Victoria University

From Hope to Disillusion? A Literary and Cultural History of the Whitlam Period, 1966–1975

by

Nathan Hollier, B.A. (Hons), M.A. (Monash).

STUDENT DECLARATION

I, Nathan Hollier, declare that the Ph.D. thesis entitled *From Hope to Disillusion? A Literary and Cultural History of the Whitlam Period, 1966–1975* is no more than 100,000 words in length, exclusive of references and footnotes. This thesis contains no material that has been submitted previously, in whole or in part, for the award of any other academic degree or diploma. Except where otherwise indicated, this thesis is my own work.

………………………………………….

DEDICATION

To my mother Pam and my brothers Nigel, Peter and Daniel, with apologies for having my head stuck in a book for the last fifteen years.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

It is argued in this thesis that Australian history between 1966 and 1975 can usefully be termed 'the Whitlam period' because the 1972–1975 ALP government of E.G. Whitlam represented the culmination of a wider set of movements for progressive social change, activated primarily by post-1965 opposition to Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War. It is suggested that the defeat of this government marked the end of the postwar 'Keynesian' public policy consensus and the rise to dominance of a neo-classical liberal public policy framework, based on a comparatively negative or 'disillusioned' view of both human nature and the capacity of society to organise itself in a rational and equitable way. And it is argued that the ongoing political importance of the Whitlam period – as the political and historical Other of contemporary Australian society – means that interpretations of this period are especially contested. Accordingly, taking its cue from Raymond Williams's still relevant theoretical argument that culture is an active element of social development, this thesis examines the cultural causes of the defeat of Whitlam and the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy. It is argued that the primary cultural cause of these social developments is a broad-based Americanisation of Australian culture. The central evidence for this contention is found in the lives and works of Patrick White, Frank Hardy and Les Murray, authors held to best represent the major – Anglocentric, nationalist and American – cultural influences of the Whitlam period.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

ABC (Australian Broadcasting Commission)

ABCB (Australian Broadcasting Control Board)

ABS (Australasian Book Society)

ACTU (Australian Council of Trades Unions)

AIDC (Australian Industries Development Corporation)

ALP (Australian Labor Party)

AMIEU (Amalgamated Meat Industry Employees' Union)

CIA (Central Intelligence Agency, US)

CLF (Commonwealth Literary Fund)

CRA (Conzinc Riotinto Australia)

EEC (European Economic Community)

IPA (Institute of Public Affairs)

OBE (Order of the British Empire)

OPEC (Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries)

PLR (Public Lending Right)

QC (Queen's Council)

TASA (The Australian Sociological Association)

UN (United Nations)

IMF (International Monetary Fund)

IWW (Industrial Workers of the World)

Introduction

From Hope to Disillusion? A Literary and Cultural History
of the Whitlam Period, 1966–1975

This thesis is a literary and cultural history. The main focus is on Australian writers and their work, as part of an attempt to explain what was happening within Australian society, particularly at the cultural level, during the period from 1966 to 1975. This decade is referred to in the thesis as 'the Whitlam period' because Edward Gough Whitlam is the central figure associated with the economic, political and cultural hopes that are almost universally held to define this time. Even historians and social commentators who do not share the hopes of this era nevertheless accept that this was a period of widespread hope. There is no agreement, however, as to whether or not the hopes of this decade were desirable or sustainable. This is in spite or perhaps because of the fact that the Whitlam period remains very important. In its quantum difference – economic, political and cultural – from the present nature and structure of Australian society, the Whitlam period continues to define us. In this thesis I attempt to shed new light on or to open up new means of understanding the reasons for this historic shift in the nature of Australian society. In the process of doing so, of course, it is hoped that the thesis might have some positive impact on the continuing ideological deadlock over interpretations of the Whitlam period and its relationship to contemporary Australia. The central question addressed is: 'What are the cultural origins of this fundamental shift within, or transformation of, Australian society?' Put another way: 'What are the cultural causes of the fall of Whitlam and Whitlamism and the rise of contemporary, neo-classical liberal or economic rationalist Australian society?'[1] My thesis, essentially, is that an Americanisation of Australian culture during the 1966–1975 period is the major cultural factor in this historic movement within Australian society from hope to disillusion and that this Americanisation helps to explain the dominance of neo-classical liberalism in the post-Whitlam age.

The History

If the period of Australian history between 1966 and 1975 is generally described as a time of hope, the period preceding it is almost inevitably depicted as a time of stasis, while that succeeding it – that of modern, contemporary Australia – becomes to a

greater or lesser degree an era in which hope, optimism, confidence and innocence are lost. There are various reasons for the shape of this historical narrative, but the main reason is that on 2 December 1972 the federal Australian Labor Party (ALP) under the leadership of Gough Whitlam was elected to power with a clear mandate to introduce a range of policies that were both substantially new (or perceived as such), in the Australian context, and based on an optimistic assessment of human nature, Australian and world social and economic conditions, and the capacity of government to effect significant and perhaps even radical democratic change.[2] Importantly also, this government rose to power on the back of a genuinely popular movement, or set of movements, for progressive social change. The Whitlam-led ALP clearly gained momentum from the mid-1960s through its successful incorporation, or representation, within its policy platform, of the needs, interests and desires of an increasing number of individuals and groups alienated by the culture, philosophy, politics and policies of the federal Liberal and Country parties, which had been in Coalition government since 1949.[3]

The Menzies era came to an end with the retirement of Prime Minister Robert Menzies in 1966. In one of his final acts as Prime Minister, however, Menzies committed Australian troops to the American war in Vietnam. This policy, more than any other, mobilised opposition to the governments of his immediate successors Harold Holt, John Gorton and William McMahon and thereby led ultimately to the ushering in of a new government from the opposite side of politics and with an alternative vision.[4] As Geoffrey Bolton explains in his authoritative history of this national, decade-long search for "new directions":

> With mounting relish Whitlam and his colleagues in the federal Labor Party pitched their appeal to the many groups who had felt excluded from decision-making during the long hegemony of the Liberal-Country Party coalition and who had been taught by the Vietnam experience that protest might in time be converted into new policies for Australia.[5]

This could not have been expected in 1966, however, when at the federal elections of that year Labor was "routed".[6] According to Laurie Oakes and David Solomon, "no-one" wrote the ALP off, despite "such a disastrous result ... largely because waiting in the wings was a man who was widely seen as the great white hope of the party".[7] Whitlam, who had been deputy leader of the ALP since 1960, did not become leader until 1967, but it was in 1966 that his support for the policy of state aid

for Catholic schools led to the breakdown of his co-operative working relationship with Labor leader Arthur Calwell.[8]

The Labor federal election campaign of 1972 was centred on the slogan 'It's Time',[9] which was resonant of the massively successful 'Age of Aquarius' musical 'Hair',[10] as well as of Bob Dylan's 'The Times They are A Changin',[11] theme-songs of the younger, 'sixties generation'. During the campaign the ALP also made use of then new market research, advertising and duchessing techniques.[12] Anticipation of the new government was heightened by the fact that the conservative Coalition had been in power for twenty-three years, the longest period of rule by one side of politics in Australian history. Over the course of this period the Coalition and its leaders had in some obvious cultural ways grown quite outdated.[13] William McMahon, Whitlam's 1972 election opponent, was a particularly uninspiring figure, pathetically rather than attractively avuncular.[14]

Many of the policies designed to redress injustice, inequity and inefficiency that Whitlam put forward prior to his election, and which he and his ministers then energetically implemented, seemed to be logical expressions of the economic and political realities of the age. From the end of the Second World War, the global economy had experienced an unprecedented period of strong and stable growth.[15] And a broadly Keynesian consensus on the framework of public policy, achieved at the Bretton Woods conference of 1944, had led generally to an increasing economic equality within and between nations. As affluence, efficiency and material equity were thought to be inevitable, the natural by-products of good, strongly resourced government, so also was the achievement of social justice.[16] The Whitlam-led ALP also expressed a commitment to economic nationalism, 'buying back the farm'; to political nationalism, via its determinedly independent stance on foreign affairs; and, with its introduction of an Australian Honours system and its strong commitment to the arts, to cultural nationalism.[17] As such, the Party embraced and reinforced a new or revived popular nationalist spirit.[18]

On coming to power on 2 December 1972 Whitlam acted quickly to begin the introduction of his Party's policy platform. Informed by the Chief Electoral Officer that the final result in a number of closely contested seats would probably not be known until 15 December, reasoning that "had the whole machinery of government been allowed to lie virtually idle during the critical first fortnight, a whole range of decisions and action would have been delayed not merely for those two weeks but

effectively for nearer two months"[19] and believing that it was important to demonstrate the government's new identity and activity, Whitlam made the decision to form a 'duumvirate' ministry with his Deputy Lance Barnard. Whitlam allocated himself thirteen portfolios and Barnard fourteen. With the Governor-General Paul Hasluck the 'duumvirate' was in fact an Executive Council.[20] Between 5 and 18 December Whitlam and Barnard introduced elements of every major area of policy.[21] Plans were announced for recognition of China and the granting of independence to Papua New Guinea.[22] Military conscription was ended, all draft resisters were released from prison and the final Australian troops in Vietnam were brought home. Major grants were made to international birth control programs, the supply of rice aid to Indonesia and to Southern Africa, via the United Nations (UN), was increased, and international conventions on nuclear arms, racial discrimination and labour were ratified. Talks on the development of Albury-Wodonga as a regional growth centre were initiated with the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales. It was announced that Australian-owned firms would be given preference over foreign companies in government tenders, where all other aspects of the application were equal; and some foreign take-over bids of Australian firms were frozen. The New South Wales government was ordered to close down the Rhodesian Information Centre in Sydney, in reality a defacto embassy, and wheat exports to that country were ceased. Racially selected sporting teams would now be excluded from Australia. The equal pay case – having special importance for women and Aborigines – would be re-opened before the Arbitration Commission. The granting of new leases on Aboriginal reserves in the Northern Territory was stopped. Aborigines were also promised their own schools and the first moves were taken towards the granting of Aboriginal land rights. The contraceptive pill was put on the National Health Scheme list and the sales tax removed from it. The Sydney Airport jet curfew would now be strictly enforced. *Portnoy's Complaint*, an high-profile film which had previously been banned, could now be screened in Australia. The government also set in place plans for the substantial increase of the tertiary education sector and announced major new grants for the arts.

Facing an obstructionist Senate Whitlam went back to the polls on 18 May 1974. His government was returned, though with a reduced majority in the House of Representatives and still without a majority in the Senate.[23] Nevertheless, despite the ongoing constraints of the Senate, worsening global economic conditions and an

increasingly hostile media, in this first term the Whitlam government did introduce further important and in certain cases long-lasting initiatives. All forms of official discrimination against non-British migrants was removed. The policy of racial assimilation was replaced by multiculturalism, and ethnic minorities were provided with services to ensure the provision of their particular needs. Women achieved the full adult minimum wage. A new Department of Aboriginal Affairs took culturally specific advice from Aboriginal advisers. University fees were abolished. A system of library royalty payments was instituted for artists and authors: Public Lending Right (PLR). Urban infrastructure funding was substantially increased. [24]

In August 1973 the government introduced a Prices Justification Tribunal before which companies would be obliged to explain proposed price increases. Later that year the government initiated a referendum seeking greater authority over the setting of prices and wages. This was opposed by the Opposition, most of the state governments and by the Trade Unions, who argued that this power could be abused by conservative governments.[25] In December the referendum was defeated. The Whitlam government had already shown its intention to increase economic planning, or the government's control over the economy, most directly through its appointment of H.C. 'Nugget' Coombs to Whitlam's staff as an economic adviser, but also through its directing the airline TAA to lower its prices.[26] If the government had been able to obtain this power to regulate prices and incomes it would probably have been able to deal more effectively with the problems of economic stagnation, inflation and stagflation that would beset the global economy in the second half of 1974. A more interventionist approach to economic policy would subsequently have been a much more politically realistic option for Australian federal governments.[27]

Concomitantly, if the election and many of the policy initiatives of the Whitlam government were based on a desire to actively shape society, on a pervasive sense of hope, the perception that a time of hope and innocence had come to an end with the demise of the Whitlam government was heightened by the dramatic nature of that demise. Whitlam was dismissed from office by the Governor-General Sir John Kerr on 11 November 1975; or more precisely, Whitlam had his commission as the leader of the Queen's Ministers of State in Australia withdrawn by her Australian representative.[28] Kerr's unilateral action was completely against established democratic precedent and nakedly advanced the interests of one side of Australian politics: namely that of the conservative parties.[29] He was supported in his decision

by Australia's Chief Justice, Sir Garfield Barwick, who on Kerr's request gave to Kerr, prior to the Dismissal, legal advice asserting the legitimacy of the Governor-General's proposed course of action. Barwick had been a Liberal member of parliament and was a life-long conservative.[30] The corporate media, significant segments of which had supported the ALP in 1972, were virtually unanimous in a strident attack on the Party in 1975.[31] Significantly, Rupert Murdoch had after 1972 shifted his allegience from Labor to the conservatives and in 1975 personally enforced a blanket News Corporation media assault on the Whitlam government.[32] The postwar conditions of strong and stable economic growth came to a crashing halt in the early 1970s, with the decision of the United States to abandon the Bretton Woods system of fixed currency exchange rates, the dramatic increases in the cost of oil brought about by the formation of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) cartel, and the widespread appearance of inflation and then stagflation. An increasingly dogmatic federal Treasury, now wedded to free-market philosophy, actively undermined the broad economic direction and specific economic strategy of the Whitlam government.[33] The corporate media and other conservative forces vehemently and uncompromisingly portrayed the difficult economic conditions of the time as the direct result of Whitlam government incompetence and or "socialism".[34] Intriguing and credible – though inconclusive – evidence suggested the direct or indirect involvement in the Dismissal of the CIA.[35] At the general elections of 13 December, called by Malcolm Fraser's caretaker government, the Coalition was returned with the largest parliamentary majority since federation. And though he did not implement his policy platform with the gusto demanded by John Howard and other government 'dries', Fraser's policy platform in the lead-up to the election of 1975 was, in contrast to that of Whitlam and the postwar governments of McMahon, Gorton, Holt, Menzies and Chifley, and like that of every federal Australian government which has succeeded it, based on a neo-classical liberal philosophy and public policy framework.[36] As Brian Head summarises:

> The sense of optimism about social reform at home, and liberation movements in the Third World, was sustained until the early period (1972–73) of the Whitlam Labor government. However since 1974–75 it has been clear that the intellectual tide has turned. The initiative in social and political discussion passed to the conservative liberals and an enormous amount of effort has been devoted to debating the reconstruction of liberalism in the light of New Right priorities,

revamping journals, re-organising employers' associations and disseminating business ideologies and critiques of the welfare state.[37]

This newly dominant philosophy and policy is based on a pessimistic view of both human nature and the capacity of government to rationally implement the democratic aspirations of society.[38]

The Historiography

The events of this decade lend themselves to a dramatic, even tragic, historical narrative, and such a narrative was set out first and most passionately by Australian history's great tragedian: Manning Clark. In Clark's history, the Australian 'common' people are essentially childlike: grasping for material rewards and sensual gratification, prone to acts of irrational emotion and anger, easily swayed by the powerful and the manipulative, and needing, ultimately, a teacher capable of showing them a better way of being: a life roughly consistent with the values of transcendent selflessness expressed in the teachings of Christ in the New Testament. For Clark, Whitlam was that leader, a prophet thrown up by history or God to lead the Australian people out of the postwar consumerist cultural wilderness. But just as the story of Christ, prior to the Resurrection, was a tragedy, in that Christ's virtue ensured his damnation on the 'fallen' earth, so too it seems that for Clark the Whitlam government could never last. Writing of the long years of conservative rule prior to Whitlam's election, Clark recalls:

> Happily in the second half of 1972 it looked as though we were at last going to get a reprieve. I remember in particular one great day of elation on a Sunday late in November of 1972. The place was Queanbeyan. The hall was packed with a crowd of men and women of all ages, all occupations, all creeds, yes and all colours. That night tears came not only to my eyes and to many people around me when we stood and clapped, and stamped, and cheered when Gough Whitlam told us that when he became Prime Minister of Australia, then the last vestiges of colonialism would disappear and our years of shame in Vietnam, and in our behaviour to the Aborigines, and in our defence of the old, corrupt order of society would come to an end. It seemed then that the years of unleavened bread were over. At long last we had a teacher who had a chance to lead us out of the darkness into the light, always provided THEY did not cut him down, that THEY spared him a little before he went from hence and was no more seen.[39]

Who the 'THEY' are in this account is not clear, but it is noteworthy that this was written in mid 1973, more than two years before the Dismissal.

If Clark at some level anticipated Whitlam's fate this made him no more sanguine about it. Less than a month after the Dismissal, in Murdoch's *Australian* newspaper, Clark gave a potted history of the Whitlam government and a brief assessment of its place in Australian history and culture.[40] The classic narrative of tragedy is by this time even more apparent. Looking back on it, Clark writes that the period of the Whitlam government "was like a summer's day which begins with the promise of the glories and splendours of noon and ends with a frightening storm. First, there were the days of glory and the days of achievement. In that first hectic year so much was achieved that one is at a loss to know where to begin."[41] "In those three halcyon, golden years", he continues, "in contrast to the pro-British, archaic, anachronistic philistinism of their predecesors, Whitlam gave the men and women with creative gifts a place of honour and respect in Australian society".[42] But "by the middle of 1974", Clark writes, "something had gone wrong": "the clouds of a summer's storm, with all the thunder and lurid lightning of a modern media-designed scenario, were gathering on the horizon."[43] For Clark the modernist, the appearance of mass consumerist culture, symbolised by the reference to 'modern media', presages the end. The direct role of the media in Whitlam's 'fall' is also alluded to. As the clouds gather, "the forces of reaction, all those men with the vision and the values one had believed to have been swept not before their time into the dust-bin of human history, sensed that Whitlam, and those of like mind in his government, had become like beautiful birds who were trapped under the nets of the fowlers of this world. They moved in for the kill".[44] "With great skill, indeed with a brazenness which was often breath-taking", these reactionary bird killers "blackened and besmirched the reputation of the man who had had the courage and the vision to lift Australia out of the doldrums of dependence, first on the United Kingdom and later on the USA".[45] "The man who had been the architect of one of the great reforming governments of this country", Clark continues, "had the mortification of being reduced to impotence by the media and the use of constitutional tricks by his opponents".[46] Further: "He had the even greater indignity of being branded as the leader of the worst government since federation by those very men who had perpetrated and gloried in the moral infamy in Vietnam. There was worse to come. The people on 13 December seemed to

endorse the verdict of his opponents, to give the seal of popular approval to all their abuse and their portrait of him as a despot".[47]

In Clark's estimation, then, Whitlam was brought down by the conservative class and their political leaders, by the media, the 'people', and perhaps by Whitlam's own moral purity. Interestingly, Clark's response to the fate of Whitlam is not to turn the other cheek but to raise the possibility that those who have committed this wrongdoing will one day be punished by political radicals according to the Old Testament principle of 'an eye for an eye':

> History will probably be kinder than the people. Indeed, it may well be that 13 December 1975 will go down in history as that day which converted radicals from belief in the ballot box to industrial action, from parliamentary to direct action. It may be the day which proved once and for all just how hopelessly wedded we, as Australians, are to the petty-bourgeois values, to that very sickness which the progressive part of the world is shedding and destroying ... It may be that the Whitlam years prove we can only march forward by destroying our old corrupt society root and branch. If that is so then those who live to see that day will remember 11 November and 13 December as the days when the wind was sown which led to the whirlwind. It is just one of the ironies of human affairs that men who see themselves as saviours of a society are often its grave-diggers.[48]

Midway through 1976 the narrative of tragedy, complete with biblical overtones, is set out again. With reference to Fraser's landslide victory in the federal elections of 13 December, Clark, quoting Xavier Herbert, asks: "Are we a nation of bastards?".[49] "During the ensuing painful days", Clark confesses, "I read, part in anger, part in agreement, editorials in the serious English, French, and German papers which told their readers that 'the ocker', or the 'Ugly Australian' was still in charge 'down under', that the 'ocker' had destroyed the man who, like Prometheus, had been trying to teach Australians that they could steal fire from heaven, that they were capable of better things".[50] Again, the people share the blame for Whitlam's 'fall' with the conservatives and the mass media: "The Australian electors", Clark explains:

> bombarded for months by stories of the incompetence, the bungling, the corruption, the jobbery, etc., etc. of the Whitlam government, had put back into government in our country a group of men who had the moral values of a troop of boy scouts and the economic and social values which were rapidly disappearing off the face of the earth except in countries such as South Africa, New Zealand, Rhodesia, and possibly Spain.[51]

And it is again suggested that, as "the history of mankind [sic] is written by the victors", and "it seems now quite certain that 1975 was an abberration, a temporary halt in the people's march to victory", it is likely that "the Governor-General and his beneficiaries can expect little mercy from the historians of the people".[52]

Clark recounts Whitlam's and Australia's tragedy again in the second edition of his *A Short History of Australia*.[53] Whitlam is "like one of those prophets of old who had been nurtured in a harsh, dry land".[54] He "had the charisma and the gifts with which to become a great reformer".[55] "With the zeal of a missionary", writes Clark, "the wit of the very sophisticated, and the gift of being able to pesent his aims in memorable language, (Whitlam) began his campaign to teach Australians – including all Aboriginal Australians – that they could achieve a measure of equality of opportunity in education, health care, and in careers".[56] Whitlam also sought to teach Australians "that they could pursue an independent foreign policy and reach standards in the world of arts and letters which would once and for all rid them of the vestiges of their one-time colonial status, with its attendant sense of inferiority and the tendency to grovel and cringe in the presence of men and women from older civilisations".[57] Whitlam, Clark says, "proposed to end the disgrace of a rich and skilled country such as Australia producing so much inequality, so much poverty, and so much that was shoddy and sub-standard".[58] Clark refers to the Whitlam government's "high-minded aims".[59] "The press, commercial radio and television", we learn, "ably assisted by the skilled dispensers of abuse, character assassination, and motive-questioning amongst the conservative politicians, portrayed a governent of visionaries, idealists, and reformers as at best inept administrators and at worst men who were not free from the odour of corruption".[60] And again the people are shown to have played their ignoble part: "At the election of 13 December, 1975 ... Once again the Australian electorate had demonstrated the truth that their history had fashioned them as sound conservatives: in a choice between the status quo and a mild change, they had opted very clearly for a conservative way of life".[61] In this account, though, the Labor leadership have also become complicit in their own downfall, by stooping to fight the election campaign of December 1975 on the managerialist terms of the Coalition rather than in terms of its original, 1972 vision. "So a moment of hope and promise in the brief history of European civilisation in the ancient, uncouth continent", Clark concludes, "seemed in danger of disappearing, as the conservatives

and Labor engaged in an exchange of abuse about which of the two was the more competent in making capitalist society work".[62]

If this moment of hope had disappeared, Clark was working very hard to ensure that the memory of it would not. The period of the Whitlam government is in Clark's account the proper culmination of Australian history, a lost opportunity for national self-realisation, if not utopia: "The Whitlam government possibly offered the final chance for Australia to show the world that it was capable of building a society free from the evils or errors in both capitalist and communist societies".[63] Whitlam is for Clark variously a prophet, a missionary and a Christ-figure; his enemies resemble the pharisees and sadducees who cut Christ and his vision down. Implicitly, the future offered by this government is still worth hoping for, or at least dreaming of.

According to John Warhurst, "Clark stood in the crowd outside Parliament House on 11 November 1975 and protested Whitlam's dismissal. He returned again the following day and from then until his death continued to speak out publicly against the Dismissal".[64] More than any other event, Warhurst suggests, the Dismissal gave Clark "something political to say".[65] "Between late 1975 and 1988", states Mark McKenna, "Clark never tired of reminding the Australian public that they should never again countenance returning the conservatives to power".[66] It is also "from about this time", according to Warhurst, that "Clark developed a general reputation as a person worth listening to", and gained a mass audience.[67] For Carl Bridge, Clark "told of how ... Prometheans like Wentworth, Curtin and Whitlam stole the fire from heaven and tried to make a distinctive Australian contribution to the human conversation".[68] Clark, Bridge notes, is "Australia's best known and probably most widely read historian",[69] though Stuart Macintyre and Peter Craven remark that Clark's position within the academy is less secure.[70] Nevertheless, the basic narrative of the Whitlam decade – as marking a national journey from hope to disillusion – set out first and most powerfully by Clark, has subsequently been repeated by historians of all philosophical and political persuasions.

An especially energetic and influential exponent of the narrative was Donald Horne. Writing between the 11 November 1975 dismissal of the Whitlam government and the federal elections of 13 December that year, Horne "wondered what it might mean if the poll figures [showing a strong swing away from the Whitlam-led ALP] accurately represented a significant mood".[71] "Perhaps", he concluded, "because of this marginal shift, the Australian people were about to betray what might have been

their destiny: positively affirming themselves a nation self-confident in its democratic forms".[72] He also wrote in the aftermath of the 13 December election, perhaps presciently, that "the campaign to destroy the Whitlam government went on for so long, involved so many powerful institutions, and had such an infamous victory that many people who believed in reform believed it possible that their time would not come again. There was too much power on the other side. They could never win".[73] Later, the elegaic note is struck again: "If Australians had given the Whitlam government a better run, Australia might have developed something of a name for itself in the world as a humane and progressive nation with a distinctive originality".[74] Horne's 1980 social history of Australia between 1966 and 1972 was, entitled, significantly, *Time of Hope*.

This central narrative and set of tropes reappear within and throughout the various histories of the Whitlam government. "In the first flush of victory after twenty-three years in Opposition", writes Michael Sexton, for example, "it was not difficult for the members of the new government to assume that they would be able to govern as a succession of (Liberal-Country Party) governments had done".[75] But "some time during that first year they realised that it was not going to be like that – the old order had changed. Exhilaration turned to bewilderment, assurance to disillusionment, as the feeling of living on borrowed time and the ever-present sense of uncertainty and unpredictability ate into the resolve of the government".[76] Sexton contends that as late as the end of 1974 Opposition leader Billy Snedden's position "was almost untenable and ... the Opposition was effectively without a leader. It was a situation any government would have relished".[77] If "not everyone in the Labor ranks shared this optimism", he continues, "not even the most pessimistic would have predicted the year that was to follow – a year of disruption and disaffection that was to reduce the government to a position where it was rendered totally vulnerable in any electoral contest".[78]

In a final chapter written with future politically progressive reformers in mind, Sexton summarises:

> If the events of November 1975 serve no other purpose, they dramatise the fact that some of the most powerful sections of Australian society are not prepared to tolerate a reform government in any cirumstances. This ought to make it impossible, for at least a generation, for the supporters of reform to be again lulled into a sense of false security as they were in the early days of the Whitlam government.[79]

Progressive hope is lost and conservative disillusion reigns. Similarly, in his centenary history of the ALP, Ross McMullin concludes his discussion of the Whitlam period by reflecting:

> The people who turned out in droves during the 1975 campaign had not only been outraged by the removal of the Whitlam government; they had been inspired and liberated by its approach and achievements. These admirers would always regard the Whitlam government with an affectionate nostalgia tinged with sadness because of the hopes and dreams that were only partly fulfilled. For the rest of their lives their pulses would quicken whenever they saw or heard replays of the exhilarating St Kilda Town Hall meeting in 1972, Whitlam on the Parliament House steps on Remembrance Day 1975, and, especially, Whitlam at Blacktown beginning 'Men and women of Australia . . .'[80]

In an emblematic personal essay, Owen Hughes writes that "what occurred in particular policy areas in the Whitlam government is less important than that change *could* occur. Under previous governments, it seemed that things were the way they were ... and that was the way it was. Whitlam gave hope".[81] Looking back on the Whitlam decade, Hughes recalls:

> It was a time in which there was a chance for Australia, a chance which has not yet come to fruition. My generation had lived its entire life under Liberal governments of varying quality, who by 1972 were very tired and also seemed to want a break. It voted for the first time for a government which seemed to offer a chance for Australia; it was a time of optimism. That it seemed to fall quickly; that economic realities crowded in when they had not been considered in the early days, does not detract from the feeling that this was a special time.[82]

He continues: "One thing the Whitlam government did was to again make politics matter; that by organising, something could be done [sic] ... It also showed that change did not need to be incremental, that major change could occur and quickly".[83] "Perhaps the charisma of Hawke and the flash of Keating may persist", says Hughes, "but it is probable that Whitlam will be remembered longer. Other governments may have been more successful, but have not been so interesting, which is what history ultimately requires".[84] Waxing increasingly lyrical, Hughes reflects: "Perhaps it was simpler in the Whitlam years, perhaps politics should be about economic statistics and not about optimism or excitement. But it nice [sic] to know that it once was. That was a time".[85]

For critics of Whitlam and Whitlamite social philosophy, such as Stephen Foley and Marshall Wilson, the electorate of the 1960s and 70s was attracted to the

"ideals of disarmament" because unlike earlier generations it was "unexposed to the ravages of war".[86] For Foley and Wilson, Whitlam's popularity and the nature of his coming to power hinted at a personality cult. The electorate was "captivated" by Whitlam, described as "a tall, striking, gifted personage" possessing a "scholarly eloquence",[87] Arthur Calwell's "dynamic heir".[88] Whitlam has "disciples"[89] and is backed by "the ALP's new breed of articulate, university-educated professionals, swept to power on a wave of anti-Vietnam sentiment".[90] Rather than being an expression of the potentially positive power of democracy, as it was for Clark, Whitlam's rise to government is here a sign of the dangerous gullibility and malleability of 'the mob', and so a cautionary tale about the dangers of democracy. Similarly, according to Patrick Tennison, "in the 1972 era" Whitlam was a "giant".[91] His personality "was the one, major, over-riding personal factor in Labor's election victories of 1972 and 1974".[92] Labor's victory in 1972 was a result of "the personality cultism Labor offered, with Whitlam the banner carrier".[93] But if the electorate was irrational in 1972 and 1974, paradoxically its rejection of Whitlam in 1975 was simply a rational response to the government's failure: "Like a few million other Australians, I had become increasingly dismayed and disaffected by so many aspects of Labor's performance once in power".[94] Open government, Tennison suggests, was just "one of the many ideals that Labor, in power, was unable to fulfil".[95] Even Whitlam's most unrelenting critic, Alan Reid, writes that in the lead-up to the 1972 federal elections Whitlam was able to make a "significant contribution" to the outcome by appearing "lucid, logical, dynamic and informed".[96] Although the Whitlam odyssey was for these authors a foolish one, it was still a journey from hope to disillusion.

In general histories of this period of Australia the basic narrative reappears. "Gough Whitlam was Prime Minister for only three years", James Walter reminds us, "one of the shortest terms of any Prime Minister in the postwar period. Yet he continues to excite attention and divide feelings, to loom large in our history".[97] Whitlam's election, Walter records, "prompted unusual euphoria in the electorate. Even the conservative press lapsed into breathless mini-biographies, dubbing him 'Australian of the Year'".[98] In his *A Concise History of Australia*, Stuart Macintyre suggests that "the completion in 1973 of the Sydney Opera House and the acquisition by the new National Gallery of 'Blue Poles', the large, dribbling creation of Jackson Pollock, caught the mood of expansive engagement".[99] But the "golden age" was

over, Macintyre writes, when in 1975 the Whitlam government "tackled inflation with a contractionary budget and unemployment passed 250,000".[100] And in his 2001 inaugural *Overland* magazine public lecture, Macintyre reiterates: "It was Whitlam's cruel misfortune to embark" on his "expansive" and "ambitious" program "just as the material conditions to support it came to an end".[101] For Bolton the fate of the Whitlam government "raised the possibility that Australia would be found essentially a conservative nation in whose history the Whitlam interval would seem a shining aberration".[102] John Molony, in *The Penguin Bicentennial History of Australia*, entitles his chapter on the decade between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s 'Years of Hope'.[103] "For a time", he writes, Australians "had every reason to believe that genuine change was taking place. No government since federation had so carefully worked out its policies and then began so readily to implement them".[104] "An air of urgency and excitement prevailed",[105] he records, and states later: "Despite its last few months, the three, short years of Whitlam had been ones of hope and excitement".[106] But the government was brought down by "conservative circles",[107] "segments of the business community",[108] "propaganda",[109] "powerful sections of the media"[110] and of course the Governor-General. "To the degree that there had been political innocence in Australia prior to 11 November 1975", states Molony, it "was at an end".[111] F.G. Clarke's chapter on '1966–1983' in his *Australia: A Concise Political and Social History*, records how "the election of the first Labor government in federal parliament for twenty-three years caused considerable excitement among the public at large and heightened expectations throughout the community".[112] "The electorate", he summarises, "had voted in favour of change".[113] And although "the electoral arithmetic appears to be overwhelmingly in Fraser's favour", he writes with reference to the 13 December elections, "we should not permit the final result to overshadow the extraordinary bitterness the events of 11 November 1975 injected into the political scene in Australia. It is difficult to recapture the divisiveness and the ugliness of the 1975 election campaign".[114]

The general narrative emerges also within more specialised and thematic histories. In their recent collection of essays on themes and debates in Australia's history, Martyn Lyons and Penny Russell emphasise the fact that the Whitlam government brought home the last Australian troops from Vietnam. This government, in their estimation, "represented hope for social change and for more positive relations with Asia".[115] Discussing the period of the Whitlam government within

Creating a Nation, a history of Australia foregrounding the experience and perspective of women, Marilyn Lake writes: "The pace of change in the 1970s was exhilarating for some, threatening to others".[116] Writing on 'A Struggle for Equality' in the 1988 *People's History of Australia*, edited by Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, Laksiri Jayasuriya and Jenni Cook write that "by 1972 ... the scene was set for Whitlam's reforming Labor government to embark on new, bold policy initiatives".[117] "By the time of the Whitlam government", writes John Rickard in his *Australia: A Cultural History*, "there was a greater acceptance of the arts as an expression of an indigenous culture. When, after decades of controversy and escalating expense, the Sydney Opera House was opened in 1973, it immediately became, for all its practical faults as a building, a symbol of the new cultural optimism".[118] But, Rickard says, there was "always a dichotomy between the expectations of Labor's supporters and the fears of its enemies".[119] "As the climate of crisis increased between 1972 and 1975", he continues, "the nervous and impressionable were drawn into the Anti-labor [sic] fold, persuaded that the Whitlam government was more trouble than it was worth". For Rickard, "1975 spelled the end of the optimism associated with the experimentation of the counter-culture and the reformist program of the Whitlam government".[120] "Optimism ... ebbed away" with "the gathering recession of the 1970s", he states, and the Dismissal itself was "a dramatic culmination of three turbulent years, and an event which has already entered Australian folk-lore".[121]

Since the accounts of Manning Clark, Whitlam is the figure universally held to best embody this hopeful spirit of his times. The character of the Whitlam government was certainly in part a reflection of the character of its leader. For many, aver Lyons and Russell, Whitlam was "an inspiring and imposing figure".[122] According to Rickard, during the election campaign of 1972 Whitlam "convincingly played the part of a man of destiny".[123] States Horne: "The nature of his dismissal may have ... turned Whitlam himself, for many Australians, into a mythic hero, affirming forever the unsatisfied ideals of 1972".[124] "I see him", Horne writes, "as marking that period in history in which we are witnessing the end of what I called 'the lucky country'".[125] This, says Horne, is what Whitlam stands for.[126] Bolton describes Whitlam as a "lion" and compares his initial two-week policy-making burst to the biblical six days of creation: "On the fourteenth day Gough rested".[127] For Macintyre, in the 1998 *Oxford Companion to Australian History*: "Whitlam remains a compelling figure, consistent in his values and yet increasingly radical in his politics; the last great politician to

follow his convictions, he rose and fell as the possibilities for a confident and expansive national government ended".[128] And in his *Concise History* Macintyre reiterates his assessment: "Whitlam remains a highly controversial figure. For some he is a hero, cut down in his prime; for others he was a dangerous incompetent. The last national leader to follow his convictions regardless of consequence, he rose and fell as the possibilities for a confident and expansive national government ended".[129] Whitlam's former principal private secretary (1967–1975) Race Mathews recalls fondly: "Australians are accustomed to having their votes sought through their purses and pockets. It is Whitlam alone in the memories of most of us who has addressed himself uncompromisingly to our consciences and intellects".[130] Suggesting that "an unresolved question of historiography is whether the times make the historical figure, or the historical figure makes the times", Owen Hughes offers the view that: "In Australia from 1972 to 1975 we had a conjunction of both: it is impossible to imagine either the times without Whitlam or Whitlam without the times. Optimism may now be hard to find in Australian politics, neither is there the passion, positive or negative, that people once had for Whitlam".[131] In Molony's estimation, "It was to Whitlam's credit that a new hope and a new vision were given to Australians".[132]

Across these various histories the primary hopes of Whitlam, his Party, supporters and the majority of the Australian nation, are for increased social equality; a new, heightened level of national self-confidence and independence; and a new mode of rational, principled and democratic government. For Horne, the hope was for "a humane and progressive nation with a distinctive originality".[133] Echoing Horne, Molony writes that Whitlam "knew that his purpose was to create a more just, humane and civilised society in which the distribution of wealth was to be more evenly balanced".[134] Whitlam's "ambitious program" aimed to bring about "an enlightened meritocracy", suggests Macintyre.[135]

However, as has already been noted, while there is a broad agreement on the existence of a national journey from hope to disillusion over the course of the Whitlam decade, there is no agreement as to the causes of this historic shift. There is no agreement as to whether or not the hopes of this time were reasonable, desirable and sustainable. As is demonstrated in chapter one, attitudes toward the naturalness or otherwise of the nature and structure of Australia today tend to strongly influence perceptions of the Whitlam period. Those intellectuals who have no sympathy for the hopes of the Whitlam government and the Whitlam decade within the current context

tend to argue that that government brought about its own downfall and that the neo-classical liberal public policy framework and social structure, which came to replace the policy framework and social structure of the Whitlam period, were the result of a necessary or rational response to social reality. Alternatively, intellectuals attracted to the broadly optimistic and democratic ideals of the Whitlam government generally portray that government as having been unneccessarily brought down by incompetent, small-minded or evil opponents (and sometimes with the help of the government's members and friends). To put it simply, understandings of the Whitlam period are shaped by competing contemporary political interests, values and desires: by ideology.

It is not difficult to see why. In its quantum difference from our own time – characterised by relative social inequality, insecurity and fearfulness, the formulation of foreign policy in accordance with the wishes of a 'powerful friend' (namely the USA), and the dominance of 'spin' over reasoned and principled government – the Whitlam period continues to define us. As Hocking and Lewis write, the Whitlam decade, "more than any other, defined modern Australia".[136] This is an important period of Australian history less because of what remains to be unearthed about it – though as with any period this is considerable – than because of the fact that, in spite of there being broad agreement on the basic features of this historical narrative and no shortage of accounts of the time already published, it continues to be regularly and passionately argued about. Hegemonic control over understandings of the present form of Australian society necessarily requires control over understandings of its origins, its historical Other. It is no surprise then that despite its comparatively brief period of rule, more has been written about the Whitlam government than about any other Australian government.[137] Concomitantly, more has been written about Whitlam than any other Australian political leader.[138] The dramatic nature of the historiography, the elements of tragedy most tellingly emphasised by Clark, ultimately reveal the continuing appeal of this government.[139] The story of the Whitlam government is an important Australian myth, in the politically neutral sense of that word. As such it cannot be simply ignored or swept away through a concerted revisionism. As Ron Eyerman suggests, the primary social function of intellectuals is to reinterpret such established myths, or narratives.[140] A study of the origins and function of the competing ideologies involved in the interpretation of this decade is

therefore more likely to move understanding of this time forward than yet another general history of it.

The Theory

Ideology, as David McLellan notes in his comprehensive and authoritative work on the subject, is "the most elusive concept in the whole of social science".[141] McLellan explains that the term "is the product of the social, political and intellectual upheavals that accompanied the Industrial Revolution: the spread of democratic ideals, the politics of mass movements, the idea that, since we have made the world, we can also remake it".[142] Ideologies, he writes, "were the products of an increasingly pluralist society and were associated with rival groups whose sectional interests they served".[143]

As Jürgen Habermas makes clear in his germinal study of the public sphere, the very notion of individuals coming together to make decisions about the future direction of society, on the basis of their reason, would not have made sense prior to the political and economic rise of the bourgeois or mercantile class, a process which challenged the traditional, absolute authority of the monarch:

> The bourgeois public sphere may be conceived above all as the sphere of private people come together as a public; they soon claimed the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in a debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatised but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labor. The medium of this political confrontation was peculiar and without historical precedent: people's public use of their reason.[144]

For Habermas, this process has its origins in a system of commercial exchange which, following the transformation of Antwerp into a permanent trade fair in 1531, developed "according to rules which certainly were manipulated by political power", but which also produced "a far-reaching network of horizontal economic dependencies ... that in principle could no longer be accommodated by the vertical relationships of dependence characterising the organisation of domination in an estate system based upon a self-contained household economy".[145] "Although directly a product of the French Enlightenment", McLellan adds, "the notion (of ideology) obviously has its roots in the general philosophical questions about meaning and direction with

which the breakdown of the medieval world view confronted Western European intellectuals".[146]

The first recorded use of 'ideology' dates to 1796 and the French Enlightenment intellectual Antoine Destutt de Tracy.[147] For him, the term was positive and progressive, referring to the notion that our ideas are based on physical sensations, rather than being innate. Destutt de Tracy argued that a rational investigation of the origin of ideas, free from religious and metaphysical prejudice, would provide the foundation for a just and happy society. However, Napoleon Bonaparte introduced a negative use of the word shortly after. For Napoleon, the ideologue is guided by ideas only, cloudy metaphysics, taking undue notice of reality. McLellan notes: "This oscillation between a positive and a negative connotation will be characteristic of the whole history of the concept of ideology".[148]

As McLellan sets out, "ideology has a German as well as a French origin".[149] The various uses of this term since its inception derive from and operate within one of these two lines of development. For the Romantic artist and philosopher, the subject is always and distinctively an active shaper of reality.[150] Samuel Taylor Coleridge for example criticises Isaac Newton as a "mere materialist": "*Mind* in his system is always passive – a lazy Looker-on at an external World".[151] The Romantic movement was particularly strong in Germany, and contemporaneous German Idealist philosophers from Immanuel Kant to Georg Hegel tried to give these Romantic ideas a systematic intellectual basis.[152] Unlike Destutt de Tracy and the French thinkers of the Enlightenment, for whom the natural and social worlds were pellucid to the rational mind, Hegel argued that the ideas of a particular age were relative to the historical conditions of that moment and could not claim universal validity.[153]

The French rationalist view of ideology was enjoined within the Anglophone world by a strong emphasis on empiricism. This view or tradition passes through Durkheim and structuralism, emphasising the consensual nature of society and embracing a contemplative model of truth. Truth here is a reflection of reality, which close observation and rational consideration should enable all people with sufficient intellect and a capacity to apply the methods of natural science, to recognise. In contrast, the second, Germanic

view or tradition rejects the emphasis on observation in favour of an attempt to *make* truth. Society is seen as ever-changing and riven by conflict, rather than as the product, or potential product, of a rational consensus. Adherents to this line of inquiry are suspicious of any 'objective' way of deciding upon truth and tend to reject the notion that the methods of natural science are appropriate for the study of society. These ideas are developed by Hegel and Marx and are carried forward through Karl Mannheim to Habermas.[154]

Marx put the concept of ideology in the forefront of political discourse, partly through his attempt to unite the French and German developments.[155] Marx combined the attempt to objectively measure the physical needs of human beings with the recognition that needs and desires are historically, socially and culturally produced, mediated by human perception. Sophisticated and successful applications of the concept of ideology, such as those of Lucien Goldmann, continue this approach, recognising that all truth is in a sense ideological while refusing to accept that all truth is equally ideological; refusing to fall into philosophical relativism.[156] As McLellan argues, "if the science / ideology dichotomy [of Enlightenment and empiricist positivism] will not do, nor will its opposite – the pale view of the omnipresence of ideology which has the additional, dangerous implication of reducing all social and political arguments to the status of mere propaganda".[157] And McLellan's further advice is instructive:

> Successful accounts of ideology must combine two attributes. The first, emphasised by Mannheim, is a hermeneutic subtlety which sees both that it is necessary to understand ideology before criticising it and also adopts a self-reflexive attitude towards its own premises. The second, stressed in most strands of the Marxist tradition, is to preserve the concept's critical potential by linking it with analyses of control and domination, thereby extricating it from the labyrinth of relativism associated with the hermeneutic circle.[158]

Ideology, McLellan concludes, is "an aspect of every system of signs and symbols in so far as they are implicated in an asymmetrical distribution of power and resources. And of which system is this not the case?".[159] Ideology may permeate all society, but this need not necessarily be the case: it is the product of human action rather than of some scientistic law of nature.

If ideology is an expression of unequal relations of power within society it can be counteracted by acting directly to make society more equal; and counteracted indirectly – within the intellectual sphere – by pointing out the impact of unequal power relations on the consciousness of a person or a group. As it is sustained by the experience of power – either as a possession or a force of oppression – ideology can be weakened by analysis which demonstrates the ways and the extent to which the operations of the conscious and rational mind are subconsciously linked to either a desire for power or for acceptance by the powerful.

But power relations are by definition relational. No power is absolute. And ideology and power are not formed in a social vacuum, just as reality itself – the meeting place of social conditions and human consciousness – is never only an expression of political power. Human reality and consciousness are the product of political, economic *and cultural* relations.[160] Culture plays an active role in the creation of individual and social consciousness and reality and, although culture is always politicised, it cannot be reduced to politics.

How can this be explained? It is helpful to consider one of Marx's founding observations. Marx suggested that all human society is founded on two fundamental struggles: the struggle of people against nature, to obtain the necessities of physical survival, and, developing from this, the struggle of people against each other, as a means by which some might gain an easier and perhaps ostensibly more rewarding life.[161] Politics and ideology can be seen as the product of the second, exclusively human struggle; and culture can be seen as the product of this struggle against nature.

It is pointless, as R.W. Connell has noted, to try to suggest that one of either patriarchal or class relations is more original than the other.[162] Similarly, it seems probable that all human societies organise themselves politically in the process of organising themselves economically and culturally. But the idea of culture, in any of its most commonly operating strands,[163] is founded on the belief or perception that human beings are partly formed out of co-operative and communal, and loving or emotion-driven, human interaction – such as the interaction between parents and children – that is a *necessary* response to the need for social reproduction. Of course these cultural relations are always political (and even, at times, abusive), but they are never *only* political.[164] The concept of culture refers to a set of conscious and unconscious beliefs and practices that, unlike politics, power and ideology, derive or are believed to derive from a group's *unmediated* relationship with nature (just as the

term 'culture' originally develops in English in primary semantic opposition to 'nature').[165] Human beings in particular groups and societies share common bonds, a common identity, that is not simply political, an expression of power, and so not merely temporal, or at least, not wholly transient. Even within the French Enlightenment tradition, in which culture is equated with 'civilisation' and with the individual's distance from 'primitive', 'natural' society, the notion of the 'civilised' and the cultural 'ideal' are based on the belief that these are expressions of *natural law*.[166]

As discussed in chapter two, most histories of the Whitlam government and of the decade of hope chiefly associated with Whitlam, have explained the social changes of this time overwhelmingly in terms of political and economic factors. The more critical of these histories have seen these social changes as expressions of political and economic power. The continuing presence of ideology within contemporary discussions of this period can on the basis of these historical narratives be seen as the result of individuals either being unable to see, or paying insufficient attention to, the impact of political power and material interests on consciousness.

Alternatively, the political and economic changes of the Whitlam decade have in (primarily but not exclusively postmodernist) places been seen as an expression of a broader national and international cultural development, a new spirit or *Zeitgeist*. Here the general role of culture is asserted – historical movement is seen as flowing on from an all-encompassing cultural transformation – while the particular role of culture, and its specific relations to the political and economic, is ignored. On the basis of these accounts, competing ideologies can be understood as parts of the overarching spirit of a particular epoch, rather than expressions of power relations.

Raymond Williams's critical 1961 depiction of the general handling of culture within historical exposition remains broadly accurate and, in relation to the history of the Whitlam period, apposite. "A good deal of history", he writes in *The Long Revolution*, "has in fact been written on the assumption that the bases of the society, its political, economic, and 'social' arrangements, form the central core of facts, after which the art and theory can be adduced, for marginal illustration or 'correlation'".[167] Alternatively, he notes, in the histories of literature, art, science, and philosophy: "There has been a neat reversal of this procedure ... [so that] these are described as developing by their own laws, and then something called the 'background' (what in general history was the central core) is sketched in".[168] "Obviously", he points out, "it

is necessary, in exposition, to select certain activities for emphasis, and it is entirely reasonable to trace particular lines of development in temporary isolation. But the history of a culture, slowly built up from such particular work, can only be written when the active relations are restored, and the activities seen in a genuine parity".[169] Culture, Williams suggests, is an active and what might be called 'generative' part of the larger process of social organisation.[170]

Stressing the extent to which cultural activity plays an active part in social organisation, Williams argues that it must be analysed in relation to society as a whole: "The art is there, as an activity, with the production, the trading, the politics, the raising of families. To study the relations adequately we must study them actively, seeing all the activities as particular and contemporary forms of human energy".[171] "It is then not a question of relating the art to the society", he writes, "but of studying all the activities and their interrelations, without any concession of priority to any one of them we may choose to abstract".[172] "Cultural history must be more than the sum of the particular histories", he goes on to say, "for it is with the relations between them, the particular forms of the whole organisation, that it is especially concerned".[173] And "to put on to Time, the abstraction", Williams notes, "the responsibility for our own active choices[,] is to suppress a central part of our experience. The more actively all cultural work can be related, either to the whole organisation within which it was expressed, or to the contemporary organisation within which it is used, the more clearly shall we see its true values".[174] He states in summary:

> I would then define the theory of culture as the study of relationships between elements in a whole way of life. The analysis of culture is the attempt to discover the nature of the organisation which is the complex of these relationships. Analysis of particular works or institutions is, in this context, analysis of their essential kind of organisation, the relationships which works or institutions embody as parts of the organisation as a whole.[175]

The particular objects of culture, then, should be studied in relation to and for what they reveal of the culture and society as a whole. "This", suggests Andrew Milner, is Williams's "central point", and he adds in 2005 that this still seems "almost exactly right".[176]

While taking a contextualist approach, Williams resists reducing culture to its context: "It was certainly an error to suppose that values or art-works could be adequately studied without reference to the particular society within which they were

expressed, but it is equally an error to suppose that the social explanation is determining, or that the values and works are mere by-products".[177] "It seems likely", rather, "that without this (cultural) activity the whole of the human organisation at [a given] place and time could not have been realised".[178] And more bluntly: "We cannot say that we know a particular form or period of society, and that we will see how its art and theory relate to it, for until we know these, we cannot really claim to know the society".[179] For Williams culture is never a passive reflection of politics, economics or technology.

As Milner explicates, Williams's "target", in criticising those who would study cultural objects without regard to the social relationships and historical conditions informing their production, was Leavisite literary criticism.[180] But, Milner goes on to say, this criticism could as easily be applied today to critics like Harold Bloom, who like Leavis indulge in a form of humanist cultural essentialism.[181] In relation to the history of the Whitlam period, Williams's criticism could be used to critique the work of scholars such as Lindsay Barrett and Meaghan Morris, who see political and economic developments as expressions of a purely cultural historical shift, a shift in the Hegelian *Zeitgeist*. As argued in chapter two, Barrett and Morris, like Bloom and Leavis, ignore the impact of material relations of power on cultural production. Williams's target in criticising those who would depict culture as wholly determined by 'society' was orthodox Marxism, though Milner notes also that this criticism could equally be applied today to the anti-humanist postmodernism of intellectuals like Tony Bennett.[182] In relation to the history of the Whitlam period, this criticism applies to much of the standard historiography on this period, in that the specific, generative role of culture is not considered. As Williams suggests, culture impacts on society in particular ways which need to be identified if the bases of social and historical development, and hence the origins of ideology, are to be grasped.

A New Cultural History

However, having set out the theoretical basis of his approach, it remained for Williams to demonstrate how this explication of the particular generative role of culture within a specific social context, could be achieved. If culture is at the same time variously the ideal of civilisation (a notion deriving most directly from French Enlightenment thought), a whole way of life (a notion deriving primarily from

Romantic and German Idealist thought) and the arts and learning, then in one sense almost everything is cultural (just as almost everything is in a sense political and economic). So which aspect or dimension of culture should be focused upon? For humanists from Matthew Arnold on, the answer had been works of art, which were held to be transcendent expressions of the culture (and at times the race). For narrowly materialist rationalists and postmodernist anti-humanists the answer has been basically to ignore the role of the artist, except where that role is seen as the reflection or reproduction of economic and political power. For Williams, however, as for intellectuals influenced by him, such as Terry Eagleton and Andrew Milner, it remains especially valuable, in seeking to understand the particular, active role of culture in social and historical development, to focus on works of art; not because these works in any way transcend the culture of which they are a part, but precisely because they are expressions of that culture. As Milner explains: "To say that value is produced by the valuing community, rather than by the inherent properties of the valued text, is not necessarily to detract from the 'value' either of literature or of culture more generally. Why should art need to be transcendental in order to be either interesting or 'valued'".[183] Similarly, John McLaren sees the study of Literature as falling between the disciplines of history and philosophy and so sees creative writers in comparable terms to Williams, Eagleton and Milner, as something like aesthetic historians.[184] For these thinkers works of art are especially important and valuable objects of study because they are the objects of culture that are valued by the particular society as expressions of the essence of their culture, objects which effectively affirm or challenge received fundamental meanings and which generate the most deep and communal forms of imagined pleasure and pain. These feelings need to be identified within a particular time and place, however partially or imperfectly that is possible, if the active role of culture in society is to be glimpsed, because these communal feelings constitute the closest thing to a cultural essence.

Williams argues that it is in the arts of a period that what he calls the "structure of feeling" of a society, "this felt sense of the quality of life at a particular place and time: a sense of the ways in which the particular [economic, political and cultural] activities combined into a way of thinking and living",[185] might be glimpsed; though only glimpsed. "In one sense", he says, "this structure of feeling is the culture of a period: it is the particular living result of all the elements in the general organisation".[186] The key word in his definition is 'quality', for he is trying to suggest

26

the importance of the 'nature' or 'aesthetic' of life in shaping the actions of a particular group of people at a particular place and time, and of course this quality, nature or aesthetic could only be either directly felt and experienced or actively – imaginatively – recovered. It could never be self-evident or empirically demonstrated. The 'structure of feeling' is a qualitative concept.

As Williams explains, this structure of feeling is "the most difficult thing to get hold of, in studying any past period".[187] "It is only in our own time and place", he says, "that we can expect to know, in any substantial way, the general organisation" of society.[188] For this reason, Williams is not completely satisfied with his own descriptive term, recognising that "almost any formal description would be too crude to express this nevertheless quite distinct sense of a particular and native style".[189] But in spite of this he suggests that the concept "is potentially of very great importance", because the experience and feeling to which it refers is important. It is within the structure of feeling of a society that the dynamic contribution of culture to the social organisation as a whole can be seen, however imperfectly. And, states Williams, "I think the fact is that we are most conscious of such contact [between aesthetics, or actual felt experience, and society as a whole,] in the arts of a period".[190]

"I think we can best understand this", Williams continues, "if we think of any similar analysis of a way of life that we ourselves share. For we find here a particular sense of life, a particular community of experience hardly needing expression, through which the characteristics of our way of life that an external analyst could describe are in some way passed, giving them a particular and characteristic colour".[191] "We are usually most aware of this", he points out, "when we notice the contrasts between generations, who never talk quite 'the same language'".[192] And he continues, usefully:

> It is in this respect that the arts of a period, taking these to include characteristic approaches and tones in argument, are of major importance. For here, if anywhere, this characteristic is likely to be expressed; often not consciously, but by the fact that here, in the only examples we have of recorded communication that outlives its bearers, the actual living sense, the deep community that makes the communication possible, is naturally drawn upon.[193]

"I do not mean", he clarifies, "that the structure of feeling, any more than the social character, is possessed in the same way by the many individuals in the community.

27

But I think it is a very deep and very wide possession, in all actual communities, precisely because it is on it that communication depends".[194]

Throughout his scholarly work, Williams is concerned with what he calls 'the long revolution': the complicated and pervasive process of radical social change which began in Europe, and more particularly Britain,[195] in the late eighteenth century: "It is a genuine revolution, transforming men [sic] and institutions; continually extended and deepened by the actions of millions, continually and variously opposed by explicit reaction and by the pressure of habitual forms and ideas".[196] Within this, he notes that "the democratic revolution commands our political attention" and that "the industrial revolution, backed by immense scientific development, commands our economic attention".[197] In his assessment, "the complex interaction between the democratic and industrial revolutions is at the centre of our most difficult social thinking".[198] But he also notes: "It is particularly evident that we cannot understand the process of change in which we are involved if we limit ourselves to thinking of the democratic, industrial, and cultural revolutions as separate processes".[199] And he goes on to say:

> This deeper cultural revolution is a large part of our most significant living experience, and is being interpreted and indeed fought out, in very complex ways, in the world of art and ideas. It is when we try to correlate change of this kind with the changes covered by the disciplines of politics, economics, and communications that we discover some of the most difficult but also some of the most human questions.[200]

The expression of culture or of a structure of feeling, in art, is always political, but never wholly reducible to politics or power, never only political. A work of art, regardless of its politics, may yield a positive or negative emotional response by affirming or questioning the communal, cultured and ultimately material basis of a person's identity. This is not to say that a work of art which yields a positive emotional response is 'good' in political terms: consider Leni Riefenstahl's affecting propagandist film *Triumph of the Will* (1934), for example.

Williams seeks to understand then the particular ways that groups of people physically and conceptually 'use' the texts and objects of their world, as part of the larger project of social organisation, and to understand how the structure of feeling – expressed and partially evident within works of art – actively shapes that social organisation. It can be seen that, in attempting to understand the nature of the

relationship between culture and society, Williams, like Marx, ultimately sought to find a balance between the insights of the philosophical traditions of British empiricism, the French Enlightenment, and German Idealism, even if a complete reconciliation of these insights was and remains not possible.

Following on from Williams's example, this thesis constitutes an attempt to understand the active role of culture in the process of change within Australian society during the period from 1966 to 1975. There is a need to demonstate the specific role of culture within this historic shift in the nature of Australian society and its public policy framework, to demonstrate how people's assessment of their political and material interests, needs and desires are impacted upon by their emotions, unconscious and aesthetic sensibility, and to demonstate how these things are in turn influenced by fundamental cultural teachings about right and wrong, good and bad, the sacred and profane – totem and taboo, in Freud's terms – deeply communal teachings about what thoughts and actions should bring pleasure or pain, and which forms of pleasure and pain are legitimate.

My thesis is that the major cultural reason for the post-1975 dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy within Australian society is a process of cultural Americanisation which has made Australians more open to what is essentially an American public policy and philosophical framework. I focus, that is to say, on the cultural pre-history of the politics and economics of neo-classical liberalism in Australia. An historical narrative is advanced in which British and British-Australian cultural traditions are challenged and replaced by American cultural traditions and a characteristically American structure of feeling, during the period under review, providing a cultural basis for the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy and philosophy. This argument is put through an account, advanced in chapter two, of the US political, economic and cultural origins of neo-classical liberalism, and subsequently through a reading of the lives and works of three writers whom it is argued best or most clearly embody the major cultural traditions within Australian society during the Whitlam period. The fate of these writers and their works, it will be argued, demonstrates the fate of the cultural traditions they represent.

In chapter three it is argued that Patrick White writes out of a puritan, liberal, British-Australian cultural tradition that was culturally compatible with the politics of the Whitlam-led ALP. White supported Whitlam strongly and his works of the Whitlam period contributed at the cultural level to the public support Whitlam

enjoyed. Frank Hardy, it is argued in chapter four, is shaped by a secular, radical Australian nationalist cultural tradition that culturally sat uneasily alongside but contained considerable common ground with the politics of the Whitlam-led ALP. Hardy was a critical but strong supporter of Whitlam and his government and his major literary works of the Whitlam period provided effective though qualified cultural support for Whitlam. The final chapter sets out how Les Murray emerges from and advances a radical, puritan, liberal cultural tradition which in the Australian context was historically quite unique but which is closely compatible with the dominant cultural traditions of the US. In coming to embody the dominant strand of Australian nationalism Murray demonstrates the shift in Australian culture towards US models. Murray claimed to be a supporter of Whitlam and was attracted to Whitlam's cultural nationalism and support for the arts, but was a strong critic of the values underpinning Whitlam's policies. His works of the Whitlam period function at the cultural level to undermine public support for Whitlam.

From Hope to Disillusion? constitutes a new approach to the study of the Whitlam period, an approach which reasserts the value of materialist philosophy within Australian literary and cultural studies and the value of cultural studies within general history. The main intellectual inspiration comes from Marx, via Raymond Williams, Andrew Milner, R.W. Connell and my *Overland* magazine colleagues and interlocutors John McLaren, Ian Syson and Sean Scalmer.

---

[1] Throughout the thesis, 'neo-classical liberalism' is preferred to 'economic rationalism', 'neo-liberalism' or 'market liberalism' because it is argued that this contemporary philosophy has its foundations in, and represents a reinvigoration rather than a superseding of, classical liberal philosophy.

[2] The argument for the practical and symbolic importance of the 1972 ALP election victory within Australian history is certainly not new. This argument will be redeveloped and reconsidered in the body of this introduction. On the optimism of the Whitlam government and its 1972 platform see especially Gough Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government 1972–1975*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1985, pp.1–24; Graham Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur: Gough Whitlam in Politics*, Sun Books, Melbourne, 1977; and Graham Freudenberg, 'The Program', in the Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1986, pp.130–144. In this article Freudenberg writes succinctly: "Certainly the whole spirit of the program reflects the buoyancy and optimism of the 1960s, an optimism which is, indeed, the essence of Whitlamism itself", p.136. For a comprehensive statement of the program of the new reformism see John McLaren, ed., *Towards a New Australia*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1972.

[3] As R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving formulate: "When a period of conflict in the ruling class undermined the Liberals, a coalition of the old unions, the new intelligentsia, and the outer-suburban working class was just strong enough to put Whitlam in office. It was not strong enough to keep him there for long". Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History: Documents, Narrative and Argument*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1980, p.305. "Whitlam's coalition", according to Paul Kelly, was made up of "women, migrants, environmentalists, Aborigines, public servants, artists and nationalists". Kelly, *The End of Certainty: Power Politics and Business in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1994, p.x.

[4] With characteristic panache, Freudenberg states: "Menzies never understood the forces he had let loose by locking Australia into Vietnam. In particular, he did not understand its impact on the uncommitted Australian middle class ... Over the next decade, four prime ministers, Holt, Gorton, McMahon and Whitlam, would all be damaged, in very different ways, by Vietnam. The only Prime Minister associated with Vietnam to emerge politically unscathed by it was Menzies, the man responsible for the original commitment". *A Certain Grandeur*, p.4.

[5] Geoffrey Bolton, *The Oxford History of Australia Volume 5, 1942–1988: The Middle Way*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1990, p.188. 'The Search for New Directions' is Bolton's descriptive label for the 1966–1975 period. See his *The Middle Way*, pp.163–244. For affirmation from one of Whitlam's opponents see Patrick Tennison, *The Lucky Country Reborn*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1976, pp.8: "The eventual defeat of the Coalition in 1972 can be traced back to events that began even before Holt's 1966 victory. These included the then Government's Vietnam policy – and conscription"; and 36: "In the run-up to the 1972 election, the Cairns Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations ... made mass public protest more respectable than ever before ... Those demonstrations showed everyone that in the face of heavy numbers united by moral outrage, the authorities were prepared to stand aside. They gave the cue to other smaller groups, from trade unions to suburban activists steamed up about municipal issues".

[6] Laurie Oakes and David Solomon, *The Making of an Australian Prime Minister*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1973, p.12.

[7] Oakes and Solomon, *The Making of an Australian Prime Minister*, p.12.

[8] See Freudenberg's chapter on this conflict: 'Is the Tumbril Ready?', in *A Certain Grandeur*, pp.24–38. Interestingly, the Australian New Right began to formulate its theoretical opposition to these trends in the mid-1960s also, in the formation of Hayekian discussion groups at Melbourne University and the 1966 establishment of the Alfred Deakin Lecture Trust, the first of a number established to propagate liberal thought. See David Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia since 1944', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, p.337.

[9] Mick Young, who headed the 1972 ALP National Campaign Committee, states that "the 'It's Time' slogan was the lynchpin, the centrepiece of our campaign". Mick Young, 'The Build-up to 1972', in the Australian Fabian Society, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, p.107.

[10] This point is made by Stephen Foley and Marshall Wilson in their *Anatomy of a Coup: The Sinister Intrigue Behind the Dismissal*, The Canterbury Press, Scoresby, 1990, p.23.

[11] Thanks to Steve Brock for bringing this to my attention.

[12] For an account of this campaign which emphasises the importance of these techniques see the chapter 'The It's Time Machine' in Laurie Oakes and David Solomon, *The Making of an Australian Prime Minister*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1973, pp.90–113. See also Neal Blewett, 'Labor 1968–72: Planning for Victory' in Henry Mayer, ed., *Labor to Power: Australia's 1972 Election*, Angus & Robertson and the Australian Political Studies Association, Sydney, 1973, pp.6–16. Mick Young himself has suggested that Don Dunstan was in fact "almost a decade ahead of anybody else" in exploiting "all the modern techniques of campaigning". However, he notes that "the period leading up to the 1972 campaign was the first time the Labor Party gave a commitment to the use of market research at national level". He suggests also: "There is no doubt that the campaign, which was different from any seen on a national level, did capture the imagination of the Australian people in an unprecedented way. We did use slick marketing techniques, and did package Whitlam to a certain extent". And in relation to Young's introduction of the duchessing of journalists, at the 1969 ALP National Conference, described by Oakes and Solomon, Young admits: "The 1969 Conference played an important role in promoting an image to the public of Whitlam as a truly significant Australian political figure. It was the first Conference totally open to the media". 'The Build-up to 1972', pp.99, 98, 107, 96.

[13] As Graham Little states: "By 1972 there were many Australians – young, educated, women – who could hardly wait for Australia's turn at the cultural revolution Kennedy appeared to have set going more than a decade before". "It was not until Whitlam's election", Little continues, "that all these [cultural] pressures were released". Little, 'Whitlam, Whitlamism and the Whitlam Years', in the Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, pp.63, 65–66. For an extended account of the connection between the Whitlam-led ALP and new cultural developments within Australian society see Donald Horne, *Time of Hope: Australia 1966–72*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1980; especially his chapter 'Waiting for Whitlam', pp.157–167. A more theorised account of the cultural momentum supporting the rise to power of the Whitlam government is Lindsay Barrett, *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card:* Blue Poles *and Cultural Politics in the Whitlam Era*, Power Publications, Sydney,

2001. And a more impressionistic sense of Whitlam's and his party's embodiment of cultural trends can be derived from Frank Moorhouse, ed., *Days of Wine and Rage*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980.

[14] Conservative intellectuals have tended to be even more harsh in their depictions of McMahon than his political opponents, as though the desire to downplay the significance of Whitlam's 1972 victory necessarily leads to a denigration of Whitlam's opponent. A representative example of McMahon's general depiction can be seen in Alan Reid, *The Whitlam Venture*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1976. According to Whitlam: "It now tends to be forgotten that McMahon was an extraordinarily skilful, resourceful and tenacious politician". *The Whitlam Government*, p.12.

[15] John Carroll, citing figures from C.D. Kemp, one of the founders of the right-wing think-tank, the Institute of Public Affairs, writes: "Keynesian theory was to dominate government policy in most Western countries from the end of the Second World War until around 1970, a twenty-five year period that produced sustained and stable growth with near-full employment. In the Australian case the 1945–70 period was particularly impressive. A comparison of average annual growth rates between 1950 and 1970 sees Australia at 4.7 per cent, ahead of Canada (4.5 per cent), the USA (3.7 per cent) and the U.K. (2.8 per cent). Over the same period the average rate of unemployment was 1.25 per cent per annum. Between 1950 and 1975 the population rose from 8 to 13 million, real GNP jumped from $5 billion to $17 billion, and output per person rose by 80 per cent. In addition the acreage under crop doubled, iron ore production leapt from 2 to 93 million tonnes, employment in manufacturing rose from 900,000 to 1,300,000. The 1960s was the most extraordinary period of economic growth in Australian history. Output per person rose at an average yearly increase of 4.5 per cent in manufacturing, 5 per cent in the rural sector, and 9 per cent in mining. Real GDP per head rose 37 per cent in the 1960s. Likewise Australia's inflation rate was stable and low, with a superior record to that of Japan, France, or the U.K., and slightly inferior to that of Canada and the USA. Above all, Australia sustained a high level of investment, a tribute to the stability and confidence fostered by the federal government". 'Economic Rationalism and its Consequences', in John Carroll and Robert Manne, eds, *Shutdown: The Failure of Economic Rationalism and How to Rescue Australia*, Text, Melbourne, 1992, p.8.

[16] "There was ... a widespread belief by the early 1960s that poverty had at last been conquered". Greg Whitwell, *Making the Market: The Rise of Consumer Society*, McPhee-Gribble, Melbourne, 1989, p.26.

[17] See Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.229–276, 25–182, 553–590. During the 1972 election campaign, Whitlam had already announced that under his government Australia would choose a new national anthem. The idea for this announcement came from Rupert Murdoch. See Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur*, p.236.

[18] This general statement has been made many times. See for example Bruce Bennett: "Menzies' departure as Prime Minister in 1966 was widely regarded as the end of an era, though it was not until the Whitlam Labor government of 1972–1975 that Australia's winds of change blew strongly with a new cultural nationalism". Bruce Bennett, 'Literary Culture Since Vietnam: A New Dynamic', in Bruce Bennett and Jennifer Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, Oxford, Melbourne, 1998, p.239. For an extended account of the cultural nationalism of this time see Horne's 'An Australian Australia?' chapter in his *Time of Hope*, pp.139–155. Other significant commentaries include those of Stephen Alomes: *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism 1880–1988*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, 1988; and John Rickard, *Australia: A Cultural History*, Longman, New York, 1988.

[19] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.14.

[20] Ibid., p.18.

[21] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.215.

[22] The following summary of policy initiatives is taken from the daily record published by the *Sydney Morning Herald* and included in Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.19–22.

[23] The Government did gain an increased number of Senators through this election, but still not a majority.

[24] See Stuart Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia* (second edn), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, pp.232–233.

[25] See Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.219.

[26] Freudenberg records that the suggestion to appoint Coombs came from Rupert Murdoch. See *A Certain Grandeur*, p.236.

[27] As Tim Rowse makes clear, the Whitlam government's commitment to cutting tariffs and to the implementation of other aspects of micro-economic reform recommended by the Industries Assistance Commission was entirely consistent with the Keynesian approach to public policy. See Rowse, 'The Social Democratic Critique of the Australian Settlement', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.219–243. The chief architect

of this policy in the Australian context was undoubtedly Nugget Coombs. See Tim Rowse, *Nugget Coombs: A Reforming Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002. See also Micahel Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-building State Changes its Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991, pp.162–163.

[28] This point is made by Colin Howard, University of Melbourne Hearn Professor of Law, in Foley and Marshall, *Anatomy of a Coup*, p.vi.

[29] See Donald Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1976, pp.32–33, 12.

[30] See David Marr, *Barwick*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1980.

[31] See Bolton, *The Middle Way*, pp.237–238.

[32] On the portrayal of the Whitlam government during the 1975 election campaign see Sean Scalmer, *Dissent Events: Protest, The Media and the Political Gimmick in Australia*, UNSW Press, 2002, pp.139–140; and Bridget Griffen-Foley, *Party Games: Australian Politicians and the Media from War to Dismissal*, Text, Melbourne, 2003, pp.217–234. "The Murdoch papers were the last to become hostile to the Whitlam government, but when they did, they were the most strident", writes George Munster. See his *Rupert Murdoch: A Paper Prince*, Viking, Ringwood, 1985, p.107. On Murdoch's personal role in this media campaign see pp.107–112.

[33] The most detailed accounts of this are Greg Whitwell, *The Treasury Line*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1986; and Leon Glezer, *Tariff Politics: Australian Policy-making 1960 – 1980*, Melbourne University Press, 1982. See also Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.207–214; and Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur*, pp.349, 354.

[34] See especially Griffen-Foley, *Party Games*, pp.217–234.

[35] The most extensive exploration of this possibility is made by John Pilger: 'The *Coup*', in his *A Secret Country*, Vintage, London, 1990, pp.187–238. See also J.A. Nathan, 'Dateline Australia: America's Foreign Watergate', *Foreign Policy* 49, 1982–83, pp.168–185; Tim Rowse, 'The CIA and the Kerr Coup', in A. Curthoys, A.W. Martin and Tim Rowse, eds, *Australians from 1939*, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon Associates, Sydney, 1987; Joan Coxsedge, Ken Coldicutt and Gerry Harant, 'Scenario for a Coup', in their *Rooted in Secrecy: The Clandestine Element in Australian Politics*, Committee for the Abolition of Political Police, Balwyn North, 1982, pp.21–42; Dennis Freney, *The CIA's Australian Connection*, the author, Sydney, 1977; and Lyndall White, 'Is that a government in Your Pocket ... or ... ? The CIA in Australia', *Semper*, 3 May 1982, p.6. In his own history, Whitlam records that in 1977 US President Carter sent a personal emissary, Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher, to meet Whitlam in Sydney. Via Christopher, Carter assured Whitlam that the US administration would "never again interfere in the domestic political processes of Australia". *The Whitlam Government*, p.52.

[36] Hugh Emy and Owen Hughes note that during the Fraser government "there was already a small group of Dries in the Liberal party pressing for lower tariffs and financial deregulation but, beyond setting up the Campbell Inquiry into the latter, Mr Fraser did little to accommodate them, for which he was subsequently much criticised". *Australian Politics: Realities in Conflict* (second edn), Macmillan, Melbourne, 1991, p.192.

[37] Brian Head, 'Introduction: Intellectuals in Australian Society', in Head and Walter, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, p.29.

[38] The shift in the public policy framework taking place at this time is spelt out by Michael Pusey: "Written into the policy discourses of the Whitlam years we ... find a much more 'constructivist' understanding of social needs as demands set upon the state, the economy, and indeed upon 'politics', by the reproduction of society *per se*. The discourse is predicated in forms of civil society and of a 'public sphere' that have a certain autonomy, and even some primacy, *vis a vis* the economy and the formal structures of the state. It is a discourse that allows social needs to be read as indices to social problems arising from changes in the institutional and cultural structures of society (work, family, community, education, popular culture and the arts, etc.)". In the post-Whitlam era, on the other hand, Pusey argues that a public policy framework of economic rationalism "creates and itself depends upon a *hyper-objectification of the market* and market processes and ... this goes hand in hand with an *uncoupling of the economic and socio-cultural* contexts and premises of state action". The result is "a certain kind of *systematising abstraction* that 'tries' to convert *action* into system co-ordinated *behaviour*". *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-building State Changes its Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1991, pp.164, 171.

[39] Manning Clark, 'The Years of Unleavened Bread, December 1949 to December 1972', *Meanjin* 32: 3, 1973, in *Manning Clark: Occasional Writings and Speeches*, Fontana Books [no place], 1980, p.202.

[40] Manning Clark, 'History Will be Kinder to Labor than the People', *Australian*, 7 January 1976, in *Manning Clark: Occasional Writings and Speeches*, pp.203–208. A less detailed response to Kerr's dismissal of Whitlam is Manning Clark, 'The Violent Option' in Myfanwy Gollan, ed., *Kerr and the*

Consequences: The Sydney Town Hall Meeting, 20 September 1976, Widescope International Publishers, Camberwell, 1976, pp.26–31.

[41] Clark, 'History Will be Kinder to Labor than the People', p.203.

[42] Ibid., p.204.

[43] Ibid., p.206.

[44] Ibid., p.206.

[45] Ibid., p.207.

[46] Ibid., p.208.

[47] Ibid., p.208.

[48] Ibid., p.208.

[49] Manning Clark, 'Are We a Nation of Bastards?', *Meanjin* 35:2, 1976, in *Manning Clark: Occasional Writings and Speeches*, pp.209–214.

[50] Clark, 'Are We a Nation of Bastards?', p.210.

[51] Ibid., p.210.

[52] Ibid., p.213.

[53] Manning Clark, *A Short History of Australia* (second edn), Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1982.

[54] Clark, *A Short History*, p.229.

[55] Ibid., p.238.

[56] Ibid., p.239.

[57] Ibid., p.239.

[58] Ibid., pp.239–240.

[59] Ibid., p.240.

[60] Ibid., p.241.

[61] Ibid., pp.246–247.

[62] Ibid., p.246.

[63] Ibid., p.246.

[64] John Warhurst, 'In the Public Arena', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, p.157.

[65] Warhurst, 'In the Public Arena', p.156.

[66] Mark McKenna, '"I Wonder Whether I Belong": Manning Clark and the Politics of Australian History 1970–2000', *Australian Historical Studies* 122, 2003, p.369.

[67] Warhurst, 'In the Public Arena', p.156.

[68] Carl Bridge, 'Introduction', in Bridge, *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, p.3.

[69] Bridge, 'Introduction', p.1. According to McKenna, Clark is "the only Australian historian who came to enjoy national celebrity status". '"I Wonder Whether I Belong"', p.366.

[70] In Macintyre's estimation: "While his position as a writer and influential figure in Australian cultural life is assured, his professional reputation as a historian is at present less certain". Stuart Macintyre, '"Always a Pace or Two Apart"', in Bridge, *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, p.29. For Craven: "Perhaps Manning Clark, like Dickens a century ago, is capable of appearing corny to the historians who have come after him, even as they acknowledge him as great, because they are not distant enough from the embarrassing manners of their Father". Craven, 'The Ryan Affair', in Bridge, *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, p.187.

[71] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.10.

[72] Ibid., p.10.

[73] Ibid., pp.16–17.

[74] Ibid., p.95.

[75] Michael Sexton, *Illusions of Power: The Fate of a Reforming Government*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1979, p.126.

[76] Sexton, *Illusions of Power*, p.126.

[77] Ibid., p.9.

[78] Ibid., p.9.

[79] Ibid., p.262.

[80] Ross McMullin, *The Light on the Hill: The Australian Labor Party 1891–1991*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1991, p.375.

[81] Owen Hughes, 'That Was a Time', in Hugh Emy, Owen Hughes and Race Mathews, eds, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1993, p.252.

[82] Hughes, 'That Was a Time', pp.252–253.

[83] Ibid., p.253.

[84] Ibid., p.253.

[85] Ibid., p.253. Another significant personal account is Carmen Lawrence, 'Whitlamites? Impressions of a '72 Novice Voter', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, pp.96–109.

[86] Foley and Wilson, *Anatomy of a Coup*, p.23.

[87] Ibid., p.23.

[88] Ibid., p.27.

[89] Ibid., p.24.

[90] Ibid., pp.23–24.

[91] Patrick Tennison, *The Lucky Country Reborn*, p.10.

[92] Ibid., p.11.

[93] Ibid., p.7.

[94] Ibid., p.2.

[95] Ibid., p.5.

[96] Alan Reid, *The Whitlam Venture*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1976, p.39. On Reid's history as a protracted attack on Whitlam see James Walter, 'Gough Whitlam: Bursting Limitations', in Judith Brett, ed., *Political Lives*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1997, p.29.

[97] Walter, 'Gough Whitlam: Bursting Limitations', p.28.

[98] Ibid., p.28. According to Foley and Wilson, "*Time* magazine, in only the second cover story ever devoted to an Australian political leader since Sir Robert Menzies, dubbed it 'The Whitlam Whirlwind'". *Anatomy of a Coup*, p.24.

[99] Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, pp.231–232.

[100] Ibid., p.233.

[101] Stuart Macintyre, 'Temper Democratic, Bias Australian: One Hundred Years of the Australian Labor Party', *Overland* 162, 2001, p.9.

[102] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, pp.243–244. Bolton's chapter on the Whitlam government is entitled 'A Shining Aberration'.

[103] John Molony, *The Penguin Bicentennial History of Australia: The Story of 200 Years*, Viking, Ringwood, 1987.

[104] Molony, *History of Australia*, p.355.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid., p.369.

[107] Ibid., p.357.

[108] Ibid., p.358.

[109] Ibid., p.358.

[110] Ibid., p.363.

[111] Ibid., p.362.

[112] F.G. Clarke, *Australia: A Concise Political and Social History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1989, p.255.

[113] Clarke, *Australia*, p.255.

[114] Ibid., p.265.

[115] Martyn Lyons and Penny Russell, 'Introduction', in Martyn Lyons and Penny Russell, eds, *Australia's History: Themes and Debates*, UNSW Press, 2005, p.xv.

[116] Marilyn Lake, 'Affirmations of Difference', in Patricia Grimshaw, Marilyn Lake, Ann McGrath and Marion Quartly, eds, *Creating a Nation, 1788–1990*, McPhee-Gribble, Melbourne, 1994, p.305.

[117] Laksiri Jayasuriya and Jenni Cook, 'A Struggle for Equality', in Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, eds, *Making a Life: A People's History of Australia since 1788*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1988, p.173.

[118] Rickard, *Australia: A Cultural History*, p.216.

[119] Ibid., p.245.

[120] Ibid., p.247.

[121] Ibid., pp.245, 217.

[122] Lyons and Russell, 'Introduction', p.xv.

[123] Rickard, *Australia: A Cultural History*, p.244.

[124] Horne, *Time of Hope*, p.177.

[125] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.93.

[126] Ibid., p.93.

[127] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.216.

[128] Stuart Macintyre, 'Whitlam' in Graeme Davison, John Hurst and Stuart Macintyre, eds, *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1998, p.684.

[129] Macintyre, *A Concise History of Australia*, p.235.

[130] Race Mathews, 'Introduction', *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, p.14.

[131] Hughes, 'That Was a Time', p.253.

[132] Molony, *History of Australia*, p.370.

[133] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.95.

[134] Molony, *History of Australia*, p.355.

[135] Macintyre, 'Temper Democratic, Bias Australian', p.8.

[136] Hocking and Lewis, 'Thirty Years Later', p.5.

[137] Gordon Bilney's 1986 assessment remains accurate: "No Australian government has been as exhaustively analysed: how and why it came to power, what it did and failed to do, how it fell". Bilney, 'The Whitlam Government: Some Personal Reflections', in the Australian Fabian Society, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, p.17. See also Hocking and Lewis, 'Thirty Years Later', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.1: "The thirtieth anniversary of the election of the Whitlam Government on 2 December 2002 was marked by an extraordinary level of media coverage. It is difficult to imagine any other government or any other Prime Minister whose tenure continues to attract such intense debate thirty years later".

[138] According to James Walter, for example, "political observers" have written "more about Whitlam than about any other Australian Prime Minister". Walter, 'Gough Whitlam', in Brett, *Political Lives*, p.29.

[139] See Nathan Hollier, 'From Hope to Disillusion? The Legacy of the Whitlam Government in Australian Policy and Culture', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, pp.414–443.

[140] Ron Eyerman's historically, sociologically and phenomenologically sensitive study of intellectuals is the most sophisticated and comprehensive work on this category. For Eyerman, "intellectuals are first of all that social category which performs the task of making conscious and visible the fundamental notions of a society". And in a later extrapolation he argues that the intellectual is best conceived of as "an emergent role, constructed by individual actors within historical contexts that condition, but do not determine, its form and content". He presents this as "a creative process in which various 'intellectual' traditions serve as resources, providing ideals and models from the past, which contemporary actors make use of". "These traditions", he goes on to say, "can either be sources of inspiration, models of what an intellectual should be like, or serve as foils against which alternatives can be formed". Ron Eyerman, *Between Culture and Politics: Intellectuals in Modern Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994, pp.6, 187.

[141] David McLellan, *Ideology* (second edn), Open University Press, Buckingham, 1995, p.1.

[142] McLellan, *Ideology*, p.2.

[143] Ibid.

[144] Jurgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (original German publication 1962), Polity Press, Cambridge, 1989, p.27.

[145] Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, p.15.

[146] McLellan, *Ideology*, p.3.

[147] McLellan lists this first use as having taken place in 1797, but Raymond Williams quotes Taylor referring to Destutt de Tracy's use of the word in 1796. See Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana, Glasgow, 1975, p.126.

[148] McLellan, *Ideology*, p.5.

[149] Ibid., p.6.

[150] For an influential statement of this general argument see M.H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1953.

[151] Quoted in E.L. Griggs, ed., *Collected Letters of Samuel Tayler Coleridge* (volume II), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1956–71, p.709.

[152] Hegel was born in 1770, the same year as Wordsworth and Beethoven. On Hegel and German Idealism see Tom Rockmore, *Before and After Hegel: An Historical Introduction to Hegel's Thought*, Berkeley and London, University of California Press, 1992.

[153] McLellan, *Ideology*, pp.6–7.

[154] See McLellan, *Ideology*, pp.7–8.

[155] Ibid., p.6.

[156] See for example Lucien Goldmann, *Method in the Sociology of Literature* (William Q. Boelhower, trans. and ed.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1981.

[157] McLellan, *Ideology*, p.82.

[158] Ibid., pp.82–83.

[159] Ibid., p.83.

[160] For a sophisticated and still instructive development of this idea see R.W. Connell, 'Crisis Tendencies in Patriarchy and Capitalism', in Connell, *Which Way is Up? Essays on Class, Sex and Culture*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1983, pp.33–49.

[161] For a discussion of the role of these insights in Marx's thought see Daniel R. Fusfeld, *The Age of the Economist* (sixth edn), Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education, Glenview and London, 1990, p.66.

[162] Connell, 'Crisis Tendencies in Patriarchy and Capitalism', p.34.

[163] For a concise account of the concept of culture see Williams, *Keywords*, pp.76–82. Questions of cultural definition will be dealt with in detail in chapter two of this thesis.

[164] This belief has both left and right-wing implications. Margaret Thatcher, who would presumably have seen herself as a very cultured person, famously suggested that there is no such thing as society, only the individual and the family. For her, culture was about binding people who shared different political interests into a common national identity, one supportive of the political status quo, on the basis of their common human or common British experience.

[165] See Williams, *Keywords*, p.77.

[166] For an account of the place of 'culture' within the French Enlightenment see again Williams, *Keywords*.

[167] Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (1961), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965, p.62.

[168] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.62.

[169] Ibid., pp.62–63.

[170] Connell productively applies Noam Chomsky's analysis of generative grammar to an understanding of class, and this mode of thinking is applicable here. On Connell's 'generative' definition of class see his *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture: Studies of Conflict, Power and Hegemony in Australian Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977, pp.1–7. On the role of this concept in Connell's thought see Demetris Demetriou, 'Towards a Genealogy of R.W. Connell's Notion of "Structure"', in Nathan Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia: The Power, Politics and Privilege of the New Ruling Class*, Australian Scholarly Press, Melbourne, 2004, pp.24–44.

[171] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.61.

[172] Ibid., p.62.

[173] Ibid., p.63.

[174] Ibid., p.70.

[175] Ibid., p.63.

[176] Andrew Milner, *Literature, Culture and Society* (second edn), Routledge, London, 2005, p.41.

[177] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.61.

[178] Ibid., p.61.

[179] Ibid., p.62.

[180] Milner, *Literature, Culture and Society*, p.41.

[181] Ibid.

[182] Ibid.

[183] Ibid., p.33.

[184] "The study of literature takes its place somewhere between history and philosophy". John McLaren, *Australian Literature: An Historical Introduction*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1989, p.vii.

[185] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.63.

[186] Ibid., p.64.

[187] Ibid., p.63.

[188] Ibid.

[189] Ibid., p.64.

[190] Ibid.

[191] Ibid.

[192] Ibid.

[193] Ibid., pp.64–65.

[194] Ibid., p.65.

[195] Perhaps the best general history of this period, and one which complements the thought of Williams, is Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789 – 1848* (1962), Abacus, London, 2003.

[196] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.10.

[197] Ibid., p.10.

[198] Ibid., p.11.

[199] Ibid., pp.11–12.

[200] Ibid., p.12.

Chapter One

Reading Whitlam and Whitlamism: The Role of Ideology

In this thesis I am primarily concerned with identifying and clarifying the specific cultural origins of Whitlamite social democracy and Australian neo-classical liberalism. In order to demonstrate the need for and value of this project, however, it must be established that there is a genuine ideological deadlock over historical interpretations of what has been termed 'the Whitlam period': that interpretations of this period are shaped in fundamental ways by power. That is what I attempt to do in this chapter. Once the role of power in shaping historical interpretation and popular perception is made clear, the primary need for an examination of the origins of that power becomes apparent.

As set out in the introduction, it is generally accepted that the hopes that had been dominant within Australian society between 1966 and 1975 came to an end through four main developments: the dismissal of Whitlam; the defeat of the Whitlam-led ALP at the federal elections of 13 December; the arrival of a new, neo-classical liberal public-policy framework, via Treasury, Malcolm Fraser and the Liberal Party, based on a pessimistic view of human nature, social reality and the prospects for social planning, democratic or otherwise; and through a deterioration of global economic conditions. However, there is no agreement as to why these events and developments occurred. In this chapter it is argued that ideology played a central role in the coming to an end of this period of hope. Legal and economic factors were secondary to political factors at each level of this dramatic change in the nature of Australian society. Moreover, ideology also clearly continues to influence perceptions of this period. Intellectuals tend to interpret the fate of this government and its policies in terms of their understanding of whether or not the adoption of a neo-classical liberal public policy framework was historically inevitable. Also, within the most politically powerful institutions of the public sphere – the mass media – a conservative, neo-classical liberal interpretation of the Whitlam period dominates. Because it stands as contemporary Australia's prime historical Other, arguments over this earlier period remain especially frequent and heated, and a clear

picture of the internal dynamics and external forces impacting upon this earlier Australian society remains especially difficult to obtain.

