In his journal entry for 22 January 1836, Charles Darwin wrote of the colony of New South Wales: "The whole population, poor and rich, are bent on acquiring wealth: amongst the higher orders, wool and sheep-grazing form the constant subject of conversation...with such habits, and without intellectual pursuits, it can hardly fail to deteriorate." Even at the time, Darwin's judgement was a little harsh. The colony's first privately owned newspaper, the Australian, had been founded in 1824, and its first library had been established in 1826. In 1830 Henry Davy's Quarterly Review had become the first Australian novel, and in 1835 E.H. Thomas' The Bard of the Rhine the first Australian play to be published in book form. The Sydney Theatre Royal had opened its doors in 1833 (and would close them again in 1838, let it be admitted). Far from deteriorating, as Darwin had anticipated, the colony's intellectual culture was to expand and grow. The Melbourne Argus was founded in 1846. The Universities of Sydney and Melbourne were inaugurated in 1852 and 1855 respectively.

By 1911, according to the Commonwealth Census, there were there, already, in the non-Aboriginal population, 3,843 priests and clergy; 2,771 authors, journalists and reporters; 297 university teachers; 30,304 other teachers; 4,784 artists, painters and sculptors, etc.; 9,453 musicians, composers, music teachers, etc.; 1,797 actors, actresses and circus performers; and 665 librarians. Seventy years later, the 1981 census discovered 11,029 priests and
clergy; 16,963 authors, journalists and related workers; 11,180 university teachers; 121,929 other post-primary teachers; 11,554 painters, sculptors and related artists; 8,524 musicians, vocalists and music teachers; 9,477 actors, announcers, dancers and related workers; and 6,529 professional librarians and archivists. Whatever other criticism might be levelled at the European settlement in Australia, as it entered its bicentennial decade, no one could deem it still devoid of intellectual pursuits.

Nonetheless, the word 'intellectual' has unfavourable connotations in Australian English. It does so for the good reason that it often smacks of elitism and for the bad reason that it excites suspicion amongst the opponents of reasoned social and political argument. 'Pseudo-intellectuals', 'so-called intellectuals', 'rabble intellectuals', and the like, are typically seen as impractical schemers guilty of the presumption that they are more intelligent than the rest of humanity. It's worth noting, however, that for all his condemnation towards the Australian colonists, these are not the senses in which Darwin himself used the term 'intellectual'. For him 'intellectual' meant more or less the same as 'intelligent'. This had been the word's dominant meaning from the fourteenth century until the early nineteenth. It was only in Darwin's own time that the word was first used to refer to a special kind of person—someone who 'thinks'. The problem with this usage should be obvious: we all think, and all our productive activities require the exercise of intelligence. Indeed, it is our capacity to think, amongst other things, that makes us human. To suggest that only intellectuals 'think' is to deny our common humanity.

There is, however, another, less elitist and even more modern sense of the term 'intellectual': an intellectual can be understood simply as someone who works at a particular type of job, that is, as someone whose business it is to produce or reproduce 'culture' in one way or another. Thus the word refers to all writers and journalists, actors and painters, priests and teachers, academics and publishers, no matter what their individual levels of 'intelligence' (whatever that means). It is this sense of the word that prompted my reference to the 1911 and 1981 censuses, and I will be using the word in this sense from now on.

The word 'radical', like 'intellectual', has a long and varied history. I use 'radical' here in its early nineteenth-century meaning, which became fashionable again in the 1950s and 1960s, as referring to any version of 'left-wing', socially critical politics. It should be stressed that the great movements of radical opinion have secured their support from much larger groups than the intellectu
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mobilization. Thus almost all radical movements have been obliged either to recruit members of the existing intelligentsia or to create entirely new intellectuals from within their own ranks. Magazines and newspapers provide the clearest instance of this affinity between intellectual life and radical politics. Since the early nineteenth century such publications have provided Australian intellectuals of all persuasions and inclinations with an absolutely vital means of circulating their cultural products. But radical movements, parties and sects have also used orations and newspapers to disseminate their own more expressly political products. Skills learnt in the one arena are thus transferable to the other. It is hardly surprising then, that some intellectuals might become radicals, and some radicals intellectuals.

