

Global Geographies of Innovation Diffusion: The Case of the Australian Cattle Industry

Abstract

The geographies and histories of the introduction of cattle breeds to Australia in the period since white settlement are documented as an example of the diffusion of agricultural innovations. Three phases of development are identified: a colonial expansion phase from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century during which a number of primarily British cattle breeds were imported by the colonial settlers; an innovative phase in the mid twentieth century when both governments and private interests sought to produce or import new breeds deemed to be better adapted to Australian environments; and a multifunctional phase in recent decades. In this final phase, government deregulation and new technologies, such as the long distance transport of genetic packages, have facilitated the importation and development of many new cattle breeds in Australia. While this has produced a significant rise in the total number of breeds represented nationally, many recent and historic breeds currently exhibit extremely small numbers and a few generally well-established breeds such as Holstein, Hereford and Angus, still dominate the national herd. This study of changing breed types and introductions provides some evidence of post-productivism and of a multifunctional transition in that several cattle breeds favoured by hobby farmers and boutique breeders are now represented, but the aggregate numbers for these breeds remain small and the numbers for several of the traditional (or colonial) breeds are currently in decline. Overall, it is apparent that Australia's cattle industry retains a strongly productivist ethos and that, particularly given the country's very great environmental variation, its levels of breed diversity remain low.

Key words: Australia; cattle breeds; innovation diffusion; productivism; multifunctionality

Introduction

One of the central characteristics of settler societies is the way in which they take on many of the social institutions, cultural attributes, and technological innovations of their colonising nation(s) (Hardt and Negri 2000; Blunt and McEwan 2003). It is also clear that, over time, these societies begin to adapt and change in response to, *inter alia*, local geopolitical circumstances, environmental conditions, and shifting economic realities. Thus, settler societies might often be regarded as 'hybrid', blending characteristics of their cultural histories with contemporary developments (Anderson 2000; Jones and Birdsall-Jones 2008). This hybridity is particularly evident in agricultural systems, with colonial agricultures adapting over time and taking on new forms to reflect their more immediate environmental, economic and socio-cultural circumstances. The aim of this paper is to examine the evolution of one aspect of Australian agriculture, the cattle industry, from its colonial origins to its current status as one of the world's largest beef and dairy producers. The paper follows Yarwood and Evans' (1998; 2000) call to examine the physique, distribution and number of specific livestock breeds to assess how they reflect, and indeed affect, structural changes in agriculture and society. In doing so, contributions are made to the strand of animal geography that seeks to understand how social practices and meanings have shaped the relationships between societies and animals (Whatmore 2002).

While a considerable body of research at the farm level has revealed the importance of local knowledges, technologies and practices in livestock farming (Holloway 2001; Gray,

1
2
3 1996; 1998), it is also recognised that farms are part of economic, technological and
4
5 social networks that extend well beyond their front gates (e.g. Gray 2000; Yarwood and
6
7 Evans 2006). Research conducted at the national scale has revealed how individuals and
8
9 institutions, as well as changing practices and policies, impact upon and reflect the
10
11 geographies of livestock breeds (e.g. Walton 1984; Yarwood and Evans 2006). However,
12
13 given that rural areas are intimately and increasingly connected to other parts of the world
14
15 (Woods 2007), it is surprising that research on animal geographies has not paid more
16
17 attention to global livestock migrations, particularly as these relate to colonialism and the
18
19 emergence of agriculture in settler societies. Accordingly, the present paper focuses on
20
21 the introduction of cattle to Australia through one of two mechanisms: i) the relocation or
22
23 migration of breeds; ii) the development of indigenous breeds. It argues that both the
24
25 relocation of cattle, and the development of new breeds of cattle, in the Australian
26
27 context can be understood with reference to the conceptual literature on the geography of
28
29 innovation diffusion. In essence, the evolution of the contemporary cattle industry is an
30
31 outcome of both innovation, and the diffusion of innovations across geographic space.
32
33 These diffusions occur at multiple scales, from global through to local, and are contingent
34
35 on a range of institutional, environmental, socio-cultural and economic imperatives.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Agriculture and the Geography of Innovation Diffusion**

47
48
49

50 The adoption of new technologies and practices in agricultural industries has long been of
51
52 interest to geographers, sociologists and economists (e.g. Ryan and Gross 1943;
53
54 Hagerstrand 1967; Brown 1981; Ison and Russell 2000; Vanclay 2004). While there is
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 considerable debate regarding the processes that lead to adoption, there is a general
4
5 consensus that the application of new technologies and practices is largely based on the
6
7 desire of farmers to maximise economic returns (Birkhaeser *et al.* 1991; Black 2000;
8
9 Huffman and Evenson 2006). Under normal circumstances, new technologies and
10
11 farming practices are adopted within particular environmental contexts to increase
12
13 productivity, reduce costs, or both (Leeuwis and Van den Ban 2004). The adoption of
14
15 new technologies and practices can result in significant transformations in farming
16
17 systems and agricultural landscapes. This is particularly apparent in the production of
18
19 grains, where the use of new technologies, such as larger seeding and harvesting
20
21 equipment, disease and drought resistant crops, and minimum-till techniques have
22
23 increased production and decreased costs (Gardner 2002; Henzell, 2007). At the same
24
25 time, they have contributed to an extensification of grain farming through which
26
27 processes of farm amalgamation and expansion are seeing smaller producers replaced by
28
29 much larger operators (Brasier 2005; Lawrence 2005).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Such transformations are also common to livestock production, largely through the
40
41 introduction or development of new breeds. This process normally occurs in one of two
42
43 ways. First, livestock breeds are 'migrated' from one place to another. Indeed, there is
44
45 considerable evidence of livestock migrations across a range of geographical scales as a
46
47 means of improving the productivity and profitability of farming (Jordan 1969; 1972;
48
49 Walton 1999). In the United States, for example, the introduction of the heat and parasite
50
51 tolerant Zebu (humped) cattle from India during the second half of the 1800s contributed
52
53 to a marked increase in beef production in the country's hotter and more humid regions
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Sanders 1980). A second mechanism for introducing new varieties of livestock is
4
5 through cross-breeding programmes. These programmes enable the development of
6
7 cattle suited to specific environmental conditions or market requirements.
8
9

10
11
12 The migration of cattle to new locations, and the development and spread of new breeds
13
14 are, in effect, forms of innovation and diffusion (Rogers 2003; Leeuwis and Van den Ban
15
16 2004; Abdulai and Huffman 2005). At the heart of much of the literature on innovation
17
18 and diffusion is the work of Schumpeter (1934) who defined three phases of
19
20 technological change: invention, innovation and the dispersal of innovation. While
21
22 Schumpeter saw invention as something quite rare that leads to the creation of entirely
23
24 new knowledge or technologies, he regarded innovation as a more widespread
25
26 phenomenon that involves a process of transformation (Schumpeter 1934; 1947). In
27
28 essence, he argued that innovation involves taking pre-existing technologies or practices
29
30 and adapting them to improve productivity and profitability (Carter 2007).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In Schumpeterian terms, the central agent in the process of change is the innovator
40
41 (Schumpeter 1947). In his view, the innovator is responsible for transforming the process
42
43 of production by displacing redundant technologies and/or practices in favour of new,
44
45 more creative and profitable alternatives: a process he described as 'creative destruction'
46
47 (Schumpeter 1934). However, and in contrast to the view of Schumpeter (1947), there is
48
49 a growing consensus in the literature on the geography of innovations that the innovator
50
51 is not necessarily an individual but an agency. In an agricultural context, government
52
53 agencies (e.g. government departments of agriculture), breed societies (Anderson 2003;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Yarwood and Evans 2006), and, increasingly, private firms(Lundvall 2001; Gertler and
4
5
6 Wolf 2002; Polenske 2007) are key innovators of new technologies and practices
7
8 (Brown, 1981; Wolf and Zilberman 2001).
9