Ideology and the Law: The Dismissal

In *Matters for Judgement*, the book he wrote in order to place his side of the story of the Dismissal on the public record, Sir John Kerr argued that as Governor-General his role was that of a neutral arbiter between the government and opposition.[1] The decision to dismiss the Whitlam government, he argues, was forced upon him by the fact that the government was unable to obtain supply – money – and was refusing to call a general election to resolve the deadlock.[2] The decision to appoint a caretaker government, that of Malcolm Fraser's Liberal-Country Party Coalition, was in Kerr's view legitimate because Fraser had agreed to ensure that supply would then be granted and a general election immediately called. In the immediate term government could go on (because supply was ensured) and in the short term the people could be given an opportunity to resolve the issue at an election. In Kerr's summary:

> The Senate, where the Government did not have a majority, in October 1975 denied supply to the Government ... The Prime Minister, instead of yielding as he had done eighteen months previously when denial of supply had been threatened, embarked on a course of attempting to govern without supply, whereas it is the responsibility of the Government to obtain supply in order to provide for the ordinary annual services of government and to meet its other commitments. If it cannot, it must let the people decide at an election what is to happen.[3]

"Failing a compromise", he continues, "or retreat by one side or the other, it was only by my having recourse to the reserve powers of the Crown that the situation could be resolved and the whole issue placed in the hands of the electorate for decision".[4] Kerr also states that he was concerned by the fact that in the face of the Opposition's refusal to grant supply the Whitlam government was considering obtaining funds through non-traditional channels, such as with loans from Australia's private banks.[5] Throughout his book, Kerr portrays his own actions as having been driven by his felt primary duty to 'the people'.[6] He emphasises that he was following the law and contends that his actions were politically neutral, that his chosen course was the rational one and that the overall

outcomes, in the face of Whitlam's intransigence, were inevitable.[7] Whitlam is depicted as irrational, emotional and arrogant, and the crowds of people who protested against Kerr's actions are seen as extremist violent thugs.[8]

Kerr's actions, then, are based on an assumption that it is legally more important for a government to be able to obtain finance than for that government to be democratically elected. As he writes: "Mr Fraser, while strongly defending the constitutionality of what had been done [i.e. the Dismissal], refused to be diverted during the [1975 federal election] campaign from economic issues".[9] The implicit suggestion here is that the economic issues were more important than legal ones. But there is no precedent for this ostensibly legal decision; it is an entirely arbitrary one. There is also obviously no way that Kerr could have known whether or not one of the sides of politics would have backed down during this deadlock by the time supply ran out on 30 November. If only one non-government Senator had decided to 'cross the floor' and vote with the government in order that the government could obtain funds to govern – a not unlikely prospect – then the constitutional crisis would have been democratically resolved.[10]

Moreover, it could be argued that the proper role of the Governor-General within the Australian political system is not the role of the Crown's arbiter between the Government and Opposition – not the role of the Queen's umpire in an Australian political football match – but rather to be the servant of the Government and Prime Minister, the party and the leader who have obtained power through obtaining a majority in the most democratic of the Australian Houses of Parliament: the House of Representatives. This had in fact been the established procedure at the federal level prior to the Governor-Generalship of Kerr, and it was widely assumed that as Australia was an independent nation the Crown's representative no longer had power to act against the Australian government on the Crown's authority.[11] Kerr derides this interpretation of the role of the Governor-General as the "rubber-stamp theory", sounding incredulous that anyone could suggest such a minor political role for himself: "A focal question: Is the Governor-General, under the Constitution, a robot, a rubber stamp, a cipher? ... Did Mr Whitlam have such a concept of the office in mind when he nominated me for it? Did he aspire to reduce the office to such a level?".[12] "The rubber-stamp theory" complains

Kerr, "negates the existence of the reserve powers, of all vice-regal personal discretion".[13] But why there should be vice-regal discretion in a democracy is not made clear; another name for the 'rubber-stamp' theory could be 'the democratic theory', since the government and the Prime Minister are elected and the Governor-General is not. Plainly the Dismissal was legal because Australia was not in fact a sovereign nation, with complete control over its own affairs, though Kerr denies this. Rather, Kerr's unilateral act becomes profoundly democratic, because although the Governor-General attains his or her authority from the Crown, in a tortured use of logic he or she supposedly acts in the interests of the people.[14] For Kerr, the British monarch and the Australian people are essentially one. This medieval notion is in the contemporary world as illogical as it is unconvincing.[15]

Though Kerr appointed Fraser and his Liberal-Country Party Coalition as a caretaker government on the proviso that Fraser could obtain supply and would immediately call a federal election, there was no reason why Fraser and his political colleagues need necessarily carry out their side of this 'gentleman's agreement'. Fraser could upon appointment have requested Queen Elizabeth II to recall her representative in Australia, appointed a new, politically quiescent Governor-General, and proceeded to attempt to govern with a minority in the House of Representatives. This minority after all did not impede the Coalition government between 11 November and 13 December 1975, in spite of the fact that on 11 November the ALP used its numbers to pass a motion of no confidence in the government.[16] As Kerr knew, it was extremely unlikely that Fraser would choose to take this option, but it was unlikely because this would be against Fraser's obvious political interests rather than because it was legally or constitutionally impossible. Similarly, while Kerr argues that the alternative sources of finance the Whitlam government was interested in obtaining may have been illegal, he did not wait for a legal decision on the matter but took action on the basis of his subjective views about which sources of finance were best.

When the Whitlam government was hampered by an obstructionist Senate in its first term Whitlam had gone back to the electorate seeking a mandate at the elections of 18 May 1974. But at that election Whitlam had been unable to obtain a majority in the Senate. With the worsening economic conditions and a more strident attack on the

government coming from the mass media, it was unlikely that if Whitlam had called another general election in November 1975 his government would have been able to attain a majority in the Senate. This would have meant that the Liberal-Country Party Coalition could easily have gone on rejecting Labor legislation and again refused to grant supply. Government would in practical terms become, as it had to a significant degree already, impossible. A perception of governmental incompetence could be created and, especially via a hostile mass media, propagandised. The fact that Whitlam had gone back to the polls once already within his short period of government should have lent weight to his claim that his government had a right to serve out its full term. Kerr's simplistic assertion that his use of the reserve powers would bring about a democratic resolution to the political and constitutional crisis is therefore either facetious or ignorant.

Finally, in choosing to dismiss the Whitlam government Kerr did not intervene in a politically neutral way. Rather, his actions contributed to public perceptions that the Whitlam government was either incompetent or corrupt. As Donald Horne argues persuasively, Kerr intervened to advance the interests of one side of politics at the expense of the other:

> What happened? This: The Governor-General secretly made a decision, the effect of which was to support the political plans of the Liberal and National Country Parties. Against all contemporary practice he did not discuss that decision with the government that was then in power. But having contemplated the decision secretly he secretly got for it the support of the Chief Justice, a person of no more constitutional significance in this matter than you or me, but one whose respected office could seem to give extra authority to what the Governor-General had decided. The Governor-General then mounted a time-tabled operation, for which the phrase 'constitutional *coup d'etat*' seems a useful description. It was an operation which had the general effect of leaving the Prime Minister with a false sense of security, then, without discussing any alternatives, kicking him out of office, installing the minority leader as Prime Minister, then dissolving Parliament. It all happened so quickly that no preventive action could be taken.[17]

"Never before", Horne concludes, "has an Australian Governor-General intervened in a way that so much favoured one party and so threatened another".[18] And he makes the vital point that "by the second half of 1975, the Labor government was adjusting itself to these new circumstances" of global economic crisis: "A few months free of political

crisis and Labor's economic ministers might have been seen by a significant margin of voters as economic managers who were sounder (as well as more humane) than the Opposition was likely to be. For the Liberals, it was vital that Labor should not have time to do this".[19] Coincidentally or otherwise, the side of politics that Kerr acted to advance was the side which traditionally accepted and embraced Australia's political subservience to the Crown, Kerr's source of power. How, after all, can a representative of the Crown ultimately be politically neutral, as Kerr claimed himself to be?

It seems that personal factors also played a part in Kerr's decisions and actions. He obviously felt slighted or insufficiently respected by Whitlam and there is an evident desire on Kerr's part to assert himself personally against Whitlam. He bridles at what he feels to be Whitlam's attempt to reduce him to a "robot, a rubber stamp, a cipher" and at Whitlam's apparent contempt for his office: "Did he", Kerr asks, "aspire to reduce the office to such a level?" Responding to having been called 'Judas' by post-11 November protestors, Kerr retorts: "Judas, as most people must surely know, was the disciple who betrayed Christ for thirty pieces of silver. Where is the Messiah whose disciple I am supposed to have been? To whom or to what cause can it be claimed I was a traitor? Can anyone seriously claim that I was or should have been Mr Whitlam's disciple".[20] According to Elizabeth Reid, Whitlam's advisor on women's issues, Kerr tried to woo her romantically prior to dismissing Whitlam, with the claim that he, rather than Whitlam, was the most powerful man in Australia, and even boasted to her about his Dismissal plans.[21]

Linked to this personal difference between Kerr and Whitlam is an important political difference. It seems likely that Whitlam did not respect the office of Governor-General to the degree that Kerr thought proper because this was not at all a democratic office and Whitlam was most fundamentally a democrat. For Kerr, on the other hand, royal power properly remained an important source of power within Australian society. As he writes: "Basic to my position was that I am a convinced constitutional monarchist, as the Monarchy exists under the Constitution in Australia".[22] Kerr sees his actions in heroic terms; he was fighting courageously against the mob to restore law and some kind of natural social order. He writes of being subjected to a "two-pronged assault" by "violence and by vilification", after the Dismissal, part of "a defined strategy, the object

of which was to make it impossible for me to stay in office. The intention was either to

make me a prisoner in [his official residence of] Yarralumla or to break my spirit so that I

could not carry on. My counter-strategy was to accept every invitation I could. I would

never have resigned in the face of aggression".[23] The run-of-the-mill 'violence' of

protestors, throwing paint at Kerr's car, for instance, is seized upon by him as a sign of

his own supposed heroism. Upon his decision in 1977 to resign his position as Governor-

General, he writes with similar melodrama: "Certainly no one could credibly claim that I

had gone defeated under attack".[24] There is the sense of a reward being obtained in his

proud recollection: "Shortly after the [1975] election my wife and I left for London so

that I could personally report to the Queen. During the visit we had the privilege of

spending a snowy January weekend as guests of Her Majesty at Sandringham".[25] Later,

without any real context, he launches into an account of the royal and quasi-royal

honours bestowed upon him in 1977 after his part in the constitutional *coup*:

> I was sworn in as a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council at a meeting
> presided over by the Queen at Yarralumla. During an audience on board
> the *Britannia* in Fremantle harbour Her Majesty invested me as a Knight
> Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order. (I had previously, in 1975
> when the Queen established the Order of Australia of which she is
> Sovereign, become the first Chancellor and a Companion of the Order and
> later, when the rank of knighthood was introduced, the first Knight of the
> Order of Australia. In 1976 Her Majesty had promoted me to the rank of
> Knight Grand Cross in the Order of St Michael and St George.
> Throughout my Governor-Generalship I was Prior in Australia and a
> Knight of the Order of St John of Jerusalem and in April 1977 was
> awarded the Grand Cross of Merit of the Sovereign and Military Order of
> Malta, the Catholic Order which exists in brotherly relationship with The
> Order of St John).[26]

The point appears to be to suggest to his readers the high esteem he is held in by the most

important of people. Clearly, Kerr did not see himself as Whitlam's underling because he

did not see the monarchy as democracy's underling.

Ideology and Democracy

It may seem unnecessary to argue that political ideology played a part in the 13

December 1975 federal election results. However, it does need to be stressed that the

political process within this election campaign was manipulated by power to a degree that was and remains unprecedented in Australian history, partly because political conservatives from Kerr onwards have pointed to this federal election landslide as evidence of the Australian electorate's purportedly fundamental antipathy toward Whitlam, Whitlamism and the welfare-state model of public policy and government, of which the Whitlam government was the last Australian representative. Within this popular narrative – enunciated for example by Paul Kelly – the end of Whitlamism and the new dominance of a neo-classical liberal public policy framework reflect an essentially rational and democratic public and governmental response to a new set of social conditions.[27]

However, although it was constitutionally entitled to serve out its full term of government and had obtained a renewed mandate once already within its relatively brief period of office (in May 1974), Whitlam's government was not given the opportunity of choosing the timing for its next election campaign.[28] In spite of the difficult economic conditions it had faced and the numerous political 'scandals' it had suffered, opinion polls clearly demonstrated that in late 1975, prior to its dismissal, the Whitlam government was regaining electoral support.[29] Then Labor was forced to run its campaign in the shadow of having been dismissed. As Donald Horne notes, "after the constitutional *coup d'état* the quick plebiscitary election was conducted in unparalleled circumstances in which Labor could seem a guilty party dismissed by rightful authority".[30] With the exception of the ABC, the owners and senior managers of the mass media aligned themselves with the conservatives, meaning that the new Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser was not questioned in any thorough-going way, while an ongoing, vehement attack on Whitlam, his government and his party, continued.[31] The mass-media assault was led by a feral Murdoch press, with Murdoch personally initiating and enforcing a blanket editorial opposition to Whitlam and Labor.[32] Such was the interference by Murdoch in his staff's reporting of politics that News Ltd printers and journalists were moved to go on strike. This strike, as Bridget Griffen-Foley notes, "was the first stoppage in Australian journalistic history over the handling of politics in a particular media outlet".[33] Though the news media had in the years leading up to these events enjoyed a relatively high degree of respect and admiration within society,[34] Keith

Windschuttle argued in 1988 that the press generally had yet to recover its public credibility after its 1975 treatment of the Whitlam-led ALP.[35]

In November 1974 Kerr made known to Murdoch his belief that he had the power to dismiss the elected government, perhaps to encourage Murdoch – via his newspaper editors – to call for this unprecedented action and so provide a veneer of 'public' demand and legal legitimacy for it.[36] The Labor election campaign, based on an assertion that the Dismissal constituted a profound threat to Australian democracy and could not be allowed to stand as the basis for a government, was not given substantial consideration within the mass media. Reasoned and critical debate as a whole took a backseat in the election campaign, to a degree that was at the time unprecedented. Corporate donations to the conservatives and corporate-funded advertising and public relations 'spin' also reached a new high and a new level of sophistication.[37] The general media attack on the Labor government and the Labor side of politics was not a reflection of any popular renunciation of Labor (as can be seen from the increasing popularity of the Whitlam government prior to the Dismissal in late 1975), but rather a reflection of the fact that an increasing number of the most powerful people within Australia were angered by the policies of Whitlam and believed that this government could no longer be tolerated. As R.W. Connell wrote on the day of the Dismissal:

> If there remained any lingering doubt about the class nature of Australian politics, the events of late 1975 must have resolved it. There is hardly a clearer case, in the recent history of the 'western democracies', of the way a threatened ruling class is able to mobilise fragments of state power, business connections, financial resources, and the legitimacy given them by the dominant culture, in a campaign to remove an offending government.[38]

In his comprehensive, detailed and sophisticated account of this 'mobilisation', Connell demonstrates how the class-based structure and nature of Australian society worked against the capacity of the Whitlam government – and by implication, any government – to advance politically progressive policy via the existing democratic process.[39] That is, the Whitlam government's interest in using the democratic process to initiate progressive social change brought it into direct conflict with the interests of the most powerful groups in society. By the end of 1973 for example, some businessmen

were complaining about no longer having the degree of special access to government that they had enjoyed in the past: "The president of the Associated Stock Exchanges ... complained in October 1973 that he had not seen a minister for three weeks!".[40] The mining sector was publicly hostile to the obvious interest of Rex Connor, Minister for Minerals and Energy, in establishing a major Australian-government owned mining company, "buying and distributing fuels, undertaking exploration and presumably production in its own right".[41] "Mining executives traded insults with the government, and continued to abuse it through 1975", Connell records; and he adds: "This sentiment no doubt was part of the reason behind the huge outcry over the government's overseas loan fiasco in 1975, involving money that seems to have been intended to finance Connor's projects".[42] The farming sector reacted against Whitlam's stress on urban issues: "It was not long before conservative politicians were stumping the countryside about the government's war on farmers, to some effect: they took three country seats from Labor in the 1974 election, tipping Grassby, one of the government's most popular figures, out of his Riverina seat".[43] The year 1973 saw a revival of extreme right and doctrinaire free-enterprise rhetoric: "'Creeping socialism', 'centralism' (a term carried over from the days of Gorton, now much favoured by conservative state premiers) and government 'interference' with business were now often heard of".[44] These complaints, Connell goes on to note,

> were even *seen*, as cartoon images of the government as a snooping bureaucrat began to pepper the propaganda of business and professional groups. The Australian Medical Association and the General Practitioners' Society in their struggle with Hayden over medical insurance gave good play to these ideas, as did the Bank of NSW in its attack on the AIDC proposals in early 1974, and the insurance companies in 1975. Most important, they were picked up by [then Liberal leader] Snedden, who very probably interpreted this rhetoric as a sign of a new business mobilisation, and certainly took a more doctrinaire position than the Liberal leadership had done since the early 1950s.[45]

Connell points out further that this "ideological offensive ... launched by some sections of business" came mostly from:

> groups of business ideologues organised in 'non-political' associations, like the Institute of Public Affairs in NSW (somewhat less militantly from the separate IPA in Victoria), and the NSW Constitutional League; and

(from) peak associations such as the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce and the Associated Chambers of Commerce. There was also a vigorous fundamentalist response from businessmen like (John) Singleton ... and the iron magnate (Lang) Hancock.[46]

Between 1973 and 1975 there was "the growth of a cadre of business 'spokesmen' and a wider use of public relations techniques both by individual companies and by industry groups: miners, advertising, and employer organisations as a whole".[47] This was in response to the fact that, "as a CRA executive put it in 1974 ... the public image of big business was low".[48]

At a more fundamental level, Connell explains, Kerr's dismissal "itself was made possible by another instance of ruling-class opposition to the government. For it was the refusal of the private banks to accept a temporary finance arrangement that finally broke its delaying strategy and gave Kerr occasion to dismiss it".[49] Moreover, "the stock market, a sensitive if oblique indicator of the state of mind of capitalists, jumped 17 points on the day Whitlam was dismissed, and had previously twitched upwards at every rumour of trouble in the government".[50] Part of Connell's argument is that within capitalist society, the capitalist class generally has structural political advantages over other classes, and that this structural power was used to dislodge the Whitlam government.[51]

Ideology and Economic Policy: Fraser's Liberals and Neo-classical Liberalism

"Like many of his generation", Bolton writes, "Whitlam had been inspired when young by the example of Franklin Roosevelt and the American New Deal, and this was a model for which Australia seemed ready in 1972".[52] As David Kemp suggests, Whitlam's social-democratic government was in many ways a logical outcome of a public-policy framework based on the thought of John Maynard Keynes.[53] That is, once President Roosevelt implemented the Keynesian 'New Deal', as a response to the 1930s Depression and the threat of communism,[54] accepting and widely propagating the view that government had the capability, the right and the responsibility to ensure full employment, it was inevitable that the demands on government to ensure greater levels of social equality, by curbing the individualistic behaviour of individuals (especially those

powerful individuals whose behaviour tended to have social effects), would increase. For this reason, Kemp contends, it was during the Whitlam government that the tensions within Australian liberalism came to the fore, and the Keynesian, interventionist liberalism of Snedden, McMahon, Gorton, Holt, and Menzies was displaced by the neo-classical liberalism of Malcolm Fraser.[55]

Kemp states that *The Road to Serfdom* (1944), by Friedrich Hayek, was along with Keynes' *General Theory* (1936) a key text for Australian liberal thought and debate in the postwar period.[56] It was from this and other books of Hayek and philosophically aligned economists, philosophers and commentators – especially Milton Friedman, who visited Australia on a highly publicised speaking tour in 1975 – that the Australian radical liberals developed a philosophical foundation for the destruction of Whitlamite social democracy and Keynesian public policy.[57] The Whitlam government was the last, in the Australian context, to be guided by the principles of social-democratic Keynesianism.[58]

The foundation of Keynes's economic theory was his observation and demonstration that at the macro level the modern economy did not function in the way that it was supposed to according to classical economics.[59] More specifically, Keynes argued that at the macro level markets do not naturally tend towards a state of equilibrium, as the classical model of perfect competition asserts.[60] He therefore saw government as having a necessary role to play in correcting chronic market failure and ensuring the proper functioning of the economy. The implication of this finding was that the creation of private profit should ultimately be subservient to social goals and the democratic process. For Keynes, the economy and society were closely dependent upon each other. Accordingly, the primary policy goal of Keynesian economics was the creation of 'positive freedom', which, put another way, is the overcoming of structural disadvantage – inequality – arising from market failure. Whitlam's economic and social policy was broadly based on Keynesian thought, as his own account attests: "I strove to relate the principal elements of the (policy) program to what I have called the doctrine of positive equality".[61] Whitlam's whole approach to policy, as he goes on to relate, is based on this Keynesian world view:

> increasingly, a citizen's real standard of living, the health of himself [sic, throughout] and his family, his children's opportunity for education and self-improvement, his access to employment opportunities, his ability to

enjoy the nation's resources for recreation and cultural activity, his legacy from the national heritage, his scope to participate in the decisions and actions of the community, are determined not so much by his income but by the availability and accessibility of the services which the community alone can provide and ensure. The quality of life depends less and less on the things which individuals obtain for themselves and can purchase for themselves from their personal incomes and depends more and more on the things which the community provides for all its members from the combined resources of the community.[62]

The policy approach of Keynes and Whitlam had its origins in the European Enlightenment, and the Enlightenment belief that it is possible to know the world and take rational steps to improve it for the benefit of all.[63] The right-wing liberal thinkers who rejected Keynesian analysis and philosophy, however, drew upon pre-Enlightenment and pre-democratic strands of thought, arguing that it is not possible for government or other *groups* of people to change society for the benefit of everyone. As Richard Cockett notes, Hayek, Friedman and other germinal thinkers of what became known as the New Right, gathered as early as 1938, in Paris, "to mourn the end of liberal, even civilised, society as they understood it".[64] "Keynes", Cockett writes, "had done more than any other single individual" to bring them there.[65] These neo-classical liberal thinkers never accepted the legitimacy of government intervention in and control of the economy and from the 1930s set out to find evidence that the economy does function at the macro level in essentially the same way that it does at the micro level – in general accordance with the model of perfect competition – and so to destroy the theoretical basis for government intervention in the economy. The neo-classical liberals wished to overturn the assumption that the pursuit of private property should ultimately be subservient to any democratic process, and they argued that market 'failure' was in fact nothing more than the *product* of government intervention. Neo-classical liberal policy is built around the goal of destroying positive freedom – seen as an inherently unjust and subtly but powerfully enslaving concept arising from unwarranted government interference – and institutionalising 'negative freedom': freedom from government intervention.[66]

Though the Fraser government did not introduce the New Right public policy agenda to the extent that many on the far right would have liked – this dubious honour being left to Hawke, Keating and Howard – the Fraser government platform was strongly

based on this philosophy in the elections of 1975.[67] While many have argued that the primary attraction of Friedman's monetarism and neo-classical liberal public policy, to political leaders, was the promise of a cure for the high inflation afflicting the world economy between the early 1970s and early 1980s,[68] Michael Pusey notes that neo-classical liberal public policy was originally "packaged" as a *political* response to new problems of social management: "In the mid 1970s ... elite opinion in the developed Western nations came to the judgement that these nations were drifting dangerously into 'ungovernability'".[69] He explains:

> Corporate sector profits and the profit share of national income had been falling steadily from the end of World War Two to the late 1970s ... and Keynesian economic policies were producing too many perverse effects. The view from the top was that the great postwar boom was threatening the very stability of democratic governance by generating too much contestation, and too many 'irresponsible demands' for higher wages and living standards and for *more* consumption and *more* publicly provided services.[70]

In response to these problems, Pusey writes, came the New Right:

> In 1975 libertarian and neo-conservative politics were first packaged as a *political* program for the reform of whole nation societies in *The Crisis of Democracy: A Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*. The diagnosis was clear: 'an excess of democracy means a deficit in governability'. The 'ungovernability of societies is a cultural failure'. Democracy is failing because governments are weighed down with an 'overload' of contradictory and 'irresponsible' demands. These were 'the disruptive effects of continuous growth' and of the excessive and 'incompatible' claims of citizens. The cure? Less, and more austere, government. And much more stern discipline from the markets.[71]

This "new policy dispensation", Pusey continues, "had clear priorities":

> Strong political leaders must take charge of public policy and bring bureaucracy to heel. They must bring the critical media into line and under corporate control. The trade unions and organised labour would be exposed to market discipline. Public debate must be managed more effectively, from the top down. The restructuring of higher education would need to mortify the 'disruptive value intellectuals' and give more scope to 'action' education, promoted as a business and for business. Variously, by recommendation and implication, the new leaders must impose fiscal discipline, slash government spending, eliminate budget deficits and widen the reach of corporations in every area of society.[72]

Pusey argues then that rather than being a response to economic crisis, neo-classical liberal public policy is a response to relative economic abundance; and to the resultant breakdown of the work ethic and traditional lines of social authority within the postwar welfare-state long boom.[73] As Greg Whitwell has noted: "The 1970s saw the dissolution of a whole host of what were thought to be 'usual' or 'traditional' relationships".[74]

The perception, widespread among both defenders and critics of neo-classical liberal public policy, that the Keynesian public policy framework of the Whitlam government could not explain or provide a remedy for stagflation, is incorrect. Tim Battin argues convincingly, for example, that although the great majority of political leaders and bureaucrats within western democracies during the period of the Keynesian public-policy consensus did believe that inflation and unemployment existed in an inverse relationship, the piece of analysis upon which this assumption wrested – namely the 'Phillips curve' of A.W. Phillips – was not developed by Keynes and was not in any proper sense 'Keynesian'.[75] In any case, economists influenced by Keynes quickly added analyses of how cost- as well as price-levels could induce inflation and made allowance for the impact of policy 'lags', pointed out by monetarists and neo-classical liberals, thereby effectively negating the monetarist and neo-classical liberal critique of Keynesianism.[76] As the chief architect of Australia's postwar reconstruction, H.C. Coombs, argued in his autobiography: "The modifications to the Keynesian model which have been necessary to incorporate the importance of money and to preserve its relevance have not invalidated it – there has been no need for a 'paradigm shift' of the kind which has become necessary in physics to comprehend contemporary observations".[77] Pusey contends too that it is possible that "the state apparatus can develop the intellectual capacity to read, accept and reconcile the complexity of demands that are inherent in the reproduction of society".[78] The attempt by the Whitlam government to introduce legislation enabling it to control prices and incomes demonstrated some awareness of this and a continuing commitment to the basic principles of Keynesian public policy.[79]

Ideology and Economic Crises

It is undoubtedly the case that the global economy did enter a period of great difficulty and uncertainty in 1973 – stagflation, in particular, was unprecedented – and that Australian political leaders, like others around the world, had to respond to these new and somewhat frightening economic conditions.[80] Although parts of the world economy have since 1973 experienced high and even very high levels of growth, at times for protracted periods, there has not been a global pattern of strong, stable and socially equitable economic growth, comparable to that which occurred in the postwar 'long boom'.[81] And as there is no consensus on why the Anglo-American nations, in particular, embraced neo-classical liberal public policy in the wake of the 1973 crisis, there is also no consensus as to why this crisis, and the subsequent, long-term phenomena of slowed world growth and increased economic inequality and insecurity, within and between nations, occurred.

For scholars influenced by monetarism and neo-classical liberalism the primary reason for stagflation lay with Keynesian public policy, which placed undue restrictions on the individual and the market and inevitably, in the long run, both stifled growth and created unsustainable inflationary pressures.[82] Such thinkers do not see the relative inequality and insecurity of the present as a problem, though they do argue that growth rates would be higher if government interference in and other restrictions on market forces were removed. Some scholars influenced by Keynes agreed with the neo-classical liberals that the problems of 1973 arose from the fact that governments had become too involved in the economy. While rejecting the monetarist and neo-classical liberal dictum that government should seek to wholly remove itself from the economy and society, these scholars accepted some of the limitations identified with economic planning – especially the problem of 'lags' – as well as the need for greater micro-economic reform, for more market 'discipline'.[83] Other scholars influenced by Keynes argued that the 1973 implosion resulted from the fact that governments had failed to put in place the more comprehensive forms of planning that Keynes had thought necessary, and pointed to social and political (including military) factors impacting upon the economic realm.[84] Marxists and others emphasising the historical importance of class relations and struggle have seen the shift to neo-classical liberal public policy as either a manifestation of a new

phase of capitalist production (in which the importance of new forms of information technology, enabling a new degree of mobility for capital and a shift from labour to capital-intensive industry, is foregrounded)[85] or as a new political basis for ostensibly democratic social management.[86] Other scholars argue that the period of postwar growth came to an end because the public policy of this time was premised on an industrial model of social advancement which had become environmentally unsustainable.[87]

What can be said with confidence, however, is that the primary factor impacting upon the final shape of the agreement on global economic (more specifically, demand) management reached at the 1944 conference of the leaders of the US, Britain and their allies, at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, was the political desire of the US administration to maintain its global economic and political supremacy. As Robbie Robertson writes:

> In 1944 at Bretton Woods (Keynes) argued that post-war recovery depended on more than just postwar reconstruction. The new postwar order, he said, had specifically 'to develop the resources and production capacity of ... less developed countries, to [raise] the standard of life and the conditions of labour everywhere, [and] to make the resources of the world more fully available to mankind everywhere'. But his advice went unheeded, drowned out by the exigencies of Cold War [sic] and by America's determination to profit most from its new global strategies.[88]

Michael Stewart explains further: "To Keynes, Britain's chief negotiator at Bretton Woods, it seemed essential that in the postwar era countries should not be forced by temporary balance of payments difficulties to deflate their economies in an effort to reduce their import bill: this would create unnecessary unemployment both at home and abroad".[89] Rather, "they should ... possess or be able to borrow enough foreign exchange to tide them over ... until things improved".[90] Accordingly, Keynes proposed the establishment of what he called an 'International Clearing Union'. This would create credit in a world context in much the same way that a central bank creates credit in a national context.[91] This scheme was conceived on a major scale: total overdraft facilities would amount to around $26 billion, equivalent to half the value of world imports in 1948.[92]

The American negotiators could see some benefits to this policy approach: ensuring a decent level of global demand would ensure a market for US exports,[93] while

increased economic security and equality would minimise the attractiveness of political and economic overtures from the Soviet Union within the looming Cold War.[94] But overall, according to Stewart, "the Americans did not like Keynes' plan".[95] The personal accounts of Bretton Woods conference negotiators and observers bear this out.[96] And Stewart reasons that the Americans "had some justification for their attitude", in that America, as the world's strongest economy, would have to foot most of the bills.[97] Consequently, the Americans insisted on establishing the International Monetary Fund (IMF) rather than the International Clearing Union.[98] The Fund did not create credit. Rather, it received subscriptions from its members in proportion to the size of their economy, and gave them in return quotas equivalent to their subscriptions: the advantage for the member nations was that seventy-five per cent of a subscription could be paid in national currency, while a quota could be obtained in US dollars. The total size of the quotas was only $9 billion, roughly a third of the figure Keynes had thought necessary. Moreover, the Americans insisted, against the arguments of Keynes, that the IMF have the right to make payments of quotas subject to certain conditions.[99] Over time, especially, these conditions have overwhelmingly suited the short-term economic interests of US corporate creditors and the long-term political interests of the US political leaders, or ruling class.[100] "It can certainly be argued", Stewart notes, "that the resources available to the IMF were inadequate to start with, and have become more inadequate with the passage of time".[101]

It can also be said with confidence that the primary reason why US President Richard Nixon decided in 1971 to suspend the convertability of the US dollar, thereby effectively beginning the end of the postwar international system of economic management, was a political one. Like President Johnson before him, Nixon wanted to increase the American war effort in Vietnam without taking the domestically unpopular decision to raise taxes. As Bolton makes clear: "These flourishing times came to an end partly because of the Vietnam War. Trying to finance the war without cutting back on welfare and economic growth, the Johnson and Nixon administrations in the United States launched a series of deficit budgets. These built up inflationary forces which released much speculative capital".[102] As French President Charles de Gaulle and later Gough Whitlam complained, the highly 'loose' monetary policy of the US government

led to an exporting of inflation throughout the world.[103] As Robertson explains in more detail:

> American deficits presented difficulties for countries that now found themselves with a surplus of dollars. Fearing that the resultant rise in money supply would increase inflation, European nations traded their Eurodollars and tried to convert reserves to gold. During the 1960s US gold reserves declined sufficiently to threaten dollar convertibility, and the United States found itself in a position similar to that of West European countries in the early 1950s. Like them, domestic pressures for social programs (and Cold War pressures for military expenditure) made the normal IMF prescription – expenditure reduction policies – *politically* impossible. By 1971 the international flight from the dollar forced President Richard Nixon to suspend the dollars' convertability, devalue the dollar 7.5 per cent, and impose a temporary 10 per cent tax on all imports to pressure European currencies to revalue. In doing so he brought down two crucial pillars of the Bretton Woods system – convertability and stability.[104]

"By 1973", Stewart writes, "the world had reverted to a regime under which the major currencies were floating fairly freely against each other".[105]

If stagflation was most directly the result of the arrival of 'cost-push' inflation, caused by increased wage and other costs of production, then this also can be traced to the Vietnam war. "Wage demands", writes Bolton, "were largely a response to the world-wide inflationary forces released by the Vietnam War and steadily undermining the American financial system as a bulwark of western capitalism".[106] The war in Vietnam served also to weaken the US – economically, politically and morally – in the Middle East. As Graham Freudenberg writes: "America's preoccupation with Indo-China where her essential interests did not lie, led to a corresponding loss of influence in the Middle East, where the West's vital interests do lie. In the Vietnam years, the Soviet Union established ascendancy in the Arab world. When the Yom Kippur war broke out on 6 October 1973, American prestige and influence was at its nadir".[107] This contributed to the willingness and ability of the OPEC nations to act collectively to substantially cut production and so dramatically increase the cost of oil between December 1973 and January 1974.

The more direct trigger for this oil 'shock', however, was the US support for Israel in the October 1973 Arab-Israeli war, a decision strongly influenced by the US

commitment to Israel as a bulwark against Soviet political influence and economic power in the Middle East.[108] This 'oil shock' is perhaps the single event most closely associated with the arrival of the global economic malaise of the mid-1970s, and along with two subsequent oil shocks between the late 1970s and early 1980s is crucial in the reshaping of global economic power, production levels and policy.[109] For with this dramatic increase in the price of oil, a massive redistribution of global wealth – into the hands of the leaders of the OPEC nations and the owners and controllers of the oil companies – takes place.[110] Partly because the OPEC nations did not have modern, industrialised economies, this wealth was in turn invested in private financial institutions, especially within the US and Western-European finance sector. Since IMF funds were so limited and came with strict and often economically counter-productive conditions, many poorer or 'third world' nations sought loans from these 'first world' banks at this time, especially to meet the increased costs of production and consumption brought about by the OPEC oil shocks.[111] Rex Connor's plan to borrow $2 billion to finance major infrastructural investment is developed in this context. During this time of economic downturn the burgeoning finance sector was only too eager to make these loans available, often with very generous initial repayment conditions, so that the sector would be able to meet its own interest payments, especially to the governments of the OPEC nations.[112] By the time these repayments began to be due, following the final oil shock of the early 1980s, it was apparent that most debtor countries could not repay their principal sum, and many could not even meet the costs of interest payments.[113] Around the world, massive and steadily increasing inequality between and within nations, and massive areas of economic stagnation, became the norm.[114]

As Paul Kennedy suggests in his study of economic change and military conflict between 1500 and 2000, "wealth is usually needed to underpin military power, and military power is usually needed to acquire and protect wealth".[115] It seems that the US commitment to maintaining its geo-political power was the major factor in the finance sector coming to displace the industrial sector as the largest and most powerful sector of capital, at the global level, by the mid-1970s. Since the finance sector clearly stands to lose out in a context of broad-based industrial productivity accompanied by increasing economic equality and consumption (because its share of wealth would by definition

decrease), people who benefit primarily from this sector have from the mid-1970s had an economic and political interest in the preservation of a climate of low levels of industrial and productive investment and relative economic stagnation, inequality and insecurity: conditions broadly characteristic of the neo-classical liberal age. Where Connell writes in 1977: "The end of the Labor government is still too recent to offer a full analysis",[116] by 2002 he is able to argue that neo-classical liberal public policy is essentially an expression of the political power of the global finance sector:

> Starting with the Eurodollar market of the 1960s, the world economy has seen a massive growth of mobile capital. Local capital markets have been amalgamated, using new communications technology, into an interacting global financial system. At some point in this process the quantitative increase in mobile funds became a qualitative shift in hegemony from industrial capital to finance capital. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that neo-liberalism has functioned as the ideology of this shift.[117]

Keith Windschuttle had earlier emphasised the importance of members of the finance sector within the international New Right movement. The New Right, he says in 1988, is comprised of "politicians, academics, PR people and big business interests, especially the financial sector whose profits were threatened in the mid-1970s by the high rate of inflation and government regulations of interest rates".[118]

Though this growth of the finance sector is clearly a new development in this historical context, once the imperialist nature of American economic policy is recognised this growth should not come as a surprise. In his classic 1902 study of the relationship between the internal dynamics of capitalism and imperialism, J.A. Hobson emphasised how increasing economic inequality, such as that flowing on from the 1970s oil shocks, tends to lead to the accumulation of capital and the pressure to invest it abroad when the domestic market is saturated. The need to finance, manage and protect these investments leads to the growth of an oversized financial class and an increasingly powerful military establishment, with each of these factors being fuelled by the growing concentration of industry resulting from the absence of restrictions on market forces, such as those of the Bretton Woods system.[119] As Wheelwright summarises Hobson's quite amazingly prescient argument:

> The apparatus of government becomes more centralised, the power of the executive grows, that of the legislature declines and there is a decay of

political party activity, especially that which is critical of imperial adventures. The nation is corrupted by the false values of its superiority and destiny, to develop a new world economic and political structure.[120]

Hobson's analysis was made of the UK, but even in 1902 he considered that the US was following in Britain's footsteps.[121]

It can be argued then that while new technology may lead to the loss of jobs in certain areas and to a new mobility of capital, it does not in itself necessitate either unemployment (there remains much useful work for people to do) or inequality (primarily a result of the specifically political injunction that an unregulated labour market is essentially rational),[122] conditions often held in the post-Whitlam, post-Keynesian era, to be inevitable characteristics of modern or postmodern capitalism. By the same logic, while the full industrialisation of the global economy may not be ecologically sustainable, this does not mean that full employment and increasing equality are unsustainable in either the 'first' or the 'third' world. In any case, it can be seen that at each social level – the legal, the electoral (or formal political), the theoretical level (of policy) and even the economic – ideology or power played a central or constitutive role, and not an incidental role, in the coming to an end of Whitlamite and Keynesian hope.

Ideology and History

Contemporary interpretations of this period and the shift to neo-classical liberal public policy tend also to reflect the political struggle involved in this historical development. Ideology continues to play a fundamental role in the interpretation of both the Whitlam period and the reasons for its demise.

In terms of its own ideology, or world view, the Whitlam government is most often labelled, as it was by Whitlam, 'social democratic',[123] though what constitutes a social democratic philosophy is not self-evident. Some historians of the ALP, such as Carol Johnson and Andrew Scott, refer to the Party under Whitlam's leadership as a social democratic party, while applying the label loosely to all those parties purportedly representing labour rather than capital.[124] But if we are to be able to distinguish between the dominant philosophies of a party leadership at different times, this blanket application of 'social democrat' will clearly not do. On the other hand, Boris Frankel argues that

Whitlam's was never properly a social-democratic government, in the sense that it never articulated any attempt to move beyond capitalism.[125] As Connell notes: "for all the ranting that was heard from the right about 'Canberra socialism', (the Whitlam government) had a most circumspect and modest program of reform".[126] Yet although it may not have spelt out a program for moving beyond capitalism or for transcending one or more of capitalism's essential characteristics – private property, markets and individual material incentive – this government did take for granted the view that government planning, rather than market forces, constituted the best means of social organisation, and did not seal off the possibility that the private business sector might in time become unnecessary.[127] In both of these senses the ideology of the ALP during the period of the Whitlam government is qualitatively different from that of the ALP under its subsequent leadership, and arguably from that of the ALP prior to Whitlam also. In Hugh Emy's persuasive assessment: "Whitlamism marked a significant ideological turn in the development of the ALP: away from Labourism, from a tight identification with both the interests and rather conservative, insular outlook of organised labour; and towards a more open, ambitious and sophisticated style of social democracy".[128] For Race Mathews, Whitlam's political philosophy and practice were centrally informed by the social democratic tradition of Fabianism:

> No other Australian political leader has so comprehensively championed the core Fabian values of liberty, community, democracy, equality and the elimination of poverty. None have been so consistently Fabian in their use of objective public policy research and advocacy in the securing of informed public consent for gradualist parliamentary reform.[129]

This social democratic philosophy of Whitlam's ALP can also be distinguished from a 'democratic liberal' ideology, that articulates a necessary but properly limited role for government: an ideology consistent with more right-wing or conservative readings of Keynes (and, by and large, the view of Keynes himself).

Contemporary social democrats tend to be most forgiving of the Whitlam government's faults and to interpret its role in this national journey from hope to disillusion in the least critical way. In the literature, Whitlam has been amongst the most active and effective exponents of the social democratic framework of his government. His major work on this subject remains the principal account of it: *The Whitlam*

Government 1972–1975.[130] In this book he writes: "By the time we came to government in December 1972, we had developed a program of reform fully capable of achievement *within* the Constitution ... The program was developed on the basis of a three-fold relevance – its constitutional relevance, its political relevance, and its actual relevance to the needs of modern Australia".[131] According to Whitlam, from the time of his election as leader of the ALP on 8 February 1967, he addressed himself to three principal tasks: "to develop a coherent program of relevant reform; to convince the Labor movement that the parliamentary institutions were relevant in achieving real reform; and to convince a majority of Australians that such reforms were relevant to themselves and to their country".[132] In the famous Blacktown Civic Centre speech of 13 November 1972, launching the ALP election campaign, "the work of the preceding six years", Whitlam writes, "came together comprehensively".[133] In this speech Whitlam stated "Our Program has three great aims", these being:

> — to promote equality;
> — to involve the people of Australia in the decision-making processes of our land;
> — and to liberate the talents and uplift the horizons of the Australian people.[134]

These can be seen respectively as Whitlam's economic, political and cultural aims. "The rest of this book", he states in his introduction, "is largely an account of our efforts to give substance to those ideals".[135]

Whitlam's works are open to criticism in that they over-emphasise the rational and carefully planned basis, not only of policy, but of policy *outcomes*.[136] Drew Cottle states of Whitlam's history of his own government:

> Without a hint of self-criticism, Whitlam, over several hundred pages of text, lists the achievements of his government. At the fateful hour in 1975, Sir John Kerr and Malcolm Fraser scuttle the Whitlam ship of state bound for Byzantium. And so the legend, like all Labor myths, persists. Everything could have been achieved, according to Whitlam, had not the blackguards Kerr and Fraser overthrown parliamentary traditions and the Australian Constitution.[137]

The expressed views of the high-profile Bob Ellis are representative of the social democratic "Whitlam industry"[138] Cottle complains about:

> Gough Whitlam may not be the answer, but he is the question ... The good old days are dead, and we live now in an era that, in John Osborne's phrase, might best be described as the Mean Time, an era that Whitlam haunts like a mocking Puck, a Robin Goodfellow darting from gum leaf to gum leaf with his wand and fairy dust and one-liners, tormenting us each midsummer night with how it might have been. A decent Swedish outcome. A golden age.[139]

But Ellis, like other social democratic intellectuals, consciously emphasises the positive social outcomes of this era in order to contrast it in the public mind with what he sees as a manifestly unsatisfying present. His overblown language is consciously polemical. And if the analysis of Ellis seems to lack rigour, this is perhaps partly because he has consciously or otherwise refused to grant the primacy of scientistic economic language. Mathematics is useful but not, according to Ellis, the desirable *basis* of public policy.[140]

Cottle's criticism of social democratic mythologising is representative of the strand of socialist thought which rejects the contention that the Whitlam government was ever a meaningful force for progressive social change. This general argument was initially formulated upon Whitlam's election by 'New Left' radicals,[141] and has more recently been argued by Carol Johnson, among others.[142] More common however among socialist intellectuals is the view that while the reforms of the Whitlam government were relatively minor and in no way constituted a threat to the capitalist foundations of society, this government did represent the Australian high-point of progressive parliamentary democracy and to this extent presided over a society closer to socialism than those which preceded and followed it. As Connell and Irving note in their landmark study of class structure in Australian history: "The Whitlam leadership represented much more than a change in federal parliament, as is shown by the emergence of similar leaderships in South Australia and eventually New South Wales and Victoria".[143] For most intellectuals sympathetic toward socialism, particularly those to whom social democratic reformism is not anathema, the hopes and achievements of the Whitlam years remain historically and politically praiseworthy.[144]

This historical perspective is usually not vastly removed from that of democratic or interventionist liberals – for whom government intervention in the economy is necessary but for whom there is no possibility of society moving 'beyond' capitalism or

any of its central features – though Whitlam's mode of government is as often viewed here as a warning of excessive democratisation as a triumph of progressive political principle. This assessment by *Canberra Times* editor Jack Waterford in a 1999 issue of *Eureka Street* is representative of the democratic-liberal field of discussion:

> We are a generation past Dunstan and past Whitlam, but have scarcely found a politician since with any of the power to inspire ideals, make people change their lives or articulate a vision about where the nation ought to be going. Dunstan's impact was not merely on the Labor Party. He and Whitlam established an agenda that operated as powerfully on the other side of politics as on their own. Few conservative politicians today would speak in the language of politics pre-Dunstan ... even though the modern trend is to attack the size of the public sector and doubt the power of collective action.[145]

Democratic liberals accept a role for government in social and economic planning, but many of them also accept, in the post-Whitlam era, the alleged inefficiencies and inflationary impact of big government.[146] Those who accept a greater contemporary role for government generally have a less critical view of the Whitlam economic record, seeing the demise of this government as a result of international conditions rather than economic mismanagement and scandal.[147] For democratic liberals generally, the attraction to economic management and social reform remain, and the legacy of Whitlamite optimism is respected if not revered.

Liberals of a more culturally traditional or conservative bent did not share the hopes of Whitlam's ALP but have in many cases been as displeased with the post-1975 neo-classical liberal governmental model. Genuine conservatives,[148] sometimes referred to as the 'Old Right', believe the 'permissive' liberal values of this era were misplaced but they do accept the responsibility of government to actively manage the economy, particularly through the erection of tariffs. Perhaps the central statement on the Whitlam government written from this ideological perspective is 'Economic Rationalism and its Consequences', by John Carroll. Carroll argues that the economic difficulties experienced by Australia in the post-Whitlam period are primarily the result of the policy and philosophy of neo-classical liberalism:

> By the 1980s ... a new mandarin caste of fanatical, free-market economists had taken over the top levels of the key policy-making departments in the Canberra bureaucracy – Treasury, Finance, and Prime Minister's. The way

had been prepared since the late 1960s by a rationalist Tariff Board, which Whitlam had expanded into the Industries Assistance Commission, later renamed the Industry Commission. They were, in true mandarin style, more devoted to the purity of their theory and the clean workings of its logic than to looking with open eyes and some intellectual scepticism at what reality was telling them.[149]

The New Right defined itself as much by its critique of the conservative Right, and democratic liberals (including the 'Wets', as Margaret Thatcher would label them), as by its opposition to Whitlamite social democracy and socialism. For this ideological grouping, the hopes of the Whitlam era were deluded and remain a primary cause of Australia's ongoing social and economic difficulties. In his substantial study of postwar Australian liberalism and conservatism, David Kemp suggests that the crisis which confronted Australian society during the Whitlam period resulted from the fact that government had grown too large, constituting such an impediment to the freedom of the individual that social stability and economic growth could no longer be sustained. Kemp concludes that a return to a more fundamental, individualist form of liberalism had become necessary:

> While in many respects the Whitlam government in 1972 seemed to be expressing views that crossed party boundaries, by 1975 it had contributed to a crisis that shattered the consensus. As government spending rose rapidly in pursuit of equal opportunity and quality of life objectives so did taxes, and their inevitable restriction on private opportunities ... The 'Whitlam-shock' ended the consensus on the role of government and exposed the tensions in Australian liberal thought in an unmistakable manner.[150]

In Boris Frankel's 1992 opinion:

> It is ... clear that, after twenty years, the Right in Australia have not yet recovered from the socio-cultural practices and values of the Whitlam years. In fact, much of the Right's future agenda is oriented to the past: the need to eradicate twenty years of 'Whitlamism'. The brief period in office of the Whitlam government had a sobering affect on the Right in Australia. Thrown into disarray after decades of conservative rule, confronted by an upsurge of social and cultural reform movements, the Right had to regroup and confront the anti-conservative challenge head-on.[151]

Ten years later the New Right commentator Christopher Pearson laments the existence of "the Whitlamite agenda (which) staked out the ground for most of the twenty-five-year-long debates that followed the government's collapse".[152] Economic rationalists and 'Third Wayers' within the labour movement have also criticised Whitlam's progressive social and economic policies, often while seeking to use the mythology of hope inspired by this government to retain working-class and social democratic support.[153]

The final ideological take on this narrative of hope and disillusion is that of postmodernist intellectuals.[154] Postmodern*ism* is most literally the theory that our present social conditions are historically unique, the belief that public and private life has been fundamentally transformed by the historical forces that brought this change about. In an important sense, as Meaghan Morris has noted, Australian postmodernists were brought into existence as an identifiable intellectual grouping by the Dismissal. It was this event and the response to it by the labour movement and the Marxist Left that led many postmodernists to give up their active involvement with political movements. Addressing a conference in 1985 Morris says:

> I can't help being aware that this is the first time in almost ten years that I've attended a large, mixed, cross-activity talkfest run by 'The Left'. It will be ten years this November, in fact, for the last Big Political Event I went to in Sydney was a large meeting of feminists held to discuss the fall, or tripping, of the Whitlam government in 1975.[155]

And she continues: "For me and for quite a few kindred spirits, those events [surrounding the Dismissal] in 1975 marked the end of a whole period of classical political activism".[156] Like the leaders of the federal ALP, who learned from the experience of Whitlam that power in capitalist society lies with the capitalist class,[157] many postmodernists came to the conclusion that direct forms of political confrontation and opposition were outdated in contemporary reality.[158]

Cultural discourse in the decade after 1975, Morris argues, became specialised and professionalised, as a result of complex social change. Those who, like her, work in the culture industries ("all those 'areas' ... which add up to the wreck of the old concept of 'superstructure'"),[159] are seen to have a unique insight into the contemporary moment, part of this insight being an awareness that generalised critique and organised democratic opposition to centres of power are no longer tenable. This postmodernist triumphalism is

lent support by Morris's description of the non-postmodernist Left as "paranoid"[160] and "nostalgic".[161]

The assertion that power has become more fluid and de-centred within postmodernity is contradicted by increasing corporate centralisation and conglomeration, while the conservative implications of defining 'real' intellectuals as those who work within the mainstream or corporate media, hardly need spelling out. Moreover, Morris's own work, supposedly grounded on a critique of totalising theory, can itself be seen as an attempt at massive generalisation.[162] The basic features of this postmodern triumphalist view of history and of intellectual debate have been repeated many times over the years, though postmodernists rarely bother with historical exposition. Most recently, Lindsay Barrett has written about the Whitlam government and its demise, in his *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, as the inevitable manifestation of a postmodern reality replacing a modern one.[163]

Clearly, historical interpretation has not been unsullied by the political interests and motivations of intellectuals. For socialists, social democrats and democratic liberals, the hopes of the Whitlam era were more or less laudible and remain attractive if not always practically achievable. Conservative liberals, neo-classical liberals and postmodernists see these hopes as deluded and, in the case of the liberal groupings, as causing, more or less, Australia's present social fragmentation, discontent and inefficiency. These competing readings of this historic journey may be labelled 'morose but hopeful' (social democratic), 'sad and sceptical' (socialist), 'resigned but unhappy' (democratic liberal), 'disgusted and confused' (conservative liberal), 'spiteful' (neo-classical liberal) and 'smug' (postmodernist). But within each ideological grouping there is, importantly, a clear nexus between views of the past, the present and of a good society. There is clearly a dialectic at work between the Whitlam and post-Whitlam periods, in which the past is interpreted in a way which legitimates the particular understanding of the present and of a desirable future.

Ideology and the Mass Media

Although this history of the Whitlam period is strongly contested in the public sphere as a whole, the ideological stalemate identified above is not evident within the mass media.

Rather, the historical interpretation that suits the interests of the most powerful social groups tends to dominate. An examination of the representation of the Whitlam government in articles published in 2002 and indexed in the Dow Jones interactive database reveals the dominance of a neo-classical liberal reading of the Whitlam government and its legacy.[164] The majority of pieces characterise the Whitlam government as an incompetent economic manager. It is also routinely referred to as having been brought down by self-induced 'crises', rather than the actions of the Governor-General, Chief Justice Barwick, the corporate sector, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the CIA, the mainstream media itself, or even the unions.[165] Several articles are devoted to correcting 'myths' surrounding this government, namely the popular association of it with social justice reforms, though none at all defend its economic record. Where support for the Whitlam legacy does arise, this is often couched in nostalgic and romantic terms which tend to affirm, rather than question, its oft-asserted contemporary irrelevance. As Bolton states, "it was unfortunate that the Whitlam government's record suggested that social change could be achieved only at the expense of level-headed political leadership and sound economic management".[166] This crucial contention, that economic growth and social justice, the economy and society, freedom and equality, exist in an oppositional relationship – a contention directly reliant on classical liberal philosophy and neo-classical liberal social analysis and diametrically opposed to the philosophy and analysis of the Whitlam government – is the most often and most vehemently asserted 'lesson' to be drawn from this government.

An article by *Fortune* magazine writer Anthony Paul, published in the Brisbane *Courier Mail*, is representative of the ongoing New Right preoccupation with the Whitlam legacy.[167] Occasioned by the then forthcoming SBS television interview with Gough Whitlam conducted by John Faulkner, Paul is moved to write, he claims, out of a desire to correct the "deeply flawed history" that results from "the program's failure to probe closely the Whitlam government's extraordinary economic bungling". This failure, Paul suggests further, and the desire to turn Whitlam "into what we are repeatedly told is a 'national icon'", is in turn a reflection of the power of "Sydney's leftist media elites", who wish to produce "unalloyed Labor propaganda" and "to obscure the mess Australia really was in the early 1970s". "In April 1975", Paul asserts, "the Australian economy

was in its worst shape since the Great Depression of the early 1930s. Largely as a result of its high-spending policies, the Labor government was running a $2.5 billion deficit, or 5 per cent of the then gross national product". Paul goes on to remark that Whitlam was the son of "one of Australia's most senior and most highly paid civil servants", that his government "plunged into a socialist-minded restructuring of the economy", that the economic rationalists in cabinet during the economic crises of 1974 were held back by "unreconstructed socialists", and that as Treasurer Cairns was unable "to say no to colleagues' pet programs". The "Khemlani Affair" is described as a surreptitious attempt to commit the nation to a massive debt. There are also the familiar New Right charges of government 'crowding out' private enterprise ("during the three years Labor was in office, the number of public servants increased by 12.6 per cent. Employment in private industry in the same period rose just 1.2 per cent") and of welfare agencies 'capturing' state resources for their own interests ("Soaring administrative overheads negated many of the well-meaning programs that Labor did introduce. Perhaps the most poignant example was welfare for Aborigines"), a key tenet of New Right 'public choice' theory. This government was in the end "swept away" when Kerr "fired" Whitlam, Paul's choice of words suggesting that it was the prerogative of Kerr to do so, as it is the prerogative of a boss to 'fire' misbehaving or incompetent employees.

Paul, a highly-paid writer for Rupert Murdoch and other individual and corporate interests, aligns himself with the 'common' person and defends a pseudo-empirical, 'common sense' notion of truth, against those who would seek to complicate matters, the intellectual 'elites', whoever they may be, who are blinded by their allegiance to Labor and socialism, these two things amounting to much the same thing. There is no consideration of the global economic situation and the complex causes of economic difficulties that impacted in fundamental ways upon Australia and the rest of the world. There never was in fact authorisation for a loan to be obtained by Khemlani, only for the offer of it to be obtained: Khemlani was not an authorised agent, merely an intermediary.[168] The highest inflation ever experienced in Australia actually occurred during the reign of Menzies.[169] Similarly, Australians are taxed more now than they ever have been before,[170] and both unemployment and inflation levels under Whitlam were lower than at times under Hawke and Keating.[171] Paul's article serves to conflate

Whitlamite social democracy with economic mismanagement. The perception is perpetuated that there is a zero-sum, oppositional relationship between government spending and economic progress, between social justice and economic growth, between planning for and achieving a just society.

While Paul's is perhaps the most strident, similar themes reappear in several other articles of 2002, which incorporate the history of the Whitlam government into a world-view consistent with classical liberal assumptions, or ideology.[172] Anne Henderson,[173] Christine Jackman,[174] the editors of the *Herald-Sun*,[175] Phillip Niddrie,[176] Miranda Devine,[177] Nick Richardson[178] and Dennis Atkins[179] write articles critical of the myth-making that takes place around this government, by which they mean the perception of its having introduced politically progressive and social justice policies, without questioning myths surrounding the causes of the economic difficulties it experienced. Peter Munro,[180] Stephen Loosley,[181] Nick Richardson[182] and Alan Ramsay[183] write nostalgic pieces lamenting the lost vision of the Whitlam era, but none of these explicitly question the rationality of present policy frameworks or the popular view of economic policy as simply a managerial process: "the euphoria of 1972 seemed to have dissipated into a kind of sour disappointment", concludes Richardson in a symptomatically resigned and analytically weak assessment.

This brief investigation of the representation of the Whitlam government within the mainstream press suggests that versions of the history of this government, which are as grounded in the known facts and truth of the time as the neo-classical liberal version, but ideologically opposed to it, are not widely visible, let alone explained in depth. There is then some support for the view that the post-1975 dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy has been enabled by the establishment of and capitalisation on popular resentment and opposition toward Whitlamism, and by the managed exclusion of policy alternatives from public dialogue. It seems that the present dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy is in part sustained through the maintenance of a neo-classical liberal interpretation of Whitlam and the Whitlam period as the hegemonic interpretation within the most politically important and powerful cultural organs of society, those of the mass media.[184]

Conclusion

Since contemporary Australia is in a sense defined by the Whitlam period – its prime historical Other – the maintenance of power is at least partially dependent on the maintenance of control over popular understandings of Whitlam and Whitlamism. A search of the Dow Jones interactive database, which indexed major Australian newspapers, revealed that the Whitlam government was mentioned 923 times between 1999 and 2002, in comparison to 42 references to the McMahon government, 570 references to the Fraser government and 820 references to the Hawke government.[185] The journalists Mike Stekettee, Errol Simper and Penelope Wilson note that "the Gough Legacy ... was relatively short lived, yet the Whitlam government still has an extraordinary grip on the public imagination".[186] Graeme Duncan has observed that Whitlam "is a kind of admonitory judgment on the present",[187] while Peter Beilharz and Patrick Troy suggest that Whitlam is "a collective noun, more, a grounding metaphor of that formative experience which still shadows us".[188] As demonstrated above, the past is commonly interpreted in a way which legitimates a particular ideological understanding of the present and future. The very dominance of ideology over evidence and logic within this highly contested history suggests that at this time what might be more useful than a reassertion of evidence and logic is a more extended and thorough-going exploration of the role of ideology within this debate, its particular origins, nature and functions. The rest of the thesis is an attempt to identify the specific cultural origins of Whitlamite social democracy and Australian neo-classical liberalism.

---

[1] "As Governor-General of Australia I occupied at that time the neutral position of representative of the Crown in Australia and repository under the Australian Constitution of reserve powers which it has vested in the Governor-General alone". John Kerr, *Matters for Judgement: An Autobiography*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1978, p.1.

[2] As Kerr notes, this was "the first time supply had actually been denied federally". *Matters for Judgement*, p.2. This directly placed at risk the government's capacity to govern.

[3] Kerr, *Matters for Judgement*, p.2.

[4] Ibid., p.3.

[5] "Mr Whitlam, as the threat became real that the money needed for the conduct of government would run out, stated his intention of governing with the aid of financial arrangements which I believe would have been makeshift, precarious and probably illegal even if obtainable, and further destructive of public stability and confidence". Ibid., p.3.

[6] Kerr chooses as his book's epigraph, for example, a quotation from the American Declaration of Independence: "Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed". In chapter 1: 'The Consent of the Governed', Kerr argues that the right of the Governor-General to dismiss the elected Government of the day and bring about a general election is exemplary of this

democratic spirit, which he says also informs the Australian Constitution. See *Matters for Judgement*, p.7. Kerr refers as well to – while not providing evidence of – a growing "public demand for and expectation of action by the Governor-General" in the lead-up to the Dismissal. Ibid., p.335.

[7] Kerr writes that his book "should be published now because in the public interest the facts of my role in the happenings of 1975 should be known – in the interests of truth and of maintaining freedom of discussion and the development of knowledge on matters of great public importance". "My decision" to dismiss the Whitlam government, he explains, "rested upon constitutional principle". "I hope the arguments that prevail", he states, "will be those founded on truth and reason and aimed at pursuing sense and perhaps a more resistant and resilient consensus for the future". Kerr quotes the letter of Chief Justice Sir Garfield Barwick, putting Barwick's legally and constitutionally irrelevant view that Kerr had a legal right to dismiss the government. "I knew the decision", states Kerr, was "constitutionally *unavoidable*". "A striking fact emerging ... from the great number of supportive letters that flooded in to Government House after the Dismissal", states Kerr, "from people having clearly a wide range of education and background, was the grasp exhibited of the essential realities of what had taken place". Ibid., pp.vii, 6, 7, 342–344, 349, 4–5.

[8] See descriptions of Whitlam and his government above and below. Kerr also writes: "There was plenty of evidence that demonstrations, especially the violent ones, were organised by militant left-wing unionists and students". "Some faces", he says, "recurred in widely separated locations, and in each State they included individuals who were well known to the police". Ibid., p.383.

[9] Ibid., p.6.

[10] According to Clem Lloyd and Andrew Clark, by 11 November 1975 "the chance of unilateral action by Senators to get out of the constitutional impasse was increasing each day. Fraser was running out of time. There is retrospective agreement among senior members of the Parliamentary Liberal Party that they could have held on for only a few more days. Very likely, the crisis would have been over by the end of the week, with the Coalition accepting a setback and letting the budget bills pass. It is even possible that the collapse of Opposition resistance would have occurred on 11 November". *Kerr's King Hit*, Cassell Australia, Stanmore and North Melbourne, 1976, p.270.

[11] For examples of variations of this argument see Gareth Evans, ed., *Labor and the Constitution 1972–1975*, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, Richmond, 1977.

[12] Kerr, *Matters for Judgement*, p.8.

[13] Ibid., p.9.

[14] See endnote 6.

[15] On the medieval precedent for Kerr's actions see 'The Men of Kent Gather on Blackheath to Await the King', in Christopher Hampton, ed., *A Radical Reader: The Struggle for Change in England 1381–1914*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1984, p.56.

[16] As Geoffrey Bolton notes, "much more than his original dismissal of Whitlam, this was a gross breach of constitutional practice". "But by this time", Bolton goes on to suggest, "nobody was worrying much about technicalities". *The Middle Way*, p.242.

[17] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.12. In his *The Truth of the Matter* (Penguin, Ringwood, 1979), Whitlam asserts that "nothing in Sir John Kerr's (*Matters for Judgement*) and nothing which has been revealed since 11 November 1975 calls for modification of (Horne's) assessment", p.136.

[18] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.14.

[19] Ibid., pp.14, 14–15.

[20] Kerr, *Matters for Judgement*, p.388.

[21] See Fenella Souter, 'Year of Women and Wonders', the *Age Good Weekend* magazine, 23 July 2005, pp.34–37. A more extended account of Kerr's career in terms of a personal quest for power is Richard Hall, *The Real John Kerr: His Brilliant Career*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1978. Hall argues: "Potential for power: that's what John Kerr was about for most of his adult life. He was obsessed by the concept of power", p.viii.

[22] Kerr, *Matters for Judgement*, p.352.

[23] Ibid., p.389.

[24] Ibid., p.398.

[25] Ibid., p.381.

[26] Ibid., p.396.

[27] Paul Kelly, *The End of Certainty: Power Politics and Business in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1994. For Tim Rowse, Kelly's notion of "political modernism" is "informed and influential". 'The Social

Democratic Critique of the Australian Settlement', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.219. Paul Boreham, Geoff Dow and Martin Leet are less impressed by Kelly's text, but in referring to it as "notorious" nevertheless implicitly make the point that it has indeed been influential. *Room to Manouvre: Political Aspects of Full Employment*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, 1999, p.5.

[28] Horne notes also that "an unfair electoral system magnified the swing (against Labor). In the House of Representatives, with 43.4 per cent of the preferred votes, Labor won only 28 per cent of the seats while the Coalition parties with 56.6 per cent of the preferred votes, gained 72 per cent of the seats". *Death of the Lucky Country*, p.13.

[29] According to Bolton: "Public perceptions of the Whitlam government were shaped by a series of ineptitudes which even the most benevolent of media would have found hard to present sympathetically". "But these events", he goes on to note, "were not turning to Fraser's advantage. As October gave way to November every week's public opinion polls told the same story: the pendulum was swinging back to the Whitlam government". *The Middle Way*, pp.238, 240.

[30] Horne, *Death of the Lucky Country*, pp.12–13.

[31] Horne argues for example that in the 1975 elections the media became "more visible campaigners than the leaders themselves". "From day to day", he writes, the media "increasingly presented (the Whitlam government) as a government of crooks and clowns". "During the election", he continues, "four of the Sydney newspapers, the *Sun*, the *Australian*, the *Daily Mirror* and the *Daily Telegraph* went after the Labor Party with techniques no newspaper has used within my adult lifetime, but to condemn these four newspapers is not to praise the others". Moreover, "what made (Fraser) safe in his campaign style of diversion and evasion was that in this election journalist-commentators prominent in elections since 1969 were sat on ... In the degrading election of 1975 this meant that routine methods of exposure of evasion and diversion were not used, or were used inadequately". *Death of the Lucky Country*, pp.65, 66, 69, 70. As Bolton states: "It was certainly the case that by 1975 every major Australian newspaper, with the partial exception of the *Newcastle Morning Herald*, was editorially hostile to the Whitlam government". *The Middle Way*, p.238. According to Lindsay Barrett, "the Whitlam Government was in no position to employ armies of public relations workers to blur the lines between its activities and those of the media, but nor, even if it had been, would this have been in keeping with the spirit of the government". 'Whitlam, Modernity and the End of History', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.412.

[32] See Munster, *A Paper Prince*, pp.95–114. He also notes: "The Murdoch papers were the last to become hostile to the Whitlam Government, but when they did, they were the most strident". John Hallows, a "resident conservative columnist", was brought in to write the Australian's editorials on a fee basis, replacing the more liberal Robert Duffield. Ibid., pp.107, 108.

[33] Griffen-Foley, *Party Games*, p.230.

[34] "In the mid-1970s both journalistic and public confidence in the role of the news media as democracy's watchdog was particularly high. The *New York Times*' willingness to publish the revelations from the Pentagon Papers and the *Washington Post*'s exposé of the Watergate break-in were still fresh and Australian interest in investigative journalism was strong". Griffen-Foley, *Party Games*, p.216.

[35] "1975 was a turning point in the political influence of the press. Not since 1949 had newspapers waged a more virulent campaign to hound a government from office. And they were completely successful. Malcolm Fraser's conservative Liberal-Country Party coalition defeated the Labor party by a record majority. But this was the peak of press influence. It is unlikely to gain it again". Keith Windschuttle, *The Media: A New Analysis of the Press, Television, Radio and Advertising in Australia* (third edn), Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, p.307. This is because, Windschuttle suggests, the press is obviously biased, and swinging voters are least likely to read the press.

[36] Munster builds a convincing case for this interpretation of events, while perhaps wisely resisting open speculation about any decisions Kerr and Murdoch may have reached from their discussions. *A Paper Prince*, pp.107–109. It seems that the arch-monarchist and the arch-capitalist formed an unholy alliance in order to defeat the arch-democrat Whitlam.

[37] In contrast to 1972, the Liberal National Party coalition in 1975 ran a highly sophisticated and media-savvy campaign. Malcolm Fraser and the other conservative leaders and strategists did not spell out policy in detail, instead focusing on the creation of broad impressions – of the ALP as incompetent, dictatorial and possibly criminal – and of themselves as skilled economic managers of sound social standing and cultural heritage. Broadly speaking, conservative political advertising (following the ALP example from 1972) concentrated on stimulating an emotional response rather than on raising awareness of complex issues.

Television, television journalists and television journalism played a relatively greater role in this campaign, reinforcing the dominance of impression over reason, propaganda over critical debate. As Griffen-Foley explains: "Liberal strategists changed the way press conferences were structured, separating television reporters and cameras from press correspondents. The television team always went first, meaning that television reporters could not watch the experienced newspaper journalists in action and pirate the more embarrassing questions for use when they got Fraser in front of the camera for an interview". *Party Games*, p.233.

[38] Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, p.vii. This 'Preface' is dated 11 November 1975.

[39] By 'politically progressive policy' I mean policy that leads to a decentralisation of economic wealth.

[40] Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, p.118.

[41] Ibid., p.119.

[42] Ibid., p.119.

[43] Ibid., p.125.

[44] Ibid., pp.125–126.

[45] Ibid., p.126, emphasis added.

[46] Ibid., p.129. Singleton was at the time handling the conservatives' political advertising campaign.

[47] Ibid., p.131.

[48] Ibid., p.131.

[49] Ibid., p.132.

[50] Ibid., p.vii.

[51] Bolton lends weight to this view. He writes that prior to the Dismissal "the critical factor was finance. The private banks could not be counted on to bail out the government if it ran short of funds, and although the government was exploring several ingenious alternatives none was obviously workable". *The Middle Way*, p.241. See also Sexton, *Illusions of Power*, p.283: "In the context of implementing such a program [of reform] it is apparent that Parliament is only a tool – although a vital one – in the process of implementation"; and p.xiv: "In the face of ... realities, (the Whitlam) government discovered that many of its own sources of power were illusory". See also Nathan Hollier, 'From Hope to Disillusion? The Legacy of the Whitlam Government in Australian Policy and Culture', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.432: "Arguably the fundamental flaw of (Whitlam's) philosophy and that of his government was to mistake the *human* capacity to control social outcomes for the capacity of *government* to do so".

[52] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.214. Coombs, Whitlam's chief economic adviser, states in his autobiography: "The publication in 1936 of John Maynard Keynes' *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, was for me and for many of my generation the most seminal intellectual event of our time" (though this publication followed the New Deal). *Trial Balance*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1981, p.3.

[53] See David Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia since 1944', in Head and Walter, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, pp.322–361.

[54] Eric Hobsbawm emphasises the extent to which the 'New Deal' was a response to the threat of communism. See his *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*, Michael Joseph, London, 1991.

[55] Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia', p.339. According to Tim Rowse: "Whitlam's Australia wsa to be an invigorating but responsible reconstruction of Menzies' Australia. The election of December 1972 seemed to be the high point in the process of 'modernising' Australian politics". Rowse, *Australian Liberalism and National Character*, Kibble Books and McPhee-Gribble, Fitzroy, 1978, p.262.

[56] Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia', p.328.

[57] On Friedman's 1975 Australian tour see Lindsay Barrett, 'Whitlam, Modernity and the End of History', in Hocking and Lewis, *Whitlam and Modern Labor*, pp.404–413. He notes that the tour was sponsored by a firm of stockbrokers.

[58] There is however debate over whether or not the final budget of the Whitlam government, that of Treasurer Bill Hayden brought down in August 1975, was guided by Keynesian or monetarist and neo-classical liberal philosophy and theory. Rowse argues that although this budget contained a greater emphasis on monetary restraint than had generally been the case within Keynesian-influenced budgets, it was still consistent with Keynesian public policy. See his 'The Social Democratic Critique of the Australian Settlement', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.240. An influential statement of the opposing view is P. Groenewegen and B. McFarlane, *A History of Australian Economic Thought*, Routledge, London, 1990, p.216. In Tim Battin's persuasive assessment, "at the very least, the 1975 budget

was anti-Keynesian in sentiment". *Abandoning Keynes: Australia's Capital Mistake*, Macmillan, London, 1997, p.84. Whitlam himself appears to take a pragmatic view, endorsing Keynesian public policy but praising the Hayden budget as economically and politically effective. "Without a doubt", Whitlam writes, "Hayden was the best Treasurer of any party during the 1970s ... As most commentators accepted and as the Opposition privately admitted, the Budget had the stamp of responsibility". *The Whitlam Government*, pp.212, 213.

[59] This is established in his major work. See John Maynard Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Macmillan, London, 1936.

[60] The Keynesian economist and author Michael Stewart writes for example that Friedman's monetarism "is fatally flawed" because "it starts from unreal assumptions about how the economy works". "The most unreal assumption of all", he goes on to say, "is the same assumption that underlay the classical economics of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to which monetarism is in many respects a throwback. This is the assumption that the economy is self-stabilising at full employment". *Keynes and After* (third edn), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1986, p.178. Similarly, Coombs writes in 1981 that he finds the monetarist model "defective" because "it is based upon a general equilibrium view of the economic system, of the way the system would look when the forces working to bring the various sub-systems into equilibrium internally and with one another, have successfully achieved their purpose. It does not deal with the processes by which that end is reached, nor what happens if non-market factors impair the movement towards equilibrium". *Trial Balance*, p.179.

[61] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.2–3. He also writes: "During the years of the postwar economic boom, questions of economic management were scarcely deemed to require original answers. The broad principles, and indeed objectives, of Keynesian economics held sway over the major parties", p.184.

[62] Ibid., p.3.

[63] Paul Boreham, Stewart Clegg and Geoff Dow attest for example that Keynesian economics derived from "the realisation which began with the Enlightenment, that social existence is and always has been amenable to volitional intervention". *Class, Politics and the Economy*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston, 1986, p.325. And Whitlam has stated: "The great tradition which links the American and French revolutionaries of the Age of Reason with the modern parties of social reform is the tradition of optimism about the possibility of human improvement and human progress through the means of human reason". Quoted in Graeme Duncan, 'Whitlam and the Problems of Social Democracy', *Meanjin* 45, 1986, pp.471–472.

[64] Richard Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable: Think-Tanks and the Economic Counter-Revolution 1931–1983*, Fontana Press, London, 1995, p.12.

[65] Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable*, p.12.

[66] The major statement of this philosophy is Friedrich Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1944.

[67] On this point see Battin, *Abandoning Keynes*, p.100. And though it is generally accepted that Fraser did not introduce a full free-market policy program, Whitlam is correct to point out: "By and large, the actions of the Fraser Government matched its rhetoric. It did cut social policy spending; it did oppose wage rises at every opportunity; it did destroy wage indexation and replace it with the Treasury-advocated decentralised system; it did impose tough ceilings on the Public Service; it did adopt an inflation-first economic strategy; and it did on numerous occasions raise official interest rates in a bid to control the money supply". *The Whitlam Government*, p.227.

[68] See for example Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.157: "The most important reason of all for the emergence of monetarism as the predominant economic doctrine of the 1970s and 1980s was the simplest of all: monetarism promised a cure for inflation".

[69] Michael Pusey, *The Experience of Middle Australia: The Dark Side of Economic Reform*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003, pp.8, 7.

[70] Pusey, *Middle Australia*, pp.7–8.

[71] Ibid., p.8. Pusey notes that the Trilateral Commission, "comprising business leaders from North America, Europe and Japan, is but one of the five leading global business organisations that were formed to advance and coordinate corporate policy interests. The others are the World Economic Forum, the Bilderberg Conference, the International Chamber of Commerce and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development. Their impact has been immense and has led to what some prominent scholars now call the 'transnational capitalist class'. Ibid., p.209.

[72] Ibid., p.8.

[73] Cockett avers: "The counter-revolution in British economic and political thinking since the Second World War was very much the result of the work of individuals. It was a conscious and, in the end, successful attempt to turn the tide of political and economic thinking in a particular direction". *Thinking the Unthinkable*, p.4. And Battin argues that "the problems thought to be economic in nature ... are more fundamentally political". *Abandoning Keynes*, p.8.

[74] Greg Whitwell, 'Economic Ideas and Economic Policy: The Rise of Economic Rationalism in Australia', *Australian Economic History Review* 33:2, 1993, p.15.

[75] "An understanding of Keynesianism which contends that unemployment and inflation could not occur together is grossly deficient. This deficiency is not only in attributing stagflation to the practice of Keynesian policy, but in ascribing Phillips Curve Keynesianism to a series of phenomena that left-Keynesians, post-Keynesians, and Kaleckians already had warned against well before Phillips had published his influential article in 1958". Battin also makes the relevant observation that: "If an association between economic ideas, the resultant policies, and the performance outcomes of those policies were to explain why policies are reversed, we should have seen a reversal of the post-1975 program by now". *Abandoning Keynes*, pp.123, 244.

[76] Monetarists and other neo-classical liberals argued that government intervention in the economy was counter-productive because, among other reasons, the economic effects of monetary and fiscal policy did not register immediately, but only after a time 'lag'. The monetarists and neo-classical liberals argued that this meant that the problems interventionist policy was designed to address had almost always changed by the time these policies took effect.

[77] Coombs, *Trial Balance*, p.179.

[78] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.206.

[79] In Whitlam's account: "Compulsory price and income controls could not have solved inflation in 1974 without widespread community acceptance, but the existence of price and income powers in the hand of the Federal Government would have brought about an agreement on an income policy more quickly and have made such an agreed policy more effective". *The Whitlam Government*, p.203. On the Keynesian credentials of the Whitlam government, Battin concludes: "On Keynesian social democratic criteria, the Whitlam government fairs well". *Abandoning Keynes*, p.243. Ironically, Bob Hawke, as President of the ACTU, rejected this policy initiative, on the grounds that a future government might use it to lower wages. Later, as Prime Minister, Hawke oversaw the introduction of a prices and incomes policy which led to just this outcome (a decline in real wages) because of his government's unwillingness to try to limit corporate profits and white-collar salaries.

[80] The unprecedented and frightening nature of these developments can be glimpsed in Geoffrey Barraclough, 'The Great Crisis', *New York Review of Books* 21: 21–22, 23 January 1975, pp.20–29; reprinted as 'The End of the World (as we now know it)', in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson, eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.5–15.

[81] Boreham, Dow and Leet argue in 1999 for example that "like the OECD economies as a whole, Australia has been in recession for twenty-five years and despite high economic growth by international standards ... has not yet entered a post-recession phase". They also argue that "the political responses to the recession after 1974 actually produced many of the outcomes that we have been living with since, most notably structural unemployment". *Room to Manouvre*, pp.6–7, 19. As structural unemployment continues to characterise Australian and other OECD economies, it is doubtful that subsequent economic 'booms' would have led them to reject their assessment.

[82] For an example of this argument see Friedrich Hayek, 'The Campaign Against Keynesian Inflation', in his *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1978, pp.191–231.

[83] An example is Michael Stewart, *Keynes and After*.

[84] See for example Battin, who argues that the economic factors had a "social (and) political context" and that the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreement was a reflection of political, "or, in the case of the Vietnam War, military decisions". *Abandoning Keynes*, p.119.

[85] In the Australian context this general position has been elaborated upon by Humphrey McQueen (see for example 'Making Capital Tick', *Overland* 170, 2003, pp.92–101) and intellectuals associated with *Arena*. For accounts of this *Arena* position see Scalmer, *Dissent Events*, pp.125–134; and Hollier, 'The Importance of Class: Points of Tension Between *Arena* and *Overland*', *Arena Journal* 15, 2000, pp.149–157.

[86] See for example Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History* (1980, second edn), Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1992.

[87] See for example Alan Roberts, 'Ecological Crisis of Consumerism', *International*, September 1973, pp.1–8, reprinted in Mayer and Nelson, *Australian Politics*, pp.17–28. And for a more recent stating of this view see Donnella Meadows, Jorgen Randers and Dennis Meadows, *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green,White River Junction, 2004.

[88] Robbie Robertson, *The Three Waves of Globalisation: A History of a Developing Global Consciousness*, Zed Books, London and New York / Fernwood Publishing, Nova Scotia, 2003, p.182. In the opinion of Coombs, Keynes' attempt to establish an International Trade Organisation following the Second World War "failed because no changes to the existing economic order could even be considered without United States support. The Charter was rejected ... not because it was unworkable, not because the Keynesian modifications of traditional economic theory which had shaped it were intellectually invalid, but simply because it did not meet the political requirements of the United States domestic scene". *Trial Balance*, p.104. Emy and Hughes add: "The New Right was an international phenomenon among liberal democracies. In America and Britain especially, the main tendencies in New Right thinking represented an attempt to reverse the perceived 'decline of the West' and restore the economic and political strength of those societies". *Australian Politics*, p.191. For a detailed account of Keynes' participation in the Bretton Woods conference see Robert Skidelsky, *John Maynard Keynes: A Biography. Volume 3: Fighting For Britain, 1937–1946*, Macmillan, London, 2000.

[89] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, pp.212–213.

[90] Ibid., p.213.

[91] Ibid., p.213.

[92] Ibid., p.213.

[93] As Lindsay Barrett explains, "By 1947 ... it had become apparent in Washington that a potential international economic crisis (the so-called 'dollar gap') was developing due to the extreme wealth of the US in relation to the rest of the world, an imbalance which would eventually lead to the collapse of the US economy through the inability of any other nation to buy America's exports. The result was the creation of the Marshall Plan to redevelop western Europe as an industrial region, and a series of initiatives aimed at reviving Japanese industrial production as a go-between linking the resources of the soon to be independent Asian nations with the factories and markets of the USA". *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, pp.48–49. For a more extensive account of this US policy and the reasons for it see William Borden, *The Pacific Alliance*, Madison, Wisconsin University Press, 1984.

[94] John Kenneth Galbraith writes for example that prior to the collapse of the Soviet bloc, "aid ... especially from the United States, was, in part, a consequence of the cold war". *The World Economy Since the Wars*, Sinclair-Stevenson, London, 1994, p.258.

[95] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.213.

[96] Coombs records for example that Sir Leslie Melville, Economist to the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, had "observed the willingness and capacity of the United States to make use of its dominant power in the Bretton Woods' negotiations and in early issues facing the (International Monetary) Fund" and so was by the late 1940s "sceptical of it continuing to serve other than as an instrument of creditor attitudes". Coombs notes also that Keynes' motivations in arguing for an expansionist and increasingly equal postwar economic context were linked to his interest in advancing the political interests of Britain: "Gradually, as a result of ... discussions and Keynes' influence, it came to be accepted that the United Kingdom's best chance of restoring its international role lay in the achievement of an expanding world trade in which real incomes would be increasing in all countries". *Trial Balance*, pp.47, 45.

[97] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.213.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid.

[100] That is, the political dominance of the US ruling class over debt-ridden national governments has certainly been strengthened by the inability of these debtor governments to make payments to US private banks. For an account of this process see Susan George, *A Fate Worse than Debt*, Penguin, London, 1988.

[101] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.214. For a more thorough-going account of the role of politics within US negotiations at Bretton Woods see Susan George and Fabrizio Sabelli, *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1994; especially their 'In the Beginning' chapter, pp.21–36. They note: "From the US point of view ... the postwar world had to have three major characteristics. First,

the Americans wanted free trade with no discrimination against US goods – easy enough to obtain, since the US was virtually the only country left with a surfeit of goods for sale. Next, they wanted a favourable climate for American investments in foreign economies – again, non-negotiable, since the US was also the only major country left with substantial disposable savings. Finally, they wanted unimpeded access to raw materials. The Bretton Woods Institutions were intended to provide for all three", p.24. See also Skidelsky, *John Maynard Keynes: A Biography. Volume 3: Fighting For Britain.*

[102] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.184. See also Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Industrial Powers: Economic Power and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, Fontana, London, 1989, p.524: "The vast boom in spending on the war, precisely at a time when domestic expenditures upon Johnson's 'Great Society' were also leaping upward, badly affected the American economy". This basic economic proposition is generally accepted.

[103] For the complaints of de Gaulle see Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Industrial Powers*, p.561; for Whitlam's stating of this argument see Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.187: "The Bretton-Woods international monetary system ... could not survive [beyond 1973] because the financing of the Vietnam war required large and prolonged balance of payments deficits by the US and hence surpluses by the rest of the world. The US was exporting inflation, not as a result of any domestic price inflation, but through external deficits. It was, in the end, no coincidence that all the major nations of the developed world experienced inflation at the same time".

[104] Robertson, *The Three Waves of Globalisation*, p.194; emphasis added. In terms of the Australian economy, Bolton writes: "much depended on the capacity of the United States to stabilise the western economy. In 1971 Washington bowed to inflationary pressures by suspending the convertability of the dollar into gold. The Bretton Woods Agreement, mainstay of the world's free enterprise economies for the past quarter-century, began to totter". *The Middle Way*, p.187. See also Kennedy: "The Bretton Woods system, very much a creation of the days when the United States was financially supreme, collapsed when its leading pillar could bear the strains no more". *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, p.561; and J. Gowa, *Closing the Gold Window: Domestic Politics and the End of Bretton Woods*, Ithaca, New York, 1983.

[105] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.212.

[106] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.186.

[107] Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur*, p.277. As Kennedy summarises, "In so many ways, symbolic as well as practical, it would be difficult to exaggerate the impacts of the lengthy American campaign in Vietnam and other parts of Southeast Asia upon the international power system". *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers*, p.521. See also Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.187–188; and Bolton, *The Middle Way*, p.184.

[108] See Noam Chomsky, *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel and the Palestinians*, South End Press, Boston, 1999. According to E.L. Wheelwright, this oil shock "was the direct result of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the new found strength of OPEC. OPEC had gained strength from the revolutions in Libya, Algeria and Iraq, and the rise of (corporate) independents and state-owned companies which weakened the grip of the major [oil corporations]". Wheelwright, *Oil and World Politics: From Rockefeller to the Gulf War*, Left Book Club Cooperative Ltd, Sydney, 1991, p.28.

[109] As Bolton writes, "It was only in October 1973, when OPEC decided to cut oil production as an answer to American support of Israel, that the industrial world temporarily lost control of inflation". *The Middle Way*, p.218. For a more extended account see Andre Gunder Frank, *Crisis: In the World Economy*, Heinemann, London, 1980.

[110] See E.L. Wheelwright, *Oil and World Politics*.

[111] See Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.216.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Stewart, *Keynes and After*, pp.216–217.

[114] As Stewart summarises in an assessment that is still broadly true: "The result has not only been severe domestic hardship in many of these countries [who have had to cut back on imports], but an adverse effect on the exports of both developed and other developing countries. This has slowed down world growth, and in turn made it even harder for debtor countries to export enough to pay for essential imports. The whole vicious circle is a sad example of the kind of situation that Keynes, in the closing years of his life, had hoped the postwar international arrangements would make it possible for the world to avoid". Ibid., p.217.

[115] Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Industrial Powers*, pp.xv–xvii.

[116] Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, p.133.

[117] R.W. Connell, 'Moloch Mutates: Global Capitalism and the Evolution of the Global Ruling Class 1977–2002', *Overland* 167, 2002, p.5.

[118] Windschuttle, *The Media*, p.361.

[119] J.A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (1902), University of Michigan Press, 1972. This reading of Hobson is indebted to Wheelwright, *Oil and World Politics*, p.xiv.

[120] Wheelwright, *Oil and World Politics*, p.xiv.

[121] Ibid.

[122] Keynesians and Marxists reject this assumption.

[123] For Whitlam, the ALP is "one of the world's great social democrat parties". Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government,* p.2.

[124] See Andrew Scott, 'Meanings of "Modernisation": the Distinctiveness of the Whitlam Government in the History of Labour Parties', in Hocking and Lewis, *Whitlam and Modern Labor*, pp.444–464, at pp.448–449; and Carol Johnson, *The Labor Legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam, Hawke*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1989, p.1. She says the governments referred to in her title were social democratic "in the modern, less radical sense of the term. They were not part of the earlier, European social democratic tradition which argued that gradual, cumulative reforms would lead to the creation of a socialist society in which the economy would be publicly owned and controlled. Rather, government policies, developed within a social harmony framework, aimed to create a humanised capitalist society which would be to the benefit of all".

[125] Frankel writes: "The ALP was not even a social democratic party despite the Whitlam government's attempt to imitate certain West European social democratic policies". *From Prophets Deserts Come: The Struggle to Reshape Australian Political Culture*, Boris Frankel and Arena Publishing, North Carlton, 1992, p.102.

[126] Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, p.vii. According to Andrew Moore, this book's "synoptic account of the forces that brought the Whitlam government to and from office remains, in my opinion, unrivalled. I might be a very lazy history lecturer but despite the millions of words that have been written since 1977, chapters 5–7 of *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture* remain the basis of my lectures on E.G. Whitlam". Andrew Moore, 'Bob Connell and the 50 Club', in Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia*, p.45. According to Connell's University of Sydney website profile, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture* was voted "in a recent survey of The Australian Sociological Association (TASA) to determine the most influential books in Australian sociology ... number 1". See <http://applications.edfac.usyd.edu.au/about/admin/FMPro?-db=EDF_SD_staff&-format=staff_profile_template.html&-lay=web&code=RCON&-Find> (accessed 20 March 2006).

[127] This was in fact the hope of certain radical intellectuals within the party at the time, such as R.W. Connell. See for example Connell's 'The Transition to Socialism', in G. Crough, Ted Wheelwright and Ted Wilshire, eds, *Australia and World Capitalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980, pp.289–302.

[128] Hugh Emy, 'A Political Overview: From Social Democracy to the Social Market Economy', in Emy, Hughes and Mathews, *Whitlam Re-visited*, p.17.

[129] Race Mathews, '"Among Australian Fabians, I am Maximus": Gough Whitlam and the Fabian Approach to Public Policy Development and Advocacy', in Hocking and Lewis, *It's Time Again*, p.299.

[130] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*.

[131] Ibid., pp.2–3.

[132] Ibid., pp.4–5.

[133] Ibid., p.12.

[134] Ibid., p.12.

[135] Ibid., p.12.

[136] Whitlam wrote in his 1979 'Preface' to *The Truth of the Matter* that "Over the last year I have been gathering material for an account of the aspirations and achievements" of the Whitlam government, p.ix. No mention is made of any attempt to offer an account of the failures of this government.

[137] Drew Cottle, '"Sailing to Byzantium": Whitlam's Welfare and the Australian Working Class', in Richard Kennedy, ed., *Australian Welfare: Historical Sociology*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1989, p.409.

[138] Cottle, '"Sailing to Byzantium"', p.409.

[139] Bob Ellis, *So it Goes: Essays, Broadcasts, Speeches, 1987-1999*, Viking, Ringwood, 2000, p.389. The reference to Sweden is to the social democratic state of the Myrdals.

[140] See also Bob Ellis, *First Abolish the Customer: 202 Arguments Against Economic Rationalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1998.

[141] See for example Robert Catley and Bruce McFarlane, *From Tweedledum to Tweedledee: The New Labor Government in Australia. A Critique of its Social Model*, Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1974.

[142] Carol Johnson, *The Labor Legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam, Hawke*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1989, p.54: "The flaws in the Whitlam model were present from the start. The most central flaws were the assumptions that a capitalist economy would function smoothly as long as it was properly managed; that the high levels of economic growth, necessary to Labor's plans for social reform, could be achieved; and that a massive expansion of public expenditure would have no detrimental effects on the private sector". Many leftists who supported elements of Whitlam's policy program are also highly critical of his government for allowing the Indonesian annexation of East Timor and of Whitlam's personal opposition to East Timorese independence. See for example Graham Pitts, 'Raping East Timor', *Overland* 159, 2000, pp.107–109; and Jim Aubrey, 'Viva Timor L'Este: beyond silence, betrayal, cowardice and murder', *Arena Magazine* 40, 1999, pp.25–30.

[143] Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, p.205.

[144] For example, David Burchall, social democrat editor of *Australian Left Review* in 1992, wrote: "The unstated premise behind the current liberal – social democratic revulsion against 'economic rationalism' is that there was another period, the 'Whitlam years', when nominally social democratic government had a *raison d'etre* and a concept of government of its own, and was not apparently parasitic on notions of the limits of government derived from classical economic liberalism". 'After Social Democracy', *Australian Left Review* 143, 1992, p.26. See also Paul Strangio, *Keeper of the Faith: A Biography of Jim Cairns*, Melbourne University Press, 2002. Andrew Milner refers to having voted Labor until recently, "like most erstwhile sixties radicals ... partly out of a nostalgia for Whitlamism". 'Shock! Horror! Chattering Classes Vote Green!', *Overland* 166, 2002, p.95. Humphrey McQueen suggests: "The Coalition and our country have paid a price for blaming the economic collapse on Whitlam, socialism, scandals and incompetence. No matter how ignorant or ill-conceived were Labor's economic policies, they merely compounded the problems; they could not cause them. Billy McMahon's retaining the prime ministership in 1972 would not have rescued the world's monetary regime or averted the oil-price shock". 'Paying the Price of Victory', the *Bulletin*, 18 May 1999, p.41.

[145] Jack Waterford, 'Of Might and Men', *Eureka Street* 9:2, 1999, p.7.

[146] See for example Whitwell, 'Economic Affairs', in Emy, Hughes and Mathews, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, pp.32–62.

[147] An initial statement of this democratic liberal argument was made by Donald Horne in *Death of the Lucky Country*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1976.

[148] By 'genuine' I mean those interested in preserving cultural traditions as a means of binding together the social order, rather than seeking to do this through the enforcement of free-market relations.

[149] John Carroll, 'Economic Rationalism and its Consequences', in John Carroll and Robert Manne, eds, *Shutdown: The Failure of Economic Rationalism and How to Rescue Australia*, Text, Melbourne, 1992, p.10. This text, edited by Carroll and Manne, represents a significant conservative right-wing statement on the Whitlam government legacy.

