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SUMMARY

For over two years from late 1976 the question of uranium mining and export was one of the most widely attended to and contested issues in Australian public politics. The topic was extensively covered in the mass media, was discussed in a wide range of community-based and political organisations, and was widely talked about in informal conversations. Opposition to uranium was sustained and broadly based, and although poorly organised it led to much well-supported protest activity. Although it initially cut across and extended far beyond the established party lines of public politics, it had major impacts within the arena of government. Consequently it was widely described as a social movement.

In this thesis I focus on two interrelated processes: the emergence, growth and maintenance of that opposition; and its subsequent decline. These processes cannot be adequately analysed within the conventional limits of the sociology of social movements, and so I necessarily locate the opposition to uranium within a broad socio-cultural setting.

I firstly focus on why the uranium issue became more important than other issues which were more direct in their impact on Australians' interests or more immediate in their morally evaluated consequences. This involves consideration of circumstances and actions in the past, ranging from Hiroshima to opposition to French nuclear testing in the South Pacific in the early 1970s. I argue that perceptions of these events established the topic's relevance for many large and overlapping audiences, providing the cultural basis of its potential as a major political issue. In the analysis of the realisation of this potential from 1976 I consider contemporary circumstances and actions through which those relevances were reinforced and extended, and through which those audiences were mobilised as political groupings. The involvement of the
mass media and the inability of political parties to act decisively to defuse the emerging issue, as well as direct protest activity, were crucial here.

I then focus on the incorporation of the issue into the established overtly party political arena. This involves consideration of the interplay between the previously analysed circumstances and actions, and established party politics, and the consequent extension of the scope of the party political arena even as the uranium issue was defused within and through that arena.

This study employs an analytical perspective which emphasises the interrelationships between generative structures and action, including the reproduction of each through the other. Running through the analysis is an argument for the utility of analysing social action - in this particular case social movement action - with an emphasis on the broad structuring settings within which that action is embedded. This contrasts with an emphasis on the organisation of that action as such, and the mobilisation of specific resources through that action, which is current within the sociology of social movements. However my broader analytical emphasis does elucidate specifically 'social movement' processes, so this study may be taken as an exploration of a direction for bringing the analysis of social movements within a generalised sociological framework.