It is difficult to speak of political radicals in Australia before the second third of the nineteenth century. Of course, both the Aborigines and the transported convicts sought to resist the new colonial order. But resistance is not radicalism. It is only in the middle of the century that radical democratic movements, such as those against transportation and in favour of suffrage reform, finally come into being. Peter Love discusses this early radicalism in the next volume of this history.

In almost all of these movements the typical intellectual figure was that of the middle-class professional who was also a radical journalist. The Republican John Dunmore Lang, for example, was a Presbyterian minister (until he was deposed from the Calvinist ministry in 1842) and parliamentarian; but he also owned and edited the Colonist from 1835 to 1940, the Colonial Observer from 1841 to 1847 and the Press in 1851, and contributed regularly and prolifically to these and other newspapers. His sometime disciple Daniel Demery was a lawyer and parliamentarian; but he was also a contributor to the People’s Advocate and Freeman’s Journal, owned and edited the Southern Cross during 1859–60 and edited the Victorian from 1862 to 1864.

As the century proceeded, the three major forms of political radicalism that were to influence twentieth-century Australian history began to take shape in socialism, feminism, and nationalism. Several chapters in the fourth volume of this history discuss these movements in detail. My main concern here is to trace the roles that radical intellectuals played within these movements.

The last two decades of the nineteenth century represent the point at which an emergent radical politics first found organizational expression. Much of the intellectual and moral power of this late nineteenth-century Australian radicalism arose from a
The early twentieth century witnessed a decline in the Australian radical movement, partly as a result of their own immediate successes. Patricracy persisted, but female suffrage had been won by 1908. Capitalism persisted, but Labor parties had been created in all states by 1905. Australia remained an imperial dominion, but in 1901 federation had been achieved. Both socialist and feminist agitators continued to press for their more long-term goals, but the mainstream of Australian radical politics coalesced around an increasingly conservative Labor Party. However, they weren't entirely marginalized. Vida Goldstein, the president of the feminist Women's Federal Political Association, polled well when she ran as an independent woman candidate for the Senate in 1910 and the House of Representatives in 1913 and 1914. And the new Victorian Socialist Party (V.S.P.), launched by Tom Mann in 1905, claimed 2,000 members in Melbourne alone within a couple of years.

Socialist and feminist radicalism continued to represent a significant but limited force; radical nationalism, by contrast, disappeared as an independent presence in Australian political life. This decline was not a direct consequence of the growing strength of the A.L.P. and of the way in which nationalism became incorporated into Labor ideology. The decline in radical nationalism also represented a real shift towards pro-imperial sentiment in Australia. From the beginning, Australian radical nationalism had been characterized by a strict anti-racism. The Bulletin represented an authentic voice when it opposed the 'cheap Chinaman' and the 'cheap nigger.' In 1905, the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War sent shock waves through the whole of Australian society. Race fears of a successful Asian military power played a crucial role in bringing about a renewed subordination of Australian nationalism to British imperialism. Australian nationalists increasingly looked, not to an independent anti-British republic, but to the need for imperial protection against Japan. Hence the
enthusiastic support for the empire during the First World War, shared by the Fisher Labor government, and by William Lane and Henry Lawson.

But the war also provided socialists and feminists with a renewed opportunity to expand and develop their political influence. Almost all Australian socialist organizations opposed the war from the very beginning, and one in particular, the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), played a vital role in general anti-war agitation and in the campaign against conscription. In July 1915, Tom Barker, the I.W.W.'s most effective public agitator, was fined £50 for publishing an anti-conscription poster; in May 1916 he was sentenced to twelve months jail under the War Precautions Act for publishing a Syd Nicholls anti-war cartoon. Two of the V.S.P.'s leading agitators, R.S. Ross and F.J. Riley, were central figures in the main anti-war coalition, the Australian Peace Alliance.

The women's movement split over the war. Vida Goldstein, who had become chairperson of the Australian Peace Alliance in 1914, led its radical wing into the new Women's Peace Army (W.P.A.), which she helped to found in 1915. The W.P.A. issued an anti-war 'Special Appeal by Women to Women'. So effective was Cecilia John's song 'I didn't raise my son to be a soldier' that it was banned under the War Precautions Act. Socialists, feminists, pacifists and Catholics banded together to defeat two successive conscription referenda in 1916 and 1917. In 1916 the A.L.P. itself split over conscription. The I.W.W. played a significant role in the general strike that paralysed much of New South Wales industry in 1917. The Women's Peace Army gave the strike its enthusiastic support, and one of its leaders, Adela Pankhurst, was jailed for her part in pro-strike agitation.