[150] Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia Since 1944', p.339. This argument is heavily influenced by Hayek's 1944 *The Road to Serfdom*.

[151] Frankel, *From Prophets Deserts Come*, p.130.

[152] Christopher Pearson, 'Who Will Come to the Aid of the Parties?', the *Age*, 15 April, 2002, p.11. Note the description of the government collapsing rather than being dismissed.

[153] See for example Paul Keating, '1975, Lessons for Labor in the 1980s', in Gary Jungwirth, ed., *Snapshots of Hope: the Making of Modern Labor: a Landmark Decade – Speeches to the Fabians*, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1998, p.47. See also Michael Costa and Mark Duffy, 'Labor and Economic Rationalism', in Chris James, Chris Jones and Andrew Norton, eds, *A Defence of Economic Rationalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993, pp.121–131.

[154] Postmodernism is a notoriously amorphous term which must in particular be differentiated from poststructuralism, an identifiable body of work produced within the humanities and social science departments of universities from the late 1960s onwards.

[155] Meaghan Morris, 'Politics Now (Anxieties of a Petit-bourgeois Intellectual)', *Intervention* 20, 1986, p.5.

[156] Morris', 'Politics Now', p.6.

[157] Graham Maddox suggests on the basis of a reading of Connell's *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, that "there is a case to be made that the trauma of the Dismissal diverted Labor towards adjustment to the ruling culture". 'Labor Tradition Revisited', unpublished paper submitted to *Overland* magazine's 'Ruling Class, Ruling Culture' conference, Trades Hall, Melbourne, 2002. He also puts this argument in *The Hawke Government and Labor Tradition*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1989. See also McQueen, 'Paying the Price of Victory', p.40: "Labor leaders had to learn from their 1974–75 debacle; returning to office in 1983 [they] were] determined to target welfare expenditures and to trim taxes".

[158] Morris's personal account has been called into question by Frankel, who suggests: "Compared to the political experiences of thousands of students at Monash and other universities in the 1960s, [Stephen] Muecke and Morris, like other 'culturists' of recent years, not only had little or no experience of political activity, but gained a great deal of their understanding of these turbulent events through film and cultural studies. Herein lies part of the answer as to why the 1960s politicisation of everyday life was replaced by little more than 'culturalism' in the 1980s", *From Prophets Deserts Come*, p.355. This point is made in order to strengthen Frankel's observation that "Precisely during the period of the most aggressive promotion of market capitalist values, radical political economy became unfashionable in academic institutions and other parts of society", pp.11–12. According to Morris, however, she was at least a member of the Communist Party of Australia. See 'Relations of Theory: a Dialogue', an interview conducted with Morris by Stephen Muecke, in David Carter, ed., *Outside the Book: Contemporary Essays on Literary Periodicals*, Local Consumption Publications, Double Bay, 1991, pp.57–78.

[159] Morris, 'Politics Now', p.11.

[160] Ibid., pp.10, 11.

[161] Ibid., p.11.

[162] As R. Samuel has written of postmodernism, "Though it claims to be a science of the particular, (it) thrills to the idea of the generic", the paradigmatic instance that will illuminate the whole. See R. Samuel, 'History Workshop Journal 33, 1992, p.232, quoted in Sean Scalmer, *The Career of Class: Intellectuals and the Labour Movement in Australia 1942–1956*, Ph.D., Department of Government, University of Sydney, 1996, p.12.

[163] For an extended critical review of Barrett's text see Nathan Hollier, 'The Whitlam Project', *Overland* 169, 2002, pp.104–107.

[164] The Dow Jones interactive database, now called 'Factiva', is a standard electronic library resource which indexes, among other publications, all of the major Australian newspapers.

[165] As Premier of Queensland, Bjelke-Petersen in June 1975 acted against established precedent by refusing to allow the Labor Party to select its own replacement for a Queensland senator who had died. Instead, Bjelke-Petersen appointed an obscure Labor renegade committed to bringing down the government. This resulted in Labor being completely unable to control the Senate. See Bolton, *The Middle Way*, pp.236–237.

[166] Bolton, *The Middle Way*, pp.243–244.

[167] Anthony Paul, 'It's Time for a Reality Check', *Courier Mail*, 9 November 2002, p.32.

[168] See Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur*, p.347.

[169] Ross Gittins, 'Dollar and Diversity Temper Commodities Vagaries, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 June 2002, p.46.

[170] Tim Colebatch, 'Tax Haul Hits New High: 31.8 %', the *Age*, 13 April 2002, p.3. This trend continues.

[171] Anne Henderson, 'Martyr to his Own Cause', *Courier Mail*, 6 November 2002, p.21, reprinted as 'Aussie Icon, but with Feet of Clay', *Canberra Times*, 8 November 2002, p.20.

[172] See for example Gerard McManus, 'Kim Carr has Come in from the Wilderness Now Foes Wait to Count Cost', *Sunday Herald-Sun*, 7 July 2002, p.26; Henderson, 'Martyr to his Own Cause' and 'Aussie Icon, but with Feet of Clay'; Norman Abjorensen, 'The New Guard – Were they Our Very Own Fascists?', *Canberra Times*, 8 June 2002, p.8; and Dennis Atkins, 'Sounds of the Suburbs', *Courier Mail*, 2 February 2002, p.26. Writers and editors of the *Australian Financial Review*, several of whom had direct involvement with the government as Treasury bureaucrats, have since the Dismissal been amongst the most energetic and vehement New Right critics of this government.

[173] 'Martyr to his Own Cause', and 'Aussie Icon, but with Feet of Clay'.

[174] 'Children to Suffer if Divorce Tougher', *Sunday Mail*, 18 August 2002, p.13.

[175] 'Editorial', *Herald-Sun*, 21 May 2002, p.18.

[176] 'It Wasn't Whitlam', *Sun-Herald* 21 April 2002, p.20.

[177] 'QC's Claims Not Tampa Proof', *Sun-Herald*, 14 April 2002, p.15.

[178] 'The Quiet Achiever', *Herald-Sun*, 20 March 2002, p.18.

[179] 'Sounds of the Suburbs'.

[180] 'Labor of Love', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 November 2002, p.2.

[181] 'Lasting Benefits of Gough's Vision', *Sunday Telegraph*, 3 November 2002, p.104.

[182] 'The World According to Gough', *Herald-Sun*, 2 November 2002, p.21.

[183] 'A Timeless Grandeur Amid All the Bloody Nonsense', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 February 2002, p.13.

[184] The concept of hegemony derives from Antonio Gramsci. According to Gramsci, a class achieves hegemony when it persuades other classes in society to accept its own moral, political and cultural values. If the ruling class is successful, the maintenance of hegemony will involve a minimum use of force. See Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds, Lawrence and Wishart, London & International Publishers, New York, 1971.

[185] Search conducted on 29 January 2002.

[186] This is the headline applied to their three articles in the *Australian*, 29–30 November 1997, pp.28–30.

[187] Graeme Duncan, 'Whitlam and the Problems of Social Democracy', p.469.

[188] Peter Beilharz, 'Whitlam Re-Visited', *Labour History* 63, 1992, p.176.

Chapter Two

The Origins of Disillusion:
Cultural Sources of Australian Neo-Classical Liberalism

Donald Horne concluded his history of the 1966–72 Australian period, *A Time of Hope*, with the comment that: "Perhaps in the future there may be some discussion on Australian theories of revolutionary change that go beyond conventional marxist recipes".[1] "The discussion could begin", he says, "by trying to explain why those with such high hopes in 1972 were, by 1975, so acquiescent".[2] The implication here is that at some level Whitlam and his supporters recognised that between 1972 and 1975 there had been a profound shift in the nature of Australian society and culture, that the very texture of Australian life now militated against the capacity of those who supported Whitlamism to reverse the apparent fate of this government. In chapter one it was argued that the fate of Whitlamism within history and readings of history was in no sense 'inevitable' or 'natural', that these things were strongly influenced by the distribution and use of power in society and the economy. However, if we are to begin to overcome the intellectual effects of this power, it is necessary, as Horne implies, to properly understand the historical and contemporary role of culture. For, as pointed out in the introduction, neither human consciousness nor social change are simply products of power: they are also expressions of culture, or of the imagined relationship between human beings and 'nature', that 'culture' essentially is. By making clear the particular role of culture within historical movement we can hope to obtain both a better – more detailed, sensitive and holistic – understanding of the nature of that movement, and a better awareness of how consciousness itself, including our reading of history, is culturally specific. The aim of this chapter then is to make clear, in general terms, the role of culture within the public policy shift from Keynesian Whitlamism to neo-classical liberalism, a shift that continues to define our contemporary moment and to an extent our consciousness. It is argued that the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy within Australia is most fundamentally an expression of Australia's shifting political *and cultural* relations with the United States.

The US Origins of Neo-classical Liberalism

The neo-classical liberalism embraced by Malcolm Fraser in the lead-up to the federal elections of 13 December 1975 and, to varying degrees, by all Australian governments of both Labor and Liberal after this time, was most energetically and effectively lobbied for by American individuals, organisations and institutions.[3] As Marion Sawer and David Kemp each make clear, the Australian New Right's ideas, publications, research and education centres, or think-tanks, and even, to an extent, its projected image, were closely modelled on US examples, and often with the encouragement and patronage of these US 'forebears'.[4] Even in the case of germinal Australian New Right publications like *Rip Van Australia* (1977), written by Bob Howard and the advertising executive John Singleton in what Sawer describes as "a distinctively Australian and racy style", the ideas were directly lifted from American New Right publications.[5] Singleton was a member of and helped to obtain considerable publicity for the Workers Party, formed in Sydney on 16 January 1975. Again, the platform of this party was based on that of the Libertarian Party already established in the US.[6]

The international New Right movement, that urged the wholesale privatisation of resources and deregulation of markets, developed to serve the interests of multinational corporations that in origin, ownership and outlook were mainly American. As Ted Wheelwright detailed in 1980:

> There are nearly 10,000 transnationals, if they are defined as having an affiliate in at least one other country. Most of these are [economically and politically] not very important, but the big ones are; those with affiliates in over eighteen countries and with sales of over a billion dollars. There are over 400 of these, and they account for over half the activity of the whole 10,000. Of these 400-odd, more than half belong to the USA.[7]

And as Richard T. Hughes explains, Americans in the early twentieth century:

> clearly needed a policy that would promote global expansion and, at the very same time, allow Americans to believe that they were not imperialists but rather the benefactors of all humankind. The truth is, the strategy was close at hand. Indeed, it was part and parcel of the kind of expansion Americans had in mind: economic expansion. An economic conquest of the world depended upon the private sector, not upon government or the military. Government would facilitate commercial expansion by providing financial assistance, by negotiating a reduction of foreign restrictions, and

by making it clear to all parties that the American military stood ready to intervene if its business interests should be threatened. America could always defend a military action of this kind as defensive rather than aggressive.[8]

American expansion after 1945, write Philip Bell and Roger Bell, was thus "at once more pervasive and less visible than European colonisation".[9] American governments, they write "sought a free flow of capital, goods, and ideas – an open international order. Its influence was not based on the acquisition of territory, but on less formal economic, ideological, political, cultural, and strategic links with other states".[10] US power abroad "was carried by commerce, advertising, print and broadcast media, and consumer goods, as well as new inter-governmental arrangements and supra-national organisations like the Marshall and Truman Plans, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and NATO".[11] US aims, they state, were "cultural, educational, economic, and political as well as military".[12] "These aims" moreover "were interrelated and promoted by both private interests and governments".[13] And "opposition to 'international communism' and the exigencies of the Cold War provided a rationale for intervention – both overt and covert – in other societies".[14]

As argued in the previous chapter, the decision of the US Nixon administration to abandon the system of global economic planning and stability put in place at Bretton Woods in 1944, a decision which led on to the adoption by that and many other nations of a neo-classical liberal public policy framework, was driven above all by geo-political considerations: most specifically the desire to protect and advance American power.

What is less well known, however, and what has been less comprehensively theorised, at least within Australia, is that neo-classical liberalism is also deeply and uniquely rooted in American culture. That is, the founding assumptions of neo-classical liberalism – that 'agents optimise', 'markets clear' and a good society is one based on the absence of government discrimination between individuals: negative freedom – have their strongest cultural basis within the American experience; or, more precisely, in the imagined experience of nature of the dominant American groups.[15] As Louis Hartz argued in his influential work on the American liberal tradition, the politics of all the 'new world' (or what he calls 'fragment') societies were most profoundly influenced by

political traditions – and, it could be added, by cultural traditions – introduced by founding generations.[16]

While American society of course nurtures subordinate and resistant cultures, Hughes argues persuasively that contemporary American culture is founded on powerful myths that have their origins in the historically specific experience and beliefs of the Puritan 'founding fathers' and other groups. Robert Crunden contends that "American culture is essentially a peculiar mixture of Christianity, capitalism, and democracy, *in that order*".[17] Hughes agrees, suggesting that each of the core American cultural myths derives from "a religious understanding of reality".[18] "Contrary to colloquial usage", he points out, "a myth is not a story that is patently untrue. Rather, a myth is a story that speaks of meaning and purpose, and for that reason it speaks truth to those who take it seriously".[19]

"The first myth", writes Hughes, the myth of the Chosen People, "emerged among the Puritans in the [seventeenth-century] colonial period of American history".[20] The Puritans believed themselves to be chosen to restore the pure, original, ancient Christian church, that had been defiled by a Catholicism which the Church of England and its overly permissive Protestant monarchs had never adequately sloughed off. The Puritans would re-establish this pure Christianity by forming a national covenant with God, the theological importance of which was suggested by the Englishman William Tyndale in his massively influential 1534 English translation of and commentary on the New Testament.[21] As Hughes explains, "Tyndale's vision of a covenant was the soil in which the notion of chosenness would slowly germinate until, finally, it would spring full-blown in the United States".[22] Maintaining the human end of this covenant entailed a complete acceptance of the inescapable wickedness, weakness and fallibility of humanity and a complete submission to the will of God. Hughes relates that "Puritans never sought liberty for its own sake ... . They rather sought freedom to place themselves under the absolute control of the law of God, revealed in scripture".[23] For the Puritans, it was thought to be the responsibility of each individual to find the task or vocation that God had set for him or her in life, and to work at that vocation to the best of one's ability, for the glory of God.[24] Hughes argues:

In its best and highest form, this myth summoned the Puritans to 'love brotherly without dissimulation' and to 'beare one anothers burthens', as John Winthrop, the first governor of Massachusetts Bay Colony, reminded the settlers in 1630. In its original form *chosenness* meant 'chosen for the good of the neighbour'. In time, however, Americans would absolutise this myth and claim that God chose the American people for special blessings and privileges in the world. At the very least, many still believe today that, in some mysterious way, God chose the American people for a special, redeeming role on the stage of world history.[25]

Generations of immigrants, Hughes adds, have found the myth of the chosen nation to accord with their experience and desires.[26]

The second myth in Hughes' account, "the myth of Nature's Nation", is he says "a construct of the Enlightenment and emerged in the Revolutionary Era".[27] "In its highest and noblest form", he suggests, "this myth essentially affirmed the promise of the American Creed, for it grounded the rights of all humankind in 'nature', that is, in the way things were meant to be".[28] However:

In order to justify the oppressive dimensions of American culture in the nineteenth century, some Americans would absolutise this myth as well. Many would argue, for example, that 'nature' had 'decreed' the removal of Native Americans and the enslavement of blacks ... To this day, our particular versions of democracy and capitalism seem so 'natural' that many Americans cannot imagine that there might be any viable alternatives.[29]

The particularly esteemed place of natural science, and the pervasiveness of positivist and scientistic explanations and justifications of thought and action within scholarly and popular American intellectual life, is clearly linked to this historic, essentially religious valorisation of 'nature'.[30] The Puritan distrust in humanity leads to a hypertrophy of both scientistic and mystical forms of knowledge, at the expense of normative reason, based on shared interpretations, experiences and values.[31] What results is a characteristically American response to the world, in which religious or quasi-religious fundamental, scientistic and essential laws of 'nature' are drawn upon to build social legitimacy for beliefs and actions that are at the same time highly idiosyncratic, individualistic or self-serving.[32] Radical positivism and scientism are the flipside of radical mysticism and subjectivism.

The third myth referred to by Hughes, "the myth of the Christian Nation", was a by-product of the Second Great Awakening and emerged in the [late eighteenth-century] early national period.[33] "At its best", he writes, this myth "summoned Americans to embrace behaviour in keeping with the teachings of Jesus".[34] Ironically, however, "this myth married itself rather quickly to the myth of the Chosen People and the myth of Nature's Nation. In this way, Americans absolutised this myth and the notion of a Christian Nation became a badge of cultural superiority, not an incentive to extend compassion to the poor and the oppressed".[35] "The fourth myth", states Hughes, "the myth of the Millennial Nation, also emerged in the early national period".[36] "Struck with the wonders of the American system of government, and especially with the newness of American freedoms", he explains, "many believed that the United States would usher in a millennial age of freedom that would eventually bless all the peoples of the earth".[37] But again "Americans have often absolutised this myth".[38] Accordingly, "Americans have sometimes been willing to *force* others to be free, as was the case with the Philippines in the Spanish-American War. More often, Americans imagined they would liberate the world through the sheer force of their example".[39]

"The practice of (American) capitalism", states Crunden, "emerged under the domination of puritan religious values and business long had religious sanction in ways that few European countries could or wanted to duplicate".[40] Laissez-faire capitalism, writes Hughes, flourished in the United States after the American civil war.[41] From this time American capitalism was in Hughes' terms "a doctrine grounded in the absolutised form of earlier national myths".[42] "Americans of the late nineteenth century", he explains, "began to promote capitalism, self-interest, and greed as fundamentally natural, as inherently Christian, as the handmaid to American chosenness, and as the presupposition for the dawn of the final golden age".[43] He summarises later:

> In the late nineteenth century, capitalism became shrouded in myth and linked to other mythical dimensions of American culture. First, Americans imagined capitalism ordained of God and grounded squarely in the natural order of things. Second, because of their virtue, God had chosen some to succeed on the capitalist playing field, and because of their sinfulness, he had chosen others to fail. Third, because they were fit, nature had decreed that some would survive in the context of capitalist competition, and because they were 'weak and listless', as William Lawrence put it, nature had decreed that others would simply die away. Finally, fidelity to the

principle of competition that stood at the heart of the capitalist system would usher in the final golden age and bring peace on earth, good will to men.[44]

Hughes goes on to say: "This constellation of myths provided privileged and wealthy Americans of the late nineteenth century a virtual mandate to extend their power not only throughout the lands that belonged to the United States, but also throughout the world".[45] "If God had singled out America as his chosen instrument among all the nations of the earth", Hughes relates, "then America had every right to engage in economic expansion. If God blessed the righteous with wealth and cursed sinners with poverty, then it stood to reason that God *required* economic expansion".[46] Moreover, "if capitalism was rooted in the natural order of things, then American economic expansion partook of the natural order as well".[47] And "if America was a Christian nation, then the work of economic expansion was an act of Christian charity".[48] Finally, "if part of the American mission was to hasten the redemption of the world and the final golden age, then economic expansion was, in all likelihood, a significant part of the redemptive process".[49]

This particular capitalist culture, Hughes notes, remains in place in the US today, "providing 'moral' justification for the [radically individualist, amoral] behaviours that led to [the 2002 US corporate] scandals".[50] "To be sure", writes Hughes, "few would argue that God has chosen some for wealth and others for poverty and deprivation".[51] But, he states, "this is only because the doctrine of 'divine chosenness' has been largely secularised. In the place of God, nature reigns supreme in modern America, and most Americans would find little with which to quibble in either the so-called law of competition or the doctrine of the survival of the fittest".[52] By the same token:

> Few today would agree with Russell Conwell that 'the men who get rich may be the most honest men you find in the community'. Americans have seen far too much corruption to subscribe to that proposition. But a great many privileged Americans would agree in principle with Henry Ward Beecher's dictum that 'no man in this land suffers from poverty unless it be more than his fault – unless it be his sin'.[53]

"Likewise", says Hughes, "many Americans find axiomatic the proposition that the creation of free markets around the globe and the expanded production of wealth and material possessions will eventually launch a golden age that will bless the world".[54]

"Americans since the late nineteenth century", he points out, "have defined the very meaning of life in terms of monetary success and the accumulation of goods".[55]

In cultural terms then, the dominant strands of American culture are ultimately grounded in the religious beliefs of the English Puritans who established settlements at Plymouth in 1620, and Massachusetts Bay in 1630.[56] As Crunden asserts in his history of American culture: "The essential characteristics of American economic behaviour and artistic endeavour stem from (Puritan) origins".[57] "Often challenged", he writes, these Puritan traditions of thought and behaviour "proved capable of overpowering alternative ways of expression to set a cultural tone accepted in most quarters as 'American' until well into the twentieth century".[58]

The Puritans believed that all human beings were innately selfish and self-serving and that it was the responsibility of the individual to fight against these submerged bestial tendencies, or drives. As Crunden puts it, "not even Sigmund Freud believed more firmly in the Id than the Puritans did".[59] Left to their 'natural' devices, the Puritans believed, individuals would 'optimise' their own material rewards at the expense of others. 'Founding father' John Winthrop writes in 1639, for example: "the habit of covetousness ... is in every man in some degree".[60]

Starting from this view of human nature, it is not surprising that the Puritans placed little faith in subjective human reason as a means of personal or social amelioration, and were accordingly concerned to place strict limits on the powers of government. For the Puritans, as Crunden explains, "uncontrollable drives motivated people and governments, and the goal of their political science was to channel these drives so that they did the least harm to society. The striving for power corrupted the best men and turned them into tyrants once they attained public office".[61] Similarly, in Henry Commager's account, "as the Fathers of the Revolution read history", in the late eighteenth century, "it taught one grand and solemn lesson: that all government tends to tyranny, that no government is to be trusted, and that government is best that governs least".[62] "A wise and frugal government", suggested Thomas Jefferson in his inaugural presidential address, "shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labour the bread it has earned".[63]

The dominant American attitude to the role of government has been further strengthened by the internal and external dynamics of US history. In Commager's estimation, "the Jeffersonian faith in the ability of the individual to fend for himself [sic] and the Jeffersonian fear of government ... were based upon realities[,] upon historical experience".[64] Where "the English economy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ... was one in many respects closely controlled by the state", he writes, "the New World environment ... was not favourable to the maintenance of rigid controls, and there were many who ... revolted against them".[65] "Many Americans", states Crunden, "had come to America to escape the religious and class antagonisms of Europe and the settlers were always suspicious of governments".[66] Governments "seemed to act in mysterious ways to deprive citizens of their liberty".[67] "Such an attitude", he says, "lies at the root of the long-standing American hostility to European social democracy in the twentieth century".[68] "Americans", he explains further, "disliked the corrupt, nepotistic relationship between the British government and capitalism, most obviously the East India Tea Company (and) the nation that resulted retained this hostility to government-assisted business ventures in ways that contrast strikingly with modern attitudes in Japan or Germany";[69] or, it could have been added until at least the last two decades, Australia.[70] The "emphasis on private group action remained a deep strain in American psychology", Crunden also suggests, in part because the "Americans managed the revolution through private, *ad hoc* organizations".[71] As a result, importantly:

> Unlike the British system, where the various branches of government represented separate social interests, the American system evolved in such a way as to have the president, the senate, and the judiciary, as well as the house, all represent the people. Each may check the power of the other, but each represents 'the people', and not a special class or interest group in society.[72]

The proper relationship between the individual and government is imagined as a 'pure' one.

The characteristically American degree of faith in free markets is obviously linked to the traditional distrust of government regulation, but is also grounded in the Puritan notion of the individual and national 'covenant' with God, through which it could be argued that social outcomes were signs of God's will.[73] Also important here is the

strength of American Deist religion during the mid- to late-eighteenth century revolutionary period, beliefs which foregrounded the idea of 'nature' as the true 'book' of God's will and thus implied that overt regulation of social activity should be minimised.[74] A further factor is the idealisation of the 'rugged' pioneering individual.[75] And there is the profound impact within America of Herbert Spencer's mid- and late-nineteenth century social Darwinism;[76] an impact strengthened, especially after the American Civil War, by the nation's radically stratified class structure,[77] the energetic propagation of social Darwinist doctrines by leading industrialists, statesmen and jurists,[78] and by a more general American idealisation of science and technology, strengthened by both the Puritan distrust of subjective human interpretation and the evident industrial and military power lent to the United States by its technological advancement.[79]

Accordingly, intellectuals of the predominantly American New Right movement repeatedly contended that, because of its grounding in positivist science, their analysis was inherently superior to the normative and evaluative forms of analysis based on the Keynesian understanding of economics and public policy as parts of social science. This claim was made in popular forums such as the *Australian Financial Review* as well within the university.[80] New Right public-policy advocacy notably ignored evidence contradicting its claims,[81] as well as alternative public-policy frameworks,[82] and was characterised by the propagation of essentialised, a-social and a-historical 'truths', such as the claims that wealth and poverty have primarily biological or psychological bases.[83] New Right intellectuals argued that a free-market society would reward hard work, rugged individualism, against the grafting hands of the weak, protected and symbolised by the welfare state.[84] At the same time they relentlessly criticised welfare recipients, public sector workers and unionists as lazy, inefficient and dishonest. In institutionalising both greed and need, individual material incentive, the New Right directly promoted radical individualism. Underpinning this scientism, subjectivism and individualism has been the characteristic American puritan rhetoric, and set of ontological assumptions, in which the inherently 'fallen' nature of humanity can be overcome by faith in and acceptance of the laws of nature, especially as these are revealed by (natural) science.[85]

Neo-classical Liberalism and the Americanisation of Australian Culture 1: A Review of the Literature

It has already been noted that the most direct sources of Australian neo-classical liberalism were American individuals, organisations, institutions and finance. And it has been argued that neo-classical liberalism is strongly underpinned by dominant strands of American culture, a culture characterised by a radical individualism with its roots in Puritanism, and, via an idealisation of 'nature', both radical scientism and its flipside: radical mysticism or subjectivism. In the postwar period, especially, Australian culture began to be strongly influenced by, or to take on the appearance of, these traditionally American characteristics.[86] The nature and extent of this Americanisation will be considered later in the chapter. Firstly, however, it is necessary to address the question of why scholars of neo-classical liberalism, of Whitlam and the Whitlam period, and of Australian politics and history more generally, have not given extensive consideration to the possibility that the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberalism within Australia might be an expression of the Americanisation of Australian culture.

Bruce Bennett has asked if "few serious analyses of North American influences (on Australian education, culture and society) have been attempted ... because, like the British influences which they in many cases superseded, they were so pervasive"?[87] There is in any case a general lack of research on Australian right-wing political philosophies and groups.[88] It is clear, however, that existing historical accounts of the shift from Whitlamite welfare-state to neo-classical liberal public policy tend to begin from an overly narrow conception of culture and so fail to properly analyse the cultural dimensions of this development in public policy. Existing accounts either suggest that the dominance of neo-classical liberalism is an expression of the contemporary dominance of scientific or instrumental rationalism over normative truth and cultural considerations (thereby ignoring the extent to which this scientific and instrumental rationality is culturally specific), or exclude questions of culture altogether, or conclude that neo-liberal public policy and philosophy, like and in the same way as all other phenomena, are cultural, and that it is therefore not meaningful to talk about this policy and philosophy in terms of cultural dominance and subservience: power. These approaches

broadly correspond with the philosophies of liberal humanism, conservatism and postmodernism. As Terry Eagleton has argued, "we are trapped at the moment between disablingly wide and discomfortingly rigid notions of culture".[89] "Our most urgent need in the area", he suggests, "is to move beyond both".[90]

The most detailed and sophisticated account of the rise of neo-classical liberalism within Australia remains Michael Pusey's 1991 *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-Building State Changes Its Mind*.[91] In this text Pusey takes note of the American intellectual and institutional sources of Australian neo-classical liberalism and points out that the philosophy and experience underpinning this new public policy is at odds with those traditionally dominant within Australia. "In every country from the late 1970s", he writes (the reference to 'every country' perhaps overstating his case), "programs of state and public sector reform have been driven by a conservative agenda".[92] He sees this agenda as informed by "an underlying scientism that seems to turn arbitrariness into givenness and imperiously asserts its own exclusive evaluative criteria for what will, in the wake of its 'reforms', count as intelligence, ability, and efficacy".[93] "What wins", he says, is a kind of 'dephenomenalising' abstraction that tries to neutralise the social contexts of program goals in every area, whether it be education, industry support, public health, or water resource management".[94] As a result of this, "a new generation of 'strategic visionaries' have taken charge of a vigorous program of public sector reform. Within 'the system', their 'mission' has been to 'demoralise' the public sector and so to produce in Canberra, purposely or not, that 'sickness in the soul of the public administrator' that now afflicts their American counterparts".[95] "There is cause to ask", he says, "whether the institutions of a supposedly 'strong' and nation-building state were really the borrowed cladding of a vanishing colonial inheritance that has (especially with the relative decline of Britain and its integration within the EEC) left Australia exposed to a recolonisation in the alien framework of a totalitarian American 'business democracy'".[96]

In his later study of the social effects of neo-classical liberal economic 'reform', *The Experience of Middle Australia*, Pusey also draws attention to the fact that neo-classical liberalism was "sold" to governments by (predominantly American) business groups as a solution to *political*, not economic, social problems.[97] However, Pusey

cannot see neo-classical liberalism as in any sense an expression of American culture, or indeed, of any culture, because for Pusey neo-classical liberalism is a form of public policy that results from a more pervasive intellectual attempt to comprehend and organise society on the basis of the natural, or positivist, scientific method, and he conceives of this scientism precisely as culture's opposite, or other: "The triumph of economic rationalism points to a weakness of culture and civil society".[98] "Perhaps the most central finding", says Pusey, is that, since the 1970s, reality has been turned upside down and society has been recast as the object of politics (rather than, at least in the norms of the earlier discourses), as the subject of politics".[99] "Societies", he concludes, "are threatened by their own coordinative structures and, most notably now, by an economic steering mechanism which violates the adaptive capacities of ordinary social life and threatens the social reproduction of culture and individual identity".[100]

"All that is solid melts into air", wrote Marx in the *Communist Manifesto*, referring in part to capitalism's tendency to crush cultural tradition, and Pusey sees capitalism in comparable terms as existing in a zero-sum oppositional relationship with culture, defined as 'traditional' society. For Pusey culture is that which is not scientific: culture is 'tradition' – pre-modern, non-rational, communal – that 'whole way of life' that is studied within anthropology, especially. Capitalism, on the other hand, is essentially a product of science, and neo-classical liberalism or economic rationalism is a product of positivist science. This is why Pusey prefers 'economic rationalism' to 'neo-classical liberalism' or 'neo-liberalism': his chosen term suggests his view that the adoption of this policy represents a new degree of dominance by a more pervasive and older positivist philosophy. Influenced by the German historicist philosophical strand of Weber and Jürgen Habermas, especially, which can be traced back to Immanuel Kant, Pusey is most vitally concerned with rejecting the view that positivist science can provide useful models for the wholesale organisation and government of society.[101] Accordingly, he sees the historical conflict between Whitlam's Keynesian welfare-state public-policy model and the neo-classical liberal model of the New Right as a conflict between *cultured* ways of knowing and acting, based on normative truth, on the one hand, and modes of thought and action based on empirical truth, or positivist science, on the other. His central argument is that within the governments of "Anglo-American capitalism",

mathematically measurable forms of knowledge have, disastrously, come to dominate over normative truths, based on shared experiences and values, in the setting of policy: "The first assumption of this economic rationalism is that the 'economy ... obeys not an immanent logic of needs, but instead the need for an immanent logic' ... The state apparatus takes on a form of rationalisation which looks more like aggressive nihilism than reason and which seems to endanger the reproduction of society itself".[102]

Pusey ignores the extent to which neo-classical liberalism and positivist scientism are rooted in American culture – in Americans' imagined experience of nature – and does not consider the possibility that the spread of American culture within Australia may have helped to prepare the way for Australians' acceptance of these developments, because in Pusey's account neo-classical liberalism or economic rationalism precisely *is* an expression of the subordination of culture to positivist science, which by definition has no cultural origins. Inevitably the proponents of this new policy framework appear in his account as simply morally bad and / or intellectually narrow, while the ordinary people who experience the personal and social effects of this policy framework can only appear to be either stupid (where they accept these changes) or mere victims. The cultural dimensions of this broad-based social change are collapsed into its intellectual and political dimensions because Pusey begins from an overly narrow conception of 'culture', an overly rigid distinction between culture and science.

'Culture' is an extraordinarily contested term, valued by both the political Right (who generally see it as a means of binding people together across class, gender and other structural social barriers) and the Left (who see in its communal nature a basis for collective opposition to holders of political, economic and cultural power). As Raymond Williams, one of the most often cited authorities on the subject, explains, the complicated meaning of 'culture' ensues "partly because of its intricate historical development, in several European languages, but mainly because it has now come to be used for important concepts in several distinct intellectual disciplines and in several distinct and incompatible systems of thought".[103] However, in contemporary usage, and leaving aside references to physical culture within various branches of the sciences, the uses of 'culture' operate in three broad categories, drawing on three core meanings of the word.[104]

The oldest still existing core meaning is that of culture as a synonym for civilisation. To be cultured is to be *cultivated*, civilised. As an independent noun, culture arrived in English from the French during the mid-eighteenth century. Culture had previously been a noun of process, as Williams explains: "the culture (cultivation) of crops or (rearing and breeding) of animals, and by extension the culture (active cultivation) of the human mind".[105] The immediate precursor to 'culture' was the Latin 'cultura', which according to Williams meant "cultivation or tending, though with subsidiary medieval meanings of honour and worship".[106] As Eagleton notes, taking cognisance of the Latin rootword of 'culture' and 'cultura': 'colere', culture has its roots in nature: "The cultural means we use to transform nature are themselves derived from it".[107] Chris Jenks adds that from the time of its first appearance in English until the late eighteenth century, the word 'culture' existed in primary semantic opposition to 'nature'.[108] It was the freedom from labour, enabled by cultivation of the earth, that enabled the social and psychological development that would be labelled culture. Here, writes Eagleton, "'culture' belonged to the general spirit of the Enlightenment, with its cult of secular, progressive self-development".[109] This was the case, Williams suggests, "first in the abstract sense of a general process of becoming 'civilised' or 'cultivated'; second, in the sense which had already been established for *civilisation* by the historians of the Enlightenment, in the popular (eighteenth century) form of the universal histories, as a description of the secular process of human development".[110] Culture here involves the development of the universally finest human qualities. Importantly, within this usage of culture, there is no distinction drawn between cultural and scientific development. As a result, the notion of culture as a synonym for civilisation, for the intellectual and social activities that sustain the society or societies that are included within the civilisation definition, in practice necessarily involves the subjugation of the cultural (as it came to be understood later) to the scientific.

A second core meaning of 'culture' derives from a late eighteenth-century German (and to a lesser extent English) dissatisfaction with the unitary logic and universalist humanism of the primarily French notion of culture as civilisation. The equation of culturedness with a society's degree of cultivation or civilisation can be seen as elitist and Eurocentric. As Eagleton writes, "it is with the unfolding of nineteenth-

century colonialism" that the second, "anthropological meaning" of culture, "as a unique way of life, first starts to take grip".[111] 'Culture', Williams writes, now becomes "a noun of *configuration* or *generalisation* of the 'spirit' which informed the 'whole way of life' of a distinct people".[112] A key figure in the development of this new sense of the meaning of 'culture' is Johann Herder, who according to Williams "first used the significant plural, 'cultures', in deliberate distinction from any singular or, as we would now say, unilinear sense of 'civilisation'".[113] Herder also wrote of culture, in his *Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (1784–91): "nothing is more indeterminate than this word, and nothing more deceptive than its application to all nations and periods".[114] This sense of culture, which according to Williams "remained comparatively isolated" until at least the mid–nineteenth century,[115] is in one sense more inclusive, but in another more specialised and exclusive. As Eagleton explains: "whereas the French 'civilisation' typically included political, economic and technical life, the German 'culture' had a more narrowly religious, artistic and intellectual reference. It could also mean the intellectual refinement of a group or individual, rather than of society as a whole".[116]

This second sense of culture informs the growth of the disciplines of anthropology and sociology.[117] The meaning of culture here begins to shift from being synonymous with, to the antonym of 'civilisation', as though in its embracing of rationality, civilisation had become antithetical to the more 'natural' feelings and practices of common people, who live according to tradition. Idealist philosophers in Germany and Romantic artists in Germany and Britain embraced this concept of culture – as an environmentally organic 'whole way of life' – as an expression of their antipathy toward the alienating, exploitative, environmentally 'inorganic' and politically imperialist social structure of capitalism.[118] Initially this was expressed in an interest in folk culture and medievalism, and in a general antipathy to technology, mechanisation and the machine, clearly evident in the poetry of Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Blake, Byron and in the work of most of their Romantic artistic contemporaries. From the time of the Idealist philosophers and the Romantic artists, according to Jenks, 'culture' ceases to exist in primary semantic opposition to 'nature' and begins to exist in primary opposition to 'the machine'.[119] By the end of the nineteenth century, Eagleton concludes, 'culture' had

become "the name of the Romantic, pre-Marxist critique of early industrial capitalism".[120]

Culture, within this second meaning, is less idealised, in the sense that it refers to a way of life as it is lived rather than to a rationalist ideal based on scientific principles. But culture here is also more idealised in the sense that the spirit or sensibility of a people who share a whole way of life is necessarily held to be generally independent from the political, economic, scientific and technological structures and processes that characterise that life style. In Eagleton's account: "As the modern age unfolded ... culture became a rather toothless form of political critique, or it was the protected area into which one could siphon off all those potentially disruptive energies, spiritual, artistic or erotic, for which modernity could make less and less provision".[121]

A third meaning of 'culture', dating to the late nineteenth century,[122] refers to the set of objects and practices that are held to define the spirit or sensibility of the society as a whole (when culture is understood in terms of its second meaning) or the civilisation (when culture is understood in terms of its first meaning). Here, 'culture' refers to the arts and learning. To the extent that the arts and humanities, within this context, are generally privileged as more cultural than the social and physical sciences, the second core meaning of culture could be said to dominate within this category. However, the very notion that a set of cultural objects and practices could encapsulate the spirit or sensibility of the culture of society as a whole can be seen to be based on the Enlightenment notions dominant within the first core meaning of culture. As Williams writes, this third use "is in origin an applied form of sense (i): the idea of a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development was applied and effectively transferred to the works and practices which represent and sustain it. In English (i) and (iii) are still close".[123] It is within this third core meaning of culture, then, that the ongoing tensions between the two earlier core meanings of culture, deriving respectively from or alongside the Enlightenment and Romanticism, are most fully evident.

Pusey, like most liberal-humanist thinkers, basically defines culture in terms of its second meaning. (It is no coincidence that this is the meaning that derives from German Idealist philosophers like Kant, by whom Pusey is much influenced.) But as Williams argues, it is an intellectual error to begin from any narrow definition of culture, since the

inevitable result will be an unsatisfactorily reductive interpretation of the complex relations between culture and society. "The complex of senses", states Williams, "indicates a complex argument about the relations between general human development and a particular way of life, and between both and the works and practices of art and intelligence".[124] He goes on to contend that "these arguments and questions cannot be resolved by reducing the complexity of actual usage", because the complexity "is not finally in the word but in the problems which its variations of use significantly indicate".[125] That is to say, the different substantial meanings of culture cannot be conflated, because the differences derive from the complex nature of human relations with the world and each other. In one sense, then, culture does include more or less everything; while it also has narrower and more precise meanings. No single definition is completely satisfactory, but it can be said that it is an intellectual error, or unjustifiable conflation of complex reality, to try to suggest a radical separateness of these different dimensions of culture, or to try to conflate the differences between them, reducing questions of culture to questions of science, or nature to culture, and so on.

In contrast to Pusey, David Kemp draws exclusively on the first and oldest meaning of culture – culture as a synonym for civilisation – in his account of the rise of neo-classical liberalism in Australia. Kemp's 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia Since 1944' is the most substantial New Right account of this history and in drawing on the first meaning of culture is broadly representative of the politically conservative approach to cultural analysis. Starting like Pusey from a narrow definition of culture, the resultant historical narrative is similarly (and perhaps even more predictably) inadequate. In this article Kemp states that:

> The increasing influence of [neo-classical] liberal thought was based principally on two factors: (a) the growing role of analysis in the policy process and on the analytical strength of liberal social science; and (b) the growing insecurity of Australia's international economic position, which liberal intellectuals identified as a consequence of the excessive pursuit in the past of short-term security through government regulation at the expense of flexibility and adaptability to change.[126]

So for Kemp the rise of neo-classical liberalism stemmed from the analytic or rational strength of neo-classical liberal policy analysis in recognising and comprehending the

objective material conditions facing the nation and the world, within a context in which rational analysis was being granted a greater role in directing public policy. Neither political power nor, it would seem, culture, play any significant role within this historical development.

This is not quite true, however, for Kemp needs to explain why neo-classical liberalism emerged in some parts of the world and not others. Accordingly, he goes on to say: "The influence of [neo-classical] liberal thought was based in turn on two features of Australian culture that were shared with the rest of Western civilisation: rationalism and individualism".[127] Only within the narrow understanding of culture as civilisation, in which no distinction is drawn between culture, science and the social structure, could rationalism and individualism be held to be aspects of culture. Within the second and third core meanings of culture these things are more likely to be seen as the antitheses of culture. The notion of a 'culture' of rationalism and individualism is further undermined by Kemp's next proposition, that "The foundation of the continuing interest in liberal thought is to be found in a basic characteristic of the human condition: people have purposes and wish to realise them".[128] Thus, while the notion of an Australian and Western culture of rationalism and individualism suggests a democratic basis for the policy direction provided by neo-classical liberal intellectuals, the real origins of these beliefs and systems of thought, and presumably of the political power of Western 'civilisation', are found in 'a basic characteristic of the human condition', in nature. Australian and Western culture then is supposedly distinguished by its members' acceptance of rationalism and individualism as essentially natural. While culture is rarely mentioned directly in other right-wing and journalistic histories of and references to Whitlam and the rise of neo-classical liberalism, this notion of Australian society as a civilisation, a product of a culture of rational individualism, informs their writing. Recent Australian history is thus similarly understood as ultimately a rational expression of the natural behaviour of individuals.

The most extensive consideration of the cultural bases of Australian liberalism is Judith Brett's *Australian Liberalism and the Moral Middle Class*.[129] Brett understandably contends that cultural factors have not been given the attention they deserve in accounts of the motivations of Australian Liberal and conservative politicians and their supporters.

"This book", she writes, "goes back to Deakin, Bruce and Lyons to explore the origins of Menzies' mid-century construction of the political world, and forward to Fraser and Howard to see what became of it".[130] She takes as her primary material "the words of those who subscribed"[131] to the Liberal tradition – qualitative rather than quantitative evidence – and finds deep connections between these statements by Liberal leaders and intellectuals and key strains of Australian culture, particularly those emanating from Protestantism. Throughout, Brett emphasises the agency of middle- and working-class Liberal voters and the positive, active reasons for their voting choice, in contrast to class-based interpretations which point to the Party's persistent inducement of and capitalisation on ignorance, prejudice and fear.

Brett convincingly identifies the origins of Australian liberalism prior to the dominance of its neo-classical form in broadly puritanical *British* Protestantism: "The British Liberalism on which the Australian Liberals drew", she writes, "had a Protestant history".[132] Menzies, she notes:

> was born in 1894 when Queen Victoria was on the throne, in what he later described as 'the outer empire', and grew up during the resurgence of British imperial fervour before World War One. Britain was the centre of his world, the source of the power, the wealth and the people that had established white society in Australia and of the institutions, values, and ideas on which it had been built.[133]

British-Australian Protestant liberalism was philosophically individualist: "Deakin's definition of a man" for example "had its tap root deep in the complex intertwined history of liberalism and Protestantism[,] in which the Protestant reformation's fight for freedom of religious conviction paved the way for its secularisation in liberalism's independence of political judgement".[134] It was therefore opposed to and intolerant of sectional or group identities and to explanations of reality in structural terms: "The underlying logic of Protestant liberalism", states Brett, "with its emphasis on the virtues of free-thinking, independent men[,] makes it impossible to recognise group-based identities as legitimate";[135] and "the fundamental position of individual choice and moral agency in the Protestant imagination makes it pre-sociological in a way the Catholic imagination is not".[136] Physical, as opposed to verbal, protest, was regarded here as deeply uncivilised.[137] A strict opposition was drawn between 'ideology', which was loathed, and

the much prized 'reason'.[138] Honesty, thought of in the Cromwellian sense of telling the 'plain truth', was an especially treasured virtue.[139]

But this individualism was notably tempered by an emphasis on personal sacrifice and the importance of fulfilment of duty, as the proper bases of good citizenship and thus of the moral health of society, upon which prosperity was assumed to ultimately wrest. "Duty, sacrifice and service", Brett finds for example, "were the major themes in the advertising for [First World War] war bonds".[140] Similarly, Prime Minister Joseph Lyons' resignation from Labor, Brett suggests, "made him the Australian Liberals' ideal representative, appealing to his conscience in defiance of the dictates of his party, putting the representative processes of parliament and the good of the nation above the claims of the party, acting from a sense of service and duty, rather than ambition and self-interest".[141]

This British-Australian Protestant liberalism placed great moral emphasis on 'sound finance', understood during the interwar years in terms of balanced budgets and a refusal to over-consume or rely on borrowed money: "The issues of financial morality in the 1930s had deep psychological roots in the belief that the stability of the nation's financial system was ultimately grounded in stability of character".[142] "The commonsense link was established in people's minds", writes Brett, "between the managing of the household and the national economies".[143] But the general emphasis on the individual's duty to society and the absence of a Deist fetishisation of nature meant that there was not a wholesale acceptance of free market relations as an essentially natural expression of God's will, as was the case in the US. Hence in the interwar period, "the growing understanding of the interdependence of the national economy was accompanied by the widespread belief that the pain necessary to restore its health must be shared".[144] Part of Lyons' appeal was in the example of restraint that he set,[145] Brett argues, and she also contends that the conservative United Australia Party – the immediate precursor to the Australian Liberal Party – lost its way in the late 1930s in part because "its financial backers [were] more obvious than ever".[146] "For most of the century, certainly until the 1970s", Brett concludes, "Australian Liberals' commitment to individual freedom was contained and limited by widely shared understandings of the basis of Australia's social unity. Race, crown and nation all provided plausible

representations of what Australians shared, and an ethic of service balanced talk of rights with that of duty and obligation".[147]

It is not at all clear that, as Brett imagines, her culturalist interpretations invalidate the materialist insights of preceding historical accounts.[148] The trouble with focusing on and taking at face value the statements of Liberals or any other group is that deliberately obfuscatory and unconscious (properly ideological) motivations cannot then be taken into account. There is no reason why conflicting culturalist and materialist interpretations cannot both be correct at the same time. If Deakin's 'Liberals' were so unwilling to be morally compromised, for example, why did they side with their erstwhile enemies, the free-trade anti-socialists, at the time of the 'fusion' of liberal and conservative parties in Australia, rather than maintain their independence? Obviously, the price of such independence, electoral failure, was *for class reasons* deemed too high.[149]

More importantly, however, because she sees neo-classical liberalism (or 'neo-liberalism', as she prefers) as an expression of scientistic logic, and like Pusey thinks of culture and science as existing in radical opposition to each other, she does not situate the rise of neo-classical liberalism within the cultural terms she has mapped out in her study. Though she has noted connections between Australian and British Protestantism and liberalism throughout her study, Brett does not go on to note connections between Australian and American Puritanism and neo-classical liberalism, or suggest the possibility that neo-classical liberalism may have its cultural origins in a peculiarly American, individualist, scientistic and subjectivist application of Puritanism.

With the appearance of Fraser and neo-classical liberalism in Brett's narrative, cultural factors are nowhere to be seen. Neo-classical liberalism is instead understood as an essentially rational response to a vaguely imagined 'postmodernity':

> The world economy had changed, as the end of the long boom gave way to a new phase of economic globalisation ... Fraser wanted to strengthen the market economy, but his market was still essentially a market of goods, tangible products like bales of wool, machines, clothes and iron ore, not the fast growing postmodern market of services, images, experiences and intellectual property.[150]

Although Brett argues that neo-classical liberalism is imposed from above – by political leaders, bureaucrats, journalists and so on – she also argues, somewhat

contradictorily, that this set of policy is a response to an *historically inevitable* breakdown or dispersal of community and to the end of socio-economic class as a popular basis of identity. Thus, while she sees neo-classical liberalism as imposed by a certain group in society – a class? – she also argues that this form of policy is, somehow naturally, the policy of the historical moment. "This [neo-classical liberal] transformation", writes Brett, "was the result, not of pressures from below, of groups and interests working through the party system to influence government policy, but of an elite conversion to the belief that the Australian economy had to be restructured, whether the Australian people liked it or not".[151] But:

> By 1996 ... class understandings no longer framed people's day-to-day lives nor their understandings of political action and possibilities. The spread of suburbia and increased levels of home ownership, the increased mobility given by the motorcar, the general increase in living standards, and spread of consumerist, home-centred lifestyles ... had made the politics of class difference seem largely irrelevant.[152]

"The decline of class-based explanations", she concludes, "left the way clear for social explanations based on individuals' qualities and actions".[153]

Where Brett has earlier, like Pusey, configured culture in terms of its second meaning, as being broadly opposed to the scientific and the 'modern', she now equates culture with its third meaning: culture as the arts and learning. That is to say, she confuses postmodernity, an arbitrarily defined historical period, with postmodernism, a philosophy which in many of its manifestations emphasises the textual nature of all reality, and so also both the capacity of the individual, or the 'reader', to 'construct' her own reality, and the absence of material centres of genuine power. In so doing Brett effectively loses the ability to differentiate between the world and representations of it. Here, neo-classical liberalism is cultural, but only in the sense that everything is cultural.

This postmodernist relativism, with its origins in Romanticism and Hegelian Idealism,[154] is articulated more extensively in Lindsay Barrett's *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card: Blue Poles and Cultural Politics in the Whitlam Era*.[155] Barrett argues that the era of the Whitlam government is best understood as 'modern', and as definitively marking off the modern from our own postmodern age. But while the profound nature of this social change may be beyond question, what Barrett means by

'modern' and 'postmodern' and his understanding of the bases and nature of this historical shift, are not. For Barrett, all thought, from the creative to the analytic, is an expression of the epoch in which one exists, of the regimes of truth, in Foucault's terms, that dominate during that epoch.[156] Accordingly, no individual or group can be seen to be capable of influencing the course of history or the historical conditions in which they live. In this text Barrett identifies many different cultural and material factors involved in this shift from Whitlamism to neo-classical liberalism, modernity to postmodernity, but eschews any suggestion that any particular factors were more important than others in bringing this general historical shift about. Indeed, it is the very indeterminacy of the causes of this historical movement that serve for Barrett as evidence of its depth, profundity and inevitability.

Beginning as Barrett does from this conceptual framework, the conclusions that he reaches are foregone ones: the Whitlam government was both an expression of its modernist age and doomed for that same reason; there was nothing that anybody or group, on either side of the political fence, could have done to halt or significantly shape what was a (postmodern) tidal wave of history; the society in which we now live may have its problems but is basically an expression of our postmodern consciousness and set of circumstances and cannot be significantly changed. Significantly, Barrett names his chapter examining the economic crises confronting the Whitlam government and the process by which monetarist and neo-classical liberal means of dealing with these crises came to dominance: 'No Free Lunch'; the famous maxim of Milton Friedman. Barrett is effectively left with no option but to conclude that the dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy in the postmodern era is simply an expression of this new age, just as Whitlamism was apparently an expression of modernity, because his whole argument wrests on the contention that the arrival of postmodernity was inevitable: "The global experience of modernity made Whitlamism *feasible* as a coherent arrangement of socio-political statements, actions and possibilities. At the same time, inevitably perhaps, the decline of modernity led directly to Whitlamism's decline".[157]

In order to arrive at this conclusion, Barrett is like Brett forced to accept the dominance of neo-classical liberalism on its proponents' own terms, as the logical or inevitable outcome of their own superior handling of a natural, rather than a social

105

science. There is no consideration of the relationship between neo-liberal analysis and the political ideology connected to and informing it, let alone of its specific cultural origins, though the general American origins *are* noted. Barrett is completely uncritical towards neo-classical liberal sources of economic thought, such as the *Australian Financial Review*, Max Walsh, Laurie Oakes, P.P. McGuinness, Treasury and even Friedman. There is no mention of the neo-Keynesian and socialist economic alternatives to economic rationalism that existed at the time and were extended later. Economic planning is supposedly outdated because the world has 'fragmented', but there is no acknowledgment of global economic trends towards corporate conglomeration and monopoly and massive and rapidly increasing inequity.[158] These conditions, predicted and focused upon by intellectuals influenced by Marx and Keynes, are definitively characteristic of 'postmodern' capitalism but fly in the face of free-market dogma and postmodernist delusions about the current dispersal of agency and power. Nowhere is the possibility considered that, if neo-classical liberalism is a product of its age, the age may also be considered a product of neo-classical liberalism.

Barrett's final chapter advances his contention that the dominant policy framework is the only possible contemporary model of government. Referring to 1995 speeches by former Whitlam Government ministers Bill Hayden and Paul Keating, Barrett summarises:

> The statements by Keating and Hayden on the illusory nature of a Labourist utopia are of the greatest relevance precisely because they emphasise the distance between the Australia of the 1990s – the Australia of postmodernity – and the Australia of the 1970s, when it was still possible for many of the political Left to publicly affirm their belief in an ideal like Progress, and maintain their faith in the possibilities of national reform through the management of change.[159]

Barrett seems intent on embodying what E.P. Thompson criticised as "the condescension of posterity":[160] reducing this political struggle of Whitlam and others against the New Right to a struggle of those clinging to the past against those embracing the future. The Whitlam "project", writes Barrett, was "doomed from the beginning".[161]

It has been said of economic rationalism that far from being empirically true, it simply ignores the evidence. The same could be said of relativist postmodernism.[162]

Indeed, an interesting feature of the final two chapters of Barrett's text is the extent to which they clarify a possible philosophical connection, even synergy, between postmodernism and neo-classical liberalism. Each body of thought tends to ignore the second meaning of culture, downplaying the importance of normative truth, based on communal experience and understanding, and valorises instead a heady mixture of idealism and positivism, based respectively on the third and first meanings of culture. Both relativist or idealist postmodernism and positivist neo-classical liberalism represent the world as operating according to certain natural and supposedly universal laws. Any social claims which contradict these laws can only be seen as subjective and non-rational, outdated or immature. Each of these philosophies constructs a model of reality in which relations of power and domination are expressions of history or reason, rather than the dialectical result of human political and cultural interaction and activity. And in their overt refusal to make value judgements on the basis of culture, to avoid being subjective or ideological in their analyses and prescriptions, each body of thought actively denies its own ideological basis.

Existing accounts of the fate of Whitlam and Whitlamism and the rise of neo-classical liberalism, then, tend to see cultural factors as wholly secondary to either political power or to intellectual change, or alternatively (in the case of relativist postmodernist accounts) assert that this political and intellectual change is actually a sign of a more profoundly cultural, and thereby essentially a-political, development, a shift in spirit or *Zeitgeist*. A more satisfying account of the rise of neo-classical liberalism requires a greater sensitivity towards the different and at times incommensurate meanings of culture: an historical narrative in which the dialectical relationship between the spiritual and material dimensions of life, between culture and society, is properly recognised.

Neo-classical Liberalism and the Americanisation of Australian Culture 2: Evidence for the General Argument

In their 1993 study *Implicated: The United States in Australia*, which remains the major work on the cultural dimensions of Australia's relationship with the United States, Philip Bell and Roger Bell observe that "when writing about Australia in relation to America,

historians have tended to concentrate on economics and on military and strategic relationships".[163] Laudably, they aim to rectify this situation: "This book ... examines in detail how cultural relationships have formed the substrata on which the more public and visible connections encoded in treaties and in economic arrangements have been built".[164] On the basis of their work and that of other scholars in the field, it can be seen that in each of the three major senses of the word, Australian culture was in the period leading up to 1975, the year of the Dismissal and of the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy, undergoing a general process of Americanisation.

Australia's economic and cultural relations (and to a lesser extent, its political relations) with the US can be traced to the southern nation's very early days.[165] In his substantial account of the Australian experience of Americanisation Richard White argues that this cultural impact "was probably most rapid in the years between [the First World] War and the Depression".[166] However, until the Second World War at least, the dominant Australian civilisation ideal, accepted as such by more or less all of the upper and middle classes and by many of the working-classes also, was that of Britain.[167] Certainly until this time most forms of culture that were consciously produced or consumed as 'culture' in Australia were British or British-aligned, while popular forms of cultural entertainment were likely to be American or a local Australian form.[168] Australians saw Britain as the greatest civilisation both in the sense of being the most powerful nation, militarily, and in the sense that it was the home of proper civility and cultural refinement.[169]

During the Second World War America became the world's most powerful nation militarily, and Australians, having been directly threatened by the Japanese and largely saved by the Americans, were especially conscious of this power.[170] Immediately after the war it became apparent that America was also the world's most powerful nation economically. And partly because it was the strongest and most wealthy of nations, America from this time came to define 'the future'. The American way of life and the technologically advanced consumer capitalist rewards it offered (potentially at least to all people) were powerfully attractive. Through its advertising, film, television, magazine and music industries, especially, America promised a life of ease, order and affluence, and 'access' – at however distant a remove – to fashionable, glamorous, sexualised

beauty.[171] From the mid-1950s for the first time American 'high art' also made inroads into the consumption patterns of "middlebrow" and upper-class Australian social groups, who had previously seen American culture as a threat to proper British-Australian patriotism.[172] Partly this was achieved, as numerous scholars have noted, through the success with which public- and private-sector proponents of the American 'high art' industry positioned New York from the 1950s not only as the global centre of art, but as the centre of an art world in which artistic value was measured according to its avant-garde status.[173] The emphasis on being artistically 'new' fitted seamlessly with the wider US culture of consumerism and technological advancement, in which aesthetic value could to an ever increasing degree be defined in terms of market value.[174] There was a general absence of aesthetic alternatives offered by the Left, with socialist realism dominating. Finally, the increasing appeal of both 'low' and 'high' forms of American culture was directly influenced by the pronouncements of the New Right, from the mid 1960s, which valorised the American free-market mode of social organisation and vilified what was seen as the 'socialist' model prevailing in Britain.[175] For all of these reasons, in the postwar context the US comprehensively came to replace Britain as the dominant model of civilisation to which Australians looked, and consciously or unconsciously expected their own nation to follow.[176]

In terms of the second core meaning of culture, culture as a spirit or sensibility informing the whole way of life of a particular people, it is of course difficult to generalise confidently about a unilinear 'national spirit', and such discussions seem best tackled via a concrete engagement with a community's or society's structure of feeling, represented within its art. But it is clearly the case that after the Second World War Australians' lifestyles and their relationships with each other were profoundly influenced by, and in many cases quite directly reflected, American initiatives.[177] It is also undeniable that Australians' thoughts and feelings about this process, their understanding of this dimension of Australian culture, were impacted upon by pervasive American political discourses, cultural products and intellectual and artistic traditions and trends. That is to say, these changes in the structure and nature of Australian society were to an extent 'normalised' by the diffusion of cultural products emanating from an American

context in which a comparable social model was already experienced as and felt to be 'natural'.

In the postwar era Australian forms and modes of economic production, industrial relations, social and urban planning and transport were all strongly influenced by the American model. As well as being the nation's principal source of imports, the American market for Australian primary-product exports increased[178] and new forms of industry, particularly in the service sector, grew up to meet a new demand arising from the Americanisation of existing patterns of work, mobility and consumption. American Fordist 'scientific' management of workplace production became the norm.[179] As in America, new technologies were incorporated into the workplace in a way that most benefitted employers and led to large-scale employee redundancies. The growth of the automobile industry, financed by US corporations, especially helped to facilitate the dispersal of industrial production and social life generally. Highways and suburbs proliferated while local communities, previously built around the need of industry for a relatively large, locally-based workforce, took on a much more diffuse and segregated character. Families and in places communities became more sealed off from the broader society. [180] In a profound way, as R.W. Connell argued in 1977, these complex social developments, originating in the US, encourage a more individualist outlook within society:

> The significance of this is not so much at the attitudinal level, as in committing the newly-forming families to a pattern of life that absorbed an increasing share of their energies in private activities and bound them economically to the system. To buy the 'little piece of earth with a house and a garden' that Menzies apostrophised in a famous wartime speech, normally sent a man into debt for most of his working lifetime. To fill the house with appliances and buy the car that derisory public transport often made necessary, meant a further debt load. Merely to sustain the basic way of life the husband was locked into his job. The wife was still locked into unpaid household labour (with a slowly growing tendency to add a part-time or unskilled job to it), now in a situation where the labour was much more isolated than in the higher-density inner districts. The routines of interaction that in the interwar years had provided a basis of working-class solidarity, mutual aid and sometimes mobilisation were altered, and mobilisation correspondingly made more difficult.[181]

This increasing social 'atomisation', pointed to also by Brett, leads to a new emphasis on more individual forms of leisure activity, especially television,[182] and to more individualist forms of identity formation. Increasingly, people defined their selfhood through what they consumed rather than the work they did or the community they were members of. In his history of this period of Australian society, Donald Horne provides concrete examples of this cultural shift:

> In 'gear shops' where the shop assistants worked barefoot on bare boards young people picked up their T-shirts from the counters and their blue denim trousers from the racks; irrespective of sex or class they were jostling each other to buy what not long before had been two of the exclusive symbols of the down-at-heel proletarian ... In their jeans they were all sisters and brothers.[183]

Again, it is evident here that the prototypes for these new entertainment and consumption patterns are developed in the US, and US corporations and their products dominate and propagate these new industries in Australia. Concomitantly, new forms of collective political mobilisation and resistance to this individualising capitalism have also tended to originate in the US.

In the major quantitative study of its kind, Michael Emmisson has found that Australians are increasingly coming to prefer American cultural products.[184] The industry of advertising, which in Australia is largely owned or controlled by or directly modelled on US corporations, expanded massively in the postwar years to build demand for these new American mass entertainment industries and for the broader range of products which, either directly or in terms of their style, emanated from the US.[185] Not surprisingly the US entertainment and advertising industries have tended to either espouse or reflect American views, attitudes and assumptions.[186] This essentially American 'whole way of life', and sensibility or spirit, has in the postwar period been most commonly legitimated within Australia in distinctly American terms, as an expression of people's supposedly universal rights to and desire for (a pure or negative form of) 'freedom'.[187] The general postwar process of social atomisation, which ultimately fulfils American cultural ideals, breaks down local community and the impact of communal values and normative truths on people's understanding of themselves and the world they inhabit. This encourages an essentially American individualist cultural

spirit, characterised by an idealisation of both scientism and technology, as the national sources of power and pleasure, on the one hand, and radical subjectivism, as the proper source of personal identity or individuation, on the other.

In terms of the third meaning of culture, it can be noted that in their intellectual and aesthetic work and play Australians anticipated and necessarily responded to these wider social and cultural changes. Within the social sciences of politics, anthropology, sociology, psychology and economics, a strong, direct American influence is evident in a general increasing emphasis on positivist aims and methods.[188] Within the humanities, the influence of scientistic postmodernism does not register until after the Whitlam period,[189] though during the Whitlam period historical and social discussion tended to be dominated by Cold War loyalties and paranoias, and hence by the question of a person's or argument's loyalty or otherwise to the US.[190] And the clear trend within Australian art in the postwar context is away from previously dominant traditions of radical-nationalist realism and Anglo-European modernism and towards American models: an individualist mysticism commonly labelled abstractionism and then postmodernism, on the one hand, and a newly essentialised or puritanical form of nationalism, on the other.

The American influence on Australian art in the postwar period has been succinctly discussed by Christopher Allen.[191] He notes that "just after the Second World War ... New York was asserting its leadership in the field of contemporary culture".[192] Further: "Australian art between the end of the Angry Penguins and the very different world of postmodernism can be considered from one point of view as a period defined by the tension between an 'international' – increasingly American – avant-garde, and a variety of local aesthetic, social or political concerns".[193] "Successive forms of abstraction", he writes, "dominated Australian painting from the mid-fifties until the beginning of the seventies. Never had an aesthetic ideology achieved such a tyrannical and exclusive hold on art in Australia, threatening all who failed to submit with obsolescence and irrelevance".[194] "In contrast to the collective spirit that animated the art of the war years", he adds, "abstraction drew on a romantic conception of the artist as solitary creator".[195] And he makes the important, related observations that "the abstract painters tended, ultimately, towards the religious horizon, even if some of them did not reach far beyond personal 'expression'"; and that "the next phase of abstraction, hard-

edge or colour painting ... which began to take hold in the mid-sixties, proclaimed the need for a rigorous purification of the medium of painting, an elimination of all extraneous matter, all vestiges of figuration".[196] Even this abstractionism, then, can be traced back to the Puritan antipathy to the subjective and the social. "If Australia had persisted as landscape in the work of [John] Olsen, [Elwyn] Lynn and [Fred] Williams", Allen concludes, "it was now reduced to mere absence: it signified nothing more than the *distance* that separated the artist from the epicentre of art history in New York".[197] The Americanisation of Australian art entailed a disengagement from Australian society.

A more broadly conceived account of the US influence on Australian art during this period is provided by Brian Kiernan. "During the later years of the Vietnam War", he writes, "the dominant cultural influences on younger generations in Australia, as in Western Europe, became those of the American counter culture".[198] "Alternatives to the perceived establishment culture in Australia", he suggests, "followed models provided by this international, but heavily United States-inspired, counter culture".[199] The 'establishment' culture comprised generally upper-class Anglo-Australian and generally working-class radical-nationalist strands. The Australian 'New Wave' in the alternative theatre was inspired by American innovators and, states Kiernan, this "was followed shortly after by a not unrelated development in local filmmaking".[200] He goes on to note: "There was a new poetry, stimulated by New York, Black Mountain and West Coast experimentation. A 'new' fiction drew on American models, including some that had already responded to Latin American and contemporary European influences. There was [also] a 'new' journalism, again influenced by American practices, which observed a 'new nationalism' in the early 1970s".[201]

On this 'new nationalism', Bell and Bell write:

> Paradoxically, since at least the dismissal of the Whitlam Labor government and the end of the Vietnam War, Australian television has been highly nationalistic. It yoked a commercially engineered nationalism to anti-political populism developed through commercial American-style network television. The content of Australian television, therefore, was often aggressively local, while the underlying social values that television encouraged were those appropriate to international (which meant largely American) consumer culture. It was the forms of broadcast commercial culture, not simply its manifest content, that mediated a modernity modelled on the US. The content, ironically, was distinctively 'Australian'

113

but it was the medium's social and political relationships that were its 'message'.[202]

Similarly, Richard White argues in 1983 that "before declaring Australia's cultural independence", the claim that "since the mid-1960s, Americanisation has lost its force ... should be looked at more closely".[203] The Australian film industry, for example, one of the success stories of Australia's 'new cultural nationalism', is increasingly "tailored for an American market: American voice coaches have been imported to modulate the Australian accent, and American stars are inserted wherever possible".[204] "Of far greater import" though, he notes, "is American influence in films which purport to be distinctively Australian and which deal explicitly with themes of national identity".[205] He points to the examples of *Breaker Morant* and *Gallipoli*, two highly successful films which "certainly are distinctively Australian, if only on [sic] their emphasis on men, mateship and militarism".[206] "But", argues White, "their explicit conception of national identity was set out in terms of a prickly display of republican sentiment which has gone out of its way to establish grounds for Australian resentment of British imperialism".[207] This, he says, is "an attempt to define an Australian identity in terms of a chauvinist and increasingly conservative American-style republicanism, a search for Australia's own Boston Tea Party".[208] White's conclusion is compelling: "What is clear is that, while media dominance is reversible, and while the provincialism entailed by cultural dependence is a state of mind, the Americanisation process becomes far more formidable when the fundamental concepts of a society's national identity are remodelled in the American image".[209]

Conclusion: An Incomplete Cultural Transformation

Through this broad-based Americanisation, Australian society and culture were in the postwar period becoming more receptive to the beliefs and habitudes of radical individualism, scientism and subjectivism, upon which neo-classical liberal public policy would depend. It is also clear, however, that unlike the situation in the US, in Australia these ways of thinking and living are not based on deep-seated cultural convictions arising from the dominant groups' imagined experience of nature. As Brett argues, neo-classical liberal ideas "were not based in the experiences or the ideologies of any

particular section of the Australian society but were the product of technical experts with few connections with people's commonsense economic understandings".[210] Puritan religion and the Puritan world view, upon which America's radical individualism, scientism and subjectivism are based, were never as radical nor as dominant within Australia. The dominant forms of Australia's liberal political culture, prior to the rise of neo-classical liberalism, as Brett attests, were grounded in more moderate, essentially British forms of puritan religion and notions of selfhood. Over the course of the same period, this dominant strain of Australian culture existed in primary opposition to or tension with a largely anti-puritanical, anti-liberal culture of Australian nationalism, with a defining commitment to an exclusivist, white, male, heterosexual 'order', or cultural code – that of mateship – the historical origins and particular elements of which were most influentially described by Russel Ward.[211] Perhaps not surprisingly, then, in his interviews with those senior members of the public service who grew to adulthood prior to the 1970s, Pusey finds:

> As far as we can judge, those who had come from comparatively humble social origins brought with them a certain empathy for the expectations of ordinary people (for what Russel Ward called 'the Australian Dream' and, above all, for redistributive justice and a 'fair go'). The majority who came ... from upper middle-class backgrounds seem to have been similarly imbued, however weakly, with some Australian strain of '*noblesse oblige*'.[212]

But "by the 1960s", writes James Jupp in 1982, "there were three cultural influences upon Australia: British, nationalist and American".[213] And in 2004 he reflects: "Australia is not yet the free market society of American ideologues, but it has moved strongly in that direction since 1974".[214]

If Australians have adapted themselves to neo-classical liberal public policy, it seems likely that this was less because they generally believed this policy framework was ordained by God or nature than because they accepted that it was politically and economically expedient or beneficial to do so.[215] Drawing upon the distinction between ideology and culture made in the introduction to the thesis – where ideology is the social result of relations of power, and culture is the social result of the way that the 'unmediated' human relations with nature are imagined – it is possible to suggest that the dominance of neo-classical liberal public policy is in the Australian context primarily an

expression of ideological rather than cultural change. There would seem to have been no solid cultural base within Australia for this set of policies that became dominant at the end of the Whitlam era. If political relations were to change, the attraction of contemporary scientism and subjectivism might fall away, while as Connell has noted, the social commitment to post-Whitlamite forms of policy, based on radical individualism, has only ever been, at best, half-hearted: "There is a great secret about neo-liberalism, which can only be whispered, but which at some level everyone knows: neo-liberalism does not have popular support".[216]

In terms of cultural politics, then – the use of culture for political ends – the challenge for members of the New Right and other proponents of neo-classical liberalism has been to 'Australianise' this public policy framework, to assert or demonstrate that this approach to governance results from the (in practice imagined) Australian experience of nature. For as Eagleton notes, "men and women are more likely to take to the streets over cultural and material issues rather than purely political ones – the cultural being what concerns one's spiritual identity, and the material one's physical one".[217] This New Right task involves 'Americanising' Australia's historical and contemporary experience of 'nature', 'purifying' or 'puritanising' that experience, particularly by removing or downplaying the role of government and endemic social conflict, and by reinserting God. Arguably, this state- and corporation-sponsored attempt to 'purify' Australian history and tradition, a cultural whitewashing, has constituted the central site of Australian cultural struggle within the Howard government's decade of New Right rule.[218] But this cultural conflict is as old as the New Right itself and in Australia has its origins in the Whitlam period.[219] As will be argued in subsequent chapters examining the Australian structure of feeling during this period, the struggle over the cultural value of Whitlam, Whitlamism and neo-classical liberalism was (as it remains) fought out through an imagining or re-imagining of the Australian experience of nature, in the broad sense of this term, and so also the nature of Australian culture. Defenders of Whitlam tended to assert the 'impurity' of this Australian experience and culture, while defenders of the New Right sought to 'purify' these things.

---

[1] Horne, *Time of Hope*, p.179.
[2] Ibid.

[3] In intellectual terms, the New Right movement's neo-classical liberal analysis and philosophy had, as Friedrich Hayek noted, three main bases: Vienna, London (the London School of Economics) and Chicago. But most of the organisational and financial impetus behind the movement came from the US. It was for example the American 1945 *Reader's Digest* condensed version of Hayek's *The Road to Serfdom* (1944), that brought Hayek's ideas into the mainstream of public discussion. This condensed version sold in the US in the hundreds of thousands. See Cockett, *Thinking the Unthinkable*, pp.109, 100.

[4] See Marian Sawer's chapter 1: 'Political Manifestations of Libertarianism in Australia', in Marian Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982, pp.1–19; and Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia since 1944', in Head and Walter, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, pp.322–361. On this general point of the American organisational origins of the New Right see also Peter Singer, 'Individual Rights and the Free Market', in Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, p.38–48. On the American bases of the advertising, public relations and polling industries that helped to facillitate the introduction of New Right ideas, see Alex Carey, 'The Ideological Management Industry', in E.L. Wheelwright and K.D. Buckley, eds, *Communications and the Media in Australia*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1987, pp.156–179.

[5] Sawer, 'Political Manifestations of Libertarianism in Australia', p.16.

[6] Ibid., p.2.

[7] 'The Age of the Transnational Corporations', in Greg Crough, Ted Wheelwright and Ted Wilshire, eds, *Australia and World Capitalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980, pp.123–125.

[8] Richard T. Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 2004, p.135.

[9] Philip Bell and Roger Bell, *Implicated: The United States in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1993, p.159.

[10] Bell and Bell, *Implicated*, p.159.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] That these are the founding assumptions of neo-classical liberalism (as of classical liberalism) can be gathered from any of the major texts of this philosophy's proponents or critics. See for example Milton Friedman's influential neo-classical liberal treatise *Free To Choose* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1980) or for a representative critical interpretation: Stewart, *Keynes and After*, p.158.

[16] See Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought since the Revolution*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1955. Miriam Dixson draws heavily on Hartz and puts a convincing case for the continuing relevance of his historiographical approach in her *The Imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and Identity – 1788 to the Present*, UNSW Press, 1999. She summarises: "A broad-brush approach to Hartz, father of the 'fragment' theory about settler nations such as ours, goes like this: the politics of all the so-called 'fragment' (Hartz's term) societies of the post-sixteenth-century Europe – including Australia – were disproportionately influenced by the political traditions brought to their new homes by founding generations". *The Imaginary Australian*, p.22.

[17] Robert M. Crunden, *A Brief History of American Culture*, North Castle Books, New York and London, 1996, p.ix.

[18] Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, p.5.

[19] Ibid., p.2.

[20] Ibid., p.6.

[21] "It is difficult to overestimate the importance" of that translation, Hughes writes, "for it helped to define and popularise in England the concept of the national covenant". "Tyndale never claimed that England was God's chosen people", Hughes explains, "but the theme of national covenant implied as much". Ibid., pp.22, 23.

[22] Ibid., p.23.

[23] Ibid., p.28.

[24] Max Weber writes that the Puritans believed that: "For everyone without exception God's Providence has prepared a calling, which he should profess and in which he should labour. And this calling is not, as it was for the Lutheran, a fate to which he must submit and which he must make the best of, but God's commandment to the individual to work for the divine glory". "This seemingly subtle difference", Weber

goes on to state, "had far-reaching psychological consequences, and became connected with a further development of the providential interpretation of the economic order which had begun in scholasticism". *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–5), Unwin Hyman, London, 1990, p.160.

[25] Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, p.6.

[26] Ibid., p.34.

[27] Ibid., p.6.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid.

[30] As Crunden notes, within American intellectual life the most adulation has tended to be reserved for the natural sciences, while the American 'plainstyle' dominated the arts for much of America's history. *American Culture*, p.11.

[31] States Hughes: "at its core, this myth encouraged Americans to ignore the power of history and tradition as forces that shaped the nation". *Myths American Lives By*, p.56.

[32] "Precisely because the myth of Nature's Nation downplayed the power of history and tradition", Hughes argues, "it found a ready and receptive audience among many American Christians". "The Reformed tradition", he goes on to note, "revered the founding period of the Christian faith, and many in that tradition rejected Christian history and tradition as carrying any significant authoritative weight". Later he explains: "Those who embraced this myth all too often found in nature their own cultural traditions and then defended those traditions as fundamentally natural". Ibid., pp.57, 58.

[33] On the Second Great Awakening see James A. Henretta, David Brody and Lynn Dumenil, *America: A Concise History*, Bedford, St. Martins, Boston and New York, 1999, p.249. They write: "Religion had always been a significant part of American life. But in the decades between 1790 and 1820, a series of revivals planted the values of Protestant Christianity deep in the American national character ... The revivals that began around 1790 were much more complex than those of the First Great Awakening. In the 1740s mot revivals had occurred in existing congregations; fifty years later they took place in frontier camp meetings as well and often involved the creation of new churches and denominations".

[34] Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, p.6.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Ibid., p.7.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Ibid.

[40] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.ix.

[41] Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, p.7.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid., p.134.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Ibid., pp.135–136.

[47] Ibid., p.136.

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ibid., p.148.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., p.149.

[54] Ibid. This is not to suggest that these views are only or even uniquely American, but rather that they are strongest within the US.

[55] Ibid., p.149. On the use of Christian religion as a pervasive and effective means of promoting free-market capitalism within the United States see also Thomas Frank, *One Market Under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism and the End of Economic Democracy* (2000), Vintage, London, 2002; especially pp.3–5.

[56] For a general account of this period of American history see Henretta, Brody and Dumenil, *America: A Concise History*.

[57] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.xv.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid., p.17. For extended and still highly influential accounts of Puritanism and its relations to capitalism see Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–5); and R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1922), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1977; especially his commentaries on Luther and Calvin, pp.89–139. According to Anthony Giddens, Weber regarded the influence of puritanism upon business activity in the United States as being "a particularly clear and important exemplification of his thesis". 'Introduction', *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Unwin Hyman, London, 1990, p.xxiii.

[60] John Winthrop, *The History of new England from 1630 to 1649*, quoted in Henry Commager, *Living Ideas in America* (enlarged edn), Harper & Row, New York, Evanston and London, 1964, p.320.

[61] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.17.

[62] Commager, *Living Ideas in America*, pp.315–316.

[63] Ibid., p.315.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., p.318.

[66] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.14.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Ibid.

[70] As Henry S. Albinski explains: "The American tradition of disdaining and deploring state intervention, of romanticising the idea that the government that governs the least is the one that governs best, reaches back at least to the eighteenth century and to Tom Paine. In truth, during the American colonial period and for much of the nineteenth century, American government did not 'govern' very much. The frontier, social variety, and atmosphere of movement and fluidity all contributed to an individualism that looked for little help from state or national organs of government". On the other hand: "The patterns of settlement and consolidation were very different in Australia. Convict origins, authoritarian strains in the early administration, experience with settlement and consolidation that was not nearly so freewheeling and opportunity-presenting as in America, the smallness of the population, the dearth of skills and capital to allow development under private auspices: all contributed to making government in Australia *the* prominent agent". 'Australia and the United States', in Stephen R. Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1985, pp.399, 400.

[71] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.15.

[72] Ibid., pp.18–19.

[73] For a discussion of the historical origins and social and cultural implications of this doctrine see Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, pp.22–34. Weber notes: "The whole ascetic literature of almost all denominations is saturated with the idea that faithful labour, even at low wages, on the part of those whom life offers no other opportunities, is highly pleasing to God". *The Protestant Ethic*, p.178.

[74] "From Jefferson's day to this", Hughes writes, "many Americans have commonly claimed that it makes very little difference what particular religious faith one embraces, just so long as one believes in God and lives a good moral life". "If anything", says Hughes, the American Declaration of Independence "made Deism America's national religion". *Myths America Lives By*, p.54.

[75] See Commager, *Living Ideas in America*, pp.316–317.

[76] See ibid; Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, pp.130–131; and Sydney Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1972. According to Ahlstrom (p.767), Spencer was "the greatest populariser of Darwinian notions in both Britain and America".

[77] "Australia was and still is less extreme than is the US in disparities across the income spectrum; the incomes of those in the middle- and upper-middle-class are more severely taxed and redistributed". Albinski, 'Australia and the United States', p.408.

[78] See for example Commager, *Living Ideas in America*, pp.316–317: "A curious amalgam ... of Jeffersonian liberalism, pioneer individualism, and social Darwinism, hardened into a philosophy of *laissez-faire*. And this philosophy, in turn, was taken over by leading statesmen like Grover Cleveland and Herbert Hoover, by businessmen like Carnegie and Rockefeller, by jurists like Justice Field and Justice Sutherland".

[79] Though he doesn't draw this connection so directly, Frank makes clear that the popular American idealisation of the information technology 'new economy' during the 1990s was grounded in the peculiarly

American, strongly individualist and pro-capitalist version of Christianity, as well as in American economic, technological and military triumphalism. See his *One Market Under God*.

[80] On the especially energetic role of the *Australian Financial Review* in the propagation of New Right ideology see Windschuttle, 'Economics and the New Right', in his *The Media*, pp.353–387. Pusey also refers to "the leader-writing ex-Treasury economists". *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.229.

[81] This general argument is put by Pusey in *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*. Gavan Butler, writing at the start of the 1980s, notes more specifically: "It is really remarkable that the Friedmans can quite so cavalierly ignore all that even their colleagues in the mainstream of economics have said about the inherent tendencies towards concentration in capitalist economies". 'Economic Notes: The Rise of "The New Conservatism"', *Australian Left Review* 76, 1981, p.20.

[82] As Whitlam notes in his own history of his government, for example, New Right intellectuals within the Treasury refused to give policy advice in keeping with the broad political aims of the government, where, as was generally the case, this was in conflict with their neo-classical liberal perspective. *The Whitlam Government*, pp.207–210.

[83] Susan Antcliff notes for example that studies arguing that poverty is linked with 'lifecycle' factors and thus usually a short term phenomenon, emanate from the US. 'Behind the Rhetoric: A Closer Look at the New Right', *Australian Quarterly* 60:1, 1988, pp.63–69. In *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*, Free Press, New York, 1994, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray find that the wealthy are innately smarter than other members of society, and particularly the especially ungifted black, Hispanic and 'white trash' components of the population. This work is critically discussed by Laurie Aarons in his *Casino Oz: Winners and Losers in Global Capitalism*, Goanna Publishing, Sydney, 1999, p.68.

[84] New Right intellectual Kenneth Minogue, for example, writes that "Among the many aspects of that curious composite called 'the New Right', the one to which least attention has so far been given is the repudiation of collective guilt". The 'guilt' described by Minogue, then Professor of Political Science at the London School of Economics and Political Science, is the recognition of structural disadvantage which began with opposition to class exploitation in early capitalism. 'Not Guilty! The Moral Premises of Modern British Conservatism', *Quadrant* 32:12, 1988, p.6. Notably, the title hints that Minogue's judgement is comparable to that of a court of law.

[85] Writing in 1976 Gavan Butler noted that the increasing popularity of neo-liberal economics was linked with its selling in terms of a return to traditional values.'Economic Notes', p.22.

[86] When 'postwar' is used in this unqualified way I am referring to the period following the Second World War.

[87] Bruce Bennett, 'Literary Culture Since Vietnam', in Bennett and Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, p.260. Statements on America's cultural influence tend to be of a general nature. Nicholas Jose for example writes: "In the later postwar years, Australia's simple provincial relationship with Britain began to alter beyond recognition. The main reason was Australia's new military alliance with the United States: economic and cultural influence soon followed". 'Cultural Identity: "I Think I'm Something Else"', in Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, p.313. Similarly, Joseph Camilleri asserts that "American values, institutions and policies have come to dominate not only Australia's external conduct, but its economic and political life". *Australian~American Relations: The Web of Dependence*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980, p.vii.

[88] In the assessment of Pam Stavropolous for example: "Australian critics are uninterested in the topic of Australian conservatism, and in 'right-wing' thought and politics more generally". 'Reappraising the Right: The Challenge of Australian Conservatism', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 39:2, 1993, p.171. More recently, in the preface to her *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class* (p.x), Judith Brett writes that "there are very few books about the Liberal Party, and even fewer ideas".

[89] Terry Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, Blackwell, Oxford and Maldon, 2000, p.32.

[90] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.32.

[91] Michael Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-building State Changes its Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991. For reasons that will be explained below, Pusey prefers the term 'economic rationalism' to 'neo-classical liberalism', 'neo-liberalism' or 'market liberalism'.

[92] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.3.

[93] Ibid., pp.10–11.

[94] Ibid., p.11.

[95] Ibid., quoting John A. Rohr, 'Public Administration and the Constitutional Bicentennial: an essay on research', *International Journal of Public Administration* 4:4, 1982, pp.349–380.

[96] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.12.

[97] See Pusey, *The Experience of Middle Australia*, pp.7–12. Pusey's general point was noted in the previous chapter. He also writes: "Who initiates and manages the new capitalism in Australia? ... The forerunner to this study demonstrated that the drivers of economic rationalism in Canberra have been top ministers and Senior Executive Service economists. In practice, this means the offices and departments of the Prime Minister, the Treasurer and the Minister of Finance – together with two or three other senior cabinet ministers – and a handful of elite and narrowly trained neo-classical economists, most of them steeped in American econometrics and with experience in Washington, the OECD, the WTO, the World Bank or the IMF". *Middle Australia*, p.10. For a criticism of the lazy use of the term 'reform' as a synonym for neo-classical liberal policy initiatives see Verity Burgmann's contribution to the public discussion 'Class in Contemporary Australia', published in Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia*, p.164.

[98] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.10.

[99] Ibid.

[100] Ibid., p.19.

[101] On this preoccupation of the German historicist tradition of social enquiry see McLellan, *Ideology*. He notes for example that Habermas's "whole revision of Marx is governed by the (Frankfurt) School's criticism of instrumental reason, the scientific or technical reason which had come to dominate society in the twentieth century" (p.67).

[102] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, pp.21, 22, quoting from his own chapter on '"Rationalisation" and Modernity'. Pusey delineates the 'Anglo-American' and four other models of capitalism in his *The Experience of Middle Australia*, p.9.

[103] Williams, *Keywords*, p.77. On Williams' stature in this field see for example Andrew Milner, 'Culture', in Richard Nile, ed., *Australian Civilization*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1994, p.215: "The classic account of the historical evolution of the term *culture* and of the culturalist tradition is Raymond Williams' *Culture and Society* [1958]".

[104] Though his views on the matter were subject to change, this argument is made by Williams in *Keywords* (Fontana, London, 1976) and is drawn upon more recently by Eagleton in *The Idea of Culture*.

[105] Raymond Williams, *Culture*, Fontana Press, London, 1981, p.10.

[106] Williams, *Keywords*, p.77.

[107] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, pp.2–3.

[108] "Whereas we began with 'culture' mediating between 'man' and Nature, it can now [following the industrial revolution] be seen to mediate between 'man' and Machine". Chris Jenks, *Culture*, Routledge, London and New York, 1993, p.7.

[109] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.9.

[110] Williams, *Keywords*, p.78.

[111] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.26.

[112] Williams, *Culture*, p.10.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Quoted in Williams, *Keywords*, p.79.

[115] Williams, *Keywords*, p.79.

[116] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.9.

[117] An extended discussion of the anthropological and sociological uses of culture can be found in Jenks, *Culture*.

[118] For an account of Romantic thought in its historical context see Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution. Europe 1789–1848* (1962), Abacus, London, 2003, pp.312–330.

[119] See Jenks, *Culture*, p.7.

[120] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.10.

[121] Ibid., pp.30-31.

[122] Williams, *Keywords*, p.80.

[123] Ibid.

[124] Ibid., pp.80-81.

[125] Ibid., p.81.

[126] Kemp, 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia', p.354.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*. Cf. Tim Rowse, *Australian Liberalism and National Character*, which does not discuss cultural bases of liberalism at all.

[130] Brett, *Australian Liberals*, p.x.

[131] Ibid., viii.

[132] Ibid., p.41.

[133] Ibid., p.126.

[134] Ibid., p.40.

[135] Ibid., pp.55–56.

[136] Ibid., p.56.

[137] Ibid., pp.68–69.

[138] "In a statement that was to be echoed many times in the 1980s, [1920s Prime Minister Stanley Melbourne] Bruce insisted: 'We were guided not by ideological motives, but by strict business principles'". Ibid., p.80.

[139] Ibid., p.87.

[140] Ibid., p.88.

[141] Ibid., p.101.

[142] Ibid., p.108.

[143] Ibid., p.91.

[144] Ibid., p.107.

[145] See ibid., pp.105–106.

[146] Ibid., p.114. The point is also made on p.117.

[147] Ibid., p.177.

[148] Brett's central argument is that: "It is liberalism, albeit broadly understood and with many internal contradictions, that has provided much of the basis of the party's enduring electoral appeal, that people have voted for the party not just because it has represented their interests but because it has accorded with what they believed". "This", she notes, "is an argument which flies in the face of the class-based model which has dominated interpretations of the Australian party system". This class-based reading, she contends, "does not ... explain the strength and durability of the Liberals' electoral appeal. The economic interests of the majority of the people are simply insufficiently coincidental with those of big business or financial capital". Ibid., p.6.

[149] A more extensive statement of this argument is Nathan Hollier, 'Liberal Tides' (a review of Brett's *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*), *Australian Book Review* 254, 2003, pp.8–9.

[150] Brett, *Australian Liberals*, pp.148, 164.

[151] Ibid., p.167.

[152] Ibid., pp.189–190.

[153] Ibid., p.190.

[154] For an example of this general argument see Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, Methuen, London and New York, 1982.

[155] Barrett, *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*.

[156] See Michel Foucault, *The Foucault Reader*, Paul Rabinow, ed., Pantheon Books, New York, 1984.

[157] Barrett, *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, p.195.

[158] "Most national economies are now globally interdependent, and highly concentrated, being dominated by a few hundred large corporations". Wheelwright, 'The Age of the Transnational Corporations', p.123.

[159] Barrett, *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, pp.236–237.

[160] E.P. Thompson, 'Preface', *The Making of the English Working Class*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1963, p.13.

[161] Barrett, *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, p.237.

[162] I am thinking especially of the work of Jacques Derrida, Francois Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard. This can be contrasted with the work of more materialist thinkers whose work is sometimes labelled postmodernist, such as that of David Harvey or Frederic Jameson.

[163] Bell and Bell, *Implicated*, p.x.

[164] Ibid.

[165] On Australian–American relations in the years prior to Australia's federation see especially N. McLachlan, '"The Future America": Some Bicentennial Reflections', *Historical Studies* 17: 68, 1977, pp.361–383; and Richard White, *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1981, pp.47–62.

[166] White, 'A Backwater Awash: The Australian Experience of Americanisation', *Theory, Culture and Society* 1:3, 1983, p.115.

[167] According to White: "After the war British culture in Australia was threatened by both the military reorientation of Cold War politics and the full industrialisation of Australia, which was underwritten by the United States, fed by large-scale European immigration and based on a mass consumer economy. Americanisation became more intense in the traditional areas of influence, took on new forms and for the first time seriously ate into the high and middlebrow cultures. There was a reassertion of American influence in the film, radio and record industries after the retreat of the 1930s, and the advertising industry expanded considerably to provide basic infrastructure for the new consumer industries". 'A Backwater Awash', p.118. James Curran argues that most Australians felt strongly British until the early 1960s. He states: "When (Australia's) intense British race patriotism collapsed around the time of Britain's first, ultimately failed attempt to enter the EEC between 1961 and 1963 and its decision to withdraw a military presence from East of Suez, Australian political leaders and intellectuals were left somewhat confused as to how to define the nation. Australians did not immediately claim a new identity; they were actually shocked, and in some cases aggrieved, that their British identity had been taken from them. It was nothing less than a crisis of national meaning". James Curran, 'Correspondence', in Robert Manne (with David Corlett), *Sending Them Home: Refugees and the New Politics of Indifference* (*Quarterly Essay* 13), Black Inc., Melbourne, 2004, p.109. As early as 1967 however, according to Geoffrey Serle: "We are happily – or phlegmatically – exchanging one neo-colonial situation for another. Australia has abandoned the prospect of independent nationhood; we are going to become just slightly different sorts of Americans". Geoffrey Serle, 'Godzone: Austerica Unlimited?', *Meanjin* 26, 1967, p.240.

