, Lyndsay** (Department of Premier and Cabinet, Victoria) Workshop 3

[lyndsay.neilson@dpc.vic.gov.au](mailto:lyndsay.neilson@dpc.vic.gov.au)

*The 'Building Better Cities Program' (and its aftermath) as a nation-building infrastructure and development initiative*

The Building Better Cities Program, initiated during the term of the Hawke Labor Government and administered by the then Department of Housing and Regional Development (DHRD), can be credited with creating the most significant change in urban Australia since the introduction of consumer credit post WWII. The genesis of the Building Better Cities Program was a Special Premier's Conference held in July 1991 at which the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments agreed to co-operate in a program focused on improving urban development processes and the quality of urban life. Its aims were to demonstrate better urban planning and service delivery as well as co-ordination within and between the various levels of government. The Program was established in the August 1991 Budget and was subsequently refocused, as part of the One-Nation Statement, in the 1992 budget to place greater emphasis on the development of infrastructure. The overall purpose of the Program was '... to promote improvements in the efficiency, equity and sustainability of Australian cities and to increase their capacity to meet the following objectives: economic growth and micro-economic reform; improved social justice; institutional reform; ecologically sustainable development; and improved urban environments and more liveable cities'. The Commonwealth Government agreed provide up to \$816 million over the period December 1991 to June 1996 in order to meet these objectives through formal agreements with individual governments and targeting 26 distinct areas throughout Australia. Initially as Chief Executive of the National Capital Planning Authority and then as Deputy Secretary of the Department of Housing and Regional Development (responsible to the Minister for Housing and Regional Development – the Hon Brian Howe) I oversaw the creation, development and implementation of the program and the aftermath following the 1996 Federal election. In my paper I will reflect on the successes and shortcomings of the Building Better Cities Program and address those aspects of the program that offer lessons for Commonwealth-State engagement in the contemporary environment.

**Neumann, Klaus** (Swinburne University of Technology) Panel 3.3

[KNeumann@groupwise.swin.edu.au](mailto:KNeumann@groupwise.swin.edu.au)

*'A free, stable, prosperous and compassionate nation': Australian responses to refugees and the invocation of a glorious past*

My paper will explore why Australia's current refugee policies (as well as the ideas of many of those criticizing those policies) are informed by references to Australia's humanitarian record, to Australians' proven generosity, to the nation's compassionate character, rather than by a critical analysis of Australia's historical approach to refugees and asylum seekers.

**Nolan, Melanie** (Victoria University of Wellington) Workshop 4

[Melanie.Nolan@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Melanie.Nolan@vuw.ac.nz)

*Gendered Path Dependency: explaining recent Australia and New Zealand Policy*

*Divergence*

In the attempt to explain surprising or seemingly irrational forms of 'persistence' of social phenomena (organizations; public policies and social conditions) economists and policy analysts have, on occasion, used path dependency. Historians are more inclined to invoke 'contingency' in their discussions of causality but they are in many ways examining the same problem. The aim of this paper is to consider a particular public policy puzzle: why do highly gendered work forces persist in Australasia, despite a flurry of policy rhetoric and programs over decades trying to alter this situation? The strength of the male breadwinner ethos in Australasian public policy for most of the twentieth century is not in question. Moreover, the

puzzle is not that it has persisted despite equal pay legislation (1959-1972) Childcare subsidization (1973-74) Maternity Leave (1973 and 1980) paid parental leave and baby bonuses. Australia and New Zealand have similar rates of women's participation in the workforce and birth rates. At some level a gendered path dependency is operating. However in Australia the Howard Liberal government made raising the fertility rate a major government objective with the country's Treasurer Peter Costello famously exhorting Australians to have 'one for the father, one for the mother and one for the country'. The sex Discrimination Commissioner has targeted the impact of housework on the birth rate and childlessness. However the issue of the effect of childcare on workplace participation is more prominent in New Zealand. In January 2005 New Zealand's Prime Minister Helen Clark announced that she wanted to lift female participation in the workforce. New Zealand's women's participation in the workforce was below the average for developed countries and economic productivity would rise if the rate was lifted and announced a number of childcare initiatives. In this paper I will unpick a complex historical causality in the varying policy configurations.

**Olick, Jeffrey** (University of Virginia) Plenary Session 1

[jko3k@virginia.edu](mailto:jko3k@virginia.edu)

*On The Hermeneutics of Historical Analogy*

The rationalist's fantasy is that finding the correct historical analogy will prevent errors in present policy. But there are no 'correct' historical analogies (though there are many incorrect ones), no unequivocal memories, only helpful and unhelpful ones. The rationalist's goal, therefore, must be to develop methods for distinguishing between more and less helpful historical analogies. This is a complex process because history and memory are cross-cut by divergent perspectives, competing goals, and irreconcilable temporal horizons. Moreover, the rationalist's fantasy must recognize its own limits: we are as much controlled by history as we control it. Governing with the past must therefore confront the ways in which we are governed by it. This entails critical procedures that extend beyond the realm of the rational.

**Painter, Martin** (City University of Hong Kong) Panel 2.3

[SAMARTIN@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:SAMARTIN@cityu.edu.hk)

*Legacies Remembered, Lessons Forgotten: Transplanting the Regulatory State to Asia*

Recent public sector reforms in states such as Japan and Korea, formerly classified as 'Developmental States' have been typified as responses to globalization and neo-liberalism, ushering in a new regulatory state in which many of the traditions of the developmental state are being overturned. Among the transformations being recorded are the adoption of NPM-type reforms such as privatization and autonomization; new 'public service bargains' that place more stress on 'agency' than 'trustee' models; and adoption of new administrative law provisions that stress transparency and eat away at traditional bureaucratic practices such as 'administrative guidance'. Many of these reforms appear to be transplants from the west in order to conform to a view of the public sector more typical of Anglo democracies, a view that is seemingly more consistent with neo-liberalism. The argument presented here suggests that while recent public sector reforms in these developmental states are more informed by the administrative traditions of those states than might appear, nevertheless these transplants are a mix of both 'best fits' and 'misfits', resulting in an amalgam of fixes and fads that, to this point, does not resemble a coherent image of the 'regulatory state'. While legacies matter, what seems to have been forgotten is the earlier lesson of successful borrowing and adaptation that so typified Japan and Korea's earlier periods of public sector transformation.