The war years represent the second great wave of radical agitation in Australia. Once again, radical agitation sought to combine ultimate ideals and immediate objectives. Once again, that combination was effected by radical intellectuals. Once again, too, the characteristic radical intellectual figure was that of the professional journalist. Tom Barker was full-time editor of the I.W.W.'s weekly newspaper Direct Action; R.S. Ross was full-time editor of the V.S.P.'s weekly Socialist (which had originally been edited by Tom Mann); Vida Goldstein was owner-editor first of the Women's Sphere, then of the Woman Voter; Adela Pankhurst edited the V.S.P. children's magazine, Draw; the indefatigable Bob Whapman edited the Australian Socialist Party's International Socialist up until the 1916 conscription referendum campaign.
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For some it was political activity itself that transformed them into journalists: just as Wimspear was by trade a miner, Tom Barker had worked as a farm labourer and tram conductor before being swept up into the full-time leadership of the I.W.W. But R.S. Ross, for example, was a professional journalist who had worked on the Barrier Truth and the Queensland Worker before moving to the Socialist, and would later own and edit Ross's Menalik. Whatever route had been taken to journalism, it remained the dominant profession of the radical intellectual.

One further parallel needs to be drawn between warring radicals, and that of the 1900s: in the aftermath of its success, the movement collapsed quite suddenly. In part, this was a result of the degree of state repression directed against the I.W.W. But the radicals' immediate successes, in defeating conscription, and in moving the A.L.P. to the left, were also ultimately important in deterring from their larger aspirations.

The 1920s saw an extraordinary collapse in radical political activity. The decade also witnessed three significant departures from Australia's shores. In 1921 Verne Gordon Childs, whose involvement in anti-war activity had cost him his tutorship at Sydney University, left for England. In 1926 the young Jack Lindsay, ambitious to establish himself as a poet, followed suit. Two years later, Christina Stead set sail. Childs and Lindsay would become Australia's two most distinguished Marxist scholars. Childs would occupy chair's of prehistoric archaeology at the universities of Edinburgh and London, and would be awarded honorary doctorates by Harvard and by Pennsylvania State University. Lindsay would acquire a formidable reputation as translator, classical scholar, biographer, novelist and critic, and would be awarded the Soviet Badge of Honour. Stead would combine radical politics with a literary career of considerable distinction, and would eventually receive the Patrick White Award. All three were exiles for most of their working lives. Childs until his retirement in 1957, Stead until 1974 and Lindsay permanently. Later generations of Australian radical intellectuals would learn to travel similar paths.

The 1920s, however, also marked the founding of the Communist Party of Australia, the organization that would dominate Australian radical politics from the 1930s until the 1960s. The Communist Party's novelty consisted above all in its status as the sole representative of Australian radicalism to the left of the A.L.P. For three decades virtually all non-Labor radical intellectuals were either Communist Party members or fellow-travellers or, at the very least, found their activity necessarily directed towards and linked with that of the Communist Party.

This was an almost unmitigated disaster for feminism. Almost all of the major Australian women writers of the 1930s were influenced by both feminism and socialism. But as the decade proceeded, their feminist interests became subordinated to the demands of Communist Party membership or fellow-travelling. Katharine Susannah Prichard had been a founder-member of the Communist Party, Jean Devanny joined in 1929, and Betty Richardson in 1935. Eleanor Dark, Marjorie Barnard and Flora Elder-shaw, Dymytha Cusack and Kylie Tennant were all involved in the Movement Against War and Fascism and in the Fellowship of Australian Writers, both of which were Communist Party front organizations. So too was the literary critic, Nettie Palmer, whose daughter Aliene served in Spain as a nurse with the International Brigade. Jean Devanny's political career front, the international form. A dedicated activist in the 1930s, she was expelled from the party in 1942 because of her feminist sexual politics. She was reinstated and guaranteed retrospective membership in 1944, resigned in 1950, but nonetheless continued virtually until her death in 1962 to seek party approval for her work.