[168] See White, 'A Backwater Awash', p.111. He suggests that "perhaps the best distinction between (high and popular culture), which avoids the whole fraught question of 'quality', is in terms of self-consciousness. High culture is aware of itself as something called culture, and this has all sorts of implications for cultural traditions, patronage, access to resources and the production of knowledge; popular culture is not as self-conscious, seeing itself essentially as entertainment".

[169] Brett writes for example that "to participate in a meeting" prior to the Second World War was "not only to enact the obligations of citizenship, and manifest one's virtuous character; one was also (participating) in the wisdom of the British race and its civilising mission". *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*, p.68.

[170] According to White: "The Second World War, and the temporary presence of American troops in Australia as part of the war against Japan, saw crucial changes in the pattern of Australia's international relationships. Australia ... now turned to the United States". 'A Backwater Awash', p.118. It was widely acknowledged during the war that, as Geoffrey Bolton writes, "only the United States could be Australia's prop and shield". *The Middle Way*, p.9.

[171] As Bell and Bell state, "more than any other society, the US embodied and encouraged that which was modern in the postwar world". "US corporations, commerce, and its culture of consumer capitalism", they go on to explain, "were the most powerful vehicles of influence abroad ... The global reach of government, corporations, and media projected America overseas as an exceptionally affluent, open, dynamic, and virtuous society – the model against which all others should measure their lives". Moreover, "American comics, movies, and records linked many ... emerging subcultures, or taste-cultures, to dynamic commercial entertainment and leisure pursuits that frequently endorsed the image of the US as the metropolitan 'centre' around which satellite cultures spun". "Notions of economic freedom and consumer choice", they contend, "were reiterated in every advertisement. Capitalism, consumerism and the modern were synonymous", "The modernisation of Australia", in their view, "increasingly followed a distinctly American form". *Implicated*, pp.160, 160–161, 167–168, 168, xii.

[172] See White, 'A Backwater Awash', p.114. White notes also that television "penetrated more rapidly [into the middlebrow culture] than radio, which was introduced before a true mass consumer market existed in Australia, and which suffered from having to expand in a Depression. What also distinguished television from radio was the fact that, with fewer channels, there was not the same scope for market differentiation. The commercial stations, in seeking to serve a single market, strove to be identical. There was no room, as

there had been on the radio dial, for specifically middlebrow networks. To accept television, middlebrow culture had to adjust to Americanisation". 'A Backwater Awash', p.119.

[173] Barrett notes for example that in the postwar context: "While America's politicians, generals and diplomats maintained and expanded their nation's power and influence around the globe, and America's corporate leaders prosecuted the economic war, American bureaucrats were hard at work promoting the elite end of American cultural production to a global audience". And he points out also that: "The world-wide acceptance of things American, of the mass culture products of Hollywood and the music industry, was partnered by a general acceptance of the serious end of American cultural production as well: the products of modernist American literature, music, and painting". *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, pp.71, 72. According to Ian Burn, Nigel Lendon, Charles Merewether and Ann Stephen, the 1967 'Two Decades of American Painting' exhibition had "a profound effect on a younger generation of artists in Australia, giving authority to the range of styles encompassed by New York art. It also served to popularise the concept of the avant-garde, thus identified in contemporary terms as a specifically American phenomenon". Ian Burn, Nigel Lendon, Charles Merewether and Ann Stephen, *The Necessity of Australian Art: An Essay About Interpretation*, Power Publications, Sydney, 1988, p.95.

[174] The postwar high art market, explains Christopher Allen, "which had developed into its modern form in New York, soon spread to Australia, if in a somewhat less aggressive form, replacing the traditional artists' association as the intermediary between painters and their public". "The art world", Allen explains further, "was already becoming top-heavy with publicists and 'theorists' who helped to accelerate evolutions in taste ... especially when the social bonds among artists, and between artists and public, were being weakened by the new market structure". *Art in Australia: From Colonisation to Postmodernism*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1997, pp.177, 180.

[175] In White's persuasive narrative: "Among intellectuals in Australia, the old loyalties were disrupted in the 1950s. The ruling class adjusted from their old mercantilist base to an industrial one. They could stop calling England 'Home'. For the new Right [sic] Britain was old-fashioned and, worse, socialist. They still had qualms about American culture but learned to live with them. Their anti-communism got the better of them: Americanisation was no longer a threat but reflected only the tattered remnant of outgrown Anglophile fears". "With the Cold War", states White, "Americanisation, which had once represented gross disloyalty, was now acceptable as 'the price of freedom'". White, 'A Backwater Awash', pp.119, 119–120. Elsewhere he writes: "A New Right was [in the mid 1970s] emerging in the pages of *Quadrant* and the *Bulletin*. Its proponents had no awkward intellectual loyalties to Britain. For them, England was old fashioned and, worse, socialist, and they had no qualms about looking to America, for protection, investment and inspiration. As early as 1949, the Liberal Party's Institute of Public Affairs was arguing that Australia needed 'the American attitude of mind ... leaders who can bring the nation to a new way of life'". 'Combatting Cultural Aggression: Australian Opposition to Americanisation', *Meanjin* 39, 1980, p.284. Marian Sawer notes that *Quadrant* turned to neo-classical liberal, or what she terms 'libertarian' ideas in 1974. 'Political Manifestations of Libertarianism in Australia', p.15.

[176] For Bruce Grant, "the American defence connection was intended to protect the Australian way of life, and the American way of life itself was the current model of civilisation standing against the threat of communism". He argues further that "this was '*liberty*' based on American, not British experience, including the American belief that the capitalist system was the *sine qua non* of personal and national freedom". *The Australian Dilemma: A New Kind of Western Society*, McDonald Futura, Sydney, 1983, p.57. In Bell and Bell's summary, Australia's "security arrangements, economic ties, and political culture were increasingly the product of a new international order dominated by American interests – interests that propagated uncompromising anti-communism within a rhetoric of liberal internationalism". *Implicated*, p.159. They note also that John Docker and others have argued that, "Australia's emergence as a modern industrial society 'meant in effect moving from a British to an American model'". *Implicated*, p.157, quoting Docker in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19 December 1987. See also Stuart Ward, *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*, Melbourne University Press, 2001.

[177] As Pierre Bourdieu and Louic Wacquant suggest, the postwar period saw a "refashioning of social relations and cultural practices in advanced societies after the US pattern – founded on the pauperisation of the state, the commodification of public goods and the generalisation of social insecurity". 'On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason', *Theory, Culture and Society* 16:1, 1999, p.43.

[178] "By the early 1980s, the US had become Australia's principal source of imports and its second most important export outlet. The United States had also become the foremost overseas investor in Australia

across a broad range of industrial, resource, agricultural, and service industries". Albinski, 'Australia and the United States', p.395.

[179] In Graeme Davison's summary: "If we examine the range of American innovations in urban life which came in the 1950s, they display a distinct family resemblance. Underlying them all is the Fordist logic of functional analysis, survey and measurement, subdivision of function, and flow technology. As that logic was applied to one area of Australian business or public management, it cleared the way for its application to others; like the logic of economic rationalism, thirty years later, it had a powerful internal dynamic. Whether it is the development of the project house, market research and supermarket design, traffic research and highway design, scientific management and factory layout, the American imprint was unmistakable". Graeme Davison, 'Driving to Austerica: The Americanization of the Postwar Australian City', in Harold Bolitho and Chris Wallace-Crabbe, eds, *Approaching Australia: Papers from the Harvard Australian Studies Symposium*, Harvard University Committee on Australian Studies, Cambridge, Mass., 1997, p.176.

[180] This argument is set out most comprehensively in Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, pp.270–310. For an account of the impact of this general process of industrialisation and post-industrialisation within the US see Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2000. Bell and Bell usefully note that "Australian consumerism was increasingly modelled on that of the US from at least the mid 1950s". Australian businessmen, they write, flocked to America to learn about new modes of selling and management as well as new products: "supermarkets, where the customers served themselves (from 1951), shopping centres, surrounded by car parks (from 1957), and motels, were the most significant new features of suburban dependence on cars instead of trains and buses". They argue that "the new car-based consumerism replaced department-store and strip-shop suburban buying and thereby accelerated changes in the nature of suburban and country town 'community'". This "linked gender to retailing directly modelled on the US pattern of 'one-stop shopping' in shopping centres (later 'malls'), which became a focal point of what had been more traditional community interactions centred on the church, the pub, and the main street" "The specific aims of Australian industry and retailers", they go on to say, "were directly imitative of American models". And they note as well that "the social and cultural changes represented by the purchase and preparation of food have been strongly influenced by American practices and American corporations". Bell and Bell, *Implicated*, pp.168, 169, drawing on M. Rolfe, 'Americanisation and Suburbia', seminar presented to School of Political Science, University of NSW, 15 October 1991, unpublished.

[181] Connell, *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*, p.216.

[182] White sees television as the "most important" vehicle for the postwar Americanisation of Australian culture. 'A Backwater Awash', p.119.

[183] Horne, *Time of Hope*, p.34.

[184] "In three major areas of cultural consumption – television, music and literature – young Australians display a preference for programs, musicians and authors emanating from the US to a far greater extent than Australians in middle age, who in their turn are more disposed towards American cultural materials than older Australians ... The evidence presented here documents a consistent trend within Australia towards the consumption of cultural products emanating from North America and points to an increasing Americanisation of Australian society". Michael Emmison, 'Transformations of Taste: Americanisation, Generational Change and Australian Cultural Consumption', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 33:3, 1997, pp.323, 340.

[185] "Advertising as we know it originated in the US and almost all the international advertising organisations originate from the US also". Bill Bonney and Helen Wilson, *Australia's Commercial Media*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1983, p.133. "Whether one defines the Australian advertising industry as American-controlled, or as trans-nationally controlled", add Bell and Bell, "it is clear that much of the expertise, ideology, and technical style of advertising continued to originate in the US parent industry". *Implicated*, p.175. According to White, "the advertising industry expanded considerably [in the postwar period] to provide basic infrastructure for the new consumer industries". 'A Backwater Awash', p.118.

[186] Bell and Bell note for example that "On the eve of the American (and later Australian) invasion of South-East Asia against the 'communist menace' allegedly emanating from China, Australia's most popular cultural pastime – watching television – was dominated by images of American domestic harmony, police, and the law pursuing American justice, and sagas of the expansion of White settlement into the American West". "These routine genres", they state further, "became as familiar to Australians as they

were to Americans, and through audience identification with their repetitive patterns of conquest over domestic disharmony, deviance, and the savage wilderness, it could be argued that many Australians accepted the invitation to see the world as popular American mythologies saw it". "That more Australians watched 'Roots' than any other television broadcast prior to 1980", they contend further, "suggests that the idioms and cultural content of American history and American television were familiar and pleasurable in Australia". "Three years after the introduction of television, in 1959, all of the 'top-ten' programs in Australia", they note elsewhere, "originated in the US". "American hegemony is seldom questioned [on the television news]", they write. "Instead it is seen as 'natural' – while antagonistic forces are seen as threatening the US, which is represented to its viewers as a 'victim'. American political authority is endorsed even as it is apparently being sanitised". Also relevant, finally, is their observation that "increasingly, as happened during the 1970s, especially in the US, Australian news and current affairs television has projected formal politics as contests over economic management". *Implicated*, 173–174, 173, 183, 185.

[187] In White's estimation, in the postwar period the US came "to represent the democratic way and all that was worth fighting for". White, 'A Backwater Awash', p.118.

[188] In James Jupp's view: "The social sciences in the English-speaking world were completely dominated from the United States by the early 1960s. As tertiary education expanded in Australia, American-influenced teaching and methodology gained influence". Jupp, *Party Politics: Australia 1966–1981*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982, p.9. For an example of this argument in relation to the Australian economics discipline see J.E. King, *A History of Post Keynesian Economics Since 1936*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA, 2002, pp.140–145 especially; and also Whitwell, *The Treasury Line*; and P. Groenewegen, 'The Australian Experience', in A.W. Coats, ed., *The Post-1945 Internationalisation of Economics*, Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 1996, pp.61–79. King writes that Keynes' "*General Theory* conquered Australia with a speed and thoroughness that would have impressed the Spanish Inquisition, so that by 1945 there was no more totally Keynesian economics profession in the world". In his view "this reflected not only the intensity of the country's suffering in the Great Depression but also the fact that *laissez faire* had never really taken hold there. European settlement itself was the direct result of state intervention, and both the colonial and (after 1901) the Commonwealth governments played a major role in economic life". He goes on to recount how "there was ... something of a 'Keynesian revolution' in economic policy, spearheaded by public servants of high intellectual calibre like H.C. 'Nugget' Coombs and Leslie Melville. By 1945 the 'Treasury Line' was unashamedly Keynesian, and would remain so for another three decades". Peter Groenewegen has conducted research revealing the predominance of British textbooks within Australia until the 1960s. King notes the "continuing strength of the Cambridge connection [where Keynes studied] until Harvard and Chicago took over as the natural destination for the talented young Australian economist in the 1960s". Most advocates of the Keynesian neoclassical synthesis were, as already mentioned, from the US. By the early and mid-1970s, "the leading US journals had become effectively closed to Post Keynesian ideas and alternative outlets had yet to emerge". King summarises: "Radical economics of all descriptions was just beginning a pronounced and continuing decline, reinforced in the Australian case by the unfortunate legacy of the 1972–75 Whitlam Labor government and an unusually strong business and academic reaction against the country's statist and protectionist traditions. Added to this was the accelerating Americanisation of the economics profession which was evident in the recruitment, publishing and research degree practices of most (if not yet all) economics departments in Australian universities. The future lay with neo-classical theory, particularly with the militantly deregulationist and avowedly anti-Keynesian variant of neo-liberalism known locally as 'economic rationalism'". King, *A History of Post-Keynesian Economics*, pp.141, 142, 143, 144. A powerful comment on the global Americanisation of intellectual discourse is provided by Bourdieu and Wacquant: 'On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason'. "Cultural imperialism", they write, "rests on the power to universalise particularisms linked to a singular historical tradition by causing them to be misrecognised as such. "Today", they suggest, "numerous topics directly issuing from the intellectual confrontations relating to the social particularity of American society and of its universities have been imposed, in apparently de-historicised form, upon the whole planet". "The neutralisation of the historical context resulting from the international circulation of texts and from the correlative forgetting of their originating historical conditions", they state, "produces an apparent universalisation further abetted by the work of 'theorisation'", p.41.

[189] Bourdieu and Wacquant note that 'postmodernism' emanates as a movement most emphatically from the US. 'On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason', p.42.

[190] "In Australia", write Bell and Bell, "the ideology of McCarthyism and the Cold War were quickly grafted to the rhetoric of Empire and monarchy". "Increasingly", they state, "local enemies of capital were linked in the public imagination to the enemies of capitalism abroad. Communists, socialists, and communist sympathisers – whether trade unionists, peace advocates, political activists, writers, or intellectuals – were portrayed and persecuted as collaborators with the new enemy, international communism". *Implicated*, pp.162, 164. In a more personal register, Chris Wallace-Crabbe, a lecturer in English at Melbourne University, recalls that "in those high, polar years of the Cold War, many of us reacted to its encampments with a sense of 'a plague on both your houses'"; his account giving a sense of the pervasiveness of these Cold War issues even for those who wished to remain 'above' them. Wallace-Crabbe, 'The Quaker Graveyard in Carlton', in Joan Kirkby, ed., *The American Model: Influence and Independence in Australian Poetry*, Hale and Iremonger, Sydney, 1982, p.44.

[191] Allen, *Art in Australia*.

[192] Ibid., p.147.

[193] Ibid.

[194] Ibid., p.154.

[195] Ibid., p.155.

[196] Ibid., pp.155, 170–171.

[197] Ibid., p.171.

[198] Brian Kiernan, 'Cultural Transmission and Australian Literature 1788–1998', in his collection of essays *Studies in Australian Literary History*, Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, Sydney, 1997, p.69.

[199] Kiernan, 'Cultural Transmission', p.69.

[200] Ibid., p.70.

[201] Ibid., p.70.

[202] Bell and Bell, *Implicated*, p.187.

[203] White, 'A Backwater Awash', p.120.

[204] Ibid.

[205] Ibid.

[206] Ibid.

[207] Ibid.

[208] Ibid.

[209] Ibid., pp.120–121.

[210] Brett, *Australian Liberals*, p.181. James Walter's summation of Brett's argument is useful here: "As Judith Brett has ... shown us, the 'moral middle class' fostered by Menzies saw its own interests as not wholly self-directed but as involving common purposes and working together to achieve them". 'Maggie Thatcher: My Part in her Downfall'. *Meanjin* 3, 2004, p.155.

[211] Russel Ward, *The Australian Legend* (1958, second edn), Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1966. On the traditional anti-puritanism and strength of secularism within Australian culture see especially Michael Hogan, *The Sectarian Strand: Religion in Australian History*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1987.

[212] Pusey, *Economic Rationalism in Canberra*, p.161. The emphasis is mine.

[213] Jupp, *Party Politics*, p.8.

[214] James Jupp, *The English in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004, p.157.

[215] Hugh Collins argues for example in a highly influential article that "the mental universe of Australian politics is essentially Benthamite". He means by this that "the dominant ideology of this society conforms to the essential character of Jeremy Bentham's political philosophy. Three aspects of Bentham's thought are crucial here: his utilitarianism, his legalism, and his positivism". 'Political Ideology in Australia: The Distinctiveness of a Benthamite Society', in Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, p.148.

[216] Connell, 'Moloch Mutates: Global Capitalism and the Evolution of the Australian Ruling Class, 1977–2002', *Overland* 167, 2002, p.11. Elim Papadakis also finds that "the New Right, in so far as it can be identified as a major proponent of radical reform of the welfare state, has exercised a decisive influence on intellectual debates rather than on public attitudes". Papidakis, 'Conjectures about Public Opinion and the Australian Welfare State', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 26:2, 1990, p.209.

[217] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.61.

[218] For recent accounts of this cultural and historical 'whitewashing' see Stuart Macintyre and Anna Clark, *The History Wars*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2003 and Robert Manne, ed., *Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle's Fabrication of Aboriginal History*, Black Inc., Melbourne, 2003.

[219] There are numerous accounts and periodisations of the Anglo-American 'culture wars'. In the American context Frank persuasively dates these to 1968: "What beat the Left in America wasn't inflation and uppity workers, it was the culture war. Starting with the Nixon campaign in 1968 and continuing up through the Gingrich years, the American right paid the bills by handing out favours to business, but it won elections by provoking, organising, and riding a massive populist backlash against the social and cultural changes of the 1960s". *One Market Under God*, p.25. In the Australian context, Barrett demonstrates, the 'culture wars' can be seen as having got underway with the Right's use of populist rhetoric to attack Whitlamite intellectual 'elites', especially over the government's purchase of Jackson Pollock's *Blue Poles*. See *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*. An important, in the sense of 'clear', marker of this developing culture war is John Singleton's 1970s free-market 'Worker's Party'.

Chapter Three

A Civilisation of Decency? Patrick White, Gough Whitlam and Anglo-Australian Cultural Tradition

Patrick White was a very strong supporter of the Whitlam-led Australian Labor Party and the Whitlam government. This is well known and has been documented by White's biographer David Marr and by White himself, in his 'self-portrait' *Flaws in the Glass* and in other writings and speeches.[1] Bernard Hickey has suggested perceptively that White and Whitlam were bound together by "one unifying, informing spirit", that of "humaneness".[2] Beyond that observation, however, there has been very little discussion of the fundamental reasons why White supported Whitlam, no consideration of whether or not this support is in any way reflected within or transmuted into White's literary works, and no systematic account of the possible political and cultural significance of this support.

In this chapter it will be argued that White supported Whitlam primarily because these two men possessed a common outlook derived from their mutual experience of and shared response to a Protestant, rationalist, Anglo-centric strand of Australian culture.[3] White and Whitlam remained attached to ideals deriving from this culture – in particular the puritan emphases on duty and vocation – and so were also strongly resistant to forms of radical individualism and greed. During the period between White's conscious politicisation, in the mid 1960s, and Whitlam's dismissal in 1975, this shared outlook is developed and advanced within White's major literary works: the novels *The Solid Mandala* (1966), *The Vivisector* (1970) and *The Eye of the Storm* (1973).[4]

White's support for Whitlam is especially significant because White was born into and grew up within an archetypal, ruling-class Anglo-Australian familial culture, because he and his literary works directly appealed to and represented the cultural capital of that segment of society within the Australian public sphere, and because his chosen medium of the novel was until the mid-1970s esteemed in popular and intellectual circles as the 'highest' (and so ostensibly least political) form of cultural expression.[5] Though the relationship between art, politics and society is (as already argued) inherently dialectical, and the impact of art on politics and society is especially hard to measure, it

does seem likely that, in embodying a shared, fundamentally Protestant Anglo-Australian social vision, White's literary work did make a powerful if subtle contribution to Whitlam's political project.

Personal and Political Connections

Having initially been only a reluctant supporter of Whitlam,[6] White was by the time of the 1972 election both convinced by Whitlam's reform agenda and considerably excited about what a Whitlam government could achieve.[7] Over the course of the Whitlam government he wrote several letters to Whitlam, mostly commenting on policy, but with a visible personal dimension.[8] He became a close friend of Whitlam-government Senator Jim McClelland and of McClelland's wife Freda.[9] At a dinner party held by the McClellands, White was approached by Governor-General Sir John Kerr and asked to accept membership of the Order of Australia that Whitlam was introducing to supplement the British Honours system. Though his personal principles forbade him accepting such awards, he relented in order not to undermine this Whitlam initiative.[10] In spite of his congenital dislike of public speaking and the fact that many of his friends and relations would disapprove,[11] White appeared as the major speaker at a 13 May 1974 Opera House rally of artists and intellectuals organised by the McClellands to provide support for Whitlam in the lead-up to the 1974 federal election. According to Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, "White, the main speaker, won the heart of a capacity crowd of three thousand".[12] Marr adds: "White spoke for seven exhilarating minutes and knew for the first time what it was to have the feel of an enormous audience".[13] This unique political event was in a sense made possible by White's agreeing to participate, for a 'name' was necessary to give the event legitimacy and attract other public figures.[14]

White referred to the Dismissal as "the cataclysm".[15] It had a devastating personal effect on him and, in one way or another, on those around him.[16] White ended friendships with people who supported the actions of Prime Minister Fraser or Governor-General Kerr.[17] He wrote in 1981 that "The Australian community was split on 11 November 1975 and has remained so".[18] As Marr recounts, the 'cataclysm':

> filled [White] with disgust: at the greed and impatience of the
> conservatives, at those who applauded this bizarre royal exercise, at all
> those Australians who continued to fawn on the Queen, and at himself for

having broken his own rules by accepting an [Order of Australia] honour from Kerr. This disgust fuelled White's politics through the years ahead. After 11 November he became more absolute, a sterner political puritan and a more convinced republican. All about him he saw the evil power of money in politics. The offices of Governor and Governor-General had to go, and he urged a total boycott. Even before scanning the Deaths, he turned each morning to the vice-regal column in the *Sydney Morning Herald* to see who had broken ranks to eat with Kerr and his successors at Yarralumla. Though almost toothless, White agreed to appear on television to speak for Labor. 'How unsuited I am to these public appearances, even with my teeth, but I shall have to do it'.[19]

On 28 November 1975 White, along with many other artists gathered at Sydney's Capitol Theatre, called for the re-election of Labor.[20] On the first anniversary of the *coup*, White appeared at a Sydney Town Hall meeting organised by Citizens for Democracy, a republican group calling for a new constitution and a Bill of Rights, stating:

> I present to you the following resolution: We Australian citizens meeting together for the first anniversary of the dismissal of an elected Australian government express our continuing concern and outrage at the event of 11 November 1975 and our firm determination to help ensure that such events will never occur again.[21]

On 28 January 1978, in the aftermath of Whitlam's and Labor's 1977 federal election defeat, White spoke at the testimonial dinner organised to mark Whitlam's departure from formal politics. At this event, White spoke of Whitlam in the reverent, almost biblical tones that Whitlam often inspired:

> Gough's worst flaw as a politician was that he had in him nothing of the hypocrite. He fell foul of the powerful few by trying to serve the cause of the many. He is an idealist in a world dicing with destruction for the sake of material returns. He is a great man and that is reason enough in this country for sticking him with niggling pins, slashing him with knives, cutting him down. But Gough will not lie down and die, either as a man, or as an influence. For many of us it has been an inspiration to have lived through the Whitlam era. We shall continue to revere this concerned, this humane man and his wife Margaret.[22]

White's basic account here remained unchanged over the rest of his life. He spoke of Whitlam's fate as a tragedy, in terms strongly reminiscent of Manning Clark, a historian White much admired and with whom he shared a broadly Anglo-Australian cultural

heritage.[23] In affectionate mood White named one of his two cats "Gough".[24] After Fraser's initial federal election victory White wrote to his agent Juliet O'Hea on 21 December: "We shall now return to everything I have always hated about Australia under the rule of sunny Philistia".[25] Following Fraser's second victory in the elections of 1977, White wrote to Clark: "The fascist sheep got what they wanted; let them now reap the results".[26] As Marr writes, "the sacking of Whitlam by the Governor-General was the decisive political event of Patrick White's life: he became a radical republican and his anger at the conservatives never left him".[27]

White's support for Whitlam was enthusiastically reciprocated. In his own history of his government Whitlam refers to White as "always a staunch and honoured supporter of my government".[28] This isn't strictly true, since after the 2 December 1972 election of Whitlam, White was soon disillusioned with how little progressive change the government was able to introduce. He wrote letters to Whitlam protesting concessions to Japanese publishers, export of wheat to Egypt after the 1973 Arab–Israel war and Labor's support for sandmining on Fraser Island,[29] but Whitlam's statement does indicate something of the extent to which he valued White's support. Partly, no doubt, this was for political reasons.[30] White's winning of the 1973 Nobel Prize provided a significant boost for Whitlam's political campaign to raise the public appreciation of Australian arts and artists. As Whitlam noted: "no event did more to secure and enhance the international reputation of Australian art and letters".[31] Whitlam sought to capitalise on this victory by inviting White on to the floor of the House of Representatives to receive the House's congratulations. As Marr records, "the only civilian ever to be given this accolade before was the aviator Bert Hinkler who made the first solo flight from London to Australia in 1928".[32] White declined, citing personal reasons, though thanking Whitlam for the offer: "Unfortunately, this is the kind of situation to which my nature does not easily adapt itself".[33] But there was also, evidently, a personal connection between the two men: White spoke (as already mentioned) at Whitlam's 29 January 1978 testimonial dinner, Whitlam attended a 1979 production of White's play *The Cheery Soul*, and they dined together while in Athens to attend the 1983 tenth anniversary of the student occupation of the Polytechnic (a crucial event in the overturning of the colonels' dictatorship in that country).[34] With the assistance of the Commissioner of Taxation, Whitlam made special

arrangements to exempt from ordinary taxation law the Patrick White Award, for older, insufficiently recognised authors, that White set up with the money from the Nobel.[35] Whitlam described White's Award as an act of "typical magnanimity and farsightedness" and as an "admirable and selfless gesture".[36] In *A Certain Grandeur*, Graham Freudenberg's account of Whitlam's life in politics, White is referred to as "the best man ... of his generation and type, if so rare a spirit can be said to be a type",[37] and his experience of the Whitlam government is juxtaposed against that of those who were unable to recognise the government's worth: "For (an Edward) St John [Q.C.] who found (the period of the Whitlam government) a time for fear, there is a Patrick White, a Manning Clark, who found it a time of liberation".[38]

Though they discuss the arts in general terms, White is the only artist Whitlam and Freudenberg single out for special mention in their respective histories of the period, indicating their belief in the significance of the role White played in building support at the cultural level for the form of society Whitlam and Freudenberg desired. As Whitlam's great political ambition was to promote social equality,[39] his great cultural ambition was necessarily to raise public appreciation for the arts: having set out to overcome radical, competitive individualism and narrow, materialistic greed, and so having professedly done away with the individual's short-term chance of attaining maximum personal wealth, what Whitlam could offer in return was a more educated and aesthetically enriched life. Hence the importance Whitlam attached to the development of the arts. Introducing the *Australia Council Bill* on 21 March 1974, he stated: "Artists have an essential role to play in society. No one can imagine a mature civilisation without their contribution" .[40] "My objective", he recalled later, "was to extend the benefits and rewards of the arts – the greatest civilising and humanising force in our lives – to a wider and less privileged audience".[41] "I recognised from the outset", he states further,

> that even with the most generous and imaginative schemes the arts could not be grafted onto a society that was barren and hostile to them. In the long run public appetites for literature and the arts would depend on the kind of society we created. Our policies of the arts have therefore to be judged in conjunction with our broader policies for education and social reform.[42]

By the same token, a more just society is one more likely to value the arts: "Education and social reform may not be cures for all our ills, but a society that cares about education and social reform will be a society that cares about literature and the arts. It will be well supplied with the qualities of understanding, sensitivity, discrimation and compassion that are the basis of artistic creativity".[43] In his clearest statement on this subject Whitlam declares:

> In any civilised community the arts and associated amenities must occupy a central place. Their enjoyment should not be seen as something remote from everyday life. Of all the objectives of my government none had a higher priority than the encouragement of the arts, the preservation and enrichment of our cultural and intellectual heritage. Indeed I would argue that all the other objectives of a Labor government – social reform, justice and equity in the provision of welfare services and educational opportunities – have as their goal the creation of a society in which the arts and the appreciation of spiritual and intellectual values can flourish. Our other objectives are all means to an end; the enjoyment of the arts is an end in itself.[44]

This comment could as easily have been made by White. In the content and style of his artistic work and in the values he espoused during the Whitlam period, White was the nation's great representative of this cultural goal. In a meaningful sense, White embodied Whitlam's hopes for a better – more just – Australian culture.

It is even more true to say that Whitlam was the political embodiment of White's hopes for a better Australian culture. Speaking at the 1974 Opera House rally, White explained his reasons for supporting Whitlam:

> Some of you to whom I am speaking may be in a quandary over how to cast your vote – as I too found myself in a quandary at a certain point in the post-Menzies era. Brought up in the Liberal tradition, I realised we had reached the stage where a change had to be made – that we must cure ourselves of mentally constipated attitudes, heave ourselves out of that terrible stagnation which has driven so many creative Australians to live in other parts of the world ... to offer an intellectual climate from which others won't feel the need to escape is most important and necessary, and this is what the Whitlam government is trying to do. I support it also for its genuine efforts to alleviate poverty, and its attempts to come to grips with that most complex of all our problems, the Aborigines, both tribal and urban. I think we have come at last to understand the important part spiritual association plays in the lives of Aborigines in their original tribal surroundings. I hope we are beginning to realise the importance of these

associations in the lives of white communities, particularly in the more neglected suburbs of our cities, and that the wholesale uprooting of human beings without regard for their feelings can have the most distressing psychological effects. The Whitlam government, I believe, recognises and respects the rights of the defenceless to a degree that the Opposition, with is subservience to monied interests, cannot pretend to emulate.[45]

As Whitlam suggested above, White avers: a better society would be one in which there is a greater awareness of and respect for artistic creativity, as opposed to material acquisition and / or brute strength, and in which humans are valued for their humanity, as opposed to their wealth or power.

In the other major statement of his reasons for supporting Whitlam, delivered at Whitlam's 1978 testimonial dinner, White states that as an artist he has a "fellow feeling" for Whitlam, a "creative politician" who, like "artists of any kind", takes risks, and "troubles the spirit, the conscience, the dormant imagination of the average man".[46] As "no doubt this is why the creative artist in Australia has always been somewhat suspect", so too with Whitlam: "a creative politician [is one] whom the competent one sees as threatening perhaps his prosperity by offering a liberating, forward-looking way of life".[47] For White, as for Whitlam, true creativity and humanity are inconsistent with narrow, competitive individualism and materialistic greed. White continues: "I believe this is why Gough Whitlam has had such an immense appeal for so many of my fellow artists. Not only because he understands and patronises the arts, but because he is a man of creative vision".[48] White repeatedly draws this distinction between the humane values of Whitlam and the inherently selfish and greedy values of mainstream Australia: "Present ease and gratification", White diagnoses in 1977, "these seem the extent of our aims and ambitions in Australia today – or at least Australia as it has been run since the ubiquitous event of 11 November 1975".[49] In the same speech he states: "I am fitted to speak, I like to think, on how our hearts, minds, our way of life should change before we can have the Australia we want. I am an artist ... the creative arts can only survive if we are politically creative as well. The Whitlam era, particularly the inspiring figure of Gough Whitlam himself, gave us [artists] this hope – which was so abjectly destroyed on November 11, 1975".[50] Still further clarification is provided by White in his self-portrait:

> After the coup of 1975 and the disastrous election which followed, I have remained a Labour [sic] supporter because, however idiotically those who lead the party behave at times, and however the unions may grasp at increased material benefits, the cynical example of the ruling class in this philistine non-culture, of money, wheels and swimming pools, does not encourage me to go along with it.[51]

Clearly, White shared Whitlam's core belief that competitive individualism and materialistic greed were not proper bases for social harmony or even true personal happiness, and this is why he supported Whitlam so passionately.

A Common Cultural Heritage

As argued in the previous chapter, mainly through reference to Brett's recent historical account of Australian liberalism, the contention that the actions of the individual and society must be grounded in a selfless moral base, that radical individualism and greed are not proper bases of behaviour or policy, is representative of a distinctively Protestant, Anglocentric tradition within Australian culture. As Brett makes clear, until the mid-1960s this tradition was very widely and strongly held; often, even generally, superseding class or socio-economic differences. In Marxist terms this moralism can be seen as a central element of the society's ruling-class ideology or culture. The main proponents of both classical and 'new', interventionist or humanist forms of liberalism, within and outside of the major political parties, continued to couch their appeals to voters in these puritan moral terms of 'selflessness' and duty until Fraser at least.[52]

Even in relation to the processes of colonialism and imperialism, where the subjection of many peoples to the demands of the empire's ruling class is more directly visible, the sustaining British myth of dutiful selfless morality was brought into play. As Joseph Conrad sets out in his classic critical engagement with European colonisation, *Heart of Darkness*:

> The conquest of the earth, which mostly means the taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves, is not a pretty thing when you look into it too much. What redeems it is the idea only. An idea at the back of it, not a sentimental pretence but an idea; and an unselfish belief in the idea – something you can set up, and bow down before, and offer a sacrifice to.[53]

Conrad was a close observer and an admirer of the British and in the quotation above is drawing a distinction between the approaches to colonialism of the (moral) British and the (rapacious) Belgians in the Congo. British society, most instrumental in the development of and benefitting most strongly from what Eric Hobsbawm termed 'the age of empire' – the period of unbridled global capitalist and colonial expansion between 1875 and 1914 – perhaps also spawned the most subtle and sophisticated justifications for colonisation and exploitation.[54] The British created and cultivated a notion of themselves as the most humane and liberal society, or civilisation, at home and abroad. Rudyard Kipling famously went so far as to suggest that the people referred to by Conrad as having 'a different complexion or slightly flatter noses' were "the white man's burden" (1899). Leaving aside the often perfidious nature of this Anglocentric moralism – captured in the ironic epithet 'British justice' – the moralism itself remained, both as a justification and a basis for protest against the ill-treatment of the powerless. White and Whitlam both grew to maturity squarely within this Anglocentric puritan liberalism and, though each man was very critical of aspects of this society, both remained committed to its central cultural ideals.

White was a third-generation child of the wealthy New England squattocracy.[55] A saying in the area referred to "the Whites, the Wrights and the not-quites", alluding to the fact that the Whites were the closest thing the region (and Australia) had to royalty.[56] White's father, Dick, was one of four brothers who owned grand properties and houses within the Hunter Valley region. As with aristocrats around the world, Patrick grew up believing in the enduring importance of a person's blood heritage.[57] In Marr's summation, White "was a child of the Empire".[58] White's parents "Ruth and Dick were, by instinct, pro-British but Dick was also an Australian chauvinist".[59] "This was not a contradiction", Marr points out: "the two loyalties lay side by side".[60] The family and extended family were Church of England, though not in an especially conscientious or fundamentalist way.[61] They believed strongly in the importance of personal financial rectitude and were opposed to the rise of organised labour. They were emotionally and socially reserved, 'practical minded' and hard working, and did not value reading or pleasure for its own sake.[62] Their houses and gardens were built on English models.[63]

They played the archetypal ruling-class English games of polo and cricket, and celebrated cultural events such as Christmas and New Year in traditional, ruling-class English style.

But White was culturally both an insider and an outsider of this society. White's values, according to Marr, were shaped chiefly by his Scottish Presbyterian nurse Lizzie Clark, who always warned against 'blowing your own trumpet' and who drummed into him the view that life was about fulfilment, and so also duty, rather than pleasure.[64] In Marr's account White's mother Ruth:

> wished him success, excitement and all the pleasure his fortune might bring him. He longed for Ruth's world, but there was also Lizzie's Scots' voice in his head, reminding him that pride has its pitfalls, that simplicity is the fundamental virtue, that pleasure must be earned. In Lizzie's Presbyterian world, the price of all that Ruth wished for the boy was a measure of punishment, pain and suffering.[65]

White himself reflected: "The puritan in me has always wrestled with the sensualist. As a child I felt ashamed of my parents' affluence. I was aware of a formless misery as well as material distress the other side of the palisade protecting the lives of the favoured few. For that reason I have never been able to enjoy what any 'normal' member of my parents' class considers his right".[66] Lizzie Clark, White writes, was "a Scottish version of the (puritan) breed".[67] He recalls that Lizzie's favourite slogan – 'never blow your own trumpet' – is "a warning which has echoed through my life to the present day, when trumpet-blowing has become one of our favourite national pastimes".[68]

It may however be the case that White emphasised the place of Lizzie Clark in his life partly out of a felt, ongoing resentment against his parents, who he believed failed to give him enough affection and emotional support. Most particularly, White resented having been sent to a brutal boarding school in England: Cheltenham. In any case, in his literary self-portrait White suggests that his values were formed out of his entire familial cultural context, and he pointedly contrasts this culture with that of the 1980s *nouveau riche*:

> I should add that my own family belonged in the category of new-rich when they came to Australia from Somerset as yeomen-farmers generations earlier and were granted great tracts of land which they proceeded to farm, professionally and profitably. As a result of their success they began building Edwardian mansions to replace their simple, early homesteads. Their imported motor-cars were the equivalent of

today's Mercedes, Jaguars, Porsches, and Ferraris. Austere in many ways, my forebears were also flash in what has become established as the Australian new-rich tradition. The distinction lies in the fact that my father and his brothers were honourable men who would not be divorced from their principles. My dowdy aunts had a moral core which could not be faulted. Even my more pretentious, more elegant mother would never have shed her principles. We were brought up never to blow our trumpets, talk about money, live beyond our means, but to give quietly.[69]

White was a homosexual, and this, coupled with other factors, such as Lizzie Clark's teachings against overwheening pride, his experience of officially sanctioned brutality at Cheltenham, his mixing with ordinary working-class men and women during the Second World War and his long relationship with the caring and gracious Manoly Lascaris, contributed to his critical attitude towards his own familial culture and Anglocentric puritanism generally.[70] He associated this culture with boredom, small-mindedness, authoritarianism and repression, and came to desire a truly multicultural Australia in which all racial and cultural groups would contribute to a distinctively new Australian culture: "It was a long time", White writes, "before I was conscious of connecting boredom with undiluted Anglo-Saxon blood".[71] "Thrashings were quickly forgotten", White recalled of his childhood, but: "What I could not forgive was my parents' amusement at their child's attempts to express his ideas, and their conviction that what I detested was what I would like. Even more, I resented their capacity for boring me, and my mother's relentless determination to do everything for your own good, which included dumping me in a prison of a school on the other side of the world".[72] "Sometimes at a distance", reflects White, "in a theatre or on the opposite side of the street, I might catch sight of my sister chaperoned by a female cousin or a maid. Ashamed of each other the siblings looked away".[73] The repression associated with his English heritage is further visible in White's statements that: "Even in the more brazen days of my maturity, English sex shivered and plopped remorsefully like a gas fire on its way out". Romance was similarly frowned upon: "Mum used to say Dad only married her because there wasn't another Ebsworth. I expect she was right. Imagination was not part of the White make-up". And in his memory of being left alone in England: "I was determined to keep my grief within the bounds of that manliness I was being taught to respect, when I would have liked to tear off the rabbitskin glove he was wearing and hold

139

the sunburnt hand to my cheek. I did nothing. I didn't cry".[74] Verity Hewitt has written of White's desire for a multicultural Australia:

> White worked from within romantic European traditions in both art and literature. His familiarity with those traditions allowed him to understand their progressions into modernism and abstract art, and to seek to foster their development in a Euro-Australian context. He had a profound desire to see develop an Australian culture that would wrench itself free from overwhelming British influence. He wanted to see it spring from the whole rich European inheritance, in conjunction with the Aboriginal spirit of the land ... In White's vision for Australian culture, there would be room for the voices of all comers–an expanding fusion and profusion of ever-growing complexity and richness. White did everything he could to foster this development.[75]

In a letter to his friend Ile Kriger's niece in Melbourne, White writes: "there are ... a great number of civilised Old Australians who are hoping that the migrants from European countries will bring something of their own cultures with them, so that we can incorporate them into what will some day be a true civilisation of our own".[76]

Nevertheless, White also associated England, and more especially London, with civilisation, the best manners and the best aesthetic accomplishments and values. Culturally, he remained notably a member of the dominant British-Australian culture: restrained, removed, high-minded, financially conservative.[77] "At heart I am a Londoner", White wrote to Tom Maschler, managing director of his publishing firm Jonathan Cape, on 20 September 1973.[78] Even while campaigning for an Australian republic, White advocated not cutting all ties with Britain: "I am not afraid to confess that I am sentimental to some extent, that I value my British ties, especially to London, the great cultural centre of the world ... It would be damaging, both practically and psychologically to sever the ties with Britain completely".[79] In spite of his flirtations with Judaism, the occult and various forms of protestant Christianity, White wrote in a letter to his cousin Betty Withycombe that he could not become a Catholic: "That is one plunge I could not take. I suppose in my heart I am a bigoted Protestant".[80] "Suffering", Marr notes significantly, "is a theme that runs through all White's work".[81]

Evidently, the puritan ideal of a selfless vocation or duty continued to underpin White's world-view. "We must resist the lust for undue wealth, which is what inspires our politicians", he stated at the inaugural meeting of the Nuclear Disarmament Party in

1981.[82] And in a speech at Latrobe University during one of his last public statements, he suggested:

> We must all, in the years to come, work towards a civilisation based on humanity ... Follow the path of humility and humanity, and Australia might develop a civilisation worthy of the name. I believe most people hunger after spirituality, even if that hunger remains in many cases unconscious. If those who dragoon us ignore that longing of the human psyche, they are running a great risk. The sense of real purpose – the life force – could be expelled from a society whose leaders are obsessed by money, muscle and machinery. That society could – quite simply – die.[83]

Marr suggests: "A common thread ran through all the political causes (White) had taken up since he spoke from the truck [against the establishment of an Olympic stadium] in Centennial Park in 1972".[84] This was "his fear of the power of money. The greed of developers threatened to destroy his city in the early 1970s; greedy and impatient conservatives deposed Whitlam in 1975; greed made Australians kotow to Americans and Japanese and British; greed linked governments, miners and manufacturers in the 'monstrous web' of the uranium industry which threatened the earth and its peoples".[85]

Though Whitlam's personal history is less well documented than that of White, he also came from a well established British-Australian Protestant family and was inculcated with, and espoused throughout his life, the central puritan belief of this culture, that personal and social behaviour must have a selfless moral foundation, that the purpose of life is to gain enlightenment and fulfilment rather than sensual enjoyment. Whitlam's father Fred, a Commonwealth Crown Solicitor, was a stronger believer in God than were White's parents. Laurie Oakes and David Solomon describe him as a "somewhat austere Presbyterian whose lifestyle was relatively frugal considering his income and position in the community".[86] Despite this, Fred encouraged free thinking in his own children.[87] In a 1973 interview with David Frost, Gough Whitlam stated that "I suppose I might have had religious beliefs up until I was eleven or twelve".[88] And he notes, importantly: "I would have thought that (my father) believed that religious faith underpinned social morality as well, as naturally, as personal morality".[89] Later in their discussion he says: "I certainly don't discount the influence that religion has had on my literary and social modes".[90] He described himself elsewhere as a "fellow traveller" of Christianity".[91]

As with his legendary work ethic,[92] Whitlam's political philosophy clearly has protean religious antecedents, and in particular the belief in the personal and social necessity of selfless devotion to a vocation: duty. As White persistently praised servants in his novels for their discretion, humility and application to duty, Whitlam praised the same qualities in the Australian bureaucracy. "Whitlam redefines the Labor Party as the party of Deakinite liberalism and the natural home of good public servants like his father", states Brett.[93] "He was, he said, the first Prime Minister of Australia who had lived in Canberra, 'the son of a great public servant, among whose colleagues were great public servants'".[94] According to Brett "this early familial experience gave Whitlam his faith in the constructive and benevolent role of government and in the capability and integrity of the public service".[95] In the opinion of Gough's sister Freda: "Coming from a home like ours, we would have had to go into some sort of service to the community. Gough doesn't go to church every Sunday, but he is completely motivated by our religious background; he would not accept that, but it is true".[96] Freda also states that "in our home" there was "of course ... never any drink. We are all very puritanical, but it wasn't obviously so. It was the way we lived".[97]

According to Oakes, Fred Whitlam had a strong sense of duty but was also capable of independent thought and action: "a model, impartial, and reticent public servant who nevertheless led a community revolt against the imposition of a special hospital tax on Canberra residents in 1933".[98] Fred was also "a generous helper of the underprivileged whose donations to chuches and charities were so large that his public service colleagues wrongly assumed that he had an independent income".[99] The family atmosphere was nothing if not high-minded:

> Fred Whitlam provided for his children an environment in which they were surrounded by books, encouraged to study, and had few distractions – not even a radio. Slang terms were banned. Idle chatter was frowned upon, and family conversation centred on such serious matters as literature, history and current affairs. When Gough and Freda were very young, even fairy tales were forbidden – bedtime reading came from the Greek and Roman myths.[100]

A comparison with White's own household comes to mind. Patrick never allowed a television in the house.[101] And though there was lots of gossip, serious subjects had to be

treated absolutely seriously. According to Oakes: "Gough Whitlam inherited his wit and sense of humour from his mother, Martha, but his attitudes, social concern, thirst for knowledge, cleverness with words, and application to work came from his dour, scholarly father".[102] Interestingly, where White feared his own 'priggishness', Whitlam was described in somewhat priggish terms by his school mates, as "pedantic, thorough, impudently witty, extremely well-read, usually defensive and withdrawn".[103] Whitlam was also reportedly teased at school for being weak in mathematics, suggesting that like White his central interest was with questions of cultural and social values.[104] And like White, Whitlam was in his younger years a shy person, very conscious of the imperative of not blowing one's own trumpet. Where White would have liked to be an actor if, he felt, he had not been made so shy by his Anglo-Saxon cultural heritage, Whitlam did begin to overcome his shyness at school through acting.[105]

Of course Whitlam, like White, was no Anglophile. Each man explicitly criticised Australia's enduring political subservience to Britain, and was an avowed Australian nationalist, though of a cosmopolitan and multiculturalist kind (they saw no conflict between their nationalism and their internationalism, wanting Australia to engage with the world, but on its own terms). Nevertheless, both men remained committed to a distinctively puritan cultural ideal – that the achievement of wealth and power cannot be an end in itself but only a by-product of a vocation – that in the Australian context emanated from and was sustained by groups of people who were culturally attached to Britain. Those influenced by this culture commonly contrasted it with the materialist, masculinist, conformist folk culture of Australian mateship, on the one hand, and the radically individualist and materialist American forms of puritanism on the other, in which for various historical and religious reasons a less firm distinction between personal gain and moral stature was generally drawn.

Attitudes Towards US and Working-class Australian Cultures

Both White and Whitlam regard 'ordinary' Australians – those who subscribe to the dominant, essentially working-class culture of conformist mateship – in paternal terms, as essentially childlike and needing instruction. White, in particular, was disdainful towards and exasperated by Australian conformity. As he wrote of the Kerr coup: "The childlike

mentality of so many Australians was easily terrified by British, American, and Liberal-controlled media propaganda into thinking they had escaped losing their all through reforms the Whitlam government was introducing. This supposedly sophisticated country is still, alas, a colonial sheep-run".[106] "Australians of all classes, levels of education, of the best intentions and integrity", White wrote, "are a prey to their native innocence. Even a man of Whitlam's intellect, wit, and capacity for leadership was brought down by precisely this strain of Australian innocence".[107]

For White, artists in Australia "have to elbow their way against the surge of the colonial sheep race".[108] Australians' consumerism and their liking for popular cultural forms exacerbates, in White's mind, their immaturity. In 1980 he states: "Quite often when I talk to children, even adults, they look at me in blank surprise because I don't trot out the half-a-dozen telly cliches – for the most part gifts from our American overlords – with which so many Australians communicate today".[109] In 1984 White says: "Over the years I have learnt to appreciate the worth of simple Australians who sincerely love their country, though in recent times this love is deflected into wrong channels by politicians and manipulators of moral values, jingle writers, the eternal flag waggers and sports promoters".[110] And in 1987 he spells out this point again: "A large proportion of grown Australians remain children at heart – I see them as kidults. That's why they're so easily deceived by politicians, developers, organisers of festivals, and that is why they fail to dig the real purpose of a giant circus like the (bicentennary)".[111]

Australians, like babies, want immediate gratification, and so are easily fooled and / or bought off by the manipulative. They must learn to endure suffering so as to properly grow up: "Australians are not prepared for anguish. I don't mean only in the sense of personal bereavement, but in the true spiritual sense, when we feel that God may have forsaken the world".[112] "A nation in the true sense isn't born of self-congratulation and the accumulation of often ill-gotten and unequally distributed wealth", White proclaims. Rather: "I suppose I'll be condemned as a miserable Jeremiah if I say it is born of suffering. Australians have suffered in the past, which they tend to forget now ... Even an occasion commemorating the horrors of Hiroshima has to be turned into a festival of sorts, with entertainers hired, often at great expense, to keep the kidult mourners amused".[113] In contrast, White feels himself to have been "born old".[114]

Whitlam expressed considerable compassion for people in poverty, and a sophisticated understanding of its structural causes in modern society:

> People are poverty-stricken when their income, even if adequate for survival, falls markedly behind that of the community. They cannot have what the larger community regards as the minimum necessary for decency. They cannot wholly escape, therefore, the judgement of the larger community that they are indecent. They are degraded for, in the literal sense, they live outside the grades or categories which the community regards as acceptable. Poverty then is more than the product of inadequate earnings, it is the product of community values.[115]

But as a social democrat, Whitlam's chief concern was that the working class be given the material and educational means of overcoming their disadvantage, rather than radicalised as a means of gaining economic, political and cultural autonomy. Clearly, both White and Whitlam have a strong sense of *noblesse oblige* and both have an Arnoldian, Modernist conception of culture as something like a secular religion. White in particular is aware that, as Terry Eagleton argues, "culture is fatally enfeebled once it comes adrift from its roots in religion".[116] Neither he nor Whitlam would have entertained the idea that working-class art and culture could be as equally 'great' as the art and culture of the Western canon.[117]

During the 1960s, however, White came to the view that the central obstacle to the social achievement of his central cultural ideals came not from within Australia but from the United States. From the late 1950s, even before his conscious politicisation, White becomes increasingly disturbed by the political, social and cultural trends he sees around him and, in particular, by the domination of narrow individualism, materialism and consumerism over moral and aesthetic considerations. White comes to see the USA as the epitome and symbol of these trends. In 1958 he writes to his English cousin Peggy Garland:

> It is really the Jews of that (cosmopolitan, intellectual) type who make life in the States bearable. Otherwise, it is a horrifying kind of sub-civilisation, full of sudden gusts of fascism. The routine of living has been made so easy that the average person has lost touch with life, its primary forms and substances. I shall be glad to get out of it, even more glad that I am Australian.[118]

White describes the US variously as decadent, uncultured, (in the sense of being unlearned and insensitive), materialistic, hedonistic, immoral, amoral, ideological (in the negative sense of the word), asocial and, above all, as corrupted by money. Importantly, White sees the dominance of material values and greed as corrupting human relations, destroying the selfless form of love that he always regarded as the most true form.[119]

Perhaps the best encapsulation of White's view of the US appears in an account of a visit to Greece he made with his partner Manoly Lascaris:

> At Tripolis, the prototype of Greek provincial towns ... While we were standing on a boardwalk above the sadly humiliated waters of that classic inlet, I glanced down, and there amongst the rubbish was a plastic spoon stamped with the word AMERICA ... Not only on a plastic spoon casually dropped beside the Saronic Gulf, AMERICA is writ large across its victim. It is tattooed into the body of a goddess turned prostitute, by poverty, materialism, and international politics.[120]

Tripolis is the original model of Greek provincial towns, suggesting that its degradation is particularly telling and sad. The '*classic* inlet' now containing 'sadly humiliated waters' suggests the lost grandeur of a greater civilisation and a better age. This civilisation is contrasted with the cultural insignificance of a plastic spoon, along with other 'rubbish'; America's 'gift' to this society. The spoon has been 'casually' dropped, indicating the ignorance of those partaking in the destruction of this great civilisation. The capitalised 'America' conveys White's sense of this nation's power and of the inexorable nature of its domination, as well as of the crass 'in your face' quality of its culture. America cannot be ignored, even here in Western civilisation's classical home. America has not only victimised Greece, personified in the figure of a goddess, it has coarsely displayed its name across the victim's body, like a form of graffiti, again suggesting philistinism and ignorant, childlike triumphalism. Greece has been turned into a degraded, tattooed prostitute, suggesting that her 'fall', in the face of the greedy, ignorant, selfish and self-serving America, is moral as well as aesthetic. America's 'victory' is plainly a hollow one.

A culture of naked materialist self-interest is for White, as he makes clear in this 1984 'Hiroshima Day' address, a culture of unreality and gullibility:

> What is reality? We may ask. Something different for everyone. Look at Reagan, the straw cowboy, and his buddy, Bush, flexing their muscles on

146

the election trail, in their Texas hats, flanked by a couple of busty starlets. Such a set-up must mean reality for many American electors or it couldn't be practised so successfully. War, I feel, must be a celluloid adventure, a series of clips from *Gone with the Wind* or *Apocalypse Now*, for those who have not experienced it on their own soil, or anyways since away back in history.[121]

"At this moment", White suggests later that year, "there is a tensely unreal atmosphere in the Western world ... in Hawke's Australia – in Reagan's Disneyland".[122] In 1986 he adds: "Reagan seems to me a perfect example of somebody unable to imagine the real".[123]

Elsewhere White expands on his dissatisfaction with American cultural domination:

> Never were there such victims of progress as contemporary Greeks. Peasants who sold their fields in Thessaly and Thrace live like battery fowls on their steel and concrete balconies or expose themselves to televison in the cells behind, in every interior the same box flickering the same message. They tell themselves they are happy. They are prosperous, at least for the time being, stuffed with macaroni, fried potatoes, and barbecued meat. Livery and neurotic. The human contacts of village life are of the past, along with those tough, golden, classic hens scratching freely amongst the dust and stones.[124]

And he writes of Rhodes being "rotted by film stars and tourism".[125] Of a proposal to turn his novel *Voss* into a film, White warns: "I would not want to see the book turned into some American monstrosity with Ava Gardner and Gregory Peck".[126] During one of his numerous visits to the US, in 1968, he reports in a letter to his New York agent John Cushman: "I haven't heard such fascist talk since Germany before the War".[127]

White repeatedly states his fear that Australia will become another United States, in which cultural considerations, upon which beauty depends, will be wholly subject to materialistic greed and the cultural relativism of the market. "As we raced through the 'Sixties into the 'Seventies", he writes, "the social climate changed: ladies of a higher social level began cooking for their equals, their inferiors too, if the money was there. Money became everything, vulgarity chic, the crooks got off provided they were rich enough. Knighthoods could be bought more easily than ever".[128] As he wrote, in what Marr terms "magisterial" letters to the *Sydney Morning Herald*, White "feared Australia

becoming a colony of the United States".[129] Speaking at the 1972 Sydney Town Hall protest against the proposed Olympic stadium, he asks:

> What, I wonder, constitutes this progress we are urged to believe in? Perhaps the vision of some American city of the 1930s when for most other countries of the world the United States was the symbol of material success. But what of today? As our well-travelled politicians are driven round Manhattan or Chicago are none of them aware of the neuroses and despair, the dirt and violence lurking in these ever-crowded concrete warrens? If our travelled politicians are not aware, many thinking Americans would be prepared to give warning. In fact, some of these thinking Americans have migrated to Australia, to escape from what we now seem to be building up for ourselves in imitation of America.[130]

In 1973 White asserts: "Civilisation is not a matter of money and concrete. (Look at what's become of the United States!) civilisation, as I see it, depends on spirit – human beings – human values".[131] "We in this Lucky Country are inveterate trumpet-blowers", White diagnoses in his 1974 Australian of the Year acceptance speech, "and what I fear for us is that, if we don't take care, we shall end up in the late Twentieth Century as kid brother of the original Lucky Country, the United States".[132] In a 1984 speech in New Zealand White suggests: "We, more than you, are plagued by an establishment which wears two faces, which adopts a *pragmatic* attitude, to use a fashionable and ultimately meaningless word. Of course it really means that we must lick the arses of our American overlords".[133] And in 1988 White saw Australia's flashy, mindless self-promotion as exemplary of the increasing dominance of American values within Australia: "This frame of mind was rife in the US in the 1930s. And now it has caught on in Oz as we become increasingly Americanised".[134]

This antipathy towards what he sees as the uncultured capitalism of the USA arises chiefly out of White's British-Australian cultural context. As Marr sets out:

> This suspicion of America was one of the few clear political convictions he absorbed from his parents and it turned out to be important. At Lulworth the decline of Britain was felt as a blow to the family of which they were part. America was certainly friendly, but this was the rise of another empire and another family to which rich Australia had little connection. The Whites and their friends voiced something of this anxiety in the amused distaste they had for American vulgarity, but Patrick could also remember his parents in the early 1930s pressing on people copies of a tract called *Honour or Dollars* which argued the need for Britain to be

forgiven the immense war debts it owed the United States. This was the Victor Whites' only political enthusiasm and their son was impressed. Thirty-five years later the transformation of this private conservative into a public radical began with his initially cautious and later vociferous disapproval of America's role in Vietnam.[135]

One of White's earliest memories is of his mother telling off his father for "chewing a wad of the disgusting new American gum".[136] "Of the American novelists", states White, "the people I like are Bellow and Updike, who are fairly detached"; in other words, those who are culturally most like the English.[137] After initially feeling tempted to join the crowds in Sydney welcoming the American evangelist Billy Graham, White heard Graham's Baptist rhetoric on the radio and was glad he didn't. Graham's emotional, flashy, self-righteous style helped White to define his own faith.[138]

This is not to say that White is pathologically anti-American, or unable to appreciate Americans or accept the value of some elements of US culture. Manoly's mother was American. During his first visit to the US in 1939 White had significant personal relationships with 'Spud' Johson and Joe Rankin (to whom White dedicated *The Living and the Dead* [1962]). While writing this novel in Rankin's apartment, White thought himself "more or less an adopted American", even while finding New York "lacking in a dimension, and the people are without roots".[139] Ben Huebsch, the publisher at Viking in New York, was in a professional sense at least the most important single supporter in White's literary career. His respectful and accommodating attitude to White's literary creativity was plainly evidence of a person of similar philosophy to White. According to Marr, for example, Huebsch "was not deterred by length. The manuscripts of authors like White were not to be cut. He put no pressure on authors to be commercial, and was happy for the Viking Press to carry unprofitable writers in whom he had faith".[140] White "could not have hoped for a better reception" to the 1939 Viking edition of *Happy Valley*, published the week France fell. "His style, which had been greeted with scepticism in London and hostility in Australia, was very much to taste in America".[141] When White delivered the finished typescript of *The Living and the Dead* to his agent, Huebsch accepted the book while the London publisher rejected it.[142] "So a pattern was set for the next fifteen years", explains Marr: "immediate acceptance of White's work in New York and a struggle to find a publisher in London".[143] In London

during the war, White wrote home saying he didn't think he could live in Europe any more, that it would have to be the States or Australia.[144] White's *The Tree of Man*, which thrilled his American publishers, was rejected by some twenty London publishers. Frank Morley of the London firm Eyre & Spottiswoode was persuaded to take the book, while visiting New York, by Huebsch. White later stated with relief: "It is the first time I have been able to relax with an English publisher as I have from the beginning with Ben Huebsch".[145] After *The Tree of Man* won rave reviews in the US and only lukewarm praise in Britain and Australia, White remarked: "If it hadn't been for the Americans I would have felt like putting my head in a gas oven".[146] The US royalties White received from *The Tree of Man* enabled him and Manoly to purchase a new Rover.[147] When White held a party for Yevgeny Yevtushenko, the star of the 1966 Adelaide Festival, Marr recounts: "Yevtushenko arrived with his 'interpreter' Oxana Krugerskaya and a local Communist novelist, Frank Hardy, whom White could never bear".[148] Later Yevtushenko launched into what White described as "an embarrassing tirade of hate" against America.[149] White reportedly "sat grim and unflinching as the poet and his translator pursued the 'operative duet-cum-ballet'. The Russian hoped that eventually 'We will all be working for all people, the whole world.' There was no applause. White left for the kitchen clutching his head".[150]

But White felt "out of love" with the US by 1971, following a drop off in the sales of his works and the increasingly harsh critical reception that greeted them there. He wrote: "Nowhere does one see a soul who might share one's thoughts and opinions. I can see why my books don't sell in the States: what is surprising is that any book should sell".[151] By that time White delayed sending his novel manuscripts to his US publisher so that they would be reviewed in London first, where they were now more likely to be favourably received.[152]

As discussed in the previous chapter, in the mid-1960s many people believed that the dominant, Anglocentric liberal culture of Australia was being replaced by a more radically individualist American culture, most visible in unabashed consumerism. This is recognised by Frank Moorhouse, implicitly though clearly, in his germinal collection of interconnected short stories, *The Americans, Baby* (1972). Notably, Moorhouse's characters here, influenced by a range of more worldly Americans, are new in Australian

literature in the extent to which they are preoccupied with immediately satisfying basic, physical and material needs and wants: for sex, alcohol and drugs in particular. Moorhouse's characters want only physical satisfaction and sensual gratification, rather than any form of spiritual transcendence, wisdom, or deep emotional fulfilment. White on the other hand believes that where ideals are replaced by material greed, and ethical and aesthetic distinctions evaporate, life becomes profoundly meaningless and unreal, human relations are degraded. He insists that a state of illumination or transcendence can only be obtained through an acceptance of suffering, which White equates with full maturity.

As a political leader and public figure Whitlam's practical capacity to comment on the cultures of foreign nations is limited, and it seems clear that he was much more positive towards American culture as a whole than was White, but he does observe that the central obstacle to his political and other public aims emanated from the policies of the United States. As he states:

> What destroyed [Lyndon Johnson's] concept of the Great Society, with all the hopes it held for the city dwellers, the poor, the old, the sick and the black of the US, was not the over-ambitiousness or expensiveness of its social programs but the cost of the war in Vietnam. The American liberals, 'the best and the brightest', believed they could have both the Great Society in America and victory in Vietnam. Even the resources of the US proved not to be limitless and the Great Society became yet another of the casualties of Vietnam. Its baleful effects did not end with the collapse of the ideal of the Great Society under Johnson. The catastrophe of the war put an end to the two decades of virtually uninterrupted growth and prosperity enjoyed by the West.[153]

White's Cultural Contribution to Whitlam's Political Project: The Novels of the Period

The cultural origins of White's politics and the political effects of his major cultural products, his novels, are questions that have rarely been given extended scholarly consideration. Yet, in both their content and form, the three novels White produced in the period between his conscious politicisation in the mid-1960s (in the context of his opposition to the American and Australian war in Vietnam)[154] and the defeat of the Whitlam government in 1975 (an event marking the end of his time of political hope), give evidence of White's enduring commitment to a politics grounded in the ideals of his definitively Anglo-Australian puritanism. Each novel is an affirmation of the value and

importance of selflessness, suffering and devotion to a vocation: through this serious and earnest performance of duty, it is revealed, an otherwise unobtainable, profound spiritual vision, illumination or transcendence, and a deep connection with humanity that is the real purpose of life, is granted.[155] The main characters of all three novels are explicitly English-Australians, suggesting White's central identification with this cultural grouping and his belief that this group had special cultural qualities and responsibilities. Perhaps most interestingly, however, these three novels also reveal White's increasing concern with the impact of American trends on Australian culture. *The Solid Mandala* constitutes a critique of British-Australian puritan hypocrisy. *The Vivisector* is above all a critique of small-minded Australian nationalism, the conformist culture of mateship, though American cultural influences are (unflatteringly) visible. *The Eye of the Storm* is a critique of selfish individualism and materialism, characteristics epitomised in the novel by an explicitly Americanised character: Doctor Gidley. These 'metaphysical' novels do, at the spiritual or emotional level of culture, make a tangible contribution to the advancement of White's and Whitlam's political values.

In *The Solid Mandala* the core puritan theme is advanced via the story of Waldo Brown. Although the novel is ostensibly structured as a mandala (a symbol of the unity of opposites like the Chinese ying and yang), with brief introductory and closing chapters encasing one extended chapter each on Waldo and his twin brother Arthur, the Waldo chapter is far longer – 191 pages to Arthur's seventy-nine – suggesting White's central thematic preoccupation (and his identification) with this character. Waldo's tragedy is that he is unable to become a fully developed human being because he is too deeply neurotic and concerned with what others – his society – may think. He desires a vocation, that of the artist, but desires it for the wrong reasons. He wants to receive social acclamation and kudos rather than to find deep truth and enlightenment. Waldo's lack of humility and his related attachment to narrow, human rationalism and conventional sexual morality, keeps him from the profound understanding upon which, it is made clear, true artistic vision depends. As a result his anger, resentment and self-loathing builds to the point where it directly or indirectly destroys him.[156]

In *The Vivisector* the central puritan message is told through the story of Hurtle Duffield. Unlike Waldo Brown, Hurtle Duffield does possess an artist's vocation, and he

accepts the personal cost of this from the earliest age. Throughout the novel it is made clear that Duffield is profoundly alone, that he has no real family: "'I think you're an artist, aren't you?'", Rhoda Courtney asks Duffield, and explains: "'What I meant was *sans famille*.'" (516)[157] As a young boy his parents give him up for adoption, suggesting immediately White's view that the artist's unique qualities affect and to an extent transcend all of his or her human relationships (importantly, Hurtle is fundamentally disconnected from society by a commercial transaction: the reduction of human to market value).[158] Duffield suffers throughout his life, both in wrestling to find the ultimate artistic vision and in being constantly misunderstood by people around him. Other characters are often horrified, if also fascinated, by the truth revealed to them in Duffield's art: "'You, Hurtle, were born with a knife in your hand. No', [his step-mother] corrected herself, 'in your eye'". (146) People generally are shown to be too frightened or vain to properly question themselves and their world, as good puritans must do. In a cultural sense Duffield is a vivisector, though in performing this function, White reveals, he is only acting as a medium for a greater power. On one level, as Marr suggests, "the novel is a writer's profound exercise in self-justification".[159] Since Duffield does stay the course with his vocation and stare honestly into the metaphysical abyss, he does achieve, at the time of his death, a profound sense of accomplishment and spiritual joy, certainly seeing the transcendent realm:

> He was mixing the never-yet-attainable blue. He pursed is lips to repeat the syllables which were being dictated: N–D–G–O ... All his life he had been reaching towards this vertiginous blue without truly visualising ... Now he was again acknowledging with all the strength of his live hand the otherwise unnameable I–N–D–I–G–O ... Too tired too end-less obvi indi-ggodd. (616–617)

Duffield has always associated the colour indigo with the divine. As Havelock Ellis pointed out in his 1896 analysis of colour in poetry, the blue colours of the sky and sea "naturally symbolise ... ideas of infinity and depth".[160] In Duffield's moment of fatal illumination he manages to produce the perfect indigo and so merges with ultimate being, wisdom, vision, becoming one with the perfect colour and the perfect being. As William Scheick points out, 'indigo' is an anagram of 'God-in-I.[161] Scheick suggests that 'indi-ggodd' conveys the idea of the godlike individual's returning into God, having grown

tired at last of human consciousness.[162] It could be argued that this is White's most optimistic novel, and it is perhaps no coincidence that it was published in the period leading up to the election of the Whitlam government.

The puritan theme of *The Eye of the Storm* is expressed in the experience of the central characters Basil Hunter, Dorothy de Lascabanes (née Hunter) and their mother Elizabeth Hunter. In order to achieve emotional fulfilment and metaphysical enlightenment these three must develop a 'pure' or selfless love for each other, one that is neither domineering (as Elizabeth's love has been) nor self-serving (as has been the children's love for their mother). Like Waldo Brown these characters are vaguely aware of their profound psychological and spritual needs but are only partially successful in meeting these. Basil and Dorothy are siblings who return home from London and Paris respectively in order to see their powerful and manipulative mother before she dies. Ostensibly their mission is to see that she is cared for in the period leading up to her death, but Basil and Dorothy also have hidden, partly repressed motives, namely to make sure that they get their hands on an acceptable share of their inheritance, that will only come to them upon Elizabeth's death. There are parallels in the story with Shakespeare's examination of filial love, duty and resentment in *King Lear* and there are allusions to this play throughout the novel. While they would like to be like Cordelia and Edgar, in the end Basil and Dorothy more closely resemble Goneril, Regan and Edmund.[163] White resented his own mother's economic power over him and the psychological pressure she placed on him, and was unable to escape the guilty feeling that he may have wished her to die.[164] The novel's title refers in a literal sense to Elizabeth's moment of illumination during the eye of a storm on Brumby Island, but beyond this is also intended to stand as a metonym for moments of numinous vision, when temporal earthly concerns drop away and a glimpse is obtained of the eternal and universal.[165]

These moments of profound stillness form the dramatic climax of all of White's novels following his personal religious conversion during his experience of such a moment at his property in 1951.[166] At these moments of ephiphany, in which "the mind moves upon silence", as Yeats put it in his poem 'The Long Legged Fly', the great dualisms, binaries, or contraries of human consciousness and reality are resolved. The individual merges with the world around her, gaining a sense of the ultimate unity of

154

everything and everybody, and thus of complete spiritual and emotional fulfilment. As Marr summarises, "*The Eye of the Storm* follows the fundamental plot of all the books White wrote since falling in the storm at Castle Hill: the erratic, often unconscious search for God".[167]

In each of these novels, then, the central theme is the affirmation of White's core, Anglocentric puritan cultural values, and these values are also affirmed obliquely via the form of these novels. As White admitted, he did not at this time place any value in the creation of plot. He was concerned instead with the creation and development of characters.[168] The stories advance through a series of often apparently insignificant or mundane incidents that, it is intimated, have a deep conscious or unconscious impact on the characters. The effect of this, throughout the novels, is to skilfully and subtly suggest the presence of generally unrecognised forces beneath ordinary human interaction, and the possibility that this ordinary interaction might be part of a greater cosmological reality and have repercussions beyond ordinary understanding. The three novels are long and 'difficult': filled with complex sentence structure, allusion, challenging ideas and a confronting, unconventional aesthetic. The reader is rarely 'delighted' by what she finds in these works, but is always aware of a deep 'instruction' being revealed (to evoke Chaucer's translation of Boethius's classic definition of the function of literature). White often refers to works of Literature in the novels, as though encouraging his readers to search for the key to his work in other great texts. Grasping the 'meaning' of these novels requires application, work: a willingness to consider aesthetic and moral issues at length, to make the development of one's own values a central part of one's life. Just as White argues in all three of these novels against the value of 'immediate sensual gratification', the form of these novels implicitly encourages notions of hard work and serious moral commitment. None of these novels could be considered light entertainment.

We learn in the brief, prefatory chapter of *The Solid Mandala* that Waldo Brown and his twin brother Arthur: "'come out from Home,' Mrs Poulter said, 'when the boys were only bits of kids.' Mrs Dun was partly pacified. 'All these foreigners,' she said, 'we are letting in nowadays. I admit the English is different.'" (15) The Brown family are English, more educated than their neighbours, and have pretensions to cultural sophistication (the father, George Brown, wishes to build a classical-style pediment on

the family house, for example). They are on the outer, socially, because of this. Both parents have strong values: "When she was ill, and fanciful, and old, Anne Brown, born a Quantrell, said to her sons absently: 'It was for his principles, I suppose. And kindness. Poor George, he was too kind. It left him too open to attack". (80) Like Whitlam, the Brown brothers' parents were members of the Fabian society. (145) And the mother, Anne Quantrell, is of aristocratic heritage.[169]

Hurtle Duffield, whom White makes a child of working-class parents in order to suggest the 'naturalness' of the artist-type and to avoid the perception that a sterile, puritan, Anglo-Saxon cultural environment could induce a creative genius, is nevertheless a child of English working-class parents:

> During break Tom Sullivan from Cox Street started making up to Ossie, whispering and laughing behind his hand. Ossie would have liked to laugh back if his long dopy face had dared.
> 'What was Tommo telling you?'
> 'Nothing,' said Os.
> 'It was too long to be nothing. Go on, what was it?' Ossie Flood's skin turned green.
> 'Tell, or I'll kick you in the guts.'
> This had always worked in Cox Street. And Ossie Flood began to tell. His biggest teeth were grooved and green. He told spitting excited frightened he said how Tommo Sullivan said Hurt Duffield was the son of a no-hope pommy bottle-o down their street, who carried around in an old cigar box a pedigree like he was a racehorse.
> Going down the steps after break Hurtle got up against Tommo Sullivan to tell him he was the biggest turd ever dropped from an Irish arse. He banged Tommo's head once or twice against the wall. Though Tommo was bigger, it came easy. (40)

From his adopted (English-Australian) parents Hurtle learns the importance of duty, and when he comes to teach his kindred spirit Kathy Volkov (significantly a child of European rather than 'ordinary' Australian heritage) about the process of artistic creation, it is a puritan message he feels the need to convey: "She hadn't suffered enough: because pity was not yet one of her personal needs, she hadn't bothered to understand, let alone confer it". (432) More than being a child of English parents, Hurtle is the child of English parents with a noble heritage. His grandfather was an educated gentleman. As with Tobias Smollett's *Humphrey Clinker* (1771), the ostensibly democratic storyline of a poverty-stricken boy 'making good' is undermined by the revelation of noble birth (the

implication could be that this heritage gives Hurtle a more noble sensibility than is allowed others of less fortunate parentage).

Elizabeth Hunter and her two children are explicitly English-Australians, and the inheritors of traditional, Anglocentric ruling-class Australian culture. They are cultivated, detached, reserved, aware of the importance of paying and receiving respect. At Elizabeth's funeral, for example: "There were no spectacular outbreaks of grief, only the hint of a soggy patch here and there in the broken rows. Elizabeth Hunter's own sense of style would not have encouraged emotional excess". (558) This focus on English-Australian characters in this and White's two previous novels suggests that White is most concerned with the fate of this community, and perhaps also implies a conscious or unconscious belief that the people of this community have the greatest role to play in the continuing development of Australian culture.[170]

The central constraint on Waldo Brown's achievement of spiritual transcendence is a degraded, 'worldly', self-serving or pharisaical form of puritanism that White identifies in Waldo's society and that Waldo has internalised. Waldo has all of the worst features of Anglo-Australian puritanical culture and none of its redeeming qualities. He is narrowly rationalistic ("Facts are facts. And Waldo Brown respected facts as much as he respected habit"); (70) deeply repressed, sexually and emotionally ("Waldo was so horrified he might have expressed his feelings"); (111) jealous ("'Waldo', [Arthur] told her [Dulcie], 'is just about the jealousest thing you'll find'"); (151) fearfully desirous of social respectability and acceptance ("Waldo", states White's narrator, might have loved [his library workmate Wally], if that truth had been admitted"); (128) while lacking any genuine care for others ("Occasionally, in passing, after returning the scones to the table, he would very carefully brush the crumbs which had fallen on Arthur's knees, with a candid though unostentatious charity which moved the observer – as well as the performer"); (75–76) filled with loathing towards the physical and especially the grossly physical ("Waldo could not bear to listen to Arthur breathing the way he breathed"); (41) and unable to cope with the unknowable, infinite or numinous ("Waldo was astonished, then horrified, at the strangeness of it"). (152) Waldo is filled with resentment and hate and, as if it is not enough for him to be physically stunted, even the dog he comes to own

(as a means of spiting his brother) is also a runt. Waldo is committed to the performance of duty, but only to free himself from guilt and gain social acceptance.

Yet Waldo is not honestly searching for truth or especially willing to examine his own limitations before or after passing judgement on others: more positive qualities that often (as in the case of White) accompany rigid puritanism. Waldo is best described as a 'prig': a "conceited didactic person ... tiresomely precise, straitlaced, over-conscious of moral superiority".[171] In White's literary self-portrait it emerges that this priggishness is what he most fears becoming.[172] Priggishness is the natural flaw of the person with high moral standards: the puritan. Marr writes that 'Waldo' was reportedly based on a real character White had known at Cheltenham, but apparently 'Waldo' was also at one time a nickname of White.[173] "I see the Brown brothers as my two halves", White wrote, "Waldo is myself at my coldest and worst".[174] White's primary target of criticism in the novel is a lived culture of small-minded, hypocritical, Anglo-Australian puritanism, though at the same time he endorses the ideals of this culture. For White, as for the original Puritans, spiritual transcendence paradoxically requires a full acceptance of the fundamental impurity of the individual and the world. White and his familial forebears believed the proper eschewal of selfishness required the performance of social duty.

Arthur, Waldo's twin, his Other both literally and metaphorically, is totally uncaring of social conventions, mores, expectations and rewards. Although very good at maths, Arthur wishes only to work for the local shopkeeper Mr Allwright.[175] Where Waldo is physically small and weak, Arthur is big, strong and good looking. He has a close friendship with their neighbour Mrs Poulter and is oblivious to people's rumour-mongering. He is completely relaxed and unselfconscious around all people, and oversteps conventional barriers of decorum in expressing his emotions, most obviously (and infuriatingly for Waldo) in his relationship with the Feinsteins (Waldo believes at one time that he loves Dulcie Feinstein). Arthur's vocation – making bread – is an appropriately simple and profound task with obvious biblical precedents and allusions. (Waldo, naturally, resents the fact that Arthur has a vocation.) Through the 'true' nature of his spirit Arthur grasps the world more deeply than Waldo and is able to create more powerful art, including a poem that, near the end of his life, Waldo discovers. In its power, the poem destroys Waldo's illusions of his own superiority over Arthur, and of

the superiority of his own way of thinking. The poem, for Waldo, is a "disgusting *blood myth*", (213) the visceral and deeply symbolic nature of blood being abhorrent for the repressed and rationalist Waldo. Allusions to Christ appear in descriptions of Arthur throughout the novel. After Arthur has killed Waldo for having destroyed his poem, for example, we hear via a panicked Mrs Poulter: "And He released His hands from the nails. And fell down, in a thwack of canvas, a cloud of dust. It was not Arthur. Arthur would never ever of done that. He was not God. Arthur was a man". (303) And later: "'This man would be my saint,' she said, 'if we could still believe in saints. Nowadays,' she said, 'we've only men to believe in. I believe in this man.'" (314)

Waldo is, we learn from early in the novel, determined to produce a great work of literary art: "'Oh,' cried Waldo Brown in anguish", while going on one of the long walks that he as an old man takes with his brother, in the hope, it is hinted, that Arthur's heart might give out, "'but I have not expressed half of what is in me to express!'". (30) As a young man he decided he "would write a play, something quite different, when he had thought of one". (40) People "did not grasp the extent of his need to express some *thing*. Otherwise how could he truly say: I exist". (82) "'What I really want to do'", he confides as a teenager to Dulcie Feinstein, a young woman he meets at a party, "'is write' ... 'What are you going to write,' she said, 'do you think it will be novels?' 'I haven't decided yet,' he said, 'what,' he said, 'what form it'll take. Sometimes I think novels, sometimes plays. It might even be some kind of philosophical work.'" (93) Afterwards he wishes "he could have conceived a poem. He had not yet, but would – it was something he had kept even from himself". (110) In later life Waldo "has a box of manuscripts clippings letters of appreciation", (117) but "he had not produced what you might call a substantial body of work". (117) He did not allow this to consciously bother him, since he believed that art was his vocation and that it could only be a matter of time before he produced something great: "He was only marking time, and would create the work of art he was intended to create". (146) In the end Waldo is reduced to copying others' poetry, and pretending to himself that it is his: "'Tennyson,' he said", when Arthur finds a Tennyson poem and describes it as "'the one you copied out'" – "'is, I suppose, everybody's property. Tennyson,' he added, 'wrote so much he must have had difficulty, in the end, remembering what he *had* written'". (195)

But Waldo has glimpses of the transcendent reality with which he hopes to connect through his art: "He went so far as to begin a [bad] poem which he hoped might be to some extent expressive of the nobler rage. He wrote:

> Oh to die where poppies shed their blood
> On youths grown faceless in the mud
> For Freedom's effigy to rear it's head ...

(As an old man Waldo Brown discovered these lines amongst his papers, and got a thrill, the 'genuine *frisson*' as it had come to be called. It was a pity he hadn't finished the thing ...)". (129–130) Later: "Human relationships, particulary the enduring ones, or those which we are forced to endure, are confusingly marbled in appearance, Waldo Brown realised, and noted in a notebook". (167) Not reflecting on this insight, Waldo fails to see White's point that the mandala, symbolised in this novel by the marbles or taws that Arthur gives to those in emotional or spiritual need, provides a key to human fulfilment or to what Carl Jung termed 'individuation'. And when briefly Waldo gave in to his deeply suppressed but equally powerful urge to put on an old dress of his mother's (being "obsesessed by it. Possessed" [193]), "when he was finally and fully arranged, bony, palpitating, plucked", he attained "a remarkable increase in vision". (193) The fact that Waldo's creativity is stifled by his suppression of his feminine and intuitive sides is further suggested by the title of the novel he begins (but of course doesn't finish): 'Tiresius a Youngish Man'. (173) White believed intuition was a feminine quality, and that the strength of his own feminine feelings contributed to his insight as an artist: hence his valorisation here of the hermaphrodite prophet Tieresius as the archetypal visionary artist.[176]

Over the course of the novel it emerges that Waldo could have achieved enlightenment and perhaps become a true artist if he had been able to accept the gift of a 'mandala' offered to him by his twin brother Arthur. Simple, Christ-like Arthur offers glass taws to people who are able to recognise their own need for spritual wholeness. The mandala became for White, as it was for many people in the postwar period influenced by the thought of Jung, a symbol of this essential human unity and wholeness.[177] White referred to people who he thought had achieved such a unity, like Manoly's younger sister Elly, as "solid mandalas".[178] In White's idiosyncratic mythological schema, Waldo

must become a 'solid mandala', he must unite his rational and moral side with his spiritual and emotional side. Although Waldo thinks of Arthur as his burden, because of his brother's simpleness, it is clear that he relies on and needs Arthur. He frequently bemoans being unable to get away from Arthur but never takes the opportunity to do so.[179]

Waldo *needs* to attain the 'true' artist's vision and sensitivity, but *wants* to be an artist in order to be praised for possessing these qualities: "He hoped against hope the Influential Client would soon speak. Then he would walk up the hill to the Feinsteins', and present himself and say: Here I am, an intellectual, working at Sydney Municipal Library – kindness is not enough, you must respect, not my genius exactly, but at least my Australian-literary ambitions". (110) Waldo's efforts to become an artist are ultimately unsuccessful because he fails to recognise that the achievement of emotional maturity, spiritual fulfilment and transcendent vision, upon which true aesthetic creativity depends, entails an acceptance of the fundamental impurity of both himself and the world. His impure desires, the bases of his creativity, remain repressed, while his revulsion at humanity's impurity remains overwhelming. So Waldo fails to achieve the puritan ideal of transcending base humanity because he lacks the true puritan's humility. For White, God himself is capable of mistakes and even wrongdoing. In this White's God is less like that of most Christians, puritan or otherwise, and more like the ancient Greek gods or the gods of the anthropologist late-Modernist poet Ted Hughes. But for White, as for the original Puritans, spiritual purity or transcendence paradoxically requires a prior acceptance of humankind's fundamentally flawed and impure nature. Waldo's tragedy, it is clear, derives not from his devotion to the puritan quest for transcendence, but from the fact that his quest is unsuccessful. The ultimate value of this essentially puritan religious quest, the overarching ideal of White's British-Australian culture, is affirmed.

Where Waldo deeply resents the fact that his brother Arthur has a vocation, Duffield's resentment is engendered by his stepsister Rhoda scoffing at the idea that he has one. This takes place when Maman (Freda) Courtney produces a planchette:

> Suddenly Hurtle knew that he would ask the question. He hoped the others wouldn't notice he was bursting trembling with it.
> When he had shouted them down, he very quietly asked: 'What am I going to be, Planchette?' He added: 'Please.'

It was the most awful moment of his life, more awful than finding out what the Duffields and the Courtneys had arranged. They must all believe if they saw it written.

The board was wobbling hopelessly. Trundling heavily.

It groaned. But wrote.

Though he was leaning forward to watch and read, Rhoda was so furiously concentrated, she got there before him and shouted in his face: "'Painter', it's written! What – a house painter?" exactly as the jackaroo at Mumbelong had said, to be funny; but in Rhoda's case, she could only be jealous: he could have killed her, but was never able to think of words deadly enough.

Maman said in her calmest voice: "Well, then, let us ask, 'What *kind* of painter will Hurtle be?'"

The board joggled worse than ever.

Because greedy and jealous, Rhoda was always the first to read. "'An oil-painter'"! she yelled. "Somebody must be guiding it."

"Why should they be guiding it?" He fairly blasted her. (117)

As Hurtle Duffield recognises and accepts his vocation from the earliest age, the central constraint on his puritan quest for spiritual transcendence is not something within himself, as is the case with Waldo Brown, but rather the culture around him, and more specifically, the popular, nationalist culture centred on the materialist and conformist ideal of mateship. While White is certainly critical of upper-class, Anglo- and European-Australians in this novel, it is the working-class and petit-bourgeois Australians who are least able to recognise Duffield's genius and who are most in need of cultural vivisection, emotional maturity and spiritual enlightenment. With the partial exception of Nance Lightfoot, and of course the 'noble' Duffield, characters of this lower socio-economic and cultural background are the least fully developed characters of the novel. There is no sense that the culture of these people might provide them with the capacity for proper artistic appreciation and the psychological growth and spiritual transcendence that are shown to flow from this.

The comparatively brief chapter on Duffield's encounter with the grocer Cecil Cutbush in a city park demonstrates the intellectual and cultural paucity of members of this nationalist Australian culture. Duffield and Cutbush meet on a council bench where "neighbourhood acquaintances ... would sit staring out over the wasteland". (254) These people, then, are immediately portrayed as stupid, or vacant-minded, and as living in a wasteland, an allusion to T.S. Eliot's panicked Modernist description of mass and popular

162

cultures and lifestyles. Cutbush arrives and, hoping for "a yarn", (254) engages in conversation the reluctant Duffield, whose mind is absorbed in higher things: "'I was watching the skyline'", says Duffied. "'There's a very brief phase when the houses opposite remind me of unlit gas fires ... I came here this evening ... because I particularly wanted to be alone'". (257)

Cutbush is an over-fed man, having come "bellying" forward, laughing a "fat-chinned laugh", (254, 255) suggesting a lack of restraint and perhaps that he has had life too good. He talks blandly of the weather to initiate conversation, and says he leads "'a very normal life. It's the right way, isn't it?'". (255) Cutbush "would have liked to assess (Duffield's) status, but it wasn't easy. Too many contradictions": (255) Duffield is too complex to be understood by this person; but Cutbush *is* somewhat awestruck by him: "'That's a fine overcoat you got,' the grocer couldn't leave alone. 'I like to see a good cloth. I'd say, at a guess, that was imported. Bet it's English.' 'Oh? It could be. Yes. I think it was.'" (255) Tellingly, quality is (as in *The Solid Mandala*) associated with Englishness. When Duffield stands up to leave, "his figure in the moonlight overawed the grocer, who became squat, pursy, apologetic: not that he wasn't as good as anyone else". (261) Cutbush is also a little frightened by Duffield's difference: "He didn't understand why the stranger hadn't completed the exchange of names like any other decent friendly bloke. He didn't hold it against him, though. Perhaps the man had his reasons: could have been a released prisoner or something like that". (256) Cutbush is "chilled" by, "though he hadn't understood", (259) Duffield's reference to his belief in a "Divine Vivisector": God. (259) We learn that Duffield is emotionally self-contained ("'I am not in need – of anything, or anyone'"), (257) but not egotistical ("'I've been accused of loving myself. How could I? When I've always known too much about myself'") (258) and has no interest in gaining wealth through his art: "I'm not interested in business ... they're buying me – almost as if I was groceries". (260) Duffield's capacity to make money, though, is precisely what impresses Cutbush: "'Go on! I never met a real professional artist!'". (260) Duffield leaves, promising to paint a picture of "'A great white arse shitting on a pair of lovers – as they swim through a sea of lantana – dislocating themselves'. It was the sort of joke an educated person could afford to make. The grocer laughed, of course, but wondered whether he wasn't being made to laugh at himself".

(261) It is alluded to at several points in the chapter that Cutbush has homosexual desires, in spite of his 'normal' family life, and part of his being 'overawed' by Duffield results from a sexual attraction to him. The chapter ends with Cutbush masturbating in the "wasteland", (262) "watching the seed he was scattering in vain by moonlight on barren ground". (262) The act not only suggests his pathetic, repressed desire to have and be like Duffield, but also his ultimate sterility, and that of his culture. Cutbush, like the "Ocker" in George Johnston's contemporaneous novel *A Cartload of Clay* (1971), is a negative archetype of the conformist, narrowly masculinist Australian culture, centred on mateship.

