



**CHILDHOOD AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION IN SOUTH
AUSTRALIA:
A CULTURAL-POLITICAL ANALYSIS**

ALBERTUS WIGMAN

awarded 21.11.89

**DISCIPLINE OF ANTHROPOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE**

Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
Abstract	v
Author's Statement	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
 <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	 1
 <u>PART A: HEGEMONY, BIOPOWER AND THE PRODUCTION OF CIVILIZED COLONIES</u>	
 INTRODUCTION	 9
 <u>CHAPTER 1: GRAMSCI AND FOUCAULT - TWO THEORIES OF BOURGEOIS HEGEMONY</u>	 12
 <u>CHAPTER 2: THE INCITEMENT TO SELF-INTEREST - DONZELLOT ON THE SOCIAL</u>	 43
 <u>CHAPTER 3: SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION, EDUCATION AND HEGEMONY</u>	 83
I: Introduction	83
II: Wakefield and Systematic Colonization	87
III: Wakefield's Political Philosophy	101
IV: The Yeoman Ideal	111
V: Civilization, the Suffrage and Education	116

PART B: THE SOCIAL CULTURE OF CHILDHOOD

INTRODUCTION	123
<u>CHAPTER 4: FATHERS, MASTERS AND CHILDREN</u>	125
<u>CHAPTER 5: COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL</u>	170
I: Introduction	170
II: State Compulsory Education, 1871-1900	174
III: The New Education, 1900-1920	188
IV: Contract and Tutelage	201
V: The Social Question - Poverty and Relief	203
VI: Feminism, Child-Saving and Boarding Out	220
VII: The Street Children Campaign, 1890-1915	232
VIII: Conclusion	244
<u>CHAPTER 6: SECONDARY EDUCATION AND THE NATURALIZATION OF ADOLESCENCE</u>	256
I: Introduction	256
II: G. Stanley Hall	259
III: State Secondary Education and Meritocracy	271
IV: Women's Education in the Late 19th Century	274
V: The Early Years of State High Schools	277
VI: Normalization and the Colleges	286
VII: The Limits of Homogenization	294
VIII: Mass Secondary Education	315
IX: The Comprehensive Coeducational High School	329
<u>CHAPTER 7: YOUTH SUBCULTURES AND SUBTERRANEAN VALUES</u>	344
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	388
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	400

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE I:</u> Occupations of 5-14 and 15-20 Year-Olds South Australia, 1891	161
<u>TABLE II:</u> Outdoor Rations Issued to Various Categories of Recipient, South Australia, Year Ended 30th June 1882	209
<u>TABLE III:</u> Total Full-Time Secondary Students in South Australia, 1944-1987, Government and Non-Government Schools	317
<u>TABLE IV:</u> Percentage of Age-Group at School at Census Dates, 1911-1981, South Australia	319
<u>TABLE V:</u> Apparent Retention Rates to Year 12 in South Australian State Schools, 1949-1987, Males and Females	340
<u>TABLE VI:</u> Percentage of People Ever Married, Australia, 1891-1971	359

ABSTRACT

The thesis has a dual intent, reflected in the division into Part A and Part B. Firstly, it seeks to contribute to a critically oriented anthropological theory of Western capitalist societies, through exploring and developing the work of Foucault and Donzelot at an abstract level. Secondly, it uses these and other concepts to analyze the culture of childhood and education in South Australia, focusing on the transition since 1875 from child and adolescent labour to increasingly long periods of formal schooling. I look at the implications of this transition in terms of the relations between childhood, familialism and the state.

I argue that a number of tendencies which are conventionally seen as in contradiction with the family or as aspects of its decline are in fact constitutive of the family in its particular twentieth century form - namely, state intervention, feminism and youth subcultures. Childhood in this cultural context is defined simultaneously in terms of a private sphere of domestic social relations and a group of publicly sanctioned educative and hygienic norms. I see these two aspects as acting in concert rather than in contradiction.

The thesis critically examines a wide range of relevant literature relating to South Australia and Australia as well as to other capitalist countries. Important criticisms are made of much of this literature, which includes some of the most influential work in the field, and the value of my own alternative perspective is highlighted in the process. The thesis has major implications for anthropology and other social science disciplines, as well as for some important debates outside of the academic context.

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any University. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously written or published by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

I consent to the thesis being made available for photocopying and loan if accepted for the award of the degree.

Albertus Wigman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research on which this thesis is based was supported by a Commonwealth Postgraduate Research Grant. In the later stages of the project, I was supported by tutoring work in the Department (now Discipline) of Anthropology at the University of Adelaide. I am grateful for both of these opportunities.

I would like to thank all the staff and students of the Anthropology Department who have contributed ideas and suggestions for the thesis, either directly or indirectly. My chief debt is to my supervisors, Adrian Peace, Michael Roberts and Roy Fitzhenry. The last-named in particular has made many valuable comments, suggestions and criticisms; I have also benefited from my association with him as a tutor in his second year course.

Bruce Kapferer provided much of my original enthusiasm for anthropology as an undergraduate and honours student. Michael Muetzelfeldt first drew my attention to what has subsequently developed into a major part of the thesis - the idea that the pursuit of self-interest in capitalist societies functions as a means of domination. Finally, Ian Davey provided me with some valuable suggestions and references.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a political anthropology of education and childhood in South Australia. It revolves around the interplay between compulsory education and child/adolescent labour, and how this interplay helps to constitute current social definitions of childhood and adolescence. The focus is on state compulsory education (introduced in South Australia in 1875), although there is some consideration of private schooling insofar as this is relevant to my argument.

A central aspect of the thesis is the transition between a situation where child and adolescent labour was routine and accepted, to one where child labour is illegal and abhorrent to the majority of people. Childhood in this latter context is defined in terms of a combination of: (1) compulsory formal education in schools; and (2) involvement in a private domestic setting stripped of any direct master/servant connotations in the relations between parents and children, and ideally characterized by mutually loving and caring sentiments.

The main aspects of this transition can be dated in South Australia as the period between two Education Acts: that of 1875 establishing a system of compulsory education between the ages of 7 and 13 years, and that of 1915 which made education compulsory on every school day and hence further restricted the possibility of child/adolescent labour.

I am not simply trying to document this transition. Rather I am using it as an empirical benchmark through which to build a set of interconnected arguments concerning the relations between childhood, education, familialism, and the state in twentieth century South Australia.

The later history of state education in South Australia is also traced, particularly secondary education. The length of compulsory and/or normative schooling has gradually increased in the 20th century, culminating in the recent endorsement of education to Year 12 for all young people as a national priority. This extension of the period of secondary education represents a further institutionalization of formal education as the defining characteristic of childhood/adolescence in South Australian culture, and hence forms another aspect of my empirical focus.

The thesis relies mainly on written sources, of which I have selectively used a wide variety. The primary sources include diaries, reminiscences, biographies, reports and minutes of royal commissions and other parliamentary papers, Education Department reports and publications (including the Education Gazette), newspaper accounts, and some archival materials. In addition I have used a large number of secondary sources relating to South Australia and elsewhere, and a wide range of theoretical texts.

The analytical framework of the thesis is derived from the work of Michel Foucault and Jacques Donzelot, particularly the latter's book "The Policing of Families" (1979a). Selected aspects of their work are considered in Part A of the thesis. These chapters introduce certain ideas which I develop in other contexts in Part B, but they also represent a separate study in their own right. They attempt to explore Foucault's notion of biopower as a distinctive pattern of power relations in Western culture - one which allows a greater penetration of power into the social body as compared with earlier monarchical forms, and which hence gives our culture a distinctively well-policed character.

Chapter 1 looks directly at Foucault, and tries to situate him in relation to Marxism and to Marxist-influenced accounts of the social control functions of education. As part of this, I use Gramsci's "Prison Notebooks", for a number of reasons. Gramsci's concept of hegemony has been the starting point for many Marxist or Marxist-influenced accounts of childhood/education, and provides a useful basis for discussing these accounts. More generally, Gramsci provides a sophisticated and non-reductionist version of Marxism which has many merits of its own. My discussion particularly focuses on his concept of the integral bourgeois state, which anticipates Foucault's analysis of biopower. My main purpose in discussing Gramsci, however, is to use him as a foil to bring out Foucault's critique of Marxism, a critique largely left implicit by Foucault himself.

Part A thus represents a contribution to the development of critical theory within anthropology and sociology, one which is sympathetic to the problems and questions raised by Marxism while also being critical of this perspective itself and of some of its applications within the sociology of education and childhood.

Chapter 2 explores aspects of the work of Donzelot (1979a) in a similar light, with critical comments on Marxism, as well as feminism. As with Marxism, my critique of feminism is not intended as a radical departure from the issues and problems raised by feminist scholars, but as a different way of tackling these same issues.

The chapter provides a grounding for my extensive use of Donzelot in Part B, but it also develops the analysis introduced in Chapter 1. I use Donzelot to construct an argument about the role of individual self-interest as a positive integrating factor in our culture, in opposition to the "repressive hypothesis" (Foucault, 1981) of both Marxism and feminism. Biopower

mobilizes this self-interest and meshes it with broader interests (of employers, of the nation state, etc.). Donzelot's concept of "the social" is introduced to elaborate this argument.¹ The social is a particular example of biopower in relation to the twentieth century culture of education, childhood and familialism. As Donzelot says, the social is a hybrid sector, simultaneously public and private, and helps to establish a functional circuit between the two spheres. Through the dual mechanism of contract and tutelage, it both valorizes the private pursuit of self-interest and provides sanctions to be used against those who are unwilling or incapable of playing this game.

The introduction and extension of compulsory education is vital to Donzelot's argument, but it is not addressed by him in any detail (nor is education discussed in a systematic way by Foucault). The thesis as a whole attempts to explore this area in greater detail, using models suggested by Foucault and Donzelot.

The third and final chapter of Part A sets the stage for this process, as well as further developing the argument integral to this first part. I use the writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield on systematic colonization to study aspects of early South Australian political culture. This political culture provides clues to the emergence of compulsory education as a project of reform, clues which are important in understanding its eventual institutionalized form.

Wakefield's civilizing project can be compared with the "micropower" of Foucault - power which penetrates into the mundane, everyday realities of the mass of the population. Wakefield envisaged three sources of such micropower - the competition between small, equivalent economic units in a

1. As will become apparent, I use "the social" in the specialized, technical sense developed by Donzelot. Consequently I have tried to limit my use of the word "social" in its looser, more normal sense(s) as much as possible.

free market situation, a system of local government based on direct face-to-face contact between elected representatives and their constituents, and the family, which he saw as a refining and civilizing influence. Wakefield's project of producing civilized colonies through the application of these micropowers can be used to elucidate the nature of biopower as discussed by Foucault and Donzelot. It also provides an introduction to Part B of the thesis, where I take up the transformative impact of compulsory education on familialism and family-state relations in South Australia.

Part B is the more empirical section of the thesis, but it is not simply the application of the theory developed in Part A to a pre-given set of data. Rather it is a further exploration and elaboration of this theory using more detailed concepts and paying closer attention to the specificities of South Australian culture. It is this theory which has guided my selection and use of particular empirical materials.

As noted above, there are two major sequences of events I am concerned with - sequences which are closely related to each other. The first is the introduction and consolidation of compulsory primary education between 1875 and 1915; the second is the emergence and extension of mass secondary education from the 1950's until the present day. Together these sequences define a new culture of childhood and education, one quite specific to twentieth century liberal capitalist societies (in opposition, for example, to the views of Pollock, 1983).

Previewing my conclusions, one of the major arguments is that state compulsory education does not act in contradiction to the definition of the family as a private and independent haven, as is often asserted (by Reiger, 1985, for example). Rather these two things are both part of the same configuration, which I analyse in terms of Donzelot's notion of the hybrid

public/private sphere of the social. I argue that state compulsory education and more diffusely the family itself partakes of a similar hybrid character.

In like fashion, I argue that youth subcultures - which I see as intimately linked with the age-graded character of education - are a constitutive feature of modern familialism, rather than being movements which stand in opposition to the family and which threaten its integrity. There is some primary evidence presented in relation to youth subcultures in South Australia, but the arguments here are mainly interpretive and take issue with some of the leading texts on youth subcultures.

These arguments are used as a springboard to critically examine recent Australian debates over extended secondary education, youth unemployment and related issues. I argue that increased length of schooling has been used as a way to "solve" youth unemployment, often in opposition to the desires of young people themselves for adult status and participation in adult affairs. The taken-for-grantedness of the particular, historically emergent culture of childhood and education described in the thesis provides the conditions favouring this "solution".

I will make a few preliminary comments here to situate my work in relation to some influential approaches. My work differs from many other accounts of education in that it takes as a central theme the relations between education and other social institutions. An adequate anthropological understanding of education in my view can not be gained by a purely "internal" analysis which focuses on education as a neatly defined and demarcated institution. Such approaches trade on members' understandings of the world and uncritically incorporate these understandings within their analytical structure (Bittner, 1965). They tend to take for granted what must be explained from an anthropological perspective - namely the constitution of

education as a major institutional complex within our culture, composed as a totality by both "external" as well as "internal" relations.

Even more, however, I am opposed to the meliorist view which sees the history of education in terms of the evolutionary march of progress away from the bad old days of child labour and illiteracy towards an increasingly enlightened education which contributes to a more egalitarian society. As will become apparent later, I do acknowledge the importance of this discourse of liberation associated with progressive education, but I do not uncritically accept the terms in which it interprets the past and projects a developing future. In fact, this discourse is one of the things which I set out to analyze. The perspective developed takes as problematic the liberating aspects of (extended) education, and examines this liberation as imbricated in a new set of power relations definitive of modern society. I argue that it is through the discourse of liberation that this new set of power relations takes hold.

My analysis is simultaneously cultural and political. It is cultural in the sense that it focuses on the constitution of education as a major site of discourse/practice in our society, and on its relationships with other major sites; it is political in the sense that I am concerned with how this constitutive process is simultaneously the constitution of a particular network of power relations ramifying through all these sites.

A brief chapter-by-chapter summary follows.

Chapters 1 and 2 systematically discuss the work of Foucault and Donzelot respectively, comparing this work with other approaches, particularly Marxism, and developing an argument about the nature of biopower. Chapter 1 contains a long discussion of Gramsci as part of this comparative exercise.

Chapter 3 is built up around the writings of Wakefield, particularly his stress on the yeoman ideal of thrifty and independent small farmers. It sets up the theme of laissez faire versus state intervention in terms of the general history of South Australia and relates it to the work of Foucault and Donzelot. This general theme is developed in Part B of the thesis in the more specific context of the relation between state intervention in the field of education and the definition of the family as an autonomous private domain.

Chapter 4 provides information on and illustrations of child and adolescent labour in late 19th century South Australia, contrasting the yeoman ethic of education-through-labour with the model of formal education in school.

Chapter 5 traces the entrenchment of this latter model in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and the implications of this in terms of the changing nature of familialism and family-state relations.

Chapter 6 covers the history of state secondary education in South Australia and how this shapes 20th century understandings of adolescence as a social category. An important element is the work of the turn-of-the-century American psychologist and educationist, G. Stanley Hall, whose writings are used to examine the general significance of adolescence in our culture.

Chapter 7 discusses youth subcultures and relates this discussion (as well as that in previous chapters) to recent debates about secondary education, youth unemployment, and other issues. In this way it attempts to link together the various strands of the thesis in a critical understanding of the present situation.

PART A: HEGEMONY, BIOPOWER AND THE PRODUCTION OF CIVILIZED COLONIES

INTRODUCTION

Part A of the thesis has a dual purpose. Firstly, it provides an introduction to some of the most important ideas and arguments used in Part B, especially those deriving from the work of Foucault and Donzelot. Donzelot in particular provides some of the most important ingredients in the analytical structure of the thesis. An extended presentation of his work is necessary because of its complexity, its idiosyncratic nature, and the existence of some ill-informed critiques. The work of Foucault is also considered, partly to complement and extend my discussion of Donzelot (an associate of Foucault), partly as an independent source of orientations and hypotheses. Chapter 3 provides a linkage between the work of Foucault and Donzelot and the more substantive concerns of Part B, introducing the political culture of nineteenth century South Australia and the associated view of education through the writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield.

Secondly, Part A of the thesis represents a contribution to the development of a critically oriented anthropological theory of Western capitalist societies. In this sense, Part A is a self-contained entity with its own analytic structure. I develop an argument about what Foucault calls biopower, and relate this argument to the problem of bourgeois hegemony as discussed by Marxists and feminists. My approach is sympathetic to the problems and issues raised by these two more conventional vehicles for a critical theory of our culture, but also departs from them in certain significant ways. This argument is taken up in a more specific context in Part B, but I

believe that it also has a more general value and significance, and I have consequently devoted some time to exploring its ramifications at an analytical level.

At its simplest, the argument follows Foucault's characterization of biopower as a distinctive pattern of power relations in recent Western culture - one which allows a greater penetration of power into the social body as compared with earlier monarchical forms. In Chapter 1, I follow through the implications of this theory by discussing the "Prison Notebooks" of Gramsci. Gramsci's concept of the integral bourgeois state provides parallels with Foucault's biopolitical state. This and other parallels are explored, before moving on to a contrast between Marxism and Foucault which helps to locate the latter and draw out the thrust of his argument. Foucault's discussion of biopower and his critique of the "repressive hypothesis" are used to cast a new light on the problem of bourgeois hegemony, one which stresses the private pursuit of self-interest as a major integrating factor in our culture. This provides the linkage to Chapter 2, where Donzelot is used to elaborate this perspective.

Donzelot discusses the twentieth century "liberalized family" as a mechanism which promotes the pursuit of self-interest, while at the same time harmonizing this self-interest with broader social imperatives. Chapter 2 outlines this view of familialism and relates it to Foucault's discussion of "normalizing individualization". Individualism in this argument is not a cultural ground or essence, as it is for Dumont (1977, 1986); rather individualism is produced within our culture as part of a particular network of power relations. Donzelot's book is used as a way of showing how this individualism came to be deployed - how institutions, practices and ideologies were put into place which elicited and rewarded the private

pursuit of self-interest. Education and familialism are highlighted as crucial sites for this deployment.

Chapter 3 shifts the context to South Australia and its nineteenth century political culture, in particular the writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. I show how this culture can be analyzed in terms of the concept of biopower, and how this analysis provides important clues to the emergence and nature of compulsory education in South Australia. I locate compulsory education within a broad political strategy operating in nineteenth and twentieth century capitalist societies, which trades off political liberalization against social normalization - the right to vote, for example, against the right of the state to determine the length and content of your child's education. This strategy can be conceptualized in Foucault's terms as making power less authoritarian but simultaneously more penetrating and more effective. Compulsory education will be taken as one very significant instance of this liberalizing/normalizing process. This process encourages individuals to fulfil their true selves (socially, economically, emotionally, etc.), rather than being tied down by outmoded authoritarian dictates, but it also normatively defines the form and limits of this individualism.

In sum, these three chapters use and extend upon the work of Foucault and Donzelot to contribute to the development of a critically oriented anthropology of nineteenth/twentieth century liberal capitalist culture, as well as providing a necessary reference point for Part B of the thesis.

CHAPTER 1: GRAMSCI AND FOUCAULT - TWO THEORIES OF BOURGEOIS HEGEMONY

This chapter examines two different approaches to the problem of bourgeois hegemony - that of Gramsci in his "Prison Notebooks", and that of Foucault, particularly in "Discipline and Punish". A number of parallels are pointed out, but the chapter as a whole concentrates on the differences between the two perspectives, and on bringing out some of the implications of Foucault's approach to the question. This approach, I believe, is centrally important to a political anthropology of Western capitalist societies, and it has ramifications in many areas.

My discussion of bourgeois hegemony is in no way intended as an exhaustive or comprehensive study of this issue. Rather I am developing certain aspects of Foucault's approach through a contrast with Gramsci and Marxism more generally. This process leads to some general hypotheses about the nature of capitalist societies, hypotheses which are important in their own right as well as providing elements of the analytical structure of Part B of the thesis.

I begin by discussing the so-called revisionist school of education, childhood and adolescence. I then indicate some reservations about this approach, introducing a critical discussion of Gramsci's notion of hegemony. This concept has been central in the attempt of Western Marxism to explain the revival and continued existence of capitalism in the post-World War II period, and in particular the relative acquiescence of the working classes in the metropolitan centres. A Marxist social control theory of the education system as a major source of hegemonic effects is one aspect of this explanation, an aspect developed particularly in the 1970's through the

reproduction approach of, for example, Bowles and Gintis (1976). Gramsci's theory of hegemony is, at a general level, an important reference point for this corpus, although his views on education have not received much attention (and will not receive much here).

Following my discussion of Gramsci, I compare his treatment of bourgeois hegemony with that of Foucault. This comparison is broadened later in the chapter to encompass Marxism as a whole. Foucault generally leaves his critique of Marxism implicit. Nonetheless much of his work can be read as a dialogue with Marxism, and many of his concerns are shared by Marxists. My discussion helps to clarify the similarities and differences between the two perspectives, highlighting some significant aspects of Foucault's work in the process. These aspects are developed towards the end of the chapter, and are further elaborated in chapter 2, where Donzelot's work is used to extend Foucault's argument.

From the 1970's a so-called "revisionist" school of adolescence appeared in the U.S.A. and Britain (Spring, 1972, Gillis, 1974, Kett, 1977; Springhall, 1977), part of a broader reassessment of perspectives within history and sociology (see Cohen and Scull [eds.], 1983). Revisionists challenged the earlier orthodoxy, which tended to portray the spread of education and other reform initiatives as a simple march of progress, a continuous and generally successful movement towards better, more enlightened provision of services. Revisionists took a more critical attitude, often based on a Marxist or Marxist-influenced notion of the social control functions of education and other reforms.

See p 386

Kett, for example, speaks of an early 19th century pattern of "semidependence" among American youth:

" 'Semidependence' has been used at a number of points to describe the status of youth aged 10 to 21 in the early part of the 19th century. The word is intended to signify two aspects of the economic experience of young people. First, as young people grew older, they customarily experienced greater freedom and acquired new responsibilities. They left home, took different jobs, and moved again in search of still more jobs. But 'semidependence' also signifies a different view of youth not as a gradual removal of restraints but as a jarring mixture of complete freedom and total subordination" (1977:29).