**Pascoe, Robert** (Victoria University) Panel 2.6

[Robert.Pascoe@vu.edu.au](mailto:Robert.Pascoe@vu.edu.au)

See under **Macintyre**

**Patmore, Greg** (University of Sydney) Panel 2.6

[g.patmore@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:g.patmore@econ.usyd.edu.au)

See under **Balnave**

**Pedersen, Howard** (University of Western Australia) Panel 3.1

[haped@westnet.com.au](mailto:haped@westnet.com.au)

*Historical Revisionism and the Conservative Dominance of Australian Indigenous Public Policy*

In June 2007, Prime Minister Howard described the issues surrounding his declared “national emergency” into the take-over of 73 Indigenous settlements in the Northern Territory as Australia’s “Katrina”. The comparison offers a useful analytical frame to examine the public policy context of the Northern Territory intervention. The hurricane that devastated New Orleans in August 2005 raised serious questions about the nature of American society and the capacity of its system of government to respond to such catastrophic events. But the comparison is relevant at another level; the battleground of ideology and the actions of government that flow from the commanding heights of public policy. Katrina provided an opportunity for neo-liberal ideologues to shape public policy, where private education and housing are the pillars of a reconstructed city with a different society based on individuals interacting with the market. In Australia, similar ideological discourse centred on issues such as individual responsibility, private home ownership and employment in the real economy have been the policy underpinnings of a government intervention premised on overhauling the key features of Indigenous self determination; Traditional land title, community governance and control over outsiders accessing settlements. This radical and comprehensive change in Indigenous policy has been implemented with widespread community and bi-partisan political support because of societal abhorrence to the evidence of child sexual abuse in these settlements. However, the comprehensive policy reform would not have been possible without a carefully constructed revision of history by a range of conservative forces that have depicted the Indigenous settlements located on Indigenous statutory land title as having been a cataclysmic public policy experiment ordained and implemented by progressive liberal elements of national Australian governments since the early 1970s. This paper examines the historical arguments by conservatives that conflate self determination with government welfare policies which it is claimed has colluded to exclude Indigenous people from the mainstream economy and citizenship services resulting in eventual societal collapse that requires government intervention. The paper argues that in the political contest of ideas, it was the political Right, as part of an alliance with the mining and pastoral industries and state governments that has essentially determined Indigenous public policy by corralling Indigenous issues to the margins of political discourse. A political settlement approach to Indigenous rights in Australia never gained a serious policy foothold following the 1967 constitutional change which has resulted in a truncated version of self-determination, characterised by paltry public investment and limited recognition of Indigenous political authority. Through a rewriting of history the political Right now asserts itself as the champion of Indigenous development through its neo-liberal policy prescriptions and the Left condemned as responsible for failed public policy and Indigenous community despair.

**Pollitt, Christopher** (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven) Panel 3.2

[Christopher.Pollitt@soc.kuleuven.be](mailto:Christopher.Pollitt@soc.kuleuven.be)

*Bureaucracies Remember, Post-Bureaucratic Organizations Forget?*

This paper proposes and explores the proposition that most of the public sector organizational forms and reforms that have self-consciously aimed at moving away from traditional Weberian bureaucracies have, as an unintended by-product, diminished organizational memories and increasingly cut public sector organizations off from their own histories. The paper sets out a theoretical model of the mechanisms by which this amnesia occurs, and cites empirical evidence to support that model. These mechanisms include contracting out, the impacts of certain kinds of IT, contemporary human resource management policies, and the

doctrines built into certain modern management techniques. A distinction is made between NPM, as a first phase reaction to bureaucracy, and partnerships and network governance, as a second phase reaction to bureaucracy. Each, in different ways, tends to encourage organizational amnesia, although NPM may be the more severe in its effects. Furthermore, most of these tendencies are amplified by the growth of the community of management experts (consultants, advisers, business school academics etc). This community (which has penetrated the public sector far more in some countries than others) has a vested interest in innovation and change, and a very low concern for 'history', which is usually seen as either irrelevant or a constraint. The paper also suggests that certain consequences that flow from this state of affairs. These consequences affect both policymaking and implementation. In conclusion, and more speculatively, the larger question is raised of the threat to democratic government itself which is posed by the growth of *de facto* amnesiac public organizations.

**Proust, Katrina** (Fenner School, ANU) Panel 3.6

[Katrina.proust@anu.edu.au](mailto:Katrina.proust@anu.edu.au)

*Lessons learnt and unlearnt about salinity since the 19<sup>th</sup> century*

This paper outlines the conflict between different types of expertise in irrigation development in south-eastern Australia in the 19th and early 20th centuries. It examines, as a case study, the delayed emergence of recognition of salinity as a major resource management issue in Australia. It traces understanding of the biophysical problem in British India and the colonies of Victoria and NSW from the 19th century. Against this case, the paper illustrates the approach of drawing on history to reveal the complex dynamics of society-nature interactions that still bedevil contemporary scholarship and policy making

**Pusey, Michael** (University of New South Wales) Public Lecture, Wednesday 12, 6-7

[m.pusey@unsw.edu.au](mailto:m.pusey@unsw.edu.au)

*In the wake of economic reform – New prospects for a nation building state?*

Has economic reform run its course? What potential remains for the resumption of nation building progress? Contrary to expectations Canberra emerges from twenty years of neo-liberalism with disciplined government, ample revenues, an effective regulative apparatus and — perhaps — the capacity for government to steer the economy towards a brighter future. These prospects are weighed against the negative impacts of neo-liberalism on our institutions and then examined from the three viewpoints of: our national political experience, the administrative apparatus, and popular expectations. The lecture then considers the dynamic energies inherent in the challenges, respectively, of climate change, infrastructure development, and economic policies based on the enhancement of quality of life.