10
11
12 While innovations are indeed important in the process of economic transformation, what
13
14 is equally significant is their diffusion across geographic space. This spatiality of
15
16 innovation and diffusion is particularly evident in the context of agriculture (Ilbery,
17
18 1985). Some of the most significant contributions to understandings of these spatial
19
20 processes of innovation and diffusion emerged in the field of agricultural geography
21
22 during the 1960s and 1970s. Perhaps the most widely cited work is that of Hagerstrand
23
24 (1967), which emphasised the role of communication and learning processes. Central to
25
26 his thesis is that the spatial diffusion of innovation reflects flows of information and
27
28 “biases and distortions in from various social and physical resistances” (Ilbery, 1985,
29
30 p.84). In other words, diffusion is a geographically uneven process reflecting both the
31
32 nature of networks and the characteristics of particular places. While Hagerstrand’s ideas
33
34 were developed largely in relation to the diffusion of innovation amongst Swedish
35
36 farmers, there is no reason why such general processes might not operate at wider
37
38 geographic scales. For example, a study of the migration of Aberdeen Angus cattle into
39
40 Argentina points to the role of communication networks stretching across the Atlantic
41
42 between Britain and Argentina, and a willingness of local farmers to adopt the breed
43
44 (Winsberg, 1970). The work of Hagerstrand inspired a rich body of research in
45
46 agricultural geography that focussed on the geographical spread of ideas through farming
47
48 systems and landscapes (e.g. Bowden, 1965; Johansen, 1971).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 In many respects, Hagerstrand's perspective was reflective of the emerging behavioural
7
8 approaches in human geography of the time, with a clear emphasis on the role of both the
9
10 information networks and decision-making process of individual farmers. One of the
11
12 major criticisms of this work is that it was excessively focused on the role of individuals,
13
14 and tended to overlook the role of public and private institutions (Brown, 1975; 1981). In
15
16 response, a number of scholars began to place greater emphasis on the public and private
17
18 sector agents through which an innovation is distributed or made available. This can
19
20 include government agencies, non-government organisations, breed societies, and private
21
22 firms. In this approach the role of infrastructure, promotional communication, price
23
24 signals and market selection are critical in shaping the geographical dynamics of
25
26 diffusion. Thus, it begins to address the limitations of the behavioural approach by
27
28 considering some of the structural drivers of innovation. By considering this alongside
29
30 the behavioural approach of Hagerstrand, it is possible to conceive of innovation as being
31
32 driven by a blend of individual decisions, spatially uneven flows of information, socio-
33
34 cultural traits, political and institutional dynamics, and economic considerations (Grigg,
35
36 1984; Ilbery, 1985; Black 2000; Vanclay 2004).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The spatial pattern that emerges when an innovation diffuses generally reflects the
47
48 combination of these factors. Yet, at the heart of the process remains the importance of
49
50 information flow and local receptiveness. Both act to shape the places where diffusion is
51
52 likely to occur. Local knowledge of an innovation, such as a breed of cattle, is necessary
53
54 if adoption is to be an option. As such, until levels of knowledge and confidence in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 innovations develop within particular geographical contexts, adoption of an innovation is
4
5 unlikely. The key controls over these forms of knowledge include geographical
6
7 proximity/distance, communications, private and public institutions, and the socio-
8
9 cultural linkages that tie disparate places together. There are also unique place-based
10
11 conditions that shape patterns of innovation diffusion and adoption. Ormrod (1990)
12
13 deploys the concept of 'place receptiveness' to highlight the interdependence of
14
15 innovation adoption and environmental settings. The central argument here is that the
16
17 geographic diffusion of innovations is linked to specific ecological, institutional and
18
19 social (and economic) contexts, and that their successful transfer depends on their
20
21 suitability to new environments.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In the case of livestock, both new breeds and existing breeds in alternative locations
30
31 might face a range of barriers to geographic diffusion and adoption. These include local
32
33 knowledge about and attitudes towards breeds, locally and regionally accepted farming
34
35 styles, and economic determinants, including the cost of local production, market
36
37 demand, and the price received for the commodity (Black 2000). In these contexts, breed
38
39 societies play a key role in promoting particular breeds (Yarwood and Evans 2006) and,
40
41 by implication, particular farming discourses (Anderson 2003). Moreover, the extent to
42
43 which breeds are suited to local and regional ecological conditions is a key determinant in
44
45 the spatially uneven process of innovation diffusion.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 Given the economic, social and environmental importance of the spatial diffusion of
54
55 innovations, surprisingly little research has considered how these processes have shaped
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the imperial and global geographies of agriculture. Much of the research that has been
4
5 conducted in this area has focused on the diffusion of agricultural innovations at local
6
7 scales (Black 2000) or, in some cases, within particular nation states (Jordan 1972;
8
9 Walton 1984; Abdulai and Huffman 2005). However, it is also apparent that these
10
11 processes operate at much wider global scales. In the case of livestock, for example,
12
13 colonial agricultures were founded almost entirely on the relocation of breeds from
14
15 colonising nations (Jordan 1972; Simoons 1974; Sanders 1980). The ongoing
16
17 development of agriculture in these new world environments was generally on the basis
18
19 of further livestock migrations. Aside from general descriptive accounts of these
20
21 movements, very few studies have attempted to explore systematically the processes of
22
23 innovation and spatial diffusion operating in this global context.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 To begin addressing these gaps, this paper uses the example of cattle to examine
33
34 diffusion and innovation in Australia's livestock industry. The first breeds were
35
36 introduced (rather unsuccessfully) in 1788, yet Australia is now the world's largest
37
38 exporter of beef and the third highest exporter of dairy produce (Chambers, 2007). The
39
40 focus on cattle farming also allows innovation and diffusion to be examined in the
41
42 context of a truly remarkable, global and rapid transformation of agriculture.
43
44
45
46
47

48 **The Australian Cattle Industry in Context**

49
50
51
52

53 Since European settlement in 1788, Australia has a history of importing cattle breeds
54
55 from other parts of the world and, through cross-breeding, of developing cattle suited to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 local ecological conditions (Figure 1). While the cattle industry was initially a relatively
4 small enterprise based on the provision of meat and dairy products for the local
5 population, it soon became an important player in the national agricultural sector
6 (Henzell 2007). The industry also began to become increasingly specialized during the
7 1880s, moving from dual dairy-beef production to being primarily oriented towards either
8 dairy or beef (Taylor 1930). This growing specialisation was accompanied by a
9 geographical separation, with dairy producers favouring higher rainfall and coastal areas,
10 while beef production tended to disperse into the harsher inland and tropical areas.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

[INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

25
26
27
28
29 During the 20th century, the cattle industry continued to expand. In the dairy sector,
30 improvements in refrigerated transport opened up new markets in Europe, North America
31 and South-east Asia from the 1890s (Camm 1971). Continued expansion during the 20th
32 century saw Australia become the source of around 16 per cent of world dairy exports by
33 2000. Even more spectacular has been the growth of the beef cattle industry, which
34 occupies some of the harshest environments in Australia and yet comprises some 25
35 million cattle. By the end of the 20th century the industry was the largest producer of
36 beef in the world, with the majority of exports focused on Japan, South-east Asia and the
37 Middle East (Bindon and Jones 2001). Ultimately, the prosperity of both the dairy and
38 beef industries in Australia is linked to the successful adoption of innovations,
39 encompassing both imported breeds and locally developed new breeds. Figure 2 shows
40 that, since colonization in 1788, some 64 breeds have been introduced to Australia.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 These introductions occurred over three basic phases: i) a colonial expansion phase,
4
5 between initial settlement and the 1920s; ii) an innovative phase between the 1930s and
6
7 the 1970s; iii) a multifunctional phase from the 1980s onwards. The subsequent diversity
8
9 of breeds has meant that both the dairy and beef industries have not only adapted to
10
11 Australia's wide range of environmental conditions, but also to changing global market
12
13 fashions and tastes.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 [INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]
21
22
23

