The late Joe Kincheloe once wrote that ‘... the amazing Deakin Mafia provided innovative and unprecedented critical scholarship on education for a few short years’. Informed by various theoretical perspectives (e.g., critical theory, neo-Marxist, poststructuralist, postcolonial, feminist, critical literacy, Bourdieuan, Foucauldian) key Deakin University scholars pursued their commitments to social justice through education. A certain criticality characterised their work. Individually and collectively they created a national and international reputation for critical scholarship in education. Since that time (the 1980s and 90s), however, most of the Deakin ‘mafia’ have moved to senior academic posts elsewhere in Australian and internationally and their influence in educational research and discourse now continues as members of the ‘Deakin diaspora’.

This collection is an account of the stories of many of these scholars. It will provide valuable reading for any scholar of education who is particularly interested in critical pedagogy and the critical project in education more generally. It also provides insights into what makes a faculty of education successful at a particular point in time.
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Cultural studies provides an analytical toolbox for both making sense of educational practice and extending the insights of educational professionals into their labors. In this context *Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education* provides a collection of books in the domain that specify this assertion. Crafted for an audience of teachers, teacher educators, scholars and students of cultural studies and others interested in cultural studies and pedagogy, the series documents both the possibilities of and the controversies surrounding the intersection of cultural studies and education. The editors and the authors of this series do not assume that the interaction of cultural studies and education devalues other types of knowledge and analytical forms. Rather the intersection of these knowledge disciplines offers a rejuvenating, optimistic, and positive perspective on education and educational institutions. Some might describe its contribution as democratic, emancipatory, and transformative. The editors and authors maintain that cultural studies helps free educators from sterile, monolithic analyses that have for too long undermined efforts to think of educational practices by providing other words, new languages, and fresh metaphors. Operating in an interdisciplinary cosmos, *Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education* is dedicated to exploring the ways cultural studies enhances the study and practice of education. With this in mind the series focuses in a non-exclusive way on popular culture as well as other dimensions of cultural studies including social theory, social justice and positionality, cultural dimensions of technological innovation, new media and media literacy, new forms of oppression emerging in an electronic hyperreality, and postcolonial global concerns. With these concerns in mind cultural studies scholars often argue that the realm of popular culture is the most powerful educational force in contemporary culture. Indeed, in the twenty-first century this pedagogical dynamic is sweeping through the entire world. Educators, they believe, must understand these emerging realities in order to gain an important voice in the pedagogical conversation.

Without an understanding of cultural pedagogy’s (education that takes place outside of formal schooling) role in the shaping of individual identity—youth identity in particular—the role educators play in the lives of their students will continue to fade. Why do so many of our students feel that life is incomprehensible and devoid of meaning? What does it mean, teachers wonder, when young people are unable to describe their moods, their affective affiliation to the society around them. Meanings provided young people by mainstream institutions often do little to help them deal with their affective complexity, their difficulty negotiating the rift between meaning and affect. School knowledge and educational expectations seem as anachronistic as a ditto machine, not that learning ways of rational thought and making sense of the world are unimportant. But school knowledge and educational expectations often have little to offer students about making sense of the way they feel, the way their affective lives are shaped. In no way do we argue that analysis of the production of youth in an electronic mediated world demands some “touchy-feely” educational superficiality. What is needed in this context is a rigorous analysis of the interrelationship between pedagogy, popular culture, meaning making, and youth subjectivity. In an era marked by youth depression, violence, and suicide such insights become extremely important, even life saving. Pessimism about the future is the common sense of many contemporary youth with its concomitant feeling that no one can make a difference. If affective production can be shaped to reflect these perspectives, then it can be reshaped to lay the groundwork for optimism, passionate commitment, and transformative educational and political activity. In these ways cultural studies adds a dimension to the work of education unfilled by any other sub-discipline. This is what *Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education* seeks to produce—literature on these issues that makes a difference. It seeks to publish studies that help those who work with young people, those individuals involved in the disciplines that study children and youth, and young people themselves improve their lives in these bizarre times.
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I have struggled to remember where and how I knew about the work that was going on at Deakin. In the 1980s I chose to undertake some studies in educational administration. As it happens these were rather truncated by the demands of my job as a busy school principal. In the mid 1990s I made the decision to return to study, this time as a rather more exhausted school leader. For the record, I did finish this second time! However the germane point here is not my failure to complete a qualification and then my success, but rather the fact that I deliberately chose Deakin—twice—as the place where I might do some further study. Of all the universities in Australia, why this one? The answer to this question is in three parts: (1) the intellectual agenda, (2) reciprocal relationships with the profession, and (3) strong institutional practices informed by social justice principles. While I separate them here, they were integral to the ways of being a scholar and doing scholarly and inseparable as a faculty practice.

THE INTELLECTUAL AGENDA

As a practicing school principal I was regularly exposed to the burgeoning literatures on school leadership and management, and to the work of the early school effectiveness researchers. Neither of these bodies of work made much sense to me and did not help me think about the kinds of challenges I faced as the designated ‘boss’ of a classified ‘disadvantaged’ school. Already engaged in school-based action research as the major mode of generating democratically agreed curriculum and school policy changes, I had encountered texts written by Deakin scholars not only about action research, but also feminist and critical approaches to school administration. It seemed at the time that Deakin and I were a logical ‘fit’. Reflecting back on this, and connecting my choice of Deakin to a current concern with the purposes of scholarly work, it seems to me that I recognised and valued the kind of intellectual work which was the hallmark of the Education faculty.

In an article reflecting on the role of academics as public intellectuals, Craig Calhoun (2008) argues for a social science that produces public knowledge. This does not mean simply bringing techniques to problems identified by policy-makers. Rather, it is the reverse. Calhoun builds an argument for what he calls ‘real time’ social science which
– is directly responsive to public issues that are already subject to public discussion and policy making,
– brings knowledge into public discussion within policy-making time scales but
– is dependent on longer term scholarship underway about rapidly changing social circumstances
Doing real time social science means choosing topics for enquiry that emerge from a sustained and critical analysis of what is happening in the world. Having identified so, real time social scientists then raise questions about what problems are and are not posed by policy and/or public debate and why they are problematised in particular ways and what are the implications of these ways of meaning-making. Vital to these considerations are questions of whose knowledges are engaged and marginalized or ignored and whose interests are served and whose are not in the process of problem-making and posing.

In making this case, Calhoun is not suggesting that social scientists ignore the importance of blue skies research. Instead, he reasons that the development of better theorizations and more robust and sensitive methods are important in order to strengthen researcher capacities to undertake the work of research and also to address and/or promote public debates. He suggests that it is crucial that social science demonstrate its usefulness by informing public knowledge, not by supporting partisan politics or by producing esoteric knowledge within bunkered disciplines. This is not the same as applied social science because real time social science is not separate from the development of disciplinary knowledges and further scholarship. Rather the goal is to address issues in ways that will meaningfully clarify understandings, and inform social activities, conversations, relations, agendas and further inquiry/ies.

This is to my mind precisely the agenda that was collectively pursued in Education at Deakin University. The faculty work that I knew made sense to me as a practitioner—it offered resources to think with, a different take on problems that I knew only too well, and spoke from a deep commitment to social justice that I shared. But how did I know this?

RECIPROCAL RELATIONS WITH THE PROFESSION

The 1970s and 80s were, in Australia as in other places, a time when there was a great deal of ‘bottom up’ political activity. The anti-war movement coincided with the growth of identity-based social movements and struggles for Indigenous rights; in Australia these were subject to a very particular government incorporation, innovation and regulation (for example see Eisenstein, 1984; Yeatman, 1990 on ‘femocrats’ and the role of equal opportunity legislation). In education, the federal government initiated, over more than two decades, waves of school funding programmes designed to address and redress the ways in which poverty, race, dis/ability and gender were implicated in the reproduction of unacceptably low educational outcomes for some groups of Australian children and young people. These programmes generally drew heavily on research and also created forums and projects where academics and practitioners could come together to share insights and understandings (see Thomson, 2007).

The feminist philosopher Linda Alcoff (2002) advocates this kind of public, dialogic space as the most desirable site for public intellectual practice. Alcoff
argues for the notion of scholar as public theorist, a position she compares with that of permanent critic or populariser both of which, she suggests, place the scholar in the distantiated position of detached/neutral-expert-who-knows-and-who-tells-others-what-to-think/do. She stresses that theoretical development and creativity do not just happen back at 'the monastery' (p. 530) but actually happen in most walks of life, that is academics are not the only people to think and reflect deeply (see also McLaughlin, 1996). She therefore posits a notion of ‘doing theory in public’ where scholars can not only receive vital feedback but where they can engage in reciprocal conversations with others who have different partial and situated knowledges and perspectives. She concludes that

…(p)ublicly engaged work is actually one of the BEST sites from which to engage in at least certain kinds of intellectual work, not because one of merely applying and testing theory developed in the academy to the public domain nor because one can simply gather raw data from which to build theory, but rather because the public domain is sometimes the best or only place in which to alter ones’ thoughts… and thus to engage in intellectual work (p. 533).

With the benefit of hindsight it seems to me that this was the kind of work in which Deakin faculty approached their involvement in the many sites available for debate and development.

At the time I certainly met Deakin staff in a variety of places—at conferences, in official committees and in community organizations. One of the things that was most obvious to me, as a practitioner, was not that they were there—because other academics were often present too—but rather that they shared what seemed to me to be a more respectful position towards those of us in the schooling field. They did not seek to tell me what to do or think. They were actually interested in my perspectives and experiences and saw them as important. This was not the case with some other university-based people with whom I often found myself becoming angry about the ways in which my understandings were trivialized. My experiences appeared to be of no interest to those with an already fixed analysis.