**Raadschelders, Jos** (University of Oklahoma) Panel 2.9

[raadschelders@ou.edu](mailto:raadschelders@ou.edu)

*Approaches to Tradition in Public Administration: Theoretical Explorations*

Is it possible to, seriously, 'discuss' the 'fact' of tradition in the context of the study of public administration? This question is peculiar because tradition is not a hot topic in a study that generally deals with social problem solving now, and, preferably, yesterday. It is a question that makes a generally forward looking study slightly uncomfortable because of the suggestion that we should look back rather than only ahead. Indeed, if anything, public administration has a tradition of looking ahead and ignoring administrative history. At the same time, public administrationists need tradition, as inherited practice or custom or as created background, to, i.a., justify and legitimize actions taken. In this paper, that serves as an introduction to the panel, three questions are addressed: 1. How is tradition conceptualized in general and in public administration? (i.e. both study and government). 2. How is tradition used, again, in general and in public administration? 3. How is tradition empirically mapped in public administration?

(and see **Vander Meer**)

**Rennie, Ellie** (Swinburne University of Technology) Workshop 5

[erennie@swin.edu.au](mailto:erennie@swin.edu.au)

*Decentralising media production - remote Indigenous broadcasting in the 1980s*

In 2006 the Australian government allocated \$90 million to Indigenous communications under the Backing Indigenous Ability scheme (BIA). BIA is now being carved-up to appease competing needs: the pressure for an Indigenous-run national broadcasting service on the one hand and the urgency of getting broadband into remote communities on the other. With 'post-broadcast' media dominating global communication debates, there is good reason to review the decentralised model of Indigenous media which was implemented in the 1980s. That history indicates that socially responsive, robust, local media organisations are a key factor in the success of emerging distributed media models. However, it also raises significant questions as to whether new media is capable of providing the levels of leadership and national unity achieved by public service broadcasters during the broadcast era. How can Indigenous media play a greater role in the public sphere? Can locally-controlled media be made to articulate into national narratives?

**Ricketson, Sam** (University of Melbourne) Workshop 5

[sricket@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:sricket@unimelb.edu.au)

*Copyright's response to new media technologies in the 1960s*

This paper will explore current tensions in rebalancing the intellectual property rights of creators and users in response to new technologies, drawing on the debates about the same issues that informed the major overhaul of Australian intellectual property law expressed in the *Copyright Act* of 1968.

**Ryan, Lyndall** (University of Newcastle) Panel 2.1

[Lyndall.Ryan@newcastle.edu.au](mailto:Lyndall.Ryan@newcastle.edu.au)

*Remembering and Forgetting the Black War in Tasmania*

The Black War in Tasmania 1826-1832, was of significant interest to historians in the 20-30 years following the conflict. John West (1852) and James Bonwick (1870) recognised its magnitude as a major colonial war, and attempted to understand the conflict from both sides. From the 1870s to the 1940s however, historians like R.W. Giblin (1929) minimised the conflict and focussed on Aboriginal aggression and when Clive Turnbull (1948) restored it to public debate, he preferred to report on press opinion rather than record incidents on the frontier. In taking this approach, settler aggression was erased from the story. The resurgence in interest in the Black War in the 1970s, arising from the publication new sources, focussed more on Aboriginal resistance (Ryan 1981, Reynolds 1995, Windschuttle 2002) and less on settler aggression so that today it has almost disappeared from public debate. This paper explores the meaning of remembering and forgetting settler aggression in the Black War and its implication for reconciliation today.

**Schoorlemmer, Niels** Panel 2.4

[N.Schoorlemmer@tue.nl](mailto:N.Schoorlemmer@tue.nl)

*Collective memory in action: understanding Dutch river policy*

The aim of this paper is to explore the role of collective memory (as defined by Halbwachs, 1992) in policy practice. An in-depth a case study of Dutch river policy will be presented. In the year 1993 and 1995 the river Meuse flooded. Although there was only material damage there was at both instances a public call for thorough measures to safeguard the public from future flooding. After the second flooding, which involved a mass-evacuation of 250.000 people, in a short time-period a national effort was presented to avoid future floods. The analysis of policy regarding the River Meuse will be based upon discursive theory of the policy process (Fischer & Forester, 1993). Two policy discourses (Hajer, 1995) and the influence of collective memory on those discourses will be traced covering the period of 1952-2007. In addition an exploratory quantitative analysis of historical references in Dutch national newspaper coverage on the Meuse floods will be presented. This analysis, combined with empirical evidence from policy documents, shows how connections to historical floods

were being used to make sense of recent floods. This process of sense making, in which collective memory plays an important role, is crucial for understanding Dutch river policy.

**Shepherd**, Anthony (Transfield Services) Workshop 3

[ShepherdA@transfieldservices.com](mailto:ShepherdA@transfieldservices.com)

*Stumbling towards nation-building: impediments to progress*

On the 50th anniversary of the Snowy in 1999, I called for unwavering political support for major infrastructure projects. Support such as was enjoyed by the Snowy project and was essential for its success. Some eight years on we see signs of cautious political support for big projects. Our economic infrastructure still suffers from major gaps particularly in transport (public and private), water, power and ports. We are suffering also from a technical skills shortage. Political support is emerging but is cautious because of the plethora of noisy single issue groups encouraged by a media greedy for the 20 second grab. The defects in our constitution are exacerbating the problem as Federal and State Governments grapple with problems best dealt with on a national basis.

**Sheriff**, Jacqui (Curtin University of Technology) Panel 2.2

[jacquelyn.sherriff@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:jacquelyn.sherriff@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)

*The public management of collective memory: managing Western Australian war memorials*

War memorials are the result of deliberate acts of community production, designed to hold and perpetuate memories of those who served and died in armed conflict. As expressions of collective memory, the commemorative activity around war memorials can differ between localities and across generations according to circumstance and experience. In Australia, war memorials are largely managed by local governments, often in partnership with the local RSL sub-branch. This is true in Western Australia, where the State Government has also taken a keen interest in the management of local war memorials in the last few years. This paper will look at the involvement of publicly funded agencies in the management of war memorials and commemorative practices around them, using selected Western Australia war memorials as case studies. It will consider how agencies respond to shifts and changes in collective memory and how this is reflected in the public management of war memorials.