For Australian socialism, the Communist achievement, represented a more ambiguous legacy. On the one hand, the party's authoritarian discipline was frequently directed at those questions of cultural policy that vitally concerned the radical intelligentsia itself. On the other, the extent of party organization permitted the creation of a whole range of alternative cultural institutions capable of sustaining an often very vital radical culture. The party maintained its own press: the national Workers' Weekly, which became Tribune in 1939, the Guardian in Victoria, the Queensland Guardian; the Red Star in Perth; and a number of union and front organization publications. Comrade Review, the party's theoretical monthly, was launched in 1934. The Writers' Art Clubs and the School of Modern Writers in Sydney, and the Writers' League in Melbourne, were Communist-inspired initiatives. So too was the New Theatre, founded in Sydney in 1932 and in Melbourne in 1936.

In 1943 the party launched Australian New Writing, edited by Prichard, George Farwell and Bernard Smith. Farwell would later proceed to a career as prolific author, broadcaster and freelance journalist. Smith would later become Director of the Power Institute of Fine Arts, and Professor of Contemporary Art at the University of Sydney. Realist Writers' Groups were established in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane, and a Studio at Realist Art in
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Sydney. Frank Hardy's *Power without Glory*, almost certainly the most influential novel ever written by an Australian Community, was first published in Melbourne in 1956. Even as long as 1957, when the political mood had swung sharply against the Communist Party, the Melbourne Realist Writers' Group was still able to initiate a new journal, the *Redlist Writer*. Edited by Bill Wadding and later by Stephen Murray-Smith, it eventually became *Opus*. The same year witnessed the founding of the Australian Book Society. Prominent Communist or fellow-travelling intellectuals also included the painter Noel Counihan and writers Alan Marshall, John Morrison, Jadah Waten, Eric Lambiet, Jack Bendr, Dorothy Hewett, Ralph de Boissiere, Helen Palmer, David Martin, Vic Williams and Mona Brand.

Between an international, imperial conservativism on the one hand, and an international, pro-Soviet radicalism on the other, there remained little room for Australian radical nationalism in the 1930s. But in 1936 P. R. Stephensen published *The Foundations of Culture in Australia*, an essay that rehashed many earlier radical nationalist themes. Its nationalism was cultural rather than political, however, and it represented an isolated personal voice rather than a community of opinion such as had sustained the *Paladin*. Stephensen himself went on to found the semi-factional *Australia First Movement*. His arrest and internment as a possible enemy sympathizer during the Second World War made it clear in retrospect just how socially isolated 1930s radical nationalism had been. Stephensen did nonetheless exercise some influence on the poet Rex Ingamells, whose *Conditional Culture*, published in 1938, provided the inspiration for the nationalist *Jindivikabob* movement. But again, *Jindivikabob* politics took a mainly cultural form, and Ingamells too flirted with the *Australia First* movement.

The A.I.P.'s return to government in 1941 made it possible to redefine the Second World War as a national people's war rather than a British imperial war. Thus a more viable form of radical nationalist politics again became possible. The A.I.P. itself, and the Curtin and Chifley governments, provided radical autonomy with its central political medium during the 1940s. As an intellectual current, however, 1940s nationalism had a more specific function: firstly, around the group associated with the Department of Postwar Reconstruction, notably H. V. Evatt, J. C. Coombs and Lloyd Ross; and secondly, around the journal *Manapin* (originally *Manapin Papers*). *Manapin* was edited by Clem Christensen and had been founded in Brisbane in 1940, but moved to Melbourne in 1945. Its prominent contributors were to include Marjorie Bar...
The social composition of the 1940s radical intelligentsia was thus diverse. This is clearly true of the nationalists; Ewen was a lawyer and Coombs an economist; Christensen and Fitzpatrick were journalists; Ward and Serle became academics; Nettie and Phillips and Eldershaw were teachers. Barney a librarian. Many of the Communist and fellow-travelling intellectuals were drawn from a similar range of professions: Frischard had worked as a teacher and a journalist before becoming a full-time writer and political activist; Cunack, Williams, Waring and Helen Palmer also worked as teachers; Roland, Wran and Martin were professional journalists; Cunin was a newspaper cartoonist; Brand a social worker; Smith and Murray-Smith became academics; Marshall had been an accountant; Dark and Lambert were professional writers.