24 **The Colonial Expansion Phase, 1788 – 1920s**

25
26
27
28

29 Australia's early history of farming was shaped by its colonial relationship with Great
30
31 Britain. As a consequence, more than a century of early farming technologies and
32
33 practices were essentially imported from Britain and adapted to fit Australian conditions
34
35 (Powell 1988). This colonial influence is particularly evident in the cattle breeds
36
37 introduced to Australia in the few decades immediately following white settlement. The
38
39 first cattle recorded in Australia arrived with the first fleet in 1788, although initial
40
41 attempts to establish herds were hampered by unfamiliar and difficult environmental
42
43 conditions, including a lack of feed and water (Hancock 1930). The breeds introduced in
44
45 1788 reflected the origins of the colonial settlers, and comprised Dairy Shorthorn and
46
47 Devon cattle from England, and Dexter cattle from Ireland.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While the pioneers who established the first Australian herds encountered a range of
4 environmental challenges, by the mid 1800s the industry had begun to establish itself as a
5 viable provider of meat and dairy products for local markets. This was largely as a result
6 of improving knowledge about climatic conditions, disease and pest risks, and the gradual
7 influx of individuals with farming experience from Britain (Cameron 1981; Henzell
8 2007). Indeed, one of the priorities in early settlement schemes was to increase the level
9 of migration amongst British farmers to improve the agricultural capacity of the early
10 colonies (Crowley 1960). The outcome was a transfer of farming knowledge and practice
11 from Britain to Australia, which produced a system of agriculture that closely resembled
12 the small farming systems that the colonising farmers had experienced in their homeland.
13 In many respects, this represented the diffusion of forms of agricultural innovations out
14 of one geographical context (Great Britain) and into another (Australia).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 This diffusion incorporated both farming practice and the commodities at the centre of
35 much British agricultural production. In the case of cattle, the first half of the 1800s saw
36 a number of British breeds being progressively introduced. These included the Beef
37 Shorthorn¹ (1825), Shorthorn (1825) and Hereford (1826), all from England, and the
38 Angus (1820) from Scotland. The only exception to this British dominance was the
39 introduction of Zebu cattle from India in 1800, although of course there was a strong link
40 here with another part of the wider British Empire. While the breeds introduced into
41 Australia during the first 40 years or so of European settlement were strongly influenced
42 by colonialism and the characteristics of the new settlers, there also appear to have been
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 ¹ In this paper, all dates of cattle introductions to Australia are taken from Parsons (2003) and Chambers
58 (2007).
59
60

1
2
3 more pragmatic reasons for their breed selections. In all cases, the preferred cattle types
4 were widely regarded as hardy and capable of adapting to a range of different conditions
5
6 (see Parsons 2003). This was particularly important in a region where the level of formal
7
8 scientific support for farming was minimal and veterinary care was generally limited to
9
10 what farmers themselves could provide. With the exception of the Zebu, the breeds were
11
12 also good producers of both milk and meat. In the case of the Zebu, its capacity to thrive
13
14 in hot tropical conditions, and its resistance to Australian flies and parasites, made it a
15
16 particularly attractive proposition to the gradually expanding pastoral industry in the
17
18 north of the country.
19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 A further wave of cattle migrations occurred around the 1850s, with the introduction of
28
29 Ayrshire (1848), Highland Cattle (1850) and Galloway (1858) from Scotland, Red Poll
30
31 (1850) from England, Jersey (1850) from the Channel Islands, and the Holstein (1850)
32
33 from the Netherlands. Again, throughout this period the dominance of British breeds
34
35 continued, with only two breeds originating from elsewhere. This theme continued until
36
37 the onset of the Great Depression, with a further two British breeds being introduced
38
39 (Lincoln Red and South Devon, both in 1900). The only other breeds introduced before
40
41 1930 were the Guernsey (Channel Islands) and the Poll Hereford (USA, but clearly an
42
43 adaptation from an English breed). Thus, by the start of 1930, of the 19 breeds of cattle
44
45 that had been introduced to Australia, only five originated from places outside the British
46
47 Isles, although these might still be regarded as 'culturally British'.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The nature of cattle migrations during the first 140 years or so of settlement needs to be
4 understood from more than a colony/coloniser perspective. Underlying the development
5 of the Australian cattle industry, and shaping its character, was a complex set of socio-
6 cultural, political and economic interactions. Of particular significance is how these
7 interactions played out in agricultural and settlement policy. For much of this period,
8 colonial policymakers were captivated by particular constructs of both landscape and
9 farming practice (Tonts 2002). According to Anderson (2003), successful farming
10 reflected a triumph of settler society over nature. Thus, embedded in the discourse of
11 much settlement policy is a desire to establish small yeoman farms and agricultural
12 landscapes reminiscent of England (Cameron 1981). As Powell (1988) points out, the
13 most important characteristic of this landscape was that farms were freehold properties,
14 family operated and cultivated.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 This ideal was strongly reflected in government policy. For example, in Western
35 Australia, which was largely typical of most other Australian colonies in its agricultural
36 policies, the final report of a Royal Commission on Agriculture held between 1887 and
37 1891 argued for the continued promotion of small scale farms “in an advanced state of
38 cultivation” (Commission on Agriculture 1891, p. 11). The report went on to argue that
39 no farm should be without cattle and that, in most cases, British breeds were superior in
40 both meat and dairy production. The Royal Commission also advocated continued
41 migration from England, with the Premier of the day, Sir John Forrest, going on to call
42 for the establishment of “a bold peasantry, their country’s pride, men of small means but
43 strong arms and stout hearts” (PDWA 1893, p. 230). Forrest was also in little doubt
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 about where these people should come from, claiming "...and we should continue to look
4 to the rural counties of England, Scotland and Wales to build this new society". While
5 the development of an extensive grains industry from the early 1900s saw the rhetoric
6 shift toward a larger scale of operation in that sector, in the dairy industry these colonial
7 discourses were maintained until at least the 1920s (Bolton 1981), and remained firmly
8 wedded to the notion of establishing relatively small farms with British migrants,
9 technologies and practices.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 In the context of the theories of diffusion of innovations, both knowledge flows and local
23 receptiveness appear to have been important in shaping the pattern of cattle introductions
24 to Australia during this colonial period. Local knowledge of innovations (in this case, of
25 particular cattle breeds) was largely influenced by new agrarian settlers, the majority of
26 whom were from Great Britain (Crowley 1960). At the same time, this created a socio-
27 cultural context that was receptive to the introduction and use of British breeds. While
28 the number of migrants originating from rural areas is unclear, there is evidence that
29 those with some agricultural experience helped shape early farming practices. In effect, a
30 situation was created in which new farmers were simply continuing with practices,
31 traditions and even livestock that reflected their histories and experiences.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 It is also apparent that there was institutional opinion and influence regarding the
49 apparent benefits of British breeds, with various government reports and policies actively
50 promoting their use. Thus, government helped to create an environment that was
51 receptive to the introduction of British breeds and, indeed, actively supported this
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 process. More pragmatically, the breeds introduced in the first 140 years of settlement
4
5 were well attuned to local ecological conditions and market demands. Not only were the
6
7 introduced breeds resilient and adaptable (Parsons 2003), but it is likely that local tastes
8
9 meant that there was a market for beef with similar textures and flavours to those then
10
11 available in Great Britain. Indeed, as Robinson (2004) points out, there is a long history
12
13 of migration resulting in the transplanting of food tastes and therefore of production
14
15 systems.
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **The Innovative Phase, 1930s – 1970s** 23

