THE SYDNEY LOCAL

USG Australia comprises a Sydney local of ten members and five other people scattered through New South Wales. The Sydney local formed in 1978 after meeting in a Marx reading group for some 18 months. The material explored during the thirty months that the reading group has now met includes a selection of the classics (Writings of the early Marx, the Grundrisse and Capital) and a variety of current material on urbanisation, housing and the State. We are currently finishing James Becker's Marxian Political Economy.

Many of the members of USG are also in the Sydney Geographical Expedition (see the article within). The expedition has been running a full-time community information centre for 17 months.

Most of the members of USG have recently begun what promises to be a long-term, in-depth study predominantly of the Australian social formation. We would welcome communication from other people with similar interests and include the following list of members and their research/praxis to that end.

*Steve Baxter
  1. Rural poverty
  2. Urban expeditions

*Katherine Gibson
  Uneven development and the Labour Process in Australia.

*Ron Horvath
  Marxism and geography

Richie Howitt
  The impact of transnational capital on the political economy of Northern Australia

Vivienne Milligan
  A Political Economy of private multi unit housing development in Sydney

*Debbie Mitchell
  State provision of housing in New South Wales

*Dave Owen
  1. A Local Theory of the State
  2. Urban expeditions

*Peter Rogers
  Housing and the State

Frank Williamson
  1. Capital and Rural Australia
  2. Geography and the homeless
  3. Philosophical links between phenomenology and Marxism

Colleen Shipman
  Librarianship

The members whose names are asterisked can be contacted through:

Union of Socialist Geographers, Department of Geography,
University of Sydney, Sydney, N.S.W., 2006, Australia.

The address for the other members is:

School of Geography, University of New South Wales,
P.O. Box 1, Kensington, N.S.W., 2033, Australia.
GEOGRAPHERS AND PRAxis

The Sydney Geographical Expedition

Dave Wren and Steve Baxter.

Past activities would indicate a preoccupation on the part of members of the Union of Socialist Geographers with theoretical issues. This has certainly been true of the Sydney local. The Sydney Geographical Expedition (SGE) has, by contrast, attempted to achieve a unity of theory and practice. Although members of the SGE have been engaged in a range of activities in inner-city Sydney during the last three years, it has only been in the last eighteen months that any attempt has been made to link Marxist theory with Expeditionary practice. This has led to a basic level of confidence that a modified form of Expeditionary can play an important role in a transitional process to socialism. It is contended that if geographers are to be anything more than spectators in a socialist transformation they must recognise the opportunities presented by Expeditionary praxis and endeavour to expand that praxis.

The philosophy of praxis that guides the SGE is best characterised as:

"... consciousness full of contradictions, in which the philosopher himself, understood both individually and as an entire social group, not merely grasps the contradictions, but posits himself as an element of the contradiction and elevates this element to a principle of knowledge and therefore of action." 1

Geographers must recognize three component concepts within this classic Gramscian notion of praxis:

1. an ongoing search for contexts in which theory and action can unite to bring about

2. a directed, partisan change - the political emancipation of the working classes, etc

3. an acknowledgement of the fundamental importance of the individual as an agent of change within class struggle.

Rarely have geographers been able to identify such contexts, and consequently geographers have rarely asserted any individual integrity as change agents. The SGE is one such context.

A brief indication of the activities of the SGE during these past three years might be useful at this point. A fuller statement on these activities will be the focus of a proposed Antipode article. The development of the SGE falls into three distinct phases. The first phase, beginning in early 1976, was inspired by Range's writings on the Detroit Expedition. Activities at this time centred around Sydney's derelict homeless population and a series of projects related to low-income housing. By the middle of 1977 a second phase had begun. This involved the realisation that good intentions combined with existent geographical theory and methodology were an insufficient basis for the geographer as change agent. The requirement at this stage was for more adequate theory and a context where SGE members could involve themselves with the day-to-day experiences of inner-city residents. A Marxist reading group provided the vehicle for the theoretical search, whilst the establishment of a "Community Information Centre" controlled and managed by the Expedition, supplied the necessary learning environment.

The present phase can be characterised as the beginnings of a genuine unity of the theoretical and practical developments of earlier phases. The consolidation of the SGE's role as a
resource group in the inner-city has been accompanied by a fuller understanding of the role of the Expedition within class struggle. Theories of the State, of class, and of ideology have been incorporated into the planning of Expeditionary activities. These activities include the linking of inner-city "community" groups around common issues such as housing, health services and the provision of information. They involve geographers playing a catalysing or organising role utilizing experiences gleaned from working at the "community" level. Responsibility for the Information Centre has legitimated the Expedition with local residents and organisations within the inner Sydney region. This has allowed the establishment of SGE members in key positions within such organisations. An ongoing influence with respect to decisions made by these bodies is thus ensured and a range of further opportunities for the geographer's praxis is facilitated.

Four lessons have emerged from the Sydney experience as crucial components in the identification of these opportunities:

1. Geographers have for too long assumed that their contribution to a given change movement is delimited by the skills they possess as geographers. It is contended that a more appropriate model is Gramsci's "organic intellectual" - one who is "leading" and "representative" in the crucial respect of being part of the daily existence of the working classes. To be effective, the intellectual must become an organic part of the working class so as to be able to articulate new values, new explanations within the shared language and symbols of the larger culture. These explanations must not be limited to the insights of the geographer. It is perhaps worth noting that the second stated aim of the U.S.G. itself is "developing

general theory to contribute to revolutionary struggle". The first struggle must still be against disciplinary fetters.

2. Despite geographers' attempts to bring about change by working within government instrumentalities and planning bodies, there has been comparatively little recognition of the State as a basic category in any analysis of such change, and few attempts to understand the role of the State within a given social formation. Arguably, the Detroit Expedition suffered from an inadequate conception of the repressive potential of State apparatuses. Sydney has learned from the North American experiences in this regard and has devoted much of its time to the establishment of a legitimating base for its operations.

3. Too often when geographers have attempted to bring about change they have done so within a structure of "community action". The role of the term "community" within the operations of the State in advanced capitalism must be critically evaluated. It is suggested that the North American Expeditions did not examine the dangers and expectations that accompany "community". The SGE attempts to use the concept rather than be dominated by it.

4. Geographers who have turned to Marx in their search for an understanding of praxis opportunities have typically neglected the action component of their praxis. This appears to stem from the mistaken belief that change within capitalism can only flow from action at the point of production, the factory floor, where the primary contradiction between capital and wage labour is located. The SGE sees this as overly extreme and contends that there exists considerable potential for revolutionary struggle within the sphere of reproduction. The geographer will find no
EASTOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

One of the little publicized, though immensely successful, community development programs in the tradition of geographical expeditions is going on in Eastown, a suburb of Grand Rapids, Michigan, U.S.A. Started by Thomas W. Edmond of the Department of Geography of Aquinas College in 1972 using methods developed by Burke, Alinsky, and Kotler, Eastown went through a remarkable transformation owing to the institution building that transpired during the next seven years. The history of the project and the methods used are reported in: Easley, L.A. and Edison, T.W., Eastown: Battle Creek, Michigan, U.S.A.: Kellogg Foundation, 85 pages. You may obtain a FREE copy by writing to: The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 400 North Ave., Battle Creek, Michigan 49016, U.S.A.

SOME FACTS ON THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL FORMATION

Some facts about these Multinational or Transnational Corporations

- By the year 2000 some 300 firms will control three quarters of the assets of the non-communist world. (Source: N. McDonald (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris)

- Who are they? They are household words. Exxon, Shell, General Motors, Ford, Unilever, Philips, Goodyear, to name just a few. If you use a radio, watch a TV, drive a car, use washing powder, dial a telephone, etc., the chances are that you are using the products of a multinational.

- Many multinational companies handle more goods and services than the entire economies of many countries. (Source: Fortune Magazine)

- Most multinational companies are growing at a faster rate than any national economy. (Source: Fortune Magazine)

The picture in the manufacturing industry today looks like this:

BIGGEST 200 COMPANIES

PRODUCE 1/2 OF ALL MANUFACTURED GOODS

EMPLOY 600,000 WORKERS

40% OF PROFIT GOES TO BIG 200

30,200 SMALL & MEDIUM SIZE COMPANIES

PRODUCE OTHER HALF OF ALL MANUFACTURED GOODS

EMPLOY 750,000 WORKERS

60% OF PROFIT SHARED BETWEEN 32,000 COMPANIES

87 FOREIGN CONTROLLED COMPANIES

EMPLOY 240,000 WORKERS

113 AUSTRALIAN CONTROLLED COMPANIES

EMPLOY 240,000 WORKERS

INCLUDING MANY WHOLLY OR PARTIALLY FOREIGN CONTROLLED COMPANIES

AMONG THE TOP 12 COMPANIES, 7 ARE FOREIGN CONTROLLED.

OF THE TOP 25, 17 ARE FOREIGN CONTROLLED

(Sources: Bureau of Statistics, Study 13/76, ref no. 12.35 Figures Compiled)

"I think it is about time we all came to understand that if each of us is paid according to his or her worth we will very soon bankrupt this country" - Mr. Fraser, Prime Minister of Australia.
Remember, capital is nothing more than stored-up labour

(Statement by J. H. Grieve, Vice President of Exxon-Esso of Australia, the world's most profitable corporation.) (Source: Nucleonics Week, December 1976).

Good 'grief!' A touching piece of 'stored up' honesty

SOME FACTS ON THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIAL FORMATION

The wealthiest 1% of the population owns 22% of the total wealth.
The wealthiest 5% of the population owns 66% of the total wealth.
The wealthiest 10% of the population owns 66% of the total wealth.
20% of Australians own less than 3% of the total wealth.
The richest 2,600 people in Australia own as much as the poorest 2% million Australians.

52% of the value of Australian real estate is owned by 10% of Australians.

Ten years ago 9 in every 10 people could afford to pay off a house. Now only 2 out of 10 can do it.

10% of adult Australians receive 92% of all the income received from interest, rent and dividends paid on shares.

56.4% of workers earn less than the average weekly earnings of $180.00 (Aug, 1978 figures).

While men in Australia have average weekly earnings of $203 per week the average for working women is $136 per week.

64% of all Australians are employed in service industries.

The number of unemployed in Australia has steadily climbed from 91,600 in May 1973 to about 451,000 in January, 1979. (These are the official A.B.S. figures).

In May 1977 the A.B.S. found there were 411,900 workers who were not regarded by the Bureau as being the workforce but who still wanted a job.

This means that at least 862,900 Australians cannot find a job - about 13% of the labour force is unemployed. (Source: "Australia a Rip-off" A.M.B.U., 1974).
THE AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY MOVEMENT

Katherine Gilmore.

Until 1976 Australia's relatively active labor movement and worker-based political groups on the left had not been offset by any similar organizations within the academy. The intellectual leadership of these left groups came from the rank and file members perhaps aided by isolated contributions from individual academics sympathetic to the cause. Leftists in the ideological bastions of Australia (the universities) colleges of advanced education and technical colleges had not "surfaced" in any organized form and their voices were represented or mis-represented only by specific individuals. The First Australian Political Economy Conference was held in Sydney in June 1976 and the organizers were overwhelmed by the response. Fifteen hundred people attended to hear papers given by Australian political economists and the four international guests: Dan Bowles, Herb Gintis, Ian Gough and Ed Meil. The outcome of the conference was the formation of the Australian Political Economy Movement (APEM) with organized and formal voice for radical academics, teachers and students interested in understanding Australian capitalism.

Since that tumultuous beginning the APEM has sponsored annual conferences, published a Journal of Political Economy and its members have directed their efforts to the institution of more radical undergraduate courses within the establishment of higher education. The majority of members come from the disciplines of Economics, Political Science and increasingly Sociology and whilst the movement is largely based in the educational institution, trade union and labor movement support has always been present. How did the movement begin and what exactly is its practice?

Ironically, the beginnings of APEM could well be attributed to the concerted efforts of some of the most reactionary and right-wing academics in the Australian universities. Let me elaborate. The first Australian Political Economy Conference was the culmination of six years of struggle within the Department of Economics at the old and now defunct establishment of the Australian National University, the University of Sydney. In 1970 the Department was joined by two economists strongly schooled in the quantitative applications of neo-classical and Keynesian economics. Entering a department which had been won and along British lines to teach a relatively descriptive, institutionalist form of economics that focused on the Australian economy, the new brooms were eager to sweep the place clean. Proposals were made to introduce a totally new course structure centered on micro and macro-economic theory heavily oriented towards quantitative techniques and applications. American Friedmanism was to replace British institutionalism. Finally at the ideological level a parallel was developing to that process which had already been successful within the Australian economy, namely the replacement of British imperialist interests by those of America.

This proposed rollout was not acceptable to some of the more radical students and faculty who were anxious that the Department maintain some of the critical courses in order to supplement the ideological orthodoxy with considerations of the real world economy. Their initial demand was merely for some alternative courses. However as the conservatives within the Department strengthened their determination to resist any opposition to their new courses, so the student movement became progressively more radical and determined in their demands to see Political Economy courses taught alongside the orthodox micro-, macro-theory and international trade courses. A bitter struggle ensued punctuated by student strikes and junior faculty sackings, culminating in an Economics faculty enquiry and a university administration enquiry. The outcome was the incorporation of a Political Economy stream within the Department of Economics through which students are allowed to study alternatives to mainstream economics including Institutionalist and Marxist approaches. The victory was a qualified one. Had the Department been split as was proposed by the Economics faculty but vetoed by the Administration, the political economists would have had the autonomy to introduce new courses without a fight, to appoint radical teachers and to supervise students in the Honours and post-graduate levels. As it stands these rights are denied the Political Economists at Sydney.