But the Communist Party also functioned as a vehicle for working-class political and cultural aspirations: Hardy was a factory hand and seaman before trying his hand as a journalist and writer; Farwell a newsreader; McCracken an administrator; Devaney was a working-class battler; and Hewett, though from a middle-class background, worked as a factory hand before returning to university at the age of thirty-seven, eventually becoming a tutor and later a professional writer.

The 1950s were endured as a long, slow agony by the organised Australian left. The central experience of the decade for the left was that of the continuing political impotence of the A.L.P. and the decline and disintegration of the Communist Party. Labor lurches from electoral disaster to electoral disaster, while Communist Party membership fell drastically. The 1950s were also, however, the decade in which the fate of the radical intelligentsia first became disentangled from that of the wider radical movement. Whatever the dismal histories of the Labor and Communist parties, the 1950s and 1960s were a period of remarkable achievement, both individual and collective, for the radical intelligentsia.


from 1953 onwards, and became a professor in 1976. Even the Arena group, though far less successful within the academic career structure than either the radical nationalist cultural critics or the labour historians, found eventual acceptability within higher education. The two main authors of the Arena thesis, Geoff Sharp and Doug White, held senior lectureships at Melbourne and La Trobe universities respectively. Thus the university system came to provide the radical intelligentsia with a relatively safe base from which to criticize the conservatism of the wider Australian society.

This intellectual radicalism might well have remained confounded to the higher reaches of higher education had it not been for the Menzies government's decision in 1965 to commit Australian troops to Vietnam. The 'Sixties'-understood as a political and cultural event rather than as a chronological measure—began with that decision and ended ten years later with the dismissal of the Whitlam Labor government. The 'Sixties' is, of course, a loose catch-all phrase referring to a number of quite distinct elements:
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A burgeoning youth culture (at its cruelest, sex and drugs and rock-and-roll); the rebirth of an independent women's movement; an unprecedented wave of working-class industrial militancy; a heightening of popular political expectations that precipitated the ALP into government in 1972. Centrally, however, the 'Sixties' meant the war in Vietnam and the world-wide protest movement in opposition to it.

The anti-war movement was never merely a student movement. Nor were the university campuses perhaps the single most important centre of anti-war sentiment and organization. The universities provided a distinctly receptive and sympathetic social milieu for the developing 'New Left', for 'second-wave feminism', and for the new look Whitlamite Labor Party. The anti-war radicals organized themselves in ALP-sponsored groups such as the Vietnam Day Committee and the Youth Campaign Against Conscription. But as the anti-war movement developed, so too did new forms of radical politics.

The socialist wing of the movement was influenced variously by libertarianism, Maoism, Trotskyism and the western Marxism being imported into the English-speaking world by the British journal New Left Review. The Communist Party redirected its newspaper Tribune towards the campuses; and its theoretical journal was relaunched as Australian Left Review in the summer of 1966. Australian Left Review published Alastair Davidson's early work on the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, which provided an important Australian introduction to one of the key western Marxist thinkers.

The main vehicle for the politics of the New Left was provided, however, by the student press itself, by National U, Let's Live, Farrago, Homi Saii and Tharunka. In 1970, the Trotskyist-inclined Socialist Youth Alliance, which published Direct Action, was founded in Sydney, and the Maoist-inclined Worker-Student Alliance in Melbourne. New socialist 'parties', and newspapers produced with the skills learnt on the student press, followed in quick succession. In 1972 a new revolutionary Marxist journal, Intervention, was launched in Melbourne by a group of young graduate students much impressed by the work of the French philosopher Louis Althusser. At this stage, the New Left remained determinedly internationalist in its politics. By far the most influential of the various New Left writings, Humphrey McQueen's A New Britain, first published in 1970, was precisely an indictment of the Old Left's radicalism for its complicity with both racism and nationalism.
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Second-wave feminism also drew much of its support and inspiration from the campus milieu. This was true of both the more militant Women's Liberation groups and the more moderate Women's Electoral Lobby. Techniques first acquired in student journalism were put to work to produce *Refuge* in 1971, *Refactory Girl* in the summer of 1972—5, *Success Women*, *WomenSpeak* and *Heate All* in 1975. In 1975, Germaine Greer, an Australian feminist teaching in England since 1967, published *The Female Eunuch*, which became one of the international women's movement's key texts. Anne Summers, a founder member of the *Refactory Girl* collective, teaching at the University of Sydney, published her *Diamond Whites and God's Politic* in 1975. The same year witnessed the publication by Penguin of a collection of essays edited by Jan Mercer entitled *The Other Half: Women in Australian Society*. Like the New Left, second-wave feminists saw themselves very much as part of an international and internationalist political movement. At least one other Australian feminist, Diane Spencer, would later repeat Greer's success in the international movement.