**Smullen**, Amanda (Erasmus University Rotterdam) Panel 2.3

[smullen@fsw.eur.nl](mailto:smullen@fsw.eur.nl)

*Assessing symbolic convergence over time: similarities and differences in official agency accounts in The Netherlands, Sweden and Australia*

This paper presents findings from my doctoral dissertation *Translating agency reform. Rhetoric and culture in comparative perspective*. The paper examines and compares official agency talk over a period of 7-15 years and across three national political contexts: The Netherlands, Sweden and Australia. Against the background of debates about convergence in public management talk, two competing explanations for management reform talk are considered: the cultural political administrative context or internationally fashionable stories of reform. Using the New Rhetoric from Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, durable national styles of speaking about agency reform are identified in each of the countries under study. Indeed, it is shown that expert speakers, public values and quasi-logical argumentation are durable features of the management reform talk produced in the consensus political administrative contexts (The Netherlands, Sweden), while informal speakers, business values and arguments based upon reasonable belief are durable features of the adversarial political administrative context (Australia). While there was some evidence of convergence in the styles of speaking about agency reform at some point in all countries, this was always incorporated within a more durable national style of speaking. The paper also demonstrates that it is financial actors that have introduced similar (Anglo Saxon) management reforms to the consensus political contexts.

**Snooks**, Graeme (The Australian National University) Workshop 1

*Growth and governance – an overview*

[Graeme.snooks@anu.edu.au](mailto:Graeme.snooks@anu.edu.au)

This introduction to Workshop 1 will explore the general issues of Australian growth and governance in both a long-run and global context.

And also by **Snooks**: *Australia's long-run economic strategy, performance, and policy*

This paper attempts to quantify and explain the economic performance of Australia from the first European settlement to the present, and beyond. A general dynamic theory – the 'dynamic-strategy theory' – has been employed to provide a new interpretation of 'dynamics Down Under'. It is shown, among other things, that the bold attempt from the 1910s to the 1960s to turn aside from the traditional development policy of exogenously driven natural-resource exploitation in order to embark on an endogenously determined dynamic process, has broken down during the course of the present generation. This was mainly due to a failure of 'strategic leadership' on the part of recent Australian governments that have, quite rightly, dismantled the framework of protection, but have failed to replace it with the infrastructure of strategically relevant technological ideas. Once again, Australia's economic prosperity depends heavily on the fluctuating fortunes of the global economy. While in the nineteenth century this took the form of reliance on Britain, today it centres on the continuing growth of Japan and China. This critical problem has been exacerbated by misconceived monetary policies that have damaged the central endogenous dynamic mechanism. What of the future? That depends on whether strategic leadership can ever be rediscovered.

**Stevens**, Rachel (Monash University) Panel 2.5

[raste2@student.monash.edu](mailto:raste2@student.monash.edu)

*The Influence of History on Immigrant Selection Policies: A Comparative Analysis*

This paper will examine how two settler societies, the United States and Australia, have publicly debated and formulated immigrant selection policies, focusing specifically on the period 1975 to 1995. As settler societies, political elites in both countries have formulated immigrant selection policies conscious of the immigration histories of their nations. This paper will use two case studies. First, this paper will analyse public and political debates in the United States on the Immigration Act of 1990. This Act was designed to admit a greater number of immigrants from traditional source countries, (that is, migrants from European countries such as Ireland, Italy, Greece and Poland) at the expense of the 'newer' immigrants from Latin America and Asia. Proponents of the Act argued that these reforms would encourage the admission of 'classic' or 'old-seed' immigrants once again, implicitly suggesting that European immigrants in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries have been remembered as more hard-working than immigrants arriving in the post-1965 period. Second, this paper will examine the ways in which particular Members of Parliament in Australia adopted a new, more sophisticated discourse to discuss immigration selection policies in order to distance them from the nation's racist past. From the late 1980s, most politicians understood immigrant admission policies within the framework of the family immigration/skilled immigration dichotomy. But underlying this division was a number of assumptions about the value of immigrants: skilled immigrants were presumed to stimulate economic growth and entrepreneurship; conversely, family reunion immigrants were perceived to be a burden on society. Using transcripts from Congressional and Parliamentary debates, hearings, inquiries, and press coverage, this paper attempts to demonstrate the pervasive influence of history in shaping policy options and framing political debates in the area of immigration in these two societies.

**Sutton**, John (Macquarie University) Panel 1.3

[John.Sutton@scmp.mq.edu.au](mailto:John.Sutton@scmp.mq.edu.au)

*Shared memories and cognitive artifacts: the entangling of personal and group remembering*

History needs to animate action and decision-making in dynamical systems like people and organizations. They must be open to the past at many time scales without being overburdened by it, and they have to access both specific past events and general past trends and practices.

What are these mechanisms of inter-temporal accounting, the means by which embodied individuals interact with each other and with a vast and uneven world of material traces? Within an interdisciplinary framework for understanding a range of social memory phenomena, this paper examines different ways in which the shared past is transmitted and renegotiated. With notes on case studies from a large organization, a small organization, and a social group, it aims to provide clear concepts for understanding the complex relations between personal memory and group processes.

**Tavan, Gwenda** (LaTrobe University) Panel 3.3

[G.Tavan@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:G.Tavan@latrobe.edu.au)

*Back to the Future? What the Howard Government's citizenship reforms owed to past policies and practices*

The decision of the former Howard coalition government to tighten citizenship criteria for migrants was the subject of significant public debate in recent months. For critics, the initiatives represented the culmination of a decades-old attempt to wind the clock back and return Australia to the bad old days of 'assimilation' and the white Australia policy. For supporters, they represented a legitimate attempt to restore the cultural and policy certainties of a previous era. Whatever one's opinion of these matters, one thing is certain – the past loomed large in Howard's immigration and citizenship discourse. But how precisely were historical precedents implicated in present-day circumstances? What processes of public and institutional remembering and forgetting were at work - and what interests were served through these? This paper considers such questions, contextualising the reforms within a broader history of citizenship policy since World War II, and evaluating the legacy and lessons of the past.

**Taylor, Tony** (Monash University) Plenary Session II

[Tony.Taylor@Education.monash.edu.au](mailto:Tony.Taylor@Education.monash.edu.au)

*Disputed Territory: who owns history in schools?*

The history wars saga of the past decade has more recently wended its way in and out of school history class. This presentation will therefore deal with several of the issues that have preoccupied teachers, administrators and politicians over the past two years including John Howard's close involvement in school history, the unsubtle role of the press, the surprise calling of a History Summit, the sudden death of SOSE, the remarkable resurrection of Chairman Mao and the unlikely convening of the Blainey panel.