In contrast the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed a more thorough and more orderly regulation of the youth's environment, via adult-sponsored youth organizations and an expansion of the high school system. Middle class parents were forced to adopt new strategies to guarantee the satisfactory placement of their children, strategies which emphasized young people's passivity and acquiescence:

"Between 1890 and 1920 a host of psychologists, urban reformers, educators, youth workers, and parent counselors gave shape to the concept of adolescence, leading to the massive reclassification of young people as adolescents. During these critical decades young people, particularly teenage boys, ceased to be viewed as troublesome, rash, and heedless, the qualities traditionally associated with youth; instead, they increasingly were viewed as vulnerable, passive, and awkward, qualities that previously had been associated only with girls. A consensus developed among small but influential groups that young people stood less in need of earnest advice than of the artful manipulation of their environment" (1977:5-6).

Basing herself on the work of the revisionist school, Miller in her Ph.D. thesis (although not in her later work) runs a similar social control argument in relation to compulsory education in South Australia (introduced in 1875):

"The gradual shift of children out of the permanent and casual workforce and their increasing experience (in school) of long periods of passive obedience to detailed authority combined to produce a shift in children's 'character' - so much so that the initiative, independence and self-confidence necessary for finding and performing a variety of casual jobs came to be referred to as 'unnatural precocity'" (1980:278; cf. 142, 153, 262, 267, 303).

Miller argues that compulsory education involved a lot more than simply modernizing the school system:

"....my hypothesis is that, with the 1875 Act, schooling in South Australia was not only updated, but transformed to be able to cope with the massive new task allocated to it - the cultural remoulding of an entire generation of working class youth" (1980:153).

The revisionist school is important in its critique of the liberal, meliorist view of education. The latter tends to portray 20th century childhood in terms of the evolutionary march of progress - away from the bad old days of illiteracy, child labour, poor sanitary and hygienic practices, tyrannical parental authority, corporal punishment, etc., and towards the recognition of the special nature and special needs of childhood - in terms of health, education, relational life, and separation from the now-adult world of work. The control argument recognizes that this is not a natural or inevitable process, that it is related to new forms of power and domination.

More recently, the concept of social control has come under fire from a variety of sources, both within Marxism and elsewhere (see, e.g., Cohen and Scull [eds.], 1983). I will mention three criticisms which I have extrapolated from the work of Foucault and Donzelot. These criticisms partly parallel arguments from other sources.

(1) There tends to be an absence of any systematic consideration of changes in patriarchal authority and how these relate to broader political and economic changes. While the lengthening of the period of childhood dependency through compulsory education may have entailed a more thorough and more orderly regulation of the child's environment, it was also associated with the (partial) liberation of women and children from patriarchal authority, and the spread of new educative and hygienic norms which limited the discretionary powers of parents over their children's

labour. This softening of patriarchal authority obviously varied by class, gender, and other factors, but it must be considered alongside the emphasis on discipline and control. The liberalization of the family did provide opportunities for young people to define themselves as autonomous agents in opposition to patriarchal authority.

(2) The approach tends to treat the liberalized family and compulsory education as something imposed on the working class, without fully appreciating the political/economic situation within which these changes occurred. In South Australia the introduction and extension of compulsory education coincides roughly with the emergence and growth of the Labor Party as an organized political force, and with various welfare state measures such as conciliation and arbitration, old age pensions, shorter working hours, the basic wage, etc. Not only this, but the Labor Party itself was a major force behind the extension of compulsory education in the early 20th century (cf. Donzelot, 1979a:222-3). While compulsory education may have been resented by some sections of the working class, it was also seen by many as part of a new age of progress, affluence and equality of opportunity. This creates problems for a straightforward model of coercive imposition.

(3) More broadly, the notion of social control is very hard to adequately delimit and slides very easily into the whole problem of social order or social constraint. Almost all activities outside of production have at one time or another been analyzed in terms of social control - education, religion, politics, sport, leisure, entertainment, the family, etc. The concept has been severely diluted in the process and has lost much of its analytical value (cf. Stedman Jones, 1983).

Social control in the literature I am concerned with is usually connected with a Marxist schema of base and superstructure (but see

Rothman, 1983), and particularly with Gramsci's concept of hegemony. I now move on to a discussion of Gramsci, whose work represents an influential and sophisticated version of Marxism, one which has a penetrating and relatively non-reductionist view of the superstructure. This is presented partly to further my critique of the notion of social control through a contrast between Marxism and the work of Foucault, partly because of the positive value of Gramsci's work and because in certain respects he anticipates the work of Foucault and Donzelot. I look briefly at the general notion of hegemony before focusing on Gramsci's treatment of bourgeois hegemony in Western Europe since 1870, which he analyzes in terms of the concept of "integral state".

Gramsci's starting point is the observation:

"....that the supremacy of a social group manifests itself in two ways, as 'domination' and as 'intellectual and moral leadership'. A social group dominates antagonistic groups, which it tends to 'liquidate', or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force; it leads kindred and allied groups" (1971:57).

This distinction is usually connected by Gramsci with the couplet state and civil society. The state (in the sense of executive-juridical-legislative authority) is the site of coercive and authoritarian domination; civil society is the arena for the hegemony of the leading group based on the voluntary consent of subaltern or subordinate groups.

Both state and civil society are seen as superstructures rising from the economic base of society. The leadership of a social group is ultimately based upon its more or less essential place in the economic structure (1971:12, 16, 67, 80n, 161, 181-2, 365-6). But economic function alone does not confer leadership. Gramsci contrasts the phase of "economic-corporate" struggle with the phase of struggle for hegemony in civil society. In the former, a social group is only unified around its own narrow economic self-interest,

and is incapable of exercising intellectual or moral leadership. Gramsci uses as an example the fate of the medieval Italian communes or city-states, and their failure to unite nationally. The communal bourgeoisie was incapable of going beyond a corporate phase and creating a state with the consent of the governed (1971:53, 53-4n). In the economic-corporate phase a group may dominate but it cannot lead. To do this it must develop a wider, more universal conception of the world which is capable of uniting other subaltern groups with it to form a historical bloc (1971:181-2; cf. xiv, 16, 18, 53-4n, 131, 160, 263, 370). Having achieved hegemony in civil society through the historical bloc, the leading group may then seize state power and exercise domination through the state apparatus.

There are many different meanings of hegemony in Gramsci, most of which I will only mention in passing. Gramsci speaks of the hegemony of the North of Italy over the South (1971:70-1, 94); the Moderates' hegemony over the intellectuals in the Risorgimento or national unification (103-4); the role of Piedmont in the same process - as a state exercising hegemony over the leading groups of the other Italian states (104-6); Ford's rationalization of production in the U.S.A. as hegemony "born in the factory" (285); the worldwide hegemony of Western Culture (416-8, 447; cf. 350). For my purposes, it is necessary to distinguish two main senses of the term, according to whether Gramsci is referring to a ruling or to a subordinate group (cf. editors, 1971:xiv); and related to this, two senses of the term "state" - a narrower one in the sense of government apparatus, and a wider sense which Gramsci refers to as the "integral state".

The first meaning of hegemony refers to the situation of a subaltern group seeking to form a historical bloc with other exploited groups in order to seize state power (e.g. 1971:160, 181-2, 189, 269, 388, 404). Here the problem is to organize other subaltern groups within civil society in opposition to the

dominant group which holds state power. The second meaning of hegemony refers to the situation of a group which is both leading and dominant - i.e. a group which has achieved state power and which exercises both domination through the state and hegemony through civil society. Gramsci does not explicitly theorize the distinction, but his repeated references to the integral state (i.e. the second case) show that he did recognize important differences between the two situations.

Closely related to this point is the distinction between two meanings of the term "state":

(1) a narrow sense of government apparatus - legislative, juridical, executive - which Gramsci is referring to when he speaks of coercion as belonging to the state, as opposed to consent or hegemony organized through civil society (e.g. 1971:12-3, 195-6, 245, 261, 264-5, 266, 267, 269).

(2) a wider sense of the integral state, which refers to the combination of state-proper (or political society) and civil society (e.g. 1971:16, 56n, 80n, 170n, 239, 263, 267, 271).

An integral state is one in which the rulers exercise their power with the consent of the governed - i.e., there is a correspondence or integration between the domination of a ruling class exercised through the state-proper and its hegemony over civil society. It is this integral state which represents the full realization of hegemony in the second sense (hegemony coupled with domination), and Gramsci uses it in a number of different contexts. The Italian communes, for example, did not transcend the phase of a "syndicalist state" to become an "integral state" (1971:56n); the Jacobins did succeed in forming such a state (1971:79, 80n, 170n).

An important referent of the integral state for Gramsci is undoubtedly his idea for a communist society (e.g. 1971:16, 193, 263, 267). Here there is not only integration between state and civil society, the state is conceived of as gradually withering away, being reduced to a "nightwatchman" role (1971:263) as more and more elements of "regulated society" make their appearance (*ibid*). It is in this light that one can read certain of Gramsci's passages in which he identifies state and civil society. "State" here can be compared with "integral state", and means that the populace at large identifies with the state and behaves in a "state-like" fashion.

The best statement of this position is in the note on "statolatry" (or worship of the state). Gramsci here speaks of the need to create

"....within the husk of political society a complex and well-articulated civil society, in which the individual can govern himself without his self-government thereby entering into conflict with political society - but rather becoming its normal continuation, its organic complement" (1971:268).

Later in the same note, Gramsci speaks of the

"....new forms of state life, in which the initiative of individuals and groups will have a 'state' character, even if it is not due to the 'government of the functionaries' (make state life more 'spontaneous')" (1971:268-9).

In a different note, Gramsci contends that in a communist society (presumably), the people's consent is permanently active,

"....so much so that those who give it may be considered as 'functionaries' of the State, and elections as a means of voluntary enrolment of State functionaries of a certain type" (1971:193).

Here then civil society itself becomes state in a certain integral sense, and the aims of the state become the aims of each individual composing it.

Gramsci's vision of communism is obviously crucial to the notion of the integral state. Prison censorship did not allow him to speak too openly about this vision. Nonetheless it is clear that Gramsci also used integral state to refer to bourgeois rule in Western Europe. The prime candidate is France from 1789 onwards (1971:18, 77-84, 179-80, 221-2). The Jacobins were able to go beyond the immediate corporate interests of the Third Estate (unlike the Girondins) and to pose the fundamental question of hegemony. They insisted on no compromises with the old order and their agrarian policy allowed them to form an alliance with the peasantry. Their political realism and expertise enabled them to establish the new bourgeois state on a solid permanent footing:

"When in 1789 a new social grouping makes its political appearance on the historical stage, it is already completely equipped for all its social functions and can therefore struggle for total dominion of the nation. It does not have to make any essential compromises with the old classes but instead can subordinate them to its own ends. The first intellectual cells of the new type are born along with their first economic counterparts" (1971:18).

Not only did the Jacobins occupy state power, they also exercised hegemony over the other subaltern groups (peasantry and proletariat) and laid the basis for the modern French state:

"For not only did they organize a bourgeois government, i.e., make the bourgeoisie the dominant class - they did more. They created the bourgeois State, made the bourgeoisie into the leading, hegemonic class of the nation, in other words gave the new State a permanent basis and created the compact modern French nation" (1971:79).

Although France is presented as the purest example of the integral bourgeois state, Gramsci also uses the concept in more general terms to describe the modern form of West European parliamentary democracy. This can be seen in the notion of "war of position" which Gramsci uses to describe the revolutionary strategy appropriate for the overthrow of this form of

regime. Gramsci contrasts the periods before and after 1870 and argues that the 1848 slogan of "permanent revolution" has to be replaced by the formula of "civil hegemony":

"The formula belongs to an historical period in which the great mass political parties and the great economic trade unions did not yet exist, and society was still, so to speak, in a state of fluidity from many points of view: greater backwardness of the countryside and almost complete monopoly of political and State power by a few cities or even by a single one (Paris in the case of France); a relatively rudimentary State apparatus, and greater autonomy of civil society from State activity; a specific system of military forces and of national armed services; greater autonomy of the national economies from the economic relations of the world market, etc. In the period after 1870, with the colonial expansion of Europe, all these elements change: the internal and international organisational relations of the State become more complex and massive, and the Forty-Eightist formula of the 'Permanent Revolution' is expanded and transcended in political science by the formula of 'civil hegemony'" (1971:243; cf. 220-1, 179-80, 80).

The implication is that after 1870, there is an expansion of the state apparatus and a greater penetration of this apparatus into civil society. In other passages Gramsci contrasts the modern and medieval or ancient states in similar terms. Instead of a "mechanical bloc of social groups". the modern state substitutes the subordination of subaltern groups to "the active hegemony of the directive and dominant group" (1971:54n; cf. 271).

Associated with this active hegemony is the idea of the state as "educator" (1971:15-6, 195-6, 242, 246, 258-60, 350). This seems to imply that the state now exercises hegemony as well as domination or coercion, although the meaning of "state" in some of these passages is ambiguous. Thus Gramsci notes:

"The State does have and request consent, but it also 'educates' this consent, by means of the political and syndical associations" (1971:259).

"State" here seems to refer to the wider sense of the term - it includes the "education of consent" through the political and syndical associations. The same could be said for the passages on pages 242 and 246. But on pages 15-6 the role of the political party in generating hegemony in civil society is directly compared with the role of the state, which here seems to mean government apparatus:

"The political party, for all groups, is precisely the mechanism which carries out in civil society the same function as the State carries out, more synthetically and over a larger scale, in political society. In other words it is responsible for welding together the organic intellectuals of a given group - the dominant one - and the traditional intellectuals" (1971:15; cf. 226).

Here the state as government also seems to be connected with educating consent. This is certainly the implication of Gramsci's remarks about the loss of autonomy of civil society vis-a-vis the state, as in the long passage quoted above. It is also implied in the passages where Gramsci directly compares law and custom as both fulfilling educative functions - the law (or the courts) as a negative educational function, and custom (especially the schools) as a positive educational function (1971:242, 246, 258). There is still an opposition here between the state as coercion and civil society as consent, but now the activities of both are classified as educative, implying a high degree of interdependence and interpenetration.

Similarly the idea of "war of position" implies a highly integrated relation between state and civil society, as in the following passage:

"The same thing happens in the art of politics as happens in military art: war of movement increasingly becomes war of position, and it can be said that a State will win a war in so far as it prepares for it minutely and technically in peacetime. The massive structures of the modern democracies, both as State organizations, and as complexes of associations in civil society, constitute for the art of politics as it were the 'trenches' and the permanent fortifications of the front in the war of position: they

render merely 'partial' the element of movement which before used to be 'the whole' of war, etc." (1971:243).

Here again there is a similarity of functions between state-as-government and civil society - both constitute "trenches".

In another passage, Gramsci speaks of the necessity for a "more 'interventionist' government...."

"....which will take the offensive more openly against the oppositionists and organize more permanently the 'impossibility' of internal disintegration - with controls of every kind, political, administrative, etc., reinforcement of the hegemonic 'positions' of the dominant group, etc." (1971:238-9).

The implication here is that the state-as-government has a role to play in reinforcing the hegemony of the dominant group.

This is clearly the implication of another note on "statolatry":

"For some social groups, which before their ascent to autonomous State life have not had a long independent period of cultural and moral development on their own (as was made possible in medieval society and under the absolute regimes by the juridical existence of the privileged Estates or orders), a period of statolatry is necessary and indeed opportune. This 'statolatry' is nothing other than the normal form of 'State life', or at least of initiation to autonomous State life and to the creation of a 'civil society' which it was not historically possible to create before the ascent to autonomous State life" (1971:268).

"Statolatry" means literally "worship of the state", and Gramsci explains it as "a particular attitude towards the 'government by functionaries' or political society" (ibid). The term thus refers to the narrow sense of "state", and the passage clearly implies that in certain conditions (probably after a socialist revolution, although this is not explicitly stated) the state-as-government has a role to play in the development of "a complex and well-articulated civil society" (ibid), i.e. presumably in the exercise of hegemony, although the term is not used. Hence in modern bourgeois society as well as in Gramsci's vision

of communist society, there is a complex interdependence between state and civil society, such that Gramsci's usual opposition between state as coercion and civil society as consent begins to break down.¹

Gramsci places great emphasis on the political party as the major organizer of hegemony in (contemporary) civil society, no doubt because of his overriding interest in the role of the Communist Party. But there are other elements in the notion of hegemony, particularly in the situation of a ruling class which exercises both domination and hegemony. Gramsci speaks of the priest, lawyer, notary, teacher and doctor as intellectuals in the countryside to whom the peasants are subordinated (1971:14-15). In another passage he refers to the local priest, the village patriarch, the "little old woman" who knows the lore of the witches, the "minor intellectual" (1971:323). On other occasions, he talks of "a traditional conception of the world", which he identifies with "common sense" (e.g. 1971:197-9).

These passages point to a wider notion of hegemony, based not only on the political party but on a whole way of life or conception of the world which is uncritically incorporated within common sense. This is also the implication of those passages in which Gramsci says that everyone participates in a particular conception of the world, or everyone tends to establish norms of conduct (1971:9, 265, 330-1). "Everyday experience" (1971:199) is thus itself an aspect of the hegemony of the ruling class, although it operates very diffusely compared with the political party. Gramsci also talks about the "forms of cultural organization which keep the ideological world in movement" (1971:341-2; cf. 148-9), including schools, the Church, newspapers, magazines and the book trade. Again we have a much broader notion of hegemony, not restricted to the party.

1. This analysis can be used to criticize Anderson's reading of Gramsci, which I find problematic in a number of respects (1977).

The result of these hegemonic activities is the subordination and passivity of the masses, and their inability to construct an autonomous conception of the world (1971:157-8, 187n, 198, 203, 327, 333, 336-7). An important element of this passivity is the belief in the "naturalness" of the world - that the world and all its institutions constitute an external reality which is God-given or in any case not amenable to change through human action (1971:157, 187n, 441). This externality or reification also occurs in relation to particular institutions:

"The individual expects the organism to act, even if he does not do anything himself, and does not reflect that precisely because his attitude is very widespread, the organism is necessarily inoperative. Furthermore, it should be recognized that, since a deterministic and mechanical conception of history is very widespread (a commonsense conception which is related to the passivity of the great popular masses), each individual, seeing that despite his non-intervention something still does happen, tends to think that there indeed exists, over and above individuals, a phantasmagorical being, the abstraction of the collective organism, a kind of autonomous divinity, which does not think with any concrete brain but still thinks, which does not move with specific human legs but still moves, etc." (1971:187n).

This "fetishism" (*ibid*) of the collectivity occurs in relation to both state and "private" agencies (parties, trade unions, etc.). The membership of these groups accept a particular leadership as being representative of their interests, but in fact this may conceal the "real predominance of one part over the whole" (1971:188). The real actions of the leadership are interpreted by the led as the actions of a phantasmagorical collective organism, which does not (except under very unusual circumstances) require any active intervention on their part but only a passive identification or fetishism.

This idea points to the very different meanings of hegemony depending on whether the reference is to a ruling or to a subordinate group. A ruling class, particularly if it has exhausted its possibilities for progressive development, will tend to exercise hegemony simply by preserving the status

quo and ensuring the passivity of the masses. The weight of traditional commonsense conceptions of the world is an important factor in the hegemony of a ruling class. A revolutionary party on the other hand will want to penetrate this commonsense, to purge it of conservative elements and to develop the progressive elements which are implicit in the similarity of the practical situations experienced by the masses. The revolutionary party must elaborate these implicit elements into an autonomous conception of the world, which is capable of standing as an antithesis to the traditional one and hence capable of enlisting the support of other subaltern groups.

For my purposes, it is the broader notion of hegemony coupled with domination which is of most interest. Especially when he talks of commonsense conceptions of the world and of the fetishism of the collectivity, Gramsci starts to move beyond the more traditional Marxist view of the superstructures as epiphenomenal and derivative. His analysis points towards a sociology of knowledge (broadly conceived) which examines the constitution of everyday experience without privileging relations of production. In this respect he anticipates the analysis of power/knowledge by Foucault and his school, although as I show later there are still major differences between the two theorists.

There is another area of overlap between Gramsci and Foucault, and that is Gramsci's notion of the integral bourgeois state. As I have already indicated, this concept leads to a breakdown of Gramsci's usual opposition between state and civil society, coercion and consent. There is a complex interdependence between the two, with the state penetrating more fully into civil society, and the citizens behaving in a state-like fashion, acting in their daily lives according to the norms diffused by the state. This offers parallels with Foucault's discussion of the formation of a "disciplinary society" (one

aspect of "biopower") and of the greater penetration of power into the social body since the late 18th century. Thus he talks of prison reform as follows:

"Throughout the eighteenth century, inside and outside the legal apparatus, in both everyday penal practice and the criticism of institutions, one sees the emergence of a new strategy for the exercise of the power to punish. And 'reform', in the strict sense, as it was formulated in the theories of law or as it was outlined in the various projects, was the political or philosophical resumption of this strategy, with its primary objectives: to make of the punishment and repression of illegalities a regular function, coextensive with society; not to punish less, but to punish better; to punish with an attenuated severity perhaps, but in order to punish with more universality and necessity; to insert the power to punish more deeply into the social body" (1979:81-2; cf. 209, 216).

Basing himself on the work of Foucault, Donzelot speaks of the emergence of a new hybrid public/private sphere of "the social" in 20th century liberal capitalist societies. The social is a particular sphere, at the intersection of public and private, but more broadly it also represents a whole mode of integration or hegemonization of our culture. The social is simultaneously the source of people's dreams, investments, desires (the liberalized family with its emphasis on economic autonomy and relational quality being the central figure here) and a legitimate area of state intervention (social work, social security, social welfare, etc.). Again there is an interplay between increasing state intervention in civil society, and the adoption by families of state-sponsored norms of conduct.

Foucault and Donzelot write in terms of a "microphysics" of power/knowledge which does not privilege any particular sector, or try to totalize history in terms of a base/superstructure model and the theory of the dialectic. As Deleuze says in the preface to Donzelot's book:

"The social sector does not merge with the judicial sector, even if it does extend the field of judicial action. And Donzelot shows that the social does not merge with the economic sector either, since in point of fact it invents an entire social economy and lays new foundations for marking the distinction between the rich

and the poor. Nor does it merge with the public sector or the private sector, since on the contrary it leads to a new hybrid form of the public and the private, and itself produces a repartition, a novel interlacing of interventions and withdrawals of the state, of its charges and discharges" (1979a:x).