Radical nationalist ideas were taken up mainly by the Labor Party itself. In opposition, the A.L.P. left attempted to define the Vietnam War as an 'American' war. In government, after 1972, the party sought not only to 'lay back the farm' from foreign ownership, but also to promote a national 'cultural renaissance' centred in particular on the cinema industry. From 1973, however, the Maoist too began to adopt an increasingly nationalist position, arguing the need for a struggle for 'independence and socialism'. Ironically, McQueen had himself been converted to Maoist nationalism: hence the toruous retractions in the introduction to the 1975 edition of *A New Brumalia*.

Campus radicalism, both socialist and feminist, clearly stood at some distance from the A.L.P. for much of the sixties. The title of *From Tyrodelism to Tyrodelate: the New Labor Government in Australia* published in 1974 by two Maoist-inclined lecturers in Politics at the University of Adelaide, Robert Folley and Bruce McFarlane, speaks for itself. There can be little doubt, nonetheless, that the radical nationalism of the early 1960s and the later Sixties radicalism both had some considerable impact on the A.L.P., forcing it firstly to the left, and secondly into governmental. Nor can there be much doubt that the Whitlam government really did implement a number of the key elements in the radical programme: Australian withdrawal from Vietnam; the abolition of conscription and a general amnesty for draft dodgers; equal pay for women, initially in the public service, and later in theory across the work-force; an injection of funds into both higher education and the culture industries. Certainly, when the Government eventually dismissed the Labor government, the radical intelligentsia had little doubt as to where its loyalties and interests lay.

The transformation of the universities from relatively secluded courses of learning into sites of real political conflict, and of successful radical political mobilisation, seemed to confirm the importance of the academic intelligentsia's social role. The older generation of radical academics also provided the younger generation of student radicals with peculiarly accessible role models. Whilst a great many radicals hoped to take the 'revolution' off campus, a great many others aspired to promotion within the academy, from student radical to radical academic. In a number of university departments, Politics at Monash and Adelaide, Economics at Monash and Adelaide, and the A.N.U., Sociology at Flinders and, later, Macquarie, radicals had acquired real influence and hence some real powers of academic patronage. In the year of the Whitlam government's election, John Playford, a lecturer in Politics at Adelaide, and Doug Kirchner, a philosophy graduate and tutor from Melbourne University, edited *Australian Capitalism: Towards a Socialist Critique*. In the year of its dismissal, Ted Wheelwright and Ken Buckley, associate professors of Economics and Economic History respectively at the University of Sydney, published the first volume in a series of Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism. The overwhelmingly male contributors to the two books are, in effect, the Sixties radicals who took honours in socialism, and their teachers.

As with the radicalisms of the 1890s and the First World War, the very success of the Sixties movement was in part its undoing. The fall of the Whitlam government compounded the problem, however. On the one hand, it inspired renewed loyalties to the defeated Labor Party. On the other, it produced a more general fear of the rightward drift in Australian society and this, in turn, encouraged the left to lower its own political expectations. The problem was further compounded by the movement's astonishingly narrow social base. Sooner or later most students had to complete their studies; and most find it simply impractical to continue to live the life of an off-campus activist. Former student radicals graduated into a whole range of 'middle-class' professions—teaching, the public service, social work, and burglary—and where they have subsequently helped to provide white-collar unionism with
the little industrial militancy it possesses. But those who continued to be actively engaged in the process of radical cultural creation were overwhelmingly concentrated at higher and further education, and in a few related areas such as union or government-sponsored research work. What remained on campus, then, was an academic rather than a student radicalism, increasingly isolated from any wider audience.