**Thelen, Kathleen** (Northwestern University) Plenary Session III

[thelen@northwestern.edu](mailto:thelen@northwestern.edu)

*Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*

This lecture provides a critique of dominant models of institutional change in political science, and offers an alternative framework for understanding institutional origins, stability and change. Illustrations of these points draw on research both on the historical evolution of key political-economic institutions in the advanced industrial countries and on contemporary trends in the face of new pressures associated with globalization and the rise of the service sector. The analysis offers insights into unexpected continuities in institutional arrangements through putative "break points" in history. At the same time, it illuminates processes of incremental but cumulatively transformative change through which institutions can be gradually but radically reconfigured over time.

**Thomas, Julian** (Swinburne University of Technology) Workshop 5

[jthomas@swin.edu.au](mailto:jthomas@swin.edu.au)

*Television's domestic transformations in the 1970s*

The transition from analogue to digital television broadcasting remains fraught with difficulty and uncertainty. What seems to be a technical matter conceals a range of complex social, economic and cultural policy decisions. One is control over the content of television broadcasts. This paper aims to illuminate this contemporary problem through the prism of an

earlier, and often overlooked, digital transformation of television, namely the consumer-driven uptake of what can be called the ‘new television technologies’ of the 1970s. In that decade a wave of new devices for household entertainment began to appear in Australian living rooms, including remote controls, teletext decoders, games consoles, home computers, video cassette recorders, laserdisc players, and other exotica. Many of these devices are now forgotten, but some have had considerable impact. Without much in the way of policy sanction or debate, these technologies substantially increased the amount and variety of information available through a TV set, and began the slow detachment of television from broadcasting. This paper suggests that the history of the new home entertainment technologies of the recent past could point towards some alternative futures for Australian television.

**Tiernan, Anne** (Griffith University) Panel 3.4

[a.tiernan@griffith.edu.au](mailto:a.tiernan@griffith.edu.au)

*The 'deep structures' of advisory space: choices and constraints facing Australian Prime Ministers*

The advisory systems supporting Australian Prime Ministers have undergone profound changes over the past three decades. Prime Ministerial advisory systems now combine a large, active and partisan personal staff with a flexible and responsive Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. This paper traces the evolution of advisory structures for Prime Ministers from Menzies to Howard. This analysis shows that although the personalities and working styles of individuals have shaped advisory arrangements, contemporary prime ministers are finding their choices constrained by the historical legacies of their predecessors, the expectations of external actors, and the demands of the broader political environment. Focusing on the legacy that John Howard will leave his successor, be it Peter Costello or Kevin Rudd, the paper speculates on the forces that will shape and constrain the advisory structures of future Australian prime ministers.

**Toonen, Theo** (Leiden University)

[toonen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:toonen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)

(See under **Van der Meer**)

**Trommel, Willem** Workshop 4

[w.a.trommel@utwente.nl](mailto:w.a.trommel@utwente.nl)

*The potential richness of path-dependency analysis*

This paper will discuss the historicist bias in path dependency analysis, in order to provide insights that may help to overcome the explanatory gap in current path dependency studies. Therefore, the main question is: To what extent does path dependency analysis suffer from historicism, how does this bias produce shortcomings in explaining (radical) policy change and how can path dependency arguments be improved at this particular point? The structure of the paper is as follows. After having introduced our central theme, we shortly discuss Popper’s ideas on historicism. Next we discuss the central propositions in path dependency theory, followed by a critical analysis of its historicist bias. In this analysis we will present a number of empirical examples which demonstrate how historicism narrows the scope of policy analysis to conclusions that are tautological rather than explanatory. The paper concludes with some suggestions for improving the quality of path dependency arguments by sketching a framework for the study of ‘initial conditions’ and ‘negative feed-back mechanisms’.

**Van der Meer, Frits M** (University of Leiden) (with **Toonen** and **Raadschelders**) Panel 2.7

[meerf@fsaw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:meerf@fsaw.leidenuniv.nl)

*Convergence and Variation in West-European Administrative Reforms.*

Looking at public sector reforms in West-European state and administrative systems, one cannot be but overwhelmed with the bewildering convergence as well as variety. The pattern is, though, much less uniform than often suggested. The convergence is suggested in the phraseology that belongs to reform: everybody decentralizes, everybody employs

managerialism, and everybody embraces the virtues of the 'civil society'. What Western European countries have in common is that they have all been involved in reform processes over the past decade, and that there are marked differences in the way in which public sector reform has proceeded in various countries. The overall pattern seems to be that common external pressures and general constitutional constraints are turned into differential reform processes that over a longer period of time reflect several common features in a context of varying state traditions. Thus far terminology, concepts and explanatory direction have been vague or indeterminate at least. Terms as administrative models, administrative traditions and administrative culture are used interchangeably and often are employed as an explanation of last resort when others do not suffice. In trying to arrive at a beginning of an explanation of institutional variation in reform, it is clear that various, sometimes very fundamental and historically deeply rooted dimensions and administrative, model, traditions and culture need to be explored. This exploration will be the topic of the paper.

**Veracini, Lorenzo** (The Australian National University) Panel 2.1

[Lorenzo.veracini@anu.edu.au](mailto:Lorenzo.veracini@anu.edu.au)