Of course, Deakin academics were not the only ones who acted in this way. However this practice seemed to be characteristic of the group, rather than of an individual. These days I would describe this way of relating to practitioners as a disposition; these were scholars disposed to act in ways that promoted mutually respectful conversations and joint knowledge production. I know now that this was borne from a political-cultural practice which was explicitly theorized as well as practiced. As a practitioner I just experienced this, but it was an experience which was critical to my choice of a place to study. I needed to be able to take my professional identity and expertise into the academy and have it taken seriously. I knew that Deakin would do this—and they did.
STRONG INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES INFORMED BY SOCIAL JUSTICE PRINCIPLES

The first time I chose Deakin in the 1980s I was influenced by the fact that they offered part-time, distance courses. This meant that I could study in my own time-space. I was not required to attend weekly lectures and could regulate the pace at which I went through the course materials and exercises. While this kind of provision does not suit everyone, it was something that I found easier to manage than the local alternatives. While this might have been a market strategy, it was also borne from a desire to provide postgraduate education to the profession in ways that were not then readily available. Regardless of where they worked, no matter how remote the location or busy the work, part-time distance education offered an opportunity for an education that might well otherwise be unavailable.

The second time I chose Deakin I did so because I knew that the faculty had a commitment to the recognition of somewhat unconventional but nevertheless evidenced knowledge production and dissemination. This was one pedagogical instantiation of the collective disposition to respect professional practice. I was confident that the School would look favourably on my somewhat chequered academic record, and my school experiences and extensive professional publications. Their support was not simply a matter of enrolment, but extended to offering a scholarship for full-time study to a very non-traditional doctoral candidate. Both were critical in offering me the opportunity to sit, think and write for a while—a luxury after twenty-seven years of non-stop ‘doing’. I was not the only practitioner to benefit from this pedagogical commitment to the recognition of different knowledges.

I note that in these days of university quality audits and the policy press for completion it is harder and harder for university faculties to make the kinds of risky offers that were made to me. Yet these were not uncommon decisions at Deakin, and in most cases, the risks did not eventuate and the decision paid off.

I confess that the only negative feelings I have about Deakin relate to ‘the frock’; as I take my place among the academic procession at Nottingham I do look rather like an ostentatious blue and red Rosella parrot among the dull and dignified English academic crows and sparrows! Seriously though, I am pleased to be a Deakin graduate. I now call many of the faculty my friends. Two of my closest research partners remain on the Deakin staff and I know they continue to work for the same kinds of public intellectual work, reciprocal relations with the profession and equitable pedagogies and institutional practices that I found important as a student.

I am genuinely delighted that the work of the faculty and its significant influences on various cohorts of its students, on other institutions, and on international educational scholarship, has now been put on record in this book.
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INTRODUCTION

The late Joe Kincheloe once wrote that ‘... the amazing Deakin Mafia provided innovative and unprecedented critical scholarship on education for a few short years’ (in Smyth 2001). Indeed, as Jane Kenway asserts

Deakin became known as ‘the’ place in Australia where conventional educational ideas and practices were put under serious critical pressure, where people were encouraged to move beyond timid and trifling, unjust and unfazed educational thought and practice and towards a rigorous engagement of the ways in which education both constrains and enables, how and for whom and how it might be otherwise. Broadly, they represented what I think of as ‘the Deakin project’ (Kenway, page 8. A melancholic melody161 this volume).

Informed by various theoretical perspectives (eg., critical theory, neo-Marxist, poststructuralist, postcolonial, feminist, critical literacy, Bourdieuan, Foucauldian) key Deakin scholars pursued their commitments to social justice though education. Individually and collectively they, and others, made Deakin and critical educational thought synonymous. For one reason or another, when these scholars were together at Deakin they created a national and international reputation for critical scholarship in education.

Since that time (the 1980s and 90s) most of the Deakin ‘mafia’ have moved to senior academic posts elsewhere in Australian and internationally. Their influence in educational research and discourse continues now as members of what we have called the Deakin diaspora. As a number of the contributors to this collection explain, the term diaspora is not unproblematic and certainly has multiple meanings. Our use of the term in the title of this book was, as we have come to understand, somewhat naïve and simplistic, but we nevertheless still consider that it does represent something of the enduring association that this group of scholars has with a shared past at Deakin University.

SOMETHING IN THE AIR?

Fazal Rizvi talks of the development of a certain criticality that characterized the early Deakin.

Over the 1980s, the Faculty of Education at Deakin had created a wonderful space for dialogue and debate, where a new set of ideas were developed
about education and its moral possibilities; and then critiqued in a most vigorous fashion.

… what can be confidently asserted is that almost everyone within the so-called Deakin diaspora attaches considerable importance to the principle of criticality, even if its meaning in the diaspora is highly contested. This emphasis on criticality is based on the diaspora’s universal rejection of positivism, and the instrumentalism that views educational thinking in technical terms, eschewing moral and political issues. (Rizvi, page 248 this volume)

Perhaps a manifestation of this criticality was the place of argument. As Stephen Kemmis writes,

We argued endlessly with each other (and ourselves, much of the time). Members of the group (and especially the new members who began to arrive in the mid-1980s) kept bringing new authors, ideas, perspectives into the court of our group meetings. We had to run just to keep up. We tried to make common sense of the ideas that rumbled around us, constantly threatening to unsettle again arguments that had been more or less settled. We took stands. We agreed to disagree. We took account of other views, even when we were ruling them external to the positions we were defending (Kemmis, page 151 this volume).

Whatever was ‘going on’ at Deakin during those years it seems, as the contributors to this collection will reveal, it was ‘worth bottling’. Like a good wine that’s taste and smell is a product of context (soil, climate, weather, cellaring, culture etc) so the Deakin project (as Kenway calls it) was a product of a particular set of circumstances. But the question arises as to whether a bottle of Deakin ‘wine’ from that period was an aberration or actually embodies some more generalisable characteristic or quality that we might attribute to a university.

When John (Cardinal) Newman wrote The idea of the university in 1850 he considered the university was a place for teaching universal knowledge. Since then, claims to universal knowledge have been critiqued by postmodern scholars and research has become an integral part (if not a dominating part) of the modern university. Sheldon Rothblatt (1997) in The Modern University and Its Discontents coined the phrase the idea of the idea of a university, meaning that the university is, in the first instance, an idea. However, he also argues that “[a] single idea of a university has never truly existed” (p.1). So, in what sense is it possible to consider that there was something in the Deakin bottle (circa 1980/1990) that might be considered as an essence of a university?

Maybe those of us who were at Deakin during the making of the Deakin project secretly believe that the criticality and ceaseless argument was something of an essence of a university culture. And maybe we lament the increasing
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corporatisation of universities with its attendant increase in managerialism and performativity (Blackmore, 2003) of the modern university in which the space for criticality and argument is seriously eroded. I know I do (see Tinning, 2007). But although it is true that most of the members of the Deakin diaspora are baby-boomers, a generational category whose overwhelming rhetoric is, according to Mark Davis (1997), one of loss ... of all the things that have been taken away, this collection of stories should not be dismissed as the lamentations of a group of grumpy old women and men. These stories represent a passionate case for certain conditions and dispositions necessary (but not sufficient) to prosecute the critical project in education.

This collection by its nature is about the past and not the future. Perhaps it is salutary to note that in addition to their changing nature, the relative influence of universities on cultural and intellectual life in general is diminishing. Whether we believe in some essence of the idea of a university or not, as McNeely and Wolverton (2008) explain in their engaging book Reinventing Knowledge, the history of knowledge development has always been one of contestation between nascent, dominant and fading knowledge institutions (e.g., the library, the monastery, the university, the laboratory, and the internet). Universities are losing their influence in the burgeoning knowledge economy of the postmodern world. Such recognition raises serious issues for the next generation of scholars predisposed to work for the critical project in education.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGIES: WHAT’S IN A TITLE?

When I first proposed the idea of this collection it was to be titled ‘Critical pedagogy and the Legacy of Deakin University: Reflections of the Deakin Diaspora’. For the reasons I explain below, over time it seemed more appropriate to change the title to ‘Education, Social Justice and the Legacy of Deakin University: Reflections of the Deakin Diaspora’.

Although there are different varieties of critical pedagogy (Gore, 1993), according to Lather (1998) “critical pedagogy emerged in the 1980s as a sort of ‘big tent’ for those in education who were invested in doing academic work toward social justice” (p. 488). In Gert Biesta’s (1998) words

Critical pedagogies are in one way or another committed to the imperative of transforming the larger social order in the interest of justice, equality, democracy, and human freedom (Biesta, 1998, p. 1).

Reflecting on his early commitment to critical pedagogy, Buckingham (1998) asks ‘What does it mean to talk about radical pedagogy [read critical pedagogy] today?’ He suggested that

Twenty-five years ago, in the wake of 1968, it all seemed crystal clear. Armed with their copies of Teaching as a Subversive Activity, Deschooling
Society and The Pedagogy of the Oppressed, a whole generation of young teachers went out into the blackboard jungle, determined to ‘conscientize’ their students, to arm them with the skills of ‘crap detecting’ and to liberate them from the shackles of ideology. Now amid the enormous social upheavals which have characterised the closing years of the century, everything seems much more confused and contradictory (1998, p. 1).