Just as in the late 1950s and early 1960s, so too in the late 1970s and in the 1980s, the fate of the radical intelligentsia became divorced from that of any broader radical movement. To a remarkable extent, radical academia simply went ahead with its collective and individual career plans. In 1970 an abortive general strike failed to dissuade the new conservative government from dismantling Medibank; it was also the year in which Bruce McFarlane was appointed Professor of Politics at Adelaide and Bob Connell, a radical from Flinders, Professor of Sociology at Macquarie. But three main political options seem to have been available to the radical intelligentsia: a much closer relationship to the radical nationalism of the Labor left; a retreat into the slipshod isolation of a purely theoretical radicalism; and a turn to the Green politics of the new environmentalist movements. Socialists and feminists opted for all three.

The Labor nationalist option was that chosen by both McFarlane and Connell. Such a project clearly underlies Connell's Riding Class, Riding Culture, published in 1977; and also much of the work of the Australian Political Economy Movement, which launched the Journal of Australian Political Economy in the same year. In 1980 Connell and the historian Terry Irving produced their Class Structure in Australian History. Also in 1980, Penguin published Australia and World Capitalism, a collection of essays edited by Ted Wheenwright, Greg Cough, another Sydney economist, and Ted Whilshire, a research officer with the metalworkers' union, which included contributions by both Connell and McFarlane. A successor volume, Crouching and Wheelwright's Australian: A Client State brought out by Penguin in 1982, retained the radical nationalist case in the bluest of terms. McQueen's later work, though clearly more radical in intent, and also more distant from the preoccupations of the academy (McQueen abandoned an academic career to become a professional writer), nonetheless shares the assumptions of an essentially radical nationalism world view.

Even the historian Stuart Macintyre, one of the founders-editor's of Intervention and one-time scourge of Old Left historiography, produced in his 1985 Winners and Losers a partial rehabilitation and...
The third available option, that of Green politics, was clearly the most activist. In the years after the fall of the Whitlam government, the movement Against Uranium Mining (M.A.U.M.) and Friends of the Earth (F.O.E.) came to provide the only really effective mobilising centre for any kind of radical opposition to the new conservatism. In 1976, F.O.E. converted its internal newsletter *Chain Reaction* into a much more polished and professional magazine aimed at a wider audience. People for Nuclear Disarmament (P.N.D.), founded in Melbourne in 1981, organised the largest political demonstration held in the city since the Vietnam War. In 1984 the Victorian Association for Peace Studies relaunched its journal *Peace Studies* in magazine format. Very professionally produced, with the assistance of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, the magazine was awarded the United Nations Association Media Peace Prize for that year. In the same year, conservationist opposition to the Tasmanian Liberal government's plans to dam the Franklin River had a substantial, and perhaps decisive, effect on the outcome of the federal election. Green issues were taken up by the A.C.T.U., by the Australian Democrats, by the short-lived Nuclear Disarmament Party (one of whose candidates was elected to the Senate), and by the A.L.P. in opposition if not in government.

Socialists and feminists were able to point to capitalism and patriarchy as the ultimate sources of environmental despoliation and nuclear madness, and both could find reasonably sympathetic audiences within the Green movement. But Green concerns were nonetheless both new and distinct. The Greens movement's social base, like that of the movement against the Vietnam War, extended into the more radical unions and the more progressive fragments of the business classes (Dick Smith, for example), but remained centred on the cultural work-force: priests, teachers, artists, musicians (notably Midnight Oil's Peter Garrett) and academics. Again radical academics assumed a role disproportionate to their numbers (although it is worth recalling from the 1981 census that there are more university academics than either priests or musicians). Jim Falk, a former Monash student activist, now Associate Professor of History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Wollongong, published his extremely influential *Taking Australia off the Map* in 1983. Jo Camilleri, Senior Lecturer in Politics at La Trobe University, and author of *The State and Nuclear Power* (1984), was the first and most successful convert of P.N.D. in Victoria. Here, however, the presence of a wider...
material interests. The Labor governments of the 1980s had certainly not brought social reforms; they had, however, apparently bought the social reforms. Doubtless, the radical intelligentsia displayed no greater capacity for vanity or hypocrisy than did other social groups. But, as a group, it is both small and articulate. Its activity has provided Labor with an incentive to silence it, in size with the possibility that such silence might be purchased relatively cheaply.