Though the central constraint on Duffield's performance of his vocation is this 'ockerism', White also identifies a worrying, encroaching American influence on Australian culture, an influence which Duffield firmly resists. America and Americans feature as bringers of mind-numbing consumerist pop culture, the crass celebration of wealth and celebrity, and sterile theoreticist intellectualism. Nance Lightfoot, the prostitute Duffield lives with when he returns home to Australia, offends Hurtle by chewing gum, just as White's mother had been offended by his father's chewing gum. Both White and his mother apparently see this as a disturbing sign of America's shallow, consumerist cultural influence: "'Here' – (Nance) came and sat on the edge of the bed, tearing the paper off a strip of fresh spearmint – 'stuff in some of this. There's nothun like gum for puttin' the juice back inter life'". (200) Nance's comment here sounds like an advertising jingle, signifying both the working-class Australians' susceptibility to cultural degradation (their capacity to be impressed by objects as meaningless as chewing gum) and the shallowness of American consumerist cultural influences:

> With his tongue he warded it off, still scented, still brittle. 'Pffeugh!'
> 'It's what they all do now.'
> 'I'm not "they",' he announced too prissily.
> 'No,' she said, 'you're the real aristercratic prick'. (201)

Shortly afterwards Duffield, trying to connect with Nance ("'Isn't it possible for two human beings to inspire and comfort each other simply by being together?' He wanted that; otherwise the outlook was hopeless"), (205) asks: "'What do *you* think about?'". She replies: "'I dunno, Money. A big dark cool house, full of furniture and clothes. And a

big American limousine. I'd have to have a chauffeur to drive me about – with a good body – just for show, though. I wouldn't mind if the chauffeur was a wonk ... I'd have one of those big – what -you-call-em dogs – that film actresses have'". (205) As the working-class are prey to degrading American consumerism, so too are the young: Duffield fears at one stage for instance that "if she had been present, he knew he wouldn't necessarily be able to invoke [Kathy Volkov's] intuitive genius in his defence. More likely, the carnal, brutal, thoughtless (or calculating) Kathy would blow bubble-gum in his face". (517)

At the age of 55 (394), at a party thrown by Mrs Mortimer, one of the Sydney upper crust who regard artists as interesting and so appropriate dinner-party guests, he meets Sharman, "a plain and shiny American girl he had been avoiding". (413) When she is introduced to Duffield she responds as someone awe-struck by celebrity:

> 'Oh, *no*! Not Duffield!' squealed the American girl ... The man on board who gave the talks told us about you, sir – oh, about Dobell, and Drysdale, and I dunno who – but *Duffield*! From squealing, she changed her tune and her expression to suit a few drawn-out cello-notes: 'Mr Duffield, I'd like you to know it's the most important moment of my life – intellectually, and spiritually.' (414)

Like a true aristocrat, Duffield is appalled by this crassness: "He could hear his own breath expiring, feel the flesh shrivelling on his bones, before sticking his nose into the bowl of roses he had more or less appropriated". (414) When he finds his sister Rhoda living in poverty and has her move in with him, she draws the connection between America and wealth, asking: "'Are you rich, Hurtle? They say you've made a packet. I suppose one can't help it once one begins. I read about a sale of paintings to the United States'".[180] (447) "He must watch himself", (518) thinks Hurtle as fame arrives, and "his cunning hand was forced to increased displays of virtuosity". (518) Indeed: "Flattery flowed as never before. Americans would pay grotesque sums for paintings he sometimes secretly admitted to be amongst his worst". (518) "Some of his paintings and drawings of this period", Duffield thinks, "would not be seen in his lifetime unless dragged into the open by force ... They were the fruit of his actual life, as opposed to the one in which he painted pictures for Americans to buy, and where the dealers jollied him along. His actual life, or secret work, was magnificent, if terrifying". (518)

After serving in the First World War Duffield works for a year in Paris, washing dishes at night and "hanging round l'Huissier's studio" (177) by day. His fellow artists there, "all of whom were making the 'new' approach to art", (177–178) included "two American ladies of doubtful age, a youngish Englishman of taste, and sundry Scandinavians". (177) One of these "American ladies bought him a meal and wished to discuss 'organic integrity'". (178) When Duffield is older and famous he receives "an air letter from the United States". (602) "But", we learn, "it was a time-waster, from a woman asking him to discuss his paintings in connection with an essay she was writing for an intellectual magazine". (602) Here, American intellectual influences are seen as overly scientistic or formalist, and so as sterile.

The central constraint on the main characters' quest for emotional fulfilment and spiritual enlightenment in *The Eye of the Storm* is a culture of radical individualism and materialistic greed, associated most strongly in the novel with America. Although the motives of Basil and Dorothy in *The Eye of the Storm* appear questionable, they are not overtly 'bad' characters and never admit to themselves that they unequivocally wanted the death of their mother. This degree of selfishness, crassness and vulgarity is reserved for Doctor Gidley, who arrives to deal with Elizabeth Hunter's body. We hear about his arrival through the perspective of one of Elizabeth's nurses, Flora Manhood:

> (Who else but fat silky smarmy Gidley?) *This is Sister Manhood speaking Doctor I have to report my patient – Mrs Hunter – has died*. Said he would come right over. (Gidley favoured the American language, except in Mrs Hunter's presence, when he became more sort of English.) Sounded excited. So he might be over the death of a wealthy senile woman. (542)

Gidley's American language goes hand in hand with the American culture of radical individualism that he embodies. Bloated from over-consumption, he lacks any respect for Elizabeth Hunter or for the importance of life and death:

> The fat slob of a doctor was standing in the porch under the light she had switched on before opening the door. He was carrying his medical bag as usual. He appeared no different, except that his eyes were shining. Probably an attempt to assume reverence for what was a sad as well as an important occasion had given him the guilty air ... They went in to what was, incredibly, a body laid out on Mrs Hunter's bed. The damp pledgets prevented you seeing what was underneath, whether human eyelids, or

slits cut out of a painted mask. The green shadows on the cheeks had been emphasised by the nurse's tying up the jaw with a bandage and removing the teeth. A thick black line surrounding the lips had melted and overflowed into the cracked crimson, making the mouth look like a stitched seam, and increasing the mask effect. The doctor laughed low. 'Kinky games the pair of you got up to!' (545)

He writes out the death certificate while sitting in "the easiest chair" (546) and he will not move so as not to be in sight of Elizabeth Hunter when Sister Manhood bathes her. He goes on to talk about the money Manhood will have left to her, and to state his resentment that doctors rarely receive a share:

> 'Expect you'll come out of it pretty well – isn't your name "Flora"?' 'I don't expect a thing.' If this dirty man forced her into talking virtuous, for once she needn't feel a hypocrite. 'The meanest of the rich remember their nurses in the will. If they don't, the solicitor reminds them. To remind them of the doctor too, would be logical, wouldn't it? But they almost never get round to that.' (546)

Gidley is also *nouveau riche* and aspirational in class terms: "Dr Gidley ('Graham') always on the up and up, with his young (monied) wife, his two little boys at the right school, his practice desirably situated, subscriber to the opera and orchestral concerts, and member of the AJC." (546)

As with the corporate entrepreneurs of the 1980s, Gidley assumes a casual, informal, 'call me Graham' air, eschewing cultural tradition, while being only interested in his own self advancement. He is also profoundly egotistical and pursuant of sexual conquest for its own sake ("[Flora Manhood] had given the mouth its last wipe with the flannel when she realised from the breathing that Dr Gidley was close behind her, or closer still: he was rubbing himself, blubbery man, against her buttocks. 'Flora, eh?' At the same time making his obscene thrust"), (547) yet is also "more wind than piss". (547) Importantly, too, he is a technically skilled worker, suggesting a connection between this shallow, self-centred American culture and the contemporary hypertrophy of technical knowledge and amoral scientism. As White wrote to Geoffrey Dutton: "In a way the book is a kind of parallel of what has begun to happen round here, though perhaps only I could see it!".[181] "A horrifying wave of vulgarity is sweeping the land", he said.[182] As Marr suggests, "The progress of ugliness and greed is a pulse that beats through *The Eye*

of the Storm. Corrupt Sydney, more corrupt than ever, was booming and half the city seemed to have been torn down to make way for cheap apartments and glass office blocks".[183]

In his lack of empathy and his unawareness of the significance of the life and death of the person he has treated, Gidley emerges as a shallow, pathetic fool. His response – and so experience – stand in stark contrast to that of Elizabeth Hunter's cook, Lotte Lippman – who kills herself now that her service has come to an end – and her chief nurse, Sister Mary de Santis:

> After a long attempt at sleeping, Sister de Santis realised she would not succeed ... Seeing the dark was beginning to thin, she went down presently. She put a coat over her nightdress. She took the rusted can which she kept filled with seed. In the garden the first birds were still only audible shadows, herself an ambulant tree. The hem of her nightdress soon became saturated, heavy as her own flesh, as she filled the birds' dishes. Reaching up, her arms were rounded by increasing light. In the street an early worker stared as he passed, but looked away on recognising a ceremony. A solitary rose, tight crimson, emerged in the lower garden; it would probably open later in the day. Light was strewing the park as she performed her rites. Birds followed her, battering the air, settling on the grass whenever her hand, trembling in the last instant, spilt an excess of seed ... She could feel claws snatching for a hold in her hair. She ducked, to escape from this prism of dew and light, this tumult of wings and her own unmanageable joy. Once she raised an arm to brush aside a blue wedge of pigeon's feathers. The light she could not ward off: it was by now too solid, too possessive; herself possessed. Shortly after she went inside the house. In the hall she bowed her head, amazed and not a little frightened by what she saw in Elizabeth Hunter's looking glass. (588–589)

Selfless devotion to duty, White suggests – this traditional puritan ideal of Anglo-Australian culture – yields a deep, satisfying, illuminating glimpse of the true value of human life.

Over the course of this decade of novel writing the object of criticism within White's cultural politics moves from being his own, British-Australian puritanism, dominant within Australia until at least the mid-1960s, to traditionally working-class, conformist Australian nationalism, strongly emergent within Australia between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s, and then on to the radical individualism and materialist consumerism of the US, seemingly beginning to gain dominance within Australia from

around the beginning of the 1970s. White stopped writing novels with such explicitly metaphysical concerns after *The Eye of the Storm*, indicating his awareness that the social structure and mode of organisation that sustained the status of these novels in the Australian context was in the process of being fundamentally changed. The structure of feeling to which he appealed and from which his books achieved their cultural status, was becoming increasingly marginal within the society as a whole. White's novels of the Whitlam period are fundamentally metaphysical in their concerns because as a devoutly (if idiosyncratically) religious intellectual White believed his society to be fundamentally materialist, that this was the biggest problem of his society, and that through novels of this kind he could offer a glimpse of a deeper reality.

Conclusion

White's position as the central inheritor of and spokesperson for British-Australian 'high' culture meant that his public, private and artistic support for Whitlam were especially important, culturally and politically. As Simon During suggests, White's work was at this time received in highly reverent terms.[184] And the novel was until the 1970s regarded as the most important and powerful art form.[185] Although critics have tended to focus on the metaphysical and religious aspects of these works and to characterise White as a 'metaphysical' or strictly philosophical novelist,[186] it can be gathered that White's spiritual, aesthetic and cultural concerns were intimately connected with his politics. *The Solid Mandala*, *The Vivisector* and *The Eye of the Storm* valorise the spiritual, stress the need for and value of emotional fulfilment and steadfastly criticise narrow materialism, utilitarianism and greed in order to build support for the kind of society, based on the traditionally dominant Anglo-Australian cultural ideal of selfless morality, that White – and Whitlam – believed in. By the same token, the declining place of White within Australian popular and scholarly reading circles[187] is indicative of the extent to which the traditional Anglo-Australian culture or structure of feeling – that helped to sustain Whitlamism – has become less powerful within Australia since the mid-1970s. "White was particularly sensitive to the precarious nature of human identity", suggests John McLaren, because he was "a member of a class on the brink of dispossession".[188] The dismissal of Whitlam and the subsequent rejection of him and his political vision by the

Australian electorate in 1975 and 1977 can be seen to mark the beginning of an effective decline within Australia of the cultural traditions White and Whitlam embodied and advanced. In the most general sense, as Raymond Williams suggested, the art and culture of a period are not simply the products of material structures and political modes of social organisation, but also shape these things. In advancing a cultural basis for Whitlam's politics, White's 'metaphysical' novels of the Whitlam period helped to shape the structure and nature of Australian society.

---

[1] David Marr, *Patrick White ~ A Life*, Random House, Sydney, 1991; Patrick White, *Flaws in the Glass: A Self-portrait*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1981.

[2] Bernard Hickey, 'Breakthrough: White and Whitlam in the early 1970s', in M.-T. Bindella and G.V. Davis, eds, *Imagination and the Creative Impulse in the New Literatures in English. Cross/Cultures* 9, 1993, p.281.

[3] Judith Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class: From Alfred Deakin to John Howard*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[4] Patrick White, *The Solid Mandala* (1966), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969; *The Vivisector* (1970), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1973; *The Eye of the Storm* (1973), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975.

[5] Cultural capital is essentially unrealised economic capital deriving from a person's knowledge, taste, family and class networks. See John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1993. Graeme Turner argues that literature had the status of the "'cultural flagship' for the [Australian] nation" until at least the arrival of the 1970s. 'Film, Television and Literature: Competing for the Nation', in Bennett and Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, p.348.

[6] In the lead up to the 1969 federal election White wrote to Geoffrey Dutton on 3 August 1969: "I shall have to vote for Whitlam whom I don't like much more than Gorton". Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.493.

[7] As Marr recounts, "White had switched his vote [from the conservatives in 1969] only reluctantly as a protest against the Vietnam War, but, by the time the watershed elections of December 1972 came, he was a committed supporter of the Labor Party". *Patrick White*, pp.514–515.

[8] According to Marr, "Letters to Whitlam were written protesting concessions to Japanese publishers, export of wheat to Egypt after the 1973 Arab-Israel war and Labor's support for sandmining on Fraser Island". David Marr, ed., *Patrick White Letters*, Random House Australia, Sydney, 1994, p.645. White also wrote to Whitlam on behalf of his publisher Graham C. Greene at Jonathan Cape, to express Greene's interest in publishing Whitlam's memoirs. Marr, *Letters*, p.505.

[9] "New friends had made Labor palatable. Senator (Diamond) Jim McClelland was a worldly lawyer almost untouched by the Tory pessimism that passes for wisdom among Sydney's barristers. They had met in 1971". Marr, *Patrick White*, p.515.

[10] As White explains: "Not long before this (dinner party) occasion, Whitlam and his government had decided to introduce a system of Australian honours to supplement the Queen's British rewards, and eventually, one hoped, replace them. I had been offered one of these gongs which I had hesitated to take because I have always felt that, although such honours may be right enough for performers, they draw a writer's teeth. Only by degrees on that evening at the McClellands' I began to scent the reason for my being there. Our hosts had not been told in advance why the Governor-General had asked for me ... After dinner, as the other guests were moving away, I was pinned against the table to the tune of a few vice-regal farts, and the subject of the Australian Order was broached. 'If you don't take it,' I was told, 'you'll ruin everything.' It was disconcerting, to say the least. After a day or two I agreed to accept, so as not to ruin everything". *Flaws in the Glass*, pp.228–230. After the Dismissal, Marr records that White was filled with "disgust" at himself for having broken his own rules to accept membership of the Order. *Patrick White*, p.557. White then quit the Order, writing to Dutton: "All such honours are bribes, and all honours are political". Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.578.

[11] In his literary self-portrait White recalled that his appearance at this rally led some to question his integrity: "There were those who said, 'Of course he has been got at.'" *Flaws in the Glass*, p.226. Earlier he wrote: "During the 'Seventies I withdrew from circulation. I had got to know the habits of contemporary rank and riches. Some of those belonging to our affluent society would argue that they had dropped me for being a traitor to my class". *Flaws in the Glass*, pp.152–153. And at a 7 March 1977 'Citizens for Democracy' rally White confides: "A conservative friend said to me the other day: 'You've changed. Have you lost your basic integrity?'" White, 'Citizens for Democracy' (1977), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, p.63.

[12] Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.50.

[13] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.547.

[14] In his account of the idea for and organisation of the rally Jim McClelland writes: "The next task was to sell the idea to enough prestigious people in the artistic community, most of whom, whatever their enthusiasms, were notoriously chary of associating their names publicly with political movements. The biggest name in Australia's artistic community was and is Patrick White. I knew that if I could persuade Patrick, something of a recluse even at that time and wary of all politicians, to appear the battle for the others would be easy. I went straight to a phone and put my request to him. There was an almost interminable pause before he replied: 'Yes, one would be prepared to do that'. We were in business". *Stirring the Possum – A Political Autobiography*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, pp.145–146. No political rally had previously been held at the Opera House, and artists hadn't been brought in to a political campaign in this way before. "Freda McClelland", Marr writes, "then recruited painters, poets, actors and playwrights for the platform". *Patrick White*, p.547. In addition to the three thousand in the hall, Marr also notes that five thousand more "stood outside listening to the speeches". *Patrick White*, p.547.

[15] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.557.

[16] As White testified in *Flaws in the Glass*: "Too much has been written already about this shoddy episode of our history ... I introduce it only because of the effect it had on me then and afterwards: the part played by the Liberal Senators, the conniving character who replaced Whitlam as Prime Minister, and the more sinister intrigues of the media and foreign powers interested in seeing Whitlam brought down, all contributed to the bitterness which had been growing in me, and which helped drive me farther to the left" (p.230).

[17] Marr writes: "White was culling out those of his friends who welcomed the Fraser government ... This sorting along political lines meant the disappearance of the Eastern Suburbs friends who had tinkled and gossiped happily at [White's house in] Martin Road for years". *Patrick White*, p.578.

[18] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.231.

[19] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.557. The final statement from White is taken from a 20 November 1975 letter to the scholar Peter Beatson.

[20] See Marr, *Patrick White*, p.558.

[21] White, 'Kerr and the Consequences' (1976), quoted in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.60.

[22] White, 'A Noble Pair' (1978), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.70.

[23] White "greatly admired the early volumes of Clark's *History of Australia*. They continued to correspond until (White) grew enraged with Clark's prominent role in the Bi-centennial celebrations of 1988". Marr, *Letters*, p.634. White "read each of the volumes [of Clark's *History of Australia*] as they appeared". "Interesting to see how we have remained the same pack of snarling mongrel dogs", White wrote to Clark in 1968, suggesting already his antipathy to attempts to 'whitewash' or 'puritanise' Australian history and culture. Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.480.

[24] See White, *Flaws*, p.255.

[25] Quoted in Marr, ibid., p.578.

[26] Quoted in Marr, ibid., p.579.

[27] Marr, *Letters*, p.645.

[28] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.559.

[29] See Marr, *Letters*, p.645.

[30] As Delys Bird suggests, the Nobel represented a tangible international acknowledgement of the value of Australian literature. 'New Narrations: Contemporary Fiction', in Elizabeth Webby, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, p.186. Geoffrey Bolton notes too: "It gave a felicitous boost to the new nationalism when in 1973 Patrick White became the first

Australian to receive the Nobel Prize for literature". *The Middle Way*, pp.229–230. The Award must have appeared to be a tacit endorsement of Whitlam's policy of significantly increasing investment in the arts.
[31] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.559.
[32] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.537.
[33] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.537.
[34] See White's letters to Whitlam (26 February 1978), Manning Clark (18 January 1979), and Dorothy Green (25 November 1983), in Marr, *Letters*, pp.505, 513, 585.
[35] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.559–560.
[36] Ibid., pp.559, 560.
[37] Freudenberg, *A Certain Grandeur*, pp.4–5.
[38] Ibid., pp.408–409. In juxtaposing a man of the law with White and Clark, Freudenberg also implicitly suggests that those who were not 'liberated' by the Whitlam government lacked imagination. James Walter observes that Freudenberg's "closeness to Whitlam might indicate that he is retailing the 'authorised' version of (Whitlam's) life". *The Leader*, p.199.
[39] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.12.
[40] Ibid., p.562.
[41] Ibid., p.588.
[42] Ibid., pp.553–554.
[43] Ibid., p. 554.
[44] Ibid., p.553.
[45] White, 'With Whitlam' (1974), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.52.
[46] White, 'A Noble Pair', in Brenn and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.69.
[47] Ibid., p.69.
[48] Ibid., *White Speaks*, pp.69–70.
[49] White, 'Citizens for Democracy', *White Speaks*, p.63.
[50] Ibid., p.64.
[51] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.227.
[52] "Fraser had never been comfortable with Keynesianism's deficit financing and now that its flaws were evident, he slipped back easily into morally charged financial precepts reminiscent of the 1930s: governments shouldn't spend money they don't have; governments must reduce their expenditure; people must accustom themselves to restraint and sacrifice; 'Governments must again learn how to say "no"', 'all the pump priming in the world will not cure unemployment', and most famously, 'life wasn't meant to be easy'". Brett, *Australian Liberals*, p.151. On 'new liberalism' see Marion Sawer, 'Philosophical Underpinnings of Libertarianism in Australia', in Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, pp.20–37.
[53] Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness* (1899), Norton Critical Edition (third edn), New York, 1988, p.10.
[54] Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire1875–1914* (1987), Abacus, London, 1994.
[55] See chapters 1 through 4 of Marr, *Patrick White*, pp.3–67, for a detailed account of the White's family history. On the nineteenth-century squatters as important members of the Australian ruling class see Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, pp.53–54.
[56] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.9.
[57] As Marr writes, White "believed in blood and ancestors". *Patrick White*, p.4.
[58] White, Marr explains further, was "born in London to Australian parents who took pains to see that his upbringing confirmed the puzzling circumstances of his birth. 'It is not that I am not Australian,' he remarked. 'I am an anachronism, something left over from that period when people were no longer English and not yet indigenous.' At whichever end of the Empire he lived, he always knew there was another home for him on the other side of the world". *Patrick White*, p.11.
[59] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.53.
[60] Ibid., p.53.
[61] Ibid., p.16.
[62] In Marr's estimation: "On their acres the Whites pursued tenacious, hard-working lives relieved by polo and marriage. They were loyal, temperate, unsociable, rather mean, conservative and cool-blooded. If they suffered any spiritual hunger, it was satisfied by the Church of England. They were not readers". Ibid., p.16.
[63] The White's mansions and other buildings were mostly designed by an American: Horbury Hunt, though in an English style, containing English stained glass for example. See Marr, ibid., p.18. According to

White, his mother Ruth "rooted out methodically" tree ferns, in order to establish "her English garden". *Flaws in the Glass*, p.17.

[64] White "loved Lizzie", his Scottish, Presbyterian nanny, from whom "the purpose of life was fulfilment not enjoyment". Marr, *Patrick White*, p.39.

[65] Ibid., p.67.

[66] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.151.

[67] Ibid., p.32.

[68] Ibid., p.26.

[69] Ibid., p.153.

[70] See Marr, *Patrick White*.

[71] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.23.

[72] Ibid., p.9.

[73] Ibid., p.8.

[74] Ibid., pp.13, 9, 14.

[75] Verity Hewitt, *Patrick White, Painter Manque: Painters, Paintings, and their Influence on this Writing*, Miegunyah Press, Carlton, 2002, pp.3–4.

[76] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.369.

[77] As Marr writes, "The old-fashioned restraint, shared on each side of the Atlantic by [publishers Frank] Morley and [Ben] Huebsch, was welcome" to White, who "would never promote his novels with interviews, tours, or campus appearances. More subtle methods had to be employed". White "did not appear to mourn" the death of his own mother. And he was notoriously tight-fisted in day to day life. *Patrick White*, pp.307, 427, 374.

[78] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.12.

[79] White, 'Citizens for Democracy', pp.65–66.

[80] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.284.

[81] Ibid., p.311.

[82] White, 'And if a Button is Pressed' (1981), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.101.

[83] White, 'A Sense of Integrity' (1988), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.195.

[84] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.612.

[85] Ibid.

[86] Oakes and Solomon, *The Making of an Australian Prime Minister*, p.49.

[87] Laurie Oakes, 'The Years of Preparation', in *Whitlam and Frost: The full text of their TV conversations plus exclusive new interviews. Articles by Laurie Oakes, Richard Farmer, Mungo MacCallum. Cartoons by Tanner and Norm Mitchell*, Sundial, London, 1974, pp.10–11.

[88] *Whitlam and Frost*, p.171.

[89] Ibid., p.171.

[90] Ibid., p.175.

[91] Quoted in Walter, *The Leader*, p.211.

[92] See for example Oakes: 'The Years of Preparation', in Frost, p.38: "Whitlam's vitality is his most striking attribute ... Whitlam worked harder [than Prime Minister McMahon], without making a public production out of it, and more efficiently and systematically. It was Whitlam's capacity for work which made Mick Young an admirer and loyal supporter".

[93] Brett, *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*, p.145.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Freda Whitlam, *Woman's Day*, 28 March 1977, quoted in Walter, *The Leader*, p.204.

[97] Freda Whitlam, in Walter, *The Leader*, p.204.

[98] Oakes, 'The Years of Preparation', in Frost, p.10.

[99] Ibid., p.10.

[100] Ibid., pp.10-11.

[101] See Ava Hubble, 'McCready Comes to the Party for Ten', *Sydney Morning Herald* ('The Guide'), 10 October 1994, p.2.

[102] Oakes, 'The Years of Preparation', in Frost, p.10.

[103] White's fear emerges throughout *Flaws in the Glass*. On Whitlam see Paul Webster in the *Australian*, 1 January 1973, quoted in Walter, *The Leader*, p.216.

[104] See Laurie Oakes, *Whitlam PM*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1973, p.17.

[105] White writes: "Most children have theatre in them. Those who carry it over into adolescence and, more or less, maturity, commit the ultimate indecency of becoming professional actors. If I didn't go all the way, I became instead that far more indecent hybrid, a frustrated one. Sexual ambivalence helped drive me in on myself. Lacking flamboyance, cursed with reserve, I chose fiction, or more likely it was chosen for me, as the means of introducing to a disbelieving audience the cast of contradictory characters of which I am composed". *Flaws in the Glass*, p.20. On Whitlam's high school acting and his personal reasons for taking it up, see Oakes, *Whitlam PM*, p.18.

[106] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, pp.231–232.

[107] Ibid., pp.226–227.

[108] Ibid., p.253.

[109] White, 'The Reading Sickness' (1980), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.77.

[110] White, 'Patriotism' (1984), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.140.

[111] White, 'A Sense of Integrity', in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.190.

[112] White, 'Australians in a Nuclear War' (1983), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.123.

[113] White, 'A Sense of Integrity', p.192.

[114] In *The Vivisector* White's artist Hurtle Duffield is "born old"; (411) and Duffield later says of the young artist Kathy Volkov (a pianist), "I should have said she sprang out of her mother fully grown." (509)

[115] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.355.

[116] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.67.

[117] As Gay Hawkins suggests, while 'community arts' was "a product of the Whitlam Labor government", community arts within the Australia Council during this time "was ... trapped within the inherited ['high' cultural] legitimations for arts funding which Whitlam left largely intact and which dominated the rest of the Australia Council". 'Reading Community Arts Policy: From Nimbin to the Gay Mardi Gras', in Vivienne Binns, ed., *Community and the Arts: History, Theory, Practice*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1991, pp.47, 50.

[118] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.341. Peggy Garland was one of the three Withycombe sisters that White met in the late 1920s. In Marr's account, they became "his English family". *Letters*, p.636.

[119] An ABC television reporter asked White in 1989 for example "How important is love to life?". White replied: "It's all important – but not lust." "What type of love is important?" pressed the reporter. White replied: "Affection, I think. Yes, affection." Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.642. Marr notes also that "in White's world, the way we fulfil our obligations to the sick is a mark of our capacity to love". Ibid., p.512.

[120] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.217.

[121] White, 'Hiroshima Day' (1984), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.163.

[122] White, 'Peace and Other Matters' (1984), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.171.

[123] White, 'Imagining the Real' (1986), in Brennan and Flynn, *Patrick White Speaks*, p.179.

[124] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, pp.123–124.

[125] Ibid., p.175.

[126] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.346.

[127] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.485.

[128] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.152.

[129] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.491.

[130] White, 'Mad Hatter's Party' (1972), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.31.

[131] White, 'Civilisation, Money and Concrete' (1973), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.36.

[132] White, 'Australian of the Year' (1974), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.47.

[133] White, 'Peace and Other Matters' (1984), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.167.

[134] White, 'A Sense of Integrity', p.191.

[135] Marr, *Patrick White*, pp.491–492.

[136] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.11.

[137] White, 'In the Making' (1969), in Brennan and Flynn, *White Speaks*, p.23.

[138] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.358.

[139] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.198.

[140] Ibid., p.198.

[141] Ibid., pp.199–200.

[142] Ibid., p.200.

[143] Ibid., pp.200–201.

[144] Ibid., p.211.

[145] Ibid., p.302.

[146] Ibid., p.311.

[147] Ibid., p.320.

[148] Ibid., p.457.

[149] Quoted in Marr, ibid., p.458.

[150] Ibid., p.458; quoting White's 3 April 1966 letter to Geoffrey Dutton.

[151] Quoted in Marr, ibid., p.504.

[152] "White delayed sending (*The Eye of the Storm*) to New York. At Christmas he told Viking he was too busy tying up parcels to get round to sending the typescript. He knew the excuse was lame, but he was stalling to make sure the book appeared first in London where good reviews might 'give a lead to those incompetent Americans'". "Quite deliberately, White delayed sending the New York copy (of *The Twyborn Affair*) so that London again had a head start. He was not going to put *Twyborn*'s fate into the hands of the New York critics". Marr, ibid., pp.514, 587.

[153] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.743.

[154] As Marr suggests, "the transformation of this private conservative into a public radical began with his initially cautious and later vociferous disapproval of America's role in Vietnam". *Patrick White*, p.492.

[155] Relevant here is Marr's observation that "God and love are the two great mysteries of White's world ... Few of his lives are shaped by the search for pleasure: his men and women sacrifice very little for desire". Ibid., p.511.

[156] Waldo's twin brother Arthur, symbolising Waldo's and White's repressed, loving, intuitive, feminine side, kills Waldo, though after having been provoked to do this by Waldo's destroying a poem that he had written.

[157] See also Brian Kiernan's observation: "On the first page, the 'crook-neck' white pullet the others peck at introduces the view of the artist as outsider that White is adapting, or translating, to Australia". *Patrick White*, Macmillan, London and Basingstoke, 1980, p.103.

[158] Duffield's experience here echoes that of White, who was put in the care of Lizzie Clark and then sent away to Cheltenham.

[159] Marr, *Patrick White*, p.471.

[160] Havelock Ellis, 'The Colour-Sense in Literature', *Contemporary Review* 15: 5, 1896, p.729; quoted in Humphrey McQueen, 'Colour: Emblem of Change, Catalyst of Commerce', unpublished paper prepared for 'Modernism and the Modernisation of Australian Life', Curtin University Symposium, Perth, 27–29 September 2004. One might like to argue with Ellis that this association of blue with the transcendent is the result of a cultural rather than natural connection.

[161] In Hewitt, *Patrick White: Painter Manque*, p.78.

[162] See Hewitt, ibid., p.78.

[163] "The novel tends to stress the darker purposes in the lives of the main characters", White wrote to Tom Maschler on 15 November 1972 (quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.494); cf. King Lear: "Meantime we shall express our darker purpose". William Shakespeare, *King Lear* (c.1605–1606), I.1.36. Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972, p.62.

[164] "I have always had the guilty feeling that [his and his sister's] suggestion [to put their mother Ruth in an old folk's home] may have killed her, not so much the prospect of leaving possessions she could no longer see, as the thought of dying surrounded by Roman Catholic nuns". White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.150.

[165] As White wrote to Ingmar Bjorksten, Swedish author of a critical introduction to White's fiction, on 27 July 1973, he intended to suggest that during the storm Basil and Dorothy's mother Elizabeth Hunter finds "peace and spiritual awareness". Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.511.

[166] On White's moment of spiritual illumination in the rain at his 'Dogwoods' property see Marr, *Patrick White*, p.281.

[167] Ibid., p.511.

[168] As White said in an interview with Craig McGregor in 1969: "Characters interest me more than situations. I don't think any of my books have what you call plots". White, 'In the Making', p.21. In the novels he wrote after the Whitlam period, generally less concerned with metaphysical issues, plots became more evident. Consider *The Twyborn Affair* (1979), for example.

[169] "Anne Brown, born a Quantrell, had created an impression even in one of her old blue dresses with tea-stained lace insertion, or until her last days and illness, which were beyond human control. Waldo understood that those who lowered their eyes in passing were paying homage to someone of his mother's stock". *The Solid Mandala*, p.59.

[170] It is clear from White's choice of characters in other novels and from his public and private statements on the nature and function of art and artists that White would not have focused on people from this Australian community only because he felt most closely aligned with them or most able to write about them. White felt able to speak for individuals of any heritage in his work – consider the portrayal of the Aboriginal Jew Alf Dubbo in *Riders in the Chariot* (1961) for example – and saw this ability as a sign of his quality as an artist.

[171] *The Pocket Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969, p.642.

[172] See for example White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.153.

[173] White's first love, 'R', at Cambridge, calls White "Waldo". Marr, *Patrick White*, p.119.

[174] White, *Flaws*, pp.146–147.

[175] Allwright's name, of course, suggests the pervasive Australian celebration of 'averageness' that White detested.

[176] As Marr suggests, for White "intuition was a powerful feminine virtue. The intuitive Patrick White was the feminine Patrick White: sexuality was not only a source of insight but one of the forces that drove him to write". *Patrick White*, p.582.

[177] According to Marr, "White's unshackled spiritual curiosity had led him in the early 1960s towards the occult. He was a figure of his time. He discovered the tarot in London in 1963 when the Duttons introduced him to the painter Lawrence Daws". *Patrick White*, p.451. Lawrence Daws, states Hewitt, "discussed Jungian archetypes at length with White, as well as giving him *Psychology and Alchemy*, which could almost serve as a concordance to *The Solid Mandala*". *Patrick White: Painter Manque*, p.67.

[178] White, *Flaws in the Glass*, p.116.

[179] See for example: "It was impossible to escape Arthur unless Arthur himself chose to escape". White, *The Solid Mandala*, p. 83.

[180] Rhoda also, significantly, accepts her own vocation as a carer for stray cats.

[181] Quoted in Marr, *Patrick White*, p.509.

[182] Quoted in Marr, ibid., p.509.

[183] Ibid., p.509.

[184] According to Simon During, it was White's "luck and fate to write just when Australia needed a great writer and there was a transnational cultural infrastructure through which it could produce one for world consumption". *Patrick White*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1996, p.4. In a more personal register, an awed Vane Lindesay recalls that shortly after winning the 1973 Nobel Prize for Literature White was the guest of honour at an inaugural dinner for *Overland* volunteers: "Patrick was majestic, impressive. Were he casually to say that a green strawberry is not ripe, then it was like god creating by command a botanical truth for all time". Vane Lindesay, 'My Fifty Years with *Overland*', *Overland* 174, 2004, p.64. A similarly awe-struck tone informs 'Encounters With Patrick White', by Paul Hasluck. *Quadrant* 34:12, 1990, pp.54–56.

[185] See Turner, 'Film, Television and Literature', p.348.

[186] A notable exception is John McLaren, who notes perspicaciously that White's history, as a semi-expatriate, "along with his homosexuality, endowed him with the double vision of both insider and outsider to Australia's ruling class. This class was itself losing its dominance as White was growing up. His own sympathies however remain with its members, with their servants and with the poor and outcast. He is a rarity in Australian literature, a genuinely aristocratic writer. This quality produces his distaste for the ordinary run of humanity". He also notes that "the new manufacturing industries which are the source of the new wealth and power remain absent from (*The Tree of Man*), as from his other novels. White's interest is in those who are being dispossessed of their power, and in those who never had it. These alone can find their true selves". 'Patrick White: Prophet from the Desert', introduction to John McLaren, ed., *Prophet from the Desert: Critical Essays on Patrick White*, Red Hill Press, West Footscray, 1995, pp.ii, vi.

[187] "White's Australian reputation", writes Kerryn Goldsworthy, was "just beginning to fade" when Simon During's monograph on White appeared in 1996; but it seems clear that his popular reputation and sales peaked in the mid 1970s following the awarding of the Nobel Prize. 'Fiction from 1900 to 1970', in Webby, *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, p.126. According to Matt Condon, "The

books of White, unlike those of fellow Nobel laureates such as Gabriel Garcia Marquez, Toni Morrison, even Hemingway and Steinbeck, do not 'move' in their hundreds, let alone tens of thousands". 'White House in Eye of Storm', the *Courier-Mail*, 28 February 2005, p.11.

[188] McLaren, 'Patrick White: Prophet from the Desert', p.iii.

Chapter Four

The Fate of the Folk: Frank Hardy, Gough Whitlam and Australian Radical Nationalist Cultural Tradition

If, as Judith Brett suggests, the dominant strand of Australian culture in the period between federation (1901) and the mid-1960s, is Anglocentric, Protestant and liberal, this culture can be said to have existed in primary tension with a more nationalist, secular and generally anti-puritanical culture, which tended to be more politically radical.[1] Where Patrick White grew up within and subscribed to the values of an archetypal Anglo-Australian, Protestant liberal community and culture, Frank Hardy grew up within an archetypal Australian radical nationalist community and culture. Hardy could be said to be the most important artistic representative of Australian radical nationalism during the Whitlam period, just as White was the central artistic representative of Anglo-Australian Protestant liberalism. As Whitlam originated from and developed a policy program broadly based on the ideal values of Anglo-Australian Protestant liberalism, it is no coincidence that White was one of Whitlam's most enthusiastic and committed supporters or that Hardy's support for Whitlam and his program was more qualified and critical. If White's cultural authority made his active support for Whitlam and his literary support for the values of Whitlamism, politically important, the same goes for Hardy. By the same token, Hardy's major literary works of the Whitlam period – *The Unlucky Australians* (1968), *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* (1971) and *But the Dead are Many* (1975)[2] – like those of White, help to explain the reasons for the political demise of Whitlamism. Both Hardy and White express an increasing disillusionment with the communities from which they originate, a belief that these communities' cultural traditions are being debased or have been lost. Each writer sees and is saddened by a radical individualism, emanating most directly from the United States of America, coming to displace older, more socially conscious Australian traditions. In imaginatively recreating the structure of feeling of the culture of his childhood, and advancing the values of that community and culture, Hardy, like White, provides important support for Whitlam and Whitlamism, thereby demonstrating the political value of art. But in documenting the dispersal of this form of community, the breakdown of the structure of

feeling associated with it, and even his personal doubts about the value of this community's traditions, Hardy also makes clear art's political limitations, the inherently dialectical relationship between art and politics, culture and society.

Australia's Radical Nationalist Culture

The most comprehensive and influential account of the origins and nature of the culture of Australian radical nationalism remains Russel Ward's 1958 text *The Australian Legend*.[3] He begins this work with the observation that "most writers (over the last seventy-odd years) seem to have felt strongly that the 'Australian spirit' is somehow intimately connected with the bush and that it derives rather from the common folk than from the more respectable and cultivated sections of society".[4] Ward's purpose in writing, he explains, is partly descriptive and partly analytic: to "trace and explain the development of this national *mystique*".[5]

In Ward's account, the typical, or most distinctive Australian,[6] is imagined to be:

> a practical man, rough and ready in his manners and quick to decry any appearance of affectation in others. He is a great improviser, ever willing 'to have a go' at anything, but willing too to be content with a task done in a way that is 'near enough'. Though capable of great exertion in an emergency, he normally feels no impulse to work hard without good cause. He swears hard and consistently, gambles heavily and often, and drinks deeply on occasion. Though he is 'the world's best confidence man', he is usually taciturn rather than talkative, one who endures stoically rather than one who acts busily. He is a 'hard case', sceptical about the value of religion and of intellectual and cultural pursuits generally. He believes that Jack is not only as good as his master but, at least in principle, probably a good deal better, and so he is a great 'knocker' of eminent people unless, as in the case of his sporting heroes, they are distinguished by physical prowess. He is a fiercely independent person who hates officiousness and authority, especially when these qualities are embodied in military officers and policemen. Yet he is very hospitable and, above all, will stick to his mates through thick and thin, even if he thinks they may be in the wrong. No epithet in his vocabulary is more completely damning than 'scab', unless it be 'pimp' used in its peculiarly Australasian slang meaning of 'informer'. He tends to be a rolling stone, highly suspect if he should chance to gather much moss.[7]

Here, the Australian of legend, or myth,[8] is intellectually practical minded; philosophically anti-puritanical and anti-idealist; culturally 'low brow', common, earthy,

Rabelaisian in an anarchic way (and so uninterested in making institutions of family or community); and politically and morally egalitarian, in both the positive, anti-authoritarian sense of believing 'Jack is as good as his master' and the negative sense of 'knocking' the successful and the different. *He* is also explicitly male and lower class and implicitly a heterosexual of European heritage. A materialist practical-mindedness is seen as unfolding into an egalitarian politics. Where the Anglo-Australian puritan liberal hopes to find the meaning of life in 'transcending' the social – through his or her individual performance of a selfless moral vocation – the Australian radical nationalist hopes to find the meaning of life through a profound *merging* with his or her society, an assertion of kinship or fraternity (not maternity) with members of that society and of antipathy to those who are not, cannot, or will not be members of it. The Australian radical nationalist finds his or her deepest meaning and sense of self in mateship. Ward identifies this idealised type – the noble bushman – as standing at the centre of a "mateship tradition".[9]

Importantly, Ward also argues that this outlook and set of ideals continues to exist, and to colour "men's [sic] ideas of how they ought 'typically' to behave": "Though some shearers are now said to drive to their work in wireless-equipped motor-cars, the influence of the 'noble bushman' on Australian life and literature is still strong".[10] He reaffirms this belief in his Foreword to the 1965 second edition: "those who follow (Friedrich) Gerstaecker's excellent example by tramping, or hitch-hiking, through the back country today will certainly find that the 'legendary' outlook *still* lives vigorously among bushmen".[11] The following year, in a personal and political crisis partly induced by his waning faith in the Australian legend, or myth, as a means of explaining and predicting social reality, Frank Hardy followed Ward's advice and left Sydney to go searching for this legendary outlook in the outback.

That Ward's text continues to serve as a touchstone within debates about the nature of Australian identity and culture, and that it continues to attract a significant amount of criticism, suggests the general success of the descriptive strand of his project.[12] As Richard White suggested in 1981, Ward's *The Australian Legend* is "the last great re-statement of the character of the Australian type".[13] Ward carefully and persuasively identifies the various components of the Australian legend, or myth: the distinctive qualities of the Australian, according to most Australians. The analytic strand

of *The Australian Legend*, however, in which Ward argues that Australian radical nationalism grows more or less directly and completely from Australians' experience of their natural environment and (in 1958 and even 1965) continues to direct their thought and behaviour, is more open to criticism.

In his historical narrative Ward contends that "the convict-derived bush ethos grew first and flourished in its most unadulterated form in the mother colony of New South Wales, but ... it early spread thence, by osmosis as it were, to become the most important basic component of the national mystique".[14] "From the beginning", he summarises:

> outback manners and *mores*, working upwards from the lowest strata of society and outwards from the interior, subtly influenced those of the whole population. Yet for long this was largely an unconscious process recorded in folklore and to some extent in popular speech, but largely unreflected in formal literature. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, when the occupation of the interior had been virtually completed, it was possible to look back and sense what had been happening. Australians generally became actively conscious, not to say self-conscious, of the distinctive 'bush' ethos, and of its value as an expression and symbol of nationalism. Through the trade union movement, through such periodicals as the Sydney *Bulletin*, the *Lone Hand*, or the Queensland *Worker*, and through the work of literary men like Furphy, Lawson or Paterson, the attitudes and values of the nomad tribe were made the principal ingredient of a national *mystique*. Just when the results of public education acts, improved communications, and innumerable other factors were administering the *coup de grace* to the actual bushman of the ninteenth century, his idealised shade became the national culture-hero of the twentieth.[15]

"The main features of the new [distinctively Australian] tradition", he says, "were already fixed before 1851", and so before the arrival of large-scale, cross-class, goldrush immigration.[16] Accordingly, while gold-seekers and later immigrants "influenced the 'bush' outlook in certain ways ... in the upshot its main features were strengthened, modified in certain directions perhaps, but not fundamentally changed".[17]

Accounting for this process, Ward theorises that "nearly all legends have some basis in historical fact", and "the Australian legend has, perhaps, a more solid substratum of fact than most".[18] "National character", he states, is "a people's idea of itself and this stereotype, though often absurdly romanticised and exaggerated, is always connected

with reality [in that] it springs largely from a people's past experiences" and continues to influence their ideas of how they ought to behave.[19] Drawing on a strongly (or narrowly) materialist reading of Marx, Ward goes on to imply that this Australian idealisation of the 'noble bushman' is a direct reflection of the fact that the distinctive cultural qualities of this 'person' were what enabled the society as a whole to survive. These bushmen were the pre-industrial-capitalist working class of white Australia's first productive base, the pastoral industry of Australia's (and Patrick White's) ruling-class squattocracy: "The pastoral industry was, and still is, the country's staple. Its nature, the nature of Australian geography, and the great though decreasing scarcity of white women in the outback, brought into being an itinerant rural proletariat, overwhelmingly masculine in composition and outlook".[20] This is a group of "outback employees, the semi-nomadic drovers, shepherds, shearers, bullock-drivers, stockmen, boundary-riders, station-hands and others of the pastoral industry".[21]

Ward 'qualifies' this materialist reading of cultural development, stating that "the germ of the distinctive 'outback' ethos was not simply the result of climatic and economic conditions, nor of national and social traditions brought with them by the 'government men' who first opened up the 'new country' beyond the Gread Divide".[22] However, culture in Ward's mind remains essentially a response to or a necessary accommodation of the material base. This 'distinctive outback ethos', he says, "sprang ... from (the outback proletariat's) struggle to assimilate themselves and their *mores* to the strange environment".[23] Elsewhere he states: "Among the influences which shaped the life of the outback community the brute facts of Australian geography were probably most important".[24]

Ward correctly recognises that culture is primarily the product of a people's consciously or unconsciously imagined experience of nature: culture is most precisely *felt* rather than consciously believed or followed. But he also reaches the problematic conclusion that this imagined experience is more or less entirely free from political or ideological factors, from human relations of power. If culture is founded "largely" on historical reality, historical reality is always in part a product of the formal and informal operations of political power. So while Ward's historical exposition does shed considerable light on the question of why Australians commonly saw and venerated

'Australianness' in the way they did, his questionable view of culture as a manifestation of nature leads him to an unduly sympathetic portrayal of his subjects and their culture. Since he sees the culture of the Australian bush labourers as, finally, the product of nature, Ward does not acknowledge these people's active role in imagining their relationship with nature, or the political dimensions of that imagining.

This is the starting point of the criticism Ward has received from politically conservative critics from Vincent Buckley to John Carroll, from 'New Left' historians such as Humphrey McQueen, from postmodernists such as Richard White and feminists such as Marilyn Lake.[25] In different ways, all of these critics argue that the culture of Australian radical nationalism was (or is) a myth, in the narrow, negative sense of that word, developed and deployed to disguise real or potential political relations of power. Moreover, it could be argued that, even if the idealisation of the nineteenth-century white male bush labourer did derive from this group's supposedly central economic role within society, the imagined economic centrality of this labour is itself a political belief. At an even more basic economic level the Australian economy was founded on the appropriation of non-white (especially Aboriginal)[26] and female resources and labour, and functioned via the enforcement of narrowly heterosexual models, existing partly for the purposes of sustaining this gender exploitation. The economy, the economic base itself, was for political reasons imagined in a way that privileged some economic activities over others. If culture is an expression of the imagined human relationship with nature, the way that relationship is imagined is never wholly free from political desire and power.

Hardy and Australian Radical Nationalism

Frank Hardy was for many people from the 1960s onwards the person who came closest to embodying Ward's typical or ideal Australian. Partly this is because Hardy consciously embraced a populist, demotic, politically committed identity and personal style.[27] He modelled himself on his great hero, Henry Lawson, at one stage even attempting to affect the same moustache as this 1890s radical nationalist icon.[28] Delys Bird suggests that through his serious literary work, by the early 1970s Hardy, along with Xavier Herbert, represents "an important aspect of Australian literary history", namely

traditional nationalist realism.[29] In this, Bird notes, Hardy and Herbert can be defined against Patrick White, who represents internationalist modernism.[30] Before "the new fiction [of the 1970s] challenged earlier critical conventions", she notes, Australian literary history "had been understood as a simple dualism" between these modes,[31] just as Australian culture was understood in terms of its radical nationalist and liberal Anglocentric strands. "In spite of academic neglect", write Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, Hardy's reputation:

> as an *Australian* writer, public intellectual and quintessential larrikin waxed. In 1962 he was equal second in the Dame Mary Gilmore Awards. *The Yarns of Billy Borker* were serialised by ABC TV in 1964 and in 1969 he received a NSW Literary Fellowship. In 1971 *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* was published and in 1973 the CLF [Commonwealth Literary Fund] awarded him a grant to work on a book on Henry Lawson. *But the Dead are Many* followed to some acclaim in 1975 and the following year *Power Without Glory* appeared on the ABC as a thirteen-part television series.[32]

This television series, like the book it was based on, was enormously popular.[33] In addition, Hardy won the Australian Yarn Spinning Competition in Darwin in 1967, and retained the title until 1991.[34] He worked as a racing writer and tipster. He appeared from time to time in the media as an 'Aussie' personality; on Michael Parkinson's variety television program for instance.[35] In Pauline Armstrong's account, "Hardy reached the peak of his career in the 1970s",[36] and according to Phillip Adams "he was certainly one of Australia's great celebrities".[37] Between 1985 and 1993 Hardy's columns 'The Most Australian Australian' and 'Hardyarns' appeared in the popular *People* and *Australasian Post* publications. The 'most Australian Australian' label was famously applied to Hardy by Malcolm Muggeridge.[38]

Perhaps the clearest evidence for Hardy's archetypal Australian persona, though, appears in the immediate aftermath of Hardy's death, in a front-page *Age* newspaper article Richard Yallop wrote about Hardy and the 4 February 1994 celebration of his life.[39] "The battlers and fighters for justice gathered yesterday at Collingwood Town Hall", writes Yallop, "to celebrate an Australian myth and to farewell Frank Hardy, writer, communist, mate of many, champion of the underdog and eternal rebel".[40] Yallop records that Hardy "was borne away beneath the Eureka flag with the words of the

'Internationale', the socialist anthem, ringing from the Trades Hall Council choir ...
Hardy once wrote that when he went to his grave with his writings, the tribute he wanted
was for people to say of him that he had remained true to his class. So the two-hour
celebration of his life was held among his own – ordinary people who care and battle".[41]
"The people", says Yallop, "were saluting a working-class hero"; and "People had come
to farewell the embodiment of the myth of the Australian rebel".[42] A friend, Alice
Hammerly, is reported as saying: "Frank is one of the last great models", and Yallop
suggests: "Hardy conformed so closely to the Australian model that he had even died
clutching the form guide, an obsessive punter to the end".[43] The federal member for
Charlton, Bob Brown, is reported as saying that Hardy "helped define and illustrate the
Australian character".[44] At Hardy's wake, Yallop writes, "People yarned, as Hardy had
done, and drank to the memory of Frank and the archetypal Australian heroes".[45]

Importantly, Hardy's projected image – variously humorous, caricatured and
serious – as a 'legendary' Australian, was transmitted to Hardy via the community of his
childhood. He was born in a large Irish Catholic family and grew up close to the bush and
away from the city: in and around the Victorian towns of Southern Cross and then
Bacchus Marsh.[46] Many members of these towns were politically radical and had become
so through their own or their forebears' experience of class conflict during the economic
depression of the 1890s,[47] also the decade in which the values of the Australian legend
were most powerfully expressed in literature and art. These people saw themselves as
being members or direct descendents of the bush proletariat studied and arguably
idealised by Ward, Ian Turner and others. The members of these communities, and
especially the men, regularly told or performed Lawsonian yarns as a means of providing
entertainment and instruction within a largely pre-literate environment. They passed these
yarns, and the values of Australian radical nationalism, on to their sons, as important
cultural 'documents'.[48] It was only in the 1940s that modern processes of
industrialisation began to break down traditional familial and cultural networks and to
mediate personal, face-to-face means of communication.[49] Hardy's own father, Tom, was
a highly accomplished yarn spinner and an avowed political radical, aligning himself
with the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), the most radical of the major early-
twentieth century political movements.[50] As Hardy made clear late in his life, his father

was a very important 'literary' and philosophical influence on his own work.[51] Born in 1917, in his formative years Hardy also experienced at first hand the impoverishing effects of the 1930s economic Depression.

Hardy maintained his radical politics throughout his life. His novelist contemporary Ralph de Boissiere, a migrant from Trindidad and fellow member of the Communist Party of Australia, recalls for example in 1998: "Very early Frank struck me as epitomising the working-class Australian I was getting to know – anti-authoritarian, militant and committed to a betterment of living conditions".[52] Hardy's novels and short stories deal primarily with working-class and other 'common' people and his central characters have this experience and lifestyle and express themselves in the language of the street and the outback.

Hardy's own identity conformed to the legend as set out by Ward, with the exception that Hardy was generally talkative rather than taciturn. Instructively, at the Collingwood Town Hall commemoration ceremony for Hardy, his brother Jim Hardy said: "He was loquacious and caustic, but he was always a mate",[53] as though Frank's talkativeness was a negative which had to be compensated for by an assertion of his inherent identity as a mate. Importantly, Hardy is always guided by a sympathy for the underdog; as he writes in *The Unlucky Australians*: "The mainspring of my life had been compassion, the feeling for the under-dog. The poor shall feed the birds, the poor shall help the poor. The indelible imprint of the hungry thirties, the idealism". (25)

Hardy also recognised the need for working-class people to produce their own cultural products, the fact that a culture will be lost if the material conditions and means for perpetuating it are destroyed.[54] He was for example a founder of the 'Realist Writer' groups and their magazine of the same name.[55] With Amalgamated Meat Industry Employees' Union (AMIEU) secretary George Seelaf and others Hardy established the Australasian Book Society.[56] Wendy Lowenstein recalls that it was Hardy who gave her the idea of establishing a society for the recording and study of Australian folklore.[57] Hardy's *Legends from Benson's Valley* stories depict the folk culture of his childhood and the impact on this culture of industrialisation and modern forms of communication, literacy and knowledge. As Adams suggests, in this collection Hardy "attempts to

develop a critique of capitalism through communitarian notions of working-class solidarity".[58]

Hardy's personal experience helps to explain his lifelong political radicalism and his perhaps unparalleled understanding of the need to preserve or produce appropriate social and material conditions as a means of maintaining the existence of a form of working-class culture comparable to that of his childhood (and perhaps indirectly explains the absence of these things in most contemporary public exponents of the Australian 'larrikin', 'ocker' and 'bogan' identity, from Bob Hawke to Paul Hogan to Dave Hughes).[59] By the early 1970s, the pervasiveness of the de-politicised 'ocker' version of the Australian Legend, largely a product of the advertising industry,[60] had begun to undermine Hardy's cultural authority and the radical political potential of his traditional, nationalist Australian culture. As Stephen Alomes writes: "In the same way that the 'Dad 'n' Dave' stories had been popularly revived in different forms (including film and radio) at a time when the small 'cocky' farmer was becoming less important in Australian life, ockerism celebrated a style of life which was beginning to decline".[61]

Hardy, Whitlam and Australian Radical Nationalism

If Whitlam derived from and subscribed to the values of Australia's Anglocentric liberal culture, it might be expected that Hardy would see Whitlam and his party as cultural and political opponents. But while Hardy is a persistent critic of Whitlam and the ALP, he also finds some common ground with Whitlam, particularly in their mutual antipathy to social injustice. Though Whitlam was more individualist, less politically radical and less determinedly nationalist than Hardy, the strongest antipathy of each man was to radical individualism, and to the small-minded and hypocritical puritanism and legalism on which that individualism was often built and through which it was sustained. Overall, Hardy is best described as a critical supporter of Whitlam's ALP. Similarly, Whitlam sees Hardy as both a political opponent and ally. At times they worked together to achieve political and social change. This mutual support is significant, suggesting both Whitlam's potential appeal to those members of Australian society who like Hardy derived from or subscribed to its traditional, radical nationalist culture, and something of the way in which Australian society as a whole changed between the mid-1960s and mid-

70s: the Whitlam period. For complex reasons, the formerly central antipathy between Anglocentric puritan liberalism and secular Australian radical nationalism was displaced at this time by new class forces and the emergence of a new culture of radical individualism.

Hardy's critical attitude towards a Whitlam government is most evident in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, the novel he published in the year before Whitlam was elected. In this novel, Whitlam is depicted as 'Jeffrey Wittylamb'. Here, Hardy adopts the practice of Robert Tressell in *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists* (1914), and Charles Dickens before him: giving his characters names which both humorously indicate their character and make a comment about their politics or social function (at one stage Hardy even refers to *The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists*, and 'Foolgarah' is reminiscent of Tressell's 'Mugsborough'). Calling Whitlam 'Wittylamb' is meant to suggest that Whitlam is more style than substance, that his wit disguises the fact that he is really a lamb, tamed by the Australian ruling class. This depiction is made explicit in the novel when Wittylamb attends a party on "Nob Hill" thrown by Sir Alfred and Lady Cynthia Dagg and attended by a host of other "Silver Tails", including "Hopps, the brewery millionaire, Sir Albert Lendem, the banking millionaire, U. Userer-Jones, the hire purchase millionaire, L.J. Hookem of Hookem and Scalem, the real estate millionaire, and last but not least, Sir John Queerfella, shipping millionaire". (189) The 'Silver Tails' term, as the author explains, "was a measure of contempt loose and flexible enough to embrace any snob from a snotty-nosed bank clerk up to a Conservative-Liberal politician". (189) The party is "to celebrate the end of the Foolgarah dispute", (190) that is, the defeat of the striking garbage and sanitary workers "and the return to the good old days". (190) Along with the millionaires in attendance, representing the capitalist class, there are that class's allies in the dispute: the mayor (Mayor Bumperbar), the shire clerk (Shy Clerk Parker), a member of the judiciary (Mr Justice Parshal),[62] the sitting local member The Right Honorable Darcy Meanswell, ministers of the government (The Right Honorable Percival Snotton, Minister for the Black, White and Brindle policy), the Conciliation Commissioner (John Settlum), a representative of the police force (Sergeant Averbash), the union official Call-Me-Jack Wrorter and the American Ambassador (Elmer C. Yip Yap, junior), this last figure suggesting Hardy's awareness of the

international dimension of class power, and the central role of America within this international context. And there is Wittylamb, "leader of the opposition in the Tweedledum-Tweedledee democratic process (Jeff came in the back way and tore his trousers climbing up the cliff to avoid being caught by the rank and file, in the act of fraternising with the class enemy". (190)

It seems clear that, before the election of Whitlam, Hardy shared a general New Left critique of the formal democratic process and the role of Whitlam's ALP within it. It was commonly argued within the New Left that social democratic parties like the ALP pretended to be concerned with initiating social reform but were in practice virtually indistinguishable from their conservative opponents.[63] Australian New Left intellectuals Robert Catley and Bruce McFarlane would in 1974 entitle their influential critique of the "technocratic" Whitlam Government *From Tweedledum to Tweedledee*.[64] The politics of *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* are also strongly shaped by the work of the Frankfurt School intellectual Herbert Marcuse, and especially his book *One Dimensional Man*.[65] Marcuse and his critique of ostensibly progressive but in practice coercive public policy were influential within the New Left.[66]

But between the mid- and late-1960s, Hardy sought to gain support from Whitlam and the federal ALP in the struggle of the Aboriginal Gurindji people, who worked on cattle stations in the Northern Territory, for better wages and conditions and, subsequently, for land rights. Hardy gives the most detailed account of this struggle, and of his own role as an advisor for and publicist of the Aborigines' cause, in 1968's *The Unlucky Australians*. According to Whitlam, "Frank Hardy called on me in Sydney to expound the Gurindji case [in mid July 1967]. Parliament resumed for the Budget session on 13 August. I immediately raised for discussion the Government's delay and confusion in discharging the mandate given at the referendum in May 1967 to promote health, training, employment and land rights for Aborigines".[67] Later, Whitlam records:

> On 16 August 1975, seven years and one month after Hardy had called on me, I flew with Wentworth, [Gordon] Bryant, [James] Cavanagh and the new Minister, [Leslie] Johnson, to Wattie Creeek, now bearing its historical name, Daguragu. [H.C. 'Nugget'] Coombs recalled to me that on the site of Melbourne in 1834 a local Aboriginal chief had picked up some earth and poured it into the hand of John Batman. He suggested I do the same to the chief of the Gurindji, Vincent Lingiari.[68]

Whitlam did so, saying in a speech written by Coombs: "I solemnly hand to you these deeds as proof, in Australian law, that these lands belong to the Gurindji people and I put into your hands this piece of the earth itself as a sign that we restore them to you and your children forever".[69] As Stephanie Peatling summarises, "The Gurindji won their claim in August 1975 after winning over then Prime Minister Gough Whitlam. The Wattie Creek battle is now regarded as the birth of the Aboriginal land rights movement".[70] Whitlam wrote the introduction to the 1977 British edition of *The Unlucky Australians*, describing it as "a landmark in the struggle for Aboriginal advancement".[71] He also called Hardy "a great humanitarian" and "a staunch fighter for human rights" and said "the book carried with it a passion and conviction that roused the whole community".[72]

Surprisingly, the only reference to Whitlam in *The Unlucky Australians* is in a 'P.S.' attached to the bottom of a letter written to Prime Minister Harold Holt by Hardy in the guise of his 'Billy Borker' persona and published in the *Australian* on 21 November 1967.[73] Hardy wanted to get from Sydney back up to Wave Hill to continue to assist the Aborigines in their fight against Vesteys, the state welfare agency and the federal government, and the letter has 'Borker' ask for a V.I.P. flight to Darwin for his "mates" Bill Jeffrey (a Northern Territory welfare worker sympathetic to the Gurindji cause) and Frank Hardy. "P.S.", 'Borker' writes, "You had better tell Howson not to put their names on the flight manifest in case Whitlam and [shadow Attorney General Lionel] Murphy get on to us". (239) Peter Howson had been dropped from the federal government ministry as a punishment for giving misleading information to Parliament about the use of VIP aircraft in 1966 and 1967;[74] presumably the letter's serious purpose was to contrast the lack of public support given to Hardy and Jeffrey with the taxpayer-funded largesse of federal government members.

But as Bain Attwood outlines, Hardy, Whitlam and the ALP did work closely together on behalf of the Gurindji during this political campaign:

> Frank Hardy and the Northern Territory Council for Aboriginal Rights launched special appeals for support for the Gurindji. Gordon Bryant, the Federal Council and its affiliates represented land rights as an 'acid test of the Government's goodwill towards the Aboriginal people' and 'an outstanding opportunity to re-establish the confidence of Aborigines in

"white man's law"'. And Gough Whitlam and the Australian Labor Party forced an emergency debate in the parliament.[75]

After Whitlam's election, he appointed Ted Woodward as head of a royal commission to consider how Aborigines could be granted land in the Northern Territory. Woodward had earlier acted as QC for the Yolngu in a high-profile case regarding Aboriginal claims to land ownership at Gove. As Attwood writes, "Woodward's recommendations formed the basis of the first Commonwealth legislation providing for land rights".[76] And *The Unlucky Australians* does contain a number of references to Hardy's contact and co-operation with federal ALP members Gordon Bryant, Lionel Murphy and Tom Uren. Bryant is enlisted to read in parliament a letter from the leaders of the Gurindji tribe expressing their "earnest desire to regain possession of our tribal lands in the Wave Hill-Limbunya area".[77] Murphy gives the advice to Hardy that the Aborigines should write requesting the return of their land to Governor General Lord Casey.[78] Uren is persuaded to ask a question without notice in the House to the relevant Minister (for Territories), Charles Barnes, as to whether or not the government has received a request for land from the Gurindji and if it intends to grant the Gurindji that land.[79] At Hardy's request Uren also raised questions in parliament about the apparently politically-inspired sacking of Bill Jeffrey.[80] According to Hocking, after getting to know Whitlam through the Gurindji campaign, Hardy "admired (Whitlam) and his government".[81]

It can be seen then that, even before the 1972 federal elections, neither Hardy nor Whitlam had a violent antipathy towards each other, and that each was at least capable of seeking and providing support for the other. "The reformism of Whitlam's government", Hocking argues, "pushed Hardy insistently, if reluctantly, towards an acknowledgment that effective change was possible through the parliamentary and party process and, heretically [for Communists], that these changes could be for the better".[82] She suggests that "the dismissal of Whitlam and his government by the Governor-General on 11 November 1975, reconfirmed Hardy's rejection of the possibility of genuine reform through parliamentary politics".[83] For Hardy, as for White, the Dismissal and subsequent federal elections marked the end of a period of political and social hope.

In 1991 Hardy and Whitlam attended the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations of the Wave Hill Aboriginal pastoral worker strike, held at Dagaragu.[84] At the 4 February

1994 celebration of Hardy's life, one of the speakers was Whitlam. Here, Whitlam "reminded the (Collingwood) town hall audience that Hardy's approach had led to the first granting of land rights to Aborigines in the Northern Territory in 1975 and, ultimately, to the Mabo legislation",[85] and described his "great debt to Frank Hardy" in expounding the case of the Gurindji.[86] As Attwood attests: "Of the white actors involved in this [Wave Hill strike and subsequent land rights campaign], Frank Hardy ... is undoubtedly central".[87] Mike Seccombe points out that the Wave Hill strike led also to "a second revolution – in health care for all Australian Aborigines, and indigenous people as far away as Africa".[88]

Clearly, in spite of the fact that his politics are not fully aligned with those of Whitlam, Hardy is willing and at times eager to work with Whitlam, his government and his party. Part of the reason for this support is undoubtedly political. Hardy was a member or close associate of the more liberal and progressive faction of the CPA, led by Laurie Aarons, both before and after the decision of a pro-Soviet faction to split from the Party in 1971.[89] From the late 1960s Hardy and Laurie Aarons were strongly of the view that the Party should try to form a united political front with other progressive political organisations, including, at times, the ALP. As Hardy reports in *The Unlucky Australians*:

> Aarons is the chief architect of the new 'coalition of the Left' line of the Party. He and I had become firm friends in recent years ... I felt that a sharp change to liberalism in the Communist movement was imperative ... The propensity of the Left to take up every issue likely to embarrass the established order, as a reflex action without feeling or depth, robs the movement of spontaneity and moral fibre. It can create a spiritual barrenness that is self-defeating.[90]

While Hardy "had always viewed politicians with particular scorn", writes Jenny Hocking, "he knew that they held the key to the successful resolution of this defining issue, as old as settlement itself".[91]

But beyond these political expediencies there is also an obvious personal and cultural connection. Hardy rang Whitlam to ask about why his Commonwealth Literary Fund (CLF) grant for the novel that would become *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, awarded in 1968, had been disallowed by the relevant parliamentary committee.[92] Whitlam was a strong critic of this instance of political interference in arts funding,[93] termed by Hocking

"the last gasp of Robert Menzies' domestic Cold War politics".[94] In 1974 Hardy rang Whitlam to ask if Whitlam could provide any help for his sister Mary Hardy in her attempt to convince the Australian Broadcasting Control Board (ABCB) to allow her back onto television.[95] At the 1991 event marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Gurindji walk off, Hardy asked Whitlam if he would provide a voice-over to be included in the play Hardy was writing about his sister, *Mary Lives!*, and Whitlam agreed, later flying to Melbourne to fulfil his promise.[96] Whitlam attended the first-night performance on 6 June 1992 at the Merlyn Theatre in Melbourne.[97] Pauline Armstrong records that "as Whitlam delivered his [1994 Collingwood Town Hall] address" on Hardy's life, "he became overcome with emotion and left the platform close to tears".[98]

Most obviously, Hardy and Whitlam share an antipathy to narrow, small-minded puritanism. Aesthetically, this anti-puritanism is manifest in the uninhibited, humourous and anarchic personas they regularly project. Whitlam's politics were influenced by his religious upbringing, as suggested in the previous chapter. Hardy also was not uninfluenced by the puritanism of his own childhood as a Catholic.[99] But as social progressives, concerned generally to do away with superstition and fear, and as people who by temperament enjoyed a degree of anarchism, both Hardy and Whitlam were consciously and deliberately anti-puritanical in their public life. Both men, for instance, enjoyed using swear words, and particularly the characteristically Australian 'bastard', which can be a compliment, an insult or a complimentary insult.[100] As James Cockington has commented, "writers such as John O'Grady and Frank Hardy ... dragged the word out of the pub and elevated it to common literary usage".[101] Hardy once described himself and his sister Mary as "an irreverent pair of larrikin bastards".[102] On the day of the celebration of Hardy's life, Gabi Hollows, wife of Hardy's late great friend Fred, is reported as saying: "Fred and Frank and all those other old bastards, wherever they are, must be having a pretty good time".[103] In political circles, Cockington notes, "Gough Whitlam can be considered the master of the bastard".[104] When Whitlam stated to the ACT branch of the ALP in 1974: "I don't mind the Liberals, and still less do I mind the Country Party calling me a bastard ... But I hope you won't publicly call me a bastard as some bastards in the Caucus have", he demonstrated not only his awareness of the complexity and specificity of Australian language and culture but also a traditional

Australian anti-puritanism.[105] The political manifestation of this anti-puritanism is in a genuine commitment to social justice and a deeply-felt sympathy for the underdog.

The support that Whitlam received from and returned to Hardy is significant because it indicates a degree of compatibility between the two major Australian cultural traditions they in turn derived from and subscribed to. The point of connection lies in the shared cultural commitment to some notion of social responsibility, recognised as fundamentally incommensurate with purely personal desire, radical individualism, or greed. This point becomes clearer when one considers the relationship between Hardy and Patrick White, the man whom, it was argued in the previous chapter, is in many ways the archetypal literary member of the Anglo-Australian culture that in political terms was dominant throughout most of the twentieth century.

White loathed Hardy and did not think highly of his work.[106] It is not hard to guess why. Hardy was Irish-Australian, often loud-mouthed, brash, uncouth and deeply irreverent, produced archetypal 'dun-coloured realism' but had artistic ideas above the station he occupied in White's Modernist artistic cosmology, and was politically radical. Hardy on the other hand regarded White as politically and artistically conservative, as disconnected from ordinary people and sexually perverted.[107] But as Hocking reports, in 1976 Hardy "agreed to become part of a group calling for a change to the constitution, Citizens for Democracy. It held its first major rally, Kerr and the Consequences, on 11 November 1976, with an open-air meeting in Sydney Square. Frank Hardy was one of several speakers, including Patrick White, who addressed the crowd from the upper-level balcony of the Sydney Town Hall".[108] Hardy later wrote a chapter for a collection of essays on the Australian constitution, occasioned by the Dismissal.[109]

At a more subtle but perhaps more revealing level, it is no coincidence that White and Hardy both chose as the publisher for their final major works – Hardy's novel *The Obsession of Oscar Oswald* and White's *Three Uneasy Pieces* – Bruce Pascoe of Pascoe Publishing.[110] Pascoe was a left-leaning 'battler' of Aboriginal descent. Despite their personal differences both White and Hardy were or became strong supporters of the poor, Aborigines, the underdog generally, Australian independence (as they understood it, sometimes differently) and Whitlam. They were also vehement critics of modern capitalism and radically individualist American capitalism in particular. As such both

White and Hardy were, by the end of their writing careers, inheritors of waning Australian cultural traditions.

Hardy's Cultural Support for Whitlamism

Hardy's writing life can usefully be divided into three periods. A first phase, lasting roughly from the mid 1940s to the mid 1960s, includes Hardy's earliest short stories (many collated into *The Man from Clinkapella and other Prize-Winning Stories* c.1951 and *Legends from Benson's Valley* 1954), *Power Without Glory* (1950), *The Four-Legged Lottery* (1958) and *The Hard Way* (1961). In the writing of this period the legendary code of Australian mateship is presented as the primary means by which ordinary people will resist the manipulations of the ruling class and obtain a form of economic liberation and / or political self-determination. A second writing phase corresponds roughly with the Whitlam era, lasting from the mid 1960s to the mid 1970s. In this phase Hardy produced, alongside stories, yarns, journalism and two plays, *The Unlucky Australians* (1968), *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* (1971) and *But the Dead are Many* (1975). In these three major works Hardy subjects the culture of Australian mateship to a sustained interrogation, asking if the mateship myth functions to maintain rather than subvert social relations of power. A final phase is evident from the late 1970s, when Hardy left Australia and lived in Nice, France, for two years. In his novel *Who Shot George Kirkland?* (1980), concepts of mateship and organised class struggle are conspicuously absent, reflecting Hardy's relative loss of hope in these forms of political organisation and in the political potential of traditional Australian radical nationalist culture. *The Obsession of Oscar Oswald* (1983) makes an overt critique of contemporary 'mateship' and of the idea that this myth might be a possible means of building popular opposition to capitalism. This does not mean that the author has come to accept capitalism. Rather, Oswald, a Ned Kelly figure who also seems at least partly based on Hardy, is also at least partly mad, and a strength of the novel is its capacity to gain the reader's sympathy for this 'madman's' disgust at the state of modern society in Orwell's year, 1984.[111]

In his major works of the Whitlam period Hardy's critical or qualified support for Whitlamism is evident. He affirms the idealised values of Australian radical nationalism

– a communal philosophy of mateship and an antipathy to radical individualism – while also charting and critiquing the disintegration of the social conditions that had sustained this culture and its structure of feeling. By the time of *But the Dead are Many*, however, Hardy no longer has any evident hope that the culture of Australian radical nationalism might serve as a potential basis for a truly just or genuinely socialist society. This leads him to question the Australian legend itself, and so his own identity. In identifying the growth of a radical individualism, linked to the spread of American-style capitalism, Hardy helps to explain in these works the deep cultural reasons for the demise of Whitlamism.

In *The Unlucky Australians* Hardy leaves Sydney to escape various personal, financial and political pressures and hitch-hikes up the east coast of Australia and across to Darwin, where he had been invited by his friend Cecil Holmes, a writer and film maker. Hardy initially hoped to rediscover his creative inspiration by reconnecting with the radical nationalist Australian spirit of his childhood community and pre-1960s identity. This is why he leaves the city. Significantly, in finding the 'real Australia', Hardy, the archetypal Australian, believes he will find himself. As he explains in the book's opening quotation, reproduced from a television interview:

> I'm going on a journey shortly across and around Australia to try to rediscover Australia, to think about what I'm going to write next, to have a look inside myself ... I want to have another look at Australia, to get some strength out of the earth. Just to wander into some out-of-the-way place and hope it is not standardised by mass media as Sydney tends to be, to hope that this terrible middle-class apathy hasn't fallen over the land ... Of course, I'll be there when I arrive at my destination. I know I can't escape from myself. (xii)

But Hardy's romantic ideas about the Australian folk are upset from the beginning by his encounters with racist white and downtrodden Aboriginal Australians. Then, in Darwin, Hardy reads a document by Frank Stevens of the Australian National University on 'Colored Labor in the Cattle Industry of the Northern Territory', given him by Holmes, meets Dexter Daniels, a leader of Aboriginal pastoral workers, and is subsequently drawn into the campaign of the Aborigines for better wages and conditions, land rights, and political self-determination.

Hardy's strong anti-racist message is perhaps conveyed most powerfully through the words of the Northern Territory Aborigines that Hardy transcribes and includes in his book, such as those of Lupgna Giari:

> The white fella give my father the name Barney Major and, when I was a piccaninny, they call me Captain Major. My proper Aboriginal name him Lupgna Giari.
>
> I was born in the Wave Hill area. I got a brother in Alice Springs called Smiler. And I got three sisters, Molly, Mona and Ivy. Molly lives on the Limbunya station near Wave Hill. The others on Victoria River Downs. They married there and work at big house. I haven't seen my father longa time. Maybe him proper finish up dead now. I don't know.
>
> I bin thinkin' long time about my people not having proper money or proper conditions. I bin thinkin' we got no one to help us, no one behind us. Then I bin hear about them white fellas talkin' in the Court somewhere about equal wages.
>
> When I first started I was working at Wave Hill. I was only a kid then. Wave Hill is my country. I am a proper Gurindji man. The Gurindji tribe still live in the Wave hill area. (I wanna go back there later on.) I learn all sorts of things: plait whips, clean hides, learn about gelding. I never went to school in my life.
>
> I left Wave Hill when I was maybe thirteen years old. The tucker at Wave Hill was rough and no money at all, only few lollies, tobacca and matches. I went from there to Victoria River Downs. Same: no proper food, no money, no clothes, only sal' beef and bread. Only extra ration you get is maybe a bit more salt on the beef (that joke I bin make up longa time ago). So I moved on to Brunette Downs. I was working there same way, rags of clothes and boots and hat but no money. Afterwards I was running a stock camp at Gallipoli. They tol' me they would gib me money, two pound a week. I bin there thirteen year. When I went away from there they gave me only eight quid. 'That not right,' I said to mesel'.
>
> Another time, longa time ago, a station manager got a whip out on me. We was in the stock camp. We run out of tucker. When we finished the last of the damper and beef I ask for more tucker. Two more days we was gonna stay in the camp. He grab the whip. I was only a young fella. I pulled the whip out of his hands and I said to him: 'Listen, boss, now we have a talk 'tween oursel's. I said we need more tucker. I reckon we need same tucker as white fella. I don't know right way to ask but you can't teach me with a whip. You try to teach native people how to work with a whip. You got no whip now.'
>
> I went away from there. (30–31)

But the book also ends with an extremely powerful section, in which Hardy emphasises the racist evil of white Australia and calls on white Australians to acknowledge this history and their own personal complicity in the ongoing crime of genocide:

> Only two peoples in history have ever deliberately planned this unspeakable crime (of genocide): the Nazi Germans and the white Australians. Defeat in the war prevented the Germans from exterminating the Jewish race. White Australia was able to pursue its crime until not one Aborigine remained alive on the island of Tasmania. Any study of race relations in Australia must begin with that crime. Others were to follow, until racism became built into the Australian character like a Pavlovian reflex, conditioning our policies towards the Aborigines, Asia and immigration. (246)

Hardy recognises, or is brought into a full acknowledgement of, the fact that the culture of the Australian Legend has in practice never been 'colour-blind'. If it was founded on an egalitarian, quasi-socialist desire to oppose a British and Anglophile Australian ruling class, it was also and equally founded on a racist and socially elitist desire to oppose and denigrate the peoples and culture of non-white groups, especially Asians and Aborigines.[112] This point is made most strongly in the book's first chapter, in which the hitch-hiking Hardy stops to visit Bourke, Winton and Mt Isa. Each of these towns is culturally significant to Hardy, but his experiences in each town undermine his romantic conceptions of the places and the culture of the Australian Legend.

For Hardy, Bourke "meant memories of Henry Lawson, and the Union burying its dead". (2) "Perhaps this is what I am seeking from the land", he writes: "Lawson and the days when the world was wide". (2) He begins to tell "the truckie about Lawson's time in Bourke and Watty's pub. He wasn't drinking this trip, he said. He didn't seem to have heard of Lawson" (2). When they arrive in town, Hardy rushes to a pub, hoping it had been 'Watty's':

> The three old men drinking around a table were in character, especially the big old bloke with the wrinkled skin, the shrewd eyes, the short-sleeve flannel; a shearer for sure who had slept in a thousand swags and river bends. 'Lawson?' he said in reply to my query. 'Can't place the name. He was never here in my time and I've been here fifty-five years. What did he do for a crust?'
>> 'He was a poet, Henry Lawson.'
>> 'Ah, yes, a good poet, too. He'd be dead by now, I reckon.'
>> Such is fame. Such is posterity. (2)

Soon after, outside the pub, Hardy turns "to ask the footsteps behind me: 'Excuse me, mate, could you tell me if that building was ever a hotel?' It was a young Aborigine dressed in a check shirt. He halted in his tracks and stepped back a pace: 'I couldn't tell you, sir. I don't know, sir.' Sir! Why the pace away – surprise, shock, shyness, inferiority, distrust and fear of the white man?" (3)

In Cunnamulla Hardy again views the blatant racism of ordinary white Australians towards Aborigines, before staying overnight in Winton. Having earlier followed in the footsteps of Lawson, Hardy is now conscious of following in those of A.B. 'Banjo' Paterson: "Struth, this is the town where old Banjo wrote 'Waltzing Matilda' – that's if he did write it ... Standing in front of the Waltzing Matilda statue I muttered: 'Banjo, old mate, did you write that bloody song or not? And where are you now, eh?'". (7) Again, Hardy seeks to commune with the founders of his culture, and mourns this culture's apparent deterioration. "What the hell am I doing here in the wilderness?" he asks, rhetorically. "Even the home of Waltzing Matilda, the ancient land, can bring no aid. There is nothing but punting and late nights and impending hangovers. Might as well have stayed in Sydney; there's nothing to be found in the land anywhere to draw new strength from". (8) The spirituality he had hoped to find seems unobtainable.

In Mount Isa hotels Hardy asks about Pat Mackie, the leader of the famous 1960s miners' strike. But he finds people "clam up and change the subject". (10) He decides that "the usual shallow matey talk about Melbourne and Sydney beer, horse racing (and) women" is "the forged currency replacing notes of communication in modern Australia". (9) And again he witnesses racism: an Aboriginal stockman being refused service at a bar. Ironically, it is his journey into Australia's rural centre, where he had hoped to find the true Australia and his true self, that leads Hardy to take seriously the fact that traditional Australian folk culture is and always has existed alongside an ideology of racism:

> I think vaguely how typical this is of Australian mateship – exclude the coloured people. The blind spot: the Aborigines and Asia. Even Lawson was not free from it ... Nothing has changed. Fear of the yellow hordes lies behind the support amongst the people for the adventure in Vietnam. And the nearer a white Australian is to Aborigines the more likely he is to be a racist. (6)[113]

"You have travelled into the heart of the land", Hardy concludes, "and all you have learnt is what you have known for more than twenty years: the Aboriginal people are treated worse than any minority on earth and Australians don't care or, caring, turn their backs". (10) The vaunted Australian culture of egalitarianism, it seems, is a fraud, and Hardy's personal search for psychological reintegration via a reconnection with the ideal Australia of his childhood, is doomed to fail.

By the end of the book, Hardy advances the view later made famous by Humphrey McQueen, that the culture of the Australian Legend is founded less on opposition to the British and Anglo-Australian ruling class than on a shared imperialist prejudice towards non-Anglo and non-white peoples:

> White Australia began as the furthest outpost of Old England's power and that power was based on the white man's inhumanity to the coloured man. The first settlers and convicts, masters and servants, shared one thing in common: contempt for the tribes from whom they usurped the land. The pioneers who drove deep into the heart of the land were ignorant and indifferent towards the culture of the black man. When the natives refused to accept the status of unpaid slave labor and raised their spears against the white man and his beasts they were cruelly flogged or shot out of hand. Punitive expeditions not only went unpunished but were encouraged or officially organised. (245–246)

As McQueen later asserted in a fiery debate with Russel Ward: "Australia was not an exploited colony in the sense that Vietnam is; rather it was (and largely is) an outpost of empire more like a Roman colony".[114] "Australia", argues McQueen, "was a willing part of the whole Anglo-Saxon empire".[115] Is Australia's official policy of 'assimilation', Hardy asks, "a polite word for genocide?" (246)

In the process of gaining a newly critical perspective on his own cultural tradition, Hardy also develops a new understanding of the cultural uniqueness of Aboriginal peoples, and the Gurindji in particular. He realises that this uniqueness cuts across any possible political and cultural alliances between these Aborigines and the broader Australian working class. He writes for example that:

> Aborigines who, like the Gurindji, have retained their tribal identity, have richer spiritual lives than white men. They believe that the dead are reincarnated in the sacred places, returning as other men or animals to

watch over the living. Their concept of heaven is that it is found on earth at the places of their Dreaming, where the dead and the living are one. For the Gurindji, the main place of the Dreaming is at the junction of Wattie and Black Fellow Creeks near Seal Gorge ... Tribal Aborigines think differently – not better or worse, but differently – from white men (sic). They learn by rote as tribal laws are learned. They do not deal in inductive thinking from the particular to the general, in cause and effect, one step following another. But their thought is rich and deep and, having accepted a concept, they never forget it and never depart from it. (167, 168)

The Aborigines do not feel part of a broader Australian working class and are certainly not treated by most members of that class as part of a common culture. Unlike the non-Aboriginal working class, the Aborigines are not primarily concerned with obtaining better wages and conditions and what might be called 'full citizenship' of Australian society. Rather, as Hardy comes to realise, they want to obtain land, as a means to self-sufficiency and genuine self-determination:

The white men, including myself, who had assisted Dexter Daniels to organise the Wave Hill strike, believed the issue was wages and conditions. But the first thing Vincent had said to Tom Fisher was: 'You white fellas bin play bloody hell with black gin women.' And the first thing Pincher had said to me in September was: 'This bin Gurindji country'. (167)

Hardy and the Gurindji: "discussed it all morning. The facts emerged: they had reserved their opinion until I had come; land had been the main issue in their strike – land and tribal identity, protection of their women, their race; they wanted to abandon white society altogether and revert to their own way of life". (167) When the Gurindji go to reclaim a portion of their traditional land, Hardy's friend, the welfare officer Bill Jeffrey, opines: "'It's the beginning of the greatest story ever told, mate. Trouble is, no bastard is going to believe you'". (174) The allusions to the Bible and the story of Exodus emphasise the sense that here is an oppressed people seeking freedom from their colonisers.

But while he has changed his perspective on Australia's folk culture and cultural traditions, and reached a new realisation that a difficult and complex negotiation of cultural difference must precede any possible development of a properly inclusive 'Australian' culture, Hardy is also emotionally and intellectually revived by his contact

with the Gurindji and other Aborigines and with those white Australians, like the welfare officer Bill Jeffrey and Actors Equity Secretary Hal Alexander, who align themselves strongly with the Aborigines' cause. He has rediscovered a purpose and, it is implied, a concrete example of the legendary Australian ideal. Early in the story Hardy tells:

> I lay awake burning with the ancient fire that I thought was dead in me, that was burned into my soul in the hungry thirties – the fire that begins with charity and ends in meanness, that begins with fear and ends in courage, that begins with love and ends in hate; the desperate determination to set the unpainted streets against the bright boulevards, the slums against the mansions, the poor against the rich. Yes, and if they wanted it that way – the black man against the white. I had seen white babies starve and not be fed, I had seen white men fall sick and not be treated, I had seen white women sell themselves for a few shillings worth of groceries, I had seen whites debased and robbed of their self-respect. But no white man, even in the depths of the Depression, had suffered as much as the black man suffers now in the height of the nation's boom. (26)

Near the end he writes:

> The self-doubt that travelled with me across Australia in the refrigerated truck nearly a year ago has been lost somewhere in the ancient land, whisked away by the willy-willys when the wind was wild. As a man who had seen too many alternatives in the present, I had been unable to plan for the future. Now, I have no immediate alternatives. The man and the writer must devote the next period of his life to the Aborigines, especially the Gurindji people. (210)[116]

In finding this political cause, Hardy rediscovers what he feels to be an authentic radical nationalist Australian tradition and so his true self.

If Hardy has given up on the (predominantly Anglo-Australian) outback communities as repositories of politically progressive culture, he hasn't necessarily given up on the Australian Legend *per se*. One of Hardy's strategies for building public support for the Aborigines, for instance, is to depict them in terms which bring to mind Ward's ideal. The tall Aboriginal stockman who was refused a drink at the bar in Mount Isa, for example, is a "tall, powerful" man, "walking, almost swaggering, legs wide apart in the horseman's gait ... He wears an Australian wide-brimmed stetson, sides turned up, shirt and tight-legged trousers bleached white and high-heeled elastic-sided boots". (8) [117] When his request for a drink is turned down, the stockman behaves as the archetypal

Australian might, with silent, stoical strength: "The Aborigine merely turns on his heels and walks out, shoulders square, without a word or a gesture, leaving the note on the counter. This is not the first time his equality and freedom have been mocked, and it won't be the last. He bears it with dignity". (9) In the concluding section, moreover, Hardy challenges white Australia to act on its own professed principles: "How do *you* plead? Can you honestly say in your defence that a rich country like ours is unable to give the Aborigines a fair go? A fair go? Mateship? Fraternalism? Why have we failed to extend our most sacred principles to Asia and the Aborigines?" (247) Just as Patrick White was critical of the lived culture of those who subscribed to the Anglo-Australian, puritan liberal tradition, while maintaining a commitment to the professed ideals of this culture, Hardy is critical of the lived culture of the Australian Legend while remaining attached to what he sees as its core ideals.

The Unlucky Australians is certainly literary,[118] but Hardy refers to it as "reportage" (218) and most authorities list the book as non-fiction.[119] It seems influenced by the contemporaneous 'new journalism' of Truman Capote, Tom Wolfe and, in the Australian context, by *Nation* and the *Observer*.[120] Hardy includes transcribed testimony from Aborigines and others involved in the conflict. If published today it would fit easily into the 'literary non-fiction' category. In his recent study of Aboriginal people's century-long struggle for formal political rights, Bain Attwood draws extensively on Hardy's account.[121] Hardy's voice in the book, always conversational, is occasionally jocular but is generally earnest and at times impassioned, and the reader gets a strong sense of the profound impact of the Gurindji and other Aboriginal people, their political struggle and their culture, on Hardy's consciousness. Hardy wrote the work as reportage rather than fiction so as to make a direct political impact: "There is a chance that this book can be timely and directly assist the Aborigines. The play or novel might go deeper, perhaps even have a lasting value. But that can wait". (211) Through his critique of the social manifestations of the radical nationalist legend and his advancement of this legend's traditional ideals, Hardy hoped to change public perceptions and influence the political direction of Australian society.

In Hardy's next major work, *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*,[122] he turns his attention to urban Australian society and develops an extended literary critique of contemporary

Australian capitalism.[123] Drawing on sophisticated, up to date social analysis – especially Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man* – Hardy sets out current forms and modes of class oppression, and possible sources and means of resistance. He also identifies and builds a critique of the cultural effects of the intertwined social, political and economic systems developing around him. In particular, he sees the traditionally idealised Australian habits of anti-puritanism, mateship, supporting the underdog and resisting authority, as having been all-but destroyed by the radical individualism of this affluent, consumerist society. Nevertheless there are in Hardy's vision people who have not been drawn into and corrupted by this capitalist game, people who remain outside of acceptable society: these are the outcasts of Hardy's title; they are presented as the last true inheritors of traditional Australian-ness; and they provide some hope of social transformation.

In Hardy's account, the most important new modes of ruling-class social control are the media and entertainment industries, which set the parameters of knowledge and of political awareness for most people and stimulate desires for consumer goods. Society, he writes, is "brainwashed" by newspapers and television, (33, 129) and Sir Jasper Storeman (based on Sir Frank Packer) has the power to 'hire and fire' prime ministers. (191) Secondly there are the consumer-goods industries, which sell on credit and so lock people into working harder and more diligently in order to be free of this debt. When the television of the hero, Chilla, a legendary Australian, is repossessed, Hardy is able to bring together his critique of ruling-class cultural control and his critique of credit-based consumer capitalism. It is only when the television is taken away that Chilla is able to see that the hire-purchase system represents a means of ruling-class control. Chilla "knew the set had to go, was glad to see the last of it, in a way, because it had clogged up something he had been trying to think out in the back of his old tin of works". (129) "So what do you do?" he ponders. "Opt out, depend on them for nothing, decline with thanks, in short, tell them aorta go and get well stuffed. To do that (and this was what he had been trying to work out), to do that, you had to owe them nothing". (129) And thirdly there are the anti-union contractors who are willing to undercut wages and conditions, particularly within the public sector. Where Turdy Tom Tinkler, the sanitary worker, is described as having a vocation for his work, and so a desire to do his job well for the sake of society,

Scabby Jack Slyme, the archetypal private contractor, is only interested in cutting costs and maximising profit.

Like these new forces for social control, the older ones – government, the public service and the judiciary – use new, indirect and subtle forms of oppression, consistent with the general notion of 'repressive tolerance' outlined in Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*. The essence of this philosophy is spelt out a number of times in the novel, most clearly (though Hardy deliberately mimicks Gorton's ponderous and at times convoluted expression) by Sneed Hearn, the character based on Prime Minister John Gorton:

> 'It is time to ensure that there is retained in this country, that capacity to express dissent, that freedom of expression; if we are to, and there has been a big if, then we must, and shall, enforce and be enforcing, every punishment, every law, every statute, every power we have, or can have, against every person who dissents, or plans to dissent, or protests, or disagrees, or takes license to freely express, because only when we have cast out, or jailed, or deported every dissenter and protester and disagreer, only then can we have, and be having, the right to dissent, protest and disagree. In short, we can retain the right to dissent only if we take it away from those who wish to use it.' Sneed Hearn thus expressed the very essence of Silver Tails' democracy. (219)

Repressive tolerance, then, is the ruling-class institutionalisation of accepted, and minor, boundaries of dissent.

Hardy portrays the great bulk of the population, including its working class, as thoroughly de-politicised. Through the easy availability of credit the working class have been given a stake in continuing economic growth and industrial harmony, thereby putting themselves in a position where they are easily 'blackmailed' by employers and others into betraying the values of solidarity that maintain wages, conditions and living standards for wage earners:

> They are caught up in the affluent rat-race unable to see any alternative to running on the treadmill in a frantic attempt to keep up with the payments on their houses, cars, electrical goods and gadgets. They are buy now and pay latered, pinned down, status-symbolled, ruled and ordered, suburbanised, manipulated – in a word, fucked-up – until they see the WHO'S WHO push, not as enemies, but as friends to be worshipped from afar. (144-145)

These people have also, in Hardy's account, become mere passive consumers of cultural products manufactured for them by and in the interests of the ruling class. The cultural differences between the working, middle and upper classes have been eroded by an homogenised and monopolised media and entertainment industry. The great myth of the ruling class, that all people in society have the same economic interests, is socially institutionalised. In the novel, this myth is manifest primarily in the notion of affluence and the affluent society, the belief that wealth and comfort can be gained without the exploitation of labour and despoliation of the environment.