The new forms of power/knowledge are seen as shaping and constituting a whole new social and economic domain. They are seen as enabling and transformative, rather than negative and repressive. This is one of the basic contrasts between Marxism and Foucault/Donzelot. Although Gramsci's version of Marxism in particular does overlap in places with Foucault, there are aspects of Gramsci and ways of developing the notion of hegemony which are quite different from Foucault's perspective.

Connell has severely criticized functionalist developments of Marxism, in particular the Althusserian school and the reproduction approach of Bourdieu, Lefebvre, Bowles and Gintis, etc. Connell stresses the contingent and managed character of bourgeois hegemony:

"Reproduction theory in general is ahistorical and functionalist; it depends on an indefensible essentialism in class theory; it burkes the key historical question of whether attempts at reproduction will actually succeed" (1983:56; cf. 36, 47, 54-6, 64, 73, 88, 114-5, 127-32, 135-6, 155-6).

Functionalism exaggerates the unity of the whole (1983:73) and tends to assimilate all events in terms of system maintenance. Connell speaks of a functionalist takeover of the concept of hegemony (1983:155-6). This leads to the danger of seeing hegemony in terms of total control and underplaying the importance of struggle and resistance (Connell and Irving, 1980:23; cf. 196). Often it also involves a mechanical notion of socialization - seeing hegemony "as a way in which conservative and complacent ideas are implanted in people's minds" (Connell et.al., 1982a:169). Connell's view is more sophisticated and treats hegemony as layering and splitting working class consciousness and so preventing the working class from mobilizing. This

view owes much to Gramsci's discussion of the hegemony of the (bourgeois) ruling class (see especially pp.25-7 above). There are progressive tendencies among subordinate groups because of the similarity of their practical situations, but these tendencies are overlaid by conservative commonsense conceptions of the world.

While I agree with Connell's critique of functionalist Marxism, I see more fundamental problems with Marxism as such - not just with its functionalist versions. I now move on to discuss Foucault's critique of Marxism (aspects of this critique will be applied to the work of Connell and his associates in a more specific context on pp.351-5 below). This critique has been influenced by two secondary accounts, Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983) and Poster (1984). It is in no way a comprehensive discussion of the issues involved. Rather it helps to bring out the general thrust of that part of Foucault's work which is relevant to my thesis and which I use in more specific ways in later chapters.

The critique is organized around four themes - truth, teleology, ideology and repression. I will move from this critique to discuss some other aspects of Foucault's account: the notion of biopower and in particular his distinction between law and norm.

(1) The first point concerns the truth claims of Marxism, the legitimacy which it claims for itself as a scientific mode of thought. Although not universal, claims to scientific status are very common in Marxism. To a large extent they are built in to its structure, given that the proletariat is privileged as the universal subject of history, which will end all oppression and mystification. Such truth claims can be seen most explicitly in Althusser's distinction between Marxist science and bourgeois ideology (Althusser, 1971; Callinicos, 1976). Another manifestation is the widespread idea of "false

"consciousness", the corollary of which is that there is one particular form of "true consciousness", informed by Marxist theory. Bourgeois hegemony is often seen as repressing or hindering this true consciousness.

Foucault on the other hand rejects any notion of absolute truth. Truth can only ever be relative to a particular cultural and pragmatic situation. Moreover one of Foucault's main interests is the production of "truth-effects" - the conditions under which particular kinds of statements come to be accepted as true:

"Now I believe that the problem is not to make the division between that which, in a discourse, falls under scientificity and truth and that which falls under something else, but to see historically how truth-effects are produced inside discourses which are not in themselves either true or false" ("Truth and Power", Working Papers, 1979:36; quoted in Poster, 1984:84).

Like Husserl and other phenomenologists, Foucault brackets or suspends the claim of serious speech acts to a context-free truth (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:50).² His view of truth or objectivity is one which regards it as necessarily situated within a particular historical context, and as something which has to be judged in relation to the intellectual and pragmatic concerns of the analyst.

(2) Another very fundamental problem with Marxism is its teleological character. There is a strong teleological element in Marx's view of history as a progression of different modes of production - from primitive communism, to feudalism, to capitalism and on to communism. The achievement of communism is seen as the final purpose or telos of history, and the proletariat as the class whose mission it is to carry out this task. Even in the more sophisticated versions of Marxism, there remains a certain inevitability about

2. I do not have time to discuss Foucault's differences from phenomenology, or how he sees the intellectual and political position of the analyst given that this position can not be regarded as privileged, objective and totally outside of the context being analyzed. Both points are well discussed in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983, *passim*.

the succession of the modes of production and the final victory of the proletariat.

Foucault rejects the notion of any inherent meaning or purpose in history:

"My aim was to analyse....history, in the discontinuity that no teleology would reduce in advance; to map it in a dispersion that no pre-established horizon would embrace; to allow it to be deployed in an anonymity on which no transcendental constitution would impose the form of the subject; to open it up to a temporality that would not promise the return of any dawn" (1972:203; quoted in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:91 - cf. 73, 106-10, 118).

Marxism for him is one example of a general hermeneutic approach in 19th and 20th century Western social science, which he characterizes in terms of the return of the origin (one side - the other being the retreat - of one of the three doubles of "man"; see Foucault, 1973:303-43):

"....Hegel, Marx, and Spengler thought of history as the movement towards some sort of completion, a fulfillment of man's true meaning, for better or for worse. They thus conceived of the return of the original truth as the end of history. Thought finally would completely appropriate its origin and attain perfection only to disappear as it undermined its own motivation" (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:42; Foucault, 1973:334).

In Marx's case, the return of the origin involved the achievement of communism by the proletariat, thus regaining the pristine condition of primitive communism.

A number of other problems flow from this teleological aspect of Marxism, problems which will be considered in the remaining two sections.

(3) Foucault's critique of the concept of ideology brings together a number of his reservations about Marxism. Firstly, it implies an opposition to something like the truth, with the resulting problems already discussed above. Secondly, it remains tied to a notion of the subject. Thirdly, it is related

to the distinction between base and superstructure which Foucault finds problematic ("Truth and Power", Working Papers, 1979:36; quoted in Poster, 1984:84).

Along with structuralism, Foucault is opposed to any attempt to see discourse as a phenomenon of expression - the verbal translation of a previously established synthesis, the unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing subject. Rather discourse is defined as a decentred totality "in which the dispersion of the subject, and his discontinuity with himself may be determined" (1972:55; quoted in Poster, 1984:86). The concept of ideology is seen by Foucault as locating ideas in collective subjects, such as the ruling class, which as Marx says expresses the ruling ideas of every age; or the proletariat, which is seen by Marx as the universal subject of history - the class which, once it achieves its true consciousness and moves from being a class-in-itself to a class-for-itself, will consummate the historical process (Poster, 1984:86; cf. Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:69, 91, 109-110, 120).³

Foucault's third objection to the concept of ideology concerns the whole base/superstructure distinction with which it is intimately connected. Foucault insists on the immanent relation of power and knowledge, which can be taken as proxies for these terms. "Knowledge is not in a superstructural relationship to power; it is an essential condition for the formation and further growth of industrial, technological society" (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:203 - cf. 114-7; and Foucault, 1979:27-8, 1981:94, 98; Poster, 1984:87). The base/superstructure distinction leads to a reductionist and totalizing view of the superstructures. All kinds of superstructural elements - the state, the family, schooling, entertainment, the mass media - can be decoded in terms of bourgeois ideology, obscuring the specificity of these different phenomena

3. For two other critiques of Marxism which are complementary to Foucault's in a number of respects, see Baudrillard, 1975, and Dumont, 1977.

and reducing them all to the unitary function of reproducing bourgeois hegemony. In spite of the more sophisticated versions of Marxism which stress the mutual, dialectical impact of base and superstructure, Foucault still sees the base/superstructure model as totalizing and as unable to give an adequate account of the complexities of the superstructure. As Poster says:

"Instead of refurbishing Marxism with a more complex method of totalization, Foucault proposed a multiplicity of forces in any social formation, a multiplicity which is dispersed, discontinuous, and unsynchronized. Social theory for him cannot grasp an entire social formation in one key concept or schema. It must rather explore each discourse/practice separately, unpacking its layers, decoding its meanings, tracing its development wherever its meandering path may lead. Foucault is an ardent detotalizer, preferring a syncopated approach which never pretends to capture the whole of a historical moment" (1984:88).

This passage also illuminates Foucault's distance from any form of teleology. Foucault stresses the uniqueness and contingency of particular events, historical periods and cultures. There is no one overarching meaning to history, nor is there one universal form of analysis which can be applied to all cultures and periods. One can describe Foucault, like Weber (cf. Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:132), as a historicist - as more interested in analyzing particular contexts than in developing universal laws. Linked to this is a flexible and pragmatic use of theory. Theory is only used to the extent that it helps to illuminate a particular context, and the kind of theory chosen is tailored to suit this pragmatic task (Donzelot, 1979a:7). The Marxist theory of ideology/economic base is diametrically opposed to this historicist perspective on a number of counts.

(4) The final theme concerns Foucault's stress on the positivity of power - its enabling and transformative character - which he contrasts with the usual Western view of power as negative and repressive:

"The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an 'ideological' representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called 'discipline'. We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production" (1979:194 - cf. 24; and 1981:81-102; Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:129-131).

What Foucault calls the repressive hypothesis is actually a crucial part of the functioning of biopower (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:182). His analysis of this linkage (see especially Foucault, 1981) is beyond the scope of this thesis. I will briefly outline how the Marxist concept of hegemony depends on a view of power as repression and some of the problems I see with this.

The negative and repressive character of hegemony in the Marxist view derives from certain very basic features in Marx's thought. As already argued, there is a strong teleological element in Marx's view of history as a progression of different modes of production. The achievement of communism is seen as the final purpose of history. Only under communism is the socialised character of the means of production created by industrialism matched by the socialised appropriation of the products of labour, so ending the contradiction between forces and relations of production which characterizes pre-communist societies.

By definition, then, any pre-communist society is divided along class lines, stemming from contradictions in the economic base. Given this starting point, the superstructures are inevitably seen as papering over these basic contradictions, preventing them from tearing the society apart. The state, the family, schooling, entertainment, the mass media, can all be decoded in terms of the reproduction of bourgeois ideology, which prevents the working class from realizing its true subjectivity and its historical mission. Whether and to what extent this is seen in terms of mystification and the socialization of the

working class into bourgeois values, the effects are necessarily seen as negative and repressive.

This viewpoint is essentialist and totalizing - not because, as Connell argues, of a "functionalist takeover" - but because of the whole base/superstructure metaphor and the negative view of power which it necessarily entails. It posits a true, essential working class consciousness underlying the phenomenal form of bourgeois hegemony, a consciousness which can be activated under the direction of a revolutionary party informed by Marxist theory. It leads to a reductionist and totalizing view of the superstructures, obscuring their specificities and prejudging their relation to the economic "base". It tends to underestimate the degree to which subordinate groups may be incorporated into the social order through the positive (if limited) benefits held out to them by this order, rather than by a process of repression. Insofar as there is a positive view of power in Marxism, it is seen in teleological terms as the more-or-less inevitable unfolding of the dialectic, which privileges the proletariat as the universal subject of history.

Although Foucault's critique of Marxism is radical and thoroughgoing, this should not be read as a total rejection of Marxism, nor as a claim to be developing a new and superior orthodoxy. What Foucault rejects is the evolutionary and totalizing nature of Marxism and the claims of many Marxists to a traditional form of scientific status. Marxist class analysis is still suitable for certain purposes, and for analyzing particular historical objects. The merits of a particular interpretive scheme have to be judged in terms of the intellectual and political purposes of the analyst - "each position will be able to illuminate certain aspects of the historical field and the merits of each position vis-à-vis the others are relative not absolute" (Poster, 1984:91).

Foucault develops a theory of bourgeois hegemony which is sensitive to the problem of the intellectual and political stance of the analyst, is non-teleological, rejects the notion of the conscious subject as the author of history, and does not privilege the economy or any other domain as an *a priori*. Relations of production are only one arena - if a very significant one - within which biopower is deployed. Rather than a universal theory of base/superstructure and class dialectics, Foucault talks of biopower as a historically specific mutation within our culture. His analysis explores the nature and implications of this mutation - he is not interested in developing a historically and culturally universal theory.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will focus on biopower and Foucault's distinction between law and norm. This argument is taken up again in a more specific context through the work of Donzelot (1979a) in Chapter 2.

Modern capitalist society for Foucault is characterized by what he calls biopower. This form of power coalesced around two poles at the start of the Classical Age (17th century). These poles remained separate until the beginning of the 19th century, when they combined to form the technologies of power which are still with us today (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:134).

One pole concerned the health and reproductive capabilities of the human beings who constituted a particular nation-state. Biology, demography, and other forms of knowledge concerned with human reproduction became the object of political attention in a consistent and sustained fashion, in the effort to improve the quantity and quality of the nation's population (*ibid*).

The other pole was also concerned with the body, but the body as an object to be manipulated rather than as a reproductive agency. Foucault talks

of "discipline" as a new political technology of the body, a technology which formed gradually in disparate, peripheral locations. The aim of disciplinary power was to produce "docile bodies", bodies which were simultaneously obedient and productive. This technology was developed and perfected in workshops, barracks, prisons, hospitals and schools, and eventually became generalized into a pervasive form (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983:134-5; Foucault, 1979, *passim*).

Discipline breaks down and analyzes the body so as to increase its productive efficiency, while at the same time making it more obedient. The body becomes "docile" in at least two senses: politically obedient, yes, but also able to be taught. Foucault talks of a "political anatomy" of the body, developed initially in quite disparate locations - for example, armies, schools, hospitals - but all concerned with manipulating, shaping, and training the body through a precise analysis of its workings and the application of this knowledge to various practical contexts, such as the most effective way to handle a rifle (1979:135-69; cf. 218-221). Thus the Prussian regulations of 1743 laid down six stages to bring the weapon to one's foot, four to extend it, and thirteen to raise it to the shoulder (1979:154).

Discipline is more subtle and less ostentatious than older forms of coercion. It presents the pupil, the patient, the recruit with a set of explicit techniques to be learnt, techniques which will aid their progress. The body becomes more useful as it becomes more obedient, more willing to absorb the techniques.

Foucault talks of the greater penetration of power into the social body (1979:82, 136-7, 209-16, 298), the latter term having the double meaning of both the individual human body and society as a whole. The Ancien Régime was characterized by harsh but spasmodic and irregular forms of domination:

the "lower orders" were by and large not tightly constrained in their everyday lives by the governmental apparatuses. Discipline by contrast introduces a more subtle but also more effective form of control which penetrates into the details of this everyday existence.⁴

Biopower should not be seen simply in terms of the growth of state power. The state uses these forms of power, but they can not be reduced to the functioning of the state nor of any other institution:

"....it cannot be localized in a particular type of institution or state apparatus. For they have recourse to it; they use, select or impose certain of its methods. But, in its mechanisms and its effects, it is situated at a quite different level. What the apparatuses and institutions operate is, in a sense, a micro-physics of power, whose field of validity is situated in a sense between these great functionings and the bodies themselves with their materiality and their forces" (1979:26 - cf. 215-6).

Foucault argues that disciplinary power is characterized by the importance of the norm, which increasingly infiltrates and operates alongside of the older system of the law. Instead of a simple binary division between the permitted and the forbidden, discipline introduces a graduated scale of privileges and impositions which allows a much more fine-grained differentiation and ranking of individuals in reference to a standard pattern of behaviour (1979:177-84, 304; 1981:144). Discipline involves both a juridical and a natural referent. On the one hand, it refers to a set of explicit laws or regulations; on the other hand, it refers to natural, empirically observable, and scientifically analyzable processes:

"The order that the disciplinary punishments must enforce is of a mixed nature: it is an 'artificial' order, explicitly laid down by a law, a programme, a set of regulations. But it is also an order defined by natural and observable processes: the duration of an apprenticeship, the time taken to perform an exercise, the level of aptitude refer to a regularity that is also a rule" (1979:179).

4. Thompson (1967) provides an illuminating comparison on this point.

This links up with Foucault's argument that discipline judges the criminal rather than just the crime. Instead of a more-or-less fixed punishment relating to a specific act, the criminal's whole life becomes subject to judgement: the circumstances surrounding the criminal act, the previous record and history of the offender, his medical/psychiatric condition, the possibilities for reformation, his general character and reputation all become elements in the calculation of the form of treatment best suited to this particular case. Similar arguments apply in relation to schoolchildren, patients, soldiers, etc. - Foucault's analysis is not of the prison as such, but rather of a general tactics of subjection.

This normalizing judgement provides a more effective and more discriminating relation between law and behaviour, which homogenizes at the same time as it individualizes: it sets up a general standard or norm, but at the same time ranks and classifies individuals in relation to this norm:

"In a sense, the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialities and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another. It is easy to understand how the power of the norm functions within a system of formal equality, since within a homogeneity which is the rule, the norm introduces, as a useful imperative and as a result of measurement, all the shading of individual differences" (1979:184).

As I will argue in detail in Chapter 6, twentieth century childhood/adolescence illustrates the double natural-juridical reference of the norm. Juvenile justice, school attendance laws, child protection and custody laws, military/political/economic qualifications and disqualifications situate childhood within a formal juridical framework of laws and regulations. But childhood is also defined in terms of a whole range of "natural" processes of biological and psychological development. The various "sciences" of childhood and adolescence provide elaborate accounts of the observable

variations of physical, emotional, moral, sexual and educational development, and hence allow a fine-grained mapping of the juridical onto the natural grid.

Juvenile justice is one example of this "humanization". Instead of authoritarian dictates and harsh penal solutions, juvenile justice has been liberalized, and now offers a whole range of corrective techniques and situations, with penal detention being reserved only as the ultimate sanction for incorrigible cases. Unlike the mechanisms of the older law, with its binary operation of law-abiding/criminal, this normalizing judgement pays much closer attention to the particular biographies involved: to the exact shape of the family situation, to different possible futures, to specialized assistance for problem cases, etc.

This liberalization has to be seen as part of a new modality of power relations oriented around the question of the normal, this being conceived of as a scientifically validated biological and psychological standard of behaviour. The spread of this norm is intimately tied in with the process of liberalization, in line with Foucault's general characterization of disciplinary technology as simultaneously more subtle and more effective.

This contrast between law and norm will be taken up again in various parts of the thesis, either directly or through the work of Donzelot. Donzelot's distinction between traditional family values and new social norms is based on this same contrast (see below, pp.64, 322-6, 359-61, 363-4). This and other aspects of Donzelot's work are taken up in the next chapter.

This chapter has attempted to develop some of Foucault's ideas on biopower, and to show the significance of these ideas through a contrast with Gramsci and Marxism generally. Foucault's view of hegemony is one which sees it as built up around many local centres of "micropower", rather than as the result of a macro-political balance of class forces. Relations between

doctor and client, employer and worker, teacher and student, parent and child, and many others, can all be compared as instances of disciplinary technology. These technologies establish the infrastructure on the basis of which macro-political struggles are formed and contested. Historically, they predated and provided essential conditions for the emergence of industrial capitalism from the late eighteenth century.

An important aspect of biopower is the way in which it mobilizes and directs a particular form of individual self-interest, a process described by Foucault as normalizing individualization. Donzelot (1979a) can be used to extend upon and elaborate this argument in relation to twentieth century familialism and the school-family connection. This is done in the following chapter. The argument also has a direct bearing on Part B of the thesis. Compulsory education and the transformation of familialism it effected was a potent vehicle in eliciting the private pursuit of self-interest and in establishing this individualism as a general hegemonizing factor in our culture.

This perspective sees education as contributing to bourgeois hegemony via a positive, enabling process - the incitement to self-interest - rather than through the negative, social control function of education as hindering and repressing the emergence of proletarian class consciousness. This positive view of power contrasts with the "revisionist" perspective on childhood/education (see pp.13-6 above) as well as with certain fundamental features of Marxism. Thus compulsory education will be treated in this thesis as an important vehicle for normalizing individualization - for establishing the private pursuit of self-interest as a hegemonizing force in twentieth-century capitalist societies.

CHAPTER 2. THE INCITEMENT TO SELF-INTEREST: DONZELLOT ON THE SOCIAL

This chapter uses Donzelot (1979a) to extend and elaborate the argument of Chapter 1 concerning normalizing individualization. At the same time, it fulfils a number of other functions. I present Donzelot's account of "the rise of the social" in late 19th and early 20th century France in some detail, and highlight its relevance for my own project. I locate Donzelot in relation to some other major works on the history of the Western family, and look at a number of critiques of his work, especially that of Barrett and McIntosh (1982).

All of this helps to bring out some of the major themes of Donzelot's work and to extend the argument of Chapter 1. It also provides a foundation for my extensive use of Donzelot in Part B of the thesis.

Apart from my general reliance on Donzelot, I have felt such an extended discussion to be necessary for a number of reasons. Firstly, because of the complexity and idiosyncrasy of Donzelot's approach. Secondly, as already argued, because of the intrinsic significance of his and Foucault's arguments within anthropology and related disciplines. Thirdly, because Donzelot's work has in general been somewhat neglected in the anglophone world, and has been subject to what I believe are invalid criticisms.

This relative neglect of Donzelot is no doubt related to the very critical stance he adopts, not only towards the contemporary Western family itself, but also to the "psy-complex" which as he says both feeds and feeds off this familial configuration. Donzelot is bracketing the truth claims of the various knowledges circulating in this psy-complex. He is attempting to analyze their cultural-political significance, rather than approaching them on their own

terms. This places him outside of and (implicitly at least) critical of a whole range of knowledges - medical, educational, social work, psychiatric, academic, philanthropic. Such a critical viewpoint challenges the ideologies and interests of a wide array of people and institutions, and is not conducive to the more limited kinds of research which attract grants and provide the basis for academic and other careers. This may explain the lack of systematic work deriving from Donzelot's book, even though it is often cited and spoken of in positive terms.

I believe that Donzelot is indispensable in understanding the dynamics of the Western family form from an anthropological/sociological viewpoint, and that any research in this area which does not take account of the perspectives, issues and problems posed by Donzelot will be seriously impoverished. In particular, Donzelot's account of the rise of the social at the end of the nineteenth century and the new pattern of familialism with which it was associated is an original and incisive contribution to the field, and provides the starting point for my presentation of his work.