The struggle did, however, have a widespread effect on the consciousness of students and faculty and provided the genesis for the broader based Australian Political Economy Movement whose members are not limited to Sydney or to Economics. APEM has no particular political line other than its members are all leftists. The types of papers presented at its conferences reflect the eclectic nature of its members' interests. For example:

The Political Economy of Australian Capitalism
Australian Neo-colonialism in Indonesia
Classics and Sexism in Australia
Industrial Rationalisation and the Trade Unions in Australia
Energy and Resources in Australia

The major practice, apart from organizational, of the movement is directed at the teaching of political economy. Sydney University, for example, has 500-600 students in PH1 each year and the courses continue to be taught under the pressure of a still largely unsympathetic Department and Administration.

So far there has been no significant move towards APEM by radical geographers in Australia. One would hope that this will change in the future as radical geographers begin to transcend the fetters of their disciplinary boundaries. The existence of a forum for cross-disciplinary debates amongst radicals is important not only for the flow of information and support that it facilitates but also because of the potential base it provides for more concerted organization by academics and students in the political sphere. In this period of economic crisis in Australia the vulnerability of the material basis for radical theoretical work is evident as junior faculty are denied any job security and post-graduate research is barely funded. As the future for radical research within the academic grows progressively dimmer owing to the contraction of tertiary educational establishments, how could it be hoped that such an organization like APEM will grow to become a focus for more than theoretical action and resistance.

*******

My thanks are due to Greg Crouch and Frank Etwell of the Department of Economics, Sydney University for their help and information regarding APEM and the political economy struggle. I am, however, totally responsible for the final content of the article.

*******
URBANIZATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Katherine Gibson and Vivienne Milligan.


Australia and New Zealand are urbanized nations. A high proportion of their populations live in urban areas which are dominantly large, primate seaboard cities (Figures 1 & 2).

Figure 1: Urban Population Growth of Australia and New Zealand in the Post-Second World War Period. Source: Kilmartin & Thorne, op cit, p66.


Both countries display some of the world's highest rates of home ownership (Figure 3) but whilst the average family owns (or is tied to a lifetime of paying off) its home, the stark residential differentiation and segregation of our urban areas highlight the inequalities of resources distribution existing in our seemingly affluent society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of owner-occupied dwellings</th>
<th>Rank order of GNP per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indeed the current urban crisis in Australia, notably manifest in chronic unemployment, especially of youth, in the outer western suburbs of Sydney and Melbourne, rapidly escalating housing prices and a severe shortage of rental accommodation, has served to remind us that the urban poor and disadvantaged are a significant and growing population.

Kilmartin and Thorne in attempting to begin a debate on the nature of urbanization in Australia and New Zealand from the perspective of the 'new urban sociology' fail to adequately come to grips with the intriguing and contradictory phenomena that characterize the uniquely urban nature of these social formations. Despite their failure it is not the purpose of this discussion to concentrate narrowly upon the inadequacies of this recent contribution to the growing number of attempted alternative or radical approaches to social science research in Australasia. Instead we wish to use this discussion as a vehicle for informing an international audience about some of the specificities of capitalism 'down-under' and the sorts of questions that need to be posed and analysed in order to understand them. In addition, the brief review and critique of Cities Unlimited that follows next is intended to provide our readers with some sense of the 'state of the art' of radical work, in this instance in sociology, in our part of the world.

Cities Unlimited is written as a comparative study of the urban structure of Australia and New Zealand with the intention of providing "illustration and development of the theoretical insights of the new urban sociology rather than simply a description of urbanization in the two countries". This emphasis has determined the selection of issues and the structure of the book so that it proceeds from theoretical and historical beginnings (Chapters 1, 2 and 3) to four chapters on the "macro structure" of the cities where the ownership and control of the central business district, the suburban land development process, urban planning and urban housing systems are the focus. In the final chapters the city is viewed from the "perspective of the consumer", first as a set of social relationships and second as the focus of social action. We have many criticisms to make of the way in which Kilmartin and Thorne have dealt with their stated topic. However, the three we have selected to discuss are those which may be applied to much of the new and so-called 'alternative' approaches to social science research being published recently.
First: perhaps the most crippling of the limitations of Kilmartin’s and Thorn’s beginning debate is given away by the book’s subtitle ‘The Sociology of Urban Development in Australia and New Zealand.’ The work exemplifies new urban sociology with quotations from the writings of Castells, Harvey and Higson. These theorists operate within a framework of analysis which identifies the dominant structural economic relations of capitalism that underlie and interact with political and ideological levels. The implication of their work is that any disciplinary component of analysis and exposition to only one of these levels would automatically render the work partial and misleading. Yet Kilmartin and Thorn are stubbornly ‘sociological’ in their approach to urbanisation in Australia and New Zealand. Their analysis is not finally at the ideological level. The spirit rather than the structure of capitalism is elevated to central importance. While there is recognition of the relation of our society’s dominant values to its capitalist structure, the latter is never analysed in terms of economic and political relations.

Second: the brevity and consequent superficiality of Cities Unlimited is at variance with the breadth of the authors’ initial aim. As an example, consider their treatment of the role of the state in urban development. This acknowledged complex and important question is raised under the heading “urban planning,” one page of theoretical discussion culminates in this position: “there is widespread agreement from all points of view that the state operates to co-ordinate and ‘keep the system running’.” Thus one description of types of government intervention in planning, provision of state housing and urban service provision in Australia and New Zealand

Third: constrained by the space and disciplinary boundaries of their own making Kilmartin and Thorn can never reconcile the disparate views that their ‘new’ theoretical sources display (Max, Veblen, for instance), let alone integrate these back into orthodox sociological thought (the publishers’ vain claim). They give the reader a confusing pot pourri of concepts and ultimately lapse back into traditional theory, giving emphasis to notions like the “resource preferences” of urbanites. At an example of this betrayal of their purpose consider a paragraph (taken from the concluding chapter of the book) which purports to explain the dominance of the motor car in our urban societies.

“A dominant role was played in the growth of cities in Australia and New Zealand by the motor car. The car reflects the basic contradictions between consumerism and privacy. Many of the choices that Australians and New Zealanders make are for greater privacy, more individualism and more separateness, rather than for more community. This is demonstrated both by their housing aspiration - for the single-family, owner-occupied home on its own block of land, and by the central place given to the private car. The car is in many ways the most compelling symbol of contemporary urban life, it releases individuals from dependence on others for mobility and allows them to establish their own unique set of pathways through the city. It also produces a reaction from the city, which must cater for the needs of the automobile. Individuals who no longer live within a specific locality but see the total urban place as within easy reach. The high rate of car possession results in strong demands being placed upon the urban system for accessibility by car and for improved transport circulation, which means wide roads and freeways despite their social and economic costs.”

Such ‘theoretical insights’ are indistinguishable from those offered by the mainstream sociology that Kilmartin and Thorn wish to separate themselves from. Paradoxically their book contains a good, comprehensive bibliography on urban theory and urbanisation in Australia and New Zealand.

Yet the influence of the authors’ cited reference group, the more radical new urban sociologists, seems to be, in the last analysis, to be barely noticeable in the content and conclusions of Cities Unlimited. The book suffers from the lack of a coherent theoretical framework that generates directed questions and focuses the discussion both theoretically and empirically. Indeed, it noted this lack, we would like to proceed with a discussion which we feel may get closer to the essence of urbanism in this part of the world and begin to provide such an organizing framework.

What are the questions about the Australian form of urbanisation under capitalism that need to be addressed by radical researchers be they new urban sociologists, radical geographers or political economists?

It would seem that to fully understand the present nature of urbanism we must look to the historical roots of the phenomenon and ask what role did urban development play in the establishment and growth of a capitalist mode of production in these countries? The population of Australia, since its colonial beginnings, has been dominated urban despite relatively late development of traditionally capitalist production. Consider this contradiction: in 1891, when only 16% of the workforce was employed in manufacturing and manufacturing goods contributed only 10% of the nation’s total output. 66% of the population lived in cities! Colonisation had brought the immediate integration of our countries into the world capitalist economy. Primary produce was supplied by Australia and New Zealand to the United Kingdom and in exchange the finance capital was invested by the ‘centre’ in the ‘periphery’. Much of this investment was channelled into Australia’s urban development. Our original question can thus be extended: considering the integration of the Australian economies into the global economy, how can the built environment in these countries be seen as an artifact of the global capitalist system and its investment patterns rather than that of dominantly local activity?

As well as these broad historical questions which prepare the way for a careful and balanced analysis of the complexity of urbanisation, more specific questions should be asked. These must relate to the particular features of urban development such as the oppressively dominant single family owner-occupied suburban bungalow on its quarter-acre block. What are the political economic bases for the homogeneity of this housing form? This question opens up a Pandora’s box of detailed considerations at the economic, political and ideological levels. Only a limited number of these are recognised by Kilmartin and Thorn.

Suburban development and associated speculation are extremely sensitive components of the Australian economy having a history of booms and slumps closely related to the wider economic conditions of production and investment at the national and international levels. (Figure 4)

It would seem that at the economic level careful analysis of the central role of the planning and infrastructure industry and related activities like land development will contribute to an understanding of the reasons for the dominance of our land and resource hungry form of residential development. Also at the economic level, the increasing rate of financial capital investment, the high ownership rate and the high speculative turnover of dwellings must be carefully considered.
At the political level the contradictory activities of the state in relation to urban development include, on the one hand, active support through favourable planning, fiscal and monetary policies while on the other, a long history of government promotion of policies of decentralization of industrial and residential development. It may be that the different and sometimes conflicting state functions of accumulation and legitimation can be demonstrated very effectively through an analysis of the history of state involvement in Australia and New Zealand.

Finally, at the ideological level, the dominance of the aspiration for private ownership of property in the form of a home, upon which Kilmartin and Thorns place so much emphasis is truly an interesting and real manifestation of the social relations of capitalism in these countries. On the surface the material wealth of the Australian working class appears substantial - they have successfully gained the right to a small slice of the economic pie. One important ideological question that must be asked of this is to what extent home ownership and mortgage repayments act as a de-radicalising influence on the working class? Also it must be recognized that the obvious dominance of the aspiration for and belief in home ownership masks the realities of the real distribution of resources in these countries. Despite the high percentage of home ownership in major cities social differentiation is manifest in marked residential segregation in terms of accessibility, environmental amenity, disposable income and level of service provision. And what of the non-home-owners, whose Kilmartin and Thorns completely ignore? Tenants, inadequately housed, are concentrated in clearly differentiated groups - the aged, aborigines, single-parent families, migrants and low-income earners - the "undeserving poor".

An adequate understanding of the urban situation in Australia and New Zealand can only come from a truly historical materialist perspective which, whilst recognizing the importance of ideology (values and aspirations in sociological jargon) beneath these to their historical and economically based roots, Kilmartin and Thorns have begun their break away from mainstream sociology but as yet their analysis of why our cities certainly appear to be unlimited remains constrained by the shackles of their parent discipline. Furthermore, no wear an empirical account of Antipodean urbanism can be gleaned from a number of earlier publications most of which were not self-consciously radical.

Footnotes

1. Some 80% of high income earners and 5% of lowest income earners are homeowners - quoted in Kennedy, J., "A Political Sociology of Home Ownership in Australia", ANZAS, 13, p.49.

2. By virtue of our limited experience and knowledge of New Zealand much of the following discussion and, in particular, the examples used focus on Australia.

3. Regular newspaper reports over the last 18 months have contained accounts of striking annual increases in house prices - for instance, 25% in some areas of Sydney in 12 months. See, for example, Hasselhurst, D., "At last - A Recovery in House Prices", The Bulletin, April 3rd, 1979, p198-9. The Real Estate Institute of N.S.W. reports current vacancy levels for rented property at record low levels around 1.9% in Sydney, 1979.


5. ibid., p.88.

6. ibid., p.164-165.

7. ibid., p.39.


Housing and Government, 1974, Boyer Lectures, Australian Broadcasting Commission.
THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF DOMESTIC LABOUR DEBATE

Colm Regan and Milda McRath, recent visitors to Ireland, upon seeing the Horvath's (second-hand) dishwasher made some disparaging remarks about the foolishness of such items. Colm may even have muttered about the unrevolutionary nature of such appliances, but observers are uncertain on this point. "But it saves time," a wounded Horvath replied, "it does not." was the response from the Irish.

Very quickly the debate moved to a theoretical level: does raising the technical composition of the domestic labour process provide the basis for liberation from domestic drudgery? Do dishwashers increase social alienation? Vigorous debate ensued. With no resolution emerging, it was decided that the matter would be settled empirically. (Through a Marxist geographer, find a positive?) Enthusiasm for data collection lasted four days with the following results obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Technical Composition of the Labour Process</th>
<th>High Technical Composition of the Labour Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM*</td>
<td>10  CPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Day 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 CPW</td>
<td>41  CPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>76  CPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.5 CPW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNUAL SAVINGS: 14,782 minutes**</td>
<td>246 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debate then ensued on the validity of the experimental conditions, the size of the sample, the quality of the work, etc. Theoretical debate resumed.

Robert J. Horvath

*Congested People Minutes

**All data have been checked and an IBM 1620 to within 0.01 megatrons and no errors remain.

***Soapsuds were frequently found as a by-product of the labour process involving low technical composition.

While the working class has of late, assiduously avoided Marx, Has Marxism become the opiate of the intellectuals? (a well known Marxist geographer).