24
25
26
27 By the 1920s and 1930s, Australian agriculture was in a process of transition (Davidson
28
29 1981). Much of this was linked to the changing technological and scientific bases of
30
31 farming, with increasing use of large-scale farm machinery, artificial fertilisers,
32
33 improvements in pest and disease control, and state-sponsored plant and animal breeding
34
35 programmes. However, it was also a period of substantial economic upheaval. Even
36
37 before the onset of the Great Depression, farmers were facing a worsening cost-price
38
39 squeeze² and were actively searching for ways of increasing productivity and reducing
40
41 input costs (Burvill 1979). Perhaps the most significant shift emerging out of these
42
43 intersecting technological, scientific and economic factors was the move towards larger
44
45 and more intense farming systems. In many respects, the antecedents of the highly
46
47 productivist ‘factory farming’ model that has dominated Australia since the 1940s can be
48
49 traced to this period of adjustment (Mauldron and Schapper 1974).
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57 ² A situation in which the cost of farm production rises at a faster rate than the prices received for
58
59 commodities.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 In the cattle industry, this shift was reflected in the increasing size of both properties and
7
8 holdings. It also contributed to the emergence of new breeds that were better suited to
9
10 environmental and market conditions. One of the major priorities of Australian
11
12 governments during this period was to increase agricultural activity in northern Australia,
13
14 where tropical conditions had hindered the development of a more productive beef cattle
15
16 industry. Most of the British breeds introduced during the colonial phase of agricultural
17
18 expansion were unsuited to these conditions, and while the Zebu had been introduced in
19
20 1800 as a means of increasing production in the north, its adoption had been limited
21
22 (Parsons 2003).
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 This challenge to expand cattle in northern Australia contributed to a vastly different
30
31 pattern of cattle migration from that which had dominated the first century and a half of
32
33 white settlement. Rather than British or European breeds, the focus shifted to breeds
34
35 from those parts of the world with similar environmental conditions to northern Australia.
36
37 The first of these new introductions were Brahman, brought to Australia from the United
38
39 States in 1933. These were heat and drought tolerant, and well-suited to the tropics.
40
41
42 While the Great Depression and World War II saw cattle migrations cease for nearly two
43
44 decades, in the period between 1950 and 1960 four new breeds were introduced to
45
46 increase beef production in arid and tropical regions: Africander (1950) from South
47
48 Africa; Sahiwal (1950) and Sindhi (1954) from Pakistan; and Santa Gertrudis (1952)
49
50 from the United States. The only other breed introduced during this period was the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 British White (1958), which tends to be most common in temperate regions and used as a
4
5 dual producer of beef and dairy products.
6
7

8
9
10 One of the central drivers of these new breed migrations was the Commonwealth
11
12 Scientific Industry Research Organisation (CSIRO). During the post-war period, this
13
14 government body played a critical role in improving the scientific and technological
15
16 bases of agriculture in Australia, largely through its research and development activities.
17
18 Working in collaboration with State government departments for agriculture, the CSIRO
19
20 also played an active extension role, using demonstration farms, field visits with farmers,
21
22 and various publications to promote and diffuse innovations at the local level. The
23
24 CSIRO's research into livestock breeds suited to northern regions ultimately contributed
25
26 to their introduction to Australia. In effect, the CSIRO was the conduit to the diffusion of
27
28 these new cattle breeds into Australia. In Hagerstrand's (1967) terms, CSIRO not only
29
30 enhanced information flows across geographical space but increased local receptiveness
31
32 by both introducing new breeds and then demonstrating their potential at the local level.
33
34 However, evidence presented in Parsons (2003) suggests that, in addition to the activities
35
36 of the CSIRO and State government agencies, it was often individual cattle enthusiasts
37
38 who 'championed' new breeds and contributed to their adoption at the local level. As
39
40 Black (2000) has suggested, it is often these individuals and their social networks that
41
42 played a critical role in diffusing these innovations beyond an institution (see also
43
44 Vanclay 2004). To date, however, virtually no research has examined these champions,
45
46 their social networks and the associated local and regional geographies of diffusion in
47
48 Australia's livestock industry.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Institutional innovations in cattle production were not limited to the migration of breeds
7
8 from other parts of the world. The post-war period also saw a number of government
9
10 agencies establish cross-breeding programmes aimed at developing indigenous breeds
11
12 that were suited to Australian environments, and particularly to tropical and arid
13
14 conditions. However, it was not only institutions that led innovation in this area, but also
15
16 individual breeders. Indeed, of the seven indigenous breeds developed between 1930 and
17
18 1962, four were created by individual breeders.
19
20
21
22
23

24 While Australia's first local breed, the Murray Grey, was produced in 1905 through a
25
26 chance mating of Shorthorn Cows and Angus bulls, cross-breeding programmes by
27
28 individual breeders resulted in the development of two new breeds in 1930: the Illawarra
29
30 in New South Wales, and the Droughtmaster in Queensland. The Illawarra was
31
32 developed as a dairy breed, and includes bloodlines from a range of British and European
33
34 breeds, although breeding programmes tended to revolve around Shorthorn and Ayrshire
35
36 cattle. The Droughtmaster, by contrast, was bred as part of an effort to expand beef cattle
37
38 production in the tropical and arid areas of Australia. Essentially, Droughtmaster cattle
39
40 are a blend of Zebu, Shorthorn and Brahman bloodlines (Figure 3). The outcome was a
41
42 breed that incorporated the Shorthorn's high meat yield, but that could tolerate heat,
43
44 drought and local parasites. Importantly, the development of this breed represented the
45
46 start of a concerted effort to develop cattle that would thrive in some of Australia's more
47
48 difficult environments.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Following World War II, these cross-breeding endeavours benefited from programmes
4 established by government agencies. The outcome was the development of the Adaptaur
5 and the Australian Milking Zebu by CSIRO in 1950, and the Australian Friesian Sahiwal
6 by the Queensland Department of Primary Industries in 1960. These institutional
7 programmes were accompanied by the continuing efforts of individual breeders, with the
8 Simbrah developed in 1960 and the Braford in 1962 (also in Fig 3). Typically, these
9 breeding programmes blended a number of desirable characteristics of British breeds
10 (e.g. high meat yields per carcass) with the qualities of some of the tropical/arid area
11 breeds (e.g. drought and heat tolerance, disease and parasite resistance). Figure 3
12 provides a summary of the blends of selected indigenous breeds developed during the
13 1950s and 1960s.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

[INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE]

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cross-breeding also led to the establishment of two other breeds now represented in
Australia, the Brangus (1961) and the Charbray (1969). These were not, however,
indigenous breeds, since both were originally developed in the United States. In both
cases, it was the import of a 'breed standard' (effectively a set of standards defined by
breed societies against which a breed is classified) that underpinned their development.
In the case of the Brangus, the breed was developed by crossing Angus and Brahman
cattle, while Charbray is the result of crossing Brahman with Charolais. The
development of these breeds is significant in terms of innovation diffusion, in that they
represent the movement of what is, in effect, a 'blueprint' (i.e. the breed standard) from

1
2
3 one part of the world to another. This movement of intellectual knowledge alone is a
4
5 significant change from earlier patterns, where the flows invariably consisted of both
6
7 knowledge and livestock.
8
9