The radical intelligentsia of the mid-1980s was almost certainly larger and more comfortable than any that had previously existed in Australia: university professors were tenured for life and in 1987 were paid around $60,000 a year. But for all its size and its economic security, it was quite incapable of mounting any kind of radical challenge to the A.L.P. This inactivity arose in part from the intelligentsia's isolation within higher education, and in part from its ultimate dependency on continued government patronage of the educational system and the culture industries.

Of the three major versions of intellectual radicalism—socialism, feminism and nationalism—only the latter seemed to have any real influence on Labor policy. But Labor's radical nationalism was a great deal more nationalist than radical. This is hardly surprising. For nationalism could only retain a genuinely radical content as long as Australia continued to be a British colony. Once federation had been achieved, nationalism became a fundamentally conservative social cement, by which subordinate groups were pacified into the belief that they share some common identity with their oppressors and exploiters. This is not to suggest that the radical intelligentsia's commitments to nationalism were mere self-deception. Quite the contrary. Nationalist ideologies were first invented and propagated by professional intellectuals, and of all the classes and groups in our society intellectuals have the most to gain from nationalism. Nationalism functions as a kind of cultural tariff, protecting home-grown intellectual products from foreign competition. As a belief system, nationalism is of little direct material value to any of the major groups in contemporary society (although its implicit general conservatism does tend to buttress each and every aspect of the social status quo). It is of very real value, however, to intellectuals confronted by overseas competitors. Given that Australia shares a common language with the United States and Britain, two major centres of experienced-oriented cultural production, its intelligentsia seems highly likely to continue its attempts to secure such tariffs, very probably in the name of 'anti-imperialism'.

Racial intellectuals: an unacknowledged legislature?

Socialism seems today to be the least healthy of our three radicalisms. Historically, socialist theories were of two main forms: those which hoped to replace capitalism from below by the rule of the working class; and those which hoped to replace it from above by the government of experts. It was the first of these two versions that made of socialism an enormously influential popular political belief in a world scale in the years before the First World War. But it was the latter version, in either its Fabian or its Communist variant, that tended to appeal to the more professionalised, in other words the more expert, sections of the intelligentsia. The Australian radical intelligentsia no longer appears to believe in its own capacity for government or in that of the working class (indeed, many 'socialist' intellectuals dispute the very existence of a working class). Doubtless, the socialist intelligentsia will continue to produce elegant works of social theory and empirically rich studies in people's history. But if a socialist politics is ever to be reconstructed in Australia, then it will almost certainly have to be done from outside the intelligentsia.

Contemporary Australian feminism manages to sustain an almost plausible radical social purpose. The feminist intelligentsia participates, at least residually, in the same kind of oppression as other women. The increasing professionalism of Equal Opportunity officialdom and feminist academia suggests, however, that feminism too may decline into self-serving social irrelevance. In the early 1980s it seemed possible that the Green option might remobilise and re-moralise radical academia, both socialist and feminist, for here were general issues of human survival which impinged on the life styles of everyone. Even here, though, the habitual academic response to political problems came to the fore: that of creating and securing funding for research centres and teaching courses.

It is difficult to predict the future with any degree of certainty, but we can safely say this: If the inequalities of race, class and gender that exist in Australia and the even more horrific inequalities that exist internationally are ever to be reduced, let alone eliminated, there will not be brought about by specialist groups of radical intellectuals. Rather, it will be achieved by the efforts of those masses of people who themselves pay the price, in human misery and suffering, for the continued existence of structured social inequality. Professional intellectuals might be of some assistance. But the intelligentsia's development into a significantly privileged new class within late capitalist society makes it unsuitable for the role it has taken upon itself, that of guarantor of the
values of liberty and equality, fraternity and sisterhood. If the tree of liberty is to be tended here in Australia, it will require firmer hands than these.