REVIEW: MARXIAN THEORIES OF THE STATE

A Critique of Orthodoxy - Boris Frankel

In the past decade the problem of the State in capitalist society has become one of increasing interest to Marxists in all countries. This has been largely in response to the increasing penetration of all spheres of society and the economy by government agencies and programs. Also the rapid growth of the public sector bureaucracies relative to the size of the productive sectors of the economy has further highlighted the importance of the State in contemporary capitalism. The myths of traditional bourgeois social and political science concerning the State have tended to predominate until the recent upsurge in Marxist analyses. More and more Marxists are coming to see the State as crucial in any attempt to understand the capitalist mode of production and its attendant social relations. Unfortunately, much of the recent work has tended to rely on outdated concepts and analyses of distinct social formations.

This short monograph by Boris Frankel has bravely attempted to identify the salient errors and inadequacies of Marxian theories of the State, and to offer guidelines and concrete suggestions as to the way to proceed in the future. It is an excellent critique, although some of his solutions are not fleshed out and some of the argument is vague and disjointed at times. Most of the more telling criticisms remain to be answered in the future analyses of the State by Marxists.

In his introduction Frankel poses several crucial questions which form the basis of his critique. What is the nature of the capitalist state? Is the distinction between the state and civil society still valid and useful? What determines the size, mode of production and the logic of reproduction of the State? Does the State merely maintain the capitalist mode of production or does it exacerbate its contradictions? Also the notion of the historical specificity of the capitalist state to a particular social formation is noted but not explored in any depth.

This historical specificity mitigates against the possibility of a theory of the capitalist 'state-in-general'. Of course, some of the roles and structures of capital are common to many capitalist societies throughout the world. But, the individuality of specific social formations must be recognized and analyzed if meaningful and effective action is to result. The understanding of capitalism as a global phenomenon should not obscure the uneven development of capitalist social relations (especially at the political level) as has been the case in the past.

There is a critical need to analyze correctly the nature of the state apparatuses. Such a task cannot be left to more rentestaments of the classical positions of Lenin and Gramsci, for example. The notion of the State as a solely repressive apparatus may be true in a period of acute crisis, but how does it apply in periods of state (and capitalist) expansion? The concept of the State as a discipline of bourgeois hegemony demands an analysis of the content and impact of the dominant ideology and of possible counter-hegemonic strategies.

Frankel attributes much of the incompleteness of consumption to the failure to examine the internal structure of the State and the relations between the State and capital. He criticizes the Frankfurt School for conceiving the Frankfurt School of consumption as being almost solely on cultural matters and ignoring the political economy of the State. At the opposite extreme, the political economists like Baran
a Swezey, Bob, Mandel, and Braverman fall to see the State as anything more than a subservient appendage to the capitalist class and the productive sector in general. Both schools of thought relegate the State to the position of a monolithic superstructure which either assumes total power in the end stages of the capitalist era, or intercedes on behalf of the bourgeoisie at times of crisis.

The base/superstructure dichotomy has tended to pervade most Marxist theories of the State. It "has only clouded up attempts to resolve the relationship between state and civil society and class power and state power" (Frankel, p.19). The famous Hilliard/Poulantzas debate, although clearing the air on many issues, failed to resolve these problems. Equality the Althusserian notion of the economic sphere being determinant 'in the last instance' relegates all non-economic institutions to the relatively powerless superstructure without providing any indication of the manner in which it relates to the base.

A partial solution, as Frankel sees it, to these problems lies in the work of the so-called State Sector theorists, like O'Connor, Habermas and Claus Offe. They directly analyse the political economy and hegemony of the state apparatuses and their role in the capitalist mode of production. Unfortunately, much of the discussion of these theorists is overly brief, but a good reference list is provided in the footnotes. Several important issues are raised. These include:

- the specificity of the historical context of the State
- the re-politicization of the mode of production because of the weakening of exchange relations by state initiatives
- the differentiation of competitive, monopoly, state, and residual labour power sectors in advanced capitalist societies
- the interrelationships between these sectors
- the manner in which state apparatuses exacerbate the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production.

Most important, perhaps, is the idea that the capitalist state "is not unambiguously reproducing capitalist social relations" (Frankel, p.50). The expanding production and distribution of social use-values by the state is largely contrary to the interests of productive capital, which is founded upon exchange relations. Despite the undeniable benefits that the capitalist class derives from the State, its position may still be threatened by both the internal contradictions of capitalist production (as documented by Marx) and the contradictions that are generated by the state apparatus.

Even at the level of the dissemination of bourgeois ideology by the State, contradictions may arise. Gramsci when he developed the notion of cultural hegemony failed to clarify what it actually represented. Frankel argues the 'pure' bourgeois ideology is not the dominant ideology in capitalist society. Rather the dominant ideology is "a 'hybrid' bourgeois hegemony living parasitically off the remnants of pre-bourgeois social relations (i.e. sexism, racism, religion, myth)." Capitalist states in disseminating bourgeois ideals of liberty and equality (irrespective of the actual conditions that exist) conflict with the residual pre-capitalist forms which are basic to capitalist exploitation. This it is important to grasp the exact nature of the dominant ideology in each social formation and confront it with a counter-hegemonic ideology. "If socialists do not make explicit broad universal socialist principles then there is no way of evaluating how political action is either overthrowing repressive, unjust social practices, or reproducing these pre-capitalist and bourgeois relations...." (Frankel, p.55).
URANIUM MINING IN AUSTRALIA

Richie Howitt & Peter Phibbs

The controversy over uranium mining has developed into one of the most contentious issues in Australia at the moment.

In contrast to most other industrialised nations, where anti-nuclear movements have focused on nuclear reactors and arsenals, the movement in Australia has put its energies principally into preventing Australian uranium entering the international nuclear fuel cycle.

This issue is a complex one, and it is not possible to provide a comprehensive account in this limited space. Therefore, the present article presents an historical overview of the uranium controversy in Australia.

Discovery of the vast uranium resources of the Alligator Rivers region of the Northern Territory was relatively recent (see Map). In fact, it was only in June 1970 that there was any real indication that the deposit existed.

An inquiry to determine how Aboriginal land rights should be recognised recommended that enabling legislation should allow Aborigines to veto mining proposals on their land unless the Federal Government felt it was in the 'national interest' to overrule Aboriginal opposition to a particular project. (Woodward, 1974, pp. 108, 110.)

ALP legislation put before the Parliament in November 1975 accepted this recommendation. However, a memorandum of understanding between the Federal ALP Government and the Ranger companies in October 1975 suggested that the ALP would overrule Aboriginal opposition to the uranium mines in the 'national interest'. In this memo the ALP committed the Australian Atomic Energy Commission to providing 75% of capital required for the Ranger Project.

Earlier, in July 1975, the ALP commissioned a judicial inquiry into the Ranger Project and its environmental impact because of increasing public opposition to uranium mining. The inquiry's terms of reference were very broad. (Fox, Kelleher & Kerr, 1976, p.1).

However, the Labor Government was dismissed from power on November 11, 1975 by a controversial decision of the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, and a 'caretaker' Government of conservative right-wingers sworn in until elections could be held. The ALP was defeated at the following election and the Liberal National Country Party Coalition formed a Government headed by grazier Malcolm Fraser. This series of events, commonly known as the 'Kerr coup', rocked the Australian Left and remains an obsession with many.

A year before the coup, Liberal Party director, Tony Egginton, predicted, to U.S. uranium executives, the blocking of the Federal Government's Supply Bill, which was the strategy which ultimately led to the coup. Further, five days before the coup a lawyer for the Ranger Company, which did not have enough uranium to fulfill its contracts, was reported as saying that "the shortage of uranium supplies is near-term... Maybe if the Labor Party is thrown out in Australia in five weeks or so, we can get uranium we thought we had." (Nucleonics Weekly, Nov. 6, 1975).

Anyone for conspiracy theories?

Therefore, neither the Aboriginal land rights legislation nor the Ranger Environmental Inquiry's Report were presented to a Labor Government. The land rights legislation eventually introduced by the Liberal-NCP Government in June 1976 specifically excluded the Ranger Project Area from certain provisions of the Act and required the Ranger Inquiry to assess the land claims of Aborigines in the area. Rather than delay their report any longer as a result of this extra burden, the Ranger Commissioners decided to submit two reports.

Their first report, published in October 1976, dealt with the general arguments for and against uranium mining. At best, it was ambiguous, and recommended that no decision be taken on the future of uranium mining until their second report was published. However, despite this warning, the press treated the first report as green light for uranium and the stock exchange went wild.

About the same time the Uranium Producers' Forum, a loose coalition of potential uranium producers in Australia, mounted a $1 million-plus advertising campaign in support of uranium mining. Much of the advertising was withdrawn after the anti-uranium movement challenged its accuracy in court.
Throughout the development of the issue, beginning in 1972 with the Land Rights Inquiry, the Australian Mining Industry Council (AMIC) has been an outspoken opponent of Aboriginal land rights and proponent of the uranium industry. Many of its suggestions were incorporated into the Land Rights Act by the Liberal-NCP Government.

The Second Report of the Ranger Inquiry, published in May 1977, dealt with local environmental aspects of uranium mining in the Alligator Rivers area, including the impact on Aborigines. It also assessed the Aborigines' land claims and recommended the conditions on which mining should occur, if the Government decided to proceed with it.

The Inquiry approved virtually all the land claims of the Aborigines. They also found that "the traditional owners of the Ranger site and the Northern Land Council are opposed to the mining of uranium on that site" (2nd Report, p.9). Further, they acknowledged that local Aborigines had been poorly informed and had perceived any opposition to mining as futile. Despite this, the Inquiry concluded that "(the Aborigines') opposition should not be allowed to prevail" (ibid. p.9).

The Inquiry recommended that no decision to proceed with mining be taken until there had been wide-ranging public discussion and deliberation. The Liberal-National Country Party made a fare of this process, announcing a go-ahead for uranium mining in August, only four months after the final Ranger Report. During the 'deliberations' one Federal Cabinet Minister was freely offering advice to his constituents to buy uranium shares as soon as possible! When it was announced, the press heralded the go-ahead as an economic boom to rocket Australia out of the recession.

Morale in the movement was low, but the determination to oppose the multi-national carve-up strengthened. After a long battle within the Labor Party the movement was rewarded when, in late 1977, the ALP National Conference adopted a policy which opposed uranium mining under present standards of waste disposal, reactor safety and nuclear arms proliferation. The policy had real teeth because the ALP announced that they would not fill export contracts negotiated by non-Labor Governments.

Trade Union support has been crucial throughout the struggle against uranium mining. In September 1975, the Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU) black-banned work on uranium mines pending the outcome of the Ranger Inquiry. Since then the labour movement has been split into pro- and anti-uranium factions, but there is still wide support, particularly among rank-and-file workers, for anti-uranium policy in the ACTU.

However, during 1978 the Liberal-NCP continued with pro-uranium decisions. Many of the conditions the Ranger Inquiry recommended which should apply to the mines were ignored. More diabolically, the Atomic Energy Act (1955) was expanded to protect commercial uranium projects and, in concert with accompanying legislation the companies and the Government now have power to:

(a) deny information on public health hazards to uranium workers and the public (Environment Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act, S.12);
(b) prohibit free speech and demonstration of opposition to uranium mining and export (Atomic Energy Act, S.60);
(c) give police the right to search and arrest people without a warrant and to convict people without proving an offence has been committed (Atomic Energy Act, S.47);
(d) ban people, including health inspectors or union organisers from uranium mine sites (Atomic Energy Act, S.60); and
(e) allow the army to be brought in to ensure nothing stops the flow of uranium (Environment Protection (Nuclear Codes) Act, S.13).

In short, the legislation turned Australia into a potential Police-State.

Events of late 1978 when Aborigines faced enormous Federal Government and corporate pressure to accept a hastily prepared and quite inadequate royalty agreement from the Ranger company encouraged more people to join the movement. The sham, trickery and unnecessary haste surrounding the final conclusion of the Ranger Agreement, which was signed by only four of the forty traditional owners of the Ranger site, resulted in increased concern over the uranium issue as well as the Aboriginal land rights issue.

As preparations for a mass-mobilisation by the movement were being finalised in early-April 1979, however, the shattering news that the nuclear reactor at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania was in a crisis situation shook many Australians out of their complacency and tens of thousands of people marched against uranium mining in cities throughout Australia in the biggest demonstrations since the end of the Vietnam War.

The polarisation of Australia on the twin issues of Aboriginal land rights and uranium mining seems likely to continue. The struggle will proceed on all political, economic and ideological fronts. Uncertainty in the future of the nuclear industry generally has not impaired upon the consciousness of Australia's pro-uranium lobby which continues to scramble back and forth from the ground at any cost and to overpower the Aborigines, and others, who stand in their way (see cartoon).

The need for the movement in Australia to continue to oppose, delay and increase uncertainty about Australia's ability to supply uranium to world markets is clearly crucial both in local and international terms.

NUCLEAR FUTURES - NO THANKS ... KEEP URANIUM IN THE GROUND.
Notes

1. Under Australian Federalism, the State governments maintain responsibility for a number of areas, including Aboriginal Affairs. The Federal Government was responsible for Aborigines only in the Northern Territory.

2. A.M.I.C. produces a free newsletter called Mining News; it also sponsors "handbooks" for geography (and other) teachers in schools (1) e.g., Mining in Australia, 1976, 1979; Nuclear Electricity, 1978; available from P.O. Box 363, Dighton, A.C.T., 2602, AUSTRALIA.

3. The Northern Land Council is a decision-making body set up by the Land Rights Act. It consists of Aboriginal delegates from each community represented by the Council, but has been plagued by conservative white 'experts' as advisers in a number of fields.

4. The company was required to negotiate an agreement with the traditional owners, and also had to consult with other Aborigines living in nearby areas, through the NLC. Members of the NLC executive were placed under great pressure by white advisors to accept an agreement between August and November. While negotiations were required by legislation, the Act also contained the threat of an arbitrator if the Aborigines refused to accept any deals. (See Felix 1978).
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MERCHANDIS CAPITAL AND UNDER DEVELOPMENT: A REVIEW

Ronald J. Hovath.