10
11
12 The rise of various cross-breeding programmes in the 1950s and 1960s partially
13
14 coincided with an embargo on live cattle imports into Australia between 1958 and 1981.
15
16 Only live cattle from New Zealand could be imported to Australia during this period.
17
18 The embargo, introduced to prevent the introduction of blue-tongue disease into
19
20 Australia, meant that new breeds had to develop locally. As a result, no further cattle
21
22 breeds were introduced to Australia through live migrations until the early 1980s. This
23
24 meant that Australia had become 'locked in' to using the 29 breeds that had been
25
26 introduced or developed prior to the embargo. This presented a number of major
27
28 challenges to the beef industry in particular, which struggled to remain internationally
29
30 competitive in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Smith and Smith 1979). Australia's cattle
31
32 herd, based largely on British and tropical breeds, was not well suited to the increasing
33
34 demand for grain-feed beef in the rapidly growing Japanese and South Korean markets.
35
36 In addition, largely as a result of growing awareness of health and dietary issues,
37
38 domestic demand for low fat beef was also influencing cattle markets. While selective
39
40 and cross-breeding programmes played an important role in adjusting the national herd to
41
42 suit market requirements, the industry's responses were limited by the import embargo.
43
44 In effect, this acted as a barrier to the adoption of innovations (i.e. new breeds) that
45
46 would improve productivity and profitability. From the perspective of local
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 receptiveness to an innovation, it was not a lack of knowledge or appropriate socio-
4
5 cultural conditions that prevented diffusion, but a regulatory barrier.
6
7

8
9
10 This impasse was overcome in the late 1960s with the development of artificial
11
12 insemination technologies. In essence, a new technical innovation paved the way for the
13
14 introduction of more innovations in the form of new breeds. As a result, between 1969
15
16 and 1976 a total of 12 new breeds were introduced using this technology (Table 1). The
17
18 majority of these originated in continental Europe, and have a number of common traits,
19
20 including high growth rates, high meat yields per carcass, and either fine textured lean
21
22 meat or meat suitably marbled for the Japanese market. Importantly, these breeds were
23
24 not only used as meat (and dairy) producers in their own right, but were often
25
26 incorporated into cross-breeding programmes to improve the characteristics of other
27
28 established breeds.
29
30
31
32

33
34
35
36
37 *[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]*
38
39

40 41 **A Multifunctional Phase? Mid 1970s - present** 42

43
44
45 Since the mid 1970s, the Australian cattle industry has consolidated and improved its
46
47 productivity and international competitiveness (Clark *et al.* 1992). The liberalisation of
48
49 markets in North Asia and North America has contributed to increasing export
50
51 opportunities, particularly for beef cattle. At the same time, the diversification of food
52
53 tastes within domestic and international markets (see Atkins and Bowler 2001) has
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ensured that the national herd continues to diversify. One of the most significant reasons
4 for this is the growing emphasis on food quality and consistency. This not only reflects
5 the demands of consumers, but also the retailers and processors that interact directly with
6 farmers. At the farm level, the outcome has been a range of innovative breeding
7 programs and cattle introductions aimed at ensuring both consistency and high standards.
8 In many respects, this represents the role of the diffusion agents discussed by Brown
9 (1981), whereby a combination of market factors and institutional agents influence the
10 nature of production. Of particular importance are the contractual and pricing
11 arrangements between retailers, processors and farmers which, in combination, are
12 shaping the nature of production at the farm level. This all tends to run counter to Euro-
13 centric views that agricultural might be moving to a post-productivist phase. Indeed, the
14 evidence from Australia suggests that cattle farming is becoming increasingly
15 productivist. Levels of production per unit area have continued to increase across much
16 of the tropical and arid zones (Holmes 2002), while intensive feedlot production is also
17 increasing rapidly (Tonts *et al.* 2003).

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 Since 1979, a total of 17 new breeds have been introduced to Australia with the direct
42 aim of increasing production. The consolidation of beef farming in tropical areas was
43 reflected in the introduction of a number of breeds well suited to such environments,
44 including the Wagyu (Japan, 1988), Boran (East Africa, 1990), Tuli (Zimbabwe, 1990),
45 Bonsmara (South Africa, 1998) and Senepol (Caribbean, 2000). In addition to thriving in
46 tropical conditions, these breeds produce high quality meats that are well-suited to North
47 Asian markets (Parsons, 2003). Other highly productive breeds were also introduced to
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 help meet the demands of these markets, including Salers (France, 1985), the Belgian
4
5 Blue (Belgium, 1988) and Piedmontese (Italy, 1989).
6
7

8
9
10 While Australian cattle farming shows few signs of moving into a post-productivist
11
12 phase, it does show considerable evidence of multifunctionality (Wilson, 2001; refs).
13
14

15 The drive towards higher levels of production in some parts of the cattle industry and in
16
17 certain regions is in part countered by a shift towards smaller scale and, in some cases,
18
19 'lifestyle agriculture' (Barr 2005). As Argent *et al.* (2007) have pointed out, across many
20
21 of the more accessible and high rainfall parts of Australia, there has been a growing
22
23 influx of amenity migrants, many of whom have become involved in small scale
24
25 agriculture (see also Bunker and Houston 2003; Halpin 2004; Barr 2005; Houston 2006).
26
27 This represents a growing complexity of the Australian agricultural landscape, and is
28
29 consistent with view that rural spaces are becoming increasingly multifunctional, with
30
31 highly productivist activities being accompanied by alternative land uses (see Holmes
32
33 2002; 2006; Smailes 2002; Borkhaug and Richards 2008).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The emergence of these smaller farms has been linked to the development or introduction
42
43 of a number of relatively docile and easy to manage breeds, including the Lowline
44
45 (Australia, 1974), Welsh Black (Wales, 1980), Square Meater (Australia, 1996) and
46
47 Miniature Hereford (United States, 1997). The Dexter, originally introduced in 1788, has
48
49 also regained popularity. In a number of cases, such as the Lowline and Miniature
50
51 Hereford, cattle were specifically developed by enthusiast breeders for the small-scale,
52
53 lifestyle farms.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 In terms of innovation, breed development during the multifunctional period reflects
7
8 changing market demand, as well as the more complex shifts occurring in agricultural
9
10 regions. Patterns of innovation diffusion in the highly productivist segments of the
11
12 industry appear to have followed an established pattern over this period. This includes
13
14 the introduction or development of new breeds to tackle particular environmental and
15
16 market conditions. At the same time, in the less productivist, smaller-scale segments of
17
18 the industry, breeds have been introduced or developed that suit different landscape
19
20 conditions (i.e. small holdings) and farmer characteristics (e.g. lifestyle producers). It is
21
22 also clear that the geographical pathways of innovation diffusion have further diversified.
23
24
25 While the colonial period was dominated by British breeds, and the productivist phase
26
27 focussed on tropical, indigenous and European breeds, the multifunctional period has
28
29 drawn from extremely diverse source areas, including Japan, Africa, the Caribbean, the
30
31 United States, Britain, and Australia. In furthering this research agenda, more needs to be
32
33 known about the processes involved here, including the role of institutions, key
34
35 individuals, social networks, and economic imperatives.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **The Situation Today: Innovation or Destruction?**