Within this general social malaise, Hardy reveals that the culture of mateship has largely been reduced to an ideology: a rhetorical means of maintaining existing power relations. In contrast with the Australians' general perception of themselves as easygoing, for instance, Hardy contends near the beginning of the novel that of any country in the "civilised world" Australia has "more rules, regulations, laws, bylaws, prohibitions, censors, lets and hindrances, restraints, embargoes, vetoes, taboos, injunctures, bans and plain bastardry in high places". (4) The officious council employee Brown Tongue Parker "had been trained from boyhood by the bureaucratic State as a red-tape purveyor, rules book reader, triplicate trickster, memo magician and lurk detector. He wasn't born a bastard. He became one because of his environment". (5) Later we learn: "No man is so gullible when it comes to a bit of bulldust sprinkled on the old national ethos than the Australian, who really believes the sun shines nowhere else except out of his arse and that his beer is really the best". (23) When the Old Digger gives his near-mute companion Moss "the cold steel theory of warfare", about how no nation of soldiers could handle the bayonet charge, "it was on the tip of (Moss's) tongue to ask the Digger how it was the Aussie was so keen on the old cold steel, but he didn't bother, it would only spoil the Old Digger's story". (41) When the writer Borky is knocked back for a grant from the Literature Board, after government interference (an incident plainly based on the Board's retraction of the grant recommended to Hardy), "the Board of Authors, in the Lawson mateship tradition, dropped Borky like a hot spud, on account of one of them being a Knight, two being OBEs and the other living in expectation of Her next birthday". (102) There is "nothing the average Australian apostle of egalitarianism likes better than a bargain at the expense of his less fortunate mates". (134) In a mock chess "tournament"

between the affluent (white) and effluent (black) teams, symbolising contemporary class struggle, Hardy writes that Black's:

> mates checked *them*, as it turned out, because there were more scabs per head of the population in Foolgarah than in any city in the world – that's if you don't count the Australian capital, Canberra. Judas Iscariot was a loyal friend compared to your average Foolgarah scab, who operated on the basis of (check) mateship. For mateship read, I'm going to kick your guts in; last place to the stranger; give up the fugitive; you wouldn't like your sister to marry one; solidarity is a Communist plot so there's nothing wrong with scabbing if you need the money. (179)

The "whole nation" watches "every move" of the "tournament" of the garbage and sanitary workers' strike, which Hardy has described in terms of a chess match between the social outcasts (black) and the leaders of the affluent society (white), "mostly praying that White would triumph over Black just once more". (180) The overall message is pellucid: Australians like to talk about mateship and their anarchic egalitarian character, but generally in practice are self-serving at best and, at worst, proponents of or sycophants toward authority.

But for Hardy, as for Marcuse, the oppressive power of the ruling class is not absolute. There are a range of groups who have resisted incorporation within the social system, its rules and culture. Near the end of the novel, when the forces of the state – in the shape of the army and police – are coming to stamp out the outcasts, the writer Fred Borky lists the members of this social category:

> 'a rag-tag army of outcasts, spawned in the fetid waters of the effluent society ... an army, hand-picked by God from amongst the foolish people of the world who reject the perverted morality of the bourgeois state, who are driven outside the repressive tolerance of the democratic process, which is only an alibi for the enslavement of the human spirit ... The foolish people, too clean at the core to accept the fraudulent rules of the game ... and so driven to a total rejection of the irrationality of the one-dimensional society, its artificial stimulated needs, and the manipulation of its mass media ... Count them on your affluent fingers ... this substratum of outsiders: the poor and the outcast, the unemployed and the unemployable, the exploited, the halt and the lame, the despised, the people out of mad houses and jails, the rejected, the pauperised aged, the rebellious young, the deprived, the despised black men, the alienated, the persecuted foreign races ... In Foolgarah, they are few; in the world they are many'. (229–230)

The language here is portentous, even biblical ("'And so it will be'" [229]), as Hardy evokes an atmosphere of prophesy to argue that the outcasts "'shall arise to challenge the comfortable ideas of the status quo'". (229) "'Watch them and wait'", he goes on:

> 'they will rise to violate the rules of the bourgeois game, for their need to end the immoral conditions and institutions is immediate and irrevocable, their refusal at last to obey the rules will mark the end of the game ... Pray upon these outcasts, as on a blasphemous rosary of beads made from balls of shit, pray upon them, oh, ye victims of the curse of affluence, for your secret dreams of freedom may be fulfilled in the world they build tomorrow'. (229–230)

As the power of the ruling class is not absolute, nor is the corruption of the Australian culture of mateship. The outcasts, who oppose the ruling class, its system of repressive tolerance and its affluent society myth, are depicted as the true inheritors of the Australian Legend. The leader of the outcasts, and the novel's central hero, is unquestionably Chilla, who is an archetypal representation of Ward's legendary ideal. Chilla is sexually virile and strongly heterosexual, having a "tendency to be tit happy", (3) for example, and becoming "randy" whenever "half tanked or worried". (114) His wife Florrie and her sister Winnie, two good working-class women, are also especially sexual, "a bit on the aggressive, too-much-make-up side, a trifle loud-mouthed, but hearts as big as buckets and bosoms to match, well stacked if not well-heeled", (13) and Florrie "was about the all-time root of the age, with Chilla that was, for she was strictly a one man woman since first she fell to sleep in his hairy tattooed arms". (16) Members of the ruling class, on the other hand, are depicted as ugly, if they are women – "'Fancy wakin' up in the morning and finding the old grey mare on the pillow,' Chilla commented" of Councillor Jilks, "female of the species" (27) – or effeminate, if they are men: consider "Stock Exchange Roy", for example, "his witty self, always ready to make the saloon bar boys (old pub) or Pacesetter poofters (new Chevron) laugh at the expense of the Garbos as a change from worrying about the drop in oil shares and telling dirty yarns"; (94) or Justice Parshal, who is "effete, gentlemanly ... mentally constipated and thoroughly useless ... the only poofter in the southern hemisphere with a bassoprofundo voice", (109, 110) who strokes "his moustache with a gesture as masculine as Liberace waving goodbye to his mother"; (111) or Brown Tongue Parker, who is a "not very passionate

husband"; (113) or Crazy Darcy Meanswell, who has "soft pink hands"; (117) or "Sir John Queerfella, shipping millionaire"; (189) or Billy Bigears (William McMahon), also repeatedly portrayed in homophobic terms as homosexual. Scabs and lurk detectors like Jack Slyme and Terry Takemback or the jail wardens Sodom and Gomorrah, who rape Commissar Albert McKakie (in Adams's view a "fictional construction of a number of New Left motifs, including perhaps the persona of Albert Langer"),[124] are physically repulsive.

Chilla is 'in control' of his wife and family and of the others who come to stay under his roof: Little Tich and Winnie, the Old Digger and Moss, Tom Tinkler and Tom Mangiari Tinkler Junior. As they all move in he becomes something of an outcasts' tribal leader. He is physically strong and tough – "massive, tattooed and rough hewn", capable of "throwing the (garbage) bags up like they contained only feathers, above his head like a weight-lifter" (35) – and a great fighter, who bashes the repossessor Terry Takembak and "could beat Cassius Clay when the acid (is) burning the fear and the affluent options out of his guts". (130) He is emotionally strong and stable, not easily 'touched', but also kind-hearted.

Chilla is disdainful towards authority and loathes its abuse. He has no cultural pretensions or sexual inhibitions and is thereby both immune from the attempts of the socially conservative to induce guilt in him and more aware than others of wealthy hypocrisy. He is the biggest drinker (of beer, naturally), with the 'Pom' Little Tich on the other hand getting "a sway up" when he drinks schooners, "emulating Chilla as in all things". (26) Chilla is not very interested in the other material offerings of his consumer society and is able to recognise the truth of Borky's theories about the outcasts as the ultimate vanguard of revolution: "Chilla read over (Borky's) shoulder ... the over-written prose only half-understood but confirming his own vague theories". (229) And he is even able to overcome his racist preconceptions towards Luigi, the migrant unionist, and the Aboriginal Tom Mangiari. The first time Mangiari speaks Chilla changes the subject back to the strike and addresses Tom Senior, "ignoring the Aborigine, with the unconscious racism of the average Australian, who thinks the old Abo is all right in his place, as long as he knows where it is" (93):

> But Chilla changed his tune when Tom Junior said: 'That plenty good idea, I reckon, all bin strike together. In Wattle Hill area we bin strike two years.'
>
> 'Turn it up', Chilla said admiringly, 'we'll be lucky to last six weeks the way things are going.'
>
> 'You got to learn how to wait,' Tom Junior avised, cheeky as you like, 'my people know how to wait . . .'
>
> 'All right, well,' Chilla said, 'get the boys together,' thinking this Abo is the bloke I saw on the television when those strikes were on, and he'll do me for a battler who won't be rushing back to work, that's if the white Sanos will come out at all.' (93)

Where the Hardy who wrote *The Unlucky Australians* was filled with pessimism about the inherent racism of the inheritors of the Australian Legend, his character Chilla is able to realise that the Legend is an expression of a culture, not a race. Hardy stresses this point by giving the most marginalised outcast, Tom Mangiari, the archetypal bushman appearance ("more than six feet tall, wearing a Stetson, check shirt, riding trousers and elastic-sided boots" [92]), by making him the most politically aware member of this group and by having him assert that in political terms, the outcasts are all 'black':

> The only sober person present was Winnie but the words of Tom Mangiari Tinkler Junior seeped through the alcoholic haze like Foolgarah effluence through clay. He was born an outcast, a black bastard in legitimate white Australia, a slave labourer who had seen his father in chains and had felt the stock whip around his own arse, despised from childhood, the most leperous outcast of them all, a Marcusian miracle who, illiterate as he was, could read all the signs of the affluent society and write black smoke signals in the Siver Tails' sky. 'You mob think you bin white fellas but you bin wrong; you black fellas like me, far as them Canberra mob bin concerned, you black fellas' ... He's summed it up, Chilla thought. (217–218).

The most outcast Australians, Hardy suggests, are the most 'truly' Australian.

At various times throughout the novel, the struggle between the outcasts and the ruling class and its active and passive supporters – between "the lurk men and Marcusian outcasts in one team, the lurk detectors and bureaucrats in the other" (124) – is explicitly represented as a struggle between the true inheritors of the Australian nationalist tradition, the salt of the earth, on one hand, and the greedy, malicious and twisted corrupters of this culture. "What follows", states the narrator early in the novel, "might be

more properly called victimisation of honest working men (the hottest case of it since they hung Ned Kelly)". (33) At a meeting of sanitary workers to decide whether or not to join the garbage workers' strike, "the thirty most loyal and strongest men in all Foolgarah, an ill-assortment of Australians, old and new", (93) gather. When the outcasts attack Scabby Jack Slyme's party, the "scene" on the "front patio" was "more Australian than Waltzing Matilda, a greater battle than the Eureka Stockade: if the miners at Eureka had fought as well as the insurgents at Nob Hill the history of Australia might have been different and the dream of the just cities in the great south land would have come true instead of the nightmare of the unjust cities". (203–204) Facing retaliation from the ruling class, via the police and the army, and having been informed of this coming attack by the Old Digger and Maoist New Left radical McKakie, "Chilla was drunk enough, fed up enough with the Silver Tails' world, and captured enough by the true spirit of Ned Kelly and the Anzacs to see plenty of sense in the warlike pronouncements of the said Digger and Commissar McKakie". (215) At the end of the novel, Chilla explicitly takes on the persona of Ned Kelly, wearing the fake armour that the Old Digger and Moss had found at the garbage tip. He somehow speaks the words that Kelly wrote in his famous Jerilderie letter. Returning "the Traps' fire, like Kelly in the old Glenrowan Hotel: 'We have been wronged,' he yelled, 'but we won't put up with your brutal and cowardly conduct. You are a parcel of big, ugly, fat-necked, wombat-headed, big-bellied, magpie-legged, narrow-hipped, splay-flooted sons of Irish Bailliffs or English Landlords". (230) "On the other side of the road", Hardy goes on, "the police dogs barked and the two-legged dingos howled at the sight of Australia's folk hero confronting them". (230–231) The final chapter takes place on Anzac Day; Hardy stressing, in a move reminiscent of Mark Twain, the irony of the official protectors of patriotism victimising those who most closely fit the patriotic ideal.

Hardy uses a great deal of alliteration and slang, including rhyming slang and strine, that fit with the Rabelaisian tone and that have a particular appeal within communities like those of Hardy's childhood, in which oral means of communication and entertainment and physical forms of work and activity are especially valued.[125] In keeping with the overall theme – that true Australians are politically radical and reject the dominant consumer culture – the novel's language makes it clear that this is a book for

common people. As with *The Unlucky Australians*, Hardy draws on traditional Australian mythology in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* as a means of attempting to directly influence the cultural and political direction of Australian society.

Conversely, *But the Dead are Many* does not affirm the core values and practices of Australian radical nationalism and instead explores the limitations of these things. As John Morel, one of the two central characters, asks: "Is mateship a nostalgic barrier to real communication in the present? If I could not tell Jack of my wish to die, what dreadful secrets was he keeping from me?" (20) In the novel, an Australian Legend character obviously based on Hardy tries to work out why his friend Morel committed suicide and why he, Jack, was unable to properly recognise his friend's feelings and stop him from doing this. Both men are Communists; Morel is most directly based on Hardy's friend Paul Mortier, a Party intellectual and 'true believer' who recruited Hardy during the Second World War and later ended his own life.[126] Jack and Hardy hope that in gaining an understanding of Morel's self-destructive act they will also gain an insight into the general experience of the Communists of Hardy's Stalinist generation: "'I've been thinking lately that if the mystery of John's mind can be solved, perhaps we could explain the dilemmas confronting the generation of Communists born around the time of the Russian Revolution'". (43) Hardy was born in the year of the Russian revolution: 1917; and so too were Jack and John ("We were each the same age as the Russian Revolution" [19]).

In his two previous major literary works Hardy identified groups who embodied what he sees as the core features of the culture of the Australian Legend, groups who directly represented that legendary tradition and directly and indirectly fought against the ruling class. The existence of these groups provides Hardy with the basis for a degree of optimism within an overarching pessimism induced by a clear-eyed analysis of the social conditions. But there is no such group in *But the Dead are Many*. Here, Hardy does not focus on culturally 'pure', authentic or 'organic' inheritors of the Australian Legend, but on its self-proclaimed political inheritors, the Communists of Hardy's Stalinist generation.[127] In this sense the book has a more international frame of reference. And Hardy does not represent his subjects as morally or even ideologically superior to, or more advanced than, Australian society as a whole. In fact, it is made clear that even the

novel's 'heroes', the morally aware John Morel and the liberal-minded Jack, must be thought of as complicit in the heinous crimes of Stalin's Soviet regime. As Jack repeatedly states, quoting Jean-Paul Sartre: "I will take my epoch upon my shoulders and I will answer for it this day and forever". (291) The novel is, in part, a work of atonement. The tone is now sombre, reflective and downbeat rather than jocular, hearty and optimistic, as it had been throughout *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* and quite often in *The Unlucky Australians*.

Jack and John and the other Communists are also deeply flawed people in a personal sense; far from heroic. Morel is puritanical (his communism is presented as a substitute religion for the Catholicism he has abandoned), sexually immature and inadequate (being aroused by his wife's treating him like a baby and repeatedly unable to have intercourse with her), addicted to gambling and unable to handle money responsibly. He is unfaithful to his wife, a cuckold, and ultimately, of course, a suicide. Jack is also neurotic, being obsessed with Morel's suicide and suicide more generally, unsuccessful in sustaining love and marriage ("I felt the sterility of regret for the first time and was bitter against the world though I had only myself to blame" [220]), feeling ongoing guilt over his friend's death and, like Morel, complicit in the crimes of Stalin.

There is no clear 'enemy' of these people, unless that is themselves and their own political circle. Neither the Australian ruling class, nor the representatives and symbols of British or American imperialism, make a significant appearance. Hardy doesn't suggest that his subjects will be able to transform society for the better. The political project of communism, it is made clear, still stands in square one, having found no practical means forward: the Party now needs to "abandon old dogmas, methods and positions". (16)

Hardy is not trying to make a direct impact on Australian political life with this novel, as was the case with *The Unlucky Australians* and *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*. Influenced by George Orwell and more pronouncedly by Sartre, Hardy's primary concern is with the psychological causes and effects of Stalinism in Australia. Hardy referred to this work as "a Freudian-Marxist novel".[128] "The landscape of *But the Dead are Many*", summarises Adams, "is the unconscious mind".[129] The book is written in a high Modernist style and form, being concerned with the 'universal' themes of high art and structured as a musical fugue, with 'exposition', 'development', 'climax' and 'coda'

sections. There are Modernist allusions, such as to Eliot's 'The Waste Land'[130] (in comparison with the 'low-brow' allusions of *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*). Hardy sought an educated rather than working-class readership.[131]

Pauline Armstrong records the complaint of Mortier's wife Dulcie that the Hardy character, Jack, is portrayed as "much stronger, more together, more debonair, more gifted, more everything" than John/Paul.[132] This is an understandable response. The name 'Jack' connotes 'Jack the lad' and 'I'm alright Jack', being the archetypal name of the common man (hence the *faux* working-class union official of *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*: 'Call-Me-Jack-Wrorter'). Jack, is confident, outgoing, relaxed, vernacular, funny, irreverent, most at home in the pub, well liked by other men, a desired mate. He is also very masculine, in a traditional gender sense, being attracted and attractive to women (and well endowed sexually), though unwilling to be 'trapped' in a relationship. Morel is depicted in the novel as a slave to his sense of justice, a person who subjects his ego to his principles to an unhealthy degree ('Morel', pointedly, may be a homophone of 'moral'). He is depicted as the ostensible opposite of Jack. Where Jack leans towards the sociopathic, at least publicly, John is profoundly neurotic. He is anxious, insular, ever serious, easily rattled and concerned by others' views, especially their views of him, he uses a formal register of speech that keeps him from being at one with 'the common man', and isn't a particularly desired or respected drinking-circle member. He is also a "puritan". (20) Where Jack seems to be both completely flippant with money and to always have it, John worries about it and is unable to stop himself from losing it through compulsive gambling. Jack is dismissive of the Party hierarchy and its attempts at authoritarianism and intimidation, but John is concerned to try to do what is ultimately right, irrespective of what effect this might have on himself. Jack is a creative and productive writer, but John's writing creativity is hindered by an inability to be comfortable on his own for sustained periods.

But in contrast to earlier Australian Legend archetypes in Hardy's fiction, and especially Chilla, Jack also suffers anxiety, recognises the shallowness of his relations with other men, is not fulfilled, emotionally, by his relations with women, and beneath the matey veneer is often unhappy: – "my whole character", he states in a strongly autobiographical section, "was shaped by ... anxiety". (264)[133] He is wracked with guilt

about his inability to recognise the suffering of his friend and to stop his suicide, about his felt complicity with the crimes of Stalin, and about his handling of his relationships with women: "Yes, guilt comes into it", he says of his reasons for wanting to write about Morel. There is also a good deal of Hardy in Morel: the strict Catholic upbringing, the ongoing concern with social justice, the gambling and inability to handle money 'wisely', and the obsession with suicide.[134] If Morel is primarily based on Mortier, he is also based on Hardy, and can even be considered a representation of Hardy's insular, serious, morally concerned, anxious side; just as Jack is a representation of his Billy Borker persona. As Patrick White, in *The Solid Mandala*, created characters based on his understanding of the two sides of his own character, so too Hardy has divided his character and personality into its two main sides, and in representing these two characters and their relationship seeks to deal with his internal psychological division and conflict. Jack and John are, for example, repeatedly referred to as being like twins:

> People said that Jack and I were like brothers or even twins ... Jack had a
> sense of ironic humour which I lacked and an air of not giving a damn
> about what anyone thought or said of him (the pride of a great sinner, he
> called it). Yet I sometimes wondered if the difference between us was
> merely the masks we wore. (19)

Near the end of the novel Jack psychologically and symbolically merges with John, being twice startled by an image in the mirror of someone he at first thinks is John: "I started back as a I caught sight of him. He was smiling the depressive's smile, his eyes reflecting agony beyond human endurance, torment that is infinite, anguish that so terrifies the spirit as to be unsupportable. But he was not really there – again it was only a trick with mirrors". (285)

This is an urban novel, far removed from the traditional subject matter of the 1890s Australian realist style, but with the exception of the love-making scenes it 'sounds' more immediately honest, contemporary and realistic than his preceding works of this period:

> I parked outside Central Station and searched my brief-case for copy paper
> and pen.
> > 'The moon was full, stars littered the sky, but for him the night was
> dark,' I found myself writing, although the sun was shining; and the ball
> point shaped the looped letters like a hangman's noose. 'As each debt had

been manipulated by a new lie another channel of escape was cut off – and he knew he would have to die.' (11)

This realism is emphasised by the first person narration (though Hardy uses third and second-person narration also) and by the honest, introspective tone of the two narrators, Morel and Jack.

Hardy's previously evident hope that the culture of the Australian Legend might serve to reconnect the (broadly conceived) Australian working class with radical politics, via the example of the Northern Territory Aborigines and the social outcasts of 'Foolgarah', has now disappeared. At the end of the novel, Jack has not even reached a conclusion as to the reasons for Morel's death or what broader social significance this act might have: "I tried to rationalise: a book's validity might be enhanced by the lack of control the author has over it, by the assertion of its own inner logic and progression. But my conviction, even my belief in the importance of the theme, had been dissipated". (287)

The Death of the Legend and the Defeat of Whitlam

Australian society was by the 1970s so urbanised that a culture with its origins in 'the bush' could only be self-consciously or ironically subscribed to by the urban majority. 'Community' itself was undermined by the process of postwar suburbanisation, which was by the 1970s well under way.[135] Working-class communities built up around mostly inner-city heavy industries were being moved by government directive and market forces out onto suburban blocks, to make way for the newly dominant finance sector arm of Capital.[136] More complex forms of mechanisation result in a relative decline in primary-industry and manufacturing employment. As class conflict was becoming more mediated by mechanisation, and production processes becoming less physical and direct, traditional notions of mateship and rugged forms of masculinity, shaped in these working conditions, became less obviously useful.[137] Racially diverse postwar immigration and the multiculturalist policies of Whitlam and Immigration Minister Al Grassby meant that the notion of a culturally united or homogenous 'people's' culture seemed less realistic. New social movements for racial, gender and sexual equity similarly cast doubt on the political value of radical nationalism.

At the same time, one important result of a generally increasing conglomeration and concentration of capital was the 'squeezing out' of alternative sources of media and cultural production, a process pointed to by Hardy in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* as a vital means by which the ruling class established effective social control. Radical and trade union publications and broadcasts had shrunken almost to invisibility.[138] A significant element of this process was the commodification of the traditional culture of the Australian Legend.[139] 'Ockerism' and the more soulful depictions of 'bushmen', which both became so prominent within Australian film, television, radio, sport, publishing and advertising during the 1970s, were essentially depoliticised versions of the traditional Australian folk culture.

These complex cultural and social changes are especially evident in the portrayal of class conflict in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*. The final clash, in which the working-class and ruling-class characters come together in direct confrontation, necessarily has little connection with reality, or realism. In order to portray modern class conflict Hardy has had to use comic literary devices that 'normalise' these two groups coming together. Australian workers, even his 'outsiders', are generally not militant in a truly revolutionary way, or willing to engage in real guerilla warfare. Similarly, the culture of the Australian Legend is not so strong or so at odds with the dominant culture that it could genuinely inspire the righteous anger of Ned Kelly, which Hardy draws upon in Chilla's final speech. As Geoffrey Dutton wrote in a 1965 assessment of 'Up the Garbos', the novel's earlier draft, "The ending has worried me a bit ... there is rather an out-of-date vaudeville aroma to the Silver Tails' party".[140] The attenuated and protracted processes through which class power operates and ideology impacts upon culture, within modern capitalist society, represent a major challenge to an author wishing to dramatise this relationship in a serious, realist portrayal, such as that carried out by Hardy in 1950's *Power Without Glory*. The idealisation of a heroic form of masculinity, such as that embodied by Chilla, can only seem impossibly romantic.

Viewed sequentially, Hardy's major works of the Whitlam period reveal his growing conviction that the way of life and structure of feeling of traditional Australian radical nationalism no longer exist; or at least no longer exist on a scale that would enable social transformation. As early as 1 January 1969, Hardy writes in his diary: "Must take a

more critical attitude to ... the limited and dubious nature of Australian anarchic egalitarianism".[141] In Hardy's account, there are two major external sources of this social and cultural change. The first is the politics and ideology of British and European imperialism, which led the white Australian working class to identify with the white establishment, the imperialist project and the capitalist system, rather than with the victims of these forces. This first source is examined in *The Unlucky Australians*. The second is the politics and ideology of the affluent society, modern consumer capitalism, which leads working-class Australians to the belief that legitimate social conflict, like manual labour, is a thing of the past, that personal liberation comes not through political struggle, but through consumption, that the point of human existence is not political emancipation, but individual wealth. This is examined in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*.

If the first ideology emanates from Britain and is transmitted to Australia from that imperial nation, the second ideology emanates primarily from the US. In this Hardy's most basic beliefs about the cultural direction of his society are consistent with those of Patrick White, though as with White, it should be noted, Hardy's modern, consumerist Australians are not unwilling victims of American individualism and greed, any more than they have been unwilling victims of imperialism. Neither Hardy nor White are mindless nationalists. In their portrayal, Australians' own moral and political failings are making them susceptible to this subtle colonisation. As Hardy argues in *The Unlucky Australians*, the "majority" of Australians "refer to the dreadful racial problems in the USA, as if all was well in Australia". (247) "White Australia, like White America", he goes on to say, "is a racist society that doesn't care a damn for the freedom of the coloured man". (247)

Though Hardy does not focus at length on the US, in either *The Unlucky Australians* or *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, this nation and its representatives appear from time to time and sit in the background of the narrative as an overarching cultural, political and economic influence, as the fate awaiting Australia should contemporary trends continue. "The Yankees" first appear in *The Unlucky Australians* in a folk song, quoted by Hardy, that arose out of the major Mount Isa mining dispute:

> The Yankees came to Mt Isa town
> And tried to cut the contract down,
> But Pat Mackie made the going hard

> They gave him a Foots and he took a yard.
> The more they try to keep me down
> The better I live ... (8)

In Darwin the film-maker Cecil Holmes talks to Hardy about "the milking of mineral resources by American and other foreign interests". (12) Holmes himself "has been driven ... outside the film industry ... by the American takeover". (12) The Americans, we learn, have major interests in the Northern Territory cattle industry, while the Aborigines have none. (35, 132) Hardy subtly advances the Aborigine's case for land through implicitly questioning this state of affairs. He quotes, for instance, the Aboriginal leader Captain Major: "'them 'mericans (have) got some land in the Territory'. ''Bout time the Aborigines got some land 'stead a them foreigners'". (132) America and Americans, then, are involved in 'taking over' Australia and in exploiting it, just as the Mount Isa folk song hints at the modern, free-market economic imperialism that would become so characteristic of American-led global capitalism from the 1970s.

Similarly, in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, Australia is being taken over by Americans. New money is American money: "Here is your chance, laze and gem, to taste the flavour of Foolgarah civilisation, to be taken on a conducted tour of the old pub and the new Yankee-owned Chevron, and observe, in the various vulgar bars and taverns the finer divisions in the most divided society in the world". (49) There are also references to the appearance of "Colonel Sanders", (50) while the party of 'Nobs' at Nob Hill, near the end of the novel, includes not only the Queen of England but the US ambassador Elmer C. Yip Yap, junior. (190) In their manifest individualism, Americans are associated in the novel with shallowness, self-centredness and superficiality ("All Lady Cynthia [Dagg] needs now is a direct representative of Her and she'd have the set. And here it is, The Tiger of Bengal himself, dressed up like a pox doctor's clerk, wearing more medals than an American general, though he never saw a shot fired in any war"), (191) as well as with self-righteousness, as in the reference to a Billy Graham crusade. (82) In *The Outcasts of Foolgarah* Hardy opposes an earthy traditional Australianness against a saccharine, trendy, Americanised Australianness.

The politically conservative and those who don't know any better, those with no sense of Australia's unique history and culture, ape the Americans, impressed by their

military, economic and cultural dominance. In *The Unlucky Australians* Hardy writes for example that in the face of the American "takeover", Australia is "indifferent" to its film makers. (12) Jack Meaney, as "a good white Territorian" one of "the best men in the world", replies to Hardy's quoting of Marx ('While black men are in chains no white men can be free'): "'He's bloody right, too, but you can't tell these boneheads who work on the cattle stations. I never met one of 'em yet who ever had a Union ticket. They all fancy themselves as Yankee cowboys. If petrified goat shit was imported from America they'd eat it for lollies'". (49) Tom Uren, "a man of athletic appearance", which Hardy associates with wholesomeness, and "rare idealism amongst modern politicians", (228) sends Hardy a telegram saying "'I am proud of your Australianism'", (228) after Hardy had told a story on the radio "satirising the Yankee wrestling bouts"; (228) the implicit suggestion from Uren being that most Australians are not standing up to the Americanisation of Australia. Hardy's feelings of emotional jadedness and political dispiritedness derive, we are told, from the fact that: "Compassion becomes blunted when wasted on people working for two bosses, overtime serving God and Mammon, affluent from the profits of genociding, all the way with LBJ, beating the little yellow bastards up there before they come down here". (19) Serving 'mammon', being ruled by greed, Hardy suggests, goes hand in hand with going 'all the way with LBJ'.

So too in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, the Astronauts Bar contains a mural depicting "Neil Armstrong and the other Yank astronouts", while there are "no Russians ... needless to say". (51) Borky thinks of the Australian government as "the lackeys of Yankee imperialism at Canberra". (100–101) Prime Minister Sneed Hearn is planning on replacing the national anthem 'God save Her' with "the Star Spangled Banner played as a Waltzing Matilda with Tricky Dick". (142)[142] Later he refers to "'my remark in Washington that we will go Waltzing Matilda with our gallant American Allies'", which he claims was "misunderstood". (204) Despite his claims to love Australian culture, such as Paterson's 'Waltzing Matilda', he is in fact a follower of America. The New Left radical McKakie burns a Union Jack and an American flag on the Foolgarah Council steps, symbolising his Maoist opposition to Australia's subservience to these nations.[143] During the final confrontation, McKakie diagnoses: "'the forces of the bureaucratic state

are mobilising, the running dogs of Yankee imperialism have taken off their democratic mask and are preparing to go over to naked force.'" (218)

Throughout both of these works, America is associated with the future – modernity – thanks to its capital base, its technological advantages, its aggressive political and economic expansionism and the pervasiveness of its cultural products. Hardy's analysis of contemporary class struggle, for example, is based on an analysis of what is taking place in America:

> The affluent society team (white) embark on a favoured gambit to try to build the effluent society team (black) into its own structure, to join it, or put its king in check. They invited Chilla to be interviewed on the television. This is known as the classical repressive tolerance gambit, perfected by the American champions, Johnson and Nixon: you catch an opponent off guard by friendly, innocent moves until he joins your team or is so immobilised as to be unable to attack. (*Outcasts*, 125)

Even when he attempts to think about an alternative Australian future, Hardy still looks to the US to see what it might look like: "Stokely Carmichael, the American advocate of Black Power, said: 'The United States is going to fall. I only hope to see the day.' Some day an Aboriginal Australian will arise and say: 'White Australia will fall.'" (*Unlucky Australians*, 248) It is also worth remembering that Pat Mackie, the union leader idealised in 'The Yankees' folk song, was an American influenced by the politics of the IWW, an organisation founded in the US. If his largely pessimistic analysis of Australian society, culture and politics is based on an understanding of what is happening in the US, and a belief that Australia is in the process of being colonised, this understanding is itself indebted to analysis emanating from America, namely that of the expatriate 'Frankfurt school' and Marcuse in particular.

Conclusion

It seems likely that Whitlam's ALP benefited from the 'in vogue' nature of Australian nationalism and folk culture during the 1960s and early 70s, but that when social conditions changed, the fact that this culture was by now *only* a fashion, something to be bought and consumed, meant that the Whitlam government's association with this fashion could easily be a liability. By 1975 Hardy no longer has hopes that members of

the Australian working class or other 'keepers' of the culture of the Australian Legend will bring about a just society. His recognition that the traditional culture of the Australian Legend was both complicit in British-Australian imperialism and corrupted and degraded by a ruling class which, thanks primarily to the mass media, now seemed to have greater political and cultural control than ever before, leads him to abandon his role as spokesperson for that traditional Australian culture, and into a more profoundly introspective literary project: *But the Dead are Many*. As Hardy's support for Whitlam was significant, revealing a degree of compatibility between traditional British-Australian and nationalist-Australian cultures, Hardy's description of the destruction of his culture and of his own alienation within Australian society is also significant, suggesting that by the mid-1970s this traditional Australian culture was no longer a meaningful source of political support for Whitlam.

This then helps to explain the electorate's rejection of Whitlam in 1975. If voters responded to shifting relations of power they also responded to an altered Australian structure of feeling. Whitlam's tears at the 1994 celebration of Hardy's life were in all likelihood influenced by a sense that Hardy was an iconic figure, that his death marked an end to the social existence of the tradition he advanced; and perhaps there was an element of sadness for himself as well, as a person who had hoped to build politically on this tradition. As Yallop observed: "In the packed hall a woman from the Tenants [sic] Union, Sandra Badova, had come to pay tribute to a dying breed. 'That ideology, defending the working class, they're all dying out now. It's all about the individual now."[144]

To return once more to Raymond Williams, and his analysis of the general relationship between culture, politics and society, the case of Hardy reveals again the political significance of artistic production, but also art's ultimate dependence on a valuing community, the fact that the political effectiveness of the artist is constrained by his or her need to ensure that the art has value as art, or culture, that it is an accurate, honest or authentic representation of the structure of feeling of a valuing community and not simply political propaganda. The artist is not able to impose political values within a community. As a particular community breaks down or is dispersed, so too are its traditions and politics, and the political power of its art.

[1] Brett's Anglocentric Protestant liberalism is dominant for most of the twentieth century in a political sense. This "liberal political tradition", Brett writes in 2003, "has been central to Australian politics since Federation". *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class*, p.viii. Australian radical nationalism was generally leftist, or at least labourist, in its political sympathies, though there are right-wing manifestations, as in the thought of P.R. Stephenson. As Richard White notes, part of this Australian nationalism is a generally working-class willingness to look to America as a civilisation model and a provider of popular forms of cultural entertainment: "Quite early in the century, the focus of the images, codes and forms of popular culture switched from Britain to the United States ... For most of the twentieth century Australia has had two cultures which can be distinguished not just by 'quality' or self-consciousness or class identification, but also quite clearly by their distinct British and American sources". 'A Backwater Awash', pp.111, 112. For a recent account of popular right-wing Australian radical nationalism see Phil Griffiths, 'Racism: Whitewashing the Class Divide', in Rick Kuhn, ed., *Class and Struggle in Australia*, Pearson, Frenchs Forest, 2005, pp.159–175.

[2] *The Unlucky Australians*, Thomas Nelson, Melbourne, 1968; *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, Allara Publishing, Melbourne, 1971; *But the Dead are Many*, The Bodley Head, Sydney, 1975. Subsequent page references will be in brackets.

[3] Russel Ward, *The Australian Legend* (1958), (second edn) Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1966.

[4] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.1. "The phrase, the Australian legend", writes Richard Nile, "was popularised in the middle part of the twentieth century by the historian, Russel Ward". 'Introduction', Richard Nile, ed., *The Australian Legend and its Discontents*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2000, p.4.

[5] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.1.

[6] "*The Australian Legend* ... does, as the title suggests, try to trace and explain the development of the Australian self-image – of the often romanticised and exaggerated stereotype in men's minds of what the *typical*, not the *average*, Australian likes (or in some cases *dis*likes) to believe he [sic] is like. Typical and not average because, in the nature of things, such a national self-image can be built only on those character-traits which differ most dramatically from the general English-speaking, or even European, norm. The average Australian is necessarily much more like the average American than is the typical Australian like his opposite number. If it be conceded that Englishmen and Americans and Australians do differ in certain ways, in their modes of pronouncing their common language for instance, surely it is clear that we shall never identify these 'typical' or characteristic differences by concentrating our attention on the much more numerous and important traits which men [sic] of these nationalities hold in common". Ward, 'Foreword to the Second Edition', *The Australian Legend*, pp.vi–vii.

[7] Ibid., pp.1–2.

[8] As the *Oxford English Dictionary* suggests, the noun 'legend' ("traditional story, myth, such literature or tradition") is a synonym of 'myth'.

[9] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.281.

[10] Ibid., pp.1, 13.

[11] Ward, 'Foreword', *The Australian Legend*, p.viii.

[12] *The Australian Legend and its Discontents* essay collection, for example, is according to its editor "anchored" by Ward's *The Australian Legend*. Nile, 'Introduction', p.7.

[13] White, *Inventing Australia*, p.154.

[14] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.6.

[15] Ibid., p.13.

[16] Ibid., p.11.

[17] Ibid., p.12.

[18] Ibid., p.1.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid., p.10. On this social category see also Ian Turner, *Industrial Labour and Politics*, Australian National University, Canberra, 1965.

[21] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.2.

[22] Ibid., p.11.

[23] Ibid., p.11.

[24] Ibid., p.10.

[25] Of Buckley's arguments John McLaren writes that he "challenged the whole accepted Australian tradition of realism". 'Bad Tempered Democrats, Biased Australians: Socialist Realism, *Overland* and the Australian Legend', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 2003, p.59. He is referring to Buckley's articles: 'Towards An Australian Literature', *Meanjin* 18:1, 1959, pp.59–68; and 'Utopianism and Vitalism in Australian Literature', *Quadrant* 3:10, 1959, pp.39–51. The essays collected in John Carroll, ed., *Intruders in the Bush: The Australian Quest for Identity* (second edn, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1992), comprise a politically conservative attack on the standard leftist interpretation of this tradition. Humphrey McQueen establishes his influential critique of the radical nationalist version of the legend in *A New Britannia: An Argument Concerning the Social Origins of Australian Radicalism and Nationalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1970. On the Australian New Left, often termed the student New Left, see Richard Gordon and Warren Osmond, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in Richard Gordon, ed., *The Australian New Left: Critical Essays and Strategy*, William Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970, pp.3–39; and John Docker, '"Those Halcyon Days": The Moment of the New Left', in Head and Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements and Australian Society*, pp.289–307. Richard White criticises Ward's treatment of the legend in *Imagining Australia*. Marilyn Lake sets out an influential feminist critique of Australian radical nationalism in 'Identifying the Masculinist Context', *Historical Studies* 22, 1986, pp.116–131.

[26] To the extent that Australia was founded as part of a wider imperialist enterprise, it was founded on a wider exploitation of non-white peoples. For a concise explanation of this transnational capitalist process see R.W. Connell and T.H. Irving, 'Yes, Virginia, There is a Ruling Class', in Mayer and Nelson, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, pp.81–92.

[27] McLaren notes that the three stories Hardy published in *Overland* "demonstrate both the populism and the political commitment that Hardy shared with the journal". 'Bad Tempered Democrats, Biased Australians', p.54. In a less generous assessment, Jack Beasley draws attention to the extent to which Hardy self-consciously adopted a 'legendary' persona. See 'The Hero of My Own Life. Frank Hardy: Fame Without Glory', in Beasley, *Red Letter Days: Notes From Inside an Era*, Australasian Book Society, Sydney, 1979, pp.53–95.

[28] Paul Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne: Frank Hardy ~ A Literary Biography 1944–1975*, University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands, 1999, p.16; and see Pauline Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 2000, p.9.

[29] Delys Bird, 'New Narrations: Contemporary Fiction', in Webby, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, p.185.

[30] Bird, 'New Narrations', p.185.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, 'Introduction', *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, p.17 (emphasis in original). Though they suggest that Hardy's growing popular reputation is "in spite of academic neglect" it also seems possible that Hardy's distance from the Academy may have added to his popular status.

[33] Armstrong describes the series as a "triumph for the ABC". *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.174. Jenny Hocking elaborates: "*Power Without Glory* ... was comprehensively the ABC's highest rating program for the year [of 1976] with an average series rating of 29, and with even higher ratings in Melbourne. The consistency and size of this result was unprecedented. That year *Power Without Glory* dominated the film and television awards in every category – the Television Society of Australia gave it four Penguins (Best Director, Best Scriptwriter, Best Supporting Actor and Best Supporting Actress); it gained Best Drama Series, Best Actress, Best Supporting Actor at the Australian Television and Film Awards ... The ABC repeated the series in 1978 before selling it to the Ten Network, which also screened it twice". *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, Lothian, South Melbourne, 2005, pp.200–201.

[34] See Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.164.

[35] See Amanda Lohrey, 'Political Larrikin' (review of Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory), *Overland* 162, 2001, p.95.

[36] Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of Power Without Glory*, p.183.

[37] Quoted in Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of Power Without Glory*, p.183.

[38] Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of Power Without Glory*, p.2.

[39] Richard Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins Farewell Hardy', the *Age*, 5 February 1994, p.1.

[40] Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins'.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid.

[46] See Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, pp.15–34; and Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, pp.1–21. Nicholas Jose suggests: "There had always been those Australians whose affinity with the Irish, by birth or maltreatment, made them resist English supremacy". 'Cultural Identity', in Graubard, *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, p.313.

[47] This area of Victoria had seen major industrial unrest in the late nineteenth century and was still politically radical until at least the second decade of the twentieth. See Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, pp.24–25.

[48] As Adams writes, "working men passed many of their 'set piece' yarns on to their sons as a traditional patriarchal skill". *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.21.

[49] Ibid., p.18.

[50] See Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.24; Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.4. On the IWW see Verity Burgmann, *Revolutionary Industrial Unionism: The Industrial Workers of the World in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1995.

[51] Many of Hardy's stories were re-worked versions of ones he had first heard from his father. In his 'Author's Note' to *The Yarns of Billy Borker*, for example, he writes: "I have often been asked where the stories came from. Billy Borker's answer to that is, of course, that they are really his father's stories. In my own case, that's part of the answer, too, for the first and best Australian yarn-spinner I ever heard was my father Tom Hardy" (*The Yarns of Billy Borker* (1965), Mandarin, Port Melbourne, 1992, p.150). And in his National Library of Australia 'Voices Off' interview Frank states how his father has come to symbolise for him the ideal member of a broader, radical working-class culture: "My actual father died more than thirty years ago before I became a writer, and I have idealised his quite remarkable personality, opinions and life to a degree where he is ... no longer a person but a personage who lives in the realm of art, a character playing a role in my writings, where he possesses the qualities I most admire in a man, militancy, bordering on anarchy, a gambler's flair, eccentric opinions" (Quoted in Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.31). Tom Hardy has clearly become a comparable figure to Ward's 'typical' Australian bushman. On the influence of the yarn model in Hardy's literary work see especially Adams' chapter 'Division and Connection in the Journey from Bacchus Marsh to Melbourne', in *The Stranger from Melbourne*, pp.15–34.

[52] Cited in Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.148.

[53] Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins Farewell Hardy'.

[54] As John McLaren writes: "The writing and publication of Hardy's *Power Without Glory*, and its subsequent trial, constitute in a microcosm the doomed attempt to establish in Australia the structures of an alternative working-class culture that would provide the basis for a socialist society". *Writing in Hope and Fear: Literature as Politics in Postwar Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1996, p.5.

[55] See Hardy, *The Hard Way*, T. Werner Laurie Ltd., London, 1961, and Ian Syson, 'Out from the Shadows: The Realist Writers' Movement 1944–1970, and Communist Cultural Discourse', *Australian Literary Studies* 15, 1992, pp.333–338.

[56] Founding directors were Seelaf, Joe Waters, Clive Buchett, Marjorie Roe and Bill Wannan. See Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.62. See also Hardy, *The Hard Way* and for an alternative interpretation of the history of the ABS see Jack Beasley, 'The Australasian Book Society', in his *Red Letter Days*, pp.129–168.

[57] Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.61. Lowenstein founded the Folklore Society of Victoria with Ian Turner.

[58] Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.30.

[59] Probably the only person whose understanding of the fact that a working-class culture is dependent on a working-class way of life (including a working-class mode of production) was comparable to that of Hardy was George Seelaf, the central figure linking 'worker' and 'community' arts. See Nathan Hollier, 'Nourishing Labourist Culture: A Report on a New Left-wing Writing and Reading Festival and a Discussion of its Antecedents', in Robert Hood and Ray Markey, eds, *Labour and Community:*

Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference of the ASSLH, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, Illawarra Branch, Wollongong, 1999, pp.224–230.

[60] "Social nationalism had made a revival in the 'cult of ockerism', in advertising, the culture of drunken male cricket fans, Paul Hogan's rewriting of the battler icon and the ironic *The Adventures of Barry McKenzie* (1968)". Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.111.

[61] Alomes, *A Nation at Last*, p.238.

[62] Parshal is also spelt 'Parshall' in the novel.

[63] An influential example is Claus Offe, 'The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation', in L. Lindberg, R.R. Alford, C. Crouch and C. Offe, eds, *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, Lexington Books, Lexington, 1975, pp.125–144.

[64] Robert Catley and Bruce McFarlane, *From Tweedledum to Tweedledee. The New Labor Government in Australia: A Critique of its Social Model*, Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1974.

[65] "In June, 1969, the fifth version of this novel came to be written. Two events, apparently unrelated to it or to each other, influenced the shape it began to take: a grant I had obtained from the Commonwealth Literary Funds was vetoed by Billy Sneddon [sic] (acting on behalf of Prime Minister, Gorton), and I read Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*. The veto was the last in a long series of events which changed me from a positive Communist critic of Australian society to a man alienated from it; and Marcuse's book convinced me that the revolutionary must step outside of capitalist society else he will be disarmed by its repressive tolerance". Hardy, 'Author's Note', *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, p.238. The correct spelling is 'Billie Snedden'.

[66] See Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.90.

[67] Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.463–464.

[68] Ibid., pp.470–471.

[69] Ibid., p.471.

[70] Stephanie Peatling, 'Land Rights Movement Born with 5000-acre Claim', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 January 1999, p.6. For a more authoritative account see Lyn Riddett, 'The Strike that Became a Land Movement: A Southern "Do-Gooder" Reflects on Wattie Creek 1966–1974', *Labour History* 72, 1997, pp.50–65.

[71] Quoted in Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.176.

[72] Quoted in Hocking, Ibid., p.177.

[73] 'Billy Borker' was an 'Australian legend' character Hardy created. As Borker Hardy wrote and performed 'yarns', including on ABC TV. "Borker", writes Bruce Bennett, "was Hardy's alter ego – a knockabout, irreverent, larrikin con-man with a broad Aussie accent who frequented race-tracks and bars. Borker's genealogy in Australian culture extends back through Lawson and the *Bulletin* to the convicts and itinerant bush workers of Russel Ward's *The Australian Legend*". Bennett, *Australian Short Fiction: A History*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2002, p.5.

[74] See Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, p.464.

[75] Bain Attwood, *Rights for Aborigines*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, 2003, p.296.

[76] Attwood, *Rights for Aborigines*, p.346.

[77] Hardy, *The Unlucky Australians*, p.122, and see for Bryant's reading p.133.

[78] Ibid., p.192.

[79] Ibid., p.214.

[80] Ibid., p.234.

[81] Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.212.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] For accounts of these celebrations see Mike Seccombe, 'Aborigines Dance to the Footnotes of History', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 August 1991, p.6; and Chips Mackinolty, 'The Birth of Land Rights Remembered', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 August 1991, p.15.

[85] Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins Farewell Hardy', p.1.

[86] Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.225.

[87] Attwood, *Rights for Aborigines*, p.265.

[88] Mike Seccombe, 'Aborigines Dance to the Footnotes of History'.

[89] This followed an earlier split within the Party induced by the breakdown of relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. For concise accounts of these splits see McLaren, *Writing in Hope and Fear*, p.179; and Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.86.

[90] Hardy, *The Unlucky Australians*, pp.45, 75.

[91] Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.176.

[92] "Donald Horne, then editor of *The Bulletin*, told me that Gough Whitlam had said in a speech that fascists could obtain literary grants, but not communists. I rang Whitlam from Horne's office and he told me that the Commonwealth Literary Fund committee had indeed unanimously given me a grant. But at a meeting of the parliamentary committee which usually rubber-stamps the annual grants, made up that year of Billie Snedden, the then Minister for Immigration who was representing the Prime Minister, John Gorton, Gough Whitlam, as Leader of the Opposition, and Phil Lucock representing the Country Party, Snedden said: 'This grant to Hardy is not on. We are precluded from giving grants to communists or communist sympathisers.' Gough said he knew of no such provisions. Snedden insisted: 'There is a letter written by Menzies to this effect.' Whitlam said that he knew of no such letter and that the grant must stand. The bells rang and Whitlam went into the House believing the grant would stand. It didn't. Snedden instructed the Commonwealth Literary Fund board members that the grant was vetoed and another applicant should be chosen". Frank Hardy, 'ASIO & I', *Sydney Morning Herald* (*Spectrum*), 21 March 1992, p.41.

[93] See Whitlam, *The Whitlam Government*, pp.556–557.

[94] Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.180.

[95] See Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.225.

[96] See Hocking, ibid., pp.246, 249.

[97] Ibid., p.250.

[98] Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of Power Without Glory*, p.196.

[99] See Paul Genoni, 'Ruth Park and Frank Hardy: Catholic Realists', in Adams and Lee, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, pp.237–246.

[100] As James Cockington argues, "Although America and Britain also have their bastards, by (the 1950s) the word had evolved its uniquely Australian meaning. Depending on the tone of voice and the situation, bastard can be used as an insult, a compliment or a complimentary insult". 'How a Bastard of a Word Became Legit', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 April 1996, p.13.

[101] Cockington, 'How a Bastard of a Word Became Legit'.

[102] Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins Farewell Hardy'.

[103] Ibid.

[104] Cockington, 'How a Bastard of a Word Became Legit'.

[105] Quoted in Sam Weller, *Bastards I Have Met*, Sampal Investments, Charters Towers, 1976, p.86.

[106] David Marr writes that White "could never bear" Hardy. *Patrick White*, p.457. See also Phillip Adams' account of Hardy and White's first meeting, in Clayton Joyce, ed., *Patrick White: A Tribute*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, 1991, pp.41–42. White described Hardy's writing in a 21 February 1976 letter to Geoffrey Dutton as "unbearable stodge laced with cliché". See Marr, *Patrick White Letters*, p.470.

[107] See Hardy's reference to White and the "Patrick White Australia Policy" in his 'Author's Note' to *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, p.243, and his 11 October 1969 letter to *Southerly* editor G.A. Wilkes, quoted in Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.153. Hardy's homophobic attitudes, discussed elsewhere in this chapter, are most clearly evident in *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*.

[108] Hocking, *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.212. In Hardy's account of the lunch meeting with Horne he implies that the idea to found Citizens for Democracy was actually his: "When, at the end [of the lunch], Donald inscribed for me a copy of *Death of the Lucky Country* with 'It's a good idea' he was referring to a simple act of calling a public meeting to test the temperature of the political water, to see if, indeed, many thousands of people felt as we did". Hardy, 'The Most Democratic Constitution in the World?', in Sol Encel, Donald Horne and Elaine Thompson, eds, *Change the Rules! Towards a Democratic Constitution*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1977, p.183.

[109] Hardy, 'The Most Democratic Constitution in the World?', pp.183–189.

[110] Frank Hardy, *The Obsession of Oscar Oswald*, Pascoe Publishing, Carlton, 1983; Patrick White, *Three Uneasy Pieces*, Pascoe Publishing, Carlton, 1987.

[111] Allusions to Orwell's *1984* recur throughout the novel. These three phases of Hardy's writing correspond with phases of his personal life. See Nathan Hollier, 'Frank Hardy and Australian Working-Class Masculinity', in Adams and Lee, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, pp.221–236.

[112] According to Nile, people like Hardy, who broadly fit with the characteristics of Ward's legendary Australian, "are celebrated as being distinctively Australian only when the subject is unambiguously white and male. No? Imagine, then, just for a moment, a switch in subject. Imagine 'shock jocks' of talk back radio, 'You know what I mean', deploying Ward's paradigm to describe an Aboriginal man ... The Indigenous Australian: has little regard for the rule of law; is unreliable in employment and prone to go walkabout; abuses alcohol; is dishonest and violent; is reluctant to enter into confidence outside his own kind for whom he will lie even when he knows that they are wrong". 'Introduction', *The Australian Legend and its Discontents*, p.5.

[113] This assessment is not without foundation. Keith McConnochie, David Hollinsworth and Jan Pettman write that in the 1967 referendum which led to Aborigines being given full citizenship rights, "the necessary referendum was endorsed ... . receiving a record 'Yes' vote of 89.34%". But "this overall result obscures the regional variations where the higher the proportion of Aborigines in an area, the lower was support in favour of the referendum". *Race and Racism in Australia*, Social Science Press, Wentworth Falls, 1996, p.125.

[114] Humphrey McQueen, 'Reply to Russel Ward', *Overland* 48, 1971, p.22. Ward had criticised McQueen's *A New Britannia*, and its treatment of the arguments of *The Australian Legend* more specifically, in the previous issue of the magazine: Russel Ward, 'Britannia Australis', *Overland* 47, 1971, pp.47–49.

[115] McQueen, 'Reply to Russel Ward', p.22. As Stuart Macintyre notes, "Racism was grounded in imperial as well as national sentiment, for the champions of the Empire proclaimed the unity of the white race over the yellow and the black ... Australians did not invent this crude xenophobic terminology – it was, after all, an imperial bard who warned of 'lesser breeds without the law' – but their inclination to overlook the multiracial composition of the Empire was a domestic indulgence that only a dutiful Dominion could afford". *A Concise History of Australia*, p.142.

[116] The reference to being "whisked away by the willy-willys when the wind was wild" is an allusion to Dorothy Hewett's poem 'Clancy and Dooley and Don McLeod', dealing with the 1 May 1946 walk-off of Aboriginal cattle-station workers in the Pilbara region of Western Australia, first published in her 1963 collection of poems co-written with Merv Lilley: *What About the People!* (The Realist Writer Group, Melbourne).

[117] Cf. the representation of the heroic 'Stranger' in Hardy's short story 'The Stranger from Melbourne': "He was tall, almost six feet. He wore dungaree trousers and a faded print shirt. His clothes were speckled lime-white, except where his trousers and boots had been in the water. He had washed his face and hands, but lime-dust was coated on his arms and neck and in his hair. It is difficult to say now how old he would have been. He looked pretty old to me at the time. Probably he was in his early forties. He was lean and fair-skinned. Curly, blond hair grew on his forearms and chest. The wrinkle lines around his eyes and mouth were cheerful but hardening into grimness, as though he'd seen and suffered much in his time". Hardy, *Legends from Benson's Valley*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1984, p.234.

[118] Grahame Johnston includes *The Unlucky Australians* in his *Annals of Australian Literature*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1970; a listing of "the principal publications of each year" from 1789; as do Joy Hooton and Harry Heseltine in their *Annals of Australian Literature* (second edn), Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1992.

[119] The book is for example listed as non-fiction in Martin Duwell, Marianne Ehrhardt and Carol Hetherington, eds, *The ALS Guide to Australian Writers: A Bibliography 1963–1995* (second edn), University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1997, and in Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of Power Without Glory*. Adams says "*The Unlucky Australians* attempts what might be thought of as a complex synthesis between oral, realist and modernist narratives". *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.104. Hocking sees the text as "a highly structured mix of documentary and fictionalised representation". *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, p.168.

[120] As McLaren notes, "the new journalism ... first appeared in the fortnightlies, the *Observer* and *Nation*, and then in the dailies, led by the *Australian*". *Writing in Hope and Fear*, p.13.

[121] Attwood, *Rights for Aborigines*, pp.187–190, 260–282.

[122] As Hardy outlines in his 'Author's Note' to *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, a short initial version of the novel was written (as 'Up the Garbos') in 1956; a second version was written in 1958; a third version was

written in 1965 but Hardy couldn't find a publisher willing to risk Australia's censorship laws; a fourth version was complete by 1966 but the censorship laws remained a problem; a fifth version was prepared in 1969, and it was this version that finally found a publisher and appeared in 1971.

[123] Again however, Hardy is explicitly and implicitly critical of Australian racism: explicitly through the portrayal of the racism experienced by Tom Mangiari Tinkler Junior, an Aboriginal character obviously derived from Hardy's encounter with the Northern Territory Aborigines, and in his critical portrayal of the conservative parties' "black, white and brindle [white Australia] policy"; and implicitly through the positive portrayal of Luigi, the Italian immigrant and rock-solid unionist.

[124] Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.115.

[125] On the influence of working-class oral culture on Hardy's work see Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, especially pp.31–32.

[126] For an account of the two men's relationship see Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, pp.170–182.

[127] As Chris Lee writes, "During and after the Second World War, the Communist Party of Australia (CPA) deployed the radical tradition for its own processes of promotion and self-definition". *City Bushman: Henry Lawson and the Australian Imagination*, Curtin University Books, Fremantle, 2004, p.120. David Carter explains further: "Cultural nationalism was reasserted by the CPA in the early 1950s when it announced an 'Australian Path to Socialism'. The 'patriotic war' against fascism had already produced an 'intense communist identification with Australian nationalism', but by the early 1950s the political and institutional meanings of reasserting cultural nationalism had changed significantly". Radical nationalism was at this time "stronger and more mainstream than ever before". This "meant that communist writers could now position themselves at the centre of a progressive tradition rather than at the radical margins, as heirs to a tradition rather than avant-garde provocateurs". Carter, 'The Story of Our Epoch, A Hero of Our Time: The Communist Novelist in Postwar Australia', in Adams and Lee, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, p.92 (the quotation is from Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.15).

[128] Quoted in Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.137.

[129] Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.137.

[130] See for example: "Unemployed and unemployable outcasts ... rattle their bones in the cupboards of the affluent society". *But the Dead are Many*, p.15.

[131] It should be noted though that the choice of the fugue structure was not arbitrary: Hardy apparently wanted to show that Morel's suicide was part of an elaborate attempt to *orchestrate* personal and social understandings of his life, to gain, in death, the control of his life that he had been unable to obtain while living. As Jack asks, "Did he at last see that (his wife Penelope) was, like the rest of us, merely a voice in the Fugue he had orchestrated"? (272)

[132] Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.178.

[133] This passage in the novel is reproduced from Hardy's National Library of Australia 'Voices Off' interview, quoted in Adams, *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.18.

[134] On Hardy's upbringing see Armstrong, *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, p.2; on his obsession with suicide see Armstrong, p.192.

[135] For a sophisticated account of this complex process see Connell and Irving, *Class Structure in Australian History*, pp.270–310.

[136] See again Connell and Irving, ibid.

[137] On the challenge posed to traditional Wardian ideals of masculinity by the postwar proliferation of white-collar work, see Tom Sear, 'Playgirl Executives: Images of Men and Work in Early 1960s Australian Pulp Fiction', in Katherine Biber, Tom Sear and Dave Trudinger, eds, *Playing the Man: New Approaches to Masculinity*, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1999, pp.200–213. For a more extended and sophisticated account of this process see Richard Sennett, *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, Norton, New York, 1998.

[138] As Bill Bonney summarises: "The story of the Australian media is the story of the progressive replacement of small-scale, community-based media by large corporations, employing a professional work-force sharply distinguished from the 'community' it 'serves'. It is also the story of the commercial media's growing dependence on advertising as a source of revenue ... One upshot of this dependence on advertising has been the virtual elimination from the mainstream of anything that could be described as the voice of labour or the voice of the people". 'Media and the People', in Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, eds, *Constructing a Culture: A People's History of Australia Since 1788*, McPhee Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy

and Ringwood, 1988, p.136. See also Keith Windschuttle, 'Economics and the New Right', in his *The Media*, pp.353–387.

[139] On the appropriation of working-class culture by corporate media see Bonney, 'Media and the People', p.141.

[140] Quoted in Hardy, 'Author's Note', *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, pp.236–237.

[141] Quoted in Hardy, ibid, pp.237–238.

[142] Though these points hardly need spelling out: 'God save Her' is meant to refer to 'God Save the Queen', then Australia's national anthem, while 'Tricky Dick' or 'Tricky Dicky' was the nickname of US President Richard Nixon.

[143] On "McKakie's origins" Adams writes: "The *Review* inferred that he was a parodic figure based on Melbourne Maoist, Albert Langer. But Hardy maintains that he was a composite fictional character of a Sydney Trotskyist with a complex about his rich father, a 'Red Brigade' type, and 'Mo (Albert) McKakie' of the old Roy Rene – Hal Lashwood radio series. More plausibly, he is a broader fictional construction of a number of New Left motifs, including perhaps the persona of Albert Langer". *The Stranger from Melbourne*, p.115.

[144] Yallop, 'Leaders and Larrikins'.

Chapter Five

A New National Identity: Les Murray, Gough Whitlam and the Americanisation of Australian Culture

In the previous two chapters it has been argued that in their major literary works of the Whitlam period Patrick White and Frank Hardy drew upon dominant Australian cultural traditions to provide important cultural support for the politics of Whitlam and his government.[1] In this chapter it is argued that in his major literary works of the same period Les Murray draws upon cultural traditions dominant within the United States and in doing so both undermines public support for Whitlamism and helps at the cultural level to clear the path for the introduction of a public policy framework – that of the New Right – more in keeping with American cultural traditions. Philosophically, Murray shares the radical subjectivism of the New Right, and in political terms he also shares this movement's radical individualism. Both Murray and the intellectuals and followers of the New Right are centrally opposed to the organisation of society on the basis of social values and democracy, and desire above all the organisation of society on the basis of a purely natural law: of science, nature itself (the physical world) and / or God. This desire for natural, self-evident law and corresponding antipathy to human reason and to socially specific rules and values have their origins in a radical puritan religious belief: that humanity is, in and of itself, 'bad', or impure. Where the New Right gains its primary cultural legitimacy through reference to an individualistic experience and radically puritan religious culture, traditionally dominant within the US, this experience and culture are closely comparable to those which prevailed in Murray's life during his formative years. Characterised by a high degree of personal freedom and isolation, a relative absence of visible government regulation and of government and union social organisation, and by the general dominance of strict forms of puritan Christianity, these conditions and this culture were, in the Australian context, quite distinctive.[2] In romanticising and purifying or 'puritanising' Australian origins, history and identity, playing down the role and importance of human agency within Australian history, and asserting the need for society to be organised on the basis of 'natural law', Murray advances characteristically American perceptions and values which both undermine

Whitlam's humanist rationalism and democracy and provide support for New Right notions of non-discretionary 'natural law' as the proper basis for public policy.

Murray and Whitlam

In contrast to White and Hardy, Les Murray was deeply ambivalent about the Whitlam Government and became strongly critical of it during and immediately after the Whitlam period. This ambivalence is evident in three essays Murray wrote between 1972 and 1976, his major statements on Whitlamism: 'Patronage in Australia', 'Patronage Revisited' and 'The Australian Republic'.[3] Murray praises the Whitlam government's support for the arts, endorses the Keynesian and Galbraithian theoretical foundations of this policy, and is explicitly critical of free-market approaches to arts policy. In addition, he is broadly positive towards the government's nationalist initiatives. But he also puts the view that Whitlam was arrogant,[4] that his government demonstrated "dangerous fiscal irresponsibility",[5] afforded too much power and influence to a ballooning bureaucracy and, most seriously, that the government was effectively taken over by an intellectual elite, or class, of "progressives and radicals",[6] which he terms "the Ascendancy".[7] He argues that this group has attempted to impose on the nation's people a fundamentally bad, unnatural and un-Australian culture. Though he records his "extravagant hope", in the spring of 1972, "when a change of government in Canberra seemed imminent",[8] and his "hope" that "the fall of the Labor government", which "soured many dreams", did not "cauterise the dreaming organ in all of us";[9] though he wrote 'Patronage in Australia' as an ALP arts policy briefing paper, at the suggestion of a Whitlam staffer, Richard Hall; though he reportedly gate-crashed the 1972 ALP election night victory party at (the now Old) Parliament House, with his friend Bob Ellis;[10] and is described by his biographer as someone who "strongly supported" the Whitlam government during its period of office and as someone who was "enraged" by the Dismissal;[11] almost immediately after the Dismissal Murray sets out his strong dislike for Whitlamism. While he desires increased funding for the arts he loathes the supposed cultural relativism of Whitlam's Enlightenment philosophy, upon which this policy is necessarily based.

'Patronage in Australia' originally appeared in the September 1972 edition of *Australian Quarterly*. It is in a sense written *to* the Whitlam government, in anticipation of its coming to power. Murray argues that government should provide "artists of genuine achievement or promise" with "a guaranteed income, reducible if and to the extent that they derive all or part of their income from either an outside job or the proceeds of their artistic work".[12] "Artists of real merit or substantial promise", he says, should be "seen as having a *right* to a decent income".[13] In order for art to perform its proper function as a social good, "societies ... will need to break the outdated nexus between art and privilege".[14] "The scheme" he outlines "would promote a reintegration of the arts with the whole life of the community, so that each might enrich the other in a natural way".[15]

In support of this central proposition that the arts should be more properly funded, Murray contends that the arts play an increasingly important social role which cannot be provided for by the free market. Artists, Murray writes, are "anciently one and the same profession" as priests.[16] Murray sees the role of the artist, like that of the priest, to be the spiritual one of reconnecting people with each other, with nature and with their own divided selves: "In a society characterised, as Western industrial society is, by *division*, art has an enormous potential value in that it is one of a very few institutions, all of them archaic in origin, whose effects are essentially *integrative*".[17] For Murray, as for the Romantics, culture is most truly or originally derived from the pre-modern, pre-industrial way of life. A true culture, he believes, is based on a timeless relationship with the earth and a social system that is in harmony with nature: a natural social order. Genuine artists, he suggests, draw on or reconnect with the pre-modern, natural world, and are motivated by a vocation rather than greed: "Art is not a job; art is work. It is therefore a principle of health in society as in the person, and a model for social and personal growth ... The nature of artistic work ... is vocational, that is to say, the diametric opposite of employment".[18]

Murray suggests that the artist's vocation, as a model of social and personal growth, is likely to become increasingly important, because economic production is in the process of shifting from labour- to capital-intensive industry and there is a decreasing number of truly necessary jobs: "Let us admit", writes Murray, showing his awareness of influential works like Daniel Bell's *The End of Ideology* (1960) and John Kenneth

Galbraith's *The Affluent Society* (1958), "that perhaps even a majority of people nowadays are being carried in make-work jobs, and stop pretending that the puritan ethic rules all our hirings and firings".[19] He adds later: "We have very largely solved the question of providing employment for all, but we have done it at a fearful cost in boredom, in make-work jobs and in misemployment of talent; now it is time for us to provide for the individuality and gifts of *each* person".[20] Murray's thought is here consistent with the dominant interventionist liberalisms of the Whitlam period, which implied an end to the need for mass labour, especially of a menial kind; an increasingly important social role for 'cultural' intellectuals, working in the arts and humanities, who would have to find values for people in a world where the work ethic had, along with economic scarcity, become redundant; and in which government would play an increasingly active and pervasive role in counteracting social disadvantage and inequality arising from the fluctuations of the trade cycle and the vagaries of the economic system. Murray also raises the possibility of ecological constraints on the way of life sustained by economic growth and high consumption, and suggests the need for a more 'natural' way of life:

> In an age when production and consumption as we have known them in the last two centuries are beginning to be seen as perhaps inimical to the survival of life on this planet ... we are going to have to make radical changes in our way of life. We are going to have to shape our life towards something like the world-view implicit in perennial artistic visions of cosmic harmony, those intimations of order which underlie the modern scientific system of ecology as surely as they underlay the ancient concept of the natural law.[21]

Murray directly rejects the New Right notion that an increasing role for government will unduly limit the freedom of individuals and lead to totalitarianism: "There is very little in the Australian tradition to suggest that governments would misuse their position as patrons in the way some fear ... A government that supported the arts in a responsible way would no longer be quite the monster many have come to see in all present big government".[22] He rejects "the belief still held by many that the best work comes from an artist when he [sic] is forced to suffer deprivation".[23] This is, "of course, fallacious in fact and puritan in origin ... To wish to prolong deprivation here is to betray a tinge of that mournful, principled sadism which has darkened the history of the English-

speaking peoples for the last three centuries".[24] He argues, in terms strongly reminiscent of Whitlam, that "businesses in this country for the most part lack the immense financial resources of governments, and their purposes only involve the good of the community in a peripheral way. They are not, after all, elected to serve the whole community".[25] Murray even draws on explicitly Keynesian analysis of social goods and market failure to argue the need for public funding of the arts and public intervention in the market generally, as part of government's proper responsibility to ensure an increased quality of life for society as a whole:

> The *laissez-faire* market-place has never provided a satisfactory framework for more than a few of the arts in any given age, and yet, popularly, practitioners of all the arts are expected to succeed there or face the consequences ... The *Laissez-faire* system, even in its modern impurity, is simply not equipped to deal with art, because art is not a consumer good, nor an investment in the market sense. It is a social good with both consumption and investment value, and its real value lies beyond both of these in the health of the human spirit. One of the remarkable developments of the last hundred years has been the expension [sic] of the concept of social goods ... the idea has expanded to embrace education, health services, communications, even certain sorts of public recreation such as parks and gardens. Provision of these things is now seen to be in the public interest ... Weakness in pure mathematics and non-applied physics will, for instance, inveitably [sic] lead to weaknesses throughout the whole of applied science and industry, and affect the whole network of production. I suggest that much the same is true of the arts, with even greater potentials for social damage.[26]

The Keynesian and Galbraithian liberalism Murray draws upon here is compatible with Whitlam's social democratic philosophy. There is also a degree of compatibility between the Arnoldian humanism informing Whitlam's attitude to the arts (remembering that he would become Minister for the Arts) and Murray's understanding of the arts' social role. Both Whitlam and Murray see the arts as a 'humanising' force within modern society, a means of lifting people above the temporal materialism of everyday life and putting them back in touch with their 'finer' feelings, their 'natural' selves. But where Whitlam sees the arts as a means of 'civilising' or finding fulfilment within industrial society and traditional ways of life, Murray sees the arts as an expression of pre-modern, timeless, essential laws of nature, to which modern industrial society must return if its

people are to overcome the profound alienation of their society and find a truly sustainable means of living on the planet.

For Murray, the role of the artist is to adapt culture to the laws of nature, which are also the laws by which the archetypal common people, the rural folk, live. He fears that: "Where artists are made to feel that the mainstream of human life in a society is inimical or indifferent to them, they can easily be driven into exaggerated alignments with the aberrant, and may generate new aberrations of their own ... Nazism [for example] was not only the most extreme but also the most literary of the fascist movements".[27] Artistic alienation leads to cultural aberration and so on to barbarism.[28] If artists "are too deeply estranged" from society, he suggests, "art can become a powerful disintegrative force": "The artist cannot refuse his [sic] services, in the ordinary sense, but he [sic] can be driven into alienation and loss of contact with the real world of human activity".[29] He worries further:

> By estranging and, in extreme cases, seeking to destroy the archaic trades, as the mercantile system has unremittingly tried to do – making priests into counsellors, farmers into industrial entrepreneurs or dispossessed urban proletariat, artists into actors-out of repressed orgiastic desires – we rob ourselves of *models* on which future human work activity may need to be based, and destroy continuities from the past which may be necessary.[30]

Murray is opposed here to the culturally "aberrant", as well as to the alienating capitalist system, and tends to see these phenomena as inextricably connected. The role of the artist – rightly 'one and the same profession' as priests – is to overcome these aspects of modern reality.

So Murray has criticised both the adherents of *laissez-faire* capitalism and those who are or accept cultural aberrance, or difference. Artists are not given the proper respect they deserve in society, Murray contends, because of the existence and role of just such a liberal-minded group, a bureaucratic "Establishment".[31] "Without any real mandate from the artistic community", he says, this group "very largely control patronage in this country".[32] He argues further, in an inversion of unionist principles, that university academics exploit artists by agreeing to be paid well, when artists, the primary producers of culture, are not.[33] It is not the employers (in this case government) who are keeping

artists from being paid properly, Murray contends, but one greedy group of employees. Murray argues that university academics should be paid less so that artists can be paid more. Interestingly, his central concern is with the relative wealth and prestige of these two groups.

In 'Patronage Revisited', Murray's next major statement on the Whitlam government, Murray elaborates on this theme. Centrally concerned here with the question of why artists and their works are not more highly valued within Australian society, Murray argues that this is in part because a wealthy, fashionable and Marxist-influenced elite – of arts bureaucrats, university intellectuals and (false, or modern) artists – spread values fundamentally removed from and opposed to those of 'nature' and the common folk, from which himself and other real artists gain their inspiration. On visits to the Arts Council he records: "There was a smell of special favour and protection there which may have resulted from the appointment of the top administrators and other leading figures from within a fashionable mandarin elite with its own lines of communication".[34] "I confess", he goes on to say, "that I have occasionally had to choke back a feeling of outrage when visiting the council's premises; everything is so sleek and fashionable and expensive-looking, and the staff look so much more affluent than almost any Australian artist I know".[35] "Some non-radical journals" have even "felt so harassed by all the bureaucratic Big Brothering as to suspect deliberate, if covert, action by Gramscian infiltrators on the Board's staff, or on the Board itself".[36] We learn that "by comparison (with artists), Professors of Australian literature are tycoons with emoluments beyond our wildest dreams".[37] "Marxist penetration, which some universities have" apparently "proved powerless to resist, tends to make at least a few of our metropolitan universities rancorous and disturbing places for anyone wishing to follow his or her own line of development in peace".[38] Bad artists are produced within this seedy environment, at once hedonistic and libertine and quasi-totalitarian:

> Gradual Marxist capture of an older, more pluralist radical milieu, and the presence of colonial-Marxist activists on university staffs mean that there are people in the universities actively recruiting students to their way of thinking; one of the methods used is that of relentless promotion of third-rate writers and even outright charlatans of the right political colour, as against people who uphold decent standards of competence.[39]

These Marxists, thinks Murray, then keep real artists from being accepted by the real people, the common folk: "Students" for example are "conditioned to regard Marxist fantasies about class warfare, the proletariat, etc., as the only possible world-view, and it can become difficult to reach students so conditioned if you don't use that terminology".[40] "In Australia, as elsewhere", Murray summarises, "there is a natural symbiosis operating between bad art and radical politics; much worshipful pushing of bad women writers simply because they are women exemplifies what I mean".[41]

Murray's argument is not based on sociological evidence or an evident economic logic: there is no explanation for the contention that artists exist in direct economic competition or class conflict with bureaucrats and university intellectuals, let alone other artists, or a naming of names. More importantly, the argument contains a logical inconsistency. On the one hand Murray suggests that there is nothing natural about society's economic system: government has the capacity and the right to intervene in the economic sphere to democratically achieve its goals for the betterment of society as a whole. But on the other hand Murray argues that there *is* a natural cultural system, or order, imagined as traditional, pre-modern, patriarchal, sexually intolerant, politically authoritarian and deeply religious. For Murray, somehow the economic system – classical economics – is not natural, but the cultural system – traditional social relations – is. Government does not have the right to organise society in such a way that genuine cultural difference or 'aberrance' is accepted: those who advocate such an acceptance, those who take Enlightenment thinking to its logical conclusions – liberal and radical intellectuals – come in for Murray's strongest criticism.

While Whitlam and his government advocated increased funding for the arts, this was part of a wider Enlightenment project of social transformation, in which interventionism would legitimise many different forms of affirmative action as a means of promoting social justice, precisely because a founding plank of this philosophical tradition was the humanist maxim that 'nature' does not set laws to which individuals and societies must resign themselves. Humans do. Enlightenment thinkers like Whitlam believe that it is possible to know the world and change it for everyone's good in a rational and democratic way. Whitlam saw the arts as an important means of providing meaning and pleasure for people within modern, industrial capitalist democracy, but he

did not see a necessary conflict between the goals or direction of that society on the one hand, and the role of artists on the other. Murray, however, who sees the artist as a priest, clearly does. He believes the artist should be funded only so that (and only to the extent that) he or she is able to put people back in touch with nature, and its timeless, unchanging rhythms and laws. Murray thinks the arts should be funded as a means of helping humanity move away from Enlightenment philosophy and the modern capitalist society that has in part at least grown from it. In his view the artist should lead society towards a greater respect for these rhythms and laws of nature, and so on to what might be called a traditional or pre-modern form of society, in which the social structure or hierarchy is similarly natural and unchanging and accepted as part of a shared – presumably religious – view of the universe.

In arguing that government has the capacity and the right to intervene in the economic sphere to democratically achieve the goals of society, Murray undermines his own argument that government does not have the right to intervene in the cultural sphere for the same reasons. In his final major statement on the Whitlam government, 'The Australian Republic', written in the immediate aftermath of the Dismissal, Murray resolves this contradiction between, on the one hand, the materialist and rationalist strands of his thought, and on the other its Idealist, Romantic or subjectivist strands, though this 'resolution' is nothing more than an assertion: in this essay, as in his later essays and public statements, Murray ignores material evidence and social or sociological reality and espouses a form of radical subjectivism. As Bruce Bennett comments, for instance, given the chance to address the Senate Committee Room of the Australian Parliament on the subject of an Australian republic, in June 1996, Murray stood "against the calls to action of [Thomas] Keneally, Donald Horne, Malcolm Turnbull and other leading republicans" and instead "preferred to indulge a daydream version of the republic: 'We love it better as a field of rosy potential, uncorrupted by the compromises its attainment might bring'".[42] As Peter Alexander writes of Murray's thinking in this 1976 essay: "Murray's was a republic of the mind, particularly of the imagination: he believed that if Australians could take imaginative possession of their country, the republic would have arrived".[43]

Murray now talks of political power as something that is obtained and operates purely at the cultural, or mental, level. Artists, and the common folk whose values artists do or should represent, are no longer oppressed by the capitalist economic system, which is not mentioned, but by the purveyors of cultural relativism, the radical and liberal inheritors of the Enlightenment. This group, alone, is seen as responsible for the dominant shape of contemporary society, and as standing between the real or common people's (the peasants'?) desire for and achievement of a more traditional and natural way of life. Where Murray claims to have voted for Whitlam he now argues, confusingly, that the Dismissal can be seen as a good thing, firstly because this government had failed to "declare" the nation a republic (a 'failure' which in Murray's view contributed to its downfall),[44] but more importantly because the Government had he suggests been taken over by a group of people who, though legally Australian, were and are opposed to the values of real Australians, the common people, the folk. For Murray the Whitlam Government was in the end brought down by the (real) people's intolerance of its fundamentally unnatural and un-Australian liberalism and radicalism.

The Dismissal and Australia's ongoing legal status as a colony, Murray writes, do not really matter, because in the most important, cultural sense, Australia already is a republic:

> The republic already exists and has indeed existed for a long time ... in our vernacular tradition, which is to say in that 'folk' Australia, part imaginary and part historical, which is the real matrix of any distinctiveness we possess as a nation, and which stands over against all of our etablishments and colonial elites. This is the Australia of our deepest common values and identifications, the place of our quiddities and priorities and family jokes. The Melbourne Cup and the Fair Go and a myriad gum trees live there, along with equality and Anzac Day and the Right Thing.[45]

Murray's 'vernacular republic', then, is actually a set of values supposedly shared by all true, common Australians, those who are not part of establishments or elites: "the vernacular republic is the subsoil of our common life".[46] (Put another way, this 'republic' is a political adjective masquerading as a sociologically descriptive noun.)

Murray makes no attempt to directly spell out what these Australian values are or to specify who, besides himself, holds them, but he does say that they are the values of all those who do not have power. Who does have power? The "Ascendancy". The

'Ascendancy' is a "new class" that Murray writes has already received a number of labels: "the Left, the trendies, the epigoni (in poetry and the arts), the radical intelligentsia, Bohemia, and a dozen more".[47] None of these "quite fits", Murray thinks, "because none gets all the emphases right and all the constituent phenomena in. Borrowing a term from Irish history", he goes on to say, "I would suggest we speak of the Ascendancy; this at least connotes both the foreign-derived oppressiveness of the new class and its *arriviste*, first-generation flavour".[48] This group is also referred to variously as "progressives and radicals" and as a "radicalised intellectual class".[49]

The 'Ascendancy' then is new, foreign and oppressive, and for each of these reasons not properly Australian. In Murray's account this class obtains and maintains power primarily through its gaining of a university education, then through having "style", dismissing opposition to itself as right-wing and finally through the cunning use of fashion. As he explains:

> Tertiary education plays a part analogous to that played by land ownership in past ascendancies: it is a central but not an entirely exclusive organising principle. Just as a university degree or some ability in the general field of letters or the higher fornication could gain one a place in the English gentry of two centuries ago, a certain radical style can get one into the new class now. Style, in fact, is probably the broadest common denominator of the new Ascendancy, and one of its most important cohesive principles. Another feature that is diagnostic for the whole class, above and beyond all of its apparent divisions, is its tendency to see all opposition to it as being right-wing, and to use fashion as a weapon of defence and attack.[50]

For Murray, the 'Ascendancy' is therefore that group of liberal and radical intellectuals who are opposed to the political Right and want to introduce fashion, or in other words to change society, those who won't leave existing or traditional social relations – the 'natural' order, the cultural centre – alone.

Murray argues that this group is involved in a war against the common folk and somehow exercises brutal power merely by arguing with and looking down on them: "Just how far this (war on vernacular Australia) can go, as we approach the radical lunatic fringe", Murray says darkly, "is well illustrated in the filmmaking sequence in Frank Moorhouse's *The Electrical Experience*, one of the most chilling things in our literature. From the crowing pack-brutality described there to the youthful SS

Sonderkommando having a bit of fun before shooting their victims is almost no distance at all".[51] Members of the 'Ascendancy' aspire "to succeed the older social elites".[52] The common folk, states Murray, were "more or less bullied into silence by progressives and radicals" during the then recent republic campaigns. These poor vernacularites "were easily persuaded that a socialist republic was the only kind in prospect, and that indeed the very idea of a republic for Australia was a leftist goal".[53] Murray goes on to say that "The new ascendancy has, if we want to be dramatic about it", and he obviously does, "captured most of education, much of the arts, and much of fashion in Australia. Under the Whitlam government, its style became very important in policy-making and administration, and some of its preoccupations were expensively promoted".[54] In summary: "Although usually presented as a generation conflict or a set of more less [sic] parallel revolutionary struggles over values, what we are really in is a sharp little class war which [with the end of the Whitlam period] may already have passed its climax".[55]

But, Murray warns:

> The new class ... is too interested in rule and power to be permanently excluded from government. It will survive its present exile partly because of a powerful psychological safeguard built into its belief system, the image of itself as a valiant, downtrodden band bearing aloft the torch of enlightenment against all oppression. We have reached the age of privileged, often subsidised martyrs.[56]

The Whitlam government, then, in Murray's estimation, was a tool of power-hungry, radical and liberal intellectuals carrying the torch of the Enlightenment. As he states elsewhere in the article, making explicit his belief that the Government was taken over by this class: "I expect that the new class will get into the corridors of power again after its present setback, though whether it will do so again under the aegis of a Labor government is less clear; socialism in Australia may have finished with Labor".[57]

In presenting his argument Murray is unconcerned with material and social evidence or logical consistency. His analysis of himself, of society and of history are all entirely subjective, or purely imaginary, as are the ostensibly sociological, but actually ideal categories of 'the vernacular republic' and 'the Ascendancy'. Though he argues that "formal education and high culture in Australia, as in any other colonial territory, are systems of foreign ideas imposed from above whose usual effect is to estrange people

from their own culture and injure their rapport with their own people" and that "it has never been possible to get a distinctively Australian education through institutional channels", he explains away his own formal primary, secondary and tertiary education with the assertion that "you must either give yourself (an Australian education), or be taught by your elders in a more or less informal way outside the institutional system".[58] He also contends that "I used and resisted my university ... all I knew was that if ever I snubbed or denied my fellow country people, those who hadn't had the education I was getting, I would be lost".[59]

Murray's account of contemporary Australian society, and its power structure, includes the vernacular republic, an old, monarchist power bloc – the squattocracy perhaps (including "a few genuine royalists, deeply romantic folk on the edge of eccentricity or over it")[60] – and the intellectual 'Ascendancy'. Governments are presented as vehicles of these classes: "The new class is the natural upper class of a socialist world order, and has come into existence as it were in anticipation of that order".[61] According to Murray, the central class division between the Ascendancy and the vernacular republic can also be identified at the global level: "The wider vernacular republic ... exists beneath the surface of the whole industrialised world, and ... has historically come closer to the surface in Australia than perhaps in any other country".[62]

But there is no mention of industrial or finance capitalists or capitalists of any kind. There is no mention of new relations and modes of production and cultural production, or of the power of the media and its owners, or of the role of public relations firms and advertisers, or of the economic class interests of anyone. There is no mention of international economic conditions and relations or of the role of multinational corporations. Though elsewhere he writes that the 'Ascendancy' is bent on and likely to attain great power, he also suggests that the "avant garde" culture of this grouping, with its "wild gestures" and "increasing mental and spiritual squalor", is, at the international level, in its "death throes".[63] The "long-lived and much adapted historic class system", through which the 'Ascendancy' has oppressed vernacularites throughout the industrialised world, is foundering in the face of "the alleged ugliness, anti-intellectualism, and larrikinism of the vernacular republic"; which hearteningly "can be seen as intransigence and cultural self-defence".[64]

The Ascendancy, Murray says, is "the educated caste" which since the 1890s has "of course ... been able to free itself from the older Establishment" and "become a dominating, oppressing power in its own right".[65] This historiography might well draw into question the 'newness' of this 'class', but Murray argues that "what is new is the strident insistency with which (the hatred of country tune) has been played in the last dozen years, and how quickly the educated classes have moved towards a position of all-out war on vernacular Australia".[66] Logically, the speed with which a particular class moves to attack another class cannot be a defining or *a priori* characteristic of that class.

By using the labels 'the vernacular republic' and 'the Ascendancy' Murray conjures images of culturally traditional rustic workers oppressed by snobby, liberal- or progressive-minded, over-educated foreigners. But each category, as stated, remains entirely unsubstantiated, socially fictitious. Members of the 'vernacular republic' need not originate from rural areas or be the children or forebears of people who did; they need not believe that people in rural areas or even poor people generally should be given more of society's resources; and they can be wealthy or privileged: "The vernacular republic is not solely rural or working-class; poets as diverse as C.J. Dennis, Douglas Stewart, the later Slessor, Ronald McCuaig, and Bruce Dawe ... have kept us in mind of this".[67] Some people – like Judith Wright – can fall out of the vernacular republic when they abandon 'its' values,[68] while no doubt others can join when they adopt these. The vernacular republic exists irrespective of the formal political independence of the nation and may not exist even in the case of that independence: "Without republican thinking now, we may easily see the *de jure* republic betrayed in any of a dozen ways when it does come in".[69] Similarly, the 'Ascendancy' includes anyone who has a radical left or a liberal philosophy, many of whom were involved in or supported the campaign against the Vietnam War and contemporaneous 'new social movements', and actively supported or voted for Whitlam.[70]

At or near the end of the Whitlam period Murray realises, consciously or unconsciously, that if his arguments are to be effective he must choose between the rationalist and subjectivist strands of his philosophy, between his short-term economic interests as an artist and his deepest political and cultural beliefs and desires (and perhaps also his long-term economic interests as an artist whose cultural capital is derived from

244

his status as a spokesperson for 'real' Australians, the 'folk'), between his gratitude towards and his criticisms of the Whitlam government.[71] In each case Murray chooses the latter of these options (while resisting, for obvious, understandable reasons, outright criticism of arts funding).[72] From this time on Murray never suggests that some people in society – artists or otherwise – might be victimised or disadvantaged in some way by economic relations or the economic system. If Murray is not happy with these he does not discuss them. For him, the only struggle that matters and in which he is willing to take part is the struggle over culture: beliefs, values, fashions, knowledge. Consciously or otherwise Murray has decided that it is better to not admit the possibility that the economic system may not be natural than to admit the possibility that his favoured, traditionalist cultural system might not be natural, pure, Divine.

Though he has expressed, during the Whitlam period, opposition to *laissez-faire* economics, Murray shares with the New Right the belief that society should be organised on the basis of natural law rather than human reason, democratic or otherwise. Politically, both are most fundamentally opposed to Enlightenment traditions. It will be argued later in the chapter that there are common, deep-seated cultural and phenomenological reasons for this shared belief, reasons which also influence Murray's own cultural production, his poetry, during the Whitlam period, and that this poetry subtly but powerfully undermines Whitlam's Enlightenment political project. Here though it can be noted, as evidence of Murray's cultural and political connection with the New Right, that this final major statement on the Whitlam period appeared in *Quadrant*, a magazine which had already become an organ of the New Right and with which Murray would later be closely associated.[73] Murray also draws on arguments initially developed and advanced by the American New Right: firstly that there is a liberal and radical 'new class' responsible for society's cultural, political and (though this claim is often made implicitly rather than explicitly) economic difficulties, and secondly, though relatedly, that there exists an oversized, self-serving, culturally and politically disruptive and authoritarian, and economically counter-productive, bureaucracy.[74] The blaming of intellectuals and cultural relativism – the endless attacks on 'trendies', the 'politically correct' and intellectual 'elites' – for Western society's cultural and economic woes, has since the Whitlam period been the primary rhetorical mode of New Right cultural politics.[75]

As Alexander acknowledges, this essay by Murray marked his conscious entry into what would become known as 'the culture wars'.[76] In Alexander's account, Murray:

> wrote with increasing confidence as a spokeman [sic] for the country he was helping to bring into being. But it would not come about without resistance and struggle, a struggle as much literary as political. He now embarked on a new aspect of his career. He was about to take a leading part in Australia's long literary war.[77]

By the early twenty-first century Murray was acknowledged as the major literary or cultural intellectual of the New Right.[78]

Murray's Medievalist and Primitivist Romanticism

> If there is anything in my work which even the best critics have tended to miss, it is its heraldic, Medieval, gargoyles-and-cathedral-carvings side (Les Murray).[79]

Murray's antipathy to the humanist and rationalist philosophy of the Enlightenment and his attraction to notions of timeless, eternal, 'natural law', is enunciated throughout his poetry, including that which appeared in his major collections of the Whitlam period: *The Weatherboard Cathedral* (1969), *Poems Against Economics* (1972) and *Lunch and Counter Lunch* (1974). He finds in rural Australia, especially his own region, a social order based directly on a natural order of the universe, ordained by God and evident in nature itself, the (always pre-modern) natural world. Within this natural society, Murray makes clear, there is no social conflict, because everyone understands and accepts the order. Members of this society, the 'real' people, or folk, are imagined in Romantic medievalist and primitivist terms. They are not interested in political or material gain but are profoundly innocent, childlike and spiritual, focused, often without knowing it, on the 'higher' things, the supernatural. Purveyors of rationalism, on the other hand – liberal and radical intellectuals – are always hungry for power and introduce social conflict.