The passions of Buckingham’s young teachers were fuelled by an emancipatory politics (Giddens, 1991) and it seems to me that a similar politic underpinned the commitment of the early Deakin scholars. Emancipatory politics, described as ‘… a generic outlook concerned above all with liberating individuals and groups from constraints which adversely affect their life chances… is concerned to reduce or eliminate exploitation, inequality and oppression’ (Giddens, 1991, p. 210–211), was avowedly utopian. But utopian aspirations and visions have always proved elusive.

Reflecting on her own experiences Kohli (1998) speaks clearly of the limitations of critical pedagogy when she claims that

As more of us extolled the virtues of critical pedagogy we came up against its limitations, including its reliance on ‘rational dialogue’ … It became clearer and clearer to me that one did not change deeply held political, social, and philosophical positions simply by acquiring new knowledge or new perspectives through conversations with others (p. 515).

It seemed to me that this was a crucial insight and it was part of what stimulated me to seek the reasons why the Deakin diaspora got involved in the critical project in the first place. Where, why and how did they develop their own emotional commitment to the critical project?

In this regard I find Carlson’s (1998) discussion of the three rhetorical styles that form the basis of Plato’s dialogues useful in thinking about the discourses that might be marshaled in prosecuting the mission of the Deakin project. They include: Logos, the analytic voice of critique associated with the truth games of science and philosophy; Thymos, a voice of rage against injustice from the perspective and position of the disempowered, the disenfranchised, and the marginalised; and Mythos, a personal voice of storytelling, cultural mythology, autobiography, and literature.

Kohli (1998) draws our attention to the fact that the search for the ‘clear and the distinct’ which is underpinned by a notion of ‘certainty’ involves ‘the separating out of the emotional, the sensuous, the imaginative’ (p. 515). It involves a privileging of rationality as the way to emancipation. While there are useful critiques of the limits of rationality (see for example Lather, 1991) a question remains as to whether the Deakin project was propelled as much by emotional commitment as by rational discourse. It seems to me that, for the Deakin diaspora, while all intellectually trained (Fitzclarence, 2009) and spending their working
days engaged with logos, there has always been a strong dimension of thymos and maybe that has made their work so powerful.

MY OWN ADVOCACY FOR CRITICAL PEDAGOGY

I was (and am still) happy to place myself within the critical pedagogy ‘big tent’, but I now have a more modest perspective regarding what can be claimed for those in the tent. As a long-time advocate of critical pedagogy and a socially critical school I have argued that issues relating to gender equity, equality of opportunity, catering for diversity, challenging unjust practices such as motor elitism, should be an integral part of physical education (see Tinning, 1985, 1987). I have also been a longstanding advocate for the need for the field of physical education to problematise knowledge construction, legitimation and dissemination, and to critically engage its own ideology, power and culture (see Tinning, 1991, 2010).

Macdonald & Kirk (1999) claim that HPE (health and physical education) teachers in Australia now have a ‘responsibility to [teach] the socially critical liberal curriculum as defined by the State’ (p. 140). In many ways this should make me feel pleased. To see many of the issues critical pedagogues raised in the 1980s and 90s now being addressed within the official discourse of our field is surely a small victory for the educational Left. However, for me at least, this is an illusionary victory. In my view the social justice discourses that are central to critical pedagogy have become mainstreamed and have often been appropriated by some teachers and administrators for reasons that are at a considerable distance from their original intention. Gert Biesta (1998) fuels my concerns when he reports

…postmodern critical pedagogy, because of its emphasis on values such as diversity and inclusion, has become an ally of new capitalism and neo-liberal educational policy, at least by offering a language that can easily be co-opted by new capitalism. Instead of being a critical device against the new capitalism, postmodern critical pedagogy in fact plays into its hands (p. 4).

This process of appropriation, co-option and corruption of curriculum reform initiatives is not a new phenomenon to education. In Australia we had seen it earlier with changes to the senior curriculum in Victorian schools in which laudable principles ended up corrupted by the politics of assessment. For example, in the case of the KLA (Key Learning Area) for HPE, the principles of social justice were effectively lost as the curriculum was manifested as practice (see Fitzclarence & Tinning, 1990). But the mainstreaming of the discourse is not my only source of ambivalence regarding critical pedagogy today. I have also become concerned over the claims made on its behalf, claims that have been, on reflection, often overstated, utopian, and perhaps even wrong-headed.
In this regard, I have become more sympathetic to Gur-Ze’ev’s (1998) argument for a more sceptical, less utopian ‘counter education that does not promise collective emancipation’ (in Kohli, 1998, p. 517). More recently I have also been challenged by Elizabeth Rata’s (2010) argument regarding a sociology ‘of’ education or a sociology ‘for’ education. Motivated by such concerns I sought to explain a rather more modest possibility for critical pedagogy (see Tinning, 2002). Such modest critical pedagog(ies) would seek to develop emotional commitment in students. It would recognise that emotional commitment is embodied. Notwithstanding the problematic dualism evoked by left/right brain discourse, it would not focus on progress through (left-brain) intellectualizing, but would also embrace activities that require the involvement of right brain (Heron, 1981). It would attempt to connect to subjectivity and would require something like Carlson’s new postmodern academic who speaks with

… a hybrid voice that crosses borders, one that interweaves voices of logos, thymos, and mythos and that shifts back and forth from analysis to anecdote, from theory to personal story-telling, from principled talk of social justice to personal and positioned expressions of outrage at injustice (p. 543).

HERDING CATS—THE PROCESS OF THE BOOK

As a faculty member at Deakin across the years 1977–1999 I was privileged to work with or along-side the contributors to this book. I was influenced by the seminars, debates and the general critical education discourse that characterized the work of those working in the Deakin project. Taking critical pedagogy to my field of physical education was both necessary and timely. Leaving Deakin at the end of 1999, I continued to meet many other members of the diaspora at the annual Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) conferences. Often at such occasions someone would make the claim that ‘we should document the history of our time at Deakin’. Such suggestions were usually quickly forgotten when we returned to our own work and institutional contexts.

A serendipitous email

In 2006 I received an email from Karen Sirna who was then completing her doctorate in curriculum studies at the University of British Columbia (UBC), Canada. Karen expressed a desire to come and work with me at The University of Queensland (UQ) and in 2007 she arrived to spend a year as a Research Fellow. Karen’s arrival turned out to be a key catalyst in the conception and completion of this collection. Karen’s story of how she came to contact me is instructive of the reach of the Deakin project.
INTRODUCTION

Karen was an Elementary school teacher in London, Ontario, Canada for 13 years and eventually a vice-principal and a principal. Throughout those years of working with students and families from diverse economic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, she found herself wondering whose interests were best met through the mandated provincial curriculum and the organization of schools. What grew over these years was a considerable sense of discord regarding curriculum, pedagogy, and the practice of education for social justice.

Karen was convinced that in order to answer her many questions and quell her unease about schools and social justice she needed a broader and deeper understanding of curriculum. Her previous studies in at University of Western Ontario and University of Toronto in physical education, exercise science and school administration had been of little help in that regard. As a consequence Karen enrolled in a PhD in curriculum at the UBC. Through her studies she was drawn to the work of scholars who questioned and explored the purposes, processes, and practices within education, schools, and curriculum (for example, Apple, 2000, 2001; Blackmore, 1993; Connell, 1985, 1993; McLaren 1994).


While her dissertation research focused on curriculum and pedagogy generally, she began to think about how the ideas generated from reading and research might relate to her previous discipline area of physical and health education. This attention to issues of education and social justice in the curriculum field of Health and Physical Education led her to the work of a group of critical scholars in that field (eg., Kirk, 1986; Tinning, 1987, 2002; Bain, 1989). Thinking about postdoctoral work that could extend her dissertation research to the field of physical education teacher education, Karen contacted me via email. During our email and phone connections Karen discovered that during my time at Deakin, I had worked with many of the scholars that had deeply influenced her thinking during her PhD at UBC.

While working as a Research Fellow in the School of Human Movement Studies at UQ, Karen and I began to discuss how influential scholars from a range of disciplines were somehow connected through history and their institutional experience at Deakin. We pondered what drew them to Deakin and how their experiences influenced their thinking and research in the years that followed. And
so the idea for a book comprising a collection of the stories of the Deakin diaspora came to life.

This book is an attempt to describe the conditions, both personal and institutional, which gave rise to this ‘innovative and unprecedented critical scholarship on education’. The essays are something of a place-marker. They help mark the place of Deakin University in the lives of the individual authors, and hopefully, they mark a place for Deakin in what we might think of as the critical education project.

Having identified the key Deakin scholars, I then made personal contact with them to solicit their interest in contributing to the book. Some of those approached politely said no, others were enthusiastic at the opportunity. Specifically they were asked to provide a reflective piece in response to a number of orienting questions put to them. We wanted to know about their personal histories and how their intellectual and emotional commitment to what we broadly call education for social justice developed. As you will see in the reading, some authors have made explicit reference to where/how their political commitments to a critical education discourse originated. Others have not been so explicit.

This collection did not come together easily. The collection has taken over a year to complete. Some authors were quick to respond to the ‘call’ and completed their chapters well in advance of the first deadline. Numerous other deadlines came and went before the manuscript was completed. Working with my diaspora colleagues was, as the saying goes … rather like herding cats! (albeit nice ones)!