*Settler colonial narratives*

Contrary to other typologies of colonial practice, settler colonialism has been in many ways resistant to decolonisation. This paper suggests that an appraisal of a narrative deficit can contribute to explaining particularly troubled traditions of decolonisation in settler societies. The first part of my paper deals with settler narrative forms. A sustained scholarly activity on the literatures of colonialisms has not yet explored the specific differences separating colonial and settler colonial storytelling. Conversely, this paper distinguishes between colonial and settler colonial narrative forms (it argues that they interact, overlap, and interpenetrate, but that they are analytically distinct). Colonial narratives normally take a circular form, an *Odyssey* consisting of an outward movement followed by domination over and/or interaction with a colonised 'other' and by a final return to an original locale. On the contrary, as settlers come to stay, the narratives generally associated with settler colonial enterprises resemble an *Aeneid* where the colonizer moves forward along a story line that can't be turned back. This structural difference expresses an intractable dichotomy of colonial narratives. The second part of my paper explores the structural divide between colonial and settler colonial forms. Postcolonial studies have traditionally been reluctant to recognise settler colonialism's autonomous status in the context of colonial phenomena. However, although both colonialism and settler colonialism pertain to a general process of European expansion, an exploration of the structural differences between varying colonial typologies would confirm the need to understand settler colonialism as a distinct and autonomous set of political traditions. This is one constitutive difference between colonialism and settler colonialism: whereas colonial regimes are geared towards the perpetuation of their colonial character (i.e.: an ongoing reproduction of the coloniser/colonised divide), settler colonialism endeavours to supersede its colonial determinants (i.e.: to 'close' frontiers, extinguish Indigenous autonomies, establish independent nationhood, etc.). The third part of my paper explores the issue of decolonisation in settler contexts by bringing together the first two sections of the paper. Because of a circular narrative form, discontinuation of a colonial regime always remains within colonialism's cultural horizon. On the contrary, because of a linear narrative form, discontinuation of a settler colonial regime remains unthinkable beyond its extinguishment by way of its fulfilment (i.e.: a final assimilation/destruction of autonomous Indigenous subjectivities). The scramble for colonies had produced colonial states that could be turned over to successor polities in a symmetrical process of counter-scramble: the great imperial rush of the late nineteenth century was replicated in the decolonising rush of the 1960s. On the contrary, in the case of settler colonial contexts, a specific narrative form produces a circumstance in which there is no intuitive narrative of settler colonial decolonisation and/or Indigenous or national reconciliation. If settler colonisation is an ultimate colonising act where settlers envisage no return, settler colonialism still tells a story of either total victory or total defeat. Discontinuing settler colonial forms requires conceptual frames and supporting narratives of reconciliation that have yet to be fully developed and narrated.

**Verbong, Geert** Panel 2.4  
[g.p.j.verbong@tue.nl](mailto:g.p.j.verbong@tue.nl)  
See under **Schoorlemmer**

**Walter, James** (Monash University) Panel 1.1  
[James.Walter@arts.monash.edu.au](mailto:James.Walter@arts.monash.edu.au)  
See under **Lowe**

**Witcomb, Andrea** (Deakin University) Panel 2.2  
[awitcomb@deakin.edu.au](mailto:awitcomb@deakin.edu.au)

*Playing to a different tune: The impact of differing forms of remembering on institutional practices and politics at the National Trust of Australia (WA)*

This paper will take off from the issues discussed in the previous paper to look at their impact on the structural organisation of the National Trust of Australia (WA). As Kate Gregory's paper will illustrate, the Trust now has its own history, a history which many within the Trust are striving against. The battle, for that is what it feels like to those on the ground, takes many forms. Informed by changing historiographies and the rise of history as the dominant discipline base rather than architecture this battle has resulted in new institutional structures, the disappearance of hallowed committees and the development of a new public profile on heritage issues. This paper will trace these changes, ending with an exploration of the Trust's recent role in the fight to preserve indigenous rock art on the Burrup Peninsula as an example of its aspirations for shaping public understandings about the past. The paper is based on a series of oral histories conducted with volunteers and current staff members of the Trust as well as its documentary archive. At its heart are differing interpretations about the proper relationship between past and present in contemporary society and the role public institutions like the National Trust should have in the management of that relationship. This paper is based on research conducted as part of an ARC Linkage with the National Trust of Australia (WA) entitled "Place Taste and Tradition: a history of ideas about heritage in Western Australia".

**Withers, Glenn** (Universities Australia & ANU) Workshop 1  
*A new narrative for Australia*  
[glenn.withers@anu.edu.au](mailto:glenn.withers@anu.edu.au)

The traditional explanations of Australia's economic progress focus on overseas goods and finance markets, natural resource exploitation, and physical investment. This paper extends this approach by also emphasising investment in human capital, innovation and social capital, and in public and private governance. It provides measurement of these over two centuries of Australian history, and it uses econometric methods to estimate their respective impacts. The bottom line is to affirm that Australia achieves most when it invests in the capacities of its people and their institutions. This is a neglected narrative that deserves new prominence. And it has major implications for contemporary Australian policy needs.

**Wooding, Robert** (University of Tasmania) Workshop 3  
[Robert.Wooding@utas.edu.au](mailto:Robert.Wooding@utas.edu.au)

*Populate, parch and panic: two centuries of dreaming about nation building in inland Australia*

In February 2007, Queensland Premier Peter Beattie made reference to an old idea of diverting water from the upper reaches of some of the major coastal rivers of tropical North Queensland towards the drier parts of Western Queensland. This idea was most famously promoted in the late 1930s and early 1940s by the retired New South Wales Government engineer JJC Bradfield, who was the principal designer of the Sydney Harbour Bridge. The 'Bradfield Plan', inspired by major hydraulic engineering projects in the self-proclaimed 'modern economies' of the United States and the Soviet Union, represented the apotheosis of a century or more of misconceptions and imaginings about inland Australia. My paper will

examine the Bradfield Plan and related proposals in the context of the history of the policies adopted by colonial, State and Federal governments towards inland Australia – particularly the western parts of the Darling Basin (or West Darling) - over the past two centuries, and will demonstrate that the intermittent revival of these ideas is a symptomatic of a pervasive policy-making climate of unrealistic optimism about nation-building and regional development which is interspersed by bouts of desperation and panic, typically triggered by external shocks such as droughts or falling export prices. The dream of an inland Australia with a strong population base continues to play a subtle, but critical role in shaping governmental thinking about key issues about the economy, environment, immigration policy and international relations.

**Young, Simon** (University of Western Australia) Panel 3.1

[simon.young@uwa.edu.au](mailto:simon.young@uwa.edu.au)

*Cultural 'Timelessness' and Colonial Tethers: Australian Native Title in Comparative Perspective*

In a discussion of the early US colonial history, de Tocqueville wrote that the Americans achieved the erosion of the 'Indian' race 'tranquilly, legally, philanthropically, without shedding blood, and without violating a single great principle of morality in the eyes of the world'. It was impossible, he said, to 'destroy men with more respect for the laws of humanity'. Australian native title jurisprudence appears to be teetering on the brink of a de Tocqueville-flavoured disaster. Citing cultural courtesy and legal precision, the courts here have descended into a pre-occupation with 'traditional laws and customs' in their handling of native title proof and content that would seem to be precedentially, technically and socio-politically flawed. The purpose of this paper is to clearly identify the Australian error, explore its likely consequences and propose its correction against a backdrop of 180 years of relevant legal history in Canada, New Zealand and the United States. In the process it seeks to corner the historical preconceptions and intellectual traditions that have contributed to the Australian approach. It seeks to map this approach against the conspicuous vacillations of relevant legal and social theory across all of the jurisdictions. And it seeks to demonstrate that while the 'tradition' focus may be well ingrained in the Australian legal psyche, this is one instance in which the law must not be permitted to 'hide in the shadows of its own making'.