Donzelot's concept of the social provides an extremely valuable tool for relating Foucault's more general analysis to the specificities of familialism and the school-family connection within twentieth century liberal capitalist societies. The social in Donzelot's usage emerged simultaneously in most such societies at the end of the nineteenth century. It represents a hybridization of public and private spheres. In particular, it refers to state/expert intervention in the lives of "problem" children - hence public intervention in the heart of the private sphere. But the social also has a broader significance, in that it redefines the whole nature of the public and private spheres and their interrelationship. In both ways, the concept has a direct and very important bearing on my own work on the culture of education in South Australia, since this work focuses on the relations between labour, education and familialism.

This chapter lays the groundwork for my use and elaboration of Donzelot's work in later chapters, but it also continues the argument of Chapter 1 on biopower and its "swarming" throughout the social body. The social is an effective way of creating and mobilizing a particular form of individual self-interest - one which is by-and-large conformable with the interests of the capitalist nation-state. The social provides a historically specific way of linking these two sets of interests together.

This chapter uses Donzelot to develop the argument that the success or swarming of biopower is tied in with the mobilization of this particular form of self-interest. Biopower produces positive integration into the political order on the basis of the private pursuit of self-interest. This contrasts with the view espoused by many Marxists and feminists, which sees hegemony as produced by the repression (by force or by stealth) of an underlying reality - e.g., the Marxist idea discussed in Chapter 1 of bourgeois hegemony splitting and disorganizing the working class, who would otherwise realize their "true" consciousness and their historical destiny. Biopower, on the other hand, creates reality, rather than being something added on to a pre-existing reality. The individualism associated with it can still be made to serve purposes of political integration because of its imbrication within a historically-specific form of power relations. Donzelot's analysis of twentieth century familialism provides important clues to the mobilization or incitement of this form of self-interest, following on from Foucault's more general discussion of normalizing individualization (pp.39-42 above).

The social as used by Donzelot is particular sector of twentieth century liberal capitalist societies (1979a:xxvi, 88-9; see also the foreword by Deleuze, "The Rise of the Social", ix-xvii). The emergence of this sector can be seen in the proliferation of terms such as social work, social security, social problems, sociology, social welfare, etc. Institutionally it refers to the social welfare

bureaucracies which are charged with intervening in civil society in order to ensure its smooth functioning. The social is a hybrid sector, situated at the intersection of public and private spheres, which works on the needs and desires of citizens (particularly those in disadvantaged groups) for the purpose of maintaining or increasing the economic, political and military power of the nation state.

The social represents a particular hybrid sector, but it also reacts on previously existing sectors, particularly the family, which Donzelot describes as "both queen and prisoner" of the social (1979a:7). The ramifications of the social extend far beyond the particular institutional sector which is its empirical locus. A quote from Deleuze will establish the point:

"Donzelot asks how the social takes form, reacting on other sectors, inducing new relationships between the public and the private; the judicial, the administrative, and the customary; wealth and poverty; the city and the country; medicine, the school, and the family; and so on. We are shown how it cuts across and reshapes previously existing or independent divisions, providing a new field for the forces already present" (1979a:x).

Education and schooling is of great analytical significance for Donzelot, but he does not discuss it in detail, which is understandable in view of the broad scope of his work.

It is my contention, however, that his book provides many insights into the nature and implications of compulsory education, introduced in most liberal capitalist societies in the late nineteenth century. This is because the main avenue for the emergence of the social was through various state and/or philanthropic controls and injunctions regarding the survival, nutrition, education and training of children, particularly children of the working class. Compulsory education was the cornerstone of these efforts, and it can be usefully analyzed using ideas derived from Donzelot.

For most of the nineteenth century, state intervention in education was a hotly contested issue in the societies we are considering. In England and Australia, compulsory education was regarded as an abrogation of what was spoken of as "the liberty of the subject" in the liberal discourse of the time. This view was influenced by the presence of competing religious denominations in these countries. Education was seen as inextricably linked to religion. Any state intervention in education risked on the one hand charges of proselytization if it favoured, for example, the established churches, or alternatively charges of secularism and godlessness if it tried to remain neutral. These debates were eventually resolved in favour of compulsory education, which was seen as a method both for controlling the morality of the working class (curbing lawlessness, pauperism, immorality and political radicalism) and improving their efficiency and productivity (cf. Foucault on docile bodies on pp.37-9 above and pp.396-8 below).

This shift of opinion is closely connected with the general dynamics of the social. Donzelot sees the social as a way of increasing state intervention in society without nullifying the liberal, minimalist definition of the state. It does this by playing on authority relations in and around families.

Donzelot contrasts the authoritarian family of the Ancien Régime, stressing the undivided rights of the father, and the twentieth century liberalized family which emphasizes the rights of women and children and the importance of the internal relational life of the family. The authoritarian model was radically challenged by the French Revolution, and the whole status of the family and its relation to the state was thrown into the melting pot. As we shall see below, a number of competing discourses emerged around this issue during the nineteenth century, so that by the end of the century, with the triumph of the social, the authoritarian patriarchal model, while still not superseded on the level of representations, had become less

and less real. Child and adolescent labour, deployed by the father as he saw fit, has in the twentieth century been increasingly replaced by extended periods of education, with the family seen as acting in partnership with the school in the raising of children. The liberalization of patriarchal authority¹ occurred through the diffusion of state-sponsored norms of education and hygiene, leading to a hybridization or interlacing of the functions of state and family.

Through this and related processes, the social has become "the reality principle of our societies" (1979a:xxvi). It is simultaneously the source of people's desires, dreams, strategies, and investments, and a legitimate area of state intervention; simultaneously the horizon of individual self-realization (relational, sexual, emotional and reproductive) and the hinge for articulating political concerns such as how best to raise children to be law-abiding and productive citizens.

Two caveats are in order before proceeding. The first concerns the term policing used by Donzelot. This word has to be read in the broader and more positive sense it had in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, not the limiting and repressive sense it has today. This reading is in tune with Foucault's analysis of the biopolitical state and more generally with his whole notion of power (see Ch.1). Policing is to be understood as all the methods used for developing the quantity and quality of the population and hence the strength of the nation state. Donzelot quotes from Johann von Justi, "Éléments Généraux de Police" (1768) to make his point:

"The purpose of policing is to ensure the good fortune of the state through the wisdom of its regulations, and to augment its

1. This liberalization was relative, not absolute. I do not challenge the partial nature of this transformation from a feminist standpoint; nor do I deny that the liberalized family has itself become a source of oppression for women. Nonetheless the change was real and very significant (see also pp.393-5 below).

forces and its power to the limits of its capability. The science of policing consists, therefore, in regulating everything that relates to the present condition of society, in strengthening and improving it, in seeing that all things contribute to the welfare of the members that compose it. The aim of policing is to make everything that composes the state serve to strengthen and increase its power, and likewise serve the public welfare" (1979a:7).

Policing refers to a set of positive and enabling procedures that contribute to the strength of the nation state. It should not be read in terms of a straight social control argument, e.g., an all-powerful state coming to dominate a beleaguered family (cf Barrett and McIntosh, 1982; discussed below, pp.73-5). As I will argue later (especially in Ch.6) the success of policing depends largely on its capacity to mobilize individual self-interest and to mesh this interest with that of the nation-state, a process which cannot be appreciated using a repressive hypothesis (Foucault, 1981).

The second caveat concerns Donzelot's historicism and whether his conclusions can be transferred from France to South Australia. As argued in Ch.1, Foucault and Donzelot are both concerned with breaking up what Donzelot at one point calls sieve-like concepts (1979a:8) in favour of a microphysics of power which stresses the particular and contingent nature of historical events. As such, there is necessarily a problem in applying ideas developed in the French context to another country. Nonetheless Donzelot himself argues that his key concepts are of general significance for all liberal capitalist societies (1979a:4, 52-3, 94), although there will obviously be individual variations. Donzelot's analysis is broad-ranging even though his method is historicist. He is looking for the distinctive, particular features of twentieth century liberal capitalist societies² but he is doing so on a very broad canvas. As such his book has many ramifications and many suggestive

2. I do not consider the twin problems of the significance of such an analysis for - (1) fascist and other authoritarian variations on the capitalist theme; and (2) so-called communist or socialist societies; problems which are only fleetingly referred to by Donzelot (1979a:41).

lines of analysis, lines which I believe are of great interest for analyzing any of the societies under review.

To further clarify the notion of the social and to ground my own usage of this concept, it is necessary to run through Donzelot's historical analysis of the French situation, even though details of this analysis may be quite different from the Australian case.

Donzelot sees the liberalized family as the solution to a nineteenth century political problem concerning the liberal definition of the state. He traces a two-fold decomposition of the family from the late eighteenth century. Firstly, the family was finding it harder to contain its members by ensuring their upkeep:

"The barriers that held individuals within organic groupings were slowly crumbling. The separation between the 'proud' poor (those who refrained from asking publicly for help through fear of dishonour) and the imploring beggars who shamelessly displayed their miseries and their sores was tending to disappear, and the end of the eighteenth century saw a substantial increase in the number of poor people demanding assistance. Moreover, the beggars were gradually transforming themselves into dangerous vagabonds who roamed through the countryside levying a tax..... in competition with that of the state" (1979a:50-1).

Secondly, family authority was being called into question by those members excluded from dowries and patrimonial inheritances, and in particular by victims of the "lettres de cachet de famille"; through these letters the head of the family could enlist the support of the state to control or punish recalcitrant members, over whom he was granted discretionary power. Donzelot argues that the construction of "*hôpitaux généraux*" (not to be confused with "general hospitals", the literal translation) corresponded in part to the express desire to furnish poor families with a means of coercion against their undisciplined members. Complaints against the letters grew steadily up to 1789.

These two lines of deconstruction of the old socio-familial apparatus converged in the taking of the Bastille, where a large proportion of those detained under the "lettres de cachet" were confined. Led by those whom the socio-familial system could not keep in check, this action, of great symbolic significance in the early phase of the French Revolution, was in effect a "summons to the state, calling on it to take charge of its citizens, to become the agency responsible for the satisfaction of their needs. At the same time, it constituted the symbolic destruction par excellence of family arbitrariness in its collusion with royal sovereignty" (1979a:51). The whole definition of the state was at issue, and the battle lines were drawn in the nineteenth century between the socialists, who wished to abolish the family altogether in favour of state responsibility for the citizens' welfare, and the liberals, who wanted society organized around the private property of the family, with the state having only a minimal watchdog role.

This second, liberal definition of the state was threatened by two things at the turn of the nineteenth century. One was the problem of pauperism,

"....the abrupt rise of those waves of indigents who, demanding more subsidies from the state, had urged the latter, at the height of the Revolutionary period, to become the agency for reorganizing the social body on the basis of the right of the poor to welfare, work, and education. Secondly, the appearance of divisions with respect to living conditions and mores [the rise of industrialism - AW] that ran so deep within the social body that they risked generating cataclysmic conflicts, thus posing a challenge to the very principle of a liberal society" 1979a:54).

Donzelot sees philanthropy as the solution to these two problems - a way of establishing public services and facilities at a sensitive point midway between private initiative and the state. He distinguishes two poles, which reflected back to the family the two lines of decomposition that emanated from it.

Firstly there was an assistance pole, which depended directly on the liberal definition of the state. This deflected back to the private sphere demands for work and assistance directed to the state. The state was seen as merely a formal means for transmitting guidelines and precepts of behaviour which would enable the family to become or to remain autonomous, particularly the importance of saving. If families failed in this quest, it was then a question of moral weakness on their part rather than a question of political rights, and any assistance that the state did provide would be under rigorous supervision.

Secondly, there was a medical/hygienist pole, which, in apparent contradiction with the liberal definition of the state, sought to use the state as a direct instrument for spreading medical and hygienic norms, but only to the extent that the liberalization of economic society produced problems which threatened the very existence of this society (e.g. the possibility of revolt or revolution) (1979a:53-8).

Going into more detail, the first pole involved the moralization of the working population. Under the Ancien Régime there was a choice between charity and repression in dealing with the poor. The state was faced either with an institutionalization of charity which sanctioned aid as a right, or violent repression, a method increasingly unacceptable after 1789. There were three main discourses around this topic - the socialists, the Christian political economists who favoured a return to the old type of charity, and the social economists.

It was the third group that gained acceptance for its proposals. Ideally they would give advice to the poor rather than material aid; children and women were to be given priority over men. This philanthropy was different from charity, which involved indiscriminate giving and encouraged the

dependence rather than the autonomy of the poor. To discriminate between genuine and staged poverty, philanthropy recommended the procedure of visiting the poor. An exhaustive inquiry into the circumstances of the applicant for relief was to be made. This was not only to weed out imposters, but also to judge the advisability of giving aid. Relief was not to be given unless it served a long-term purpose of rehabilitation of the family. In this way morality was linked to economy. Any request for aid automatically implied a moral fault or weakness that more or less directly produced the economic problem.

As compared with charity, which relied on externally manifested associations, philanthropy penetrated fully into the details of family life. On the basis of this investigation, philanthropy offered an alternative of autonomy through saving, and relief payments in conjunction with a supercilious tutelage. The autonomization of the family with respect to the old networks of solidarity and blocks of dependence was accompanied by a displacement of morality from the level of public relations to the private relationship with the economic sphere (1979a:58-70).

The second pole of philanthropy involved state action in spreading medical, hygienic and educative norms (normalization). There was a whole series of perceived problems dealing with the migration of poor people to the cities, the promiscuities implied by their living conditions, and the effects of industrialism, problems which carried with them the twin threats of pauperism and political independence. The consequences for children were disastrous in the eyes of the philanthropists. There was no thought as to the number of children in relation to the economic capacity of the parents; children were exploited by their parents either by working around the home or by being sent into factories at an early age - all produced by the arbitrary authority of the family head.

Many people (including socialists and members of the Christian political economy group) saw a direct relationship between industrialism and these abuses. But the hygienist philanthropists argued that these abuses could be corrected by decreeing norms that would protect children, and that the real danger came from a population which resisted this normalization. Hygienist philanthropy evaded a political challenge to the economic order by transforming it into a challenge to family authority by way of the norm. Compulsory education was the main vehicle whereby these norms were to be spread. This also had the advantage of reducing child labour.

From the 1840's to the end of the nineteenth century there was a mass of bills enacted decreeing standards for the protection and education of children. These aimed not only at remedying the state of abandonment in which working class children were apt to find themselves, but also at breaking the initiatory ties that existed between adult and child, associated with freedom of movement and agitation. They were at once hygienic and political, and were aimed at a population which had broken loose from its territorial moorings while still preserving the weight of its origins, which made it an unpredictable and uncontrollable moving force. The political defeat of these "preindustrial" masses was signalled by the crushing of the Commune (1979a:70-82).

At the end of the nineteenth century a third pole of philanthropy emerged out of the combination of the first two around the question of children. Various associations emerged around two issues. Firstly, there were societies which urged state intervention rather than private initiative in the care of abandoned, delinquent or vagabond children. Secondly, there were societies which attempted to introduce modern methods of child-rearing and education in working class families.

Both came up against an unbreachable point of resistance - parental authority. It was to satisfy these societies that laws were passed in 1889, 1898, and 1912 which organized a gradual transfer of sovereignty from the "morally deficient" family to the body of philanthropic notables, magistrates, and children's doctors. There was a collaboration of the judiciary and the philanthropic organisations, resulting in a three-fold system of juvenile justice. First, the minor was judged and hence became the responsibility of the penal administration; second, the latter returned him to a protective society; third, if everything was in order, the philanthropic society returned him to his family while keeping checks on their supervision of the minor.

There was a junction of the state norm and philanthropic moralization which obliged the family to look after its children or else become an object of surveillance and disciplinary measures in its own right. This junction worked to the benefit of both sides of the state/family couple. The family regained control over its recalcitrant members. The state solved the problem of what to do with abandoned or neglected children, without having recourse either to a quasi-prison or to a system of training which would have advantaged state children and encouraged working class families to abandon their children. The softening of patriarchal authority extended the right of correction to the mother and created the conditions for controversy between husband and wife. This gave the societies an additional point of entry into families, and justified an investigation involving the child and the neighbourhood. Demands coming from these families could thus be referred to the same modes of administration as those resulting from the corrective intervention in families that abandoned their children (1979a:82-8).

It is this junction of moralization and normalization at the end of the nineteenth century which signals the emergence of the social (1979a:88). Two apparently contradictory strategies - one aimed at making the family

autonomous and relieving the state of the burden of pauperism, the other aimed at increasing the role of the state through direct normalizing intervention in the family - were combined into one general set of practices.

Moreover, the two strategies were coupled in such a way as to exchange procedures. On the one hand, the assistance movement that had sought to eliminate pauperism through the private initiative of employers and philanthropists found legitimization of its actions in the decreeing of hygienic and educative norms. All the facilities created by paternalistic employers to contain the poor populations - social housing, schools, savings banks, etc. - were now acknowledged as of public benefit. The state now rationalized and generalized these activities (previously very patchy and uneven, depending on the philanthropic attitudes of particular employers). This relieved the economic sector of the administrative burden of providing these facilities, and also freed employers of the image of direct domination resulting from the paternalistic way in which these facilities were provided. This rationalization did not contradict the liberal definition of the state, since it was only a matter of systematizing what was already there:

"It was not as if the state had taken the initiative, the original and thus political responsibility for these facilities and services. By ensuring their rationalization and generalization in the last instance, it only confirmed its function of guarantor of the sound working of liberal societies" (1979a:89).

On the other hand the normalization practices of the state received from economico-moral philanthropy a formula for intervention which made it possible to spread these norms. This happened according to two distinct lines of transformation. Where the norms were not respected, where they were accompanied by poverty and hence a presumed immorality, the neutralization of patriarchal authority permitted a procedure of tutelage to be set up, involving a reduction of family authority. Where the family showed a

capacity for autonomy, the spread of these norms was via enticement, following the path already cleared by philanthropy through the savings campaign. Private initiative - the contractual embracing of new sanitary, educative and relational behaviours - would operate as a means of reinforcing the family's autonomy and reducing the risk of public intervention. A liberalization of intra-familial relations, including the law on divorce passed in 1884, helped to get the norms accepted, thereby linking the desires of individuals for autonomy in choosing marriage partners with that of families for economic and social autonomy (1979a:89-92).

Summing up Donzelot's analysis of the rise of the social, there were two couplings of the state and the family, one positive and the other negative. (1) Negative - the absence of financial autonomy expressed in a demand for assistance was presumed to indicate an immorality that produced educative and hygienic deficiencies and thus justified an economic tutelage to enforce these norms. Noncompliance with health requirements could justify preventive action using this same tutelage formula. Basing itself on the protection of the weakest family members (women and children), tutelage made possible a corrective intervention by the state, but at the cost of a near-total dispossession of private rights. (2) Positive - although autonomy was no longer guaranteed (this would undermine the liberal definition of the state) the family could nonetheless preserve and augment it through controlling its needs and appropriating the state norms. This would create a thriving milieu, resistant to crises and failures, with free contractuality as the means for coping with family problems (e.g. psychotherapy for a troublesome minor) as well as a means for creating better conjugal combinations (1979a:92-3).

Donzelot argues that there were two registers or channels along which the twentieth century family emerged - tutelage and contract, linked to the bipolarity of working class and middle class. These two registers were unified

by their common reference to the social, but simultaneously divided by the very different relation to the social in each register - one involving state intervention and neutralization of family authority, the other private initiative and free contractuality. The character of these registers was influenced by the differing social and economic possibilities associated with the class bipolarity; e.g., the working class was, and remained, at much greater risk of tutelary intervention, even if it only happened in a small minority of cases.

The working class family was connected to the social promotion and claims-making procedures of the bourgeois family through savings banks, educational prompting and relational counselling, but it entered this quest with severe disadvantages because of its general social and economic position. Social promotion became a universal integrating factor, based on the private pursuit of well-being, but state intervention remained as a reserve power, to be brought into play when families or individuals were unwilling or incapable of playing this game. This as I understand it is what Donzelot means by the hybrid character of the social, its effective integration of private initiative and state intervention (1979a:93-4). As Deleuze expounds it in the foreword:

"Thus, in the first case, the state tends to free itself of excessive burdens by bringing into play private investment and the incitement to saving; whereas in the second case, the state is obliged to intervene directly by making the industrial sphere into an arena for 'civilizing mores'. Consequently, the family can be simultaneously the object of liberal praise, as a locus of saving, and the object of social - even socialist - criticism, as an agent of exploitation (protect the wife and child); simultaneously the occasion of an unburdening of the liberal state and the target or charge of the interventionist state: not an ideological quarrel, but two poles of one strategy on the same line. It is here that the hybridization of the two sectors - the public and the private - takes on a positive value in order to form the social" (1979a:xiii).

Donzelot in his last two chapters analyzes in detail the registers of tutelage and contract respectively. I will not pursue his analysis here, as it is

not especially relevant for my current purposes, although at various points of the thesis I will utilize the main features of his later arguments.

I will now try to situate Donzelot in relation to some of the major trends in the history of the family, in order to bring out some other features of his approach. Following this, I will examine some critiques of his work.

Since about 1960, family history - before then of little importance - has become a major intellectual concern, both within history narrowly conceived and in cognate "cultural sciences" such as demography, social geography, sociology and anthropology. For my rather crude purposes, two broad tendencies can be distinguished within this field. One is a quantitative approach, using parish registers and other sources to reconstitute the demographic features of the family. Led by Peter Laslett and the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure, this approach has generated a great deal of valuable data and some controversial hypotheses. Chief among the latter is the attempt to rebut the traditional wisdom about the transition since the Industrial Revolution from an extended complex family to a smaller nuclear form. Based on his quantitative data, Laslett has argued that in England at least the large extended family has never existed; household size has remained small and relatively constant (about 4.75, including servants) from the sixteenth century to the end of the nineteenth century, when it started to decline to today's figure of about three (Anderson, 1980:23; significantly, though, Laslett pointed out that the majority of the population - 53% - actually lived in households of six or more members). Another controversial finding concerns household composition. Laslett found that only 6% of households in his sample contained relatives of three different generations, and only 10% had resident kin beyond the nuclear family of husband, wife and children. Reviewing evidence from other countries, Laslett

tried to extend his argument to the whole of Western Europe and North America (Anderson, 1980:24-5).