Although there are over thirty Deakin Education faculty who have become professors of the Deakin diaspora, for various reasons this collection provides merely a sample. The first ‘filter’ used in offering invitations to write was geographic and temporal. I restricted the contributions to those who had been located on the Geelong campus of Deakin. Another reason for omitting some of the ex-Deakin faculty was that they did not, in any coherent or explicit way, identify with, or commit to, the Deakin project. They had other agendas, and that was fine.

For reasons as much to do with length as substance, this collection does not include the reflections of such faculty as Barbara Kamler, Lesley Farrell and Francis Christie in language education, Ian Robottom in environmental education, John Henry in indigenous education or Neil Pateman in mathematics education. Each of these scholars worked in various ways within an ethic that was consistent with the Deakin project. Notwithstanding these omissions, I suggest that this collection does include the main players in creating the Deakin legacy.

This book is a disparate collection of tales that reflect personal journeys, commitments and scholarship. They are different in their form, their substance and what they reveal of their authors. Each story represents an attempt to write of the past in a way that weaves the personal, intellectual and emotional. This was not an easy task as many of the authors attest. Each author has taken her/his own history and woven it into the storyline. Individually the contributors are, to a person, talented intellectuals. Collectively they provide a unique window into
that special period of time that saw Deakin University School of Education enjoy significant international attention for its contribution to the discourse on education for social justice.

NOTES

1 Not to be confused with the popular Australian wine brand called Deakin Estate that has no connection to the University.

2 The phrase ‘The socially critical school’ was articulated back in 1983 by Kenmis, Cole & Suggett in their book ‘Towards the socially-critical school’. Such a school considers that it has a responsibility for social transformation and will embrace a critical pedagogy as a means of pursuing this responsibility. From this perspective, ‘education must engage society and social structures immediately, not merely prepare students for later participation’ (p. 9).

3 Of course I’m not absolutely happy to use this term for I find the critiques of its increasing meaninglessness rather compelling (see for example Waleed Aly’s (2010) essay ‘What’s right: The future of conservatism in Australia’).

4 The title Professor in this sense is the English educational system meaning attributed to a highest rank of academic as distinct from the North American system meaning one who teaches at a college or university.
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1. AND WHAT ROUGH BEAST, ITS HOUR COME ROUND AT LAST, STRUGGLES …TO BE BORN?

I remember vividly my first day at Deakin. Australia Day 1979. Forty-two degrees centigrade. Being met at Tullamarine by an enthusiastic Iain Wallace, the Dean of the Faculty who drove us to Geelong. A wife and two young children in a single motel room. No airconditioning. No shops open. Hardly a restaurant in sight. Not a promising beginning! But, I consoled myself, I had only committed myself for three years before moving on to somewhere more interesting and important. Little did I know that the next decade would be the most exciting of my professional life!

My University office was down the back of a collection of portable buildings hurriedly thrown together as a response to the need for teachers in the post war surge of school enrolments. I was welcomed by several cheerful colleagues who had been members of the preceding Geelong Teachers College: Laurie Rattray-Wood, Keith Boyd, David Dawkins and June Parrott in particular, who had been working hard to keep the educational administration area alive following the sudden departure of Wilf Carr who had returned to the UK. Mainly they were using the materials developed by Ron Glatter (1970) and his colleagues at the Open University; an interesting connection. We were soon to be joined by John Smyth, fresh from Edmonton with a PhD in clinical supervision. Interestingly he was under the impression that he had been recruited to set up a new program in Educational Administration: the very job I had been recruited for!

The immediate task we faced was what such a Deakin program should look like. Clearly we could continue to teach the Open University program by proxy, but none of us were really enthused about that. We could also appropriate one or other of the standard (American) texts in the field and teach from that. Again, there was little enthusiasm for that approach. What we wanted was a fresh approach, one that was, perhaps, Australian.

My own background, developed at Massey University in New Zealand, was in the philosophy of education and the sociology of education, more particularly the sociology of the school (Bates, 1978a; 1978b; 1980a; 1980c; 1981a). I had become preoccupied with what I saw as a hiatus between macro level analysis of the school and society and micro level analysis of the school as a social system. Little seemed to link these two areas of analysis and research although authors were keen to extrapolate or interpolate from their level of analysis to the broader field of education. What was missing were appropriate studies that linked these two levels.
of analysis and concern. As I thought more about the problem, the opportunity to develop analyses of educational administration as the link between macro and micro seemed more and more attractive. Perhaps in the study of educational administration we would be able to forge such links.

Deakin didn’t seem too perturbed that I had no serious background in educational administration. However, as I read my way into the field I became more and more perturbed. It was a field left behind by the winds of time. Despite nearly a century of developments in philosophy and particularly the philosophy of science, the key figures in the field were committed to a positivism that was outdated and indefensible. The field was thought by some of its leaders such as Dan Griffiths, to be in ‘intellectual turmoil’ (1979). I couldn’t see much in the way of turmoil, except for the unwarranted attacks made by scholars such as Don Willower on Thom Greenfield’s (1975) attempt to introduce a Weberian interpretivism into a field dominated by American positivism. As far as I could see, Thom’s was about the only defensible intellectual position in an arid and introspective academic landscape that had been left behind by developments in philosophy, science, sociology and education (Bates 1980a; 1980b; 1980c; 1980d; 1982a; 1983).

Moreover, search as I could, I could find no reference in any of the classic American texts on ‘educational’ administration to any educational ideas. There was not a single reference to curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, school culture, teaching and teachers work or to the social context of the school. Instead there was an obsession with establishing a ‘knowledge base’ for the field through an empiricist determination of a set of fundamental propositions from which an axiomatic theory of administration could be developed to guide the administrator’s hand, thus allowing a ‘scientific’ determination of administrative practice. And all this in response to a practical activity riven with conflicts over values, purposes, achievements, resources, governance etc.

Clearly, if we wanted to achieve a defensible educational theory of educational administration, one informed by developments in other related fields, we would have to start from the ground up. In one sense this was a daunting prospect—there were few shoulders to stand on—but in another sense, it was truly liberating. Moreover, as Deakin University was modelling itself in part on the Open University, especially in the production of high-quality course materials, we had the chance of providing a resource base for others in the field who were looking for new directions.

We were, of course, not completely alone in our aspirations. Clearly Thom Greenfield’s work was important to us as was that of Peter Gronn, who championed his work from Monash University. John Codd at Massey University was steeped in the philosophy of science as well as ethics and became a close colleague. Bill Foster from San Diego spent time with us in those early years developing his Habermasian approach. We were also fortunate enough to have sufficient funds (derived from keeping some staff positions unfilled and sending
other staff overseas to complete doctorates on half pay) to bring scholars here to work with us for brief periods. Henry Giroux, Tom Popkewitz, Mike Apple, Larry Iannaccone, Bill Boyd, Lou Smith, Paula Silver, Mary-Lou Holly, John Prunty, John Clarke, Eric Braithwaite, David Jenkins spent time with us and wrote for us and with us. Other leading scholars such as Dan Griffiths, wrote for us. Australian scholars such as Peter Musgrave, Dean Ashenden, Adrian Carr, Doug White, John Hinkson, Gerry England, Richard Smith, Bill Hannan, Hugh Watson, Peter Dwyer, Deborah Towns, Ross Harold, Gerald Burke, Michael Garbutcheon Singh, and John Freeland joined in. We were fortunate enough to recruit as colleagues, teachers who were doing their doctorates with us such as Peter Watkins and Lawrie Angus as well as colleagues with recent doctorates from elsewhere: Jill Blackmore, Jane Kenway and Fazal Rizvi. Interestingly, few of these people had a background in educational administration but rather in philosophy, sociology, history, policy studies, curriculum or in the day-to-day life of schools.

Collectively, during the decade to 1989, the Social and Administrative Studies Group, as we became known, produced some sixty 100–150 page monographs as well as over 200 papers and several books. This was a major intellectual project.

Our project began with an attempt to initiate the reconstruction of the field of educational administration through a critique of the positivist foundations of the field (Bates, 1980b, 1981b; Smyth, 1982) followed by an examination of the crisis in society and administration (Rattray-Wood & Parrott, 1982); a study of alternative approaches to the study of the field (England, 1982); studies of the administrator as manager (Watkins, 1982) and educator (Codd, 1982a). Administration as philosophy in action was discussed (Codd, 1982b) and the difficulty of adjudicating competing claims was addressed (Clark, 1982), as were the relationships between bureaucracy, education and democracy (Bates, 1982b). On the basis of this initial analysis and critique a reformulation of the idea of leadership was undertaken. Traditional views were canvassed and found wanting (Foster, 1986; Gronn, 1986); the role of the educational administrator in the development of educational ideas was addressed (Smyth, 1986a, 1986b). The notion of administrator as a contributor to the development of a democratic community was outlined (Rizvi, 1986) and the implications of the new perspective for educational administration were reviewed (Watkins, 1986b).

Alongside these analyses a cultural perspective on the work of schools was developed based upon the notion that the major resources of schools are culture and knowledge (Bates 1980b; 1981b; 1986) and that all other resources are managed in relation to these fundamental resources. This perspective was employed to examine the controversial area of school effectiveness (Angus, 1986); policy formation (Caldwell & Spinks, 1986); the importance of time as a resource (Watkins, 1986b); and a case study of class, curriculum and culture in a secondary school conducted (Angus et al, 1986a, 1986b, 1988).