## Presenters, authors and conveners

**Aitkin, Don** [danbee@netspeed.com.au](mailto:danbee@netspeed.com.au)  
**Ang, Ien** [i.ang@uws.edu.au](mailto:i.ang@uws.edu.au)  
**Argy, Fred** [fargy@ozemail.com.au](mailto:fargy@ozemail.com.au)  
**Ballard, John** [john.ballard@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.ballard@anu.edu.au)  
**Balnave, Nikola** [n.balnave@uws.edu.au](mailto:n.balnave@uws.edu.au)  
**Barr, Trevor** [tbarr@swin.edu.au](mailto:tbarr@swin.edu.au)  
**Bauman, Toni** [Toni.Bauman@aiatsis.gov.au](mailto:Toni.Bauman@aiatsis.gov.au)  
**Beer, Chris** [chris.beer@anu.edu.au](mailto:chris.beer@anu.edu.au)  
**Botterill, Linda** [linda.botterill@anu.edu.au](mailto:linda.botterill@anu.edu.au)  
**Brown, Nicholas** [Nicholas.brown@anu.edu.au](mailto:Nicholas.brown@anu.edu.au)  
**Butcher, John** [john.butcher@netspeed.com](mailto:john.butcher@netspeed.com)  
**Cairney, Paul** [paul.cairney@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:paul.cairney@abdn.ac.uk)  
**Christensen, Tom** [tom.christensen@stv.uio.no](mailto:tom.christensen@stv.uio.no)  
**Clark, Anna**  
[Anna.clark@education.monash.edu.au](mailto:Anna.clark@education.monash.edu.au)  
**Connery, David** [david.connery@anu.edu.au](mailto:david.connery@anu.edu.au)  
**Cornish, Selwyn** [selwyn.Cornish@anu.edu.au](mailto:selwyn.Cornish@anu.edu.au)  
**Curran, James** [james.curran@arts.usyd.edu.au](mailto:james.curran@arts.usyd.edu.au)  
**Curthoys, Ann** [ann.curthoys@anu.edu.au](mailto:ann.curthoys@anu.edu.au)  
**Dovers, Stephen** [stephen.dovers@anu.edu.au](mailto:stephen.dovers@anu.edu.au)  
**Dryzek, John** [john.dryzek@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.dryzek@anu.edu.au)  
**Eccleston, Richard**  
[Richard.Eccleston@utas.edu.au](mailto:Richard.Eccleston@utas.edu.au)  
**Edwards, John** [john.k.Edwards@hsbc.com.au](mailto:john.k.Edwards@hsbc.com.au)  
**Errington, Wayne**  
[wayne.errington@anu.edu.au](mailto:wayne.errington@anu.edu.au)  
**Evans, Richard** [revans@vicnet.net.au](mailto:revans@vicnet.net.au)  
**Featherstone, Daniel**  
[media@ngaanyatjarra.org.au](mailto:media@ngaanyatjarra.org.au)  
**Flanagan, Jason**  
[jasoncflanagan@bigpond.com](mailto:jasoncflanagan@bigpond.com)  
**Ford, Lisa** [lisa.ford@law.mq.edu.au](mailto:lisa.ford@law.mq.edu.au)  
**Given, Jock** [jgiven@swin.edu.au](mailto:jgiven@swin.edu.au)  
**Goggin, Gerard** [gerard.goggin@unsw.edu.au](mailto:gerard.goggin@unsw.edu.au)  
**Gregory, Kate** [kategregory@gmail.com](mailto:kategregory@gmail.com)  
**Gregory, Robert** [bob.gregaory@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:bob.gregaory@vuw.ac.nz)  
**Halligan, John** [john.halligan@canberra.edu.au](mailto:john.halligan@canberra.edu.au)  
**Halpin, Darren** [d.r.halpin@rgu.ac.uk](mailto:d.r.halpin@rgu.ac.uk)  
**'t Hart, Paul** [hart@coombs.anu.edu.au](mailto:hart@coombs.anu.edu.au)  
**Head, Brian** [brian.head@uq.edu.au](mailto:brian.head@uq.edu.au)  
**Kay, Adrian** [a.kay@griffith.edu.au](mailto:a.kay@griffith.edu.au)  
**Kelly, Paul** [kellyp@theaustralian.com.au](mailto:kellyp@theaustralian.com.au)  
**Kent, Bruce** [Bruce.Kent@anu.edu.au](mailto:Bruce.Kent@anu.edu.au)  
**Kleist, Olaf** [okleist@swin.edu.au](mailto:okleist@swin.edu.au)  
**Laegreid, Per** [per.lagreid@aorg.uib.no](mailto:per.lagreid@aorg.uib.no)  
**Leigh, Andrew** [andrew.leigh@anu.edu.au](mailto:andrew.leigh@anu.edu.au)  
**Lovell, Melissa** [melissa.lovell@anu.edu.au](mailto:melissa.lovell@anu.edu.au)  
**Lowe, David** [arts-head-shhs@deakin.edu.au](mailto:arts-head-shhs@deakin.edu.au)  
**McConnell, Allan**  
[a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:a.mcconnell@econ.usyd.edu.au)  
**MacIntyre, Andrew**  
[andrew.macintyre@anu.edu.au](mailto:andrew.macintyre@anu.edu.au)  
**Macintyre, Stuart**  
[s.macintyre@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:s.macintyre@unimelb.edu.au)  
**McKay, Huw** [hmckay@westpac.com.au](mailto:hmckay@westpac.com.au)  
**Magee, Gary** [g.magee@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:g.magee@latrobe.edu.au)  
**Maley, Maria** [maria.maley@anu.edu.au](mailto:maria.maley@anu.edu.au)  
**Marsh, Ian** [i.marsh@gsg.usyd.edu.au](mailto:i.marsh@gsg.usyd.edu.au)  
**Martin,**  
[Daviddavid.martin@anthropos.com.au](mailto:Daviddavid.martin@anthropos.com.au)  
**Mayrl, Damon** [mayrl@berkeley.edu](mailto:mayrl@berkeley.edu)  
**Mein Smith, Philippa**  
[philippa.meinSmith@canterbury.ac.nz](mailto:philippa.meinSmith@canterbury.ac.nz)  
**Millmow, Alex** [a.millmow@ballarat.edu.au](mailto:a.millmow@ballarat.edu.au)  
**Neilson, Lyndsay**  
[lyndsay.neilson@dpc.vic.gov.au](mailto:lyndsay.neilson@dpc.vic.gov.au)  
**Neumann, Klaus**  
[KNeumann@groupwise.swin.edu.au](mailto:KNeumann@groupwise.swin.edu.au)  
**Nolan, Melanie** [Melanie.Nolan@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Melanie.Nolan@vuw.ac.nz)  
**Offe, Claus** [coffe@sowi.hu-berlin.de](mailto:coffe@sowi.hu-berlin.de)  
**Olick, Jeffrey** [jko3k@virginia.edu](mailto:jko3k@virginia.edu)  
**Painter, Martin** [SAMARTIN@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:SAMARTIN@cityu.edu.hk)  
**Pascoe, Robert** [Robert.Pascoe@vu.edu.au](mailto:Robert.Pascoe@vu.edu.au)  
**Patmore, Greg** [g.patmore@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:g.patmore@econ.usyd.edu.au)