While it has been recognized for a number of years that dependency theory, after providing an excellent basis for ideological critique, has failed to provide an adequate theory of the underdevelopment of peripheral capitalist societies, some hopeful signs are beginning to appear that this gap is in the process of being filled and Geoffrey Kay's Development and Underdevelopment: A Marxist Analysis (Macmillan, Melbourne, 1975) is one such sign. Kay characterizes the legacy of dependency theory as follows: inasmuch as dependency theory "does not recognize the law of value... (it is) an eclectic combination of orthodox economic theory and revolutionary phraseology, saturated with supposedly self-explanatory facts, such as data concerning the pattern of trade and capital movements, and spiced with cynical quotations by Western politicians and businessmen on their aims and methods adopted to achieve them. The conclusions reached are not wrong insofar as they go, only they cannot get beyond the level of general ideological critique. Turning their backs on the law of value the best they could achieve was a historical account of the process of underdevelopment elaborated through empirical categories such as dependence, metapole, and satellite, which collapse into hopeless contradiction in the first half of close investigation". (103-04).

And when Kay's critique is added to the equally formidable one provided by Robert Brenner ("The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Marxian 'Rationalism'" New Left Review, 104, July-Aug. 1977, 25-92), it appears that the resolution of the theoretical confusion produced by the failure of dependency theory is beginning to emerge.

In a mere 187 pages Kay attempts to provide an introduction to a large part of Marxian economics "with the intention that it should be understandable to readers with no previous knowledge of Marxian or economic theory" (n). How successful? The first four chapters are devoted to explaining many of the basic concepts of Marxian economics such as production, circulation, surplus, reproduction, social relations of production, surplus value, profit, wages, accumulation, unequal exchange, etc. with particular effectiveness, the circuits of capital, which Marx developed in Volume II of Capital, to define many of these concepts. These chapters serve as background to chapters 5 and 6: "Merchant capital and underdevelopment" and "Industrial capital and underdevelopment", which contain the core of his argument. And while one could criticize and quibble with the early chapters and inflitrum for his method of developing concepts and their uneven treatment, it is not an incompetent review of Marxian economics especially given his purpose.

In chapter 5 Kay discusses the role of merchant capital in the process of underdevelopment including the transformation of merchant capital associated with the rise of industrial capital. I will return to this discussion toward the end of this review. In this context, his review of the critique of A. Emmanuel's Unequal Exchange is especially useful. His discussion of "industrial capital and underdevelopment" in chapter 6 is based on Marx's concepts of fixed and circulating capital, the effect of turnover on the rate of profit, the effect of turnover on accumulation and employment, and all of the factors in the foundation of the proletariat.
It is in the most theoretically formidable chapter, along with the section on the intensification of labour in chapter 7, that he provides the basis for a proposition put earlier in the book: "Capitalism has created underdevelopment simply because it has exploited the underdeveloped countries but has not exploited them enough" (55). While one can hardly imagine that Kay will have the last word on the subject, what I find useful is the law of value which he brings Marxian economics and the law of value to bear upon the underdevelopment of the Third World given some of the laws of motion of capital the situation industrial capital found in the Third World.

The final chapters represent a slim addendum on selected changes in industrial capitalism in the 20th century, e.g., Fordism, Keynesianism. Given the more comprehensive treatment of these and other subjects available elsewhere, e.g., E. Mandel's *Late Capitalism*, the last two chapters are sketchy and incomplete. And if one were to judge the book on the basis of the works cited, the book could be dismissed altogether. How can one write a book like this and fail to mention the work on imperialism within the Marxist tradition? At this point, I would prefer to highlight what appears to be one of the real contributions of this book: namely, his discussion of the role of merchant capital in the underdevelopment process.

Kay draws together Marx's discussion of merchant capital which is scattered throughout *Capital* but is found in a relatively compact form in chapter 22, "Historical facts about merchant capital" of Volume III. In that chapter Marx unambiguously distinguishes between merchant and industrial capital, a distinction Ricardo and Smith failed to make with the consequence that they failed to understand the role that failed to understand the role that it played in the production of wealth, etc. Although merchant capital is confined to the act of circulation, and produces no value, Marx distinguishes between merchant capital as an adjunct to industrial capital and merchant capital that is independent of industrial capital. Indeed, during the period of manufacture, the relationship between the nascent industrial capital and merchant capital were the reverse: commercial supremacy produced industrial predominance, etc.

Kay argues: "Whenever merchant capital still predominates we find backward conditions" (III, p.327). In fact, he formulated a "law" regarding merchant capital: "The independent development of merchant capital, stands in inverse proportion to the general economic development of society" (III, p.328). Kay was, of course, referring to merchant capital still dominant in the certain towns in England as well as other parts of Europe, but Kay has taken this thesis and used it to explain the initial development of underdevelopment. Thus it is not that capitalism has dominated Latin America since the 16th century, as some dependency theorists have claimed, but that Latin America was underdeveloped initially by merchant capital. The "system of robbery, plunder, piracy, colonial conquest" were all associated with merchant capital according to Kay. Merchant capital had "a more or less dissolving influence everywhere ... to what extent it brings about a dissolution of the old mode of production depends on its explosiveness and internal structure" (III, p.331-2). And it is the particular relationship between merchant capital and England (and subsequently other developed countries) as opposed to its relation to what became the underdeveloped world, that explains what dependency theory, in failing to adequately distinguish between merchant and industrial capital, obscured.

Kay's thesis may be summarized as follows: Merchant capital has existed under three 'circumstances' in the underdeveloped world. Initially (ca. 1500-1850) merchant capital functioned as free capital and promoted exchange between a variety of pre-capitalist modes of production. The preceding comments by Marx pertain especially to these circumstances. Second, between ca. 1850 and 1930 merchant capital mediated between the capitalist mode of production (industrial capital) and a variety of pre-capitalist modes of production on the periphery of capitalism. It is during this phase that the development of underdevelopment occurred. The underdeveloped world remained the "final preserve of merchant capital... but it was forced to become the agent of industrial capital" (100). Since 1930 and more clearly after World War II, industrial capital, and therefore the capitalist mode of production, began to move into the underdeveloped world. Merchant capital's independence is further diminished as industrialization proceeds.

While I find merit in Kay's formulation, it suffers from what Ernest Mandel has described in relation to other attempts to link Marxist theory to history as a 'nonoccasional explanation' of development (late capitalism, chapter 1). If we are to view merchant capital as being confined to the sphere of circulation, then to argue for merchant capital as the specific differentia of underdevelopment is to displace the role of the mode of production in the underdevelopment process, that is both forces and relations of production. In addition, the relationship between the above and various Third World structural elements, including the colonial and neocolonial state, ideological agents (missionaries, etc.) must be clarified. An adequately constituted theory of underdevelopment will have to take into account the complex interaction of 1) the capitalist mode of production (including its periodization), 2) the force compelling the C.M.P. to include pre-C.M.P. in its expanded reproduction (theories of imperialism), 3) the internal structure of the pre-C.M.P. (including its periodization especially in relation to changes brought about by capitalism) and 4) the forms of economic, political, and ideological mediation which connect the capitalist and underdeveloped worlds. Kay's contribution is his attempt to clarify the role merchant capital has played in economic mediation (the economic aspect of point 4). Points 2 and 3 are hardly treated at all and Kay's discussion of point 1 varies from being sophisticated (the discussion of fixed and circulating capital) to simplistic.

Kay has identified the role of merchant capital in the process of underdevelopment. Dependency theory leads us up a blind alley: Kay's work along with that of Amin, Huy, Brenner and others points to a way out.
BOOKNOTE

PAPER TIGERS: An Introduction to the Critique of Social Theory -
Rud O'donnell, Peter Stevens & Ian Lennard (eds.)

This collection of papers from the General Philosophy Department at
Sydney University is an attempt to deliver a philosophical critique of
orthodox social theory. Apart from the exclusion of several important
social sciences, this critique succeeds admirably in its task. The only
major problem with the book is in the density, and at times obscurity
of the epistemological argument.

Beginning from the notion the orthodox theories in a wide range of
disciplines are generated by a common set of principles, Paper Tigras
examines this orthodox problematic as an instance of a dominant theoretical
ideology. The problematic is a theoretical framework used for the production
of knowledge. It is the means of the production of knowledge. Within this
framework the various elements are articulated with each other and the
structure in definite ways. Consequently, there are certain properties of
orthodoxy which may be uncovered and described. This task is the one which
Paper Tigras attempts to begin.

One of the major properties of orthodoxy is its closed nature. That is, only a
"limited domain of social reality" is investigated. Thus, the
production of knowledge of society is confined within a narrowly prescribed
field. This serves to preserve and perpetuate existing social relations by
mystifying and obscuring our comprehension of the society which is being
investigated. An epistemological examination of social science enables one
to criticise the foundations and hidden assumptions of orthodoxy. To this end
Paper Tigras pursues four interrelated themes: empiricism, theoretical individ-
ualism, idealism and values.

The book is divided into two sections. The first describes and examines
the orthodox problematic and its political/social consequences. Secondly the
disciplines of social work, psychology, history, economics, politics, law,
medicine, and visual arts, and philosophy are analysed both as
manifestations of the orthodox problematic and as sources of its sustenance
and extension. Anthropology, education, sociology and science are listed as
forthcoming chapters in what is hoped will be an ongoing critique of
orthodox social theory.

BOOKNOTE

THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF HISTORICAL MATERIALISM
Marta Harnecker

This book is a basic introductory text in the science of historical
materialism. As such it is largely based on the work of French philosophers,
Louis Althusser, and is useful as a compendium of his work to be kept close
at hand when reading the more difficult passages of Althusser, Foucault,
Bakhtin, and even Manuel Castells, on occasions. More importantly it may be
useful as an educative device for both university students and the people,
in general. The book is mostly clear and concise, with definitions of important
terms emphasized and discussion questions at the end of each chapter.
Some of the more subtle of Althusser's arguments are glossed over but this
does not weaken the impact of the book as an introductory text. It is soon
to be published by Harvester Press.

ON PREMATURE CLOSURE AND OPEN MINDS:
Some 'heretical' thoughts on phenomenological Marxism

Frank Williamson

"The role of philosophical thought is to eliminate premature explanations, those limiting positions
which would prevent us from generating and possessing the formidable content of our being."
(Lefebvre, 1969, 115)

Preamble

I would like to continue and thus add to a mode established by a
contribution to each of the last two U.S.G. newsletters. These were:
(1) Sayer's discussion of Philosophy of Social Science, Marxism and Geog-
raphy, itself generated by Gregory's book; and (2) Peet's response to his
critics and his plea for common sense criticism. The mood is one of critical
and reflective tolerance and struggle, as I read it, and to this I would
add my plea for acceptance of diverse paths towards common goals.

More specifically, I wish to begin a discourse among socialists,
(hopefully to be geographers, for the most part), on the virtues, perhaps
even the necessity, of a reinvigorated philosophical basis of our marxism.
I believe there is a need for a vitally important foundation of truth and
power with definitions of truth that are not just those of language.

Preamble

This paper was intended as an annotated bibliography of attempts
to merge, or re-interpret phenomenology and marxism, but has been wound
by the complexity and multiplicity of such a task. It now offers a partial,
skeletal guide to this literature and a more personal statement of commit-
ment and justification for the unfinished task. My purpose is seeking to
initiate a discourse on this theme is to question what I fear is a rigidity
in stances taken by geographers who are marxists. I sense that there are
premature explanations and rejections of compatibilities and affinities
which should be part of the marxist effort. Especially, I would
take issue with the dismissal of phenomenology because it is 'idealism'.
The over rigid faith in the idealist/materialist antinomy is a denial (or
at least a dilution) of the relatedness of ideas and material base. Such
relatedness is at the very core of the revolutionary potential of marxism.

I agree with Sayer's criticism of humanist geographers for their focus on
subjectivity, rather than intersubjectivity. And feel that the move 'beyond
the individual' which a focus on the latter provides is a further aspect of
phenomenology prejudged by some of its critics.
A Middle Way or a Cul-de-Sac?

We embark then on a project which several of the leading critical thinkers of this century have begun. It is salutary to note that some of these have retraced their steps and repudiated their journey's worth and it is perhaps frightening that none have claimed any hint of completion or even fulfillment. To sustain us, however, the last decade has witnessed a vigorous revival of interest, especially as the prospect of a share of power (?) dangles before Eurocommunism. Within this setting, Paul Piccone is one of the more active writers in literature in English, and under his stimulus, a critic has become a major cultural force and was as well as more recent attempts at a phenomenological Marxism. The major work by Enzo Paci, first published in Italian in 1963 and translated in 1972 provides another focus and stimulus for 'orthodox' Marxists from a range of disciplines.

The following is a preliminary typology of some of the relevant literature in this field and an indication of the principal thrusts within recent controversies. Many of the writers were or are philosophers, a designation with some overtones of almost an a-worldly position. The common bond between philosophers we are aware of, for most of us I'm sure, is... in deep mists of introspection and rhetoric, but these are insufficient reasons to leave unexamined and unexplored the bases and presumptions of our own thoughts and actions, or to accept a Marxism which has no scope for incorporation of experience and creativity.