Laslett's findings have been criticized on a number of grounds, which I shall not consider here. For my purposes, the important point is the emergence of a loosely-defined countervailing school stressing "qualitative" factors such as sentiments, values and attitudes, rather than household size and other demographic variables. Represented chiefly by the work of Aries, Flandrin, Shorter, and Stone, this school argues that the important questions concern the nature of relationships within the family, rather than the size of the household as such (Anderson, 1980:39-40).

Donzelot's approach is closer to this second option, and he acknowledges the work of Aries and Flandrin (1979a:xxv). Like them, and in opposition to Laslett (and more recently Pollock, 1983), he argues for a recent emergence of the "nuclear" family (he speaks of the recentering of the family on itself - 1979a:45 - or its autonomization - 1979a:69-70, 73, 48). But Donzelot also criticizes the sentiments approach:

"....the disadvantage of this fascinating and meticulous restitution of the familial past is in the haphazard nature of this separating-out of mentalities, in the fuzziness it allows to settle in between this domain and that of economic and political transformations" (1979a:xxv; cf. 5-6).

Donzelot attempts to deconstruct the family, by positing it "not as a point of departure, as a manifest reality, but as a moving resultant, an uncertain form whose intelligibility can only come from studying the system of relations it maintains with the sociopolitical level" (*ibid*). The chief result of this investigation is the analysis of contract and tutelage as two different channels along which the recentred family emerged. Rather than a single model gradually spreading from bourgeois to working class families (cf. Willmott and Young, 1975:22), Donzelot insists that there is no single model

of the family, and that rather than positing an evolutionary process of the diffusion of mentalities, we have to look at specific political strategies, alliances, conflicts, compromises, etc., and how these are worked out: in Foucault's terms, a microphysics of the power relations surrounding the family.

Donzelot thus rejects any approach based on the evolution of mentalities (in the Anglo-Saxon world, associated with the structural-functionalism of Parsons and Shorter in particular). His approach stresses the changes in meaning and function of an apparently unitary object under different conditions, and the political significance of these changes.

But "political significance" has to be read in a particular way. Although undoubtedly critical of the established order and of the family, Donzelot distances himself from both Marxism and feminism (and also psychoanalysis, but this is less relevant for my purposes), the conventional vehicles for a critical theory of the family.

Donzelot criticizes the Marxist notion that the family is vital to the reproduction of the capitalist order because of its twin functions as an anchorage point for private property and as the agency responsible for socialization of children into the ruling ideology. If we accept this viewpoint, then the introduction of divorce, feminism, child protection laws, and similar trends can only be seen as a crisis of the bourgeois order.

Donzelot argues on the other hand that this reproduction formula works much better for the family under the Ancien Régime than for the post-1789 family. Under the Ancien Régime, family authority was continuous with and a constituent part of wider forms of authority. The head of the family received aid and protection in maintaining his power (through, for example, the lettres de cachet) precisely insofar as this power was in keeping with the

requirements of the public order. The family was directly inserted into the political sphere - it was the smallest possible political unit, and it was of like character to more embracing units.

This configuration was transformed during the nineteenth century with the increasing separation of public and private spheres:

"This position of the family would gradually disappear in the nineteenth century, not through the effect of a crisis in the bourgeois order, but as a consequence of transformations brought about by individuals or groupings who were entirely representative of the new, so-called bourgeois, order" (1979a:xx).

The "so-called" is very significant. Donzelot challenges the usual political debates surrounding the family: conservative free enterprise defenders of the family facing socialist and feminist critics. He notes a change at the beginning of the twentieth century. Socialists no longer demanded the abolition of the family. "On the contrary, in the mass organizations the family became the buttress at the foot of which all criticism stopped, the point of support from which demands were launched for the defense and improvement of the standard of living" (1979a:5; cf. 222-3).

The working class itself is implicated in the emergence and continuing importance of the autonomized family, not because of a brutal imposition of this model by the bourgeoisie, but through active participation. In a much-quoted passage, Donzelot asks:

"If today's family were simply an agent for transmitting bourgeois power, and consequently entirely under the control of the 'bourgeois' state, why would individuals, and particularly those who are not members of the ruling classes, invest so much in family life? To assert that this is the result of an ideological impregnation comes down to saying, in less delicate language, that these individuals are imbeciles, and amounts to a not too skilful masking of an interpretive weakness. Nor does it explain why the modern family organized its ties in so supple a manner, so contrary to the old juridical rigidity. If the family were solely a means for the bourgeoisie to cling to the defense of the

established order, why would it let the juridical framework that sanctions its power grow so lax?" (1979a:52-3).

A similar argument applies in relation to feminism:

"In point of fact, this transformation of the family was not effected without the active participation of women. In working class and bourgeois strata alike - albeit by quite different means and with quite different results - women were the main points of support for all the actions that were directed toward a reformulation of family life. For example, the woman was chosen by the medical and teaching professions to work in partnership with them in order to disseminate their principles, to win adherence to the new norms, within the home. This is not to deny the resistances of women to this domestic instrumentalization of their persons - for example, their resistance to the reduction of their mastery in the ancient techniques of the body in exchange for the role of devoted auxiliaries of men doctors. But this is providing we recognize the extent of the revaluation of power relations between man and woman inside the family, which was the positive consequence for the latter (1979a:xxii-xxiii).

Donzelot criticizes feminism for overplaying the continuity of patriarchal domination and for its neglect of the role of (nineteenth century) feminism itself in the construction of the autonomized family. This argument is further considered in Ch.5 (pp.220-5, 244-5) and the Conclusion (pp.393-5).

Rather than manichean confrontations between good and evil, Donzelot insists on the complexity, both historical and moral, of the set of transformations leading to the liberalized family, transformations which are difficult to pin down in terms of totalizing concepts derived from theories of oppression and social control, whether Marxist or feminist. Donzelot avoids the pitfalls discussed in the last chapter, associated with the totalizing and teleological nature of Marxism, with its base/superstructure distinction and its subject/object dichotomy. He sees the "crisis" of the family as part and parcel of its functioning in liberal capitalist society. The "psy" agencies which both feed and feed off this crisis are an essential component of modern

familialism, not a sign of its breakdown (as argued, for example, by Lasch, whose work I discuss below, pp.73-5).

Donzelot speaks of a flotation of norms and values - of new social norms and traditional family values, through the vehicle of psychoanalysis. Instead of legal/moral/religious interdictions of a relatively fixed and specific content, modern familialism substitutes a flexible method of adjusting social norms and individual desires, a method analogous to the fixing of prices in a hybrid variable market (1979a:xvi-xvii, 211-7). Instead of a fixed law or standard, modern familialism is regulated by the minima and maxima of the "serpent" marked out by this flotation (1979a:xv; as Deleuze here points out, this distinction is related to Foucault's more general one between norm and law, which I discuss on pp.39-42 above). Each individual can within these limits readjust his or her relational life on a "free" basis, in the search for a more satisfying combination. If this means breaking up an existing marriage - well, this is the price one must pay for relational fulfilment. It is this latter which is seen as primary, rather than the rigid maintenance of an unsatisfying marriage. This "economic" regulation or flotation avoids the politically dangerous choice between "a juridical stiffening of the family and....a costly and leveling imperialism of social norms" (1979a:217).

A full appreciation of this argument demands a thorough knowledge of Donzelot's whole book, which I cannot provide here (I return to aspects of it in the remainder of the thesis). I mention it here to give an indication of the scope and forcefulness of Donzelot's analysis, in opposition to the opinions of Barrett and McIntosh (1982), to whose critique of Donzelot I now turn.

Barrett and McIntosh published "The Anti-social Family" in 1982. The book includes a lengthy discussion of Donzelot's work. Although praising some aspects of his work, their remarks are mostly critical, sometimes very

strongly so (1982:94-105, 116-8). I believe that these criticisms are misplaced, and I will look in turn at five major points which the authors make in order to answer their critique of Donzelot. I feel that it is necessary to do this given the high international reputation of the authors, which renders their discussion one of the standard commentaries on Donzelot in anglophone countries. Their highly critical remarks have perhaps contributed to the relative neglect of Donzelot in these countries.

(1) The first point concerns Donzelot's supposed claims to "an apolitical and objective knowledge" (1982:99):

"Who is this paragon who subscribes to no ideologies and has no views on controversial questions? As we shall show later, Donzelot has very clear political positions and the attempt to depoliticize academic knowledge and present it as objective is - as usual - mystificatory" (1982:100).

This point is linked with a complaint about Donzelot's "inaccessible and elitist" style and the lack of contextualization of his work (1982:99). I will not attempt to defend Donzelot's style, other than to say that such judgements are very personal and are in this case perhaps tied in with differences between the French and Anglo-Saxon academic traditions (cf. Laslett 1980:306-7). Two other aspects of this first point are more serious. Firstly, the lack of contextualization provided by Donzelot; as indicated explicitly by Donzelot, his book has to be read as part of a corpus of work deriving from Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze (1979a:xxv,6). Donzelot's work can only be fully appreciated by connecting it with Foucault's, something which Barrett and McIntosh do not do. The third aspect of this first point is the accusation that Donzelot adopts a value-free stance; this is very foreign to Foucault's and Donzelot's general outlook. To quote Poster:

"For Foucault.... all discourses are merely perspectives. The only way to judge their value is in terms of their role in constituting practices, not in terms of their intrinsic value as 'truth' or 'science'" (1984:84-5).

Donzelot adopts the same perspective. His analysis is not presented as an objective, value-free account. It is an analysis with particular purposes in mind, and has to be judged in terms of these purposes:

"I have in mind a plan of description that I hope will permit us to escape both the epic register - that narrative loftiness where the inscription of a meaning in history proceeds through the recounting of manichean confrontations - and the one characterized by the passive contemplation of in-depth mutations. On the basis of this twofold rejection of the lofty and the profound, we shall attempt a history of the social surface. This will involve identifying lines of transformation fine enough to account for the singularities assigned to family roles in the different types of figures noted earlier, but perceiving these roles as the strategic resultant of these diverse forces" (1979a:7).

Donzelot wishes to cut a new path, to break out of the usual constellation of debates surrounding the family (Marxism, feminism, and psychoanalysis in the French context), but this does not mean he is claiming to develop an objective or value-free position - it is simply a different perspective, and he is quite explicit in his rejection of the usual debates and his reasons for this rejection (1979a:xix-xxvii).

Rather than being "apolitical", Donzelot's book is precisely concerned with the political ramifications of what in bourgeois rhetoric is seen as a natural and apolitical institution:

"Nothing can be said against this argumentation if one accepts the terms in which it is deployed, the crisis of the family as the result of an evolution of mores, the development of psychologism and psychoanalysm as the solution, the least objectionable response to the situation. But what becomes of this line of argument when we challenge its assumptions, when we identify the emergence of the modern family and the expansion of 'psy' organizations as a single process, and one that is not politically innocent in the least?" (1979a:220; my emphasis).

Donzelot sees the liberalized family as providing the solution to the problems faced in the nineteenth century by a liberal definition of the state (see pp.50-8 above). It is a means of stabilizing and hegemonizing a particular variant of industrial capitalism, although Donzelot's notion of hegemony, as argued in Chapter 1, is a very different one from that of Gramsci and Marxists generally.

The whole purpose and tone of his work as well as many particular sentences show that he is far from being disinterested or apolitical. I will only give one further example:

"....the devices of savings, educational prompting, and relational counseling became operative by connecting the moralized and normalized working class family to the bourgeois family. Between the powerlessness of the former and the blossoming of the latter, they wove an obsessive web of social promotion which was to furnish the petty bourgeoisie with its characteristic traits, its overinvestment of family life, its sense of economy, its fascination with education, its frantic pursuit of everything that might make it into a good 'environment'" (1979a:93; cf. 227-9).

Hardly a very kind reading of contemporary capitalism! Nor is it value-free or "objective": quite the opposite.

Summing up the first point - Donzelot is quite explicit about his analytical intentions, particularly when his work is set in relation to that of Foucault. He certainly makes no claims to be producing a value-free analysis; his own political preferences may not be very explicit, but even a casual reading soon brings out Donzelot's very critical attitude to contemporary society, from a class-based but not Marxist perspective. Donzelot does seek to escape from the usual debates surrounding the family, but only to produce a different and more satisfactory interpretation, not to produce an "objective" or value-free account³.

3. An extended discussion of the position of the analyst in the Foucault/Donzelot tradition can be found in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983, *passim*.

(2) Barrett and McIntosh's second major point is a passing but very important shot - that Donzelot poses the question of the family's appeal very well, but does not and cannot answer this question:

"Having posed for himself the question why individuals have conceived an attachment to the family, the answer he comes up with is: because. More precisely, because over a period of time it came to be regarded as positive" (1982:100-1).

This a very poor caricature of a rich and complex argument. Donzelot's whole book is an attempt to answer the question referred to. Barrett and McIntosh do not justice to Donzelot or to themselves by making such a derogatory statement. As though they had realized this themselves, their next sentence reads: "We do not seek to make a cheap point here" (1982:101).

I contend that Barrett and McIntosh do make a "cheap point" in their caricature of Donzelot's argument. To pretend, firstly, that there can be any simple one-line answer to such a difficult question is in itself very improper. Donzelot's argument about the positivity of the family involves his whole book - the liberal definition of the state, the threat of a collectivist abolition of the family in favour of state normalization, the way in which this confrontation was resolved in favour of a liberalized form of familialism, no longer tied directly to political and economic structures but still serving purposes of social integration and hegemonization - even this extremely bare outline of Donzelot's book should provide sufficient evidence that Barrett and McIntosh's reading is nothing less than a gross caricature (I have examined these arguments somewhat more fully above, pp.50-8).

Donzelot's account is rich, detailed and persuasive. Barrett and McIntosh dismiss it flatly while barely scratching the surface of his argument. Even if there was some basis to their claims, they would need to examine Donzelot's whole book in detail and compare it with available alternatives

before coming to such a damaging conclusion. Some of the more salient general statements relating to the question under review can be found on pp.xxi, xxvi, 57-8, 90-5 and 226 of Donzelot's book, but I repeat that the whole book is an attempt to answer the question and no isolated quotations are in the end sufficient. Nonetheless I will quote from pp.57-8 to show the perversity of Barrett and McIntosh's critique:

"If the discourse on the morality of saving was able to function, this was not primarily because workers were compelled to deposit a portion of their meager resources in savings accounts (even if this was the case in some paternalistic firms) but because this saving enabled them to achieve a greater family autonomy in relation to the blocks of dependence or networks of solidarity that continued to exist after a fashion. If the hygienist norms pertaining to the rearing, labor, and education of children were able to take effect, this was because they offered children, and correlatively women, the possibility of increased autonomy within the family in opposition to patriarchal authority" (1979a:57-8; emphasis in original).

This argument tries to explain the success of modern familialism and is directly relevant to Barrett and McIntosh's critique; but it is nowhere mentioned by them: they present only the bare statement quoted at the start of this section, together with a supporting quotation from Donzelot in footnote 35 (p.101). Barrett and McIntosh may not find the above arguments very palatable or convincing, but they are obliged to take them into account if they expect their critique to be taken seriously.

(3) The third major point concerns what Barrett and McIntosh see as Donzelot's functionalism: "The Policing of Families" is a thoroughly functionalist text" (1982:101). They refer to a number of different pages in Donzelot to substantiate this claim (footnote 39, p.102). I have checked these pages and can only conclude that Barrett and McIntosh's claim is dubious at best. It is very difficult to go any further with these references. One of the two references (presumably the best ones from their point of view) which they do

quote is however very damaging to their case. The passage involved is as follows:

"....the family is an agency whose incongruity with respect to social requirements can be reduced, or made functional, through the establishment of a procedure that brings about a 'floating' of social norms and family values" (Donzelot, 1979a:8, quoted in 1982:101; emphasis by Barrett and McIntosh).

The crucial word here is "made". Functionality for Donzelot is not a product of the system or structure, or of a process of structural differentiation à la Parsons - rather it is made, it is produced, and it is this process of manufacture, the way in which this functional circuit is assembled and the political significance of this circuit which is of interest to Donzelot, not simply the functionality as such. Donzelot is primarily concerned with the political conflicts, alliances, compromises, stand-offs, etc., which resulted in the emergence of this functionality - the microphysics of the power relations around familialism. This is vastly different from any kind of functionalism which I am familiar with. Barrett and McIntosh make the mistake of labelling Donzelot as functionalist simply because he uses the word function. This does not necessarily follow. All social scientists to my knowledge make statements about the impact of one institution, belief or practice on other institutions, etc., i.e. they posit "functional relations" between different aspects of a culture or society. This does not make all of them functionalists (although I would not want to underestimate the continuing importance of structural functionalism in overt or disguised forms).

The second quotation used by Barrett and McIntosh can be brought in here: "these are the things that made the family into the essential figure of our societies, into the indispensable correlate of parliamentary democracy" (1979a:94; quoted in 1982:102; emphasis by Barrett and McIntosh). The implication of their emphasis in both quotations is that to posit any kind of

relation between two objects (family and society, or whatever) is necessarily to slip into functionalism, a position which is quite untenable. As Donzelot says quite explicitly at the outset, it is a question of the particular way in which these relations are conceptualized which is crucial, not simply the existence of these relations:

"So we can neither speak of the family as an ideological apparatus of the state nor put its modernization down to a lack of coherence in advanced liberal societies. Doubtless it is tied, decisively, to the present order, but not in the form of a direct dependence with respect to the 'bourgeois state', or in that of a pure and simple subjection to the imperatives of the transmission of fortunes. Before and instead of considerations of this sort, we would do better to take account of its largely successful inscription within a new form of sociality, of which it appears to be both queen and prisoner" (1979a:xxi-xxii).

Barrett and McIntosh go even further in demonstrating the facile nature of their critique. They say:

"Donzelot's is a functionalist text; but what is radical about his approach, and the reason why his work has been taken up from an anti-functionalist position, is that he rejects the integrated logic of a functionalist perspective" (1982:102).

But surely this "integrated logic" is precisely what identifies functionalism as a theoretical option! That society is made up of a series of interlocking parts, all of them contributing to the maintenance of the social system, the latter usually conceived of as an harmonious entity, free of conflict; that change proceeds from the slow evolution ("structural differentiation" for Parsons) of system parameters ("pattern variables"), a concept which again tends to be apolitical and conservative in its implications. While Donzelot may posit functional relations between, for example, psychoanalysis and the legal/administrative procedures for dealing with juvenile offenders, he never regards the whole of society as being analogous to a functional assemblage of parts. The functional circuits which he refers to are analyzed in terms of the historically specific and politically significant microphysics through which

they emerged, and through which they will eventually disappear. It is this microphysics of power and domination which is the primitive in Donzelot's analysis, as it could never be in a functionalist one.

(4) Barrett and McIntosh criticize Donzelot for not "theoretically deconstructing" the family (particularly that of the Ancien Régime), to complement his "historical deconstruction". I find their argument quite faulty, but a refutation would be long and complex, and I will therefore decline to comment on this point. This supposed failure on Donzelot's part, however, leads on to a charge of "essentialism" which it is necessary to address:- "It is not too fanciful to read this as residual essentialism, as an idealized evocation of 'the family' we have now lost" (Barrett and McIntosh, 1982:103). This represents a major leap by the authors. From decrying Donzelot's failure to deconstruct the family of the Ancien Régime, Barrett and McIntosh now accuse him of pining for this idealized family: "Feeding as it does into the emotional rhetoric of an idealized family, the title of Donzelot's book is in itself instructive. When it comes to being policed, we all know whose side we are on" (*ibid*).

I have already discussed the meaning of policing for Donzelot (pp.48-9 above) and will not elaborate here, except to say that Barrett and McIntosh have obviously ignored Donzelot's explication of the concept. I can find nothing which suggests that Donzelot mourns the passing of the patriarchal family. He is concerned, as is Foucault, with charting the transformations from one set of power relations to another. Barrett and McIntosh provide no further evidence for this claim.

They continue: "It is, of course, relevant that Donzelot has established at an early stage the guilt of the wife - it is she who is in alliance with the doctors, collaborating with the experts and technicians" (1982:104). The use of

the term "guilt" here is unwarranted. Donzelot certainly does not use it, nor does he in any way blame women for the present social order. His argument is that women were involved or active in the emergence of this order (see p.63 above), contra some of the less sophisticated versions of feminism which overlook the late nineteenth century alliance between feminism and philanthropy. To say that women were implicated in this process is not to blame them or to say they are guilty.

Barrett and McIntosh rightly point out that Donzelot regards the modern family as pathological, but this does not mean that he regards the patriarchal family as any better, as they imply.

(5) The fifth point follows on directly from the previous one. Donzelot is seen as mourning the patriarchal family. Barrett and McIntosh use this argument to link Donzelot with Christopher Lasch. Barrett and McIntosh argue that Lasch and Donzelot are "remarkably consonant" in their accounts of how "the family has been taken over by the mushrooming guidance agencies of the corporate state" (1982:117). The two authors also concur "in diagnosing an unhealthy alliance between women and the plethora of agencies that disguise state intervention in the family as 'expertise'" (*ibid*). The term "unhealthy" in this passage is misleading, as with the "guilt" discussed above (p.72). Donzelot does not make this kind of value-judgement, although he is obviously critical of the contemporary family form.

Moreover the whole comparison with Lasch is extremely suspect. Lasch may have written "an adulatory jacket-blurb" for the American edition of Donzelot's book (Barrett and McIntosh, 1982:117), but the warrant for the comparison cannot rest on this, it must come from a substantive comparison of the two authors' work. A close reading of "Haven in a Heartless World" reveals many differences from the work of Donzelot.

Following directly the work of the Frankfurt School on the "authoritarian personality", Lasch argues that the authoritarian family dominated by the father has declined under the impact of feminism and other forces; this decline of paternal authority has led to a decline of parental authority in general (Lasch, 1977:74-5, 85, 90-1). The decay of the bourgeois family form is linked with a whole series of factors: (a) invasion of the family by experts of various kinds - health and welfare officials, marital counsellors, educators, and others - who have taken over responsibility for many functions which previously were performed by the family (1977:18-9, 101-2, 109, 115, 171-2); (b) the intrusion of the marketplace, leading to commercialization of relations within the family (1977:19-20, 166); (c) the influence of the media, and (d) of school (both on p.126); (e) the growing importance of the peer group in children's lives (1977:74-5, 126, 173-4, 186). Mass culture replaces the father as the source of authority, and Lasch brings in psychoanalytic concepts to dissect this mass culture and its effects. His analysis is parallel to Adorno and Horkheimer's analysis of the "authoritarian personality" with its weakness and its susceptibility to fascist hero worship.