**Pedersen, Howard** [haped@westnet.com.au](mailto:haped@westnet.com.au)  
**Pollitt, Christopher**  
[christopher.pollitt@soc.kuleuven.be](mailto:christopher.pollitt@soc.kuleuven.be)  
**Proust, Katrina** [Katrina.proust@anu.edu.au](mailto:Katrina.proust@anu.edu.au)  
**Pusey, Michael** [m.pusey@unsw.edu.au](mailto:m.pusey@unsw.edu.au)  
**Raadschelders, Jos** [raadschelders@ou.edu](mailto:raadschelders@ou.edu)  
**Rennie, Ellie** [erennie@swin.edu.au](mailto:erennie@swin.edu.au)  
**Ricketson, Sam** [srickets@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:srickets@unimelb.edu.au)  
**Robbins, Jane** [jane.robbins@flinders.edu.au](mailto:jane.robbins@flinders.edu.au)  
**Rowse, Tim** [tim.rowse@anu.edu.au](mailto:tim.rowse@anu.edu.au)  
**Ryan, Lyndall**  
[Lyndall.Ryan@newcastle.edu.au](mailto:Lyndall.Ryan@newcastle.edu.au)  
**Schoorlemmer, Niels**  
[N.Schoorlemmer@tue.nl](mailto:N.Schoorlemmer@tue.nl)  
**Schot, Johan** [j.w.schot@tm.tue.nl](mailto:j.w.schot@tm.tue.nl)  
**Shepherd Anthony**  
[ShepherdA@transfieldservices.com](mailto:ShepherdA@transfieldservices.com)  
**Sheriff, Jacqui**  
[jacquelyn.sherriff@postgrad.curtin.edu.au](mailto:jacquelyn.sherriff@postgrad.curtin.edu.au)  
**Smullen, Amanda** [smullen@fsw.eur.nl](mailto:smullen@fsw.eur.nl)  
**Snooks, Graeme** [Graeme.Snooks@anu.edu.au](mailto:Graeme.Snooks@anu.edu.au)  
**Stewart, Jenny**  
[Jenny.Stewart@canberra.edu.au](mailto:Jenny.Stewart@canberra.edu.au)  
**Strelein, Lisa** [Lisa.Strelein@aiatsis.gov.au](mailto:Lisa.Strelein@aiatsis.gov.au)  
**Stevens, Rachel** [raste2@student.monash.edu](mailto:raste2@student.monash.edu)  
**Stilwell, Frank** [franks@econ.usyd.edu.au](mailto:franks@econ.usyd.edu.au)

**Sutton, John** [John.Sutton@scmp.mq.edu.au](mailto:John.Sutton@scmp.mq.edu.au)  
**Tavan, Gwenda** [G.Tavan@latrobe.edu.au](mailto:G.Tavan@latrobe.edu.au)  
**Taylor, Tony**  
[Tony.Taylor@Education.monash.edu.au](mailto:Tony.Taylor@Education.monash.edu.au)  
**Thelen, Kathleen** [thelen@northwestern.edu](mailto:thelen@northwestern.edu)  
**Thomas, Julian** [jthomas@swin.edu.au](mailto:jthomas@swin.edu.au)  
**Tiernan, Anne** [a.tiernan@griffith.edu.au](mailto:a.tiernan@griffith.edu.au)  
**Toonen, Theo** [toonen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:toonen@fsw.leidenuniv.nl)  
**Trommel, Willem** [w.a.trommel@utwente.nl](mailto:w.a.trommel@utwente.nl)  
**Van der Meer, Frits**  
[meerf@fsaw.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:meerf@fsaw.leidenuniv.nl)  
**Veracini, Lorenzo**  
[Lorenzo.veracini@anu.edu.au](mailto:Lorenzo.veracini@anu.edu.au)  
**Verbong, Geert** [g.p.j.verbong@tue.nl](mailto:g.p.j.verbong@tue.nl)  
**Walter, James**  
[James.Walter@arts.monash.edu.au](mailto:James.Walter@arts.monash.edu.au)  
**Wanna, John** [john.wanna@anu.edu.au](mailto:john.wanna@anu.edu.au)  
**Weller, Patrick** [p.weller@griffith.edu.au](mailto:p.weller@griffith.edu.au)  
**Witcomb, Andrea** [awitcomb@deakin.edu.au](mailto:awitcomb@deakin.edu.au)  
**Withers, Glenn** [glenn.withers@anu.edu.au](mailto:glenn.withers@anu.edu.au)  
**Wooding, Robert**  
[Robert.Wooding@utas.edu.au](mailto:Robert.Wooding@utas.edu.au)  
**Young, Simon** [simon.young@uwa.edu.au](mailto:simon.young@uwa.edu.au)