Many of Murray's poems deal with his home region of Bunyah in rural New South Wales. In these poems, such as 'Evening Alone at Bunyah' and 'Hayfork Point' from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*, 'Toward the Imminent Days', from *Poems Against Economics*, and 'The Broad Bean Sermon', from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*, the natural environment is described as a place where a 'Golden Age' (imagined in traditional

European terms) has never ended, as unspoilt, bountiful and restorative, a feminine entity both desiring insemination and eager to give motherly care. The country people, as evident especially in 'Evening Alone at Bunyah', 'Troop Train Returning' and 'Once in a Lifetime, Snow', from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*, 'Lament for the Country Soldiers', from *Poems Against Economics* and in 'Folklore' and 'The Edge of the Forest', from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*, are very much a 'folk' of the kind imagined within traditional, conservative medievalism: they are simple, shy, kind, seemingly non-literate, innocent and without guile, but also capable of performing great sacrifices, as soldiers or hunters or slaughterers of animals, and especially aware of the deep spiritual significance of these acts.[80] The work that these country folk perform, as evident in 'Blood', bears no resemblance to the systems of mass production introduced with industrial capitalism. There are traditional tools and small-scale modes of production; the farmers, rural labourers and others are in no sense exploiters of the land or of people: they are craftsmen. And where the Bunyah poems present a politically conservative medieval idyll, other poems, such as his long sequence 'Walking to the Cattle Place', from *Poems Against Economics*, idealise an 'exotic', non-European, pre-modern society in similar terms: as containing a 'traditional', unchanging social structure, directly based on and living in tune with nature and, via God, the universe.

These people not only live in harmony with the land and the universe but also, Murray suggests in poems such as 'The Commercial Hotel', 'Working Men', 'Hayfork Point' (from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*), and 'The Edge of the Forest' (from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*), in harmony with each other. Class conflict or social conflict of any systemic kind is wholly absent. No-one here desires wealth or power, though these things are plainly desired by the evil humanist rationalists who appear in 'An Absolutely Ordinary Rainbow' and 'The Fire Autumn' (from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*), 'SMLE' and 'Walking to the Cattle Place' (from *Poems Against Economics*), and 'Sidere Mens Eadem Mutato' and 'The Action' (from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*).

In 'Evening Alone at Bunyah', the lead poem of *The Weatherboard Cathedral*, Murray describes his experience of sitting at home while his father goes to a dance. (While it is conventional for readers to distinguish between the author of the poem and the poet in the poem, this often seems unnecessary and even misleading when reading

Murray's poetry, which is filled with obviously personal references and stories. This autobiographical dimension is seemingly intended to convey a realist element to Murray's aesthetic.) He recalls some memories of his childhood in this house, then discusses the local area, expressing his regret that "Since those moth-grimed streetlamps came", signifying encroaching modernity, "my dark is threatened." Already, here, the place is represented as dark, as Gothic rather than shining in the bright light iconised by influential nationalist artists such as those of the Heidelberg 'school'. The poet goes on to suggest that his family and community sprang directly from this land, a land notably more fertile than in the more realist literary works of '1890s' radical nationalists like Henry Lawson or even the pastoralist 'Banjo' Paterson: "This was the plot from which we transplants sprang. / The trees grew straight. We burgeoned and spread far." A "field" in which "four perfect firs stand dark", was we learn "lost long ago". The 'perfection' of the gothic, dark, European firs, suggests their supposed originality, the virginal nature of the land; while the 'losing' of the field reinforces the fecundity of nature in this area. There may also be a subtle suggestion that the firs are the poet's forebears: the field in which they stand "holds a map of rooms". "This country", says the poet, asserting his deep connection with this place, "is my mind". The poem's final section twice mentions that the "country" is "dark" and also describes this as a "wilderness", stressing the absence of human control (and of original, or Aboriginal, human possession). It is hinted that the 'dark' land, which is also, we remember, the poet's 'mind', makes the poet isolated: "Sitting alone's a habit of mind with me ... / for which I'll pay in full". But the dark land itself is a giver of deep solace:

> Today, having come back, summer was all mirror
> tormenting me. I fled down cattle tracks
> chest-deep in the earth, and pushed in under twigs
> to sit by cool water speeding over rims
> of blackened basalt, the tall light reaching me.

The poet, his family and their community are not only shown to live in profound harmony with the nature around them, but with the universe as a whole: "Beneath this moon", the poet states, "an ancient radiance comes / back from far hillsides . . ." In the same collection 'Hayfork Point' presents, even more explicitly, a world of rustic harmony:

> For the mouths of following cattle, boys on tractors
> bayonet green stacks and hoy them down the sky
> green spinning in air.
> The bull, looking up,
> is drenched in flying meadow ...
>
> . . . something has turned
> and from the heavens, gently
> invisibly, gently
> grass goes on falling.

Similarly, in 'Toward the Imminent Days', a poem celebrating the fecundity of farm life, the land wants to participate in the farmer's cultivating process: "With Advent so near beneath a man's pitchfork, / the wild and paddocks rising into each other / in the whole green crescent of the tented air ... wheat is crowding through cities". "The woman of seed who is the landscape", the poet states, "is seizing / all things in her gift". The "farmland" traversed by the wandering poet has a "heart". In contrast, "the cities are debris driven by explosions / whose regulation takes a merciless cunning". "Houses" in this rural region "pass into Paradise continually", while "voices" and "loved fields" are "all wearing away into Heaven", suggesting the whole enterprise is blessed by God. And in 'The Broad Bean Sermon', Murray's often anthologised poem about the pleasure to be obtained from (cultivated) nature's offerings, he again depicts a naturally fertile environment and hints that the farmer is blessed by nature and God: "Could I have overlooked so many, or / do they form in an hour?" This general depiction of the Australian landscape in traditional European terms, as fertile, comforting and maternal, and in the American terms of being all of these things and infused with the presence of God, reappears throughout Murray's poetry. The natural environment in these poems is never depicted in the terms traditionally dominant within Australian 'nationalist' art: as sterile, harsh, weird and alienating.[81]

The idyllic depiction of the land is echoed in the depiction of 'its' people. The poet's father in 'Evening Alone at Bunyah' has "an innocent sly charm" and "small" and "delicate" feet. Though a widower, he is "married still"; a deeply traditional man who "yarns about his son" with "old friends". He is so removed from cultural and social changes he "steps outside" the dance hall when "they announce some modern dance".

The poet is "home again from the cities of the world", suggesting his fundamental cultural difference from urban dwellers. The 'Troop Train Returning' carries "shy" soldiers back to their homes in the 'natural' areas that love them: "The pepper-trees beside the crossroads pub / Are dim with peace ... This perfect plain / casts out the things we've done". The farmer of 'Once in a Lifetime, Snow', the poet's 'natural', sentient, fertile, gentle, loving uncle, tastes and eats the snow on his land before alerting his children to its unexpected arrival: "Then, turning, he tiptoed in / to a bedroom, smiled, / and wakened a murmuring child / and another child". At the poet's aunt's house in 'Toward the Imminent Days' we learn that "our talk is" of the wholesome subjects of "cattle and cricket". Murray's uncle is a "quiet" man who also lives within and fulfils the timeless rhythms of nature, having "spent the whole forenoon sailing a stump-ridden field / of blady-grass and Pleistocene clay never ploughed / since the world's beginning". "The Georgic furrow", states Murray in a classical allusion that again foregrounds his pastoralism: "lengthens / in ever more intimate country". The children are "well-mannered" and "gentle with cows". Where in an earlier poem, 'SMLE', his cousins were "compatriots", his addressee here is an "old henchman".

The "gallant" subjects of Murray's 'Lament for the Country Soldiers' are not interested in politics but are called to war by "the king of honour, louder than of England". 'Folklore' tells the story of "the sights of our town", particularly a skeleton attached to a cord which leads to the honeymoon suite of the local hotel, and which bounces around amusingly. The poet, in *faux naïve* voice, informs us: "Some say there's a larger / cord goes up there" to the stars, "but I doubt it", he says, "I mean / but then I'm no dancer." Again, country 'folk' are presented as simple, good, intuitive, spiritual. Similarly 'The Edge of the Forest' tells a story of an old man, a tree "cutter", who "at four years old ... was milking easy cows / and was put to the plough at fourteen, the day after school". He is deeply in tune with his surrounding natural environment ("Two taps on a trunk / and he can tell you its life") and a great craftsman ("Steering the chainsaw / he can drop a tree on a cigarette paper").

In 'Blood', Murray tells a story of himself and his cousin killing a pig. This is described as a timeless, natural, sacred ritual, which restores the poet and gives him a deep sense of ownership over his environment: "Strong in my valleys, I may walk at

ease".[82] The land itself appreciates this act: The pig bleeding "frees the earth", and "I walk back up the trail of crowding flies, / back to the knife which pours deep blood, and frees / sun, fence and hill, each to its holy place". Murray's "cousin", who kills the pig, "sheathes in dirt his priestly knife." Having killed the pig the cousin "lifts it to the sun" in a traditional (or clichéd) sacrificial gesture. "Looking down", the poet concludes, "we praise for its firm flesh / the creature killed according to the Law". Here, as elsewhere (consider the farmers working with pitchforks and cane-knives in 'Hayfork Point', for example), the forms of impersonal mass production characteristic of modern capitalism are nowhere to be seen. The pig is personalised: "Georgie". And his killers feel for him: "I should have knocked him out, poor little bloke", says the cousin. Country people are described as both more gentle and sentient and more capable of truly powerful acts, such as the taking of life, than those from the city. The cousin says to Murray, when he thinks Murray is not being careful with his knife: "It's made you cruel, all that smart city life"; and later, in the time immediately before the sacrifice: "It's made you squeamish, all that city life. / Sly gentleness regards me." The rustic folk both reject fashion and humanist reason and recognise the true meaning of life, which for Murray lies in deeply natural, spiritual acts of sacrifice. The true Australians who "prove (the) nation" and for whom Murray writes his 'Lament for Country Soldiers', for example, create in death "the spreading rose of their honour" and remain "leaping on the mountains" like Gods of classical antiquity.

In 'The Commercial Hotel', Murray writes:

Days of asphalt-blue and gold

confirm the nation in its mould
of wages, contract and supplies,
lorries bought, allotments sold,

and the brave, their stories told,
age and regard, without surmise,
days of asphalt-blue and gold
lorries bought, allotments sold.

The poem celebrates trade in this localised, rural context. There is no exploitation or greed visible here, and there is also a sense, suggested by the allusion to Keats in the final

stanza, that there is a lack of imagination in this lifestyle.[83] In this the poem brings to mind Lawson's famous 'Middleton's Rouseabout', while lacking the sense evident in Lawson that those without "opinions" and "idears" are to be disapproved of. 'Working Men' is a short poem which describes and implicitly praises "fettlers" being "gentle" with, or comforting, "their foreman", who has just received a telegram bearing bad news. The poem suggests that humanity shouldn't be divided by different political or class interests. A comparable message emerges from 'The Edge of the Forest'. The old man of the poem is nearing retirement age: "Neighbours talked heart. They tell you when to die / in a community". But he is saved by the firm that employs him: "when the Company, in person, / told him *Stay on: you're our best man*, some custom / and cliché were bent. It was a commutation. / Life. Life given back. Almost a father speaking". Now, "He will come and go for years yet through the edge of the forest". The voice of the company is 'almost' that of a father, revealing Murray's desire for an idealised, pre-modern or pre-capitalist form of relations between employee and employer, as well as his distrust of collective or communal decision-making.

'Walking to the Cattle Place', "a meditation", is one long paean to ancient modes of thought and life. The poem carries an epigram by Tagore: "At once I came into a world wherein I recovered my full being"; suggesting immediately Murray's thesis that full being can only be obtained within a society that in its structure and in the way it relates to its natural environment, is organic, timeless, at one with nature, socially unchanging, bound together by a common religious understanding of the universe. In such a society, it is suggested, a deeply satisfying connection with God, or the cosmic order, can be obtained. The first poem of the sequence, 'Sanskrit', then develops this idea, including as it does 'exotic' terms and concepts, mimicking pre-industrial and non-literate ways of thinking,[84] and seeking to bring to the fore God's cosmic order:

> Upasara, the heifer after first mating,
> adyaśvīnā, the cow about to calve, strīvatsā
> the cow who has borne a heifer calf (atrinada
> the calf newly born). I will smuggle this sutra.
>
> Around the sleeping house, dark cattle rubbing
> off on stiff corner joists their innocent felt
> and the house is nudged by a most ancient flow.
> I will wake up in a world that hooves have led to.

"Today", says the seemingly pre-modern, unlearned poet, "for no sin much, neither killing a brahmin / nor directly a cow, I will follow cattle". The sequence of poems, like the title of the collection in which it appears – *Poems Against Economics* – constitutes an implicit critique of the Enlightenment and industrial, capitalist, rationalist, literate modernity: "living and work are one thing, or the rivers die, / my neighbour's wife's saying, / a blackfellow told me tonight, and I knew". Significantly, part of the focus is on the Brahmin society of India, often idealised by politically conservative Romantics for its clear and stable social order and for the social power of its religion.[85]

'The Action', from 1974's *Lunch and Counter Lunch*, refers in prophetic sounding, Old Testament cadences to Enlightenment ways of thinking and being: "*maker of tests and failures. / It is through the* [always capitalised] *Action / that the quiet homes empty, and the barrack beds fill up, and cities / that are cover from God. The Action, continual breakthrough, cannot abide slow speech*"; which in the poem are contrasted throughout with a more natural, unhurried, contented, pre-modern way of living, enjoyed at this moment by the poet:

> Turning slowly under trees, footing off the river's linen
> to come into shade – some waterhens were subtly
> edging away to their kampongs of chomped reeds –
> eel-thoughts unwound through me. At a little distance
> I heard New Year children slap the causeway.
> 　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　Floating
> in Coolongolook River, there below the junction
> of Curreeki Creek,
> 　　　　　　　　　water of the farms upheld me.

Here, the pre-modern environment is stressed by the use of especially non-European sounding Aboriginal place names, while the idiosyncratic spacing adds to the feeling of lightness, creating an apparent absence of constraining formal artistic structure. Later in the poem, Murray replicates the poetic style and form of pre-modern, non-literate cultures:

> Wash water, cattle water, irrigation-pipe-tang water / and water of the Kyle,
> 　　　the chainsaw forests up there
> where the cedar getter walks at night with dangling pockets,

> water of the fern-tree gushers' heaping iron, water of the bloodwoods,
> water of the Curreeki gold rush,
> water of the underbrush sleeping shifts of birds
> all sustained me . . .

From the same collection, 'Cycling in the Lake Country' similarly idealises natural living and the natural world, and draws upon ancient wisdom: "The Tuareg say / God made the desert last / as his most spacious great hall / to withdraw in from creation"; and valorises an idealised image of the eternal, unchanging cycle of life:

> I rest, and my two wheels
> continue as if the plains sloped
> south, as the map falls.
> Sunrise and sunset ride over me,
> unending wheels.

The weeping man of 'An Absolutely Ordinary Rainbow' weeps, significantly, in Martin Place, the centre of Sydney's finance sector. Murray's targets for criticism in the poem are "the Stock Exchange scribblers" and "the fiercest manhood, / the toughest reserve, the slickest wit amongst us". In crying, the man achieves a form of spiritual purity, thereby creating a holy space around him, a "pentagram of sorrow".[86] The description of the crying man having "wept" and as having, in his purity of spirit, drawn "the smallest children" to him, reminds us of Jesus. He also, notably, and in contrast to proselytising activists, makes no attempt to bring a social message: he "does not declaim" his grief, "nor beat his breast, nor even / sob very loudly"; and so has, in his lack of a social or political agenda, it is mentioned twice, "dignity".[87] The weeping man "cries out ... not words, but grief, not messages, but sorrow", and in the end "he hurries off down Pitt Street" after "evading believers".

'The Fire Autumn', which praises a natural order of the universe and society, also takes time to criticise "mankind" for having gone "critical": in the rational world, we learn, "Murder forms out of nothing in streets unspeakably adult". The modern world has also given us nuclear "fallout", while childbirth, which should be sacred, has become optional: "wombs become wardrobes. Only the poor need to be born". And in 'The Action' Murray attacks Enlightenment rationalism, which in his view "*invented Yokels, / it invented the Proles, who are difficult/noble/raffish, / it invented, in short, brave Us and*

254

the awful Others". For Murray, somewhat contradictorily again, the very acknowledgement of structural relations of power, or essential cultural differences, is a form of oppression. In 'The Action' Murray goes on to bring together Enlightenment rationalism with Napoleon and Stalin, who, we learn, "*were, mightily, the Action*".

In 'Sidere Mens Eadem Mutato', a "spiral of sonnets" dedicated to Robert (Bob) Ellis, Murray reports that "Academe has grown edgier. Many still drowse in the sun" like he and Ellis had done, "but *intellect* sounds like the cocking of a sten gun": knowledge has been politicised. Freud and Marx, he complains, "are left and right things in a goosestep", creating war. Universities supposedly "deserved to be shaken. They had sought to classify humans"; Murray here signalling again his antipathy to quantitative and rationalist forms of knowledge. Though the sixties radicals "shamed Magog their father and crippled his war", these people "colonised one another", because of selfishness and a confusing of the university with the whole world:

> . . . selfhood kept claiming the best people hand over fist
> in a few months a third of mankind had been called fascist –
> as the music slowed, the big track proved to be
> 'Fantasia of the World as a Softened University'.

Murray next suggests that "Academe has gained ground", in a class sense, and is now "the great house of our age, / replacing Society, granting the entrée to privilege". The university's study is "fashion", by which he means political and perhaps cultural fashion. The university "loves this new goddess for whom abortion is orgasm ... Nothing, now, less intense, could thrill an elite". Hedonism and perversion, supposedly the products of the modern university, now prevail, in Murray's mind at least. "Most rhymes in -ism and -ation / are nothing but cabals", states Murray in the final sonnet of the sequence, "out to take over the nation / compared with true persons" such as "Peter who sought gallant war". Theorisation of society, Murray suggests, is inevitably an expression of a lust for power; it can be contrasted with those, like the gallant Peter, who perform or want to perform "true" acts, like those carried out by soldiers in "gallant war" and who accept the natural social order.

As Eric Hobsbawm reminds us, "the longing that haunted" the Romantic "critique of the world" was "for the lost unity of man [sic] and nature. The bourgeois world was a

profoundly and deliberately asocial one".[88] He notes that "three sources assuaged this thirst for the lost harmony of man [sic] in the world: the middle ages, primitive man (or, what could amount to the same thing, exoticism and the 'folk'), and the French Revolution.[89] Romantic medievalism, Hobsbawm points out:

> attracted chiefly the romanticism of reaction. The stable-ordered society of the feudal age, the slow organic product of the ages, coloured with heraldry, surrounded by the shadowy mystery of fairy tale forests and canopied by the unquestioned Christian heavens, was the obvious lost paradise of the conservative opponents of bourgeois society, whose tastes for piety, loyalty and a minimum of literacy among the lower orders the French Revolution had only sharpened.[90]

"Closely allied with medievalism", Hobsbawm states further, in a passage that is equally relevant to Murray's poetry, "especially through its preoccupation with traditions of mystical religiosity, was the pursuit of even more ancient and profound mysteries and sources of irrational wisdom in the orient: the romantic, but also the conservative, realms of Kublai Khan or the Brahmins".[91] 'Walking to the Cattle Place' is of course partly set in Brahmin India.

As with Murray, "it was accepted among Romantics of all shades that 'the folk', i.e. normally the pre-industrial peasant or craftsman, exemplified the uncorrupted virtues and that its language, song, story and custom was the true repository of the soul of the people".[92] It is generally accepted that Romanticism failed to appear in Australia during the 'Romantic period', precisely because the nation was founded largely as a capitalist enterprise: there never was a completely pre-modern Australian 'folk' (assuming that 'folk' is a European social and conceptual category).[93] As Hobsbawm says, 'the folk' "could be a revolutionary concept, especially among oppressed peoples about to discover or reassert their national identity", but on the other hand "for those who were struck more by the folk's simple virtues of contentment, ignorance and piety, the deep wisdom of its trust in pope, king or tsar, the cult of the primitive ... lent itself to a conservative interpretation. It exemplified the unity of innocence, myth and age-old tradition, which the bourgeois society was every day destroying".[94]

For the conservative primitivist Romantic, like Murray, "the capitalist and the rationalist were the enemies against whom king, squire and peasant must maintain their

hallowed union",[95] though Murray is from the end of the Whitlam period, especially, demonstrably much less concerned with the operations of capitalists than with the operations of rationalists: radical and liberal intellectuals. Where many major Romantic artists were inspired by the possibilities of social renewal suggested by the revolutions in America and especially in France, for those Romantics like the conservative Murray, who remained attached to medievalist, folk and 'noble savage' ideals anchored firmly in the past, such social renewal was (or is) appalling. As Murray writes in 'Sidere Mens Eadem Mutato':

> Now student politicoes well known in our day
> have grown their hair two inches and are running the country.
> Revolution's established. There will soon be degrees
> conferred, with fistshake and speech, by the Dean of Eumenides.[96]

In contrast, says Murray, "the Church of Jesus and Newman / did keep some of us balanced concerning the meanings of *human* / that greased golden term (all the rage in the new demiurgy) / though each new Jerusalem tempts the weaker clergy". Humanism, Murray suggests yet again, is to blame for the world's decline.

In the Australian context Murray's medievalist and primitivist Romanticism is a definitively new artistic direction. Politically conservative Australian artists have tended to favour aesthetic classicism, a more obvious cultural base for the imperialist project, while those artists interested in political radicalism generally foregrounded the difficulties experienced by those common people most directly involved in the settling or invading of the land: their work was realist in style, and rationalist, or historically and sociologically 'true to life', in content. Arguably Murray's capacity to invoke a Romantic rustic world is aided by the relative destruction of this world, of traditional rural modes of production, consumption and evaluation, by the processes of modern capitalism (a process which realists like Frank Hardy were coming to accept had always had profound effects on the Australian 'folk').[97]

In romanticising the Australian 'folk' Murray also purifies or 'puritanises' Australian origins and identity: the (implicitly European, and so also white) Australian 'folk' emerge directly and naturally from the land, untainted by capitalism or imperialism, and remain in complete harmony with it. As Kevin Hart tellingly writes,

Murray's poetic aim is "the purification of the Australian vernacular into a poetic language".[98] These people live with the blessing of nature and of God and at peace with each other and (where this is allowed by aggressive Others) with the rest of society and the world. According to Alexander's blithe restating of the Murray family history, for example, "Hugh Murray and his brothers found the Aboriginals no threat, and offered them no violence".[99] The 'folk' provide spiritual refuge and regeneration for the poet and a model of personal behaviour and social organisation for the broader society. In Murray's vision Australians, like Americans, become a 'chosen' people, their land a gift from God (rather than a burden) and their way of life simply natural, which is also to say, ordained by God.[100] As Richard T. Hughes explains, the myth that theirs was 'nature's nation', "encouraged Americans to ignore the power of history and tradition as forces that shaped the nation".[101] The constitutive historical role of human reason and power in creating the structure and nature of Australian society is ignored, and so the contemporary justification for social planning is undermined. The cultural path towards the introduction within Australia of an ostensibly 'natural' public policy framework is swept a little more clear.

Sources of Murray's Philosophy

Murray's Romantic idealisation of the Australian 'folk' is in part an expression of his class interests. The presentation of rural white Australians as battlers (there are no rich farmers in Murray's poetry), and as gentle, spiritual, childlike, pure beings, living in harmony with nature, advances the political and economic claims of these people against Aborigines, who might claim a special form of 'authentic' Australian identity (and perhaps forms of government affirmative action policy because of this), and urban people, who might also want to be considered authentic Australians in spite of their lack of 'direct' connection with the land, or 'nature'. The theme of 'Thinking About Aboriginal Land Rights, I Visit the Farm I Will Not Inherit', for example, from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*, is that the implicitly white speaker deserves land rights because he has as strong a connection with the land as any Aboriginal: "By sundown it is dense dusk, all the tracks closing in. / I go into the earth near the feed shed for thousands of years";[102] while in 'To the Soviet Americans', from Murray's 1990 collection *Dog, Fox, Field*, he

suggests that "the working class" is merely a term invented by urban intellectual elites and deployed for their own greedy and authoritarian purposes: "in the forest, a working man / must say ... *I used to have work and a family here / but both them have shot through. / Now that trees belong to the working class / I don't suppose I do*". To a degree Murray co-opts a traditional, European, exoticised view of Aboriginal people and identity for rural whites, as a means by which they might exclude non-rural Australians from a full, spiritually whole Australian-ness. As he stated in a moment of uncharacteristic political frankness in 1976: "I was brought up in Country Party ideology and politically I might be said to belong to the mystical wing of the Country Party".[103]

More importantly, since Murray was after leaving home to attend university never even indirectly dependent on farming for his income, his wealth as an artist can be seen to be dependent on his capacity to position himself at an idealised and exclusive 'centre' of Australian culture. His economic capital from this time is directly dependent on his cultural capital, his capacity to speak for a particular cultural constituency. From at least the time of his entry into Sydney University Murray felt that poetry was his vocation. In 1971 he pledged that he would no longer work at any job other than poetry in order to make his living, and stuck to this pledge.[104] Given that he would be largely dependent on state patronage for his income, within a competitive grant-allocation system, it made economic sense for Murray to romanticise the Australian bush, his local community and, often implicitly, himself, as the real Australians. Murray's economic status and advancement was directly dependent on his capacity to use his particular cultural capital effectively within the arts funding 'marketplace'. This relative disconnection from actual rural labour (and for whatever reason Murray from a young age never actually worked physically on his farm[105]) also helps to explain the degree of romanticisation of rural life and work, evident in Murray's poetry and prose; as well as his degree of antipathy towards those intellectuals in the Enlightenment tradition who might criticise Murray's Romanticism, mysticism and appropriation of Aboriginal and other non-European and 'pre-modern' or traditional forms of spirituality and identity.

The spread of American-led consumer capitalism in 1960s Australia, and its destruction of traditional forms of culture and community, induced in Murray, as in many other people, including Frank Hardy, a longing for those traditional ways of life.

According to James Tulip: "The American cosmopolitanism of Sydney presented Murray with a challenge which has driven him back in thought and imagination to consider the basis of the Australian cultural tradition".[106] But where the realist and rationalist Hardy finds, in *The Unlucky Australians* and *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, that the archetypal Australian 'bushman' has in various ways become, or now appears, culturally 'corrupted' – racist, in particular – the Romanticist mystic Murray finds a more 'pure' 'bushman' than had previously been present in the Australian literary imagination, let alone society.[107] Where Hardy was disheartened to find his romantic illusions quashed, Murray in a sense capitalises on this wider desire for a spiritual reconnection with the land, created and exacerbated by the spread of modern capitalism. As Hart writes, Murray "names our country for us, and for the Americans and Europeans who gaze at it with nostalgia or desire".[108] Murray's "public, discursive aspect", Hart continues, "has helped to make him one of our prime cultural icons and certainly one of our most popular literary exports".[109]

Again, this aesthetic strategy can be seen as consistent with Murray's economic interests. He did not actually write poetry about his local community and culture until this was suggested to him at university by his friend Geoffrey Lehmann. Before then, according to Lehmann, he wrote about a wide range of topics, including "inquisitors, Japanese barges, refugees, lovers in city parks and thunderstorms".[110] But the idealisation of rustic rural life can also be seen as a positive strategy by which Murray can advance his inevitably (given the capitalist, scientist and technologically advanced social context) 'visionary' ideal of a good society. And the social and political conservatism and individualism of this vision are influenced not only by direct economic factors and political concerns but by Murray's childhood experience.

Murray was an only child whose isolation was exacerbated by the community in which he lived and by his parents' shame at their poverty. As Alexander recounts:

> In many ways the Bunyah community was a world unto itself ... Before the motorcar became common, after World War Two, Bunyah was deeply secluded ... The Bunyah community, cut-off, interrelated, and with plenty of space and opportunity to develop eccentricities and peculiarities, took on a character of its own in a short time ... Regional words, many of them Scots or northern English in origin, combined with Aboriginal words for plants and animals in the local Kattangal language ('jojo' for a bindii burr,

'carrawak' for currawong), and with peculiarities of grammar and delivery, constituted something close to a Bunyah dialect. They both reflected and reinforced the peculiarity and closeness of the valley community and were part of the birthright of everyone born into it. They also helped to exclude outsiders.[111]

"He had little to do with other children of his own age", states Alexander, "though his relations occupied all the farms around and there were cousins aplenty": "He grew up even more of an only child than he might have been if his parents had not suffered this deep shame of poverty".[112] Murray was, not surprisingly, a person with eccentricities from an early age. His considerable size also meant he stood out. At school (especially high school) and university he was or felt victimised, always not part of the group, or at least not part of *the* group.[113]

Murray's family were not rural labourers, as were the majority of the rural Australians of the nineteenth century, the central objects of the Australian radical nationalist mythology. They were not working class as such. Although they were at times very poor, the Murrays were self-employed farmers. They were mostly small farmers because they hadn't managed to be successful large farmers for very long.[114] So they did not have an experience of having been oppressed by or of having to gain wages from employers, the characteristic experience out of which the dominant, radical traditions of Australian nationalism developed. They neither had nor wanted significant government involvement in their lives. They understood their poverty in individualist terms, as the result of a desire to stay on the land, of bad luck, from droughts and other natural disasters, of personal failings, such as alcoholism, and of personal meanness. Murray's grandfather was in particular, from all accounts, a violent, bullying, selfish person. Murray explains to Alexander: "My parents detested (their) house because to them it was the image of being kept poor, unnecessarily poor, by my grandfather. And by brute circumstance, the droughts".[115] "Drought and shortages of all kinds", Alexander notes, "were to sink deep into (the) child's consciousness".[116] Earlier Murray had written:

> In our family (whisky) caused untold damage and suffering during roughly the first three generations in Australia, and this left me, like many of the generation just before mine, with both a certain nostalgia for the wealth we might have had if our grandfathers had held on to their land and a lasting fear of induced madness, of all false glamours and disarray.[117]

There is no mention here of broader social factors or of the role of government or big business, or even unions. As Alexander states of Murray: "His parents' 'fate' was clearly personalised: 'Them and He', the class enemy, was not some distant boss, but Cecil's boorish, bullying father".[118] Murray's experience of community mobilisation or action was felt as a largely negative one: "In his later writing", states Alexander, "he would recognise the universality of his situation at Taree High: every society has its victims, every society its torturers".[119] He would not have been told the stories of the struggles of organised labour during the 1890s and 1930s depressions, and he was too young to experience first hand the social effects of the 1930s depression. All of these factors probably contributed to Murray's political individualism and conservatism.

Murray's longing for a politically conservative, strongly religious, pre-modern world, is also influenced by his Catholicism, to which he converted formally in 1964.[120] As he makes clear in his important essay on 'Athens and Boeotia' and elsewhere in his prose, Murray believes that the medieval 'dark ages' are misnamed and that the European society of this time was generally preferable to the world of 'enlightened', modern industrial democracy.[121] Murray's idealisation of small-scale rural production is reminiscent of the ideal social model put forward by B.A. Santamaria,[122] while Bert Almon notes that, intellectually, "the obvious precedent for Murray in the Australian tradition is James McAuley".[123] Almon explains that:

> McAuley was much taken by [Eric] Boegelin's interpretation of the Enlightenment and its manifestations in liberalism and modernism: for Voegelin, all these trends are the latest forms of the Gnostic heresy, which 'immanentised' the meaning of existence, making it available only to the illuminated individual: the kind of transcendence offered by Christianity was bypassed.[124]

"Murray's distrust of the technological imperative, and his alienation from what he calls the left-liberal establishment", Almon continues, "show an affinity to Voegelin's similar scepticism about the Gnostic tendencies of modern man".[125]

But in its fixation on spiritual transcendence and its strong anti-humanism Murray's Catholicism retains traces of the puritanism of Murray's childhood. His familial culture was fundamentally Puritan: Calvinist. As Murray recalls, "in our family ... the

whisky fed, in its delusive way, all the spiritual hungers which a sclerotic and rigid Calvinism disdained to notice".[126] And he says of his parents, "they were puritan people".[127] Alexander writes that "the imaginative child was ... terrified by hellfire sermons in the monthly Free Presbyterian services in Bunyah Hall".[128] "Knowing himself to be a bad sinner", Alexander continues, "for why else would his father beat him so ... he read the Bible from cover to cover".[129] "The superb music of the Authorised Version", recounts Alexander, "wove its way deep into his mind".[130] This was "The first poetry I *encountered*", Murray avers, with emphasis.[131] Though Murray converts to Catholicism, he retains this core Puritan belief in humanity's fundamental 'badness', a puritan aversion to social and sexual 'aberration', and a desire to find meaning through a God imagined as the embodiment of purity.

Where the ideal or imaginary 'typical Australian' in Russel Ward's carefully researched and closely documented account is "sceptical about the value of religion", Murray is most fundamentally a Christian.[132] Where Ward's typical Australian possesses no more "completely damning ... epithet in his vocabulary" than 'scab'", Murray is strongly opposed to unions and socialism and not interested in workplace or economic oppression, even as concepts.[133] Where Ward's Australian "is a fiercely independent person who hates officiousness and authority, especially when these qualities are embodied in military officers and policemen", Murray attempted as a young man to join the army, repeatedly idealises Australian soldiers and at times policemen in his poetry, and associates authoritarianism with groups and with intellectual argument.[134] According to Ward, the typical Australian "tends to be a rolling stone, highly suspect if he should chance to gather much moss".[135] But Murray stresses his spiritual attachment to the particular region of his childhood. Figuratively, and to an extent literally, Murray is a small farmer rather than an itinerant worker. He wants to stay in the bush, not merely travel through it or work in it, and he professes an active dislike of the city. "Above all", writes Ward, the Australian "will stick to his mates through thick and thin, even if he thinks they may be in the wrong".[136] Yet Murray's primary concern is not with being 'true' to his 'mates' (however these are defined), but with being free from the constraints these or other people might put on him. As he wrote in the October 1993 edition of Michael Duffy's *Independent Monthly*: "the fundamental attitude of the human world is

predatory contempt".[137] "The spirit of mob persecution", Alexander comments, "represented all (Murray) was determined to go on identifying and fighting, whether it showed itself in playgrounds, literary coteries, political witch-hunts or in the gulags of totalitarianism".[138] The flipside of this is an individualist belief in the virtues of self-sufficiency: as Alexander notes, Murray also believes himself to have embraced "the bush values of self-sufficiency and decency that [his father] Cecil represented to him".[139]

The social and cultural conditions of Murray's childhood, characterised by personal and social isolation, an absence of government regulation and union organisation, and the prevalence of strongly puritan forms of Christianity, more closely resembled those experienced by the culturally dominant settlers or invaders of the United States than those experienced by the great majority of Australians. Murray's political and aesthetic response to his experience is therefore, not surprisingly, comparable to that of the original, US Puritans.

While it would be possible to find many people within Australia, and even within Australian literature, who have embraced and popularly embodied American culture in a way that Murray has not – John Tranter, for example – in another sense it is Murray's identity as today's 'most Australian Australian', the most prominent spokesperson for the Australian 'folk',[140] that makes him the most worthwhile figure to examine in this context. It is Murray's Americanised Australian nationalism rather than (say) Tranter's Australianised American aesthetic which best demonstrates the subtle but powerful Americanisation of Australian culture. Murray re-imagines Australian identity in traditionally American terms, as the product of an unbroken covenant between God and His children, as inhering in those people who live according to (Murray's conception of) God's will, the natural law. In so doing Murray also works to facilitate Australia's adoption of public policy frameworks, such as those of the New Right, grounded in these same, fundamentally puritan beliefs. Murray gives a traditionally American form and focus to language and imagery that carry distinctively Australian cultural resonance. While his nationalism is Australian in content, it is in its form more akin to traditional American nationalisms.[141]

Murray and the New Right

Murray's distrust of human reason and his desire for natural law have their origins in the puritan belief, especially dominant, traditionally, within the United States, that as God is pure, humanity is, in and of itself, impure. Human reason, therefore, is not to be trusted. Within the New Right, this belief manifests itself in a fetishisation of natural science, and the idea of scientific public policy, while Murray fetishises nature itself: scientism and mysticism are two sides of the same anti-humanist, anti-rationalist, anti-democratic coin. In searching for a natural basis for his world view, Murray, like the New Right, descends into radical subjectivism. Arguably, they both find in nature and natural science what they consciously or unconsciously want to find: that is, beliefs and polices that suit their particular desires, politics and interests. A further corollary between Murray's mystical and the New Right's empiricist radical subjectivism, consequently, is political individualism. Though Murray idealises communities of 'traditional', pre-Enlightenment peoples, this idealisation is premised on these communities' acceptance of and reverence towards a 'natural' cosmic – and so also an unchanging social – order. The politics of Murray and of the New Right are mobilised primarily by their shared desire to oppose the purported 'right' of groups to impose their version of reality – be it economic, political or cultural – onto the individual.

Murray articulates his world view most clearly and comprehensively in his important 1978 essay 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia'.[142] He responds in this essay to Peter Porter's characterisation of Australian culture, in his poem 'On First Looking Into Chapman's Hesiod', as 'Boeotian', asserting that while Australian culture is, as Porter suggests, "essentially Boeotian",[143] this is something that should be celebrated rather than criticised or apologised for. "In this essay I will be concerned mainly to delate [sic] upon the background and cultural implications of the themes (Porter) raises", explains Murray, "though I may venture to argue respectfully with him towards the end, as the 'side' he chooses is the opposite one to my own".[144] "I think there is a wisdom", Murray writes, "in Australia's Boeotian-ness".[145]

Murray argues that contemporary Australian society, like other societies around the world, contains within it a central tension or conflict between Boeotian and Athenian

cultural impulses, a cultural conflict that can be traced back to its original manifestation in the classical Greek Boeotia and Athens of the sixth-century BC:

> Within Western culture itself it is possible that not only the oppressive use of contrasts such as *modern* versus *old-fashioned* or *cultivated* versus *rude* but even the very notion of such polarities may ultimately derive from the submerged and almost forgotten conflict between Athens and Boeotia in early classical times.[146]

Theogony and *Works and Days*, by the Athenian Hesiod, are he says "second only to the two great Homeric epics in the number of progeny they have generated and the cultural influence they have had".[147] "The work of Hesiod", Murray goes on to say, "stands on one side of a rift that runs through the whole of Western culture, a fundamental tension which for convenience we may call the war betwen [sic] Athens and Boeotia".[148] This "conflict", says Murray, again signalling that he won't be constrained by questions of historical accuracy or material or sociological evidence, is "part-historical, part-metaphoric".[149] Not surprisingly, Murray finds that the Middle Ages was "a period in which the highest Boeotian civilisation in Western history flourished".[150] Though a 'high' peasant culture may seem a contradiction in terms, Murray argues that like himself Dante had the "deeply Boeotian purpose of creating a vernacular poetry capable of handling sublime matters".[151]

"The Boeotians", Murray explains, "living to the north-west of Attica, were held to be rude, boorish, and stupid, their country swampy and cheerless, their arts old-fashioned and tedious".[152] In terms of cultural difference, "Athenians *count*, we may say, while Boeotians *list* and *name*. The distinction makes for a profound difference in cultures that follow one model or the other".[153] Athens is rationalist and scientistic, guided by the mind rather than the body, by greed rather than the laws of nature, and is fundamentally urban rather than rural. Athens is narrowly patriarchal, driven by phallocentric urges, Boeotia maternal and fertile: Murray refers to Athens and Boeotia in gendered terms throughout the article. Athens is also culturally relativist: foregrounding the temporal and socially specific values of the society – via the institutions of democracy – over the eternal truths of nature and God. Boeotia, in contrast, is:

> mistrustful of Athens' vaunted democracy – which after all involved only a minority of voters living on the labour of a large slave population – *she*

(Boeotia, emphasis added) clings to older ideas of the importance of family and the display of individual human quality under stress. If aristocracy is her besetting vice, that of Athens is probably abstraction.[154]

Within Athens, Murray informs us, "conflict and resolution take the place, in a crowded urban milieu, of the Boeotian interest in celebration and commemoration, modes that perennially appear in spacious, dignified cultures".[155] (Murray's poetry consistently celebrates space as a metaphor for this type of transcendent, a-political existence: "In the silent lands", writes Murray in 'Recourse to the Wilderness', for example, "time broadens into space ... iron-brown and limitless, the plains / were before me all day. Burn mountains fell behind / in the glittering sky".) Social and class conflict is foreign to Boeotia, whose inhabitants are guided by common belief, by the eternal rhythms of nature and the will of God.

Murray argues that as Boeotia was oppressed by the Athenians, so the Boeotian cultural impulse is oppressed by Athenianism throughout recorded history, in the West and subsequently the entire world. He explains:

> What is at issue are two contrasting models of civilisation between which Western man has vacillated; he has now drawn the rest of mankind into the quarrel, and resolving this tension may be the most urgent task facing the world in modern times. In the past, Athens, the urbanising, fashion-conscious principle removed from and usually insensitive to natural, cyclic views of the world, has won out time and again, though the successes of Boeotia have been far from negligible.[156]

And he states later:

> We have been mesmerised during the last few centuries by evolutionary ideas that contrast 'primitive' with advanced, progressive with stagnant, dynamic with decadent – the basic metaphor has been stretched many ways. It has taken the Second World War and the decolonisation after that of much of the world to reveal the iniqities [sic] perpetrated by Western cultures, using these sorts of ideas as their cover and justification, on traditional cultures. We are beginning to be conscious of a nexus of thinking and of oppression here which extends all the way from personal to international relations, and goes far beyond the bounds of art.[157]

Murray identifies an historical pattern in which new or young societies originate as culturally Boeotian but become, or have thrust upon them, the more rationalist, analytic, unnatural, emotionally deprived Athenian culture:

> Within our civilisation we repeatedly see a pattern of autonomous, distinctive art at the beginning of each people's cultural history, followed by the importation and imposition of the general Roman–Athenian cultural inheritance. In some cases the native tradition will live on more or less vigorously at the level of folk art, with idiosyncratic works of a strongly 'popular' flavour surfacing from time to time within the purlieus of the 'high' culture.[158]

As an example: "The tradition (Walt Whitman) founded is still productive and part of the reason for our being able to speak of a distinctive American poetry".[159] "At best", he writes, "these fruitions of distinctiveness, these new departures full of idiosyncrasy and character", are "the treasures of nationality".[160]

Murray sees the Australian culture of his own society as being still in its 'Boeotian' phase: "In any sense broad enough to admit the great majority of Australians, our culture *is* still in its Boeotian phase, and any distinctiveness we possess *is* still firmly anchored in the bush".[161] He hopes that Australia might resist the general historical pattern he has identified, and choose not to become culturally Athenian:

> The idea of our deliberately remaining Boeotian is full of exciting possibilities. It would be something indeed, to break with Western culture by not taking, even now, the characteristic second step into alienation, into elitism and the relegation of all places except one or two urban centres to the sterile status of provincial no-man's-land largely deprived of any art or any creative self-confidence.[162]

This is, Murray thinks, a democratic and liberatory hope, and he views his own work as part of this struggle:

> Whether the pre-eminence of the ballads and other vernacular poetry was excessive at one time or not, it is true that these sorts of writing remain the core of whatever specifically Australian poetry the nation's people still value and refer to. And it is here, with the position of the people to whom Athens perennially offers nothing and whom she disdains as *hoi polloi*, the ockers, 'your average suburban yobbos' and the like, that I have to begin to fight against Peter's poem, or rather against its untimely, if personally valid and honest, conclusion.[163]

Poetry itself, Murray suggests, echoing his characterisation of the artist in an earlier essay as an "archaic trade", may ultimately be a Boeotian art, an art properly based on the timeless, eternal and transcendent values of nature.[164]

But Murray is expressly opposed to the possibility of a Boeotian culture displacing the historically dominant Athenian. Rather, he desires a unification or reunification of these, a "long-needed reconciliation of Athens with Boeotia", that "lasting organic country where *urban* and *rural* no longer imply a conflict, and where one descovers [sic] ever more richly what one is and where one stands and how to grow from there without loss or the denial of others": social harmony within a common culture.[165] The cultural debate he is taking part in is especially important, he implies, because Australia is uniquely positioned to act as an example to the rest of the world. Australia finds "herself", he writes, "very much to her surprise, to be one of the places in which some sort of synthesis might at last be achieved".[166] "It may be reserved for us", he states later, "to bring off the long-needed reconciliation of Athens with Boeotia".[167] "If this is to happen here, though", Murray warns, "we will need to clear our heads of many remnant colonial obeisances, and look at things clearly and straight";[168] that is to say, cast off the influence of the Athenians, aka the Ascendancy: radical and liberal intellectuals.[169]

Murray's central argument then is that Australians should, like him, live in accordance with a natural order, which is purportedly also the order, the culture, of the common people, the 'folk', who are fundamentally the most truly Australian Australians. The reason why Australians as a whole have not so far followed this order is that they have been kept from doing so by rationalist intellectuals, also known as liberals and radicals, and 'the Ascendancy', and 'Athenians'. In presenting this argument Murray does not offer evidence that there is an Australian 'folk' or that they continue to live by this ancient natural code. He does not say definitively who the 'Athenians' are or demonstrate how they obtain and exercise power. The 'Athenians', in his account, oppress the 'Boeotian' folk merely by the act of looking down on them. Just as it is not explained how this constitutes oppression (what is to stop 'Boeotians' from ignoring this or from looking down on 'Athenians'?), it is asserted that a synthesis of 'Boeotian' and 'Athenian' ways of living is possible if people just believe it is: there is no necessary

trade-off between 'Boeotian' and 'Athenian', pre-modern and modern, ways of living: hence he suggests that the culture of "the black Australians", who "have been here for tens of thousands of years", is "a Boeotian *resource* of immeasurable value for us all".[170] Under Murray's tutelage, Australians can be both increasingly wealthy and powerful and at the same time increasingly 'natural', earthy and even marginalised: both economically wealthy and culturally pure, so long as one accepts Murray's conservative cultural politics (his 'natural law') and does not begin to question the social order on which it is based. To do so, Murray makes clear, or to demand evidence and logical consistency in accounts of society, would be deeply Athenian, unnatural and un-Australian.

As with the 'vernacular republic' and the 'Ascendancy', 'Boeotia' and 'Athens' are purely subjective, essentialised categories.[171] All that it takes to be a member of Boeotia is to say that you are and to not compromise the claim by questioning the social order. All that it takes to be slotted into the Athens category is to question the social order. Murray doesn't discuss the impact of industrialisation on the social structure of Western or other societies, enabling the European working class and whoever else subscribes to his 'Boeotian' definition to see themselves as peasants, still members of a culture with its roots in the soil. A people can supposedly be imperialist without conquering and destroying other peoples – the archetypal Athenians are intellectuals not soldiers or capitalists – while another people – white Australians for instance – can be Boeotian even when they have, largely through their ownership of and continuing desire for ever more sophisticated products and technologies, conquered and set out to destroy other peoples.

This timeless historical conflict set out by Murray is, notably, a conflict between two groups who are, in world terms, quite close together, ethnically and culturally. Both Boeotians and Athenians are of the West, yet Murray draws no distinction between the experience of the Boeotians and the experience of non-Western peoples who came into contact with the imperialist Athenians. Reading history in this way, Murray is able to suggest, firstly, that there is no essential difference between, on the one hand, the experience, culture and identity of the various 'Boeotian' groups around the world who have been the victims of European imperialism, and on the other hand those white members of European and 'New World' societies who have remained culturally

'Boeotian'. Secondly, it is suggested that there was never any fundamental basis for conflict between Athenians, and their imperialist European offspring, and non-European indigenous peoples. The conflict between Europeans and non-Europeans, Murray asserts, is really no different from the cultural conflict between the European Boeotians and Athenians. By conflating the experience of all groups who feel victimised by European imperialism and capitalism with the experience of the Boeotians in his fable, Murray effectively denies the cultural specificity of these groups, robs them of a voice and an identity, denies their history of political oppression and material exploitation, and works to legitimate existing social and economic relations.[172]

To question Murray's beliefs or existing social relations is to automatically become culturally Athenian, morally bad, less than fully human. To demand evidence of any of his claims for instance is constructed as an inherently Athenian act.[173] To begin to discuss material redistribution of wealth or the political emancipation of a particular group is to spread 'division', to exacerbate 'alienation', to attack 'community' and its traditional values of 'individual achievement' and 'the family', to involve oneself in that deeply Athenian and un-Boeotian practice that is so characteristic of today's Athenians, the powerful, oppressive liberals and radicals: "One of the few Athenian features that have 'taken' in Australian society has to do with the image of the artist. In Boeotia he [sic] is a craftsman, with some remnant of priestly dignity. In Athens, he is an intellectual, a member of a class for which entropy and the corrosive analysis of value are principles of life".[174] Artists and priests reaffirm the great truths, the natural order, while intellectuals 'corrode' value by questioning the naturalness of social and cultural relations.

Murray's argument is likely to strike a chord with many people in a 'first world', Western nation like Australia. Alienation is a pervasive experience within modern industrial society. Most people are aware that the West (and North) has oppressed the East (and South) and undervalued the cultures of the peoples of these regions. It is appealing for Westerners to believe that their own 'primitive', pre-Enlightenment or pre-industrial spirituality can be 'recaptured', particularly if, as Murray suggests, the recapturing of this spirituality does not entail giving up the material benefits of industrial society, and even more so if the embracing of this spirituality might somehow lead to the

liberation of other oppressed non-rationalists, like those of the societies of the East and South. In Murray's account, all that is required for Westerners like himself to attain a traditional, natural, spiritually whole identity, is that they realise that Athenians – questioners of natural orders and purveyors of rationalist and democratic thought – what Murray disgustedly terms intellectual and political 'fashion' – have created this alienation, and that of oppressed peoples throughout the world. Culture is in Murray's thought completely disconnected from its material base and becomes a purely personal and imagined thing, its shape purely a matter of personal choice. This is in a sense the perfect cultural politics for an age dominated by New Right individualism. The implicit suggestion is that one can both obtain wealth through the successful exploitation of people or resources and at the same time obtain a feeling of spiritual wholeness and moral righteousness through appropriating the spirituality of those being oppressed. The radical subjectivism of Murray and the New Right is finally indivisible from the radical individualism they also share.

From one point of view Murray's historical and social analysis is narrowly propagandist, which is not to say that he does not believe it. As with the original Puritans he has looked to uncorrupted nature for guidance and found what he (subconsciously?) wanted to find. The denial of the value and moral worth of human reason leads not only to the construction of a rigid personal code of behaviour and correspondingly rigid social order, but also to a relative inability to see (or admit) the political basis of one's own, or society's, 'pure' desires; it leads, that is to say, to pure subjectivism. Clearly, Murray's Romanticism is of this order. It functions to reposition himself and his conservative traditional values at the centre of Australian culture. In Hart's 1991 estimation: "By an extraordinary act of self-mythologising Les Murray is becoming for Australia what Robert Frost is for the United States: a monument to a way of life that is always and already past".[175] "Although he laments that Australia has 'vanished into ideology'", Hart continues, "Murray himself remains the most ideological of writers. Perhaps no other Australian poet has so successfully naturalised a mystification of the country and our possible relations to it".[176]

Though Murray criticises political liberals and radicals as followers of or slaves to 'modern' thinking or technology, a criticism often mounted via an attack on their

supposedly inhuman scientism or Soviet-style totalitarianism, like the New Right he also fetishises natural science and suggests that it underpins or is consistent with his Romantic mysticism. In one of his 1974 *Sydney Morning Herald* articles for instance he finds that *The Challenge of Chance*, by Alister Hardy, Robert Harvie and Arthur Koestler, is "an important book" because "it suggests, on the basis of sober mathematical and experimental work ... that we [sic] call chance and randomness, if they exist at all, are full of strange regularities and twists".[177] "Through ESP and other phenomena", he goes on to say, "the biological sciences have begun, in their turn, to go critical. The social sciences will obviously follow, probably with economics and politics bringing up the rear, investment in things-as-they-are being a notorious brake on intellectual venturesomeness of a genuine sort".[178] "It is some time since I looked at the current state of research into paranormal phenomena", states Murray, elsewhere, and on "coming back to the subject, I'm not greatly surprised to find that it has pretty nearly become respectable".[179] According to Murray:

> There is ... more and more support for notions of the interconnectedness of all living things and for interactions which have for long been beneath our notice. Women may, for example, be in intimate telepathic contact with their babies throughout pregnancy – which makes abortion seem an even viler crime that [sic] it does now, though this probably won't affect the vogue for it; abortion in our society has become an important ritual by which women enter the 'enlightened' privileged class or express identification with it. It's degree [sic] you take on the way up".[180]

Similarly, "what is fascinating" in Leonardo Da Vinci's "career", Murray informs us:

> is not so much the unrivalled extent of his curiosity but the way in which, for him as for few since his time, art, science, technics, and craft knowledge are all parts of a conscious whole and not ashamed to borrow from one another. This is a legacy of the Middle Ages and makes nonsense of the ultimately polemical and anti-Christian, rather than historical, view that the Renaissance was, to quote from the very first chapter in Signor Reti's book, 'the rebirth of man out of the dark years of medieval superstition and belief and a return to the light of human reason'. This is outdated twaddle.[181]

Murray's anti-humanist, positivist scientism combines seamlessly with his anti-humanist mysticism.

Murray takes offence, however, when science is used to discredit the spiritual or the Christian: an author is described as "admirably objective", but "when we come to his chapters on messiahs and specifically on Christianity ... we see the thinness of his objectivity and how inescapably the anti-religious bias of Western science peeps through the thinking even of a patently honest man".[182] This author, indeed:

> quite unwarrantably ... reads the Scriptures selectively to produce a picture of Jesus as just another insurrectionary folk prophet whose teachings were altered by Paul to make them palatable to non-Jewish concerts and then altered again into a wholly other-wroldy creed after the destruction of the Temple in AD 70. All of which is old stuff, but holds together if you want it to.[183]

"The residue of anti-Christian ideology in Western science", Murray goes on to say, "is what gives this otherwise fascinating book its slightly flat, unsatisfying quality".[184] "Some of the author's good insights" now "begin to seem simplistic, and his apparently uncritical acceptance of approved modern concepts such as class warfare begins to worry us".[185] "We sense that the impulse to elucidate", says Murray, resignedly, "has given way to the older temptation to explain away".[186] "Perhaps the moral of this", Murray concludes with a complete lack of reflexivity, "is that to be really objective, you have to be free".[187]

Fundamental, scientistic and essentialist laws of nature are drawn upon to build legitimacy for thoughts and activities that are at the same time highly idiosyncratic, individualistic and subjective. Like his puritan forebears and his New Right contemporaries, Murray's distrust of humanity leads to a hypertrophy of both mystical and scientific forms of knowledge, at the expense of normative reason, based on shared, social interpretations, experiences and values; and to a preference for political individualism and authoritarianism over democracy. As Robert Crunden writes of the archetypal Puritan evangelist Jonathan Edwards, so too it could be said of Murray: "In his reading the nature of an inscrutable God through the elements, in his combination of mysticism and science, in his eagerness to make order out of chaos, he summed up much of the American experience";[188] although in Murray's case of course this 'summing up' was taking place in Australia, and so constituted a 'reshaping' of the Australian experience.

For the New Right the ideal society has not yet been achieved, and the members of this informal political movement remain fixated on a more rational and efficient future, while Murray idealises 'pre-modern', medieval and 'primitive' societies. But Murray is by the end of the Whitlam period opposed to Whitlamism and a fellow traveller with the New Right movement because like the members of the New Right he rejects the Enlightenment argument that society should be organised on the basis of human reason and democracy and espouses the view that society should be organised on the basis of a natural order. Both Murray and the members of the New Right believe strongly that groups of people should not have the right to impose their version of reality – be it economic, cultural or political – on the individual. The defining features of Murray's thought, as of that of the New Right, are its (philosophical) radical subjectivism and (political) individualism. As their thought is purportedly based directly on nature or natural science rather than human reason, Murray and the New Right are each able to ignore questions of material evidence and of the relationship between the world as it is and the world as they represent it, and each is able to interpret the world in a way that serves their respective political interests and purposes, while at the same time denying that their interpretations are political.

Beginning from a desire to avoid human subjectivity and fallibility, Murray and the New Right arrive at pure subjectivism. Beginning from an idealisation of those who supposedly live according to natural law – be they a pre-modern 'folk' or the New Right's 'rugged individual' – Murray and the New Right end up seeking to impose this generally self-serving 'natural' law onto all people, thereby bringing into question, if questioning was needed, its naturalness. Both Murray and the New Right are expressly opposed to the right of any group of people to consciously choose to organise their society in a way that is not consistent with their respective conceptions of 'natural' law. Murray and the New Right are each opposed to the use of reason as the basis for such organisation, and accordingly both turn without equivocation to self-serving forms of knowledge – propaganda – as a means of defeating rational and collective organisation.[189] Where the New Right espouses political individualism it does not accept forms of individualism that conflict with its conception of natural law, such as the 'law' of master and servant, while Murray's idealisation of his imagined community of the

275

Australian folk is, similarly, entirely premised on this group's supposed acceptance of the natural, pre-modern cultural and social order he has enunciated. In their rejection of democracy, of the 'tyranny of the masses', Murray and the New Right advance models of society which combine a tightly controlled and limited individualism – negative freedom – with strong authoritarianism.[190]

Conclusion

Les Murray was ultimately a critic of Whitlam and Whitlamism because the values upon which Whitlam's philosophy and politics were based were not consistent with those of Murray. Where Whitlamism was influenced by and broadly amenable to previously dominant cultural traditions within Australian society, as demonstrated by the support afforded Whitlam and his government by Patrick White and Frank Hardy, Murray's formative experience and culture were, in the Australian context, unique, or at least much less representative. Murray re-imagines Australian culture and identity in radically subjectivist and radically individualist ways that undermine Whitlamism and dominant Australian cultural traditions and provide cultural support for the politics of the New Right. This is because the politics and philosophy of both the New Right and Murray are ultimately derived from or underpinned by a radical puritan metaphysics. As this radical puritanism had traditionally been dominant within American but not Australian culture, the suffusing and normalisation of forms of public policy and of art that draw upon this puritanism, within Australia, significantly assist the Americanisation of Australian culture and society. To the extent that the New Right political movement was able to gain support or tolerance within the US through its drawing upon or overall compatibility with dominant American cultural traditions, it seems logical that this movement's acceptability within Australia was aided by a general 'Americanisation' of Australian society – by the spread of a characteristically American structure of feeling – as well as by specific reframings of Australian history, society and identity in American terms. In 'puritanising' Australian origins and identity, Murray Americanises these, and in the process both undermines public support for Whitlamism and provides cultural support for the distinctively American public policy of the New Right. As is the case with White and Hardy, Murray's literary works and professional career bear out Raymond Williams'

important, general theoretical argument, that the art and culture of a period are not simply the products of material structures and political modes of social organisation, but also powerfully shape these things.

---

[1] As discussed in previous chapters, White and Hardy had doubts about the Whitlam government and were at times critical of it but were broadly supportive of this government, particularly as they looked back on it from the post-Whitlam period.

[2] Murray's family belonged to a particularly narrow or strict denomination, the Calvinist Free Presbyterians. See Peter F. Alexander, *Les Murray: A Life in Progress*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, 2000, p.31.

[3] These are reprinted in *The Peasant Mandarin: Prose Pieces*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1978, pp.1–21, 22–35, 143–158.

[4] Murray writes for example that "Approval or disapproval of the purchase (of Jackson Pollock's *Blue Poles*) almost became a test of progressive right-thinking and political *chic*. This naturally created a good deal of resentment, and the thing could have been handled with more tact. It had an element of that triumphant, rub-their-noses-in-it bravura which was one of the less likeable features of Mr Whitlam's style". 'Patronage Revisited', in Murray, *The Peasant Mandarin*, p.29.

[5] Ibid., p.33.

[6] Murray, 'The Australian Republic', p.143.

[7] Murray's first reference to the 'Ascendancy', is in 'The Australian Republic', p.148.

[8] Murray, 'Patronage Revisited', p.23.

[9] Ibid., p.33.

[10] Michael Leunig is quoted as saying that at this election-night party "Ellis and Les Murray gatecrashed by climbing through an open window and wove their way into the ballroom along a series of corridors". Peter Weiniger, 'Lean and Nosy, Like a Ferret', the *Age*, 1 November 1993, p.9.

[11] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.159.

[12] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', pp.16–17.

[13] Ibid., p.16.

[14] Ibid., p.2.

[15] Ibid., p.20. According to Alexander, "this, his first contribution, would have a major effect on ALP policy on the arts, for though the details of his paper were not followed, its major thrust, 'that artists of real merit or substantial promise be seen as having a *right* to a decent income', would influence the Whitlam government when it set in place the Australia Council after its election 1972. When Murray argued for income-spreading for artists, to reduce their tax-burden in good years, Whitlam adopted a modified version of his scheme. And although Murray never felt content with the results of his efforts, he would be mildly gratified, years later, to come across his phrasing in Australia Council literature". *Les Murray*, p.145. However, it is difficult to find evidence to corroborate this claim. In his comprehensive history of his own government (*The Whitlam Government*), Whitlam makes no mention of Murray.

[16] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', p.9.

[17] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', p.1.

[18] Ibid., pp.1, 4.

[19] Ibid., p.18.

[20] Ibid., pp.20-21.

[21] Ibid., p.4.

[22] Ibid., p.19.

[23] Ibid., pp.6–7.

[24] Ibid., pp.6–7.

[25] Ibid., p.9. Cf. Whitlam: "Quality of life depends less and less on the things which individuals obtain for themselves and can purchase for themselves from their personal incomes and depends more and more on the things which the community provides for all its members from the combined resources of the community". *The Whitlam Government*, p.3.

[26] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', pp.3–4. The concept of social goods is dependent on the concept of market failure. Social goods, or public goods, are those which by definition must be provided publicly, by government, because left to its own devices the market will not provide them. Social goods represent a breakdown in what Keynes called 'effective demand' because they cannot be owned solely by an individual or because the value of the product is not measurable in monetary terms. So there is demand, but no-one willing or able to purchase the product.

[27] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', p.5. Revealingly, Murray also describes the characterisation of sexual deviation as a sickness, rather than as an expression of sexuality, as "wise". Murray, 'Agnostic Glossolalia', in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.56.

[28] This argument is also explicitly put in Murray's 'Pound Devalued'. Ezra Pound, Murray writes, "went on to promote the ideal of the bohemian guru standing over against the Establishment, an ideal which led on to the grotesqueries of Messrs Ginsburg, Ferlinghetti, and a score of others. The Sharon Tate murders may be said to have consummated that line of historical development". In *Peasant Mandarin*, p.75.

[29] Murray, 'Patronage in Australia', pp.1, 4.

[30] Ibid., pp.4–5.

[31] Ibid., p.2.

[32] Ibid., pp.2–3.

[33] Ibid., p.10.

[34] Murray, 'Patronage Revisited', p.27.

[35] Ibid., pp.27–28.

[36] Ibid., p.32.

[37] Ibid., pp.32–33.

[38] Ibid., p.35.

[39] Ibid., p.34.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Bennett, 'Literary Culture Since Vietnam', in Bennett and Strauss, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, p.261.

[43] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.159.

[44] "It can now be argued that Labor's failure to declare a republic in 1973 when the time was ripe for it was a failure of vision and of nerve which ultimately betray [sic] many of their other initiatives in the field of national identity and self-confidence. The republic, pushed through then, would have made so many other innovations irreversible". Murray, 'The Australian Republic', p.144. Like many other statements in this article, this one is extraordinary in its lack of concern for evidence and reason. How the Whitlam government could have simply declared a republic, thereby overcoming the manifold legal and other practical obstacles to this fantasy, is not even commented upon.

[45] Murray, 'The Australian Republic', p.146.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Ibid., p.148.

[48] Ibid.

[49] See Murray, ibid., p.143; and his 'Corruptio Optimi', in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.228.

[50] Murray, 'The Australian Republic', pp.148–149.

[51] Ibid., p.147.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., p.143.

[54] Ibid., p.149.

[55] Ibid., p.148.

[56] Ibid., p.149.

[57] Ibid. Ironically, from any objective standpoint it was actually Labor that had finished with socialism.

[58] Ibid., p.150. Murray's claim to have been taught by his 'elders' is not only a highly selective reading of his own history but implies that his own education is comparable to that of Australia's original, Aboriginal inhabitants, since 'elder', as a formal title, is in Australia generally used by Aborigines. 'Elder' could also be used however within the Presbyterian Church of his family.

[59] Ibid. Murray began a Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Sydney in 1957. He left the university in 1961, without completing it. In that year he hitch-hiked around the east coast of Australia then, although

not formally enrolled, returned to what Lawrence Bourke describes as his "familiar haunt" of Sydney University, in 1962. Murray met his wife Valerie Morelli, a theatre costume mistress, while playing the part of Satan in a Sydney University German production of *Faust*. During this period his verse appeared in the student magazines *Hermes* and ARNA (which he jointly edited with his friend Geoffrey Lehmann), and in *Southerly*. On being awarded a literary grant from the federal government in 1968, he returned from a fourteen month visit to Europe to live near Lehmann in Sydney's affluent northern suburbs. The next year he re-enrolled at Sydney University and completed his B.A. See Lawrence Bourke, *A Vivid Steady State: Les Murray and Australian Poetry*, University of New South Wales Press in association with New Endeavour Press, Sydney, 1992, pp.10–12; and Alexander, *Les Murray*, pp.61–142.

[60] Murray, 'The Australian Republic', p.147.

[61] Ibid., p.148.

[62] Ibid., p.156.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid., p.148.

[66] Ibid., p.147.

[67] Ibid., p.154.

[68] "Judith Wright seems to have lost all her compassionate understanding of country people since she became an activist. Her work has lost its intimate linkage with the vernacular traditions it used to draw on, and has become strident. She seems to have denied the pioneers and lost her Dreaming, and it's a tragedy". Wright, says Murray, has now gone "over to the colonial party". Murray, ibid, p.151. Paradoxically, though characteristically, in Murray's analysis Wright, in denying the [white] "pioneers", loses her [implicitly Aboriginal] "Dreaming", her claim to spiritual ownership of the land. For Murray's account of his conflict with Wright see Alexander, *Les Murray*, pp.209–214.

[69] Murray, 'The Australian Republic', p.157.

[70] "It is an interesting speculation", writes H.C. 'Nugget' Coombs, for example, "to see the politics of both Gorton and Whitlam as expressions of the period of revolt and demand for change which swept the world in the late sixties. It could be that Whitlam's tragedy was that he narrowly missed coming to power [in 1969] while that mood was in full flower". 'The Predecessors', the Fabian Society of Australia, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, p.59.

[71] 'Cultural capital' is best understood as cultural resources capable of translation into economic capital. See John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 1993.

[72] This was to come many years later, in 1993, when perhaps coincidentally Murray was in a more comfortable financial position. See Alexander, *Les Murray*, pp.256–258.

[73] Marian Sawer notes that *Quadrant* turned to neo-classical liberal, or what she terms 'libertarian' ideas, in 1974. 'Political Manifestations of Libertarianism in Australia', in Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, p.15. Murray became literary editor of *Quadrant* in 1989 and remains in that position. As demonstrated by his clashes with then *Quadrant* editor Robert Manne between 1994 and 1997, Murray has been instrumental in keeping the magazine firmly on the political right. As Alexander explains of this conflict, "Murray thought *Quadrant* almost the last publication standing out against the left-wing fashions he deplored, and he did not want to see it abandon that position". *Les Murray*, p.280. See also Robert Manne's editorial, 'Why I Have Resigned', *Quadrant* 342, 1997, pp.2–3; and his letter in *Quadrant* 343, 1998, pp.5–7.

[74] The argument about the existence and influence of a liberal and democratic 'new class' can be traced to President Richard Nixon's 1968 campaign, the first to be based on a 'backlash' against the radicalism and liberalism of the sixties. See Frank, *One Market Under God*, pp.25–28. The attack on the bureaucracy is a New Right staple, enunciated at greatest length in the Public Choice Theory of James Buchanan. See for example James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock, *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*, Michigan Institute of Technology Press, Ann Arbor, 1965; and James Buchanan, *The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan*, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

[75] As Lindsay Barrett notes, Whitlam's purchase of Jackson Pollock's *Blue Poles* painting, "like so many other aspects of Whitlamism ... illuminated the divisions within Australia's social fabric, and it brought to the fore disputes over the nature and direction of Australian society and culture which would continue to remain unresolved, and indeed be exploited, for decades. Whitlam and his culture bureaucrats, their taste

apparently so at odds with that of Labor's traditional working class supporters, were then just the sort of 'elite' which, twenty years later, both Howard's Coalition and Hanson's One Nation would accuse Paul Keating of having 'created'". *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card*, pp.10–11.

[76] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.160. For a good general account of the 'culture wars' see David Bennett, 'PC Panic, the Press and the Academy', *Meanjin* 52, 1993, pp.435–446.

[77] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.160. Bourke notes also that "the 1970s saw Murray recognised as a foremost Australia poet and established as a prominent figure in the politics of local publishing and writing". *A Vivid Steady State*, p.17.

[78] Connell writes that "In twenty years of hegemony in Australian government, the new conservatism has attracted only one intellectual figure of any weight. That is the poet Les Murray". 'Moloch Mutates', p.9. According to John Leonard (the poet, not the anthologist), Murray "enjoys the reputation he has largely because the political Right in Australia has exerted itself to puff his poetry". *Overland* 172, 2002, p.86. It is certainly the case that Murray's public status as *the* representative of Australian folk culture owes much to the work of political conservatives from Ken Slessor to Leonie Kramer to Rupert Murdoch to John Howard; in addition, of course, to his own efforts in the field of cultural politics, as a poet, editor of books and magazines, anthologist, essayist and commentator. On the role of Slessor and Kramer see Alexander, *Les Murray*, especially pp.122–123; 153–154. Murdoch's newspapers, especially the *Australian*, have been instrumental in promoting Murray in these terms, and Murdoch also owned Angus & Robertson, where Murray worked as poetry reader and adviser between 1978 and 1991. See Bourke, *A Vivid Steady State*, p.17. Prime Minister Howard induced Murray to write a preamble for the Australian constitution. See Diana Bagnall, 'The Murray-Howard System', *The Bulletin* 117: 6168, 6 April 1999, pp.40–41, 44; and Tony Stephens, 'Murray Rewrites His Preamble for the Constitution, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 April 1999, p.3.

[79] Les Murray, 'Afterword', in Alexander Craig, ed., *Twelve Poets 1950–1970*, Jacaranda Press, 1971, p.220.

[80] As David McCooey notes, "Murray's interest in violence is related to a sacramental imagination, where incarnation and grace are connected to sacrifice". 'Contemporary Poetry', in Webby, *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, p.172.

[81] As Paul Kane summarises, "Nature seemed foreign and unassimilable". *Australian Poetry: Romanticism and Negativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996, p.12.

[82] The line brings to mind the famous passage from the twenty-third Psalm: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou *art* with me"; suggesting that the poet's ownership of the land is blessed by God. Bible (King James version), Psalm 23: 4.

[83] Cf. John Keats, 'On First Looking Into Chapman's Homer' (1817): "Then felt I like some watcher of the skies / When a new planet swims into his ken; / Or like stout Cortez when with eagle eyes / He stared at the Pacific, and all his men / Looked at each other with a wild surmise – / Silent, upon a peak in Darien". Quoted in Duncan Wu, ed., *Romantic Poetry*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2002, p.158.

[84] These are described by Murray in 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', in *Peasant Mandarin*, pp.172–184. For a more comprehensive account of these 'pre-modern' and 'modern' ways of thinking (which, in its assumptions about the inevitable dominance of 'modern' or 'first world' societies, is open to serious questioning) see Walter Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologising of the Word* (1982), Routledge, New York and London, 1995.

[85] This point is made by Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, p.320.

[86] "The pentagram is key [sic] image". Murray, 'Afterword', in Craig, *Twelve Poets*, p.219.

[87] This man thus brings to mind Murray's Boeotians, members of "perennial ... spacious, dignified cultures", who are interested in "celebration and commemoration" rather than "conflict". Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', p.175

[88] Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, p.318.

[89] Ibid., p.319.

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid., p.320.

[92] Ibid., p.321.

[93] As Ian Turner writes, in the early years of the Australian settlement, or invasion, "there was little time for cultivation of mind or soul: those who had the advantage of education and status were preoccupied, for the first few years, with keeping the colonists fed, maintaining order, and staying alive; later, as the temporary

settlement grew into a permanent colony, with making their fortunes. (Indeed, the preoccupation of Australians with material considerations and values has been a continuing theme of inquiring visitors, from the 1820s to the present time)". 'The Social Setting', in Geoffrey Dutton, ed., *The Literature of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1964, p.15. "For reasons – or accidents – of history", writes Paul Kane, "Australia did not experience romanticism during the romantic period per se. But neither did it undergo a delayed romanticism, as in the late efflorescence of Transcendentalism in the United States from the 1830s into the 1850s ... In Australia, romanticism simply did not happen. Why was this so? The historical or chronological argument goes a long way to account for this absence". *Australian Poetry*, p.10. There were though neo-Romantic Australian writers, such as Norman Lindsay, Kenneth Slessor and Murray himself.

[94] Hobsbawm, *The Age of Revolution*, pp.321, 322.

[95] Ibid., pp.321–322.

[96] 'Euminedes' is one of the names given to the three avenging Furies of classical mythology.

[97] As Hobsbawm argues, "It is never wise to neglect the heart's reasons which reason knows nothing of. As thinkers within the terms of reference laid down by the economists and physicists, the [Romantic] poets were outclasssed, but they saw not only more deeply but also sometimes more clearly". As human control over nature increases, so too does desire for nature and the natural, affording poets increased authority. Consequently, "the romantic critique of the world, though ill-defined, was not therefore [socially or politically] negligible". *The Age of Revolution*, p.318.

[98] Kevin Hart in *Southern Review* 10:1, 1977, quoted in Helen Lambert, 'A Draft Preamble: Les Murray and the Politics of Poetry', *Journal of Australian Studies* 80, 2004, p.8.

[99] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.9.

[100] Hobsbawm also states that "naturally the noble savage played an immeasurably more important part in American romanticism than in European"; while, as already noted, Romanticism failed to develop at all in Australia. *The Age of Revolution*, p.322.

[101] Hughes, *Myths America Lives By*, p.56.

[102] Relatedly, Murray argues in his *Persistence in Folly: Selected Prose Writings* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1984, p.5), that the Aborigines are "actually part of a larger class of the rural poor, and it is still often more useful to see them in that light than in currently fashionable radical-racialist terms".

[103] Robert Gray, 'An Interview with Les Murray', *Quadrant* 113, 1976, p.71. This statement also obviously draws into further question Murray's professed support for Whitlam's ALP.

[104] See Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.154.

[105] When he returned to Bunyah after his first year at Sydney University, Alexander reports that "there were particularly angry scenes when Murray refused to help with any of the heavy work around the farm, digging post-holes, grubbing out stumps and the like. 'That's the way you earn your living, it's not mine', he would tell his father, but this was a difficult line of argument to sustain at a time when he needed his father to pay for his next year of study. All the same Cecil, driven by his wife's dying wish, agreed to give him £5 a week". *Les Murray*, p.68.

[106] James Tulip, 'Poetry Since 1965', in Laurie Hergenhan et.al., *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, p.478.

[107] As Stuart Macintyre notes, "Radical nationalists codified the legend of laconic, egalitarian, stoical mateship just as modernising forces of change were erasing the circumstances that had given rise to that legend". *A Concise History of Australia*, p.220. It is interesting to consider also in this context *Wake in Fright* (1961), the contemporaneous novel by Kenneth Cook, which describes a very 'impure', bestial outback Australian culture.

[108] Kevin Hart, 'Discourse, Image: After Poetry 11: A Quarterly Account of Recent Poetry', *Overland* 125, 1991, p.64. Kane notes also that "Murray has succeeded in establishing himself as a popular (if controversial) authentic Australian voice, particularly in the minds of his admiring overseas readership". *Australian Poetry*, p.185.

[109] Hart, 'Discourse, Image', pp.63–64.

[110] Quoted in Bourke, *A Vivid Steady State*, p.13.

[111] Alexander, *Les Murray*, pp.13–14.

[112] Ibid., pp.25, 26.

[113] "At Taree High", Alexander writes, Murray "would come to see, he was the victim of an organised, powerful majority, a mob with leaders who set the fashion and who had decreed his torture and exile". At

university, "Murray would always feel excluded by groups like that at [Germaine] Greer's table". Ibid., pp.51, 66.

[114] See Alexander's account of this history in ibid., pp.5–18.

[115] Ibid., p.21.

[116] Ibid., p.22.

[117] Murray, 'The Old Religion' (1976), in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.160.

[118] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.21.

[119] Ibid., p.52.

[120] Though baptised in 1964, Alexander notes that in 1960 he already felt that he "belonged" to this faith. On Murray's baptism see the 'Chronology' in Carmel Gaffney, ed., *Counterbalancing Light: Essays on the Poetry of Les Murray*, Kardoorair Press, Armidale, n.d. [1997]; and on Murray's earlier Catholic leanings see Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.85.

[121] See Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', in *Peasant Mandarin*, pp.172–184.

[122] On Santamaria's small-farming ideal see Robert Murray, *The Split: Australian Labor in the Fifties*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1970, p.107. Santamaria's National Catholic Social Studies Movement grew out of the National Catholic Rural Movement.

[123] Bert Almon, 'Les Murray's Critique of the Enlightenment', in Gaffney, *Counterbalancing Light*, p.2. Murray wrote 'James McAuley – a personal appreciation', after the death of McAuley, in the 16 October 1976 *Sydney Morning Herald* (reprinted in *Peasant Mandarin*, pp.185–190). "Much that this clear-minded and passionately engaged man did and said", suggests Murray, "will survive him". *Peasant Mandarin*, p.185. Murray writes of his small-farming ideal: "For all of my life, under Liberal Country Party governments and Labor governments alike, we have been steadily getting rid of our small farmers and replacing them with bigger, more 'efficient' units which now prove to be no more efficient at producing food and fibres, and far *less* efficient if we consider ratios of energy to production or expense to production. And we have done our best to break the morale of our small farmers with every weapon of cultural deprivation and social denigration at our disposal. I come from there, and I know". 'Spirit Farming', in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.219.

[124] Almon, 'Les Murray's Critique of the Enlightenment', p.3.

[125] Ibid. As Kane also observes, "Murray often aligns himself with ancient or primitive modes of consciousness, as opposed to what he considers Enlightenment or post-Enlightenment traditions". *Australian Poetry*, p.185. If McAuley provides the Australian intellectual precedent for Murray, a contemporaneous intellectual fellow-traveller would be the deeply anti-humanist John Carroll. See for example Carroll's *Humanism: The Wreck of Western Culture*, Fontana Press, London, 1993.

[126] Murray, 'The Old Religion', in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.160.

[127] Quoted in Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.40.

[128] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.31.

[129] Ibid.

[130] Ibid.

[131] Quoted in ibid.

[132] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p. 2.

[133] Ibid.

[134] Ibid. On Murray's unsuccessful attempt to join the army see Bourke, *A Vivid Steady State*, p.11. Murray idealises soldiers in such poems as 'Troop Train Returning' (from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*) and 'Lament for the Country Soldiers' (from *Poems Against Economics*). Robert Gray and Geoffrey Lehmann write that Murray was "one of the few Australian poets unopposed to the Vietnam war". 'Introduction', in Gray and Lehmann, eds, *The Younger Australian Poets*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1983, p.14. In Murray's account, "I'm a child of the borderlands of war, and of the military age which preceded the paramilitary and police age of Marxism". 'ANZAC and Why I Write', *Kunapipi* 18: 2&3, 1996, p.328. Murray idealises policemen in 'The Police: Seven Voices' (from *Lunch and Counter Lunch*). Though as Alexander notes (*Les Murray*, p.234), he has also had personal problems with accepting police authority.

[135] Ward, *The Australian Legend*, p.2.

[136] Ibid.

[137] Quoted in Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.259.

[138] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.289. This desire to be free from social constraints is also expressed in Murray's poem 'The Tin Wash Dish', from 1990's *Dog, Fox, Field* collection: "Watch out if this does well at school / and has to leave and longs to leave: / someone, sometime, will have to pay".

[139] Alexander, *Les Murray*, p.282.

[140] As David McCooey notes, Les Murray is "the poet most associated with rural Australia". 'Contemporary Poetry', p.171.

[141] This formulation is influenced by Bell and Bell's account of the advertising industry in Australia: "Because advertising gives focus and form to otherwise inchoate or vague motives through the selection of subculturally resonant images and words, the 'Americanisation' of the Australian advertising industry has ironically resulted in an expansion of images flattering the uniqueness of Australia and Australian consumers", *Implicated*, p.176.

[142] "The distinction that has done most to construct 'Les A. Murray' is one for which he must definitely take responsibility: I mean, of course, the contrast he sets up between himself and Peter Porter in his essay 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia'. Kevin Hart, '"Interest" In Les A. Murray', *Australian Literary Studies* 14:2, 1989, p.149.

[143] Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', p.180.

[144] Ibid., p.173.

[145] Ibid., p.183.

[146] Ibid., p.176.

[147] Ibid., pp.172–173.

[148] Ibid., p.173

[149] Ibid., p.180.

[150] Ibid., p.177.

[151] Ibid.

[152] Ibid., p.174. Swamps in Murray's poetry are restorative, purifying. In 'The Incendiary Method', for example, from *The Weatherboard Cathedral*, Murray (or the poet) is "cleansing the spirit" by burning trees "in the dark of this swamp".

[153] Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', p.174.

[154] Ibid., p.175. 'Athens', notably, is both elitist and democratic.

[155] Ibid., p.175.

[156] Ibid., pp.173–174.

[157] Ibid., p.175.

[158] Ibid., p.178.

[159] Ibid., p.179.

[160] Ibid.

[161] Ibid.

[162] Ibid., p.183.

[163] Ibid., p.181.

[164] "It may be that poetry, of all but the dramatic sort, is ultimately a Boeotian art". Murray, ibid., p.175.

[165] Ibid., p.183.

[166] Ibid., pp.173.

[167] Ibid., pp.183–184.

[168] Ibid., pp.173–174.

[169] Elsewhere, in a piece on the French Revolution, Murray gives the impression that it was the liberal and radical intellectuals who seized power and carried out the 'reign of terror', and he characterises contemporary student radicals as inheritors of this tradition: "Intellectuals, as a class, first took up their caste-strategy of comfortable disaffection during the lifetimes of Louis and Antoinette": the period of the Enlightenment. 'The Deluge' (1976), in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.136.

[170] Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', p.183. Notably, Aboriginal culture is a resource, a commodity. Similarly, in an essay on his use of Aboriginal art and culture within his own writing, Murray explains how he is primarily interested in cultural convergence, rather than difference: "In art, in my writing, my abiding interest is in integrations, in convergences ... In Australian civilisation, I would contend, convergence between black and white is a fact, a subtle process, hard to discern often, and hard to produce evidence for". 'The Human Hair Thread', *Meanjin* 36, 1977, p.569.

[171] In this sense these terms are comparable to Menzies' 'forgotten people' and Howard's 'battlers'. On the "ideological suppleness" of these terms see Sean Scalmer, 'The Battlers Versus the Elites: The Australian Right's Language of Class', *Overland* 154, 1999, pp.9–13.

[172] In contrast with Murray's simplistic, timeless 'rural' versus 'urban' dichotomy, Raymond Williams reminds us: "The 'country way of life' has included the very different practices of hunters, pastoralists, farmers and factory farmers, and its organisation has varied from the tribe and the manor to the feudal estate, from the small peasantry and tenant farmers to the rural commune, from the *latifundia* and the plantation to the large capitalist enterprise and the state farm. The city, no less, has been of many kinds: state capital, administrative base, religious centre, market-town, port and mercantile depot, military barracks, industrial concentration. Between the cities of ancient and medieval times and the modern metropolis or conurbation there is a connection of name and in part of function, but nothing like identity". Williams, *The Country and the City*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1973, pp.9–10.

[173] See for example Murray's review of *Realities of Race: An Analysis of the Concepts of Race and Racism and their Relevance to Australian Society*, by Keith McConnochie. Murray argues this book undermines the process of reconciliation, already underway between black and white Australia, by talking about the structural and systemic oppression of Aborigines. When people are not aware of such structural factors, Murray apparently reasons, they will be able to accept each other. He takes issue with McConnochie's depiction of Aborigines and white Australians as being in some way fundamentally different, suggests that Aboriginal activist anger derives mostly from white leaders who are "rabid" and "psychotic" and that this book "becomes something close to an act of identification with an elite class". Murray, 'The Completed Australian' (1975), in *Peasant Mandarin*, pp.100, 99.

[174] Murray, 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', pp.181–182.

[175] Hart, 'Discourse, Image', p.64.

[176] Ibid.

[177] Murray, 'The Dimension of Luck' (1974), in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.58.

[178] Ibid., p.59.

[179] Murray, 'The PSI Revolution' (1976), in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.130.

[180] Ibid., p.133.

[181] Murray, 'A Vincian Retrieval' (1975), in *Peasant Mandarin*, pp.107–108.

[182] Murray, 'Sense and Scientism', in *Peasant Mandarin*, p.170.

[183] Ibid., p.171.

[184] Ibid.

[185] Ibid.

[186] Ibid. Paradoxically, as he is writing in a scientistic context here Murray criticises the author, Marvin Haris, for being overly traditional in his thinking. Elsewhere in Murray's work, of course, radical and liberal thinkers are criticised ad nauseum for being insufficiently traditional.

[187] Murray, 'Sense and Scientism', p.171.

[188] Crunden, *American Culture*, p.12.

[189] Interestingly, Murray says that working in advertising is "not entirely bad training for a poet". 'On Sitting Back and Thinking About Porter's Boeotia', p.179.

[190] Cf. Whitlam: "I strove to relate the principal elements of the program to what I have called the doctrine of positive equality", based on a notion of 'positive' freedom. *The Whitlam Government*, p.3.

Conclusion

The Whitlam Myth

2005 marked the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the Whitlam government. During the year, a number of books either focusing directly on or dealing extensively with this government were published. These included *The Great Crash*, by Michael Sexton, *Selling the Australian Government: Politics and Propaganda from Whitlam to Howard*, by Greg Barns, *The Truth of the Matter*, by Whitlam himself, *1975: Australia's Greatest Year*, edited by Mark Juddery, *Head of State*, by David Smith, and *The Dismissal: Where Were You on December 11, 1975?,* edited by Sybil Nolan.[1] The title of this last publication makes explicit the common perception that the Dismissal is the closest thing Australian society has experienced to the assassination of John F. Kennedy (as well as the fact that the most common Australian points of reference are now American).[2] In doing so, Nolan's publication stresses the drama of the story of the Dismissal, the sense of tragedy that accompanies it, and the general importance of this story and this government within Australian history, and contemporary Australian culture more particularly. By contrast, in 2005 only one book exclusively focused on (and highly critical of) the Howard government appeared.[3]

In the same year *The Dismissal* television miniseries produced by Kennedy Miller and first released in 1983 was re-released on video and DVD. Major journals published articles on the Whitlam legacy.[4] ABC television's '7.30 Report' ran a thirtieth anniversary Dismissal special on Thursday, 10 November. And between 10 and 14 November alone, Australia's mass-circulation newspapers published no fewer than thirty-one articles revisiting the Whitlam story, plus letters on the theme from readers.[5]

Of these articles, twelve were explicitly critical of the Whitlam government, and six of these articles stridently and polemically attacked it, as did all of the seven letters published by Murdoch's *Australian* flagship (published by a corporation, News Ltd, which during 1994 shifted its base from Australia to the United States).[6] One article timidly implied support for the Whitlam government,[7] one suggested that the Whitlam era was not as bad, politically and morally, as the present, Howard era,[8] and one implicitly critiqued Kerr's actions by arguing that along with "the key figures in this

deadly power play" – Whitlam, Kerr and Fraser – "just about equal billing goes to the chief justice of the High Court at the time, the late Garfield Barwick, and media magnate Rupert Murdoch".[9] "More nebulous but playing a role", states this journalist, Andrew Clark, "was the United States".[10] Clark, it is worth noting, is Manning Clark's son, suggesting a personal basis for his isolated stance. Not a single article directly praises the policy framework or overall legacy of the Whitlam government.

Sixteen further articles were essentially politically neutral: revisiting the events of 11 November 1975 merely to mark the anniversary,[11] running the line that 'healing' across the political divide has, is, or should be taking place,[12] recording that "on the rights and wrongs of the affair, (today's leading politicians) split predictably down party lines",[13] speculating on the legal and constitutional issues involved, and whether or not the Dismissal could happen again,[14] suggesting contrarily that nothing is served by continually talking about the Dismissal,[15] or reporting Paul Keating's 9 November 2005 assertion that if he had been in Whitlam's shoes he would have put Kerr under house arrest.[16]

Evidently, the story of the Whitlam government remains an important part of Australian history and culture. People who are broadly supportive of the ideals and policy of this government or are critical of the present nature of Australian society regularly feel the need to re-discuss this government and its ambitions and achievements (or can't avoid doing so). Equally, critics of this government find it both necessary and useful to refer to the history of this government as an instructive lesson about the folly of those who would seek to organise society on the basis of political progressivism. A continuing interest in and nostalgia for Whitlamism is matched by a determination, visible within the mass media especially, to assert and reassert the essential incompetence, dishonesty, immorality and multifaceted dangerousness of this government and its philosophy: "When John Howard won the last election, Australians voted for someone in whom they had a sense of trust when it came to the two fundamental contemporary political issues; security and the economy", asserts Ian Smith. He continues on to say, in a representative passage: "The Whitlam government could not have been more different in these domains".[17] "While it may have been time in 1972", he concludes, "it is indisputable that Mr Whitlam would not have been a leader for our time".[18]

Although the nature of the legacy of the Whitlam government remains energetically contested, the memory of this government, within society as a whole, appears to be in no danger of disappearing. Similarly, there seems to be a general acceptance of the social and historical importance of this government, while the number and the vehemence of right-wing attacks on Whitlamism indirectly suggests its continuing political importance, and, at least potentially, its political appeal.

In a sense, as suggested in the introduction, the story of the Whitlam government is an important Australian myth (for the Right, it should be stressed, who complain endlessly about this government's mythical status,[19] as much as for the Left). Australians explain their present society, and thus who they are, in part through reference to this foundational story. Modern Australia arises from the fall of Whitlam, as, say, modern Germany arises from the fall of the Berlin wall. Myths, like legends, arise from great events, which people feel the need to commemorate, either as inspiration or a warning against their happening again.[20] As in biblical and classical precedent, the birth of modern Australia out of the tragic fall of Whitlam comprises, rhetorically, a journey from innocence to experience. For those broadly on the political left, the experience gained relates mainly to the wily and perfidious nature of political conservatives (including, at times, those in the ALP) and to the high degree of difficulty involved in changing institutional and systemic features of economic, political and cultural power. For those on the political right (including, often, those in the ALP), the experience of Australia under Whitlam reveals the immaturity and perhaps the stupidity of challenging the traditionally hierarchical nature of human society and its 'natural' economic, political and cultural relations.[21]

No myth can be completely or self-evidently 'true'. Within a particular social context the interpretation of a myth and the application of a mythic story are always influenced by that context and necessarily require active or imaginative human involvement. The telling of a mythic story is inevitably impacted upon by political power and dominant forms of human relations, by ideology. In one sense, as argued generally within the Idealist philosophical tradition and most thoroughly, perhaps, by Jacques Derrida, all truth, all knowledge, is mythical: it is never simply self-evident. As Hegel stressed the ontological equivalence of Being and Non-being, Derrida argues

persuasively (via a critique of de Saussure's structuralist linguistics, initially) that the apprehension of meaning is always dependent on the making of an *arbitrary* distinction between signs in a sign system, a 'supplementary' act.[22] Meaning, that is to say, does not inhere in an object, or in a word, but only in a sign system that has no essential or ontological connection with particular objects or words. In this sense no truth – no word – has any essential or transcendent status. All truth is linguistically and so also socially derived and specific, or contingent.[23]

However, while some have taken this to mean that all truth or all assertions – all uses of words – are equally valid, Derrida himself has rejected this view.[24] Moreover, it is not at all clear that the socially specific nature of knowledge and truth renders these things invalid. If Derrida's critique changes everything, in another sense it changes nothing. As society continues to exist and human beings continue to need to organise themselves to enable life to continue, socially and historically specific truths continue to be necessary, and even useful.[25]

Myths are a simplification of reality. They include an element of fantasy: in reality the world could not be as perfect as it was in the Garden of Eden, or in the Golden Age, no matter how closely society followed the 'right path', or proper moral principles, from which it supposedly slipped in bringing about our 'fallen' reality. Hopefully the world could not be as ghastly as it is meant to have been during, for example, the various Old Testament times of pestilence. Though having said this, one can never be completely sure of these things; and perhaps this is part of the reason why myths 'work', socially. Myths, or broad truths, or 'big truths', to adopt a term from Peter Read, enable people to act.[26] In the absence of myth, of belief in a 'big' or general truth, no action can be contemplated. As it is necessary in life to act (a point apparently forgotten within certain fundamentalist poststructuralisms), it is also necessary to believe in or to accept the importance of myths.[27]

By the same token, a denial of the importance of myth and mythic narrative within one's particular culture, and an attachment to some ostensibly transcendent system of knowledge – such as positivist science for example, or fundamentalist Christianity – leads only to a complete entrapment within myth, an inability to see the extent to which one's own beliefs are culturally specific. Terry Eagleton writes that "culture is fatally

enfeebled once it comes adrift from its roots in religion, even if clinging to those roots means consigning itself to irrelevance".[28] But it could be argued that the more a society is convinced of its own secular, rational nature, the more it is prone to desiring 'transcendent' forms of truth that are wholly mythical (and often completely self-serving). As argued in the final chapter of this thesis, these scientistic and mystical modes of belief are in no way mutually exclusive. Freedom from and enslavement by culture might be the same phenomenon viewed from different angles. As Susan George and Fabrizio Sabelli assert, "There are no societies without religion, even, or especially, those which believe themselves to be entirely secular".[29] Any society, like any religion, functions on the basis of certain fundamental conceptions about the nature of reality and of the experience of its members within that reality.