The problem of evaluating schools was addressed. Here the early work (Bates et al 1981h, 1981i) reviewed various notions of evaluation (Codd, 1981a; explored
the potential of aesthetic approaches to evaluation (Parrott & Codd, 1981); discussed ideological components of the evaluation process (Bates, 1981c) as well as the relationship between evaluation and control (Dawkins, 1981). These resources were employed to set out an alternative critical approach to evaluation (Bates, 1981e; Codd 1981b); classrooms (Smyth, 1981); and school evaluation systems (Bates, 1981f). The administrative and social context of evaluation was assessed (Clarke, 1981) and a case study approach to school evaluation and review was outlined (Bates, 1981g).

Alongside these theoretical approaches a series of interviews with leading Australian educators was conducted in order to provide an up-to-date account of the various currents, tensions, possibilities and lacunae in Australian education. *Thinking Aloud* (Bates & Kynaston, 1983) was the result of collaboration between an academic (Bates) and a journalist (Kynaston) and showed in a very succinct form, how many of the theoretical issues developed within our course materials were at work in the day-to-day concerns of leading movers and shakers within various Australian education systems.

Alongside this formal presentation of Australian educational ideas was a less formal but fascinating attempt to make available the wealth of knowledge and experience of our students. Many of them were in positions of considerable responsibility in schools and school systems throughout Australia. As they fed back their experience to those of us who were reading their accounts of various aspects of Australian education, our whole program was enriched by a sense of immediacy as well as complexity. Some of this was fed back into our courses by the annual publication of selected student assignments. These became the ‘Working Papers’ (Bates, Watkins and Rizvi 1984, 1986; Bates, Angus & Watkins 1985) which themselves became part of the required reading for currently enrolled students. For many students this was their first publication and an introduction to the possibility of an academic career. In the event, several of them went on to become professors at various Australian universities.

Much of our work at this time was associated with the development of a new Graduate Diploma in Educational Administration, which was part of a suite of new developments in classroom processes, curriculum studies, and the sociology of education as well as in specific curriculum areas. In this we were fortunate to work alongside colleagues such as Stephen Kemmis, Rob Walker and their visitors such as Bob Stake, John Elliott, Ulf Lundgren, David Hamilton, whose work on classroom processes, curriculum and, most importantly, action research was a further stimulus to the development of a critical approach across the board. Other staff from the previous Teachers College also returned from completing their doctorates overseas and rapidly made a name for themselves within this rapidly developing project. Robin McTaggart, Richard Tinning, Ian Robottom, were important contributors here as were others who completed their doctorates more locally such as John Henry and Colin Henry.
As our students moved on from the Graduate Diploma to the Masters program we extended our critical analysis to a wider series of theoretical issues in the attempt to explicate and analyse some of the broader influences at work in the administrative structuring of educational systems. We used Callahan’s (1962) analysis of educational administration as a ‘cult of efficiency’ as a starting point but went on to look at the Theory Movement (Griffiths, 1985); Thom Greenfield’s Interpretivism (Gronn, 1983); the New Sociology of Education (Bates, 1983); the early Frankfurt School (Giroux, 1983); the new Political Science (Boyd, 1983); Critical Political Theory (Iannaccone, 1983); Marxism (Watkins, 1983) and Critical Philosophy (Codd, 1983, 1989). Several emerging analyses relevant to the field were also examined: stability and change (Popkewitz, 1983), Professionalism (Silver, 1983) and Loose-Coupling (Foster, 1983).

These explorations led on to the development of a critical approach to policy analysis (Prunty, 1984; Rizvi 1989, 1991) in which the role of the state (White, 1987) and the specific issues of inequality (Smith, 1984), gender (Towns, 1984), multiculturalism (Rizvi, 1984) and the relations between youth, schooling and work (Watkins, 1984, 1985b) were addressed. More generally the relationship between educational administration, public administration and the state was analysed through an account of Liberal and Marxist approaches (Bates, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c, 1985a, 185b, 1985c); the implication of public administration in the crisis of the state (Bates, 1985d); the question of agency and structure (Watkins, 1985a 1986a) and the possibility of democratising education (Watson, 1985), curriculum formation (Musgrave, 1985) and assessment (Hannan, 1985).

The relationship between economy and administration was also explored through analyses of the economy and schooling (Harrold, 1985; the economics of teacher supply and demand (Burke, 1985); technology, economy and education (Watkins, 1986); social division economy and schooling (Dwyer, 1986) the political economy of schooling (Freeland, 1986) school culture, corporate culture and the administrative and social structures of schools (Bates 1987a, 1987b, 1988, 1989a, 1989b) and school and professional development (Smyth1984a, 1984b, 1989a, Smyth, Henry and Dickie, 1982).

With the arrival of Jill Blackmore and Jane Kenway, a series of monographs on administration and gender were developed as part of a critical approach to the administration of education (Kenway, 1990; Blackmore, 1992), which enormously extended the development of a critical perspective by enriching it with feminist theory.

Throughout the 1980s, the period to which this account is restricted, the intellectual and publications agenda was accompanied by a research agenda which included case studies of schools (Bates Smyth, Angus and Watkins 1983; Angus, 1986, 1988); the politics of regional education (Bates, Angus, Prunty, 1983); the reorganisation of the Victorian Department of Education (Bates, Angus, Watkins, Rizvi, & Dawkins, 1985); the operations of regional boards (Watkins, Angus & Rizvi, 1985); school closure (Watkins, 1986c); assisted school evaluations (Smyth,
Kemmis & Henry, 1980); case studies of clinical supervision (Smyth et al, 1984); professional renewal in TAFE Colleges (Smyth, Henry, & Dickie, 1982); case studies of transition programs (Dawkins, 1984); a major evaluation of a State Participation and Equity Project (Rizvi & Kemmis, 1987). In addition some thirty doctoral theses were supervised and completed by the group.

But from this point onwards I became distracted by the responsibilities of the Deanship during a period of massive transition: through successive amalgamations and a severe downsizing and reorganising of the Faculty under somewhat hostile conditions. But that, as they say, is another story. But the question remains as to what we achieved collectively during this most exciting of professional experiences. What we attempted to do was set out a new approach to educational administration and leadership which was theoretically informed by recent scholarship in fields that had not previously been employed in the theorising of educational administration and leadership and to focus on the management of educational processes within schools and systems as they affected particular groups of students. At the heart of this analysis was a concern with social justice and the employment of critical approaches to the structures of systems and the techniques and effects of administrative processes within them. In this endeavour we attempted to link system-wide analyses with school-level analyses, showing how contextual effects interacted with both.

If I can attempt brief encapsulation of some of our shared perspective it would look something like the following.

In contrast to the functionalist assumptions of the body of work current in educational administration at the beginning of the 1980s we sought to develop a socially critical perspective. Our starting point was that educational administration is a socially constructed system of behaviour which is the result of contestation between social groups of unequal power in terms of, for instance, class, race and gender. The resulting organisational structures can be seen as facilitating the agency of certain groups and limiting that of others. In this sense organisations represent a particular mobilisation of bias. This bias is not always predictable as differing settlements are reached in different contexts at different times. Central to such settlements are ideological appeals to particular notions of technical efficiency (which is itself an ideology) and to various conceptions of social order including those of the rationally administered society on the one hand, and of participatory democratic community on the other. The processes of contestation through which settlements are reached are conducted through the exercise of various forms of power. While some of these are in extremis physically coercive, most of them are economic, political and cultural. The tendency of established groups is to use whatever means are at their disposal to define their particular mobilisation of bias as a ‘natural’ order and to be preoccupied with reproducing that cultural and social order in as intact form as possible through mechanisms such as education. The tendency of non-established groups is to contest such hegemony and win concessions that mobilise organisational, social and cultural
resources in ways that produce a counter-hegemony. Such contestation means that administration cannot be viewed as a neutral, value-free, technical exercise and must be seen to be centrally concerned with ethics and the ways in which ethics inform social, cultural and political concerns. Such concerns lie at the heart of the practices of schools and school systems and affect the message systems of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment through which the experiences and life chances of students are shaped. The management of these message systems through the processes of educational administration and leadership are at the heart of the process of schooling and the proper study of administration in education.

Such a socially critical approach and its insistence on the contested nature of the social construction of reality through the message systems of schools, opens up the study of educational leadership and administration in quite new ways. But it also connects with the reality of life in schools in ways that the ‘axiomatic theory of administration’ does not. This reconnection, moreover, opens up new ways of researching leadership and administration which explore the situatedness of administrative practice and the conflicting demands that surround the school and ensure that it is in Willard Waller’s (1936) terms, a social organism, a nexus of social relationships, a despotism in a perilous state of equilibrium, threatened from within and without.

So what were the achievements of this decade of intellectual endeavour? It did, I think, open up new ways of looking at a field that had become moribund; new ways of conceptualising the practices of educational administration and leadership and connecting the field with major intellectual developments in cognate disciplines. It reaffirmed the centrality of educational processes in the study of educational administration and it connected those processes with life in classrooms with broad social movements. It put cultural and social concerns at the forefront of the analyses and it introduced ethics and contestation as central to the field. This was a significant accomplishment.