This analysis differs from Donzelot's in a number of important respects:-

(1) Lasch's heavy reliance on psychoanalytic categories, which Donzelot rejects as an adequate way of analyzing contemporary familialism, and which is in fact part of the data for Donzelot's study, rather than an analytic tool.

(2) The lack of any kind of class analysis in Lasch's work (also noted by Barrett and McIntosh, 1982:115-6), which leads to all kinds of ambiguities and omissions. Contrary to Barrett and McIntosh, Donzelot can not be linked with Lasch in this respect. His analysis of contract and tutelage, which lies at the

heart of his work, is an explicitly class-based theory. Moreover it points directly to a major weakness in Lasch's book - his account of the "invasion" of the family by outside agencies, which ignores the way families (especially bourgeois families) have themselves courted this invasion through the contractual search for better doctors, teachers, analysts and lawyers. As Donzelot argues, these contractual relations actually augment the autonomy of the family, making it into a thriving milieu, resistant to crises which might provoke state intervention and tutelage (1979a:92-3). It is only in relation to the tutelary pole that it makes some sense to compare Donzelot and Lasch.

(3) This absence makes Lasch's position rather facile in comparison to Donzelot's. Rather than a simple abolition of the family, its invasion by mass conformist society, Donzelot traces out in detail the functional circuits established between public and private spheres which encapsulate modern familialism. He shows that the family has become enmeshed in a new set of social/political structures rather than simply disappearing. Although he does argue that the family's power as a direct political/economic agent has decreased since the late eighteenth century, this process coincides with an increased emphasis on the internal relational life of the family and particularly its educative role. Lasch tends to oppose this "companionate marriage" with state/expert intervention in the family, whereas Donzelot's whole point is that these two processes are part of the same set of transformations, unified by their common reference to the social. State/expert discourse is part of the deployment of the liberalized family, part of our culture's intense interest in this relational configuration. This analysis is taken up again in the Conclusion (pp.390-3).

Barrett and McIntosh's attempt to class Lasch and Donzelot together is facile and misleading, as is their whole critique of Donzelot. Lasch may or may not mourn the patriarchal family, but I have been unable to find any

support for this view in relation to Donzelot. Barrett and McIntosh's very scanty evidence for this claim does not hold water, as I have shown. Barrett and McIntosh fail to consider Donzelot's explicit critique of feminism (although complaining about how his position is not clearly expressed and not open to debate - p.105). Are they arguing that the alliance noted by Donzelot between nineteenth century feminism and philanthropy did not take place? They imply this in a number of places (especially pp.104-5) but the argument is never really taken up. I will show in Part B of the thesis that this alliance is easily discernible in the South Australian case and can be usefully analyzed in the terms provided by Donzelot.

Donzelot's work has received little attention in the Australian literature. Reiger (1985; see also 1986, 1987) repeats Barrett and McIntosh's critique of Donzelot without adding much to it. She also links Lasch and Donzelot together, both mourning the patriarchal family and both blaming women for its passing (1985:18), an argument which I have already commented upon. She criticizes Foucault and Donzelot for "an inadequate conceptualization of the process of social structuring"; and Donzelot and Lasch for ignoring class and gender (1985:17-8), an argument which for Donzelot is quite fallacious. Her preference for Anthony Giddens (and his critique of Foucault) is not shared by me.

Reiger's reading of Donzelot is quite faulty in my opinion:-

"Lasch and Donzelot's anti-feminism is not shared by Ehrenreich but in none of their accounts do women play an active role. Rather the professionals impose the new notions of domestic life largely on behalf of the ruling class, or in Donzelot's view, in the interest of general social administration" (1985:211).

In fact women's active role is a crucial part of Donzelot's argument, and a part which has been explicitly noted and attacked by Barrett and McIntosh, who

accuse Donzelot of seeing women "as collaborators with the enemy" (1982:105), and as "guilty" of an "unhealthy alliance" with the experts (1982:104, 117). Seeing professionals as "imposing the new notions of domestic life" is also quite foreign to Donzelot, and must at the very least take account of the class-based distinction between contract and tutelage.

Reiger argues that "Donzelot seems to me to provide no coherent let alone convincing explanation" (1985:211). Her own book could have been improved by a closer reading of Donzelot's work. Her central argument is the contradiction between professional rationalization of domestic life and the bourgeois "cult of domesticity", with its stress on the natural and ingrained character of women's domestic role. Donzelot shows on the other hand that this apparent contradiction resolves into two interlinked strategies on the same line of transformation. The companionate family and expert intervention in the family can then both be seen as essential parts of modern familialism, acting in concert, not in contradiction (Reiger's argument is taken up again in the Conclusion, pp.390-3).

This linkage between "internal" and "external" factors is one of the most innovative aspects of Donzelot's work, and it distinguishes him from most other writers in the field. Strangely, it is also something which is misinterpreted by many commentators, despite Donzelot's quite explicit disclaimers. I have already shown how both Barrett and McIntosh (1982), and Reiger (1985) misread Donzelot in this respect, but these are not the only examples. Thus Laslett in his review comments as follows on the title of the book:-

"The phrase must, I suppose, imply the process by which families have lost their own spontaneous, immemorial autonomy and had their membership, especially their children, removed from their control and placed under the collectivity" (1980:306).

Here we have another example, along with Barrett and McIntosh, of a scholar with a high international reputation who has simply ignored Donzelot's quite explicit warnings about his use of the term "policing"!

Similarly, Vandepol cites Donzelot as part of a growing body of literature which "portrays powerless parents facing expanding government authority over the family" (1982:221). Even Hodges and Hussain, in their very sympathetic review, place a one-sided emphasis on external interventions:- "The development of the modern family.....is a result of changes which, as Donzelot shows, did not originate within the family but in a number of domains outside it" (1979:94-5). While Donzelot certainly does not see the modern family as a self-enclosed, autonomous domain, neither does he see it as a passive receptacle of external interventions. These interventions gained their effectivity through the ways in which they were linked to problems, disputes and aspirations within the family - families, and particular family members, were active participants in the changes described (Donzelot, 1979a:57-8).

Donzelot radically deconstructs the family, seeing it not as a unitary, bounded entity, which is affected/not affected by external forces. Both the family and these external forces are part of a general deployment of power relations in which a particular form of individual self-interest is integrated with broader interests and made to function in concert with them. In line with Foucault, this involves active, positive integration into the social order, rather than a process of repression (see chapter 1).

Compulsory education is a central vehicle for generalizing this configuration of individual and collective interests. It creates the formally meritocratic framework within which this self-interest can be incited and made to function in socially appropriate ways. Within this universal

meritocratic system, suitable displays of self-interest become a sign of normality, a sign of social usefulness. Conversely, lack of interest in schooling, or resistance to it, become signs of "underachievement" and hence of limited social utility (this theme will be taken up in my discussion of state secondary education in South Australia in chapter 6).

Compulsory education is analytically vital to Donzelot's argument, given the convergence of moralizing and normalizing philanthropy on childhood in the late nineteenth century. Yet education is not discussed in any detail by Donzelot because of the broad scope of his argument. My thesis will not only exploit Donzelot's ideas within a different ethnographic context, but will also focus much more explicitly on compulsory education in an effort to fill out and extend these ideas. I will conclude this chapter by briefly recapitulating the importance of compulsory education for Donzelot and how I intend to use this analysis in the remainder of the thesis.

The revalorization of childhood and correlative of motherhood at the end of the nineteenth century was crucially dependent on compulsory education. This was not only a matter of using education to instil the state-sponsored norms of thrift, hygiene, morality, political docility, etc., in working class and lower middle class children. As well as doing this, compulsory education automatically restricted child labour, effecting an economic and cultural revaluation of children and consequently a wholesale transformation in the dynamics of familialism.

Compulsory education was thus able to deal with a number of problems which worried nineteenth century reformers:- (1) the exploitation of children by their parents - either by putting them to work in the family household/trade, or by sending them out as wage-earners to supplement the familial income; (2) the problems associated with this exploitation - the direct

threats to children's health and safety, the premature exposure to physically demanding tasks which stunted their development, their lack of education or training, and the loss of national resources which all of this entailed; (3) the initiatory ties between parents and children, which led to the transmission of what were seen as politically and morally dangerous views; (4) the unhealthy linkage set up between number of children and familial income - more children meant more wages; this linkage led to exploitation of child labour, abandonment, pauperism, and to fears that the "lower orders" were outbreeding the higher, with potentially disastrous consequences; compulsory education reversed this relationship, so that children became financial liabilities rather than assets, not only because of the loss of their wages, but also because of the expenses associated with their education (cf Zelizer, 1985).

The introduction of compulsory schooling involved much more than fulfilling children's "need" for education (conceived of as a natural and universal requirement). A complete revalorization of childhood and familialism resulted, part of the broader transformation from law to norm discussed in chapter 1. Donzelot distinguishes two models of twentieth century childhood emerging from this process (1979a:47).

The first model was connected with the bourgeois family and involved protected liberation. The child was to be liberated from harsh and arbitrary patriarchal authority, but this liberation was to take place within a specially designed, carefully insulated and discreetly supervised environment. Within this hothouse, the child was encouraged to develop its "natural" abilities to their fullest, unrestrained by obsolescent authoritarian dictates. The child's particular abilities were to be read from its own "spontaneous" inclinations, and these abilities were to be carefully elicited and supported.

In contrast, the working class child did not - in the eyes of the reformers - need to be liberated. Rather (s)he was excessively liberated as it was - left to roam the streets in pursuit of work. The problem here was to curb an existing state of "freedom", to bring the child back into spaces where (s)he could be watched and supervised - the school and the family dwelling. Donzelot refers to the resultant model of working class childhood as supervised freedom.

Twentieth century childhood can be seen as falling along a continuum between these two opposing models. Compulsory schooling and other legislation relating to children set up general norms concerning the proper education, hygiene and moral training of children. This helps to create a universal system of social promotion, in which (formally) each child can pursue its individual self-interest, knowing that its future will be determined impartially on the basis of merit, as demonstrated in its success at school. But families at different levels of the social hierarchy are related to this system in very different ways, ranging between the two poles of contract and tutelage discussed above. The private contractual pursuit of self-interest becomes a generalized method of positive integration into the social order, but tutelage remains as a reserve power to deal with those who are unwilling to enter this contest, or incapable of doing so. Hence education remained, in spite of the meritocratic dreams of the reformers, linked to class hierarchies, but in a more disguised and informal way.

Donzelot's analysis of these two models of childhood provides an important element in the framework of Part B of the thesis, in particular chapter 5. Further discussion will be deferred till then. In the next chapter, which concludes Part A, I examine the political culture of nineteenth century South Australia through the writings of Edward Gibon Wakefield. This political culture valorized compulsory education as a project of reform and

helped to shape its eventual institutional form. I will argue that analysis of this political culture is important in understanding compulsory education in South Australia, and that this analysis can be fruitfully conducted using the concepts of Foucault and Donzelot discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Chapter 3 thus extends on the analysis already developed, an analysis integral to Part A, as well as laying the groundwork for the elaboration and development of this approach in relation to South Australia, which constitutes Part B.

CHAPTER 3. SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION, EDUCATION AND HEGEMONY

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapters I have developed an argument about the nature of biopower and how it incites a characteristic form of self-interest. I have shown how this self-interest acts as a hegemonizing force in liberal capitalist societies, and have briefly indicated how universal compulsory education can be seen as eliciting this form of individualism.

Chapter 3 continues this argument by looking at the significance of compulsory education as a project of reform in nineteenth century South Australia. Universal education existed for a long time as a programme for social development in Western countries before its full institutional realization. As such, it was an important marker of progressive versus reactionary attitudes. I will therefore examine the cultural connotations which universal education acquired in this pre-institutional phase. These understandings influenced its emergent form, as well as its subsequent development and its present.

I do this through the writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield on "systematic colonization". Wakefield was instrumental in establishing the colony of South Australia, and his ideas were a prime ingredient in its nineteenth century political culture (see Pike, 1967:52-95). I use Wakefield to locate compulsory education within a "civilizing" or "normalizing" project, a project which can be compared with the "micropower" discussed by Foucault - power which penetrates into the mundane, everyday realities of the mass of the population. Wakefield envisaged a number of sources of such micropower, as we shall see below. Although he did not advocate state-

directed education as such, the latter can be seen as a way of realizing the civilizing project espoused by Wakefield and other nineteenth century social reformers. Hence Wakefield will not be treated as a direct causal influence on the founding of state compulsory education. Rather his work will be used as a convenient window through which to view the significance of universal education in its pre-institutional phase, and its place in the political culture of South Australia at that time.

This chapter thus continues the analysis of the previous two, but also begins to develop this analysis in the more specific context of the emergence of compulsory education in South Australia in 1875. State-directed compulsory education contradicted nineteenth century laissez faire views. At a deeper level, however, it can be seen as part of the deployment of disciplinary power in Foucault's sense, and hence as congruent with certain general features of liberal capitalist societies. I use Wakefield to argue that state intervention/regulation is not an alien growth on an originally pure laissez faire order, it is rather a definitive part of that order; this state regulation is an expression of, although not identical with, the deployment of biopower, as discussed above (pp.37-42). In this way the chapter provides a linkage to Part B of the thesis, as well as continuing the analysis of disciplinary power at a general level.

The degree and nature of state intervention in the field of education has always been a major political issue in liberal capitalist societies. This is because state education brings together and encapsulates a whole range of problems which touch on every major institution in such societies: the proper duties of parents towards their children and vice versa; the division of labour between genders; social mobility; job training; inculcation of moral, civic and hygienic norms; the economic, military and political power of the nation-state. The problem which is crucial to this chapter and more diffusely to the

thesis as a whole is the contradiction between state intervention and the ideology of a free enterprise, laissez faire society. This contradiction forms the chief basis of political discourse in liberal capitalist societies (and most other present-day societies), and education is one of the key grounds upon which this discourse is deployed.

It is the emergence of this field of discourse in nineteenth century South Australia and the specific forms it took locally that this chapter addresses. This process will be charted on the basis of the social philosophy and political economy of Edward Gibbon Wakefield. Wakefield was a key figure in the planning of the British colony of South Australia, as well as having a major influence on nineteenth century British colonization generally. Though his theories have been disparaged by many commentators in the twentieth century, he was regarded as an important figure in political economy in his day. His critique of Ricardo and other earlier political economists was received sympathetically by John Stuart Mill among others. His plan of systematic colonization was widely praised, and was to some extent practised by the British government (Philipp, 1971; Philipp provides an important corrective to earlier, more disparaging assessments of Wakefield's ideas).

Wakefield will be treated not as the purveyor of a fixed and definite body of belief - bourgeois ideology - but as the critical initiator of a discursive field in the South Australian context - a field revolving around the question of laissez faire versus state intervention. Wakefield's ideas can not be pinned down to a particular point within this field. His importance lies in the way he was able to encompass this whole field and give birth to a compelling synthesis which reconciled its two poles.

This synthesis was never realized in its totality, nor does it bear a direct relation to any current or recent political ideology in South Australia. The process of ideological formation in South Australia is much more fragmentary, episodic and complex than the simple transmission of an essentially unchanging bourgeois ideology inherited from Wakefield or the other founding fathers. Wakefield's synthesis provided the raw materials out of which various political ideologies have been formed, through a process of fragmentation and recombination. The original Wakefieldian ideas were faithfully preserved in the colony for some years by the so-called frugalist party, but by the 1870's this tightly unified set of ideas had fallen apart. The fragments survived as the ideologies of particular parties and interest groups. These fragments were then available to be recombined in new forms and articulated with different ideological positions. In turn, these new articulations were subject to similar processes of fragmentation and recombination as the original synthesis.

This process of fragmentation and recombination has led to some curious bedfellows in the South Australian context, judged according to commonsense political categories. Parties representing farmers and other small businesses have at various times espoused highly collectivist legislation involving major state intervention in economic life. The results of this legislation include agricultural marketing schemes, the State Bank, the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust. Conversely the early Labor Party in South Australia tried for a while to actively woo the small farmer vote, and has generally been quite willing to shelve its radical or socialist rhetoric when in government. Twentieth century governments of all complexions have been prepared to provide all manner of costly infrastructure - roads, pipelines, electricity, schools, hospitals, etc. - in the effort to attract major new investments to the state, often in competition with the other Australian states.

SECTION II: WAKEFIELD AND SYSTEMATIC COLONIZATION

Edward Gibbon Wakefield was born in 1796 of Quaker and philanthropic stock. His father was successively farmer, civil servant, estate steward and surveyor. His paternal grandmother was the reputed founder of friendly societies and savings banks, and his father and other relatives were also involved in philanthropic activities (Collier, 1914, pp.v-vi). In 1826, Wakefield abducted Ellen Turner from school and eloped with her to Gretna Green. He was tried and sentenced to three years imprisonment for this escapade (Philipp, 1971:1).

It was in prison that Wakefield became enthralled by theories of colonization. Pike argues that his ideas on what he called "systematic colonization" were derived from many sources and were not original in themselves (1967:74-7), although this view has been challenged by Philipp (1971). In any case, Wakefield provided a powerful synopsis of these ideas and effectively propagated them among wealthy, aristocratic and influential circles. Wakefield helped to remove the stigma attached to emigration because of its association with "convicts, paupers, fugitives, poor relations and rum racketeers" (Pike, 1967:74). Instead of a negative view of emigration as getting rid of undesirables and of surplus population from Britain, Wakefield substituted a positive vision. Colonies should not be used as dumping grounds for convicts and misfits (as in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land), they should be settled by carefully selected young persons of sober and thrifty habits. This would relieve population pressure in Great Britain and provide opportunities for surplus capital. Wakefield believed that there was "excessive competition" at all levels of British society - among capitalists and among the middle class as well as among labourers. Well-established colonies would provide opportunities for all classes and would reduce this excessive competition (Wakefield, 1849:64-78). In time these

colonies would also provide valuable commercial links with the "mother country". Because of the cheapness and ready availability of land in the colonies, most people would be engaged in agricultural or pastoral pursuits, or in producing other raw materials. This would complement the production of manufactured goods in Britain and provide a natural trading link (1849:83). Many other advantages would also flow to the mother country from this creation of civilized and prosperous communities in the colonies.

Wakefield's most important idea was the "sufficient price" of colonial land. He argued that in all previous colonies land had been sold too cheaply or even given away in many cases. There were two damaging consequences of this. Firstly, it tended to produce a dispersed population, which had various economic and social disadvantages:

"In the newest settlements, universally, we find much land, which is become private property without being used in any way; not even cleared of the forest; taken out of control of the public, and yet of no service to any individual; while all such land interposes so much desert, or so many deserts, among the settlers, increasing the distance by which they are separated, interfering with the construction of roads, and operating as a check to social intercourse, to concert, to exchange, and to the skilful use of capital and labour" (Wakefield, 1834:279).

In "A Letter from Sydney" (1929:22; originally published in 1829), Wakefield, fictionally portraying himself as a colonist in New South Wales, bemoans the absence of intellectual society in the colony and predicts the probable fate of its inhabitants:

"Some generations hence, their descendants will probably be as uncouth, and ignorant, and violent as the great mass of North Americans. Perhaps, as here there are no dense forests to prevent them from spreading, they may become as wild as the inhabitants of the Pampas, or as gross, lethargic, and stupid as the boors of the Cape of Good Hope; who, by the by, were compelled to spread by the Dutch mode of granting land."

Concentration of settlement, on the other hand, would lead to rapid increases in land values, would allow a proper division of labour, would provide ready markets for colonial goods, and would produce a colonial gentry to provide leadership and civilizing influence (Pike, 1967:77-81). Wakefield seems to have softened his opinions on concentration of settlement in later years, possibly in response to criticisms that it restricted settlers' choice of land (1849:429-39).

The second virtue of the sufficient price was the key point of his whole system. In his 1849 book, he states baldly that "The sole object of a price is to prevent labourers from turning into landowners too soon: the price must be sufficient for that one purpose and no other" (1849:347). Giving land away or selling it too cheaply produced a chronic shortage of labour. Labourers could very quickly save enough to purchase their own land, in which case they would have no incentive to remain labourers. Wages would be very high and profitability low. Apart from the absolute shortage of labour, employers could not rely on getting together a large body of labourers for extensive projects, and even if they accomplished this, they could not rely on the labourers to stay long enough to complete the project (1849:165-71, 331-44).

Wakefield, in short, urged the sufficient price as a means of creating a reliable and disciplined working class in the colonies. Capitalist relations of production between employers and workers were to him the natural and eternal basis of society, and if they did not arise spontaneously in the colonies because of the abundance of land in proportion to people, then these relations had to be artificially induced. Marx sums up Wakefield's "discovery" as follows:

"....Wakefield discovered that, in the colonies, property in money, means of subsistence, machines and other means of production does not as yet stamp a man as a capitalist if the essential complement to these things is missing: the wage-

labourer, the other man, who is compelled to sell himself of his own free will. He discovered that capital is not a thing, but a social relation between persons which is mediated through things. A Mr. Peel, he complains, took with him from England to the Swan River district of Western Australia means of subsistence and of production to the amount of £50,000. This Mr. Peel even had the foresight to bring besides, 3,000 persons of the working class, men, women and children. Once he arrived at his destination, 'Mr. Peel was left without a servant to make his bed or fetch him water from the river.' Unhappy Mr. Peel, who provided for everything except the export of English relations of production to Swan River!" (1976:932-3).