Early attempts - and repudiations

Most writers on the theme of phenomenological Marxism agree Lukács's central position for his set of essays first published in 1923. Although not acknowledging any debt to Husserl phenomenology, the very vitality of Lukács's Marxism, according to Goldmann, consists in "the decisive progress that his work entails by substituting the phenomenological idea of a temporal meaningful structure... with the Marxist and dialectical concept of meaningful structure, which is both dynamic and temporal, based on the idea of social totality." Dallmayr highlights a further major contribution which Lukács made as being his "incipient critical posture, ... [his] repeated emphasis that Marxism should be viewed as method and key to further inquiry not as a closed paradigm of fixed propositions." A more fully clarified, Lukács repudiated his early views in later work although some of his followers have not done so, as noted below.

The earliest documented effort at a synthesis between Marxism and phenomenology is attributed to Herbert Marcuse in 1926, before his affiliation with what is now known as the Frankfurt School. Marcuse saw several Marxists notions (revolutionary praxis, class antagonism as the driving historical force, inter alia) as receiving a solid theoretical grounding in phenomenology, especially in Heidegger's existential categories. This foundation, though, as Dallmayr notes, remains "abstract and elusive, refusing to proceed from general categories to the examination of concrete historical experience. In order to achieve a comprehensive perspective and to gain realism right with concreteness, therefore, phenomenology had to be merged with dialectical materialism." Marcuse later moved to other formulations, although Dallmayr claims some residue of his early project remained in his Frankfurt writings. A similar "subterranean linkage with the intonations of both Husserl and Merleau-Ponty" is detected for Habermas, and, in fuller vein, Dallmayr uses Adorno as a crucial link between phenomenology and critical theory, seeing him journeying from Idealism in the direction of a non-orthodox (and anti-positivist) dialectical materialism.

A final example of a Marxist who sought to incorporate a phenomenological Marxism was the Vietnamese philosopher Trân Dức Tho, operating within the same cultural milieu as Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Tho's "fertilization" with Husserl was especially an attempt to reformulate the Marxist nexus of infrastructure and superstructure in terms of the opposition between a basic layer of experience and awareness - revealed through bracketing - and the realm of opinions and institutional objectifications. His rejection of such views five years later in 1951 is regarded by Piccone as unconvincing.

The very nature of the workers face by both Lukács and Trân Dúc Tho, and the intensely 'political' nature of reactions to their work and to that of the French existential Marxists (Sartre and Merleau-Ponty) attests to the centrality of such issues for a vibrant Marxism.

Persistent Searchers

Both Sartre and Merleau-Ponty have been seen, correctly, in recent years as important sources for philosophical and sociological reformulations of Marxism. Even the enormously strong vogue of grandiloquent was almost predicated by Piccone's and Dallmayr's claims that the Italian master was situated in this same 'critical Marxist' tradition albeit with only a tenuous direct affiliation with phenomenology. Gramsci figures prominently as part of the heritage of Paci's recently translated major effort of merging phenomenology and Marxism. Paci views Husserl, the founder of phenomenology, as being as important to contemporary Marxists as Hegel was to Marx, hence the necessity of addressing Husserl's writings as a resource for retrieving the 'critical Marx' from positivist orthodox Marxism. A stance rather reminiscent of the early Lukács. Some of the latter's Hungarian colleagues have been contributors to Tolos and other venues for the exploration of the critical roots to an understanding of the crises of society, society and Marxism, the arena for the rich relational thinking of such 'persistent searchers.'

Several of the more recent writers also doggedly pursuing the 'illusory' synthesis have been cited already - Piccone, probably the most strident and convincing, Dallmayr as a political scientist, O'Nell as a sociologist - while a great many other flirt meteor-like across the sky of critical social literature, apparently falling into obscurity, or... should it be to invigorated social practice?

Closer to Home - Sociology and Geography

The awakening of interest in critical and radical activity has swept through the social sciences with increasing pace in the past decade. A writing parallel can be seen between sociology and geography in this regard. (a) An initial flowering of hope for a phenomenologically-based encounter with 'the real world' has been followed by (b) a cynical reaction and an often severe dismissal, (without trial). A concurrent emergence of a Marxist sociology/geography has very recently allowed (c) an attempted fusion of the two critical and radical positions, or at least an exploration of the relations between them (following Gregory's terminology).
Conclusion ... and now to begin ...

This short paper has traversed an enormous territory of theory and practice, and has done little justice to the richness of much of the ground. Hopefully, it will stimulate debate and struggle in the sense in which Foucault has recently cast the political function of the intellectual — namely of knowing that it is possible to constitute a new politics of truth."

I believe that a merger of phenomenological intent and purpose with Marxist focus and urgency is an appropriate way to create not only the basis of a post-revolutionary, classless society but of emancipatory, revolutionary activity now.

Notes

1. School of Geography, University of N.S.W., P.O. Box 1, Kensington, N.S.W., 2033. Despite their preliminary nature these thoughts have already accumulated heavy debts. For their continuing support and encouragement I would like to thank Richie Howitt, Louise Johnson, Kathy Mackie and Vivienne Willigan. Louise and I hope to elaborate and substantiate some of the ideas in the present paper and would be delighted to receive reactions, comments and suggestions.


5. By closely-related source I mean existentialist. The crudeness of my grouping such bases as the many varieties of phenomenology and existentialism is possibly justified for my present polemic purpose but would be disabling of a more careful project. For the remainder of this paper I will use phenomenology as 'umbrella' term for this large area of philosophy.


7. As well as the references cited below see Piccone, Reading the Grundrisse: Beyond 'orthodox' Marxism, Theory and Society 2, 1975, 255-55, and ibid, Gramsci's Marxism, Theory and Society 3, 1976, 485-512.


12. P. Marcuse, Contributions to a Phenomenology of Historical Materialism, Telos, No. 4, Fall 1969, 3-34, (originally published in German in 1928).


14. Ibid.


17. Piccone, Phenomenological Marxism, p. 142.


22. For example, see Vajda, Marxism, Existentialism, Phenomenology: A Dialogue, Telos, 7, Spring 1973, 3-29, and the following in a symposium on 'Fifty Years of Sociology of Knowledge' in Cultural Hermeneutics 3, 1975: A. Heller, Towards a Sociology of Knowledge of Everyday Life, 7-18; Markus, The Marxian Concept of Consciousness, 19-28; and Vajda, Truth or Truths ?, 25-39.

23. Among a 'cast of thousands' the following may be of interest: B. Howard, Existentialism and Marxism, 101-31 in Gribani and Piccone, Towards a New Marxism, note 10, plus the other essays in the same book; E. Shimwell, Can Phenomenology Accommodate Marxism ?, Telos, 17, 1973, 169-80; J. Scheurl, Adventures of the Dialectic, Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 5, 1975, 463-74; P. Freund and M. Abrams, Ethnomethodology and Marxism: Their use for critical theorizing, Theory and Society,
REVIEW: MARXIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY


James Becker has produced a clearly written reconstruction of classical Marxian political economy. The book provides a remarkably systematic analysis of the economic logic of the triumvirate of Volume I of Capital, part III of Volume II, and parts I, II, and III of Volume III. I would highly recommend reading this book as a companion to reading the above sections of Capital.

In addition to summarizing the classical texts, Becker attempts to update Marx in several areas, notably in the areas of labour value accounting, the causes of contemporary stagnation, and the nature of class structure in advanced capitalist countries. It is the latter subject in which Becker goes into the greatest detail and the one which deserves commendation.

Becker argues that Marx provided only a first approximation of the class composition of the capitalist mode of production in his famous general law of capitalist accumulation (Chapter 25, Volume 1). It was there that Marx showed the relationship between capital accumulation and the composition of population. As accumulation proceeded, there was on one side a growing class and on the other a working class comprised of a shrinking employed workforce and an increasing reserve army of the unemployed (Fig. 1A). And then Marx qualified his law of accumulation with the comment: "Like all other laws, it is modified by the many circumstances, the analysis of which does not concern us here." (p.790). Becker proceeds for three chapters in analyzing these circumstances and thereby provides a second approximation to Marx's first approximation (Fig. 1B).

More firmly than Poultzis (CLASSES IN CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM, N.Y., 1975) and in sharp contrast to Wright ("Class Boundaries in Advanced Capitalist Societies" H.M.E., 1978), Becker develops his analysis of class on the basis of the principles of Marxian political economy. Marx's law of accumulation is its starting point and thus Becker argues that "the accumulation of capital is one accumulation of population." (101). Becker asks "What is material and technically distinctive within the whole field of social capital today?" His answer is "the leading technique of our era is administrative" and "is primarily suitable for coordination activity." (229). The major form of accumulation within recent times has been the accumulation of administrative capitals within the sphere of circulation. And labour performed within the sphere of circulation is, according to Marx, unproductive. Becker provides a convincing discussion of unproductive accumulation in Chapter 3, and discusses the economic consequences of unproductive consumption in advanced capitalist countries in Chapter 6. But in his analysis of class, Becker focuses upon the impact of the accumulation of administrative-circulatory capitals in the composition of population, i.e., the expansion of administrative labour and the managers. The consequence of the form that contemporary accumulation takes is that there is a tendency for the value composition of social capital to rise. This rise in the value composition, in turn, helps to temporarily solve aspects of the realization problem by 3: stimulating aggregate demand and 2: reducing real growth. And since circulatory capitals function like constant capital, those firms with circulatory capitals above the social average enjoy favourable terms of exchange within the entire social economy. In brief, these are some of the arguments Becker offers to explain the changing nature of accumulation in advanced capitalist countries which have produced the new divisions of labor represented by administrative labor and managers.
AURUKUN

THE ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Richie Howitt

Aurukun is an isolated Aboriginal community on the west coast of Cape York Peninsula, North Queensland, about 1600 km north of Brisbane and 1000 km east of Darwin. Originally controlled by the Uniting Church (formerly Presbyterian), the Aurukun community was taken over by the conservative and notoriously racist Queensland Government under Premier Bjelke-Petersen, in March 1978.

As the map below suggests, the western side of Cape York Peninsula contains vast deposits of bauxite, the principal ore of aluminium. These deposits are estimated to contain about 35% of the 'free world' known bauxite reserves. Since its discovery in 1955, Cape York bauxite has changed both the political economy of the 'free world' aluminium industry and the daily lives of the Aboriginal people at Aurukun and the other nearby Aboriginal communities Weipa and Mapoon.

Ronald J. Horvath
Three companies currently hold bauxite mining leases over areas of Cape York. They are: Comalco Ltd. (comprised of Kaiser Aluminium, USA - 45%; Rio Tinto Zinc, UK, through its subsidiary Comalco Mining of Australia - 45%; and "public" shareholders - 10%); Alcan Aluminium Ltd., Canada and USA; and the Aurukun Associates consortium (comprised of Shell RIL, Holland and UK, through its subsidiary Hililton - 40%; Tipperary Corporation, USA - 40%; and Pechiney, France - 20%). At present only Comalco is actually mining bauxite on Cape York.

These companies' mining leases cover more than 50,000 ha. of land which traditionally belongs to Aboriginal people from Napoon, Weipa and Aurukun. Many of these people continue, despite suffering 100 years of frontier brutality and missionary zeal, to rely on their land for their daily needs and to perform religious ceremonies and other duties required by the time-honored laws handed down to them from the first people, more than 30,000 years ago.

Given the contradiction between aspirations and interests of the mining companies and those of the Aboriginals, the struggle for land rights and self-management at Aurukun provides an instructive example of several aspects of the Australian social formation. Although a great deal of work remains to be done in documenting the penetration of capitalism into Cape York, of which the Aborigines' struggle against the mining companies is the most recent stage, I was able to gather some data for a fourth year thesis in 1978. The rest of this brief paper summarises this material.

In the late 1950s mining and aluminium companies were actively assessing the viability of the Cape York bauxite deposits. At that time Aborigines throughout Queensland were "protected" by the infamous Queensland Aborigines Act.

In the 1950s neither the Queensland State Government, the aluminium companies nor the Presbyterian Church wanted the Aborigines to speak out on their own behalf. Instead, they assumed that they, and not the Aborigines, knew what was best for the Aborigines. Despite this, the Aborigines continued to demand to speak on behalf of their tribal homelands in negotiations about mining.

Their pleas were ignored. In fact, it was suggested on a number of occasions that Aborigines from Napoon and Weipa should be forcibly removed from their land and "relocated". These suggestions culminated in the violent closure of the Napoon Mission by the Queensland Government, against the wishes of both the Presbyterian Church and the Napoon people. Early on 16 November, 1963, people were forced to leave their beds at gunpoint and herded into a patrol boat by members of the Queensland Police Force. The people's homes, gardens and Church were then burned to the ground by the police.

The role played by the companies in the State Government's decision to close Napoon is unclear. However, the evidence available suggests that members of the Queensland Government thought that closure of the Napoon Mission would hasten Comalco's development of the area's bauxite resources.

Tipperary, which later organized the Aurukun Associates consortium, started bauxite exploration in mid-1968. In 1968 the Queensland Government continued to oppose Aborigines' right to own and control their traditional land or even speak for themselves. However, the Presbyterian Church had, by this time, become more aware of its responsibilities in relation to the dispossession and oppression of the Aurukun Aborigines. Thus the Church supported the Aborigines when they asked to negotiate directly with Tipperary officials to determine the condition on which the company could prospect on the Aurukun Aboriginal Reserve.

An agreement between the community and the company was reached at a meeting organised by the Church. The most important condition required Tipperary to negotiate a new agreement with the community if and when they decided to apply to the Queensland Government for a mining lease over the Reserve. However, this term was quickly made obsolete by the permanent head of the Queensland Department of Aboriginal and Islander Advancement who added a further clause suggesting that further negotiations would be unnecessary.

In 1975, Aurukun Associates secretly applied for and were given a mining lease over 11,600 ha. of Cape York Peninsula from the Queensland Government. Traditional owners of the land were not consulted, or even informed at any stage of these negotiations. The first notice they received was a front-page report in a three-day old newspaper when it reached Aurukun.