45
46
47

48 So far, this paper has considered the introduction and innovation of cattle breeds. It has
49
50 given the impression that the Australian national herd is diverse and diffuse. While many
51
52 breeds have indeed been introduced to Australia both in the early stages of European
53
54 settlement and more recently, there is a strong reliance on not only a handful of key
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 breeds, but a very narrow genetic pool. In 2003, Holstein cattle accounted for 70 per cent
4 livestock in the dairy sector (Chambers, 2004), Jerseys accounted for 10 per cent and
5
6 Jersey-Holstein crosses a further four per cent. Given that a further 13% of animals in the
7
8 national dairy herd were of an 'unknown breed', other recognised breeds only accounted
9
10 for three per cent of Australia's national dairy herd. The beef sector showed marginally
11
12 more variety with British breeds (especially Herefords and Angus animals) accounting
13
14 for 57 per cent of the national herd; tropical breeds (particularly Brahman and Santa
15
16 Gertrudis) for 19.3 per cent and European (Charolais, Limousin and Simmental) for 12.3
17
18 per cent of beef breeds. All of these dairy and beef cattle are the most efficient and
19
20 productive animals in their class and location, lending weight to Evans et al's (2002)
21
22 assertion that a supposed transition from productive to post-productive agricultural
23
24 regimes may have been exaggerated. Clearly the economies and discourses of
25
26 productivism dominate the Australian cattle industry. One of the issues associated with
27
28 this highly productivist system is that in-breeding of animals is reducing the genetic pool
29
30 of Australian livestock, a trend also common in North America (Chambers 2004).
31
32 Although data on this issue are complex, it appears that rates of in-breeding are
33
34 increasingly leading to concerns for the long-term health and vitality of the national herd.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The overall picture is one of a national herd dominated by a handful of breeds, and a
47
48 large number of 'boutique' and even rare breeds. For Schumpeter (1934), the decline
49
50 and/or marginality of these minority breeds, or their failure to be adopted widely,
51
52 represents the process of 'creative destruction'. He argues that part of the creative
53
54 process within capitalism means that new innovations by necessity destroy (or make
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 redundant) inefficient technologies. In the case of cattle, this means that some breeds
4
5 lose favour to those that have attributes that are more suitable in particular environments
6
7 or markets. Of course, the creative destruction concept only partly explains why some
8
9 breeds become rare or extinct. In some cases, the level of adoption at the local level may
10
11 be relatively low following the introduction or development of a breed. This may be
12
13 because of a lack of information about a breed, or low levels of local receptiveness or,
14
15 quite simply, fashion or 'taste' (Yarwood and Evans 2006). Consequently the popularity
16
17 of some animals can fluctuate. Over recent years, for example, Angus animals have been
18
19 more popular than Herefords and Red Polls. There continue to be high numbers of each
20
21 breed and so their relative popularity may simply reflect changes in fashion and/or short-
22
23 term market fluctuations.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Although no breeds of cattle introduced to Australia appear have been lost to the country
33
34 (Chambers 2007), some are perilously close to local extinction and the decline of some of
35
36 these livestock breeds has prompted greater interest in rare breeds in Australia. Table 2
37
38 summarises cattle breeds that have reached very low levels based on assessments
39
40 undertaken by the Rare Breeds Trust of Australia (RBTA). The RBTA has identified a
41
42 number of Australian breeds that have become scarce, including the Milking Zebu,
43
44 Adapteur, and Belmont Red. Interestingly, protected breeds from outside Australia are
45
46 almost exclusively of British origin and date to the colonial phase of the development of
47
48 the cattle industry. This suggests that British breeds are still highly valued in Australia,
49
50 reflecting a longstanding colonial legacy. Some breeds that originated in Britain are
51
52 classed as rare in Australia, such as Devon Cattle, although they are not classed as such in
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 their country of origin. By contrast animals with low and falling registrations that do not
4 originate from Britain have not, as yet, been afforded protected status. For example
5
6 tropical breeds such as Tuli, Boran, Chiangus, and European ones, such as Belgium Blue
7
8 and Brauvieh, all show very low registrations. One explanation for these discrepancies
9
10 might be that at least some of these breeds are relatively new introductions and are
11
12 expanding from a low base rather than declining (as is the case for Wagyu cattle (Parsons
13
14 2003)).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

24
25
26
27
28

29 Although the geographies of rare breeds often show local associations (Yarwood and
30
31 Evans, 2006), the preservation of rare livestock breeds is now an international movement
32
33 with societies in many countries following the lead of the Rare Breed Survival Trust
34
35 (RBST) in the UK. Although genetic diversity and farming sustainability are important to
36
37 the RBST, the RBTA places more emphasis on these dimensions and highlights that
38
39 ‘food security is the RBTA’s overarching objective and encouraging biodiversity is one
40
41 of its primary goals’ (Chambers 2004, p.5). However, if this is the case, the RBTA should
42
43 perhaps pay more attention to breeds that are non-British in origin.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Discussion and Conclusion**

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This paper has traced the introductions of cattle breeds to Australia. In doing so it has
4 highlighted a number of factors that are important to the expansion of the number and
5 diversity of cattle breeds in Australia. Although other papers have considered these issues
6 at national scales, the Australian example has fore-grounded the importance of global
7 linkages in geographies of livestock and, more generally, of farming practices. Moreover,
8 it suggests that understanding these global linkages and the pattern of introduction can be
9 understood with reference to the literature on processes of innovation diffusion.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Reflecting on the theoretical perspectives developed initially by Hagerstrand (1967) and
22 extended by other agricultural geographers in the 1960s and 1970s, it is clear that both
23 information networks and the decision-making processes of individual farmers are critical
24 in shaping the spread of cattle breeds. It is also apparent that processes of innovation
25 diffusion operate not only within particular regions and nations, but at a wider global
26 scale. The spread of information within the British Empire, and later, within new
27 network forms played a crucial role in the pattern of cattle migration and development.
28 However, it is also clear that there are strong institutional and market-based elements to
29 this process, consistent with the work of Brown (1981). The role of breed societies and
30 research organisations (such as the CSIRO) in contributing to cattle migrations and
31 development has been crucial in the Australian context. This is particularly evident in the
32 focus placed on tropical breeds, where cattle imports were not simply about agricultural
33 production, but also the economic development of northern Australia. As Crown (1975)
34 has suggested, these institutional dimensions are coupled with market signals. Thus,
35 changing consumer demand and the emergence of new international markets has
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contributed to the import and/or development of breeds to cater for these new tastes and
4 economic opportunities. This paper has just touched on some elements of the way
5 innovation diffusion processes might operate at wider scales, and clearly there is a need
6 for more detailed analysis and conceptual work in this area.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14
15 It is also apparent that the process of innovation diffusion at the global scale needs to be
16 understood against a broader socio-cultural background. For example, the ongoing
17 interest in British breeds seems to reflect not only the productive capacity of these
18 animals, but an enduring cultural legacy linked to an agricultural system that emerged
19 under Empire. Yet, the growing popularity of other European, tropical and Australian
20 breeds points to underlying changes not only in the economic structure of farming, but
21 also its cultural orientation. Thus, cattle migrations and development in an Australian
22 context needs to be understood as an outcome of complex and dynamic economic, socio-
23 cultural and institutional factors. Based on the analysis in this paper, five main factors
24 can be seen to have influenced the introduction and the geographies of livestock breeds in
25 Australia, namely: the colonial legacy; climatic conditions; state policy; individual
26 enthusiasts and breed societies; and international trade relations.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The story of Australia's cattle industry reflects the country's broader ambivalence over its
47 colonial past whereby an acknowledgement of the formative nature of British influence
48 on the country has consistently been moderated by a desire to achieve a distinctive
49 Australian identity. Almost all the rare cattle breeds over which concerns have been
50 officially expressed are British in origin and Britain has provided Australia with more
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 imported cattle breeds than any other overseas country. Nevertheless, members of these
4
5 breeds were initially transported to a very different environment and, within the space of
6
7 less than a century, Australian pastoralists were attempting to establish a cattle industry in
8
9 the arid and tropical parts of the country's north. In these circumstances it was inevitable
10
11 that farmers would look to import cattle from analogous environments overseas, such as
12
13 India and Africa, and that both colonial/state and federal governments and individual
14
15 breeders would seek to facilitate the development of such characteristics as tropical
16
17 disease resistance, drought tolerance and easy birthing in new Australian cattle breeds
18
19 more suited to the "sunburnt country" of Dorothea McKellar's (1906) imaginary. These
20
21 processes of diffusion and innovation – and of diffusion of innovation - were readily
22
23 apparent in Australia's first century or so of white settlement and all have continued to
24
25 operate up to the present.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33
34 In more recent decades, however, further forces have come into play as Australian
35
36 agriculture has become increasingly deregulated and increasingly integrated into global
37
38 circuits of trade and knowledge. At one extreme this has allowed individual breeders to
39
40 follow their enthusiasms to introduce or to create what might be termed boutique cattle
41
42 breeds, several of which have particular appeal to hobby farmers. At the other, it enables
43
44 the vast majority of commercial cattle farmers to study and, through the composition of
45
46 their herds, to respond to a range of market demands and tastes. While these might
47
48 include designer products, such as organic, or Wagyu beef, Australian cattle production
49
50 overall remains firmly focussed on mass market orientation and thus on the maximisation
51
52 of output. In these circumstances, a geography in which different breeds may be most
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suited to specific environmental conditions emerges to a certain extent, particularly in
4
5
6 relation to beef cattle where a clear tropical/temperate divide is evident.
7
8
9