The sufficient price would, Wakefield hoped, prevent such unfortunate situations and ensure that colonies were replicas of the mother country, with suitable relations of domination and subordination, or as Wakefield would say, suitable proportions between land, labour and capital. Not only this, but the sale of land at a sufficient price - rather than giving it away or selling it at a nominal price - would raise large sums of money for the colonial authorities. This money, Wakefield suggested, should be used solely as an Emigration Fund for bringing more labourers to the colony. A self-regulating system of colonial expansion would be set up, with always the right balance between land, labour and capital. The sufficient price meant that labourers would have to work for some years before saving enough money to buy land for themselves. Prudent labourers would save this sum of money in the appropriate time, buy land, and hence be withdrawn from the labour market. But in buying land, these new capitalists would be indirectly paying for the immigration of fresh labourers to take their places in the labour market, thus preserving the correct balance between demand for and supply of labour (Wakefield, 1834:294-9; 1849:372-81). Marx again provides a wonderful commentary:

"This 'sufficient price for the land' is nothing but a euphemistic circumlocution for the ransom which the worker must pay to the capitalist in return for permission to retire from the wage-labour market to the land. First, he must create for the capitalist the 'capital' which enables him to exploit more workers; then, at his own expense, he must put a 'substitute' in the labour-

market, who is dispatched across the sea by the government, again at the worker's expense, for his old master, the capitalist" (1976:939).

Further, these labourers would be brought out to the colony at no expense to the mother country. In his early publications, Wakefield suggested that any surplus left over from the Emigration Fund might be used to defray other government expenses in the colony, relieving the mother country of all the expenses of colonization (1929:89, 104-5). Later he insisted that all the proceeds of land sales must be used for emigration (1834:297-9; Philipp, 1971:32-5).¹

In contrast with the old system of "shovelling out" paupers, convicts and other undesirables, these emigrants were to be carefully selected, with preference given to young married or marriageable persons without children, with an equal proportion of males and females (Wakefield, 1832:6; 1834:291-309; 1849:405-16). Wakefield deplored the excess of males in New South Wales and other colonies, and preached the refining and civilizing influence of women and of family life. The family was seen as the fundamental building block of an orderly society, a microcosm of "industry, steadiness, and thrift" (1849:413). Such a selection would lead to the greatest possible increase of colonial population as well as being of the greatest benefit in reducing overpopulation in Britain, by removing those on the verge of bearing children and thereby possibly needing assistance from the poor rates. It would also provide the colony with male labourers in the prime of life, with their domestic wants provided for by their wives (cf. Pike, 1967:180 and Nance, 1977:29-43 on the partial success of this plan).

1. See Pike, 1967:169 for the fate of the Land Fund in South Australia; for the sufficient price, see Pike, 1967:80, 120-4, 179; for concentration of settlement, Pike, 1967:175-84; Nance, 1977:37-8.

Only "superior" labourers were to be selected. Although praising the work of the South Australian Commissioners and the New Zealand Company, Wakefield still had reservations even about these most favourable instances: "So we hear of emigrant ships bound to Adelaide or Port Philip, receiving a few English passengers in London, and filling up with the most wretched Irish at Plymouth" (1849:416). Nonetheless the absence of convicts in South Australia was a major contrast with New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land (Western Australia also received convicts for a time), and has always been part of South Australia's self-image. The "superior" quality of colonization in this state can be directly traced to Wakefield's influence (cf. Pike, 1967:310-8).

A central part of the South Australian experiment was religious liberty, a point on which Wakefield was somewhat ambiguous. Pike argues that Wakefield's advocacy of religious liberty for South Australia was pragmatic - he used it to "bait his hook" (1967:82). Wakefield was an Anglican and in later years he advocated settlements based on one religious creed only. He was directly involved in the establishment of two such colonies in New Zealand - the Scottish Free Church colony of Otago and the English High Church colony of Canterbury (Collier, 1914:xv; cf. Wakefield, 1849:54-8, 152-65). "But in the foundation of South Australia he insisted on religious equality and personally supported the proposal to employ the voluntary principle in planting the Church of England in the new colony. With much fervour he refused to allow grants to be made for religion and education from public funds, particularly from the Land and Emigration Fund" (Pike, 1967:83).

Wakefield advocated self-government for the colonies on a number of grounds. The American War of Independence had led many in Britain to despair of colonization altogether. Wakefield attempted to reverse this, and his plea for self-government was related to the American experience

(1849:232, 260). Wakefield was extremely critical of the Colonial Office in London, largely no doubt because of conflicts with them about his theories of colonization, and in particular because of what he saw as the deleterious consequences of a distant, bureaucratic, and ill-informed government, which almost of necessity had no knowledge of local conditions in the colonies (1849:224-62).

Wakefield proposed local self-government but not independence. Britain would retain control over certain matters such as defence, foreign relations, the post office, and ("most important") the disposal of waste land and of the proceeds of its sale (1849:312-3). In other matters the colonies should be able to make their own decisions through their own representative assemblies, limited by the reserve powers of the governor. Wakefield envisaged that under this form of government, the links between mother country and colony would be strengthened rather than weakened:

"....if colonization were systematically conducted with a view to the advantage of the mother-country, the control of the imperial power ought to be much greater, and the connexion between the colonies and the centre far more intimate than either has ever yet been" (1849:275)

Wakefield argued that colonial waste lands were an asset of empire and should remain under imperial control (1849:275-6, 300, 313; Pike, 1967:81).

Pike's comments lump together and confuse "self-government" and "civil liberty", which Wakefield kept separate: "It would seem therefore that Wakefield's pleading for colonial self-government was designed more to discomfit the Colonial Office than to satisfy any passion for civil liberty" (Pike, 1967:82). This is based on Wakefield's opposition to universal suffrage, of which there is abundant evidence (e.g. 1849:301). But Wakefield insisted loudly on the virtues of colonial self-government, which is a separate issue from the nature of this local government. Apart from the 1849 references cited

in this and in the previous paragraphs, see also 1832:8 and 1834:322-331. Pike cites 1929:90 [1829] to support his contention that Wakefield's "prescription for colonial self-government was never precise. Sometimes it was colonial representation in the imperial parliament, sometimes a colonial assembly". This is certainly true of Wakefield's 1829 book, but not of his works of 1832, 1834 or 1849. Wakefield considered that the issue of local versus imperial government of colonies was more important than the basis of the colonial government - "whether the government of a colony is democratic, aristocratic, or despotic, it must be either municipal or central, or both combined in some proportion to each other" (1849:224; cf. 271-2).

It was the local basis of the colonial government which was crucial to Wakefield (at least after 1829). This government was to be elected on the basis of a restricted franchise, in opposition to the views of some of the other founders and pioneers of South Australia and perhaps also in opposition to some of Wakefield's early pronouncements (e.g. 1832:8), but this issue has to be separated from that of self-government.

Another problem with Pike is his portrayal of Wakefield's view of government:

"Some government would be necessary, if only to superintend the arrival of emigrants, control surveys and land sales, administer the law and provide public works beyond the scope of individuals. Salaries would have to be paid to a few officials, but taxation could be reduced to an insignificant trifle. The remaining functions of government, Wakefield believed, could safely be left, in a new colony, to the automatic operation of economic and social forces" (1967:81).

This tends to portray Wakefield as following a simple laissez faire attitude. This is quite wrong if we use his 1849 book, although his earlier views may have been different:

"....the intervention of government is more, and more constantly, needed in the multifarious business of constructing society, than in that of preserving it" (1849:211).

"Without plenty of government, the settlement of a waste country is barbarous and miserable work: the vain exertions, the desperate plunges, the stumbles, the heavy falls, the exhaustion and final faintness of the settlers put one in mind of running, as it is called, in a sack. It is as difficult, as impossible, to colonize well without plenty of government, as to work a steam-engine without fuel, or breathe comfortably without enough air. Ample government, in a word, is the *pabulum vitae*, the unremitting *sine qua non* of prosperous colonization. The quality of government, I repeat, is of less moment to colonists than the amount.

"Throughout the British colonies, the amount of government is curiously small" (1849:211-2).

This may have been too strong for the early Wakefield that Pike is mainly concerned with, and I have not been able to locate anything as explicit as this in his earlier works. But I would argue that such a view is implicit in Wakefield's whole corpus. Wakefield embodies a massive contradiction between laissez faire and state intervention, something which he was perhaps not willing to admit in his earlier days. He wished to reproduce in the colonies the supposedly laissez faire society of Britain, but the process of colonization was to be anything but laissez faire. It was to involve a carefully worked out and carefully regulated plan for constructing a new society - a very particular and uniform method of disposing of waste land, very firm ideas as to how the money raised from land sales was to be used, careful selection of emigrants, a regulated pattern of settlement, as well as all the accepted forms of state intervention in the fields of public works, maintaining law and order, defence, etc. Wakefield used the familiar categories of classical political economy - land, labour and capital - but what he proposed was to construct a planned and regulated utopia in which the proper relations between these elements would be contrived by state action. Wakefield wanted to construct a laissez faire society.

Even in his earlier writings, there is evidence for Wakefield's belief in the importance of state regulation in the colonies. In "A Letter from Sydney" (1829), Wakefield stresses the great responsibility of government in the disposal of colonial waste land - "The proportion between people and territory does, in new countries, depend altogether upon the will of the government. Every new government, therefore, possesses the power to civilize its subjects" (1929:77). In "England and America", Wakefield goes further and suggests that the government must be prepared to adjust the price of land under differing conditions of productivity. The "sufficient price" must be determined by the government on the basis of practical experience in the particular colony (1834:301; cf. 274-6). The whole basis of systematic colonization is the action of government in controlling the sale of land and the proceeds of this sale. In this Wakefield was at odds with Adam Smith and other political economists, as Philipp points out:

"'New' societies which developed naturally in New South Wales and North America - both virgin countries with fertile land of unbounded extent - from the immediate gratification of short-term individual self-interest, needed to be modified by means of government intervention so that a set of artificial conditions would be established which would compel colonists to forgo the satisfaction of immediate desires and allow the realisation of long-term or real interests. In this matter, Wakefield was taking a stance contrary to that of earlier writers such as Adam Smith and Bentham who had believed that conditions in virgin countries, such as America, were ideal for the natural development of free societies: where plentiful, fertile and cheap land, and high wages would ensure the development of a free, educated and disciplined people, increasing rapidly in numbers, wealth and greatness" (Philipp, 1971:27-8; Wakefield's critique of Smith on this point is in 1929:70-7).

Wakefield did believe in free enterprise and *laissez faire* as general principles: "We cannot force either capital or people to emigrate. The principle of *laissez faire* must be strictly observed in this case: and were it otherwise, I cannot imagine the law or act of government that would have the effect of inducing anybody, not being so minded at present, to send his capital to a

colony, or go thither himself" (1849:124). In extolling the benefits of concentration, Wakefield says: "In all these cases, people are attracted from a worse to a better proportion between land and people, from lower to higher profits and wages. That it should be so is consistent with the principles of human nature and political economy" (1834:290). This is an obvious endorsement of Smith's "invisible hand", whereby the private pursuit of self-interest by individuals leads to the greatest benefits for the whole nation through the automatic operation of economic and social forces. Speaking of his plan for regulating the supply of labour by the amount of land sold, Wakefield says: "One of the greatest merits of this plan, therefore, seems to consist in its self-regulating action" (1834:297). This is somewhat ambiguous, since this "self-regulating action" has to be established and maintained through government action, but nonetheless it shows Wakefield's desire to align himself with Smith's "invisible hand". Wakefield refers approvingly on a number of occasions to "self-reliance":

"When Englishmen or Americans have a public object, they meet, appoint a chairman and secretary, pass resolutions, and subscribe money: in other words, they set to work for themselves, instead of waiting to see what their government may do for them. This self-relying course was adopted by a few people in London in 1830, who formed an association which they called the Colonization Society" (1849:39; cf. 230, 258; 1834:327-8; Philipp, 1971:25).

Finally Wakefield was a firm believer in free trade (1834:241-2, 329-31). In the "Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia....", one of the provisions is: "The trade of the colony shall be perfectly free; the colonists having the privilege of selling their produce and buying their supplies wherever they may think proper" (1832:7).

Wakefield accepted much of classical political economy. His objections to it were derived from his thinking about colonization, which was regarded negatively by earlier political economists. Following the American

Revolution, many people in Britain became disillusioned with colonization, and saw it as an unnecessary and unproductive drain on the nation's resources. Wakefield refers to Mr. Mill (James?) who deprecated colonies as a ground for jobs, monopolies, and wars; and quotes from Bentham who criticized colonial monopolies of trade: "There is no necessity for governing or possessing any island in order that we sell merchandize there". Wakefield argued in reply that "in order to sell merchandize in a colony, it is necessary that the colony should exist" (1834:242).

Another argument against colonization derived from Say's Law, and stated that capital used for colonization detracted from the wealth of the mother country. Wakefield argued on the other hand that not only was there excess population in Great Britain, but also excess capital and "excessive competition" among the middle class. Export of all three would be beneficial to both Britain and the colonies, rather than detracting from Britain's wealth (1849:64-95; Philipp, 1971:17-8). Wakefield thus believed that there was no necessary tendency for the greatest good of the greatest number to be achieved by the automatic operation of economic forces. State intervention was necessary in some situations at least to guide and regulate the "invisible hand". There could be an "excess" of one or more of the three key elements of economic activity (land, labour and capital), and there could be "excessive competition" - propositions rejected by earlier political economists, for whom "excess" could only ever be a temporary phenomenon, soon to be ironed out by adjustments in price or demand.

Another opponent of colonization was T.R. Malthus, who argued that emigration might provide temporary or short-term relief to the problem of over-population, but that in the long run it would only exacerbate it because any slackening of the pressure of population on the means of subsistence would create a vacuum which would be filled by an even greater increase of

population (Philipp, 1971:31). Wakefield felt that his selection of emigrants would counter this objection: "To check this too rapid increase of people *in Britain*, it would be advisable to select as emigrants young persons only, and especially young couples of both sexes. The Domestic power of increase would thereby be greatly weakened, and the Colonial power of increase would be strengthened in the same degree" (Wakefield, 1929:84).

Wakefield's relation to other political economists is complex and cannot be examined in detail here, nor am I in a position to evaluate the validity of Wakefield's theories. These theories were taken seriously at the time (by John Stuart Mill among others) and economists have continued to debate the issues until the 1960's at least (Philipp, 1971:17-20).

The important point for my purposes is that Wakefield combined belief in free enterprise and self-reliance with a conviction that colonies needed much more government intervention and regulation than they had hitherto received. Wakefield's stress on government action is largely related to his application of the general principles of political economy to the very special case of the founding of new colonies, where these principles seemed to him to be in need of revision. A strong government was obviously necessary in this case for many pragmatic reasons, as well as for the reasons adduced by Wakefield from his political economy. Wakefield's philosophy points to a curious feature of South Australian society - the co-presence of free enterprise individualism with widespread government intervention and regulation. Wakefield's attempt to reconcile these opposite tendencies provides a privileged entrance point to South Australian history - it established the parameters of a field of discourse whose ramifications are still with us today.

Wakefield had both a practical and an intellectual impact of great significance in relation to South Australia. But there is no simple unilinear

relationship between Wakefield's ideas or motives and the actual history of South Australia. Wakefield had a certain practical impact, in concert with many other sympathetic persons and in relation to a particular set of political conditions. What is more important for my purposes is his intellectual influence - again not a simple cause-effect relation, not simply the transmission of a particular group of ideas from Wakefield to selected individuals or to the general population in South Australia. What is involved is the creation of a discursive field around the issue of laissez faire versus state intervention. Wakefield accepted much of classical political economy, but he was prepared to accept the necessity of government intervention to a much greater degree, something which was systematically downplayed by Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, etc. He was thus able to make explicit the issue of state intervention and its relation to the automatic economic forces of classical political economy - he raised this issue to a new level of awareness and made it respectable - i.e. he created a field of discourse.

Such a discourse was problematic in the early and mid-nineteenth century. Wakefield's success can be partly attributed to the fact that he created this discursive field primarily in relation to the colonies, rather than in relation to Britain. State intervention was obviously necessary in new colonies for a number of reasons, and could be more easily accepted in this context than in the metropolitan centre. South Australia provided a privileged instance for the elaboration of this field of discourse. It allowed the realization of a degree of state intervention which remained enormously problematic in contemporary Britain.

As we shall see, the form of this intervention led to a society very different from the one envisaged by Wakefield. Wakefield established the field of discourse which helped this form to take shape, but there is no simple relationship between Wakefield's ideas and the reality of South Australian

society. To further elucidate what this relationship actually is, it is necessary to consider Wakefield's political philosophy in more detail.

SECTION III. WAKEFIELD'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Wakefield's views on self-government for the colonies have been briefly outlined above (pp.92-4; see especially Wakefield, 1849:184-217, 224-62, 271-8, 297-321). Wakefield believed that as much self-government as possible, short of complete independence, was the most effective way to tie colonies to the mother country, as well as being the best form of government for the colonies themselves. He was extremely critical of the bureaucratic government of colonies at a distance from the Colonial Office in Downing Street (1849:224-62; cf. 1834:322-31). The "local" basis of colonial government was the important point for him, rather than the particular form of this government (democratic, aristocratic or despotic) (1849:224; cf. 271-2).

"Local" for Wakefield, however, carried a whole range of quite specific connotations. He equates "local" with "municipal", having in mind the old chartered colonies of British North America, and the political philosophy of Edmund Burke. Municipal or local government is defined as follows: "The custom with those nations which have governed their dependencies municipally, has been a delegation of the maximum of power compatible with allegiance to the empire" (1849:227). Government of colonies through the Colonial Office, on the other hand, tends to be expensive, out of touch with the colonial situation, arbitrary, and subject to jobbing, patronage, etc. (1834:323-8). British interference in the local affairs of the North American colonies was blamed for their break with the mother country (1849:232, 260, 272-3). Government of colonies from Downing Street is essentially foreign government:

"Not having been formed by the communities whose government it is, not even breathing the same air with them, it wants the strength which a domestic government derives from its nationality. The nation which surrounds it, scarcely recollects its existence. As a government, therefore, it is like a tree without roots, all stem and branches, apt to be bent any way. As a machine of government, the forces by which it is moved or stayed are quite insignificant when compared with the power they influence" (1849:236).

Wakefield envisaged a local government which would be "representative, aristocratic, and monarchical" (1849:301). As will be discussed in detail below in Section V, Wakefield did not believe in universal suffrage:

"If I could please myself in this particular, the electoral franchise should be so limited by a property qualification, as to deprive the poorest immigrants and settlers, which is another expression for the most ignorant, of the superior influence in the legislature which universal suffrage bestows on the most numerous class: for besides the ordinary objections to universal suffrage for a people most of whom are very ignorant, there are two others peculiarly applicable to new countries; namely, the constant influx of strangers, and the roving disposition of fresh colonists" (ibid).

Wakefield harks back to a romanticized view of English aristocratic government. The colonial legislature would be composed of local gentlemen in direct touch with the needs of their electorate, and motivated by the highest ideals of maintaining a cultured and civilized community - in effect a kind of representative squirearchy. Each little corner of the empire would be superintended by a cultivated and responsible gentleman in face-to-face contact with his constituents. This localistic element was crucial. The old proprietary charters of the North American colonies:

"....worked well whenever the grantee, whether an individual or a corporation, resided in the colony, and was identified with the colonists;.....they worked very ill indeed, nearly always when the grantee resided in England. The residence of the grantees in the colony was a carrying out of the municipal principle; their residence here gave effect, so far, to the principle of central or distant government. Baltimore and Penn, and the joint-stock company of cabinet ministers who founded Carolina, were kings, in fact, within their colonies. During the periods when Penn or Baltimore resided in his colony, the whole colony was

local or municipal; whenever he resided in England, and always in the case of Carolina, the kingly authority of the colony was exercised, like that of the present Colonial Office, ignorantly, more or less secretly, and from impulses not colonial" (1849:261-2).

The success of municipal rule would come about not only because of the superior form of government, but also because Anglo-Saxons were for Wakefield a superior race: "whilst colonial prosperity is always dependent on good government, it only attains the maximum in colonies peopled by the energetic Anglo-Saxon race" (1849:79). He speaks of "the singular energy of British industry - that characteristic of our race" (1849:84); "the Anglo-municipal quality of self-reliance", and "the self-governed and energetic English race" (1849:230; cf. 1849:234, 257-9; 1834:327).

This leads on to his critique of the central bureaucratic system which is the opposite of all this: "The bureaucratic system is essentially repugnant to our general institutions, and even to our national character" (1849:234). This system "robs the Englishman of what used to be deemed his birthright" (1849:257). The central bureaucratic system is identified with France and Spain (and their empires), and with Prussia (1849:224-37). In relation to colonization, this system suffers from two defects:-

"The old English colonists under the best charters were self-governed in two senses; first, as their government was local, and next, as it was free or popular: whereas the governments of the old colonies of France or Spain were both absolute and distant" (1849:231).

As already noted, however, Wakefield's attitude to absolutism was somewhat ambiguous. It was the local basis of government which was crucial, rather than its democratic or other character:

"If the absolute form of government was necessary, then at least sovereign or independent despotism should have been erected. Had this been done, the French and Spaniards might perhaps have shared pretty equally with the English in the ultimate

colonization of America; but a combination of the despotic form with distant administration was the worst conceivable government; and the tree has yielded its proper fruit in the degenerate and fading communities resulting from French and Spanish colonization in America" (1849:232).

Nonetheless bureaucratic government is seen as repugnant to English national character and is associated in Wakefield's view with despotism and central control. Not only is nineteenth century British colonial government bureaucratic (unlike the government of the seventeenth century North American colonies), it is "spoiled" bureaucratic - not a true bureaucratic system:

"Our colonial system of government is the bureaucratic, spoiled by being grafted on to free institutions" (1849:234).

It was precisely such a central bureaucratic government which emerged in South Australia in the 1870's, rather than Wakefield's idea of government by local, cultured, superior gentlemen, endowed with statesmanlike vision and leadership qualities. As in the other Australian colonies, the central government performed functions which were generally regarded elsewhere as the province of local government. The South Australian government controlled and paid for the police force, poor relief and the major hospitals. Between 1873 and 1875, important decisions were made in the areas of main roads, public health, and education, which greatly extended this tradition of central control.

In all three cases the central bodies had virtually complete control vis-à-vis local bodies, and all the money came from the central government. The return of prosperity from 1871, after the poor seasons of the 1860's, helped make this centralization possible. Revenue from customs doubled between 1871 and 1876. Later in the decade, receipts from land sales rose rapidly, reflecting the huge areas taken up under the Selection Acts in the early 1870's.