But there were other accomplishments besides the intellectual agenda. The collective nature of the endeavour brought a special excitement to the enterprise. There was little of the self-regarding careerism which typifies much academic life. Living together in ‘F’ Block was very much a communal experience where doors were seldom closed and where colleagues were always and often instantly available to talk through a new idea, a possibility, a difficulty, a lack of sources. Part of this was due to the extensiveness of the agenda we had set ourselves—an agenda that was constantly opening up new areas for exploration—areas where we found few scholars had been before. There was plenty of intellectual space to occupy. Part of it was a deep but seldom publically expressed concern for the welfare of each other as various crises arose at a personal or institutional level. Part of it was the combination of strong personalities, each of which was given space in argument and whose positions would be contested, sometimes heatedly, but always with respect. I could not have wished for better colleagues.
At another level there was institutional support for the promotion of our agenda, through publication certainly, through conference support, through international travel, through invitations to internationally recognised (or soon to be recognised) scholars to spend time with us. These opportunities very rapidly built networks through which our ideas mixed with, supported and contested, ideas in the wider scholarly community. I remember Lawrie Angus (at that time a colleague and doctoral student of mine) coming with me to the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference in Chicago in 1985 and beginning to explain to the official on the registration desk where Deakin University was, only to be cut short with a ‘yes, of course, we all know where Deakin is’. Such recognition had been established in a very short time. To have moved from a provincial teachers college to the status of an internationally recognised Faculty in five short years was indeed an accomplishment.

It was also the result of a conscious strategy. What we were trying to do was at odds with the traditions of the field and it was clear that we were unlikely to be welcomed into the cosy clubs that were committed to continuity rather than change. This became particularly apparent to me when I learnt that following my appointment to Deakin, Bill Walker, at that time the doyen of the field in Australia and the Commonwealth, had rung the Vice Chancellor and told him that he had made a serious mistake in appointing me in preference to one of his protégés. Clearly if we were going to make an impact we had to go outside Australia and establish a reputation in a more open context. I cannot say that we were welcomed by the old guard in the United States either although Dan Griffiths, the grand old man of educational administration in the US, did give us his imprimatur by recommending Deakin as a place where new things were happening and where it would be worth doing a doctorate. Unfortunately the tyranny of distance and the absence of doctoral fellowships prevented much traffic of this kind. We were, however, welcomed by a newer generation of academics in the field and, although the mainstream US traditions continued almost uninterrupted we might have had some influence at the margins, especially in showing that other kinds of thinking were possible.

One source of influence in the wider field is surely the result of the movement of members and students of the Social and Administrative Studies group to positions at other universities. John Smyth moved to a chair and an enormously productive career at Flinders University. Jane Kenway moved to a chair and an equally productive career at the University of South Australia and then to Monash. Lawrie Angus moved to Monash and then to a chair and Head of Department at the University of Ballarat. Fazal Rizvi moved to a chair at Monash and then to RMIT and now the University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana. Peter Kell holds a chair at the University of Wollongong. Marie Brennan holds a chair at the University of South Australia. Adrian Carr until recently held a chair at the University of Western Sydney. Tony Kruger is Associate Professor and Head of department at Victoria University. Geoff Shacklock is Associate Professor and Head of
Department at RMIT. Hemamali Palihakkara became director of the Institute of Education in Sri Lanka. Alan Reid holds a chair at the University of South Australia. Richard Bates and Jill Blackmore hold chairs at Deakin and have continued to uphold and extend their work under somewhat difficult circumstances—especially during the 1990’s.

But most of all, for those of us who were part of that brief decade of the 1980’s, the reward was the sense of excitement, of doing something new, of challenging the foundations of the field, of opening up new territory for exploration, of connecting with broader social movements. To have had the opportunity to do this in the company of such great colleagues and with such great students was an opportunity that rarely comes to us in academic life. It was an experience to be treasured.
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2. ENACTMENTS, NETWORKS AND QUASI-OBJECTS: A STRANGER IN A STRANGE LAND

When I began work on this chapter I was struck by the question of just what were the stories of the Deakin past that I have told myself and perhaps bored others with over time? What are the stories I have forgotten, edited out of easy recall or suppressed? And, then, perhaps more importantly, what is the framing device, the sensibility I now bring to a past however patchily recalled? I put these considerations “up front” as it were and wonder if I am not writing what Bruno Latour (2000) calls a scientifiction, ‘using the tools of fiction to probe a scientific or a technological domain deeper than it can itself do with its own talk of efficiency and profitability’ (p.78). While I’d never describe Deakin back then as efficient, let alone profitable, I wonder about the efficacy of reflexivity in tracing a trajectory which owes as much to dumb luck, chance and the perversity of formal education organisations. Still, the urge to make sense, to give order and describe patterns remains strong in all of us.

‘Looking forward to working with you in July’. These words were spoken to me by a senior academic in the Education Faculty at Deakin before I had been interviewed. This was my introduction to Education at Deakin and I must confess it made me a little jumpy. I had little experience of job interviews and when I walked into the small meeting room which was located in a relocatable which housed ‘the office’ of the Faculty and saw fifteen or more faces look up at me I did wonder what I was letting myself in for. All I recall of that interview was stumbling through the questions (for a junior academic appointment) and being prompted on more than one occasion by the same senior academic.

How I got to this point is useful to briefly recount as I think it may help make some sense of what follows. Sense making is something that is often seen as a good thing. I am wary of claims of making sense. The making part is fine. I wonder about the sense. Does it all have to make sense and to whom? Nevertheless, what I hope this little contribution to the collection will do is provide the reader with one more enactment (Mol, 2001) of Deakin way back then and hopefully allow us to mull: ‘how on earth did this all hang together, if indeed it can be said to have?’

My PhD was in physical organic chemistry at ANU¹. It was past its use-by a decade later when machines were able to do the analysis I had struggled to do manually and with much less computational power. They don’t give PhDs to

---

machines but given some of what now passes as science, I think the machines should feel offended. I had begun to use these machines, also known as computers, during my honours year in 1968, the year Intel was founded. Using a computer in those days meant submitting a large box of punched cards to be processed by a computer that lived in a large air conditioned room and occupied most of it and had the computational power of about one thousandth of that in current mobile phones. During the PhD I learned to work with a bigger range of computers, from those that provided an interface to equipment to what was then a new time-shared computer which had all of 8K of RAM in single user mode. It was here I developed a sensibility about these machines which was that they simply were good to do certain kinds of work to progress a research agenda. Always pragmatic, never over-hyped, it was always about getting it to work or do the job that was wanted.

I returned from ANU to continue my teacher training and then taught in a High school for a year before moving to what was then Melbourne CAE, a teacher training college. Here I continued to make, what I thought were sensible uses of various computers, building interfaces to equipment to support student practical work in Chemistry and writing software to automate some of the problem generation work for students. I also built computer models and simulations to support teaching and learned much about how much one learned when building such things and how little students learned when they used them. It was during this time that I was asked to manage the purchase of the College’s first time-shared computer and, around the same time, to lead a team that developed one of the first Graduate Diplomas in Computer Education. My interest in student learning was totally informed by literature drawn from educational psychology and, in the Department in which I worked, I was able to experiment with many different approaches to teaching the variously sized cohorts that passed through our program. There was no formal research during this time. I worked in a department that taught chemistry to would-be science teachers and the staff struggled to do research in their areas of specialism largely due to lack of equipment and resources. A modest amount of research in education happened elsewhere in the College but the Balkanisation of departments made it difficult to work outside perceived disciplinary boundaries.

I came to Deakin armed only with my interest in computing and pedagogy and had no idea of the various intellectual agendas which the fledgling Faculty was developing. I felt like a stranger in a strange land. Just as my curiosity for exploring various pedagogies at Melbourne CAE was supported by my colleagues, at Deakin, I was able to pursue my curiosity about ideas in general which was fed by a number of very generous colleagues who would talk of their own agendas and intellectual influences. I was on a pretty steep learning curve. Broadly speaking, this was in sociology and I had only ever thought that psychology was all that mattered in terms of thinking about teaching and learning.
The other aspect of Deakin that I was abruptly introduced to was that Deakin then primarily taught off-campus students. In my first week I was greeted by two colleagues working in the computing area, Peter Evans and Robin Stevens. In the first few minutes of meeting it was a matter of thank goodness you are here, we have an off-campus course to write! I had no idea what these ‘things’ even looked like so I dutifully replicated what was then a standard model of structured weeks of activities supported by readings and, because it was a course about computers and education, we mandated particular computing activities. I have always described that work as committing almost every distance education sin in the book. I recall my awkward writing featuring prominently on the door of our assigned editor!

I never was concerned about my ‘fish out of water’ status in terms of adapting to teaching at a distance or my lack of awareness and knowledge of key critical thinkers and their work in education. What the Faculty was after was someone to drive or lead computer-related developments and, from my point of view, given what I had learned in my previous position, I thought I could shape a useful agenda and base my writing around these ideas. I had some firm non-negotiables based on my experience. The role of staff was an important focus. I was strongly of the view that if we could not influence colleagues to use these technologies to do their routine work in the first instance then there would be little or no chance of them exploring the use of computers to support their teaching.

It is important to recall that in describing what follows that this was a period at Deakin prior to the manic scrutiny of costs and the central manipulation of budgets to meet corporate university purposes. Without having the correct words for it at the time, we set out to establish a praxis around the use of computing technologies. We had initial ideas that were fragmented but which developed as we explored a range of practices and theory with our fellow academics.