In this thesis I have tried to demonstrate the role of myth – in both the negative and neutral senses of the word – in the history of the Whitlam government.[30] That is, understandings of the Whitlam government and its history, it has been suggested, are strongly influenced by both political ideology and culture. Demonstrating the role of political ideology or power within this history has entailed making clear, firstly, the extent to which contemporary valuations of the Whitlam government are influenced by current attitudes towards neo-classical liberalism: the public policy framework that came to dominance after it; and revealing, secondly, the extent to which the end of Whitlamism came via the exercise of political power. There is nothing natural or historically inevitable, it has been argued (in chapters one and two, especially), about the social path from Whitlamism to neo-classical liberalism. Demonstrating the role of culture within this history has entailed, firstly, articulating the extent to which both Whitlamism and neo-classical liberalism can be seen as culturally specific; and setting out, secondly, the active role of cultural producers – artists – in building, variously, support for and antipathy towards Whitlamism and neo-classical liberalism. This focus on culture's effects *and creativity*, it is hoped, suggests how humans are both influenced by and shape their culture.

The operations of political power can be pointed to, if not with ease, then at least with relative clarity. The history of 'the Whitlam period', as demonstrated in the thesis, is shaped to a significant extent by Australia's absorption within or subservience to

dominant American military, economic and political interests and desires. An Americanisation of Australian culture, at a surface level, or at the level of consumption, can also be identified with relative ease in the postwar context. It is more difficult, and less common, to try to identify deep cultural changes, changes to the forms rather than the content of culture, within a particular society. It is hard to definitively trace or measure how objects, beliefs and ways of thinking shift over time, from one epoch to another, in response to intellectual and artistic creation.

However, as Raymond Williams argues persuasively: "It is when we try to correlate change of this (intellectual and aesthetic) kind with the changes covered by the disciplines of politics, economics, and communications that we discover some of the most difficult but also some of the most human questions".[31] A 'correlating' of this kind is what I have tried to do in the second half of the thesis, in the chapters on the relationship between the lives and works of White, Hardy and Murray, respectively, on the one hand, and Whitlamism and neo-classical liberalism on the other. If, as suggested in the introduction, the mythic Whitlam narrative derives primarily from Manning Clark, Clark's emphasis on the personal and psychological dimensions of this story was not accompanied, as it might have been, by a thorough-going linking of these aspects of Australian culture to broader ideological, social and economic changes.[32]

As Williams suggests, a failure to take proper cognisance of the cultural dimension of society, or of culture's relations with its society, leads to one-dimensional historical exposition of one (materialist or Idealist) kind or another. In order to obtain a better – more comprehensive and nuanced – understanding of both the general process of Australian historical and social development and the active or socially generative role of culture within that development, it is important to recognise the particular role of intellectuals and artists. It has been suggested, accordingly, that Australia's general subservience to American initiatives and policies has been facilitated by the spread of American culture and by the development, by intellectuals and artists, of American or American-style cultural values within Australia: especially a radical individualism and subjectivism ultimately deriving from, or most powerfully underpinned by, radical puritan Christianity.

Documenting the active social and historical role of culture requires examining, in detail where possible, the works of cultural producers, artists, "for here, if anywhere", in Williams's explanation, "the actual living sense, the deep community that makes the communication possible, is naturally drawn upon".[33] Works of art, that is to say, articulate a more widely existing structure of feeling, of which broader social developments are also, in part, an expression. Any understanding of or attempt to describe the *nature* of particular social developments, their most fundamental origins and characteristic functions, must therefore be obtained or presented through a close engagement with works of art.[34] Thus, when Dennis Altman, in his recent study of Gore Vidal, voices the general perception that "it is almost impossible to judge how fiction influences larger social developments", he seems only partly right.[35] While we cannot see precisely how fiction or creative writing results in social mobilisation of whatever kind, we can see how that mobilisation is sustained and in a sense enabled by the cultural values and beliefs expressed in works of art.[36] The study of the meaning and value of works of art enables a qualitative rather than quantitative study of social change, but it is evident that these qualitative factors influence the shape of, and are not merely reflections of, the quantitative or material factors, just as the opposite is also true.

As cultural producers, artists both express and help to define the structure of feeling of their society. An examination of the life and work of Les Murray, in particular, during the Whitlam period, reveals that Australians' increasing tolerance of neo-classical liberal public policy was accompanied and aided by a reconceptualisation of the nature of Australian experience and identity, and by a new, more emotionally charged feeling of what it is to be Australian. As suggested above, this 'purified' Australian-ness can be seen as a necessary cultural precondition for a society coming to be organised on the basis of an ostensibly value-neutral positivist scientism. Murray re-imagines Australian cultural content in traditionally American form and thereby helps to clear the way for the introduction, from America, mainly, of neo-classical liberal public policy.

Since Murray is expressing and giving shape to more widely experienced feelings, it can also be said that the rise to dominance of neo-classical liberalism in Australia and the more general dominance of the traditionally American cultural values of radical individualism, subjectivism (including scientism) and puritanism is in part an expression

of Australians' increasing desire for, or at least acceptance of, American culture: its model of civilisation, way of life, arts and entertainment. The implication of this is that – in this specific social and historical case, as well as more generally – thorough-going social change requires, in addition to material and political change, a socially responsive and affective art, capable of expressing and advancing a new set of emotions, which can thereby come to be understood or felt as natural and ideal. This is also to say that profound social change requires a reconsideration of what myths are important to us, and why. (Perhaps the political Right has understood this better than the Left in the contemporary, post-Whitlam age.)

This thesis grew out of a desire to further develop existing understandings of the fate of the Whitlam government. I have been particularly concerned to shed light upon the question of why Australia's political leaders, and to a certain extent (given that the nation is, however imperfectly, a democracy) Australian society as a whole, abandoned the humanist, Enlightenment hope that society could be organised on the basis of goodwill, reason and democracy, in 1975, and came to embrace or tolerate a public policy framework based on a disillusioned, negative, pessimistic conception of both human nature and the capacity of government to implement the aspirations of society. A focus on culturally central, or powerful, figures, rather than the culturally marginal, has been necessitated by the preoccupation with the *general* relationship between politics and culture within this society during this period. But in answering this important question about Australian history and society I have tried to demonstrate the specific, complex interrelations of economic, technological, political and cultural forces of change, in order to build an historical narrative that, to the extent this is possible, avoids and undermines narrowly ideological interpretation, accurately represents the constraining and enabling role of structural and systemic social factors, and does proper justice to the various actors within this story.

---

[1] The complete references are: Michael Sexton, *The Great Crash: The Short Life and Sudden Death of the Whitlam Government*, Scribe, Melbourne, 2005 (originally published as *Illusions of Power: The Fate of a Reform Government*, 1979); Greg Barns, *Selling the Australian Government: Politics and Propaganda from Whitlam to Howard*, UNSW Press, Sydney, 2005; Gough Whitlam, *The Truth of the Matter* (third edn), Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2005 (originally published 1979); Mark Juddery, ed., *1975: Australia's Greatest Year*, John Wiley & Sons, Milton, 2005; David Smith, *Head of State*, Macleay Press, Paddington; and Sybil Nolan, ed., *The Dismissal: Where Were You on December 11, 1975?*, Melbourne University Publishing, Carlton, 2005.

[2] Paul Donegan, interviewed by Thornton McCamish as part of his article on perpections of Whitlam among younger Australians ('1975: A Dimming Legacy', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.13), is also quoted as saying: "It's like that whole 'Where were you when Kennedy was shot,' isn't it?"; just as, in his 1999 memoir *Confessions of a Thirteenth Man* (Text, Melbourne, 1999, p.31), John Harms says: "I remember precisely where we were: just driving past the Hamilton Hotel. I imagine it'll stick in my mind, like where I was when Whitlam was sacked (I'm too young for JFK)". For further discussion of the iconic status of this moment see Kurt Brereton, 'That Iconic Moment: The Dismissal', *Artlink* 17:3, 1997, pp.18–19.

[3] This was Marion Maddox, *God Under Howard: The Rise of the Religious Right in Australian Politics*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, 2005.

[4] See for example Tim Battin, 'The Whitlam Government, Labor tradition and the Paralysis of the Present', in Tim Battin, ed., *A Passion for Politics: Essays in Honour of Graham Maddox*, Pearson Education Australia, Frenchs Forest, 2005, pp.41–54; Troy Bramston, 'Beginning of the End', *Eureka Street*, 15:2, 2005, pp.28–30; Tony Harris, 'A sort of Brigadoon'?: ALP politics and the Residents' Advisory Committee of the Glebe Estate during the time of federal government administration, 1974–85, in Greg Patmore, John Shields and Nikola Balnave, eds, *National Labour History Conference: The Past is Before Us*, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History and Business and Labour History Group, Sydney, 2005, pp.151–158; Peter Holding, 'It's Time Again', *Overland* 180, 2005, pp.27–29; Erica Izett, 'Sitting Down with Indigenous Artists', *Artlink* 25:2 2005, pp.26–29; Clive James, 'Comment', the *Monthly*, November 2005, pp.10–12; and I.C.F. Spry, 'Mafia Influence and the Whitlam Government', *National Observer* 65, 2005, pp.5–7.

[5] Those noted were: [no author listed] 'Kerr Curse from Keating', *Herald-Sun*, 10 November 2005, p.13; [no author listed] 'Lockup Answer to Kerr', *Herald-Sun*, 10 November 2005, p.13; Peter Charlton, 'Keating Had an Arresting Solution', the *Courier-Mail*, 10 November 2005, p.3; Peter Coleman, 'Hits and Myths of the Worshippers of Whitlamism', *Australian Financial Review*, 10 November 2005, p.71; Steven Scott, 'Keating Lampoons Naive Lefties of Whitlam era', *Australian Financial Review*, 10 November 2005, p.14; Mike Steketee, 'Believe It: The Dismissal Could Happen Again', the *Australian*, 10 November 2005, p.12; Mike Steketee, 'I'd have Arrested Kerr: Keating', the *Australian*, 10 November 2005, p.2; Kenneth Wiltshire, 'It's Time to Dismiss Flaws in System', the *Courier-Mail*, 10 November 2005, p.17; [no author listed] 'A Day to Remember', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.17; [no author listed] 'The Lessons of History Cannot be Dismissed', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.14; Bob Chisolm, 'Man who Sacked an Elected Government', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 November 2005, p.62; Andrew Clark, 'Conversations Behind a Constitutional Crisis', *Australian Financial Review*, 11 November 2005, p.3; Andrew Fraser, 'So, Was He God's Gift to Culture?', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.18; Stephen Loosley, 'Lingering Memories of Illegitimacy', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.16; Thornton McCamish, '1975: A Dimming Legacy'; Matt Price, 'It's Time We Got Over It, says Tanner', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.6; Mark Scala, 'Queen's Reign Ends – Council Removes Portrait', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 November 2005, p.23; Lindsay Tanner, 'We Have Bigger Issues than One Unfair Dismissal', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.16; David Wroe, 'The Day They Can't Dismiss: Whitlam's Sacking Helped Form a Younger Generation of Pollies', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.6; Nicolette Burke, 'Australians Hear a New Wake-up Call', *Hobart Mercury*, 12 November 2005, p.17; Nicolette Burke, 'Time to Recall 30 Years Later', the *Advertiser*, 12 November 2005, p.32; Wayne Crawford, 'Day to Remember', *Hobart Mercury*, 12 November 2005, p.36; John Mangan, 'Insight: The Five Big Talking Points', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.2; Alan Ramsey, 'Here and There, the Signs of Tyranny', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 November 2005, p.39; Laura Tingle, 'Kerr Not to Blame, Says PM', *Australian Financial Review*, 12 November 2005, p.5; Anne Twomey, 'Governing Oddities: the *Australian* Remembers 1975', the *Australian*, 12 November 2005, p.27; Anne Twomey, 'Vice-regal Defiance of Britain Set the Scene', the *Australian*, 12 November 2005, p.27; David Wroe, 'History Too Hard on Kerr, says PM', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.5; Michael Baume, 'Gough's Hypocritical Claim to Martyrdom', *Australian Financial Review*, 14 November 2005, p.63; Peter Game, 'My Part in his Downfall: Behind the Scenes of Whitlam's Sacking', *Herald-Sun*, 14 November 2005, p.25; and Ian Smith, 'It was Gough's Time, but John's got Aplomb', the *Advertiser*, 14 November 2005, p.18. See also the six letters under the 'Most Talked About' heading in the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.17; and the letter from Joan McColl, under the 'Most Talked About' heading, the *Australian*, 14 November 2005, p.9. A further article, profiling defence lawyer and social justice campaigner Rob Stary, records Stary's continuing gratitude to the Whitlam government for his university education: "My parents could never have afforded it ... (without

Whitlam) it would never have happened". Katherine Kizilos, 'Seeking Justice for Those on the Margins', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.5.

[6] Articles critical of the Whitlam government were Scott, 'Keating Lampoons Naive Lefties of Whitlam era'; Loosley, 'Lingering Memories of Illegitimacy'; [no author listed] 'A Day to Remember'; Chisolm, 'Man who Sacked an Elected Government'; Twomey, 'Governing Oddities: the *Australian* Remembers 1975', and her 'Vice-regal Defiance of Britain Set the Scene'; Tingle, 'Kerr not to Blame, Says PM'; Fraser, 'So, Was He God's Gift to Culture?'; Mangan, 'Insight: The Five Big Talking Points'; Baume, 'Gough's Hypocritical Claim to Martyrdom'; Smith, 'It was Gough's Time, but John's got Aplomb'; and Game, 'My Part in his Downfall'. Stridently attacking this government were Scott, Loosely, the author of 'A Day to Remember', Baume, Smith and Game.

[7] Crawford, 'Day to Remember'.

[8] Ramsey, 'Here and There, the Signs of Tyranny'.

[9] Clark, 'Conversations Behind a Constitutional Crisis'.

[10] Ibid.

[11] See Wroe, 'History Too Hard on Kerr, says PM'; McCamish, '1975: A Dimming Legacy'; Scala, 'Queen's Reign Ends – Council Removes Portrait'; and Coleman, 'Hits and Myths of the Worshippers of Whitlamism'.

[12] See Burke, 'Australians Hear a New Wake-up Call' and her 'Time to Recall 30 Years Later'.

[13] Wroe, 'The Day They Can't Dismiss'.

[14] See [no author listed], 'The Lessons of History Cannot be Dismissed'; Steketee, 'Believe It: The Dismissal Could Happen Again'; Wiltshire, 'It's Time to Dismiss Flaws in System';

[15] See Tanner, 'We Have Bigger Issues than one Unfair Dismissal'; and Price, 'It's Time We Got Over It, says Tanner'.

[16] See [no author listed], 'Kerr Curse from Keating'; Steketee, 'I'd Have Arrested Kerr: Keating'; [no author listed], 'Lockup Answer to Kerr'; and Charlton, 'Keating Had an Arresting Solution'.

[17] Smith, 'It Was Gough's Time, But John's Got Aplomb'.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Some of the more shrill examples of this complaint in recent years have come from Sir John Kerr's Official Secretary David Smith. See for example his 'The Truth About the Dismissal', *Quadrant* 414, 2005, pp.12–16.

[20] "The most powerful myths are about extremity; they force us to go beyond our experience". Karen Armstrong, *A Short History of Myth*, Text, Melbourne, 2005, p.3.

[21] Even where what is imagined to have replaced Whitlamism is a more fluid society, or a greater spread of opportunity, the naturalness or desirability of social hierarchy itself is not questioned.

[22] For Hegel's ontology see especially his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (trans. A.V. Miller), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977 (and for a discussion of this and other aspects of Hegel's thought see Rockmore, *Before and After Hegel*). For a discussion of Derrida's work in terms of its critique of Ferdinand de Saussure's structuralism see Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1983, pp.127–132. Derrida's classic work is *Of Grammatology* (trans. G.C. Spivak), Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1976 (and for a useful discussion of Derrida's use of the 'supplement' concept, see Raman Selden, *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory* (second edn), Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, 1989, pp.87–92).

[23] As Eagleton explains, "Just as Western philosophy has been 'phonocentric', centred on the 'living voice' and deeply suspicious of script, so also it has been in a broader sense 'logocentric', committed to a belief in some ultimate 'word', presence, essence, truth or reality which will act as the foundation of all our thought, language and experience. It has yearned for the sign which will give meaning to all others – the 'transcendental signifier' – and for the anchoring, unquestionable meaning to which all our signs can be seen to point (the 'transcendental signified')". But, as Eagleton goes on to say: "There is no concept which is not embroiled in an open-ended play of signification, shot through with the traces and fragments of other ideas. It is just that, out of this play of signifiers, certain meanings are elevated by social ideologies to a privileged position, or made the centres around which other meanings are forced to turn". *Literary Theory*, p.131.

[24] According to Christopher Norris for example Derrida has criticised those who see in deconstruction "a passport to limitless interpretative games of their own happy devising". *Deconstruction*, p.127.

[25] As Eagleton, again, suggests, while "any such transcendental meaning is a fiction", it is also "perhaps a necessary fiction". *Literary Theory*, p.131.

[26] Peter Read explains what he means by 'big truth' in relation to the Jewish Holocaust: "The Big Truth about the Holocaust is that six million Jews perished during World War Two at the hands of the Nazi oppressors. In the forty years since the appearance of Leon Uris' *Exodus* few historians, David Irving notwithstanding, have seriously challenged the standard account, which I am going to call here, 'the big truth'. The local variations, what we could call 'smaller truths', began a decade or more later – of heroism, of betrayals, of Germans who protected Jews, of ethnic and local and regional variations – but the parameters of the larger story have remained almost entirely unchanged". 'Clio or Janus? Historians and the Stolen Generations', *Australian Historical Studies* (Special Issue: Challenging Histories: Reflections on Australian History) 33: 118, 2002, p.54.

[27] As Armstrong explains, "From the very beginning we invented stories that enabled us to place our lives in a larger setting, that revealed an underlying pattern, and gave us a sense that, against all the depressing and chaotic evidence to the contrary, life had meaning and value". *A Short History of Myth*, p.2.

[28] Eagleton, *The Idea of Culture*, p.67.

[29] George and Sabelli, *Faith and Credit*, p.6.

[30] On the negative and neutral meanings of 'myth' see Williams, *Keywords*, pp.176–178.

[31] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, p.12.

[32] As Miriam Dixson writes, "One of Clark's major strengths as an historian, the source of our greatest debt to him, is his insistence that we should try to understand the human psyche if we want to understand our culture". His "use of psychology can suggest real insight into particular personal destinies in [his] *History* [of Australia]. But left without further development, without more linkage to broader ideological, social and economic currents, his use of psychology does not contribute much to an understanding of specifically Australian cultural outcomes". 'Clark and National Identity', in Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark*, pp.202, 205.

[33] Williams, *The Long Revolution*, pp.64–65.

[34] This is why I have focused at greatest length in the thesis on particular, and I believe particularly powerful, works of art, rather than seeking to trace overall cultural production and consumption patterns.

[35] Dennis Altman, *Gore Vidal's America*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2005, p.viii.

[36] The concept of social mobilisation is taken from Connell, who in *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture* (pp.5–6) talks about this in relation to socio-economic classes: "The class structure develops by the extension of the labour market to engulf other forms of economic organisation, and the economic, social and political mobilisation of the groups who appear in the labour market. Mobilisation typically occurs under the influence of smaller groups, who may find their positions solidifying as the leadership of a class. It is conditioned by the consciousness of class membership, and the possibilities of class action, that have been developed by the members of emergent classes. Mobilisation is never total, and can be reversed". But mobilisation can also be seen to occur more widely within society, when a particular group becomes aware of itself as a collectivity and acts in a concerted, relatively united way.

Bibliography

Whitlam, the Whitlam Government, Whitlamism

[No author listed], 'A Day to Remember', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.17.

[No author listed], 'Editorial', *Herald-Sun*, 21 May 2002, p.18.

[No author listed], 'Kerr Curse from Keating', *Herald-Sun*, 10 November 2005, p.13.

[No author listed], 'Lockup Answer to Kerr', *Herald-Sun*, 10 November 2005, p.13.

[No author listed], 'The Lessons of History Cannot be Dismissed', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.14.

Aubrey, Jim. 'Viva Timor L'Este: Beyond Silence, Betrayal, Cowardice and Murder', *Arena Magazine* 40, 1999, pp.25–30.

Barns, Greg., *Selling the Australian Government: Politics and Propaganda from Whitlam to Howard*, UNSW Press, Sydney, 2005.

Barrett, Lindsay. *The Prime Minister's Christmas Card:* Blue Poles *and Cultural Politics in the Whitlam Era*, Power Publications, Sydney, 2001.

————., 'Whitlam, Modernity and the End of History', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.404–413.

Battin, Tim. 'The Whitlam Government, Labor tradition and the Paralysis of the Present', in Tim Battin, ed., *A Passion for Politics: Essays in Honour of Graham Maddox*, Pearson Education Australia, Frenchs Forest, 2005, pp.41–54.

Baume, Michael. 'Gough's Hypocritical Claim to Martyrdom', *Australian Financial Review*, 14 November 2005, p.63.

Beilharz, Peter. 'Whitlam Re-Visited', *Labour History* 63, 1992, pp.174–176.

Bilney, Gordon. 'The Whitlam Government: Some Personal Reflections', in The Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon: Fabian Papers*, McPhee Gribble and Penguin Books, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1986, pp.16–40.

Blainey, Geoffrey. 'Mr Whitlam Loads the Dice', in Blainey, *Eye on Australia: Speeches and Essays of Geoffrey Blainey*, Schwartz & Wilkinson, Melbourne, 1991, pp.51–55.

Blewett, Neal. 'Labor 1968–72: Planning for Victory' in Henry Mayer, ed., *Labor to Power: Australia's 1972 Election*, Angus & Robertson and the Australian Political Studies Association, Sydney, 1973, pp.6–16.

Bramston, Troy. 'Beginning of the End', *Eureka Street*, 15:2, 2005, pp.28–30.

Brereton, Kurt. 'That Iconic Moment: The Dismissal', *Artlink* 17:3, 1997, pp.18–19.

Burke, Nicolette. 'Australians Hear a New Wake-up Call', *Hobart Mercury*, 12 November 2005, p.17.

————. 'Time to Recall 30 Years Later', the *Advertiser*, 12 November 2005, p.32.

Catley, Robert and McFarlane, Bruce. *From Tweedledum to Tweedledee: The New Labor Government in Australia. A Critique of its Social Model*, Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1974.

Charlton, Peter. 'Keating Had an Arresting Solution', the *Courier-Mail*, 10 November 2005, p.3.

Chisolm, Bob. 'Man who Sacked an Elected Government', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 November 2005, p.62.

Clark, Andrew. 'Conversations Behind a Constitutional Crisis', *Australian Financial Review*, 11 November 2005, p.3.

Cohen, Barry. *Life With Gough*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1996.

Coleman, Peter. 'Hits and Myths of the Worshippers of Whitlamism', *Australian Financial Review*, 10 November 2005, p.71.

Coombs, H.C. 'The Predecessors', The Fabian Society of Australia, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, McPhee-Gribble, Fitzroy, 1986, pp.41–59.

Cottle, Drew. '"Sailing to Byzantium": Whitlam's Welfare and the Australian Working Class', in Richard Kennedy, ed., *Australian Welfare: Historical Sociology*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1989, pp.408–424.

Crawford, Wayne. 'Day to Remember', *Hobart Mercury*, 12 November 2005, p.36.

Crofts, Stephen and Craik, Jennifer. 'Constructing the Political in *The Dismissal*', *Australian Journal of Cultural Studies* 1:2, 1983, pp.91–96.

Cunningham, Stuart. '*The Dismissal* and Australian Television', *Australian Journal of Cultural Studies* 1:2, 1983, pp.83–90.

Davidson, Jim. 'Mr Whitlam's Cultural Revolution', *Journal of Australian Studies* 20, 1987, pp.83–91.

Davis, Mark. *Whitlam* [videorecording], Lighthouse Films, Australia, 1992.

Duncan, Graeme. 'Whitlam and the Problems of Social Democracy', *Meanjin* 45, 1986, pp. 469-478.

Emy, Hugh. 'A Political Overview: From Social Democracy to the Social Market Economy', in Hugh Emy, Owen Hughes and Race Mathews, eds, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1993, pp.16–31.

Evans, Gareth, ed., *Labor and the Constitution 1972–1975*, Heinemann Educational Books Ltd, Richmond, 1977.

Foley, Stephen and Wilson, Marshall. *Anatomy of a Coup: The Sinister Intrigue Behind the Dismissal*, Canterbury Press, Scoresby, 1990.

Forward, R.K. 'Australian Political Chronicle', *Journal of Politics and History* 22, 1976, pp.3610–3625.

Foster, Darryl. 'The Loans Affair', in E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley, eds, *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism* (vol II), Australian and New Zealand Book Co., Brookvale, 1978, pp.81–86.

Fraser, Andrew. 'So, Was He God's Gift to Culture?', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.18.

Freudenberg, Graham. *A Certain Grandeur: Gough Whitlam in Politics*, Sun Books, Melbourne, 1977.

———. 'The Program', in The Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1986, pp.130–144.

Game, Peter. 'My Part in his Downfall: Behind the Scenes of Whitlam's Sacking', *Herald-Sun*, 14 November 2005, p.25.

Ghosh, Sailesh. 'Business and the Whitlam Government', in Patrick Weller and Dean Jaensch, eds, *Responsible Government in Australia*, Drummond Publishing on behalf of the Australasian Political Studies Association, Richmond, 1980, pp.225–231.

Hall, Richard. *Whitlam: A Biography*, HarperCollins, Sydney, 1999.

Harris, Tony. 'A sort of Brigadoon'?: ALP politics and the Residents' Advisory Committee of the Glebe Estate during the time of federal government administration, 1974–85, in Greg Patmore, John Shields and Nikola

Balnave, eds, *National Labour History Conference: The Past is Before Us*, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History and Business and Labour History Group, Sydney, 2005, pp.151–158.

Henderson, Anne. 'Martyr to his Own Cause', *Courier Mail*, 6 November 2002, p.21, reprinted as 'Aussie Icon, but with Feet of Clay', *Canberra Times*, 8 November 2002, p.20.

Hickey, Bernard. 'Breakthrough: White and Whitlam in the early 1970s'. M.-T. Bindella and G.V. Davis, eds, *Imagination and the Creative Impulse in the New Literatures in English. Cross/Cultures* 9, 1993, pp.281–290.

Hocking, Jenny and Lewis, Colleen, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003.

Hocking, Jenny and Lewis, Colleen, 'Thirty Years Later', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.1–9.

Holding, Peter. 'It's Time Again', *Overland* 180, 2005, pp.27–29.

Hollier, Nathan. 'From Hope to Disillusion? The Legacy of the Whitlam Government in Australian Policy and Culture', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.414–443.

———. 'The Whitlam Project', *Overland* 169, 2002, pp.104–107.

Horne, Donald. *Death of the Lucky Country*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1976.

Howard, Colin. 'Preface', in Stephen Foley and Marshall Wilson. *Anatomy of a Coup: The Sinister Intrigue Behind the Dismissal*, Canterbury Press, Scoresby, 1990, pp.vi–ix.

Hughes, Owen. 'That Was a Time', in Hugh Emy, Owen Hughes and Race Mathews, eds, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1993, pp.247–253.

James, Clive. 'Comment', *Monthly*, November 2005, pp.10–12.

Juddery, Mark, ed., 1975: *Australia's Greatest Year*, John Wiley & Sons, Milton, 2005.

Keating, Paul. '1975, Lessons for Labor in the 1980s', in Gary Jungwirth, ed., *Snapshots of Hope: the Making of Modern Labor: a Landmark Decade – Speeches to the Fabians*, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1998, pp.44–54.

Kerr, John. *Matters for Judgement: An Autobiography*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1978.

Lawrence, Carmen. 'Whitlamites? Impressions of a '72 Novice Voter', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.96–109.

Lawson, Sylvia. 'An Audience for *The Dismissal*', *Australian Journal of Cultural Studies* 1:2, 1983, pp.97–100.

Little, Graham. 'Whitlam, Whitlamism and the Whitlam Years', The Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1986, pp.60–76.

Lloyd, Clem and Reid, G.S. *Out of the Wilderness: The Return of Labor*, Cassell Australia, North Melbourne, 1974.

Lloyd, Clem and Clark, Andrew. *Kerr's King Hit*, Cassell Australia, Stanmore and North Melbourne, 1976.

Loosely, Stephen. 'Lasting Benefits of Gough's Vision', *Sunday Telegraph*, 3 November 2002, p.104.

————. 'Lingering Memories of Illegitimacy', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.16.

Macintyre, Stuart. 'Whitlam' in Graeme Davison, John Hurst and Stuart Macintyre, eds, *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1998, p.684.

Mangan, John. 'Insight: The Five Big Talking Points', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.2.

Mathews, Race. '"Among Australian Fabians, I am Maximus": Gough Whitlam and the Fabian Approach to Public Policy Development and Advocacy', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.299–310.

Mathews, Race. 'Introduction', in Hugh Emy, Owen Hughes and Race Mathews, eds, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1993, pp.7–15.

McCamish, Thornton. '1975: A Dimming Legacy', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.13.

McColl, Joan. 'Letter', the *Australian*, 14 November 2005, p.9.

McLaren, John, ed., *Towards a New Australia*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1972.

Munro, Peter. 'Labor of Love', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 November 2002, p.2.

Niddrie, Phillip, 'It Wasn't Whitlam', *Sun-Herald* 21 April 2002, p.20.

Nolan, Sybil, ed., *The Dismissal: Where Were You on December 11, 1975?*, Melbourne University Publishing, Carlton, 2005.

Oakes, Laurie. *Whitlam PM*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1973.

————. 'The Years of Preparation', in *Whitlam and Frost: The full text of their TV conversations plus exclusive new interviews. Articles by Laurie Oakes, Richard Farmer, Mungo MacCallum. Cartoons by Tanner and Norm Mitchell*, Sundial, London, 1974, pp.9–39.

Oakes, Laurie and Solomon, David. *The Making of an Australian Prime Minister*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1973.

O'Brien, Patrick. 'The Whitlam Years – An Alternative History', in Robert Manne, ed., *The New Conservatism in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1982, pp.141–160.

Paul, Anthony. 'It's Time for a Reality Check', *Courier Mail*, 9 November 2002, p.32.

Pitts, Graham. 'Raping East Timor', *Overland* 159, 2000, pp.107–109.

Pont, Graham. 'Creative and Free – For How Long? Whitlam on Labor Arts Policy', in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson, eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.546–547.

Price, Matt. 'It's Time We Got Over It, says Tanner', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.6.

Ramsay, Alan. 'A Timeless Grandeur Amid All the Bloody Nonsense', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 13 February 2002, p.13.

————. 'Here and There, the Signs of Tyranny', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12 November 2005, p.39.

Reid, Alan. *The Whitlam Venture*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1976.

Richardson, Nick. 'The Quiet Achiever', *Herald-Sun*, 20 March 2002, p.18.

————. 'The World According to Gough', *Herald-Sun*, 2 November 2002, p.21.

Scala, Mark. 'Queen's Reign Ends – Council Removes Portrait', *Daily Telegraph*, 11 November 2005, p.23.

Scott, Andrew. 'Meanings of "Modernisation": the Distinctiveness of the Whitlam Government in the History of Labour Parties', in Jenny Hocking and

Colleen Lewis, eds, *Whitlam and Modern Labor: It's Time Again*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.444–464.

Scott, Steven. 'Keating Lampoons Naive Lefties of Whitlam era', *Australian Financial Review*, 10 November 2005, p.14.

Sexton, Michael. *Illusions of Power: The Fate of a Reforming Government*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1979.

————. *The Great Crash: The Short Life and Sudden Death of the Whitlam Government*, Scribe, Melbourne, 2005 (originally published as *Illusions of Power: The Fate of a Reform Government*, 1979).

Smith, David. *Head of State*, Macleay Press, Paddington, 2005.

————. 'The Truth About the Dismissal', *Quadrant* 414, 2005, pp.12–16.

Smith, Ian. 'It was Gough's Time, but John's got Aplomb', the *Advertiser*, 14 November 2005, p.18.

Spry, I.C.F. 'Mafia influence and the Whitlam Government', *National Observer* 65, 2005, pp.5–7.

Steketee, Mike. 'Believe It: The Dismissal Could Happen Again', the *Australian*, 10 November 2005, p.12.

————. 'I'd have Arrested Kerr: Keating', the *Australian*, 10 November 2005, p.2.

St John, Edward. 'The Dismissal of the Whitlam Government', in Robert Manne, ed., *The New Conservatism in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1982, pp.161–179.

Strangio, Paul. 'Gough and Jim', *Arena Magazine* 40, 1999, pp.41–43.

Tanner, Lindsay. 'We Have Bigger Issues than One Unfair Dismissal', the *Australian*, 11 November 2005, p.16.

Teichmann, Max. 'Assessing the Whitlam Years', *Journal of Australian Studies* 20, 1987, pp.99–102.

Tennison, Patrick. *The Lucky Country Reborn*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1976.

Tingle, Laura. 'Kerr not to Blame, Says PM', *Australian Financial Review*, 12 November 2005, p.5.

Turner, Ian. 'High Noon at Yarralumla', *Overland* 65, 1976, pp.9–22.

Twomey, Anne. 'Governing Oddities: the Australian Remembers 1975', the *Australian*, 12 November 2005, p.27.

————. 'Vice-regal Defiance of Britain Set the Scene', the *Australian*, 12 November 2005, p.27.

Walter, James. 'Gough Whitlam: Bursting Limitations', in Judith Brett, ed., *Political Lives*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1997, pp.28–51.

————. *The Leader: A Political Biography of Gough Whitlam*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1980.

Warhurst, John. 'Transitional Hero: Gough Whitlam and the Australian Labor Party', *Australian Journal of Political Science* 31:2, 1996, pp.253–276.

Whitlam, Gough. *The Truth of the Matter* (third edn), Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2005 (originally published 1979).

————. *The Whitlam Government 1972–1975*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1985.

Whitwell, Greg. 'Economic Affairs', in Hugh Emy, Owen Hughes and Race Mathews, eds, *Whitlam Re-visited: Policy Development, Policies and Outcomes*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1993, pp.32–62.

Wiltshire, Kenneth. 'It's Time to Dismiss Flaws in System', the *Courier-Mail*, 10 November 2005, p.17.

Wroe, David. 'History Too Hard on Kerr, says PM', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.5.

————. 'The Day They Can't Dismiss: Whitlam's Sacking Helped Form a Younger Generation of Pollies', the *Age*, 11 November 2005, p.6.

Young, Mick. 'The Build-up to 1972', in The Australian Fabian Society, eds, *The Whitlam Phenomenon*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1986, pp.92–108.

Clark

Bridge, Carl. 'Introduction', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, pp.1–9.

Clark, Manning. *A History of Australia* (five vols), Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1962–1987.

————. *A Short History of Australia* (second edn), Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1982.

————. *Manning Clark: Occasional Writings and Speeches*, Fontana Books [no place], 1980.

————. *The Beginning of an Australian Intelligentsia* (Blaiklock Memorial Lecture), Wentworth Press, Sydney, 1973.

————. 'The Violent Option' in Myfanwy Gollan, ed., *Kerr and the Consequences: The Sydney Town Hall Meeting, 20 September 1976*, Widescope International Publishers, Camberwell, 1976, pp.26–31.

Craven, Peter. 'The Ryan Affair', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, pp.165–187.

Dixson, Miriam. 'Clark and National Identity', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, pp.188–227.

Macintyre, Stuart. '"Always a Pace or Two Apart"', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, pp.17–29.

Rickard, John. 'Manning Clark and Patrick White: A Reflection', *Australian Historical Studies* 98, 1992, pp.116–122.

McKenna, Mark. '"I Wonder Whether I Belong": Manning Clark and the Politics of Australian History 1970–2000', *Australian Historical Studies* 122, 2003, pp.364–383.

Warhurst, John. 'In the Public Arena', in Carl Bridge, ed., *Manning Clark: Essays on his Place in History*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 1994, pp.153–164.

White

Adams, Phillip. 'Untitled', in Clayton Joyce, ed., *Patrick White: A Tribute*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, 1991, pp.41–44.

Andersson, Lars. 'Excess Denied: Australian Modernism and a Marxist Response', 15, 2005, pp.5–21.

Bjorksten, Ingmar. *Patrick White: A General Introduction* (trans. Stanley Gerson), University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1976.

Brennan, Paul and Flynn, Christine, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989.

Condon, Matt. 'White House in Eye of Storm', the *Courier-Mail*, 28 February 2005, p.11.

Docker, John. 'Patrick White's Australian Literary Context', in his *Australian Cultural Elites: Intellectual Traditions in Sydney and Melbourne*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1974, pp.59–76.

During, Simon. *Patrick White*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1996.

Hasluck, Paul. 'Encounters With Patrick White', *Quadrant* 34:12, 1990, pp.54–56.

Hewitt, Helen Verity. *Patrick White, Painter Manque: Painters, Paintings, and their Influence on this Writing*, Miegunyah Press, Carlton, 2002.

Hickey, Bernard. 'Breakthrough: White and Whitlam in the early 1970s'. M.-T. Bindella and G.V. Davis, eds, *Imagination and the Creative Impulse in the New Literatures in English. Cross/Cultures* 9, 1993, pp.281–290.

Hubble, Ava. 'McCready Comes to the Party for Ten', *Sydney Morning Herald* ('The Guide'), 10 October 1994, p.2.

Kiernan, Brian. *Patrick White*, Macmillan, London and Basingstoke, 1980.

Lindesay, Vane. 'My Fifty Years with *Overland*', *Overland* 174, 2004, pp.63–66.

Marr, David. *Patrick White ~ A Life*, Random House, Sydney, 1991.

————., ed., *Patrick White Letters*, Random House Australia, Sydney, 1994.

McCann, Andrew. 'Decomposing Suburbia: Patrick White's Perversity', *Australian Literary Studies* 18:4, 1998, pp.56–71.

McLaren, John. 'Patrick White: Prophet from the Desert', introduction to John McLaren, ed., *Prophet from the Desert: Critical Essays on Patrick White*, Red Hill Press, West Footscray, 1995, ppi–xi.

————., ed., *Prophet from the Desert: Critical Essays on Patrick White*, Red Hill Press, West Footscray, 1995.

Shepherd, R. and Singh, K., eds, *Patrick White: A Critical Symposium*, Centre for Research in the New Literatures in English, Adelaide, 1978.

Thomson, Helen. 'Patrick White: Our Last Colonial Novelist?', in Wenche Ommundsen and Hazel Rowley, eds, *From a Distance: Australian Writers and Cultural Displacement*, Deakin University Press, Geelong, 1996, pp.61–71.

White, Patrick. 'And if a Button is Pressed' (1981), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.99–102.

————. 'A Noble Pair', in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.69–71.

————. 'A Sense of Integrity' (1988), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.189–195.

————. 'Australian of the Year' (1974), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.47–49.

————. 'Australians in a Nuclear War' (1983), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.113–126.

————. 'Citizens for Democracy' (1977), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.63–67.

————. 'Civilisation, Money and Concrete' (1973), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.35–37.

————. *Flaws in the Glass: A Self-portrait*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1981.

————. 'Hiroshima Day' (1984), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.161–165.

————. 'Imagining the Real' (1986), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, p.177–181.

————. 'In the Making' (1969), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.19–22.

————. 'Kerr and the Consequences' (1976), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.59–60.

————. 'Mad Hatter's Party' (1972), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.31–33.

————. 'Patriotism' (1984), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp139–143.

————. 'Peace and Other Matters' (1984), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.167–173.

————. *The Eye of the Storm* (1973), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1975.

————. 'The Reading Sickness' (1980), in Paul Brennan and Christine Flynn, eds, *Patrick White Speaks*, Primavera Press, Sydney, 1989, pp.73–78.

————. *The Solid Mandala* (1966), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1969.

————. *The Vivisector* (1970), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1973.

————. *Three Uneasy Pieces*, Pascoe Publishing, Carlton, 1987.

Wilding, Michael. 'Patrick White: The Politics of Modernism', in John McLaren and Mary-Ellen Ryan, eds, *Prophet from the Desert: Critical Essays on Patrick White*, Red Hill Press, West Footscray, 1995, pp.24–33.

Wilkes, G.A., ed., *Ten Essays on Patrick White*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1970.

Wright, Judith. 'Patrick White and the Story of Australia', in Wright, *Going on Talking*, Butterfly Books, Springwood, 1992, pp.49–52.

Hardy

Adams, Paul. *The Stranger from Melbourne: Frank Hardy ~ A Literary Biography 1944–1975*, University of Western Australia Press, Nedlands, 1999.

Adams, Paul and Lee, Christopher. 'Introduction', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 2003, pp.9–21.

Adams, Paul and Lee, Christopher, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 2003.

Armstrong, Pauline. *Frank Hardy and the Making of* Power Without Glory, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 2000.

Blanch, Anna. 'Frank Hardy and Australian Folk Narrative', *Australian Folklore* 18, 2003, pp.27–34.

Brennan, Niall. *John Wren, Gambler: His Life and Times*, Hill of Content, Melbourne, 1971.

Capp, Fiona. *Writers Defiled: Security Surveillance of Australian Authors and Intellectuals 1920–1960*, McPhee-Gribble, Ringwood, 1993.

Denoon, Donald. 'Guilt and the Gurinji', *Meanjin* 29, 1970, pp.253–265.

Docker, John. 'A Study in Context: And the Dead are Many', *Arena* 41, 1976, pp.48–61.

Genoni, Paul. 'Ruth Park and Frank Hardy: Catholic Realists', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, pp.237–246.

Hardy, Frank. 'ASIO & I', *Sydney Morning Herald* (*Spectrum*), 21 March 1992, p.41.

————. 'Author's Note', in Frank Hardy, *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, Allara Publishing, Melbourne, 1971, pp.232–245.

————. 'Author's Note', in Frank Hardy, *The Yarns of Billy Borker* (1965), Mandarin, Port Melbourne, 1992, pp.149–153.

————. *But the Dead are Many*, The Bodley Head, Sydney, 1975.

————. *Legends from Benson's Valley*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1984.

————. *The Hard Way*, T. Werner Laurie Ltd., London, 1961.

————. 'The Most Democratic Constitution in the World?', in Sol Encel, Donald Horne and Elaine Thompson, eds, *Change the Rules! Towards a Democratic Constitution*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1977, pp.183–189.

————. *The Obsession of Oscar Oswald*, Pascoe Publishing, Carlton, 1983.

————. *The Outcasts of Foolgarah*, Allara Publishing, Melbourne, 1971.

————. *The Unlucky Australians*, Thomas Nelson, Melbourne, 1968.

Hocking, Jenny. *Frank Hardy: Politics, Literature, Life*, Lothian, South Melbourne, 2005, pp.200–201.

Hollier, Nathan. 'Frank Hardy and Australian Working-Class Masculinity', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 2003, pp.221–236.

Lohrey, Amanda. 'Political Larrikin', *Overland* 162, 2001, pp.94–96.

Yallop, Richard. 'Leaders and Larrikins Farewell Hardy', the *Age*, 5 February 1994, p.1.

Murray

Alexander, Peter F. *Les Murray: A Life in Progress*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, 2000.

Almon, Bert. 'Les Murray's Critique of the Enlightenment', in Carmel Gaffney, *Counterbalancing Light: Essays on the Poetry of Les Murray*, Kardoorair Press, Armidale, n.d. [1997], pp.1–19.

Bagnall, Diana. 'The Murray-Howard System', *The Bulletin* 117: 6168, 6 April 1999, pp.40–41, 44.

Bourke, Lawrence. *A Vivid Steady State: Les Murray and Australian Poetry*, University of New South Wales Press in association with New Endeavour Press, Sydney, 1992.

Gaffney, Carmel, ed., *Counterbalancing Light: Essays on the Poetry of Les Murray*, Kardoorair Press, Armidale, n.d. [1997].

Gray, Robert. 'An Interview with Les Murray', *Quadrant* 113, 1976, pp.69–70.

Gray, Robert and Lehmann, Geoffrey, 'Introduction', in Gray and Lehmann, eds, *The Younger Australian Poets*, Hale & Iremonger, Sydney, 1983, pp.11–16.

Hart, Kevin. 'Discourse, Image: After Poetry 11: A Quarterly Account of Recent Poetry', *Overland* 125, 1991, pp.61–67.

————. '"Interest" In Les A. Murray', *Australian Literary Studies* 14:2, 1989, pp.147–159.

Hergenhan, Laurie and Clunies Ross, Bruce, eds, *The Poetry of Les Murray: Critical Essays* (*Australian Literary Studies* special issue, 20:2), University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2001.

Lambert, Helen. 'A Draft Preamble: Les Murray and the Politics of Poetry', *Journal of Australian Studies* 80, 2004, pp.5–14, 231–232.

Leonard, John. 'Reading Les Murray's *Collected Poems*', *Overland* 172, 2002, pp83–86.

Manne, Robert. 'Letter', *Quadrant* 343, 1998, pp.5–7.

———. 'Why I Have Resigned', *Quadrant* 342, 1997, pp.2–3.

Matthews, Steven. *Les Murray*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, 2001.

Murray, Les. 'Afterword', in Alexander Craig, ed., *Twelve Poets 1950–1970*, Jacaranda Press, 1971, pp.218–220.

———. 'ANZAC and Why I Write', *Kunapipi* 18: 2&3, 1996, pp.328–329.

———. *Blocks and Tackles: Essays and Articles 1982 to 1990*. Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1990.

———. 'Bulby Brush Boy', in Brenda Niall, Ian Britain and Pamela Williams, eds, *The Oxford Book of Australian Schooldays*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1997, pp.238–239.

———. 'From Bulby Brush to Figure City: A Sketch of Schooldays', *Blocks and Tackles: Essays and Articles 1982 to 1990*. Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1990, pp.159-162.

———. 'In Defence of Country Folk', *Independent Monthly* 6:11, June 1995, p.55.

———. *Lunch and Counter Lunch*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1974.

———. *Persistence in Folly: Selected Prose Writings*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1984.

———. *Poems Against Economics*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1972.

———. 'The Human Hair Thread', *Meanjin* 36, 1977, pp.550–571.

———. *The Peasant Mandarin: Prose Pieces*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1978.

———. *The Weatherboard Cathedral*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1969.

Niall, Brenda, Britain, Ian and Williams, Pamela, eds, *The Oxford Book of Australian Schooldays*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1997.

Pierce, Peter. 'Les Murray's "Narrowspeak"', in Laurie Hergenhan and Bruce Clunies Ross, *The Poetry of Les Murray: Critical Essays* (*Australian Literary Studies* special issue 20:2), University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2001, pp.76–86.

Porter, Peter. 'Country Poetry and Town Poetry: A Debate with Les Murray', *Australian Literary Studies* 9, 1979, pp.39–48.

Smith, Angela, ed., *Les Murray and Australian Poetry*, Menzies Centre for Australian Studies, London, 2002.

Stephens, Tony. 'Murray Rewrites His Preamble for the Constitution, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 10 April 1999, p.3.

Wright, Lincoln. 'Robert Manne Quits *Quadrant* After Bitter Stoush with Les Murray', the *Canberra Times*, 14 November 1997, p.3.

General Philosophical, Theoretical and Historical Background

Aarons, Laurie. *Casino Oz: Winners and Losers in Global Capitalism*, Goanna Publishing, Sydney, 1999.

———. *Here Come the Uglies: The New Right: Who They Are, What They Think, Why They're Dangerous*, Red Pen Publications, Ultimo, 1987.

Abjorensen, Norman. 'The New Guard – Were they Our Very Own Fascists?', *Canberra Times*, 8 June 2002, p.8.

Abrams, M.H. *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition*, W.W. Norton, New York, 1953.

Ahlstrom, Sydney. *A Religious History of the American People*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1972.

Aitkin, Don. 'Australian Political Culture', *Australian Cultural History* 5, 1986, pp.4–11.

Albinski, Henry S. 'Australia and the United States', in Stephen R. Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, Angus and Robertson, Sydney, 1985, pp.395–420.

Allen, Christopher. *Art in Australia: From Colonisation to Postmodernism*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1997.

Alomes, Stephen. *A Nation at Last? The Changing Character of Australian Nationalism 1880–1988*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, 1988.

Altman, Dennis. *Gore Vidal's America*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2005.

———. 'The Personal is the Political: Social Movements and Cultural Change', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.308–321.

Andrews, Barry. 'The Federal Government as Literary Patron', *Meanjin* 41:1, 1982, pp.3–19.

Antcliff, Susan. 'Behind the Rhetoric: A Closer Look at the New Right', *Australian Quarterly* 60:1, 1988, pp.63–69.

Armstrong, Karen. *A Short History of Myth*, Text, Melbourne, 2005.

Atkins, Dennis. 'Sounds of the Suburbs', *Courier Mail*, 2 February 2002, p.26.

Attwood, Bain. *Rights for Aborigines*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, 2003.

Australian Institute of Political Science, ed., *Parliament, Bureaucracy, Citizens – Who Runs Australia?*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1972.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. 'The Great Crisis', *New York Review of Books* 21: 21–22, 23 January 1975, pp.20–29; reprinted as 'The End of the World (as we now know it)', in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson, eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.5–15.

Battin, Tim. *Abandoning Keynes: Australia's Capital Mistake*, Macmillan, London, 1997.

———., ed., *A Passion for Politics: Essays in Honour of Graham Maddox*, Pearson Education Australia, Frenchs Forest, 2005.

Beasley, Jack. *Red Letter Days: Notes From Inside an Era*, Australasian Book Society, Sydney, 1979.

Bell, Philip and Bell, Roger. *Implicated: The United States in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1993.

Bennett, Bruce. *Australian Short Fiction: A History*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2002

———. 'Literary Culture Since Vietnam: A New Dynamic', in Bruce Bennett and Jennifer Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998, pp.239–264.

Bennett, David. 'PC Panic, the Press and the Academy', *Meanjin* 52, 1993, pp.435–446.

Beresford, Melanie and Kerr, Prue. 'A Turning Point for Australian Capitalism: 1942–52', in E.L. Wheelwright, and Ken Buckley, eds, *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism* (vol IV), Australian and New Zealand Book Co., Brookvale, 1980, pp.148–171.

Biber, Katherine, Sear, Tom and Trudinger, Dave, eds, *Playing the Man: New Approaches to Masculinity*, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1999.

Bible, The King James version.

Bird, Delys. 'New Narrations: Contemporary Fiction', in Elizabeth Webby, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, pp.183–208.

Blainey, Geoffrey. *Eye on Australia: Speeches and Essays of Geoffrey Blainey*, Schwartz & Wilkinson, Melbourne, 1991.

Bolton, Geoffrey. *The Oxford History of Australia Volume 5, 1942–1988: The Middle Way*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1990.

Bonney, Bill. 'Media and the People', in Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, eds, *Constructing a Culture: A People's History of Australia Since 1788*, McPhee Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1988, pp.136–155.

Bonney, Bill and Wilson, Helen. *Australia's Commercial Media*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1983.

Borden, William. *The Pacific Alliance*, Madison, Wisconsin University Press, 1984.

Boreham, Paul, Clegg, Stewart, and Dow, Geoff. *Class, Politics and the Economy*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and Boston, 1986.

Boreham, Paul, Dow, Geoff and Leet, Martin. *Room to Manoeuvre: Political Aspects of Full Employment*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton South, 1999.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Wacquant, Loic. 'On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason', *Theory, Culture and Society* 16:1, 1999, pp.41–58.

Brett, Judith. *Australian Liberals and the Moral Middle Class from Alfred Deakin to John Howard*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

————., ed., *Political Lives*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1997.

Brown, Marshall. *Turning Points: Essays in the History of Cultural Expressions*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1997.

Buchanan, James. *The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan*, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Buchanan, James and Tullock, Gordon. *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of Constitutional Democracy*, Michigan Institute of Technology Press, Ann Arbor, 1965.

Buckley, Vincent. 'Towards An Australian Literature', *Meanjin* 18:1, 1959, pp.59–68.

————. 'Utopianism and Vitalism in Australian Literature', *Quadrant* 3:10, 1959, pp.39–51.

Burchall, David. 'After Social Democracy', *Australian Left Review* 143, 1992, pp.24–27.

Burgmann, Verity. *Revolutionary Industrial Unionism: The Industrial Workers of the World in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1995.

Burgmann, Verity and Lee, Jenny, eds, *Constructing a Culture: A People's History of Australia Since 1788*, McPhee Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1988.

Burgmann, Verity and Lee, Jenny, eds, *Making a Life: A People's History of Australia since 1788*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1988.

Burn, Ian, Lendon, Nigel, Merewether, Charles and Stephen, Ann. *The Necessity of Australian Art: An Essay About Interpretation*, Power Publications, Sydney, 1988.

Butler, Gavan. 'Economic Notes: The Rise of "The New Conservatism"', *Australian Left Review* 76, 1981, pp.18–23.

Camilleri, Joseph. *Australian~American Relations: The Web of Dependence*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1980.

Campbell, D.A.S., ed., *Post-war Reconstruction in Australia*, Australasian Publishing Company in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Political Science, Sydney, pp.67–99.

Campbell, Neil, Davies, Jude and McKay, George, eds, *Issues in Americanisation and Culture*, Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Carey, Alex. 'The Ideological Management Industry', in E.L. Wheelwright and K.D. Buckley, eds, *Communications and the Media in Australia*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1987, pp.156–179.

Carey, Hilary. *Believing in Australia: A Cultural History of Religions*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1996.

Carroll, John. 'Economic Rationalism and its Consequences', in John Carroll and Robert Manne, eds, *Shutdown: The Failure of Economic Rationalism and How to Rescue Australia*, Text, Melbourne, 1992, pp.7–26.

———. *Humanism: The Wreck of Western Culture*, Fontana Press, London, 1993.

———., ed., *Intruders in the Bush: The Australian Quest for Identity* (second edn), Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1992.

Carroll, John and Manne, Robert, eds, *Shutdown: The Failure of Economic Rationalism and How to Rescue Australia*, Text, Melbourne, 1992.

Carter, David. 'Documenting and Criticising Society, in Laurie Hergenhan, et.al., *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, pp.370–389.

———. 'The Story of Our Epoch, A Hero of Our Time: The Communist Novelist in Postwar Australia', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 1993, pp.89–111.

Cathcart, Michael, Burgmann, Verity, Connell, R.W. Mayne, Stephen and McGregor, Craig, 'Class in Contemporary Australia', in Nathan Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia: The Power, Politics and Privilege of the New Ruling Class*, Australian Scholarly Press, Melbourne, 2004, pp.154–181.

Catley, Robert and McFarlane, Bruce. *From Tweedledum to Tweedledee. The New Labor Government in Australia: A Critique of its Social Model*, Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney, 1974.

Chant, David, Knight, John and Smith, Richard. 'Reconceptualising the Dominant Ideology Debate: An Australian Case Study', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 25:3, 1989, pp.381–409.

Chomsky, Noam. *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel and the Palestinians*, South End Press, Boston, 1999.

Clark, Peter. *The Keynesian Revolution in the Making 1924–1936*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1990.

Clarke, F.G. *Australia: A Concise Political and Social History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1989.

Cockett, Richard. *Thinking the Unthinkable: Think-Tanks and the Economic Counter-Revolution 1931–1983*, Fontana Press, London, 1995.

Cockington, James. 'How a Bastard of a Word Became Legit', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 15 April 1996, p.13.

Cohen, Barry, ed., *After the Party: More Political Anecdotes*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988.

Colebatch, Tim. 'Tax Haul Hits New High: 31.8 %', the *Age*, 13 April 2002, p.3.

Collins, Hugh. 'Political Ideology in Australia: The Distinctiveness of a Benthamite Society', in Stephen R. Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1985, pp.147–169.

Commager, Henry. *Living Ideas in America* (enlarged edn), Harper & Row, New York, Evanston and London, 1964.

Connell, R.W. 'Crisis Tendencies in Patriarchy and Capitalism', in R.W. Connell, *Which Way is Up? Essays on Class, Sex and Culture*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1983, pp.33–49.

———. 'Moloch Mutates: Global Capitalism and the Evolution of the Global Ruling Class 1977–2002', *Overland* 167, 2002, pp.4–14.

———. *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture: Studies of Conflict, Power and Hegemony in Australian Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977.

———. 'The Transition to Socialism', in G. Crough, Ted Wheelwright and Ted Wilshire, eds, *Australia and World Capitalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980, pp.289–302.

———. *Which Way is Up? Essays on Class, Sex and Culture*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1983.

Connell, R.W. and Irving, T.H. *Class Structure in Australian History: Documents, Narrative and Argument*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1980.

Connell, R.W. and Irving, T.H. 'Yes, Virginia, There is a Ruling Class', in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson, eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.81–92.

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness* (1899), Norton Critical Edition (third edn), New York, 1988.

Coombs, Anne. *Sex and Anarchy: The Life and Death of the Sydney Push*, Viking, Ringwood, 1996.

Coombs, H.C. 'The Economic Aftermath of War', in D.A.S. Campbell, ed., *Post-war Reconstruction in Australia*, Australasian Publishing Company in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Political Science, Sydney, pp.67–99.

———. *Trial Balance*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1981.

Cope, Bill and Kalantzis, Mary. *A Place in the Sun: Re-creating the Australian Way of Life*, HarperCollins, Sydney, 2000.

Costa, Michael and Duffy, Mark. 'Labor and Economic Rationalism', in Chris James, Chris Jones and Andrew Norton, eds, *A Defence of Economic Rationalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993, pp.121–131.

Coxsedge, Joan, Coldicutt, Ken and Harant, Gerry. *Rooted in Secrecy: The Clandestine Element in Australian Politics*, Committee for the Abolition of Political Police, Balwyn North, 1982.

Craven, Ian. 'Changing Courses: Australia Since the Forties', *Australian Studies* 11, 1997, pp.1–7.

Crough, G. Wheelwright, Ted and Wilshire, Ted, eds, *Australia and World Capitalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980.

Crowley, F. *Tough Times: Australia in the Seventies*, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1986.

Crunden, Robert M. *A Brief History of American Culture*, North Castle Books, New York and London, 1996.

Curran, James. 'Correspondence', in Robert Manne (with David Corlett), *Sending Them Home: Refugees and the New Politics of Indifference* (*Quarterly Essay* 13), Black Inc., Melbourne, 2004, pp108–111.

Curthoys, Ann. 'Mythologies', in Richard Nile, ed., *The Australian Legend and its Discontents*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2000, pp.11–41.

Davis, Mark. *Gangland: Cultural Elites and the New Generationalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1997.

Davison, Graeme. 'Driving to Austerica: The Americanization of the Postwar Australian City', in Harold Bolitho and Chris Wallace-Crabbe, eds, *Approaching Australia: Papers from the Harvard Australian Studies Symposium*, Harvard University Committee on Australian Studies, Cambridge, Mass., 1997, pp.159–183.

Davison, Graeme, Hurst, John and Macintyre, Stuart, eds, *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1998.

Demetriou, Demetris. 'Towards a Genealogy of R.W. Connell's Notion of "Structure"', in Nathan Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia: The Power, Politics and Privilege of the New Ruling Class*, Australian Scholarly Press, Melbourne, 2004, pp.24–44.

Denholm, Michael. *Small Press Publishing in Australia: the early 1970s*. North Sydney, Second Back Row Press, 1979.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology* (trans. G.C. Spivak), Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1976.

Devine, Miranda. 'QC's Claims Not Tampa Proof', *Sun-Herald*, 14 April 2002, p.15.

Dixson, Miriam. *The Imaginary Australian: Anglo-Celts and Identity – 1788 to the Present*, UNSW Press, 1999.

Docker, John. '"Those Halcyon Days": The Moment of the New Left', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements and Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.289–307.

Dutton, Geoffrey, *A Rare Bird: Penguin Books in Australia 1946–1996*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1996.

————., ed., *The Literature of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1964.

Duwell, Martin, Ehrhardt, Marianne and Hetherington, Carol, eds, *The* ALS *Guide to Australian Writers: A Bibliography 1963–1995* (second edn), University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 1997.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1983, pp.127–132.

————. *The Idea of Culture*, Blackwell, Oxford and Maldon, 2000.

————. *Walter Benjamin or Towards a Revolutionary Criticism*, New Left Books, London, 1981.

Ellis, Bob. *First Abolish the Customer: 202 Arguments Against Economic Rationalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1998.

————. *So it Goes: Essays, Broadcasts, Speeches, 1987-1999*, Viking, Ringwood, 2000, p.389.

Emmison, Michael. 'Transformations of Taste: Americanisation, Generational Change and Australian Cultural Consumption', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 33:3, 1997, pp.322–343.

Emy, Hugh and Hughes, Own, *Australian Politics: Realities in Conflict* (second edn), Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1991.

Encel, Sol, Horne, Donald and Thompson, Elaine, eds, *Change the Rules! Towards a Democratic Constitution*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1977.

Eyerman, Ron. *Between Culture and Politics: Intellectuals in Modern Society*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1994.

Ferrier, Carole, ed., *Gender, Politics and Fiction: Twentieth Century Australian Women's Novels*, UQP, St Lucia, 1985.

Fitzgerald, V.W. 'Chris Higgins's Early Career – The Establishment of Economic Modelling in the Australian Treasury', *Economic Record* 67, 1991, pp.257–260.

Foucault, Michel. *The Foucault Reader*, Paul Rabinow, ed., Pantheon Books, New York, 1984.

Frank, Andre Gunder. *Crisis: In the World Economy*, Heinemann, London, 1980.

Frank, Thomas. *One Market Under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism and the End of Economic Democracy* (2000), Vintage, London, 2002.

Frankel, Boris. *From Prophets Deserts Come: The Struggle to Reshape Australian Political Culture*, Boris Frankel and Arena Publishing, North Carlton, 1992.

Freney, Dennis. *A Map of Days: Life on the Left*, Heinemann, Port Melbourne, 1991.

————. *The CIA's Australian Connection*, the author, Sydney, 1977.

Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

————. *Free To Choose*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1980.

Fusfeld, Daniel R. *The Age of the Economist* (sixth edn), Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Higher Education, Glenview and London, 1990.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Affluent Society*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1958.

————. *The World Economy Since the Wars*, Sinclair-Stevenson, London, 1994.

Garber, Marjorie and Walkowitz, Rebecca. *One Nation Under God? Religion and American Culture*, Routledge, London, 1999.

Gaustad, Edwin. *A Religious History of America*, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1990.

Gelder, Ken. 'The Novel', in Laurie Hergenhan, et.al., *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, pp.503–519.

Gelder, Ken and Salzman, Paul. *The New Diversity: Australian Fiction 1970–1988*, McPhee-Gribble, Melbourne, 1988.

George, Susan. *A Fate Worse than Debt*, Penguin, London, 1988.

George, Susan and Sabelli, Fabrizio. *Faith and Credit: The World Bank's Secular Empire*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1994.

Giddens, Anthony. 'Introduction', Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Unwin Hyman, London, 1990, pp.vii-xxvi.

Gillen, Paul. 'National Liturgies: Policy Speeches in Four Australian Election Campaigns, 1949–83', in Helen Wilson, ed., *Australian Communications and the Public Sphere: Essays in memory of Bill Bonney*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1989, pp.182–207.

Gitlin, Todd. 'Under the Sign of Mickey Mouse and Bruce Willis', *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 15:2, 1998, pp.4–9.

Gittins, Ross. 'Dollar and Diversity Temper Commodities Vagaries, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 June 2002, p.46.

Glezer, Leon. *Tariff Politics: Australian Policy-making 1960 – 1980*, Melbourne University Press, 1982.

Goldmann, Lucien. *Method in the Sociology of Literature* (William Q. Boelhower, trans. and ed.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1981.

Goldsworthy, Kerryn. 'Fiction from 1900 to 1970', in Elizabeth Webby, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp.105–133.

Gordon, Richard and Osmond, Warren, eds, 'An Overview of the Australian New Left', in Richard Gordon, ed., *The Australian New Left: Critical Essays and Strategy*, William Heinemann, Melbourne, 1970, pp.3–39.

Gowa, J. *Closing the Gold Window: Domestic Politics and the End of Bretton Woods*, Ithaca, New York, 1983.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds, Lawrence and Wishart, London & International Publishers, New York, 1971.

Grant, Bruce. *The Australian Dilemma: A New Kind of Western Society*, McDonald Futura, Sydney, 1983.

Graubard, Stephen R., ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1985.

Griffen-Foley, Bridget. *Party Games: Australian Politicians and the Media from War to Dismissal*, Text, Melbourne, 2003.

Griffiths, Phil. 'Racism: Whitewashing the Class Divide', in Rick Kuhn, ed., *Class and Struggle in Australia*, Pearson, Frenchs Forest, 2005, pp.159–175.

Griggs, E.L., ed., *Collected Letters of Samuel Tayler Coleridge: Volume Two*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1956–71.

Grimshaw, Patricia, Lake, Marilyn, McGrath, Ann and Quartly, Marion, eds, *Creating a Nation, 1788–1990*, McPhee-Gribble, Melbourne, 1994.

Groenewegen, P. and McFarlane, B. *A History of Australian Economic Thought*, Routledge, London, 1990.

Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1993.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (orig. German pub., 1962), Polity Press, Cambridge, 1989.

Hall, Richard. *The Real John Kerr: His Brilliant Career*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1978.

Hampton, Christopher, ed., *A Radical Reader: The Struggle for Change in England 1381–1914*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1984.

Harms, John. *Confessions of a Thirteenth Man*, Text, Melbourne, 1999.

Hartz, Louis. *The Liberal Tradition in America: An Interpretation of American Political Thought Since the Revolution*, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1955.

Haskell, Dennis. 'Poetry Since 1965', in Bruce Bennett and Jennifer Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, Oxford, Melbourne, 1998, pp.265–285.

Hawkins, Gay. *From Nimbin to Mardis Gras: Constructing Community Arts*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993.

———. 'Reading Community Arts Policy: From Nimbin to the Gay Mardi Gras', in Vivienne Binns, ed., *Community and the Arts: History, Theory, Practice*, Pluto Press, Leichhardt, 1991, pp. 45–53.

Hayek, Friedrich. *New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1978.

———. *The Constitution of Liberty*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1960.

———. *The Road to Serfdom*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1944.

Head, Brian. 'Introduction: Intellectuals in Australian Society', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.1–44.

Head, Brian and Walter, James, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988.

Hegel, Georg. *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807, trans. A.V. Miller), Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1977.

Held, David. *Models of Democracy*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991.

Henretta, James A., Brody, David and Dumenil, Lynn. *America: A Concise History*, Bedford, St. Martins, Boston and New York, 1999.

Hergenhan, Laurie, ed., *Nationalism and Class in Australia 1920–1980*, Australian Studies Centre, University of Queensland, 1982.

————., et.al., *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988.

Herrnstein, Richard and Murray, Charles. *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*, Free Press, New York, 1994.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*, Michael Joseph, London, 1991.

————. *The Age of Empire 1875–1914* (1987), Abacus, London, 1994.

————. *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789–1848* (1962), Abacus, London, 2003.

Hobson, J.A. *Imperialism: A Study* (1902), University of Michigan Press, 1972.

Hodge, Bob and Mishra, Vijay. *Dark Side of the Dream: Australian Literature and the Postcolonial Mind*, Allen & Unwin, North Sydney, 1990.

Hogan, Michael. *The Sectarian Strand: Religion in Australian History*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1987.

Horne, Donald. *Time of Hope: Australia 1966–1972*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1980.

Hollier, Nathan. Nathan Hollier, 'Liberal Tides', *Australian Book Review* 254, 2003, pp.8–9.

————. 'Nourishing Labourist Culture: A Report on a New Left-wing Writing and Reading Festival and a Discussion of its Antecedents', in Robert Hood and Ray Markey, eds, *Labour and Community: Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference of the ASSLH*, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, Illawarra Branch, Wollongong, 1999, pp.224–230.

————., ed., *Ruling Australia: The Power, Politics and Privilege of the New Ruling Class*, Australian Scholarly Press, Melbourne, 2004.

————. 'The Importance of Class: Points of Tension Between *Arena* and *Overland*', *Arena Journal* 15, 2000, pp.149–157.

Hood, Robert, and Markey, Ray, eds, *Labour and Community: Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference of the ASSLH*, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, Illawarra Branch, Wollongong, 1999.

Hooton, Joy and Heseltine, Harry. *Annals of Australian Literature* (second edn), Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1992.

Horne, Donald. *Time of Hope: Australia 1966–72*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1980.

Horsfall, J.C. *The Liberal Era: A Political and Economic Analysis*, Sun Books, Melbourne, 1974.

Hudson, Wayne and Bolton, Geoffrey. *Creating Australia: Changing Australian History*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1997.

Hughes, Richard T. *Myths America Lives By*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana and Chicago, 2004.

Hutton, Drew and Connors, Libby. *A History of the Australian Environment Movement*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1996.

Irving, Terry. 'Intellectuals and Class in Australia in the 1960s and 1970s', in Laurie Hergenhan, ed., *Nationalism and Class in Australia 1920–1980*, Australian Studies Centre, University of Queensland, 1982, pp.47–54.

Izett, Erica. 'Sitting down with Indigenous Artists', *Artlink* 25:2 2005, pp.26–29.

Jackman, Christine. 'Children to Suffer if Divorce Tougher', *Sunday Mail*, 18 August 2002, p.13.

Jacob, Margaret. *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*, Allen & Unwin, Boston and London, 1981.

James, Chris, Jones, Chris and Norton, Andrew, eds, *A Defence of Economic Rationalism*, Allen & Unwin, St Leonards, 1993, pp.121–131.

Jayasuriya, Laksiri and Cook, Jenni. 'A Struggle for Equality', in Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, eds, *Making a Life: A People's History of Australia since 1788*, McPhee-Gribble and Penguin, Fitzroy and Ringwood, 1988, pp.166–176.

Jenks, Chris. *Culture*, Routledge, London and New York, 1993.

Johnson, Carol. *The Labor Legacy: Curtin, Chifley, Whitlam, Hawke*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1989.

Johnston, Grahame. *Annals of Australian Literature*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1970.

Jones, Evan. 'Positive Economics or What?', *Economic Record* 53, 1977, pp.350–363.

Jordon, Grant and Ashford, Nigel, eds, *Public Policy and the New Right*, St. Martin's Press, London and New York, 1993.

Jose, Nicholas. 'Cultural Identity: "I Think I'm Something Else"', in Stephen R. Graubard, ed., *Australia: The Daedalus Symposium*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1985, pp.311–342.

Joyce, Clayton, ed., *Patrick White: A Tribute*, Angus & Robertson, North Ryde, 1991.

Jungwirth, Gary, ed., *Snapshots of Hope: the Making of Modern Labor: a Landmark Decade – Speeches to the Fabians*, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1998.

Jupp, James. *Party Politics: Australia 1966–1981*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982.

———. *The English in Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

Kane, Paul. *Australian Poetry: Romanticism and Negativity*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

Kelly, Paul. *The End of Certainty: Power Politics and Business in Australia*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1994.

Kemp, David. 'Liberalism and Conservatism in Australia since 1944', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.322–362.

Kennedy, Paul. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Industrial Powers: Economic Power and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, Fontana, London, 1989.

Keynes, John Maynard. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Macmillan, London, 1936.

Kiernan, Brian. 'Comic-Satiric-Realism: David Williamson's Plays since *The Department*', *Southerly* 46:1, 1986, pp.3–18.

———. *David Williamson: A Writer's Career* (1990), Currency Press, Paddington, 1996.

———. *Studies in Australian Literary History*, Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, Sydney, 1997.

King, J.E. *A History of Post Keynesian Economics Since 1936*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA, 2002.

Kirkby, Joan, ed., *The American Model: Influence and Independence in Australian Poetry*, Hale and Iremonger, Sydney, 1982, pp.42–53.

Kizilos, Katherine. 'Seeking Justice for Those on the Margins', the *Age*, 12 November 2005, p.5.

Knight, John and Chant, David. 'Australian Fundamentalism and the New Right', *Australian Religion Studies Review* 5:1, 1992, pp.5–13.

Kuhn, Rick, ed., *Class and Struggle in Australia*, Pearson, Frenchs Forest, 2005, pp.159–175.

———. 'What a Labor Government Is', *Politics* 24:2, 1989, pp.147–156.

Lake, Marilyn. 'Affirmations of Difference', in Patricia Grimshaw, Marilyn Lake, Ann McGrath and Marion Quartly, eds, *Creating a Nation, 1788–1990*, McPhee-Gribble, Melbourne, 1994, pp.297–314.

———. 'Identifying the Masculinist Context', *Historical Studies* 22, 1986, pp.116–131.

Levine, Lawrence. *The Unpredictable Past: Explorations in American Cultural History*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1993.

Lyons, Martyn and Russell, Penny, eds, *Australia's History: Themes and Debates*, UNSW Press, 2005.

Lyons, Martyn and Russell, Penny. 'Introduction', in Martyn Lyons and Penny Russell, eds, *Australia's History: Themes and Debates*, UNSW Press, 2005, pp.xiii–xx.

Macintyre, Stuart. *A Concise History of Australia* (second ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

———. 'Temper Democratic, Bias Australian: One Hundred Years of the Australian Labor Party', *Overland* 162, 2001, pp.4–12.

Macintyre, Stuart and Clark, Anna. *The History Wars*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2003.

Mackinolty, Chips. 'The Birth of Land Rights Remembered', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 28 August 1991, p.15.

Maddox, Graham. 'Revisiting Tradition: Labor and Socialism', *Overland* 173, 2003, pp.51–57.

———. *The Hawke Government and Labor Tradition*, Ringwood, Penguin, 1989.

Maddox, Graham and Hagan, Stephanie. 'A New Sophistry: The Rhetoric of the New Right', *Politics* 22:2, 1987, pp.29–35.

Maddox, Marion. *God Under Howard: The Rise of the Religious Right in Australian Politics*, Allen & Unwin, Crows Nest, 2005.

Manifold, John. *Who Wrote the Ballads?*, Australasian Book Society, Sydney, 1964.

Manne, Robert, ed., *The New Conservatism in Australia*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1982.

Manne, Robert, ed., *Whitewash: On Keith Windschuttle's Fabrication of Aboriginal History*, Black Inc., Melbourne, 2003.

Marginson, Simon. *Educating Australia: Government, Economy and Citizen Since 1960*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

Marr, David. *Barwick*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1980.

Marsden, George. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1980.

Mayer, Henry and Nelson, Helen. eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.5–15.

McClelland, Jim. *Stirring the Possum – A Political Autobiography*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988.

McConnochie, Keith, Hollinsworth, David and Pettman, Jan. *Race and Racism in Australia*, Social Science Press, Wentworth Falls, 1996.

McCooey, David. 'Contemporary Poetry', in Elizabeth Webby, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp.158-182.

McGann, Jerome J. *The Romantic Ideology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1983.

McLachlan, N. '"The Future America": Some Bicentennial Reflections', *Historical Studies* 17: 68, 1977, pp.361–383.

McLaren, John. *Australian Literature: An Historical Introduction*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1989.

———. 'Bad Tempered Democrats, Biased Australians: Socialist Realism, *Overland* and the Australian Legend', in Paul Adams and Christopher Lee, eds, *Frank Hardy and the Literature of Commitment*, Vulgar Press, Carlton North, 2003, pp.53–69.

———. *Writing in Hope and Fear: Literature as Politics in Postwar Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1996.

McLellan, David. *Ideology* (second edn), Open University Press, Buckingham, 1995.

McManus, Gerard. 'Kim Carr has Come in from the Wilderness Now Foes Wait to Count Cost', *Sunday Herald-Sun*, 7 July 2002, p.26.

McMullin, Ross. *The Light on the Hill: The Australian Labor Party 1891–1991*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1991.

McQueen, Humphrey. *A New Britannia: An Argument Concerning the Social Origins of Australian Radicalism and Nationalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1970.

———. 'Colour: Emblem of Change, Catalyst of Commerce', unpublished paper prepared for 'Modernism and the Modernisation of Australian Life', Curtin University Symposium, Perth, 27–29 September 2004.

———. 'Making Capital Tick', *Overland* 170, 2003, pp.92–101.

———. '*Nation*: A Magazine Which Helped Wake Us from the Great Australian Silence', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17 July 1982, p.30.

———. 'Paying the Price of Victory', *Bulletin*, 18 May 1999, pp.40–41.

———. 'Reply to Russel Ward', *Overland* 48, 1971, pp.22–24.

Meadows, Donnella, Randers, Jorgen and Meadows, Dennis. *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update*, Chelsea Green, White River Junction, 2004.

Melleuish, Gregory. 'Conservatism in the 1980s', *Australian Quarterly* 60:3, 1988, pp.305–307.

Milner, Andrew. 'Culture', in Richard Nile, ed., *Australian Civilization*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1994, pp.215–235.

———. *Literature, Culture and Society* (second edn), Routledge, London, 2005.

———. 'Radical Intellectuals: An Unacknowledged Legislature?', in Verity Burgmann and Jenny Lee, eds, *Constructing a Culture: A People's History of Australia Since 1788*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, pp.259–284.

———. 'Shock! Horror! Chattering Classes Vote Green!', *Overland* 166, 2002, pp.95–97.

Minogue, Kenneth. 'Not Guilty! The Moral Premises of Modern British Conservatism', *Quadrant* 32:12, 1988, pp.6-13.

Molony, John. *The Penguin Bicentennial History of Australia: The Story of 200 Years*, Viking, Ringwood, 1987.

Moore, Andrew. 'Bob Connell and the 50 Club', in Nathan Hollier, ed., *Ruling Australia: The Power, Politics and Privilege of the New Ruling Class*, Australian Scholarly Press, Melbourne, 2004, pp.45–47.

Moorhouse, Frank, ed., *Days of Wine and Rage*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980.

Moran, Albert. 'Media Intellectuals', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.109–126.

Morris, Meaghan. 'Politics Now (Anxieties of a Petit-bourgeois Intellectual)', *Intervention* 20, 1986, pp.4–12.

Muecke, Stephen. 'Relations of Theory: a Dialogue' [interview with Meaghan Morris], in David Carter, ed., *Outside the Book: Contemporary Essays on Literary Periodicals*, Local Consumption Publications, Double Bay, 1991, pp.57–78.

Munster, George. *Rupert Murdoch: A Paper Prince*, Viking, Ringwood, 1985.

Murray, Robert. *The Split: Australian Labor in the Fifties*, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1970.

Nathan, J.A. 'Dateline Australia: America's Foreign Watergate', *Foreign Policy* 49, 1982–83, pp.168–185.

Nile, Richard. 'Introduction', in Richard Nile, ed., *The Australian Legend and its Discontents*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2000, pp.1–7.

———. ed., *The Australian Legend and its Discontents*, University of Queensland Press, St Lucia, 2000.

Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, Methuen, London and New York, 1982.

Offe, Claus. 'The Theory of the Capitalist State and the Problem of Policy Formation', in L. Lindberg, R.R. Alford, C. Crouch and C. Offe, eds, *Stress and Contradiction in Modern Capitalism*, Lexington Books, Lexington, 1975, pp.125–144.

Ommundsen, Wenche and Rowley, Hazel, eds, *From a Distance: Australian Writers and Cultural Displacement*, Deakin University Press, Geelong, 1996.

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologising of the Word* (1982), Routledge, New York and London, 1995.

Papidakis, Elim. 'Conjectures about Public Opinion and the Australian Welfare State', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 26:2, 1990, pp.209–234.

Pascoe, Robert. *The Manufacture of Australian History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1979.

Patmore, Greg, Shields, John and Balnave, Nikola, eds, *National Labour History Conference: The Past is Before Us*, Australian Society for the Study of Labour History and Business and Labour History Group, Sydney, 2005.

Pearson, Christopher. 'Who Will Come to the Aid of the Parties?', the *Age*, 15 April, 2002, p.11.

Pilger, John. *A Secret Country*, Vintage, London, 1990.

Peatling, Stephanie. 'Land Rights Movement Born with 5000-acre Claim', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 January 1999, p.6.

Pusey, Michael. *Economic Rationalism in Canberra: A Nation-building State Changes its Mind*, Cambridge University Press, Melbourne, 1991.

———. *The Experience of Middle Australia: The Dark Side of Economic Reform*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, Simon & Schuster, New York, 2000.

Quiggan, John and Robinson, Marc. 'Retreat from Social Control: Financial Deregulation Since World War II', *Journal of Australian Political Economy* 18, 1995, pp.9–16.

Ray, J.J. ed., *Conservatism as Heresy*, ANZ Book Company, Sydney, 1974.

Read, Peter. 'Clio or Janus? Historians and the Stolen Generations', *Australian Historical Studies* (Special Issue: Challenging Histories: Reflections on Australian History) 33: 118, 2002, pp.54–60.

Rickard, John. *Australia: A Cultural History*, Longman, New York, 1988.

Riddett, Lyn. 'The Strike that became a Land Movement: A Southern "Do-Gooder" Reflects on Wattie Creek 1966–1974', *Labour History* 72, 1997, pp.50–65.

Roberts, Alan. 'Ecological Crisis of Consumerism', *International*, September 1973, pp.1–8, reprinted in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson, eds, *Australian Politics: A Fourth Reader*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1976, pp.17–28.

Robertson, Robbie. *The Three Waves of Globalisation: A History of a Developing Global Consciousness*, Zed Books, London and New York / Fernwood Publishing, Nova Scotia, 2003.

Rockmore, Tom. *Before and After Hegel: An Historical Introduction to Hegel's Thought*, Berkeley and London, University of California Press, 1992.

Rowse, Tim. *Arguing the Arts*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1985.

———. *Australian Liberalism and National Character*, Kibble Books and McPhee Gribble, Fitzroy, 1978.

———. *Nugget Coombs: A Reforming Life*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

———. 'The CIA and the Kerr Coup', in A. Curthoys, A.W. Martin and Tim Rowse, eds, *Australians from 1939*, Fairfax, Syme & Weldon Associates, Sydney, 1987.

———. 'The Social Democratic Critique of the Australian Settlement', in Jenny Hocking and Colleen Lewis, eds, *It's Time Again: Whitlam and Modern Labor*, Circa, Melbourne, 2003, pp.219–243.

Ryan, Peter. 'The Labor Pantheon', *Quadrant* 327, 1996, pp.87–88.

Sawer, Marian, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982.

———. 'Looking Backwards – the Liberal Party and Laissez-faire Liberalism', *Australian Quarterly* 53:3, 1981, pp.252–261.

———. 'Philosophical Underpinnings of Libertarianism in Australia', in Marion Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982, pp.20–37.

———. 'Political Manifestations of Libertarianism in Australia', in Marian Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982, pp1–19.

Scalmer, Sean. *Dissent Events: Protest, The Media and the Political Gimmick in Australia*, UNSW Press, 2002.

———. 'The Battlers Versus the Elites: The Australian Right's Language of Class', *Overland* 154, 1999, pp.9–13.

———. The Career of Class: Intellectuals and the Labour Movement in Australia 1942–1956, Ph.D., Department of Government, University of Sydney, 1996.

Sear, Tom. 'Playgirl Executives: Images of Men and Work in Early 1960s Australian Pulp Fiction', in Katherine Biber, Tom Sear and Dave Trudinger, eds,

Playing the Man: New Approaches to Masculinity, Pluto Press, Annandale, 1999, pp.200–213.

Seccombe, Mike. 'Aborigines Dance to the Footnotes of History', *Sydney Morning Herald*, 30 August 1991, p.6.

Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory* (second edn), Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hertfordshire, 1989.

Sennett, Richard. *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, Norton, New York, 1998.

Serle, Geoffrey. *From Deserts the Prophets Come: The Creative Spirit in Australia*, Heinemann, Melbourne, 1973.

————. 'Godzone: Austerica Unlimited?', *Meanjin* 26, 1967, pp.237–250.

Skidelsky, Robert. *John Maynard Keynes: A Biography. Volume 3: Fighting For Britain, 1937–1946*, Macmillan, London, 2000.

Singer, Peter. 'Individual Rights and the Free Market', in Marian Sawer, ed., *Australia and the New Right*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1982, pp.38–48.

Smith, Margaret. 'Australian Women Novelists of the 1970s: A Survey', in Carole Ferrier, ed., *Gender, Politics and Fiction: Twentieth Century Australian Women's Novels*, UQP, St Lucia, 1985, pp.200–251.

Souter, Fenella. 'Year of Women and Wonders', the *Age Good Weekend* magazine, 23 July 2005, pp.34–37.

Southern, Michael. *Australia in the Seventies: A Survey by the Financial Times*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972.

Spillman, Lyn. *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

Stavropolous, Pam. 'Reappraising the Right: The Challenge of Australian Conservatism', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 39:2, 1993, pp.171–183.

Stephens, Julie. Idioms of Cultural Protest: The 'Sixties' and the Emergence of Postmodernism, Ph.D., University of Melbourne, 1992.

Stewart, Michael. *Keynes and After* (third edn), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1986.

Stocks, Ian. 'The Rise and Fall of the Underground Press and Alternate Media 1965–1975', *Imago* 3:1, 1991, pp.26–32.

Strangio, Paul. *Keeper of the Faith: A Biography of Jim Cairns*, Melbourne University Press, Carlton, 2002.

Syson, Ian. 'Out from the Shadows: The Realist Writers' Movement 1944–1970, and Communist Cultural Discourse', *Australian Literary Studies* 15, 1992, pp.333–338.

Taksa, Lucy. '"Pumping the Life-Blood into Politics and Place": Labour Culture and the Eveleigh Railway Workshops', *Labour History* 79, 2000, pp.11–34.

Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1922), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1977.

Thomas, Cora. '*Nation Review*: An Overview of the Ferret Phenomenon', *Melbourne Historical Journal* 20, 1990, pp.128–147.

Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1963.

Thompson, Grahame. *The Political Economy of the New Right*, Pinter, London, 1990.

Throsby, David. *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

Tulip, James. 'Poetry Since 1965', in Laurie Hergenhan et.al., *The Penguin New Literary History of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1988, pp.475–492.

Turner, Graeme. 'Film, Television and Literature: Competing for the Nation', in Bruce Bennett and Jennifer Strauss, eds, *The Oxford Literary History of Australia*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998, pp.348–363.

Turner, Ian. *Industrial Labour and Politics*, Australian National University, Canberra, 1965.

———. 'The Social Setting', in Geoffrey Dutton, ed., *The Literature of Australia*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1964, pp.13–54.

Wallace-Crabbe, Chris. 'The Quaker Graveyard in Carlton', in Joan Kirkby, ed., *The American Model: Influence and Independence in Australian Poetry*, Hale and Iremonger, Sydney, 1982, pp.42–53.

Walter, James. 'Intellectuals and the Political Culture', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.237–273.

———. 'Maggie Thatcher: My Part in her Downfall'. *Meanjin* 3, 2004, pp.149–156.

Ward, Russel. 'Britannia Australis', *Overland* 47, 1971, pp.47–49.

———. *The Australian Legend* (1958, second edn), Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1966.

Ward, Stuart. *Australia and the British Embrace: The Demise of the Imperial Ideal*, Melbourne University Press, 2001.

Waterford, Jack. 'Of Might and Men', *Eureka Street* 9:2, 1999, p.7.

Watt, John. 'Cultural Capital in Australia', *Discourse* 10:1, 1989, pp.53–69.

Watts, R. *The Foundations of the National Welfare State*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1987.

Webby, Elizabeth, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Australian Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–5), Unwin Hyman, London, 1990.

Weiniger, Peter. 'Lean and Nosy, Like a Ferret', the *Age*, 1 November 1993, p.9.

Weller, Patrick and Jaensch, Dean, eds, *Responsible Government in Australia*, Drummond Publishing on behalf of the Australasian Political Studies Association, Richmond, 1980

Weller, Sam. *Bastards I Have Met*, Sampal Investments, Charters Towers, 1976.

Wells, Andrew. 'The Old Left Intelligentsia', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.214–234.

Wheelwright, E.L. *Oil and World Politics: From Rockefeller to the Gulf War*, Left Book Club Cooperative Ltd, Sydney, 1991.

———. 'The Age of the Transnational Corporations', in Greg Crough, Ted Wheelwright and Ted Wilshire, eds, *Australia and World Capitalism*, Penguin, Ringwood, 1980, pp.123–125.

———. 'The End of the Age of Growth', *Journal of Australian Political Economy* 1, 1977, pp.53–61.

Wheelwright, E.L. and Buckley, K.D., eds, *Communications and the Media in Australia*, Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1987, pp.156–179.

Wheelwright, E.L. and Buckley, Ken, eds, *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism* (vol II), Australian and New Zealand Book Co., Brookvale, 1978.

Wheelwright, E.L. and Buckley, Ken, eds, *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism* (vol IV), Australian and New Zealand Book Co., Brookvale, 1980.

White, Lyndall. 'Is that a Government in your Pocket . . . or . . . ?: The CIA in Australia', *Semper*, 3 May 1982, p.6.

White, Richard. 'A Backwater Awash: The Australian Experience of Americanisation', *Theory, Culture and Society* 1:3, 1983, pp.108–122.

————. 'Combatting Cultural Aggression: Australian Opposition to Americanisation', *Meanjin* 39, 1980, pp.275–289.

————. *Inventing Australia: Images and Identity 1688–1980*, George Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1981.

Whitlock, Gillian, and Bulbeck, Chilla. '"A Small and Often Still Voice"? Women Intellectuals in Australia', in Brian Head and James Walter, eds, *Intellectual Movements in Australian Society*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1988, pp.145–169.

Whitwell, Greg. 'Economic Ideas and Economic Policy: The Rise of Economic Rationalism in Australia', *Australian Economic History Review* 33:2, 1993, pp.8–28.

————. *Making the Market: The Rise of Consumer Society*, McPhee Gribble, Melbourne, 1989.

————. *The Treasury Line*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1986.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society 1780–1950* (1958), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1976.

————. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, Fontana, Glasgow, 1975.

————. *The Country and the City*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1973.

————. *The Long Revolution* (1961), Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965.

Wilson, Helen, ed., *Australian Communications and the Public Sphere: Essays in memory of Bill Bonney*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1989.

————. 'Public Relations: Mobilising Consent', in Helen Wilson, ed., *Australian Communications and the Public Sphere: Essays in memory of Bill Bonney*, Macmillan, South Melbourne, 1989, pp.163–182.

Wimmer, Adi, ed., *Australian Nationalism Reconsidered: Maintaining a Monocultural Tradition in a Multicultural Society*, Stauffenberg Verlag, Tubingen, 1999.

Windschuttle, Keith. *The Media: A New Analysis of the Press, Television, Radio and Advertising in Australia* (third edn), Penguin, Ringwood, 1988.

Wu, Duncan, ed., *Romantic Poetry*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2002.