The Aurukun Aborigines challenged the legislation granting the lease in the Queensland Supreme Court, but lost an appeal to the Privy Council in England initiated by the Queensland Government. The Privy Council decision, handed down in 1978, encourages the Queensland Government to step in and take over Aurukun and nearby Mornington Island.

This action precipitated a long, complex struggle between the Queensland Government and the Federal Government, led by arch-conservative Malcolm Fraser, over who should control the land and the bauxite in it (see cartoon).

"We'll soon know who it belongs to — Bjelke-Petersen or Fraser."

As soon as the Queensland Government threatened to take control of the community, the Aurukun Aborigines asked the conservative Federal Liberal-National Country Party coalition Government to acquire their Reserve land and hand it back to its traditional owners. Despite numerous Federal Government promises that this would happen, the Federal Government eventually acquiesced to a Queensland compromise resulting in the Aurukun Reserve being administrated by the Queensland Department of Local Government.

The compromise was opposed by the Aborigines, although they tried to work within the new legislation once it had been forced upon them. However, the Aboriginal Council was eventually sacked by the Queensland Local Government Minister because it had failed to "co-operate" with him.
Throughout this dispute, Aurukun Associates avoided making its position public. However, it is clear that the consortium was satisfied to let the Queensland Government do the "dirty work" of undermining community solidarity and cohesion at Aurukun. This would, if it happens, leave the way open for the consortium to start mining whenever economic conditions make mining at Aurukun a profitable proposition, without any coherent opposition from the Aborigines.

This situation, where the 'state' intervenes in disputes on behalf of transnational corporations would be familiar to observers of many aspects of the Australian social formation. Throughout Australia, State and Federal Governments have trampled on Aboriginal rights to facilitate pastoral or mining development by the corporations (e.g. see article on uranium mining in this Newsletter). In other areas conservative governments have intervened in industrial disputes to protect scabs and bosses. They have introduced economic policies resulting in high unemployment (50%+ among Aborigines) to placate the corporations.

Of course, these policies have not gone unopposed. For example, the Aurukun dispute has been crucial in raising consciousness about state intervention in both Aboriginal and Anglo Australian economies.

Across North Australia a cultural revival movement has gained strength in the last two or three years. Large cultural gatherings have contributed not only to development of a self-conscious Aboriginal identity, but have also provided forums for Aborigines from different places to sit down together to discuss the economic and political problems each isolated community has, and to be forced to face alone. This has encouraged increasing political consciousness and action among many Aborigines.

Among white Australians, long famous for their racism and parochialism, the land rights movement has forced at least some sections of Australian society, e.g. sections of student and labour movements, left political parties, including the major opposition party, the Australian Labor Party, and some of the major churches, to become aware of the political and economic reasons for increasing underdevelopment in the country so often referred to as "the lucky country".

Footnotes:


2. This material is dealt with at greater length in Hout, 1978. The management strategies of aluminium companies with iron ore on Cape York Peninsula, 1955-1978, unpublished Honours thesis, Dept. of Geography, Newcastle University, NSW; and in a paper called Beyond the Geological Imperative to be published shortly by the Dept. of Geography, Newcastle University, Shortland, 2308, NSW, Australia.

3. Although they have been amended several times since 1955, the Queensland Acts, as they are commonly known throughout Australia, still exist and continue to oppress Queensland Aborigines. See Black Resource Centre Collective, 1976, The Queensland Aborigines Act and Regulations 1971 – so that anyone can read them, Black Resource Centre, P.O. Box 345, Brisbane, 4000, Qld. The Act and Regulations were amended earlier this year.


RULING ECONOMY, RULING CLASS

Jim Kenney
Senior Lecturer in Political Sociology
University of Adelaide.

In terms of foreign ownership of the economy, Australia can be accurately described as the Canada of the southern hemisphere. This owes to the dubious distinction of belonging to a small group of countries which, while highly urbanised and industrialised, are incapable of finding the capital resources to maintain the necessary rate of investment needed to ensure the stability of the economy. The high degree of penetrations of the Australian economy by foreign capital is now well documented. Yet to date there has been almost no recognition of the significance of this fact for the class structure of Australian capitalism. Most important, studies of the class structure are predicated on the assumption that the Australian ruling class is comparable to those of industrial societies where there is a relatively high degree of indigenous ownership of the means of production. Models of the ruling class tend to be drawn from the experience of Britain and the U.S.A. on the assumption that although the economies of these countries differ fundamentally from that of Australia their class structures are basically similar.

This assumption must now be challenged. If the basic Marxist principle that the nature of the economy determines or heavily influences the class structure, and if we can point to major structural differences in the ownership of the means of production of different countries it follows that major structural differences in class relationships are almost certain to exist. The wealth of data and analysis on foreign control of certain economies which has recently been documented could in large part be usefully applied to studies of class structures. The aim in this paper is to sketch out in a preliminary manner some of the wider implications and ramifications for the structure of the Australian ruling class of an economy heavily penetrated by foreign capital. Such a task must be seen as one element in a reappraisal of the class structure which must be extended to the working class and eventually to the more detailed studies of fractions of capital and labor.

Estimates of the degree of foreign ownership of the Australian corporate economy are one third and two fifths, compared to that of Canada and in stark contrast to highly 'autonomous' capitalist societies such as Japan and Sweden where foreign ownership is negligible: less than five percent. The most important sources of overseas investment are, as one might expect, Britain and the U.S.A., which together accounted for some 70 percent of all foreign investment in 1974. Australia possesses no indigenous multinational corporations whose brands are household names around the world. With almost twice the population of Sweden, Australia has no equivalent of Volvo, Electrolux, or GE. Australian cars are manufactured by Chrysler, General Motors and Ford; its electrical goods by Westinghouse, General Electric and Hoover, and its chemical products by ICI and Dow. In some sectors of the economy, notably motor manufacturing, foreign control is almost complete. Now is the relative absence of Australian capital in the economy the result of heavy investment of Australian capital overseas. Although Australian capital is exported to Britain in considerable amounts, the only economies substantially penetrated by Australian capital are those of New Zealand and Papua New Guinea.

The weaknless of Australian capital and its heavy dependence upon foreign supplementation on a massive scale is particularly noticeable in mining and other primary extraction industries. The recently planned 'North West Shelf' development off the north-west coast of Western Australia based on oil and gas resources and estimated to cost several billion dollars to develop, is heavily dependent upon foreign capital. Indigenous capital is quite unable to raise the necessary funds to finance the development of the most profitable and expanding sectors of the economy to the end of the century. The implications of the weakness of indigenous capital for the structure and cohesion of the Australian ruling class are far-reaching. It is axiomatic that the power of any ruling class derives directly from the extent of its control over capital and through this of the entire corporate economy. A ruling class which does not possess sufficient capital resources to develop the economy and whose economy is heavily penetrated by foreign capital is necessarily in a much weaker position to control and exploit the economy than a ruling class which is not so heavily dependent on foreign capital.

Unfortunately, 'degree of control over the economy' is difficult to quantify. One simple index might be the way in which the web of interlocking directorates is likely to be influenced by foreign penetration of an economy. The concept of interlocking directorates and its importance in understanding the nature of the ruling class has been extensively studied, and it is clear that many directorships, and less obviously, the holding of executive positions in political, administrative, educational, religious, and other institutions by the directors of major companies is an important aspect of the integration and control of capitalist society by members of the ruling class.

Foreign ownership is likely to differ from indigenous ownership in that interlocks will be held, a foreign-manufacturer's subsidiary will generally have as its directors the appointed executives of the parent company who are little interested in the local political scene and who function as often temporary people, answerable to the parent company and who may be mere members of its board.

What data are available on Australian registered foreign-owned subsidiaries suggests that this is largely the case. A comparison of the interlocks of a number of large foreign-owned companies with Australian-owned companies shows that each director of an Australian company held on average four other directorships against the directors of foreign subsidiaries who held on average only one other directorship. In so far as interlocks are important for the cohesion and integration of capitalist economies therefore, Australia's deeply penetrated economy weakens control at the strategic level through the maintenance of a dense and comprehensive network of interlocks.

The implications of this are worth pursuing in a little more detail. Australia's economy is not uniformly penetrated by foreign capital. Some sectors of the economy, such as automobile manufacturing, mining, electric utilities, and so on, are heavily dominated and in some cases monopolised by foreign companies. Others, such as retail stores, the media, banking and finance are still largely owned by Australian companies. This means that some sectors of the economy will be characterised by dense interlocks, while others will be poorly represented, and still others will be almost devoid of interlocks. Sectors of the economy virtually monopolised by foreign companies, such as major manufacturing, will be all but excluded from the network of interlocks which the indigenous ruling class can sustain.
The patchy and incomplete nature of Indigenous control over the Australian economy must necessarily have profound implications for the structure of the ruling class. One major implication concerns the national integration of the economy. The fact that between a third and a half of the economy is foreign-owned understates the importance of foreign ownership in one sense. In that foreign ownership is heavily concentrated in large firms, operating at the national level, the foreign ownership is in the form of the subsidiaries of multinational corporations, this necessarily means that Australian-owned major companies are more under-exploited than in the case with smaller companies, even if both are protected from foreign penetration of the economy. Because of this, comparisons with the structure of the Canadian ruling class would be especially useful to bring out similarities and differences. Not the same goes for the case of the Australian ruling class. Hopefully, this sort of starting point can shed more light on the detailed working of the class structure of capitalist societies.

Notes


3. Calculated from Ibid. p.17.

4. Ibid. p.149.

5. Ibid, p.17.


8. For further discussion see my 'Capitalism: the Australian way' (editor) title, Arena Melbourne No. 31, 1978 pp.84-104.
 AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY

Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism

edited by E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley, 3 Volumes
Australia and New Zealand Book Company, Sydney
Volume 1, 1975; Volume 2, 1978; Volume 3, 1978

This collection of twenty six essays, three introductions and 685 pages originates in "the belief that a 'history of the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism from the Earliest Times to the Present Day' should be written; that this would be best attempted from a basic Marxist standpoint; and that before it could even be started, it would be necessary to provide both bricks and straw" (Volume 1, p. 1.). All but three of the 26 contributors and editors are academics, and those 'three outsiders' have close links with academia. However, they are all academics, all have been influenced by academic disciplines - one third from sociology, followed by history, and on from law and communications studies. More than half, however, are based at academic institutions in the greater Sydney area (including a North Shore C.A.E.) with a smattering from the universities of Monash, Adelaide, and Flinders. Does this mean that the bricks and straw of Marxism are not represented at Wollongong, Western Australia, James Cook or New England? Though this might be too sweeping since not all the contributors are Marxists anyway, as in the editors itself, "the main criterion for inclusion was that an essay was considered to be putting forward a tenable point of view on a significant issue ..." (Volume 1, p. 9.). That is an argumentative point given the goal eschewed only eight pages earlier. It is questionable that some important areas of concern are represented for example by John Connell, whose better known publication "Ruling Class, Ruling Culture" uses a very questionable definition of "class", or Jill Roe, whose Social Policy in Australia, 1901-1975 treats poverty from a reformist standpoint on top. If I mention their major publications rather than their specific chapters least one tries to excuse them for lack of space to thoroughly develop their arguments. Of the total, seven articles concern either the long range evaluation of the Australian social formation or historical moments in its development; six deal with general areas of the

* Subtitled, "studies of conflict, power and hegemony in Australian life", and published 1977 by Cambridge University Press.

** A collection of essays edited by her and published 1976 by Carsell Australia Ltd.
present conjunctural, and a further six tackle specific topics of current concern (housing, racism, poverty, education, the environment, and Australia's role in the global order). Four deal with class relations, and there are two concerned with culture (meditation and representation).

My familiarity with these books came as I was parachuted into teach someone else's course on "Social Issues" and sought them as an antidote to what Samir Amin called Australia's "world of absolute silence" in a review of socialist writing.

He also went on to note perceptively: "... how is it possible to be an Australian? Yes, it is possible, there are some. Australian; one can even be comfortable, it seems, being an Australian, even have a slightly better chance (statistically) of being a tennis champion. But all the technocrats in the world must be automatically sent to Australia, they will like it there... because they belong to Australia. Functionalist is a thing you get hooked on."

So let all the technocrats in the world be automatically sent to Australia, they will like it there... because they belong to Australia. But all the technocrats in the world must be automatically sent to Australia, they will like it there... because they belong to Australia. Functionalist is a thing you get hooked on.

Is this then Wheelwright and Buckley's answer to the functionalism that is so much the motor of Australian social science? Despite the difficulties of some of my Australian students in finding space in these volumes, and the uneven coverage of Australian political science, this is the best single volume I have read on the subject as a whole. You get the sense that we are talking about a self-sustaining Australian capitalism, and are only now becoming aware of this when it is too late.

These tasks are spelt out more fully in pp. 6-9 of the first introduction, written in the "turbulent" Whitlam years, but not revised in Volumes 2 and 3, under the Fraser regime, so presumably still extant: "the left-motiv is that although capitalism may be regarded as a socio-economic system which involves certain fundamentals which revolve around the relationship of capital to wage labour, nevertheless the system takes different forms in different physical and cultural environments, and indifferent historical periods. In elementary form the particular topics are, the role of the state; the penetration of capital from many sources, rational rather than free sources; the critical role of nationalism; the impact of imperialism; and to use Geoffrey Blainey's phrase, the "tyranny of distance". With more volumes promised, many of these individual topics and the left-motiv are covered in the present 28 essays in Volume 1, largely dwelling on the evolution of the Australian social order in the long term, Volume 2 centres around an analysis of contradictions within the role of middle classes, and Volume 3 looks at working class Australia - though that is a post factum observation of the organisation, not one imposed by the editors.