When I came to Deakin in 1984 there was a kind of text factory in operation in the Faculty. Academics would hand write or perhaps type a draft of a paper or teaching materials. It was then word processed courtesy of a large typing pool (all women) who made use of what was then a state-of-the-art Wang system complete with 8” floppy disks. This was at a time when there was a proliferation of brands of 8-bit microcomputers and the shift to the so-called personal computer had begun. We acquired a small network of 8-bit BBC microcomputers and we had our Vice-Chancellor open the first microcomputing lab at Deakin, much to the chagrin of the folk in the IT Faculty. The Educational Computing Lab or ECL as it was known had plants, fish, and as supporting and friendly an environment as we could manage. What I had learned from my years at Melbourne was that if you taught students in a particular way, more than likely they would pick up some of those habits in their own teaching. The ECL became a place that staff and students used routinely. I recall teasing Stephen Kemmis on occasions as he sat in his office typing on a typewriter. Stephen, apart from being most generous in his intellectual support was also someone who quickly learned how to exploit available technologies to support his work. I recall him writing a book with Wilf Carr and
emailing floppy disks to and from the UK. He was highly influential in the Faculty
and while some academics would often mutter that they were employed to write
and not type, Stephen always demonstrated an uncanny ability to derive clever use
from the various computing resources he used. The use of word processing
software, even in its limited form, grew slowly to a point that when we were able
to afford a few of the new fangled Macintosh computers (the breadboxes). Usage
grew a good deal more. These were days when we shared a small pool of
computers, staff would book computers to take home and our access to the
Australian Research Network was via a long cable that ran all the way up the hill
to a relocatable building, which was the ECL. In those days email was expensive.
We had access to a text screen and in order to send email we had to use the screen
editor, vi. I found it amazing that academic staff would go to the trouble of
mastering enough of this ugly editor to send an email. The attraction of being able
to communicate rapidly with colleagues in other parts of the world was highly
attractive to many colleagues.

We had a practice of largely unquestioning support for any academic wanting
to try most anything with computers in their teaching. There were some very
ordinary things we supported but also many memorables. Stephen Kemmis and a
team teaching a third year unit on education were making use of a preliminary draft
of a book David Hamilton (then in Scotland) was writing. Peter Evans developed
software to allow students to comment on each week’s set text on the BBC
network. The teaching team would meet in the ECL and write a summary of the
student comments and questions. The summary was then moved from the BBC
network to the Internet point of connection and emailed to David. He considered
the summary and then posted back a reply which was moved back onto the BBC
network for students. By today’s standards this activity is routine. It wasn’t in the
mid 1980s.

Our experience with on- and off-campus students and the use staff made of the
various technologies contributed to a developing praxis of computer use in
education. To me, with my science background, the technology remained a means
to achieving something rather than an end in itself. I began to write small pieces
about my thinking about computer use in education and teacher education. My first
step in writing something larger came about as a consequence of a bid Stephen
Kemmis and colleagues from other universities in Australia put together to
evaluate a national computer education program. Stephen had written a small
monograph with Colin Henry for teachers: a point-by-point guide to doing action
research. With Stephen’s encouragement, I modified that to address the study of
computing in schools. This document was part of a bid for a grant to conduct an
evaluation to the Commonwealth Schools Commission. The bid was successful
and I embarked on my first evaluation study in education. The monograph was the
first of a further nine monographs which I wrote for off campus teaching.

I was still coming to terms with the likes of Illich and Freire as a result of being
in the company of what was a large group of colleagues interested in curriculum
and critical pedagogy led by Stephen Kemmis. I explored these new ideas as I wrote monographs like *The convivial spreadsheet*, *The collaborative database*, and *Computers, nomads and other things*. My reading ranged from influential thinkers about computing and media generally (Weizenbaum, Turkle, Papert, McLuhan) and folk whose work I stumbled on such as Bruce Chatwin’s *The Songlines*.

My puzzling about people changing practices and the persistent problem of how to think about humans and computers continued. There was grist everywhere. Computers, despite their puny computational power began to take on a larger significance in the lives of colleagues who slowly came to see the advantage of a word processor to support their writing and, later, the convenience of dial-up modems which allowed some work to be done from home.

I had begun to develop a critical sensibility about computers in education I think in part as a reaction to the over selling of the technology to schools and parents, in part arising from working on the national evaluation study and in part from working with colleagues for whom being critical was their stock in trade. A burgeoning literature concerned with computer use in schools was, and remains for the most part, utopian and generally insensitive to the major social-justice issues which had long characterised schooling and about which I had become more aware since coming to Deakin.

It was a time when reading groups of various kinds were active and a good friend and colleague Lindsay Fitzclarence encouraged me to join one that was operating in the curriculum group. Not long after I joined this group, Lindsay had distributed a pre-publication version of Henry Giroux’s *Border Pedagogy*. It was my first encounter with the notion of the post-modern. I vividly recall Stephen Kemmis coming to that meeting and posing the question to the group: ‘how can you work in a field where the sign posts change overnight?’ At the time I had little awareness of the intellectual conflict between Habermas and Lyotard. But, intrigued by Stephen’s strong reaction, we formed a small group to further explore this intellectual territory. We began working through Giroux’s bibliography and were making heavy going of it. A chance visit by Bill Green from Murdoch at the time was pivotal. I recall a meeting we had with him and so much of what was a tangled and confusing mess falling into some kind of order.

About this time the Faculty decided to make another appointment to the computers and education area. It came totally out of the blue. We advertised and ended up with applicants that were similar in background and expertise to Peter Evans and me. This was at a time when I felt we needed to be working on better theorising of the practices emerging around computer use in education. I recall talking to Richard Bates about this and he pointed out that the Faculty, in trying to avoid mimicking the larger universities in Melbourne, would try and appoint from outside the mainstream. For example, if they needed to appoint an educational philosopher they would try and find a good philosopher who would commit to an educational agenda. So we tried again and attracted an interesting field, one of whom was Bill Green. He was appointed to a lectureship in computers and
education. His computer skills were low but his command of curriculum, literacy and, importantly the literature on postmodernism was invaluable. He and I enjoyed a productive relationship from the early 1990s which continued after I left Deakin. It was to Bill’s credit that he put up with my unorthodox idea set. It was also through Bill that we joined a small reading group in the Arts Faculty whose field might be broadly described as Science, Technology and Society. I can’t say this involvement predisposed me to working with actor-network theory (ANT) subsequently, but the papers we read and the conversations we had, opened up for me ways of looking at the computer/human binary in different ways. This conundrum had dogged my thinking for a long time. I did not know it at the time but one of the Arts group with whom we met was David Turnbull who is a distinguished scholar with a long record of work with ANT.

I think it is important, particularly given where my intellectual sensibilities now lie, to point to the physical layout of the Faculty at this time. There were a number of portable buildings which were linked by covered walkways. The office and staff room was at one end and so people would spend some time waking to and from this hub. It meant you would bump into people and, on many occasions, you’d end up talking about ideas for research, a new paper and so on.

During this time, colleagues generously included me in research grant bids, many of which were successful. I learned a good deal from many colleagues during this period. Schooling the Future with Richard Bates, Lindsay Fitzclarence, Bill Green and Rob Walker studied identity formation of students in the later years of secondary school in the early 1990s. It was a period when there was significant change to many of the old patterns associated with schooling and work as the deployment of new computing and communication technologies began to reshape and disrupt (Fitzclarence, Green, & Bigum, 1995). Other projects included Consuming Education with Jane Kenway and Lindsay Fitzclarence and Learning to change in devolved school systems, Mediating change: global/local pressures upon school performance both with Jill Blackmore, Louise Laskey and John Hodgens and Schooling and Learning in the Age of the Internet with Jane Kenway and Bill Green.

In 1992, the Faculty moved into a new building and hosted the annual Australian Association for Research in Education conference. Bill and I decided, rather foolishly, to run an electronic salon in parallel with the conference. We were able to assemble a dozen or so excellent papers from key thinkers around the world and established an email list to support discussions. It was probably the first of its kind in education. It worked well for the overseas participants but was less attractive for those who attended the conference. During the conference the then Federal Minister for Education came to open the new building. Deakin’s public relations office asked me to “show” the Minister the e-salon! I produced a summary list of external participants by country and arranged for him to write an email to the list. I discovered later that he thought the e-salon was a hoax. What followed was amusing and informative. The Minister’s email prompted a
flurry of replies addressed back to him from people not only in his electorate but from around the world. These were ‘tidied’ and forwarded to his office, at which point he apparently conceded that the e-salon had taken place.

In 1993, the University established the Deakin Centre for Education and Change and I was appointed Deputy to the Director, Jane Kenway. Others are better placed to write about the Centre but, to me, it was an attempt to give the very large amount of research coming from the Faculty a higher profile and also, to provide a means of making the products of this research work accessible for teachers. I recall arguing for the merits of a K-Mart style publication to accompany the normal designer publications which were only read by a small group of academics. I fondly recall a component of this publication being called bottom rungs. Lindsay Fitzclarene used to argue that a feature of much university teaching was akin to the careful construction of a ladder with the bottom few rungs removed which made access to the ladder almost impossible for students.

It was in the early- to mid-90s that what were to become two major foci for my research emerged. One came from my ongoing puzzling over the social technical binary which characterised so much of the thinking about computers in education16. I don’t recall how I stumbled into this literature. Oddly, it was not from the association with the STS folk in Arts. It was not an easy theoretical field but as I worked my way through the early ANT papers it provided a means by which I could draw together all of the key principles I had arrived at from mulling about how best to think about these technologies and educational practice. ANT opened a world of quasi-objects, of hybrids and monsters as Latour (1994) would put it. The social technical binary was no longer an explanation but something to be explained.