10
11 In addition to providing a long term and long distance agricultural case study of the
12
13 diffusion of innovation, this paper has also shed light onto some of the changes in
14
15 Australian agriculture and, more broadly, on current debates in agricultural geography, in
16
17 particular those relating to post-productivism and multifunctionality. Holmes (2002)
18
19 queried whether the changes occurring in Australia's rangelands represented 'a post-
20
21 productive transition with a difference?'. At a time when the genetic diversity of
22
23 livestock breeds has the potential to become a major food security issue, it would be
24
25 useful to know just how 'different' the changing geographies of cattle breeds in Australia
26
27 are from those in other settler – and non-settler - societies.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Abudulai A and Huffman W 2005 The diffusion of new agricultural technologies: the case of crossbred cow technology in Tanzania *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 87 645-659.
- Anderson K 2000 Thinking 'postnationally': dialogue across multicultural, indigenous and settler spaces *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 90 381-391.
- Anderson K 2003 White natures: Sydney's Royal Agricultural Show in post-humanist perspective *Transactions of British Institute of Geographers* 28 422-441.
- Argent N, Smailes P and Griffin T 2007 The amenity complex: towards a framework for analysing and predicting the emergence of a multifunctional countryside in Australia *Geographical Research* 45 217-232.
- Atkins P and Bowler I 2001 *Food in Society: Economy, Culture, Geography* Arnold, London
- Barr N 2005 *The Changing Social Landscape of Rural Victoria* Department of Primary Industries, Melbourne.
- Bindon B M and Jones N M 2001 Cattle supply, production systems and markets for Australian beef *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 41 861-877.
- Birkhaeser D, Evenson R, and Feder G 1991 The economic impact of agricultural extension *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 39 607-650.
- Black A W 2000 Extension theory and practice: a review *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 40 493-502.
- Blunt A and McEwan C eds 2003 *Postcolonial Geographies* Continuum New York.
- Bolton G 1981 *Spoils and Spoilers: Australians Make their Environment 1788-1980* George Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Bowden L 1965 *The Diffusion of the Decision to Irrigate* Department of Geography, University of Chicago.
- Borkhaug H and Richards C 2008 Multifunctional agriculture in policy and practice? A comparative analysis of Norway and Australia *Journal of Rural Studies* 24 98-111.
- Brasier K J 2005 Spatial analysis of changes in the number of farms during the farm crisis *Rural Sociology* 70 540-560.

- 1
2
3 Brown L 1975 The market and infrastructure context of innovation *Economic Geography*
4 51 185-216.
5
6
7 Brown L 1981 *Innovation Diffusion* Methuen, New York.
8
9
10 Bunker R and Houston P 2003 Prospects for the rural-urban fringe in Australia:
11 observations from a brief history of the landscapes around Sydney and Adelaide
12 *Australian Geographical Studies* 41 303-323.
13
14 Burvill G H 1979 *Agriculture in Western Australia* University of Western Australia
15 Press, Nedlands.
16
17
18 Cameron J 1981 *Ambition's Fire: the Agricultural Colonization of Pre-convict Western*
19 *Australia* University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands.
20
21
22 Camm J 1971 The development of the geographic pattern of dairying in Queensland,
23 1880 to 1915 *Australian Geographer* 11 473-491.
24
25
26 Carter A 2007 Measurement of clustering and dispersion of innovation in Polenske K ed
27 *The Economic Geography of Innovations* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
28 13-29.
29
30
31 Chambers F 2004 *Status of Rare Breeds of Domestic Livestock in Australia, 2004* Rare
32 Breeds Survival Trust of Australia, Victoria (on line:
33 <http://www.rbta.org/Pdf%20Files/Status%20of%20Rare%20Breeds%20in%20Australia%20v10.pdf>).
34
35
36 Chambers F 2007 *Status of Rare Breeds of Domestic Livestock in Australia, 2007* Rare
37 Breeds Survival Trust of Australia, Victoria (on line:
38 <http://www.rbta.org/Pdf%20Files/Status%20of%20Rare%20Breeds%20in%20Australia%20v10.pdf>).
39
40
41
42 Clark J, Lembitt M and Warr S 1992 *A Regional Model of Australian Beef Supply*
43 Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Canberra.
44
45
46 Commission on Agriculture 1891 Final report of the Commission on Agriculture, in:
47 *Votes and Proceedings of the Western Australian Parliament, Part XII* Perth,
48 Government Printer.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 Davidson B R 1981 *European Farming in Australia: An Economic History of Australian*
61 *Farming* Elsevier, Amsterdam.

- 1
2
3 Evans N, Morris C and Winter M 2002 Conceptualising agriculture: a critique of post-
4 productivism as the new orthodoxy *Progress in Human Geography* 26 313-332
5
6
7 Gardner B L 2002 *American Agriculture in the Twentieth Century: How It Flourished*
8 *and What it Cost* Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
9
10 Gertler M and Wolfe D 2002 *Innovation and Social Learning: Institutional Adaptation in*
11 *an Era of Technological Change* Palgrave, London.
12
13
14 Gray J 1996 Cultivating life on the Borders: Scottish hill sheep farms and the European
15 Community *Sociologia Ruralis* 36 27-50.
16
17
18 Gray J 1998 Family farms in the Scottish borders: a practical definition by hill sheep
19 farmers *Journal of Rural Studies* 14 34-356
20
21
22 Gray J 2000 The Common Agricultural Policy and the reinvention of the rural in the
23 European Community *Sociologia Ruralis* 40 30-45
24
25
26 Grigg D 1984 *An Introduction to Agricultural Geography* Hutchinson, London.
27
28
29 Hagerstrand T 1967 *Innovation Diffusion as a Spatial Process* Chicago University Press,
30 Chicago.
31
32 Halpin D 2004 *Australian Organic Industry Profile* Department of Agriculture, Fisheries
33 and Forestry, Canberra.
34
35
36 Hancock W K 1930 *Australia* Benn, London.
37
38
39 Hardt M and Negri A 2000 *Empire* Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
40
41
42 Henzell T 2007 *Australian Agriculture: Its History and Challenges* CSIRO Publishing,
43 Collingwood.
44
45
46 Holloway L 2001 Pets and protein: placing domestic livestock on hobby farms in
47 England and Wales *Journal of Rural Studies* 17 293-308
48
49
50
51 Holmes J 2002 Diversity and change in Australia's rangelands: a post-productivist
52 transition with a difference? *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 27
53 362-384.
54
55
56 Holmes J 2006 Impulses towards a multifunctional transition in rural Australia: gaps in
57 the research agenda *Journal of Rural Studies* 22, 142-160.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 Huffman W E and Evenson R. E. 2006 *Science for Agriculture: A Long Term Perspective*
4 Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
5