Within this collection, uneven though it may be, there are

But most notably "comparador capitalism" in which the local bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie are agents of international capitalism mark strong parallels with Quebec too. There are other essays which I found of considerable interest as well - Bob Catley's assessment of the impact of the end of the "Age of Growth" on Whitlam's social democratic government and its inevitable replacement by Fraser's coalition of the right, Sol Eoel's review of the particular features of capitalism in Australia in the late 1970s and its reflection in the nature of the labour market and the labouring class in the city. Turner's provocative essay "he's no good from the bush" which contrasts the home-manipulated O'Keefe, popular culture, and the elitist bourgeoisie high in Australia, and Michael Dunn's description of the convict labour system which were all notable.

There is no doubt that these three volumes, including many of their best, do represent a very healthy filling of that Australian silence. The parallels with struggles elsewhere are obvious: they tackle issues we have all been pondering: political economy in general, and its Marxist basis; more to the point, the nature of the state comes to the fore as its class and class consciousness. That not all the essays succeed in sharply part of the learning process that helps identify an Australian contribution to the literature on the left. As I left Australia, Kibble Books launched a new series "theses on the left," of which the first by Tim Rowse is a contribution as worthy of note as the start, revised here, under Whelewright and Buckley's supervision, Rowse takes a them were mentioned a few of the above; these three volumes - that of this practice of ideological struggle and its relation to class and the hegemony of a particular group in Australia. Not only is it an excellent and critical introduction to "liberal democracy", but it is a working example of the practice of Marxism in the social science. I am convinced that the ANZ trilogy helped paved the way for more Marxist scholarship of this type.

To end I need only quote the editors' final plea from Volume three: "(we) now look forward to preparing Volume Four in the series. Contributions of essays are invited and may be sent to either editor. The essential elements are that the essays be related to Australia, and the approach of the authors should be 'left' and preferably Marxist - using this term in its widest sense." (Volume 3, p. 10.)

Michael E. Elliott Hurst
Simon Fraser University
April 1979

* Australian Liberalism and National Character, Box 210, Melbourne, Victoria, 1978.

"Is socialism... the highest form of capitalism?"

RECENT LEFT AUSTRALIAN LITERATURE

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RADICAL JOURNALS IN AUSTRALIA

ARENA

A Melbourne-based left/radical journal concentrating mainly on discussions of the Australian social formation, with some commentary on international events.

No. 49 (1977)

'Genetic Blot: The Nuclear Waste Disposal Problem' - Alan Roberts
A discussion of the nuclear waste disposal problem, focusing on the social responsibilities of scientists and technocrats.

'The Political Economy of Housing' - Jim Kemeny
Superficial comparison of the profitability and social costs of home ownership, private rental, and public housing. Also considers movements of capital investment between housing and other sectors of the economy.

'Superstate Mystical Imperialism in the South Pacific' - Anthony Abbot
U.S. Imperialism in Micronesia: good historical and political analysis, with some consideration of the economic impacts.

'The Economic Cycle in Pre-War Australia' - Charles Silver
Harsh discussion of the current crisis in Australian capitalism and the end of the so-called 'long boom'.

No. 50 (1978)

'Minerals and Multinationalism' - Bob Catley and Bruce McFarlane
A useful description of the reaction of mining capital to a crisis in capitalism.

'Cultural Independence'
Eight short articles on underdeveloped areas within and near Australia, especially their penetration by foreign capital and culture. 'The Bonds of Charity: The Aid Debate' - Ronie Sharp
'Culture of the Torres Strait People' - Hironobu Kitaoji
'Papua New Guinea' - Hoschilden for the Warri R. - Peter Kaval
'East Timor: The People and the Struggle' - Arnold Zable
'Land Rights for Tasmania's Aborigines' - Michael Hanson
'The Kauriian Story' - Lyndon Shae
'Living Black' - Sandra Milley
'New Context for the West Irian Struggle' - Ronie Sharp

'Sublime Anatomy of Capitalism' - Malinzie Beresford
Excellent review of Jesse Schwartz's book of the same name. Includes comments on Graff and his interpreters (Montheis, Robinson, Steedman) on the critique of the labour theory of value and the theory of crisis.

No. 51 (1979)

'The Social Character of Time' - David Jenkins
Disappointing examination of time as a social concept and the means by which it affects the development of society.

'Social Work: The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing' - Pat Skendridge & Ian Lenni
Aithusserian critique of the ideology of social work and the role it plays in the maintenance of capitalist social relations.

'Capitalism: The Australian Way' - Jim Kemeny
Foreign capital in Australia and its effect on the indigenous class structure. Mainly descriptive.

'Raymond Williams: The Critic and Society' - Peter Williams
Very fine review of Williams' book ' Marxism and Literature', which examines the debate between the Romantic Humanists and those influenced by Althusser and Colletti.

AUSTRALIAN LEFT REVIEW

Union-oriented magazine which focuses on national issues of interest to the union movement, as well as including reprints of theoretical articles and news of international socialist and workers movements.

No. 63 (Mar 1978)

'Contemporary Feminism and Socialist Movements' - Barbara Ehrenreich
Focus on the women's movement within the broader socialist context. Includes an interesting section on the political economy of the family under capitalism.

No. 64 (May 1978)

'History of the Land Rights Struggle in Queensland' - Daisy Marchiotti
Brief history of the Queensland Aboriginals and their struggles against Federal and State Governments and mining interests.

'Feminist Notes' - irregular column
Interesting attempt to explain the arguments of 'Capital' in seven pages of graphs and explanation.

No. 65 (Aug 1978)

'TV without Tears' - Daniel Ben-Horin
Analysis of television as a mass artform. Critiques media even urban and content analysis and positive statement analysis. Offers a strategy for socialist TV.

No. 66 (Nov 1978)

'Socialist Feminist Theory: An Appraisal' - Ruth Connell
A postmodern feminist theory since Engels. Some important points raised but not explored in any detail.

'Recent Theories of the Capitalist State' - Rob Jones
Perceptive overview of the contributions of Marx, Lenin, Gramsci, Hillis, Foucault, the Neo-Ricardian, the Capital Logic school (Althusser, Miler & Moussalam and Rodolfo) and Class Off to an understanding of the contemporary State.
ON CRITICISM, COUNTER CRITICISM, AND COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE CRITICISM

Michael A. Elliot Hurst

Laying aside the personal sensitivities, for which so many are renowned, and unfortunately crippled to some extent by the necessity of a personal or collective nature in vital to the continuing battle of Marxism. We should feel free to offer criticism as best we can, without "against subjectivism, arbitrariness and vulgarity, statements should be based on facts, and criticism should centre on political, in addition, to paraphrase Marx, we must involve ourselves in an uncompromising critical evaluation, a critical dialogue which is its own result, or conflicts with others (including the establishment, as such).

ON SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

First, however, let us get rid of the trivial and set the record straight.

(a) I am somewhat surprised that the alleged "inaccuracy" was taken up by Dick L'Estrange, since I had explained both in person and in writing that we were dealing with a typographical error, in which the phrase "and spatial relations" was omitted. In fact, given the context of my argument, it weakened my line of reasoning not Dick's. To take it up and repeat it several times is unnecessary.

(b) The context in which the error occurred was a typescript of a presentation I made at the IAG meetings, Townsville, August 1978. The typescript contained the note:

"This paper was originally conceived with a slightly different title 'The Lacanian, Lapsus, and Alchemy of Geography: Towards a De-definition'. Subsequent thought has shifted the emphasis from simply considering an 'archaeological' type research into Geography as an established domain, to that of arguing the position of abandoning that domain altogether for a different organisation of 'epistemological space'. This change in emphasis has delayed completion of the full paper, and what is presented here is only a summary paper with a partial bibliography".

This summary was also circulated to a number of individuals in North America, Britain, and Australia, asking specifically for critical feedback before it was revised and possibly published (in Dick's use of 'external' domain)...

(c) It is ironic that in accusing me of selective quotation from his work, Dick then does the same to mine. Very importantly given

Dick’s plea for a “Marxist Geogaphy” and my argument against such an stand, he calls the critical sentence (italics in the following) To set the record straight here is the contextual paragraph

“Radical Interventionism. Increasingly fashionable over the last decade this current has attracted many leftward drifting liberals. There has been a concern to expose and denounce the ideological distortions of both mainstream geography and its variants listed above (“outgrown humanism” and “magnificent positivism”). In particular, the works of Marx and his 20th century interpreters has been utilized in this critique. For some it is a genuine intellectual transition, but for others who learn only a few catch-phrases and phrases and historical and dialectical materialism as well. Unfortunately for both groups, because they were not able to see Geography as a problematic, as a product like the other “social sciences” of a particular economic, political and ideological conjuncture (capitalism) the moves by Peet, Santos, Buch-Hansen and Haakon, Soja, and others to create a convergence of Geography with a “radical” approach is doomed to failure. Their interventions are futile and unscientific; even though Harvey has warned them early on, that the co-optation of Marxist language “without conveying the essence of Marxist thinking” has effectively prevented the true flowering of Marxist thought...” [Footnote quotes] This new strand of Marxist enquiry is then by some authors (e.g. Newman) reconstituted as a fusion of a bourgeois discourse, geography, and some aspects of a critical science, Marxism, “Geographical”. It also produces a wholly contradictory discourse that makes Marx turn in his grave! It is not far from that confusion to define, as Peet does...” [Footnote quotes].

(d) Against mine and Leach’s comments (which have not reached Australia at the time of writing) Dick sets the example of Buch-Hansen and Haakon’s “criticisms of his earlier poverty articles in the ARA Annals.” That particular criticism occupies only 24 lines in a lengthy article (where ironically the two authors repeat very similar mistakes). Dick himself has reprinted his poverty article without comment or update in his more recent “Radical Geography” collection. This particular article has been analyzed in more depth, constructively criticized, and built upon by myself in a manuscript on poverty to be published in 1979 by Oxford University Press. “The point being to learn from our earlier attempts and Marxian analysis and to improve upon it. In Dick’s example this is not carried out.

ON IMPORTANT MATTERS

There are, as Dick points out, some fundamental issues at stake, the practice of those of us who are now ‘other Marxists’, or at least like myself still on the threshold and Rand within the discourse (Geography), from which we received our training, current employment, etc. the origins and continuance of a particular and historically specific division of epistemological space, geography, the role of space, place, and location, in the language of the discipline. Given these issues and others that critique of spatial fetishism can be counter-critiqued by being termed fetishistic too! These crucial issues are in fact the concern of my “de-territorialization” paper as well, as an in order to clarify the situation it is important to define some of these concepts and terms being used.

some facts: Marxism is both a science and a guide to social action; a part of historical materialist theory and a revolutionary movement. The two cannot be separated from each other without the result being a very shallow radicalism on the one hand or futile cognitive political action on the other.

In its claim to be scientific, Marxism uses a particular mode of analysis and an orientation of historical materialism, and a philosophy (dialectical materialism). Althusser refers to the “necessity...for...a...which is...dialectically, not merely a set of history, but also and simultaneously as a science that is...for itself” by taking itself and its scientificity as an object (1969, p. 7). We can regard historical materialism as the Marxist science of social formations and their histories. It is a science as the theory of the production of knowledge, the theory of science, and the theory of the history of science, and the theory of theoretical practice. Through these, the concept of science used here in this way;

(1) There exists an external world independent of men’s conceptions of it, of which science tries to gain knowledge, and which provides science with its real object (materialist postulate).

(2) What science studies is not external reality as it appears to everyday sense perceptions, but a theoretically defined object, by means of which it strives to grasp the real world (anti-empiricist thesis). These conceptual objects are incessantly worked upon and transformed in the scientific production of knowledge.

(3) The rise of a new science... means above all the discovery production of a new system of concepts defining as object of systematic investigation. This entails a break with previous conceptualisations (Discontinuist thesis of the history of science)...

(4) A basic difference between science and ideology is that the former is an open system of questions asked of itself, the answers to which are not prejudged. Ideology, on the other hand, is characterised by posing problems whose solutions are pre-ordained, produced outside the cognitive process. Ideological questions are answered in the process of the ideological content or its ideological solutions...)

(5) No external proof of the truth of a science can be given. The verification of scientific propositions is itself part of scientific practice (anti-empiricist thesis)" (1976, p. 60).

In short Althusser listed the three elements of science as, “a materially existing object, a theory, and a method”. Note that in contradistinction to science, there is ideology. Ideology is a general concept which involves both material practices and the ideas interwoven with them, it is a system of "representation of the world" but one which does not refer to the world as an object external to that system. It is a lived relationship with the world in terms of practical and institutional ideologies and more or less systematic frameworks and theories about the natural and social world in the form of theoretical ideologies. Although these ideologies are often deployed in the "real" world, it is a world in which people experience in which people experience in which people experience in which people experience in which people experience in which people experience in which people experience...
knowledge of anything outside it. The limitations are not innocent, of course, but function to support and reproduce that limited reality.

From science and ideology we can move onto the notion of problematization which we have both invoked from time to time. A problematic is a specific unity of a theoretical complex, whether scientific or ideological, which serves to conceptualize and delimit such a complex. This complex governs not merely the solutions that it is capable of providing, but the problems/questions it can pose, the form in which they are posed, and determines what is excluded therefrom. My earlier reference to "lacunes, ideas, and silences" is relevant here.