At that time ANT was something of an enfant terrible in social theory. However it offered an anti-essentialist approach to thinking about change. Anti-essentialist theorising also characterised much of the literature my colleagues employed in their critical pedagogy work. I have a sense that some theoretical resources fit better with one’s mental terrain than others at particular times and ANT, for me, proved to get better in its fit over time. It was an example of what Richard Dawkins (1999) calls a selfish meme. The influentials at this time were Bruno Latour, John Law and a growing group of scholars drawn to this sociology of translation as it was sometimes called. Perhaps the thing about Latour’s writing in particular was its irreverence, its playfulness and its considerable scope. ANT concerned itself with alliances, network effects and actants. As John Law (1999, p.3) puts it:

Actor network theory is a ruthless application of semiotics. It tells that entities take their form and acquire their attributes as a result of their relations with other entities.
At the time I had not thought through any relationships between ANT and critical social theory as was being enacted in various forms at Deakin then. Cussins (2000, p.340) points to a tension in this way:

ANT differs from the Continental “critical tradition” in wanting to dissociate the possibility of critical understanding of science of technology from the necessity of being antiscience, or, as Bruno Latour calls it, antimodern.

At the time, my grasp of ANT did not permit conversations about such conflicts with colleagues.

Looking back on my interest in ANT, I recall a curiosity about some of the social theory that appeared to rise and fall in interest among colleagues at Deakin. Interests were often triggered by visitors or new appointments. In the days before the Web became such an everyday resource for scanning theorists and theories, it often took time for the work of a particular thinker to find its way into Education. I picked up on who most of the key influentials were in conversation with colleagues, going to reading groups and taking every opportunity to satisfy my curiosity about what seemed to me to be big ideas. Colleagues were always very generous with suggestions and advice. To me, having lived through the educational psychology fads which informed education during my time at Melbourne CAE, it seemed similar faddishness was associated with some of the social theory which came into play at Deakin. Fads in theory are not of themselves a bad thing if the theorising works to achieve good outcomes for those who appear to be systematically disadvantaged in education.

I continued to read thinkers from outside the usual fields which informed educational practice. I recall pursuing a good deal of literature when so-called chaos theory bubbled into popular discourse. I was intrigued by the mathematics and explored it via computer programs I wrote. By chance, I was offered a small off-campus unit in mathematics education which was more or less an elective that students did. I developed the unit around doing non-linear mathematics. The unit was a great experience. There were teachers who worked in the unit who were much better mathematicians than I. There were teachers who struggled with the simplest of the mathematics. But we were able to collaborate and share ideas and ways of tackling some of the trickier elements. Apart from having them do some mathematics and reflect upon their learning, what mattered to me was the way I worked with them. I was less of an expert and more like someone trying to orchestrate individual achievements that could be shared and from which a modest amount of peer teaching could take place. Years ago, I had developed an interest in the separation many teachers have from their disciplinary base, i.e. teachers of mathematics rarely did mathematics, teachers of history rarely did any history and so on. This separation from what Colin Lanksheer calls mature insider forms of practice remains a focus for me and it finds some expression in the other major research interest I developed, that which is now known as knowledge producing schools or KPS.
This still modest agenda had its beginnings in my work with teachers who had signed on to do a course in computing and education. These courses ended up being much more concerned with teacher professional development as they puzzled about the use they made of particular computing resources they had to hand. In these courses we encouraged teachers to challenge many of the then and still now, taken-for-granted assumptions about these technologies and education. I recall many telephone conversations with teachers over these issues and, on occasion, teachers would say that it was easy to be critical of much of what was happening in schools but a lot harder to make positive suggestions. It was this challenge that prompted me into thinking about what schools and teachers might do. I began to mull over a notion that countered the then current consumption of information logic that characterised the use of computing and related technologies in schools. The notion of schools as sites of serious knowledge production became an interesting proposition. I explored these ideas with the teachers in the computing units I taught and had begun to think that this might be something of an option for the middle years of secondary school. I vividly recall talking to a primary teacher one evening on the telephone and she was most indignant. She insisted that primary schools do a massive amount of data collection, some of it not very well and they never did anything with the data they collected. This was the beginning point for KPS which did not begin to happen in classrooms until I left Deakin for Central Queensland University and was fortunate enough to bump into a principal who had stumbled into this space from a different direction. The details are probably best captured in publications (Bigum, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2004; Bigum, Gilding, & Burton, 1988; Bigum & Rowan, 2009); (Rowan & Bigum, 2004) and the work of Masters and PhD students.

This approach to schooling is one in which students work on projects that are valued by and have value for the local community. The students typically generate a product or performance. The quality of the output is critical to the work being taken seriously by students and the community group for whom they are doing the work. Here access to expertise, mature insider forms of practice, is an important component. Often, the products draw comments from adults like, ‘wow, did kids do that?’ An interesting outcome of this work is the sense of agency the students who participate in this work achieve. Perhaps more importantly, there is good evidence of students who were largely disaffected with school, re-engaging through a KPS project or two.

There were other threads that developed during my time at Deakin and were the basis of ongoing intellectual curiosity. A chance reading of Brand’s (1987) *The Media Lab*, drew my attention to two things: scenario planning and global money. I taught myself how to conduct a scenario planning exercise from online resources and Schwartz’s (1991) book, *The Art of the Long View*. What was of interest was that the process was designed to shift mindsets, which is another way of talking about learning. The technique was something I refined over time and I conducted a good many planning sessions with a wide range of folk.

My curiosity about global money was piqued by a conversation Stewart Brand had with Peter Schwartz and which is reported in the book. I recall being stuck by the
volume and rate of growth of global financial transactions and that, as Schwartz argued, less than 10 percent of this money corresponded to material goods. This began a long interest in and curiosity about the global financial system and in particular the role computing and related technologies play. The recent collapse of large sectors of the financial system across the globe underlined for me the concern I have always had that the educational engagement with these technologies only ever looked at the trees and had no sense of or interest in the forest.

The use of computing and related technologies remains a key interest, primarily because the deployment of these technologies have, for the most part proved to have large negative impacts on the disadvantaged of the world. The prospect of greater impact, as these technologies continue to conform to the empirical observation known as Moore’s law is also an important ongoing interest. Kurzweil’s work identifies the exponential growth of not only integrated circuits in terms of price/performance (doubling now every nine months) but to a broad range of related technologies showing similar growth with different doubling periods. He argues,

An analysis of the history of technology shows that technological change is exponential, contrary to the common-sense “intuitive linear” view. So we won’t experience 100 years of progress in the 21st century—it will be more like 20,000 years of progress (at today’s rate).

This consideration puts the ongoing interest in using computers in schools and for “educational purposes” generally into a perspective that needs serious attention. The history of technology also shows that the beneficiaries of most if not all technological change will always be those already advantaged.

A final consideration that marks my current interests but which I trace back to those beginnings at Deakin has been the emergence of the so-called read/write web. While these developments have been largely read in education as just more of the same, there is a growing literature that documents new social patterns as we move from a world dominated by broadcast logic to one which is characterised increasingly by many-to-many communication. There is an argument that this shift is akin to the shifts that the invention of moveable type, the so-called Gutenberg revolution produced. The work of Clay Shirky, David Weinberger and Kevin Kelly are typical of thinkers whose work is, in my view, influential about these shifts. If, as happened following Gutenberg, there is a decline in dominant social institutions which have grown up around the control of publication (Weston, 1997), the interests for the disadvantaged are again unlikely to be well served.

NOTES

1 The John Curtin School of Medical Research at the Australian National University.
2 I had taken a studentship to undertake my undergraduate degree and that required me to teach for three years on completion of my study.
We found some money to fund student helpers, known as Neddy’s (after Neddy Seagoon, given that the lab’s name approximated that of the Goon Show character, Eccles!) The Australian component of the then embryonic Internet. The Faculty operated in a set of relocatables until a new building was built in 1992. This was largely Peter Evans and me. Peter was exceptionally good technically and, in those days, did a lot of coding and interface work to make things happen for various projects. Along with Stephen Kemmis, Susan Groundwater-Smith, Shirley Grundy, Sue Willis, Stewart Bonser, Peter Evans and a number of others. The other large group in the Faculty worked on educational administration under the leadership of Richard Bates. I was reminded, humourously, of the insensitivities to gender issues that I brought to Deakin by Jane Kenway when I left Deakin after ten years. Lindsay Fitz Clarence, Robin McTaggart and me. I was also unaware that the Educational Administration group in the Faculty had also been working on literature about the post-modern. There was a gentle rivalry between the two groups. Fazal Rizvi, another colleague most generous with his time and ideas probably falls into this category. Probably the most influential paper we did together was: (Green & Bigum, 1993). A monograph (Bigum & Green, 1995) Bill and I wrote, captures where my thinking was at that time about how to theorise the combination of human and computer. Rob was the first-appointed chair to the Faculty. He was and remains a generous and very supportive colleague. He always had an eye for the unusual, things that most education academics would not see as remotely interesting. We continue to exchange odd snippets. This manifested itself in terms of debates about social and technical determinism. James Gleick’s book (1987) popularised the key ideas. N. Katherine Hayles work (1990; 1991) provided connections with my fledgling understandings of the post-modern. Gleick (1987, p.68) writes, “The mathematician Stanislaw Ulam remarked that to call the study of chaos ‘nonlinear science’ was like calling zoology ‘the study of non-elephant animals’” Sue De Vincentis and Carmel McGrath This is a favourite quote of the Principal with whom I worked in Central Queensland, Trudy Graham. As per the Global Business Network: http://www.gbn.com/ http://lifeboat.com/es/law.of.accelerating retourns The ease with which anyone with access to the Web can publish has improved greatly.
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