6
7 Ilbery B 1985 *Agricultural Geography: A Social and Economic Analysis* Oxford
8 University Press, Oxford.
9

10 Ison R and Russell D eds 2000 *Agricultural Extension and Rural Development: Breaking*
11 *Out of Traditions* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
12

13
14
15 Johansen H E 1971 Diffusion of strip cropping in southwestern Wisconsin *Annals of the*
16 *American Association of Geographers* 61 671-683.
17

18
19 Jones R and Birdsall-Jones C 2008 The contestation of heritage; the colonizer and the
20 colonized in Australia in Graham B and Howard P eds *The Ashgate Research*
21 *Companion to Heritage and Identity* Ashgate, Aldershot.
22

23
24 Jordan T 1969 The origin of Anglo-American cattle ranching in Texas: a documentation
25 of diffusion from the lower South *Economic Geography* 45 63-87.
26

27 Jordan T 1972 The origin and distribution of open-range ranching *Social Science*
28 *Quarterly* 53 105-121.
29

30
31 Lawrence G 2005 Globalisation, agricultural production systems and rural restructuring
32 in Cocklin C and Dibden J eds *Sustainability and Change in Rural Australia*
33 University of New South Wales Press, Sydney 104-120.
34

35
36 Leeuwis C and Van den Ban A W 2004 *Communication for Rural Innovation: Rethinking*
37 *Agricultural Extension* (third edition) Blackwell, Oxford.
38

39
40 Lundvall B 2001 *Innovation, Growth and Social Cohesion: The Danish Model* Edward
41 Elgar, London.
42

43 Mackellar D 1908 *My Country*
44 <http://www.dorotheamackellar.com.au/archive/mycountry.htm>
45

46
47 Mauldron R and Schapper H 1974 *Australian Farmers Under Stress in Prosperity and*
48 *Recession* University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands.
49

50
51 Ormrod R K 1990 Local context and innovation diffusion in a well-connected world
52 *Economic Geography* 66 109-122.
53

54
55 *Parliamentary Debates of Western Australia (PWDA)* 1893 Government Printer, Perth.
56

57
58
59
60 Parsons J 2003 *Cattle Breeds in Australia* CH Jerram and Associates, Victoria

- 1
2
3 Polenske K ed 2007 *The Economic Geography of Innovations* Cambridge University
4 Press, Cambridge.
5
6
7 Powell J 1988 *An Historical Geography of Australia: The Restive Fringe* Cambridge
8 University Press, Cambridge.
9
10 Robinson G M 2004 *Geographies of Agriculture: Globalisation, Restructuring and*
11 *Sustainability* Pearson, Harlow.
12
13
14 Rogers E M 2003 *Diffusion of Innovations* (fifth edition) Free Press, New York.
15
16 Ryan B and N Gross 1943 The diffusion of hybrid seed corn in two Iowa communities
17 *Rural Sociology* 8 15-24.
18
19 Sanders J 1980 History and development of Zebu cattle in the United States *Journal of*
20 *Animal Science* 50 1188-1120.
21
22
23 Schumpeter J 1934 *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits,*
24 *Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle* (Trans, Redvers Opie) Harvard
25 University Press, Cambridge MA.
26
27
28 Schumpeter J 1947 The creative response to economic history *Journal of Economic*
29 *History* November 149-259.
30
31
32 Smith A W and Smith R L 1979 The Australian Cattle Industry: Prospects and
33 Consequences *The Australian Economic Review* 3rd Quarter 57-68.
34
35 Smailes P 2002 From rural dilution to multifunctional countryside: some pointers to the
36 future from South Australia *Australian Geographer* 33 79-95.
37
38
39 Simoons F J 1974 Contemporary research themes in the cultural geography of
40 domesticated animals *Geographical Review* 64 557-576.
41
42 Taylor G 1930 Agricultural regions of Australia: instalment II *Economic Geography* 6
43 213-242.
44
45
46 Tonts M 2002 State policy and the yeoman ideal: agricultural development in Western
47 Australia, 1890-1914 *Landscape Research* 27 103-115.
48
49 Tonts M, Halpin D, Collins J and Black A 2003 *Rural Communities and Changing Farm*
50 *Business Structures: An Assessment of the Socio-economic Impacts* Rural Industries
51 Research and Development Corporation, Canberra.
52
53
54 Vanclay F 2004 Social principles of agricultural extension to assist in the promotion of
55 natural resource management *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 33 213-
56 222.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Walton J 1984 The diffusion of the improved Shorthorn breed of cattle in Britain during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 9 22-36.

Walton J R 1999 Pedigree and productivity in the British and North American cattle kingdoms before 1930 *Journal of Historical Geography* 25 441-462.

Whatmore S 2002 *Hybrid Geographies: Natures, Cultures, Spaces* Sage London.

Winsberg M D 1970 The introduction and diffusion of the Aberdeen Angus in Argentina *Geography* 55 187-195.

Wolf S A and Zilberman D eds 2001 *Knowledge Generation and Technical Change: Institutional Innovation in Agriculture* Kluwer, Norwell, MA.

Woods M 2007 Engaging the global countryside: globalization, hybridity and the reconstitution of rural place *Progress in Human Geography* 31, 485-507.

Yarwood R and Evans N 1998 New places for 'old spots': the changing geographies of domestic livestock animals *Society and Animals* 6 137-165.

Yarwood R and Evans N 2000 Taking stock of farm animals and rurality in Philo C and Wilbert C eds *Animals Spaces, Beastly Places* Routledge, London 98-114.

Yarwood R and Evans N 2006 A Lleyen sweep for local sheep? Breed societies and the geographies of Welsh livestock *Environment and Planning A* 38 1307-1326.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure and Table Captions

Figure 1 Country of Origin of Cattle Breeds in Australia

Figure 2 The Introduction of Cattle Breeds to Australia (cumulative frequency)

Figure 3 Development of Selected Australian Breeds of Cattle

Table 1 Breeds Introduced Via Semen Imports, 1969-1976

Table 2 Rate Cattle Breeds in Australia

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Figure 1 Country of Origin of Cattle Breeds in Australia
84x51mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2 The Introduction of Cattle Breeds to Australia (cumulative frequency)
117x99mm (600 x 600 DPI)

iew




Figure 3 The Development of Selected Australian Breeds of Cattle
61x27mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Breeds Introduced Via Semen Imports, 1969-1976

Breed	Year of Introduction	Place of Origin
Charolais	1969	France
Simmental	1971	Switzerland
Blonde d'Aquitaine	1972	France
Braunvieh	1972	Germany/Austria/Switzerland
Limousin	1973	France
Maine Anjou	1973	France
Brown Swiss	1974	Switzerland
Chianina	1974	Italy (via Canada)
Belted Galloway	1975	Scotland
Chiangus	1975	United States
Romagnola	1976	Italy
Glebvieh	1976	Germany

Table 2 Rare Cattle Breeds in Australia

Breed	Approximate Date of Origin in Aust.	Place of Origin	Status
Adaptaur	1950	Aust. (Queensland)	Critical
Australian Friesian Sahiwal	1960	Aust. (Queensland)	Vulnerable
Australian Milking Zebu	1950	Aust. (Queensland)	Critical
Beef Shorthorn	1825	Britain	At Risk
Belmont Red	1979	Aust. (Queensland)	At Risk
British White	1958	Britain	Critical
Devon	1788	Britain	At Risk
English Longhorn	c1860	Britain	Vulnerable
Galloway	1858	Britain	At Risk
Red Poll	1850	Britain	At Risk
Traditional Angus	1820	Britain	Endangered
Traditional Dairy Shorthorn	1788	Britain	Endangered
Traditional Hereford	1826	Britain	Endangered
White Park	1988	Britain	Critical

(Source: Chambers 2007)

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60