There are perhaps four further terms used by Dick which we should be clear about. First, "metadisciplinary", which can be quickly defined as an internal meaning of "root, root causes, or fundamental principle": "fetishism" is embraced in the Althusserian notion of structural causality (the affectionity of a structure on its elements) and is linked to ideology. In these terms a fetish is an objective structural social formation which is imposed on most people by a mechanism they do not understand, a mechanism which determines that structure as the objective mode of appearance of reality; "relative autonomy" is very much a concept in vogue at the moment. Drawing fromEngel's letters** in which he emphasizes the non reducibility of legal and political forms to economic phenomena, Althusser has argued that the legal/political and ideological levels of society are characterized by a "relative autonomy" from the economic base. These levels or structures take concrete form in material apparatuses (such as those of the state, courts, etc.) which have their own specific unity and coherence, their relative autonomy. Each plays a part in determining social events, although the economic structure remains "determinate in the last instance". This explanation makes scientific sense to both Marxians and others have used it, but it is not a concept that can be applied necessarily to other concepts, domains, etc.***

Lastly we can mention dialectics as such. The dialectic is the "study of contradiction the very essence of objects" or "the doctrine of the unity of opposites". But very importantly we should stress that we are dealing with Marxian, not Hegelian dialectics. Hegelian dialectics presupposes "a simple original unity which develops within itself by virtue of its negativity, and throughout its development only ever restores the original simplicity and unity in every more concrete totality".

*See O'Neill Stearns and Friend (1978). I have had reason to pursue notions of "ideology" and "culture" further in two recent papers (1978a, 1978b).

**For example to Bloch (9/1890), Schmidt (10/1890), Nahrin (1/1891), and Stearnak (1/1894), in Selected Correspondence.

***I think the concept of society that we can build from this does make scientific sense: a dialectical structure of distinct but related structures/levels existing in relative autonomy from the mode of production, and thus developing at different tempos (the line of uneven development). However, it is not clear that we can use this concept of "relative autonomy" to make scientific sense of economic determinism, as escape which is always, inexplicably foiled in the "last instance", and as Althusser rather cryptically warns us "from the reality of the last instance, the only fool of the last instance comes!" (1969, p.113). "Relative autonomy" and "last instance", as well as autonomy and determination which are conditions for us understanding the first two, need much refinement.

(Althusser, 1969, p.187). Dialectics in a Marxist usage are never uncivil, nor for that matter equivocal. The contradictions reflect in their very nature a relationship to the unevenness of a complex whole, determined by the structured complexity that assign them to their roles, or to use Althusser's words, are "over-determined (complexly-structured and determined). This is, dialectical processes are complex processes in a structured social world, and so called "simplicity" or the "simple" category is merely the product of a certain dialectical idealism which itself is a product of scientific rather than an ideological notion, and one to be used with care and not converted into a series of adjectival dialectics with no meaning.

Where do ideas come from?

Ideas, knowledge, and "divisions of knowledge" are something that are produced. They are not innate and they do not fall from the sky, and as Mao continued, "ideas come from social practice and from it alone ... it is not a social being that determines his thinking ...". In other words ideas are produced by our material lives, social practice, by activity in the struggle for production, in class struggle, and in scientific and artistic pursuits.

Ideas that are produced however need to be produced by a certain means, the production of a problematic. As a structure or framework, a problematic consists of certain specific elements such as theories and concepts which are joined in definite ways. One of the most important properties of the problematic used to produce orthodox geography is that it is "closed", that is that it can only investigate a certain limited domain of social reality and is unable to produce knowledge of anything outside this domain. Thus geographers can produce knowledge which is descriptive of spatial patterns, but they cannot give us knowledge of how these patterns are generated. So long as social scientists continue to use this problematic (bourgeois geography) they are constrained in advancing our knowledge of social formations.

Not that such practice is innocent! As Brian Hudson has commented: "In the nineteenth century geography was largely promoted ... largely, if not mainly, to serve the interests of imperialism in its various aspects including territorial acquisition, economic exploitation, militarism, and the practice of class and race domination". That is this particular problematic is a theoretical ideology; it mystifies our understanding of the world (as for example when it takes "space" as prior to society) and it does this to reproduce social relations and itself to pose the particular question.

Where does geography come from?

Economics as a discourse emerged as a concomitant of the rise of this mode of production, as a new type of economy. Thus, as a particular historical period (economy) sociology was a term coined by Comte in 1830, after the bourgeois revolutions were largely over, and in the period when a counter-revolutionary conservatism had set in. Foucault (1973) has argued that these eighteenth century discourses represent "monuments" to past divisions of epistemological spaces, and in his case it has led him to "abandon the great divisions that are now familiar to us all ... the space of knowledge was then arranged in a totally different way". In the quote above Hudson sees geography's origins in similar terms: Geography as a discourse was a particular set of demands brought about by the social relationships determined at a particular conjuncture -- gazaar

*See chapters 2 and 3 of Thernhold (1976)
for the ruling class, explora for the Royal Geographical Society, apologists for the humanities of industrial revolution, colonialism, and imperialism. It is an interesting exercise to glance back at the handbooks, the popular geography of the period. The problems remain, but the problematics have not simply evaporated with the passage of years, though having weathered the stagnation of a post-colonial, post-apartheid period, its fundamental issues now lie in terms of defense of the imperial against cosmopolitan rationalization of new networks of communication and the effective location of the component parts of a new global economy. The tools and crafts may now carry the venerable and sophisticated of a "technocratic" ideology and the basic elements of the nineteenth century discourse and its theoretical ideology remain.

Geography in the 1970s

Geography exists to this day as a problematics within the ideological level of dominant social formations. We cannot specify how many "definitions" papers we write or wish that such structure and apparatus away..." it has "texts", "teachers", "departments" and so on, ensuring its reproduction. However lacking a theoretical base that relates it to a real object of its own, geography is not a real science, but rather a by-product of various technical-administrative techniques, ideological techniques of social adaptation and reappropriation. In short, a theoretical ideology. Such a discourse may of course claim for itself a "scientific" status, since it uses method which are commonly called "scientific" (though defined independently of the specificity of their presumed objects). Althusser notes that a discourse, like geography, is not "like a house", "like a physical object", "in our case "space", when they are merely dealing with a certain given reality that is anyway disputed and torn between several competing 'sciences', a certain hegemony, have not yet constituted ideological facts and therefore not unified disciplines which in their present form cannot constitute "true" theoretical practices because most often they only have the unity of a "technical practice" (1969, p.172).

Marxist and geography

Given all the preceding comments let us take the argument one step further, and look at a particular problem tackled by some Marxists currently "working" (though obviously in a contradictory sense) within this bourgeois geography. We can look at the attempts as revealing and moving from "space" through "laws of uneven development" to "spatial patterns", "forms" or "processes". We can compare this to the dialectical process that Althusser notes, saying "like a house, like a physical object", in our case "space", when they are merely dealing with a certain given reality that is anyway disputed and torn between several competing 'sciences', a certain hegemony, have not yet constituted ideological facts and therefore not unified disciplines which in their present form cannot constitute "true" theoretical practices because most often they only have the unity of a "technical practice" (1969, p.172).

"Space", an abstraction, is argued produces spatial patterns by its own movement of auto-determined auto-genesis (uneven development). Such Hegelian logic is unsatisfactory. It is not the general concept of "space" which produces concrete patterns by auto-development but on the contrary it is the "concrete" (pre-developed concrete patterns which lead us to the abstract concept, "space"). However, that simple inversion of ideology, does not alone, Althusser argues, produce a science.

"A science is obtained on the condition that it is the ideology which the ideology believes that it is dealing with the real is abandoned, that is, by abandoning its ideological problematic... in another element", in the field of a new scientific problematic"

(Althusser, pp.192-3).
Now I have compressed a very complex process of Althusserian argumentation here, but I think it clearly illustrates the problems of those taking a concept, "space", defined by a particular problematic, geography, attempting still to work within the latter, yet at the same time trying to ask radical questions by invoking "determinate ideologues." Obviously then, this unproblematic intellectual somersault/high dive/pirouette all rolled into one! Its contradictory, scientifically meaningless ideological, and above all, non-Marxist, non-Marxist, non-Marxist, non-Marxist. So, "empty," dogmatic formulae to destroy the creative mood: not only that, they first destroy Marxism. Dogmatic Marxism is anti-Marxism.

Hence my plea for the "de-definition" and abandonment of a scientifically untenable position "Marxist hyphen Geography", historical/dialectical materialism for what would be a transcendental, materialist, such as Marx, transcend classical, economics, and the development of the science of society. Marxist-theoretical practice has not yet produced a science of "human development/environment" as a regional study of social formations.

"The Marxist theoretical practice of epistemology of the history of science, of the history of ideology, of the history of philosophy, of the history of art, has yet to be extended. Not that there are not Marxists who are working to extend these domains, have acquired much real experience there, but they do not have behind them the equivalent of Capital or the Revolutionary Practice of a Century of Marxists. Their practice is largely..."

Here is a rub in the contradiction in which self-proclaimed "Marxists" (geography) to a theoretical ideology (geography) produces nothing but a new meaningless name, that of Marxist Geography. "The application of the 'laws' of the dialectic..." spatial patterns let us say, "makes a lot of difference to the structure of the theoretical practice..." and a lot of difference to the structure of the theoretical practice..." (cf., pp. 549-560).

CONCLUSION

Marxism is a theory/science of the specific levels of human practice (economic practice, political practice, in fact, scientific practice) social formations, each of these levels is relatively autonomous, each presents us with different types of initial object or raw material, which are transformed into different types of products to the degree that
there are regional studies of those levels and practice, we can say those regions of Marxian are relatively autonomous. Outside of Marxian as the science of society are only the mathematical and physical sciences. Whether the convergence nor synthesis of the theoretical ideologies and geography can achieve such a coherent attempt to study the totality of social existence, whether they become adjectival "Marxist" disciplines or not, since they are scientifically incapable of sharing the openness of Marxism. However, to indicate that the transcendence of those domains or discourse to Marxism is needed, is not to achieve it. Goren Fisch's closing words of Science, class and society, the extent to which...[this]...prove(s) capable of realization will not depend on intra-scientific events alone. The rise and formation of the social sciences were determined by the class struggles of particular historical societies and will be their further development or repressed development. Thus the question of a future development of social sciences in the direction of historical materialism remains open -- above all to those of us who are committed to working for it" (p. 439).

***********

I personally think it is an enormous, and extraordinarily healthy step forward that we can publically review our work without fear. In attempting to reply to Dick's concern about my possible misrepresentation of his work and his need to answer comments like yours in the last RSS Newsletter, "Marxist-hyper-Geography" [from a personal communication] I hope that we have begun a fruitful interchange in which many may join. In my attempt to descriptify "space", and see it as an ideological concept within or without a "Marxist geography" I may have misunderstood or mangled Althusser, and have ended up mystifying myself. The importance being that I attempted a critical dialogue. I deliberately chose an Althusserian exposition because I know from conversations with Dick, that like myself, he is very sympathetic to that particular scientific account.

However, I must continually remind myself both in terms of personal critiques (excluding anti-critiques of one's own practice, like my "Human/Inhuman Geography"), and in critiques of the ideological and scientific practice of others that we should always be in mind Leibniz's warning that in personal development, "each form is the frozen temporary image of a process. Thus any work merely represents a staging point in the process, becoming, not a fixed goal".
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CHANGES IN NEWSLETTER EDITING, PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

Owing to the decline in numbers of active USG members in Vancouver, the AGM of the USG, which was held in Vancouver in May, decided to appoint Eric Sheppard as Newsletter co-coordinator, and to shift the final editing and production functions of the Newsletter to Minneapolis.

The address for the Newsletter co-coordinator is

Eric Sheppard
Department of Geography
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455 USA

The schedule for editing and publication of the newsletter in 1979 and 1980 (Volume 5) is given overleaf. Please send contributions to the appropriate addresses.

Details of the AGM and its decisions relating to other matters will appear in the next issue of the Newsletter.

ANNOUNCEMENT: USG (BRITISH ISLES) ANNUAL MEETINGS

The USG (British Isles section) will be organizing sessions at the Institute of British Geographers Annual Conference at Lancaster University, January 2 to 5, 1980. We expect to hold one 'official' session within the USG programme. In addition, we hope to have evening USG workshop sessions (and the USG (BI) AGM).

If you would like to organise a workshop, give a presentation, or have suggestions for the meeting, please contact

Jo Foor or Malcolm Forbes
26 Teesdale Road
Laytonstone
LONDON E11 1HQ (please use postcode to ensure delivery)

England
### Newsletter Publication Schedule

**Volume 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Editors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Aug 15 '79 | Mark Garner  
Department of Geography  
University of Wisconsin  
Madison WI 53706  
USA |
| 2     | Sept 1 '79  | Jo Foord  
26 Teamalve Road  
Leytonstone  
LONDON E11 1NG  
England  
(Use postcard to ensure delivery) |
| 3     | Dec 15 '79  | John Holmes  
Department of Geography  
Queen's University  
Kingston Ont.  
Canada |
| 4     | Mar 1 '80   | ?  
Not yet arranged - volunteers, please contact  
Eric Sheppard, Newsletter co-ordinator |

**USSG Textbook Project**

Last autumn, contributions were solicited for a proposed textbook that could be used to present a socialist alternative to mainstream geography. It was felt that this would be a politically important venture and one which could perhaps be carried out under the auspices of the USSG. The eventual deadline for manuscripts was March 31, 1979. Unfortunately, sufficient contributions were not forthcoming and this meant that the project would either have to be shelved or that the coordinators would be required to write most of the first draft. Eventually, it was decided that the former was the only reasonable course. The textbook project has been shelved indefinitely due to a lack of response by potential contributors.

We still remain committed to such a project in principle. It is politically vital that the growing number of socialist and other sympathetic teachers have an introductory text for use in the classroom. Therefore, we would ask that the USSG reaffirm its commitment to this project, again in principle, in the hope of succeeding at some later date.

Neil Smith  
Phil O'Keefe