The government was in a position to provide services centrally without requiring any local contributions (for main roads, see Hirst, 1973:129-32; for public health, 1973:132-5; for education, 1973:135-44).

Even after allowing for the tradition of central control, going right back to the foundation of the colony, Hirst still puzzles over the indifference to local government. Local versus central control was still a contentious issue in mid-Victorian Britain, yet in South Australia there was hardly any debate at all. Hirst poses two additional reasons.

Firstly, there was the limited nature of the belief in political democracy: "In the debates on education a distinctly paternal, even authoritarian, tone is evident. Members were very ready to dismiss the trustees of the vested schools as illiterates and incompetents, though these men had been concerned with education when most politicians had been neglecting it" (1973:149). As one of the opponents of the 1875 Education Bill pointed out, if local authorities could not be trusted with control over education, then the people at large could not be trusted to elect a parliament. This widespread feeling can be directly related to Wakefield's doubts about universal suffrage.

Secondly, and more importantly, was the absence of any feeling that South Australia was a collection of separate regions or localities. Parliament itself was more an extension of the life of the metropolis rather than a gathering of representatives from all over the colony. City members were pleased with central authority because it could act effectively where they saw the greatest need - in Adelaide. But country members were equally willing to assign control to the central government, on the assumption that South Australia could be treated as one community. As Hirst argues throughout his book, there was ample justification for this assumption - country people were highly mobile; Adelaide was the social, economic and political centre of the

whole colony; country people visited Adelaide regularly - during Show Week in September, country people often met directly with their members and ministers in Adelaide; the central government provided many public works without provoking any major conflicts between city and country. It was very easy to see the central government as the "local" government for the entire colony. There was nothing in economic or social life that made the establishment of strong local bodies an administrative impossibility. The means to local control already existed in the shape of district councils, but they were not utilised (Hirst, 1973:147-52).

This very close relation between Adelaide and country South Australia mitigates the apparent contradiction between Wakefield's political views and the bureaucratic centralism established or extended in South Australia in the 1870's. Although this may no longer be the case today, South Australia in the 1870's could still be seen as one single "local" community, if on a larger scale than that envisaged by Wakefield. "South Australia" could easily be seen as "Adelaide", and the Adelaide-based government was able to provide a range of services throughout the state without provoking any major conflicts with country or regional interests. Adelaide itself was still relatively small (the population was 61,361 in 1871 - Hirst, 1973:227), there were no other major towns in South Australia, and Adelaide was separated by vast distances from any other Australian capital city. Despite the huge area of South Australia, various social, economic and political factors contributed to make the state a tightly integrated and parochial unit.

Another point of contact with Wakefield is brought out by the debates on education. Politicians and others lacked faith in the trustees of the vested schools. Bureaucratic centralism was necessary in their eyes in order to save the civilizational project of Wakefield and the other founders and pioneers. "Voluntaryism" in religion (i.e. lack of an established, state-funded church)

had proven somewhat shaky even in the provision of churches and support for clergy, and much more so in the field of education, which was seen as inseparably linked to religion until the 1840's, and was widely regarded as the key to any civilized society (see Pike, 1967:115-9, 249-79, 353-91, 423, 434-7). Frugalism or self-help in the economic sphere (as opposed to state funding or the importation of British capital) had also been found wanting, particularly in the building of railways, which was a frenzied political topic in the 1870's (Pike, 1967:300-18, 343-7). Material and spiritual progress both needed something more than self-help, and this could be provided most readily in the South Australian context through centralized funding and direction, for the reasons outlined by Hirst. Wakefield's civilizational mission could only be realized through a radical mutation of many of Wakefield's particular ideas.

There is an even closer connection between Wakefield and bureaucratic centralism in his insistence on the necessity of government intervention in new societies: "Ample government, in a word, is the *pabulum vitae*, the unremitting *sine qua non* of prosperous colonization" (1849:212; see above, pp.94-7). As Mills says in his introduction to "A Letter from Sydney and Other Writings":

"In many things Wakefield has been a true prophet of the directions to be taken by colonial development; in none more than in this. Plenty of government, government in excess, government *in excelsis*, with the absorption of private enterprises by the State, is the distinguishing feature of the leading Australasian colonies at the present time" (1929:xxi).

Wakefield of course envisaged a very different form of government - local, aristocratic, with a maximum of delegation of authority. Underlying this romanticized squirearchy, however, there is another view of government which is closely related to the legal-rational framework of bourgeois society. This is the notion of an orderly, rule-governed, predictable administration, as opposed to the arbitrary and capricious rule which Wakefield saw as

characteristic of the contemporary British colonial system. The basis of this systematic colonization as we have seen was the sufficient price of colonial waste land. Giving away land or granting large tracts of it at a minimal price led to dispersion, scarcity of labour, a barbarous society, corruption and jobbing. Although less prominent later, in his earlier writings, Wakefield was very explicit in his critique of aristocratic arbitrariness, in, for example, French Canada (1834:269) and Dutch South Africa (1834:322).

Even where regulations regarding the disposal of land had been issued (e.g. in New South Wales in 1831), they were often ignored, or exceptions were made for favourites, for reasons of patronage, or for jobbery. For example, Wakefield asserts that in New South Wales good blocks of land could only be had with suitable patronage:

"Has he brought a letter of recommendation to the governor, or the treasurer, or the secretary, or some member of council? If yes, if the letter come from a powerful man or woman in England, the grant is made out" (1834:271).

Wakefield also gives the example of a proposal to make a road from Sydney to the settlements at Hunter's River to the north (now Newcastle). Before the road had even been commenced, two or three small grants of land were made in this district to persons of high official rank in the colony, closely connected with the governor. The road subsequently ran past these blocks, and licensed inns were constructed on them, which did a roaring trade. Other persons applying for similar blocks of land were refused, preserving the monopoly of the original grantees and "turning two or three of his excellency's favourites into highwaymen" (1834:272; for similar arguments, see 1834:261-73, 323-4, 331; 1849:195, 257, 339).

Instead of this courtly, aristocratic and bureaucratic system of patronage, jobbery, and arbitrary power, Wakefield suggested a fixed,

uniform, general and unvarying rule for the disposal of waste land (1834:266-7; cf. 276-91, 320-1). As argued above, his whole scheme is thus dependent on a rule-governed framework established and maintained by the state (imperial in this case, as Wakefield reserved this power to the crown - see above, p.93). In spite of Wakefield's critique of the "spoiled" bureaucratic colonial system, his own plan is based precisely on an impartial, universal, official, bureaucratic rule.

There is a deep congruence between Wakefield's systematic colonization and the bureaucratic centralism of 1870's South Australia. While he advocated the largest possible degree of local self-government, the main point of his whole system - the disposal of colonial land - was to remain vested in the central, imperial authority, and was to be governed by a bureaucratic rule (although the sufficient price for each colony was to be worked out on the basis of local and practical experience).

What Wakefield was advocating was the imposition of order and control on a previously disorderly and irregular system:- "Of real, effective, fruitful control, there never has been half enough" (1849:276). This control was to be of a particular kind. The advocate of the present system "recommends control, arbitrary, undefined, irregular, capricious, and masked; I propose a control according to law; that is, a control definite, orderly, steady, above all seen and understood by the subjects of it" (*ibid*).

Wakefield's system can be compared with the "disciplinary" power analyzed by Foucault and Donzelot, as discussed in the first two chapters. Power is decentralized and liberalized, but at the same time made more effective, more encompassing; it spreads its net more widely and penetrates more deeply into the "social body". Self-government for the colonies links them more effectively into this disciplinary network; it allows a better

"composition of forces" (Foucault, 1979:162-7) with other such units and with the imperial centre, as well as ensuring the internal order and development of each colony.

As argued in previous chapters, this disciplinary regulation is a general feature of so-called laissez faire society. The legal-bureaucratic framework of the bourgeois state, which utilizes this disciplinary power, is not an alien growth on an originally pure laissez faire order, it is an integral and essential part of this order - it is the means by which the bourgeoisie asserted and codified its rights against arbitrary royal and aristocratic power, and it provides the ongoing basis for bourgeois economic and political power.

Wakefield himself draws the parallel between government involvement in guaranteeing the security of property (cf. 1849:81) and in promoting systematic colonization:

"For the good of all, the interference of government is not less necessary to prevent a few individuals from seizing all the waste land of a colony than it is necessary to prevent robberies. As it is for the good of all that no one should be allowed to take any other one's property, so it is for the good of all that no individual should be allowed to injure other individuals by taking more than the right quantity of waste land" (1834:275).

Capitalist society is founded on two apparently contradictory principles - laissez faire and state intervention. What is important, however, is the particular combination or hybridization of these two principles. Capitalism creates a new and effective hybrid out of this polarity, a historically specific interlacing. The contradiction between the two poles persists as characteristic political ideologies, and yet at a deeper level these ideologies are united by their reference to a common discursive field and a common modality of power relations, a modality which can be analyzed using Foucault's concept of biopower. Education is an especially significant site of this hybridization and a crucial bulwark of disciplinary "civilization".

At the same time, and essentially because of this, it is an exceptionally fertile ground for the deployment and battle of competing ideologies.

SECTION IV: THE YEOMAN IDEAL

Wakefield had promised a utopia for the labouring classes in colonies established according to his prescriptions:

"Such a colony, then, would be highly attractive: how much more attractive, both to capitalists and labourers, than colonies have ever been, will be seen in the following section of this treatise; where it is explained, that if all the purchase-money of waste land were properly disposed of, capitalists in the colony would always be supplied with labour, and every labourer reaching the colony might surely become not only a landowner, but, something more grateful to one of his class, a master of other labourers. The first colony in which labour was plentiful, though dear, and in which labourers might be sure to become masters as well as landowners; the first colony in which there was the good without the evil of an old society, would probably attract people, both capitalists and labourers, from colonies in which, along with the good, there was all the evil of a new society" (1834:291; cf. 1849:127-8).

Wakefield envisaged continuous social mobility, with labourers becoming landowners after a suitable period of hard work and prudence, to be replaced by a fresh batch of immigrant labourers. The sufficient price of land would act as an automatic regulator of this process and perpetually ensure the balance between the supply and demand of labour, and more generally the correct balance between land, labour, and capital.

There are obviously a whole series of assumptions and conditions involved in all this which are in practice unlikely to be fulfilled. It is hardly worthwhile to run a proper critique of Wakefield's scheme, something which has already been done before anyway (see Philipp, 1971, for references to the relevant literature). I take it as given that a definite if relatively open class structure has been a constant feature of South Australian society, and that this

class structure involves a certain degree of closure - i.e. there are barriers to social mobility to a higher class.

Wakefield hardly ever admits the possibility that some settlers might become permanent members of the working class. I have found only one passage where Wakefield admits that some labourers may not "make it":

"If he is a brute, as many emigrant labourers are, through being brutally brought up from infancy to manhood, he lives, to use his own expression, 'like a fighting cock', till gross enjoyment carries him off the scene: if he is of the better sort by nature and education, he works hard, saves money, and becomes a man of property...." (1849:128).

Wakefield believed that upward social mobility was easy in the colonies - all it required was initiative and a bit of hard work. The abundance of land would ensure ample opportunities for everyone to become their own master on their own little plot of land. This yeoman ideal exercised a decisive influence on the structure of South Australian society, right up to the present day, and will be taken up in various contexts in the thesis. For now I will very briefly discuss political developments in South Australia around the turn of the century to broadly indicate the fate of this yeoman ideal.

Wakefield's world view as such cannot be said to be directly reflected in any of the political parties of late nineteenth and twentieth century South Australia. But fragments of this discourse have survived, no longer as part of an integrated and highly explicit world view, but as the sectional ideologies of particular parties and interest groups. What is interesting is that these fragments have been picked up by very different parties at various times, so that it is impossible to speak, for example, of a monolithic bourgeois ideology extending remorselessly from 1836 to the present; nor is it possible to say that Wakefield's views are exclusively linked with one side of what has become a two-party system.

The yeoman ideal has at different times been picked up by political groups of quite different complexions. I will single out three major examples - Kingston's liberalism, the early Labor Party, and the Liberal Union (I have used Hirst, 1973:153-215, as my source for the political history of South Australia at this time).

(a) The liberal government of C.C. Kingston of the 1890's was a direct political expression of the small farmer or yeoman interest. They were a diverse group with strong notions of independence. A priori one might expect that they represented pure individualism, but in fact Kingston's policies were highly collectivist, including the establishment of a State Bank and various marketing schemes. Not only this, but Kingston's government was very unusual in its day for its long duration and for the tight control exercised over its policies by Kingston. It was Kingston who sounded the death knell of government by independent gentlemen (as favoured by Wakefield).

The United Labor Party or ULP (founded in 1891) formed the junior partner in the Liberal/Labor alliance headed by Kingston, which was opposed to the interests of the large metropolitan capitalists and landowners represented by the Australian National League or ANL (also founded in 1891 in response to the ULP). At this point small farmers and skilled tradesmen formed a collectivist pole in opposition to the individualism of large business and pastoral interests. After a complex series of shifts in the first years of this century, the Liberal/Labor alliance emerged in a new form in 1905, but this time with Labor as the dominant partner.

(b) The ULP is thus the second major party to pick up the yeoman ideal, but this time in combination with quite different policies and objectives. The 1904 constitution gave greater independence to country branches and made platform changes to try and attract the small farmer vote. It spoke of

farmers as "producers", analogous to the city working class who were seen in socialist doctrine as the producers of all wealth. For reasons discussed by Hirst (particularly the growth of unionism among agricultural and pastoral workers), this alliance of workers and farmers was short lived, leading to the third case, that of the Liberal Union of 1910.

(c) This union is the direct ancestor in South Australia of the Liberal and Country League, which ruled the state from 1933 to 1965, and of today's Liberal/National Party alliance (developments were different in the other states). Because of the concessions made by the ANL regarding the independence of local branches, as well as other factors discussed by Hirst, the small farmer vote became increasingly attached to the conservative half of what had now become a two-party system. This was fuelled by the new antagonism of the ULP towards farmers, whom they now saw as employers and hence class enemies rather than as producers. In this way an effective combination of big and little bourgeoisie was formed, and at the same time an effective combination of individualism and collectivism on the conservative side of politics. After the emergence of this two-party system, it becomes very difficult to talk of individualism versus collectivism as differentiating factors.

The yeoman ideal has at different times been picked up by parties of quite different political complexion. It has not been exclusively associated with "bourgeois" parties. As I have suggested, a more fruitful model is one of fragmentation and recombination within a discursive field structured by free enterprise versus state intervention. The frugalist and voluntaryist models of radical self-help fell apart under the weight of various pragmatic exigencies in the 1850's and 1860's. The yeoman ideal, however, survived this fall, and changes in land legislation, good seasons, and other factors led to a massive expansion of "concentrated" agricultural settlement in the 1870's.

At the same time, and closely connected with this, central bureaucratic regulation by the state underwent a similar expansion. A new combination of the fragmented discourse was formed, bringing into an effective fusion the individualist and collectivist elements both present in Wakefieldian discourse.

Economic depression from 1884 contributed to the breakdown of this relatively consensual discourse. There was a renewed differentiation along the lines of collectivism versus individualism, but the latter was now represented by big pastoralists and big Adelaide merchants rather than by petty bourgeois yeoman farmers. The yeoman interest became attached to the collectivist policies of Kingston's liberalism, supported by the ULP with its skilled working class base. The general structure during this period, then, represented a splitting of the previously consensual discourse into collectivist and individualist halves, with big metropolitan capitalists lining up against small farmers and the metropolitan working class.

There was a complex series of shifts in the early years of the twentieth century. During this flux, the ULP tried but eventually failed to attach the small farmer vote to itself, with the result that all other political groupings were arrayed against it. The conservative fusion of 1910 signalled the emergence of a relatively stable two-party system, in which big city and little country bourgeoisie combined against an expanded Labor Party. A new and different recombination of individualist and collectivist tendencies was formed, ostensibly in opposition to each other at opposite poles of a two-party system, but actually in a much more complex relationship.

SECTION V: CIVILIZATION, THE SUFFRAGE AND EDUCATION

"On my passage to this place, by way of North America, I built many castles in the air. I then intended to settle in Van Diemen's Land, because I fancied that its insular position and small extent would render it, not merely foreign, but also superior, to New South Wales. All the land, thought I, in that beautiful island will soon be appropriated. The people will increase rapidly, and will be unable to spread. The proportion between people and territory will be like that of an old country. Labour, therefore, will be plentiful, and, perhaps, even cheap; at least, there will not be a scarcity of dear labour. Division of labour will follow. That will cause, as, indeed, nothing else can cause, great production. Wages being moderate, the employer of labour will take a large share of a great produce. This will cause accumulation; and the accumulated produce of labour is wealth. Wealth will bestow leisure; and leisure will bestow knowledge. Wealth, leisure, and knowledge mean civilization. Schools and colleges will be established. The arts and sciences will flourish, because artists and discoverers will be paid and honoured. Abstract truth will be sought, because its pursuit will be rewarded; and this will make philosophers. A little island of the Southern Ocean will produce painters, sculptors, poets, orators, and friends of mankind. A nation will be born free, under a clear sky, and will be highly instructed. Being a new people, they will reject the prejudices, whilst they improve the accumulated knowledge, of other worlds; and at length it will be fairly decided whether or not man can reach perfection" (Wakefield, 1929:45-6 [1829]).

This "castle in the air" sums up the whole Wakefieldian edifice. Concentration of settlement leads inexorably and automatically to high profits and wages, wealth, leisure, knowledge, and civilization. In common with most of his contemporaries, Wakefield saw social hierarchy and the existence of a privileged class as essential to preserve culture and civilization. Only a wealthy and hence leisured class could have the time to devote to the arts, to science, to philosophy, etc. Wakefield's boldness was to assert that such a cultured and civilized community could be created in the colonies, usually regarded as havens of crudeness, barbarity and vice. One of the key points of his system was to attract to the colonies settlers of a "superior" class. Ideally, the colony should be a complete replica of the old society, with all classes represented and hence all the civilizing influences of an established society.

Wakefield liked to hark back to the Greek colonies of antiquity as exemplars of this model:

"The leaders of bodies of emigrants from Greece were men of the highest distinction, whose fame, ability and wealth enabled them to collect and transport a great number of followers, drawn from all ranks in the old State. Thus a body of Colonists formed, not a new society, in the common acceptation of the term, but an old society that had changed its abode" (1929:73).

Similarly the old North American colonies prospered, firstly, because of their local self-government, but secondly, because of the "superior men" furnished by the noble English race (1834:327; 1849:79, 84, 234, 257-9). Well-established and well-governed colonies would attract a superior class of immigrants (*ibid*). Conversely the superior quality of the human materials used in founding colonies would guarantee their capacity for self-government. This reasoning underlies Wakefield's attitude towards universal suffrage.

In 1832, in the "Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia.....", presumed to be written by Wakefield, it is suggested that the Legislative Assembly be "elected annually by the male adult population of the Colony" (1832:8). This suggests universal male suffrage, which was supported by many of the founders and pioneers of South Australia. Whether Wakefield personally held this view is problematic.

In his later writings Wakefield came out strongly against universal suffrage, although he still saw it as desirable in the long run. At the moment however: "The misery and ignorance of the bulk of the English people render them unfit to enjoy, or rather fit them to abuse, a great extension of the suffrage" (1834:124). The franchise should be limited by a property qualification so that the poorest "most ignorant" settlers would be excluded

(1849:301; quoted in full above on p.102). Only those with a stake in the colony should have the right to vote:

"A property qualification in land, its amount in extent or value being such that few could possess it except permanent settlers having a deep interest in the future well-being of the colony, would yet, from the facility of obtaining landed property in a new country by means of industry and steadiness, render the franchise attainable by the steadier and more intelligent portion of the working class: and I think it desirable that if there were any property qualification for representatives, it should not exceed that of voters, so that morally-qualified members of the working class might take a direct part in legislation" (1849:303-4).

In the existing state of the colonies, universal suffrage is very damaging, and excludes "the wisest and most upright men"; for example, in Canada:

"The favourite candidates are the ablest demagogues; the men who best know how to flatter the prejudices and excite the passions of the ignorant and passionate mass of electors. The result is that not a few of the 'representatives of the people', whether in the House of Assembly or in the District Councils, are of that order of noisy, low-lived, spouting, half-educated, violent, and unscrupulous politicians, one or two of whom occasionally get into the British House of Commons" (1849:189-90; cf. 503-4).

Universal suffrage for Wakefield is dependent on a suitable standard of education, morality and civilization among the working class. But this connection is mediated by another factor. It is no use trying to educate the common people until their physical wants are satisfied (1834:103-4, 129). Until this happens, education will be of no use, in fact, will be positively harmful:

"....the bulk of the people in this country has been taught to read. It is the fashion to praise this so-called education, and to insist that all sorts of good will grow out of it. I hope so: I think so: but I must be allowed to add that the good has hardly yet begun to grow. Thus far, the education of the common people has not improved their lot; it has only made them discontented with it. The present fruits of popular education in this country are chartism and socialism" (1849:67).

In a well-established colony, there should be no physical want or privation. Such a colony would provide an ideal testing ground for universal education:

"In a colony thus peopled, there would scarcely ever be any single men or single women: nearly the whole population would consist of married men and women, boys, and girls, and children. For many years, the proportion of children to grown-up people would be greater than was ever known since Shem, Ham, and Japhet were surrounded by their little ones. The colony would be an immense nursery, and, all being at ease without being scattered, would offer the finest opportunity that ever occurred, to see what may be done for society by universal education. That must be a narrow breast in which the last consideration does not raise some generous emotion" (1834:308; this passage is virtually reproduced in 1849:413-4, except that the last sentence has been dropped and "universal education" has been replaced by "really educating the common people").

In such a colony, then, there will be a direct connection between education and the suffrage. As education spreads to more and more sections of the population, so it will be safe to extend the suffrage in proportion. Education is to be the great agent of morality, culture and civilization.

Universal male suffrage was introduced in South Australia in 1857 (Pike, 1967:461-80). This was not in line with Wakefield's thinking, but as we have seen (p.105 above), many people in South Australia had a very limited belief in parliamentary democracy and shared Wakefield's doubts about the capacity of the working class to exercise its vote responsibly. The introduction of universal education in 1875 was in general consonant with Wakefield's ideas, but the means employed - state funding and state central bureaucratic control - were not. Wakefield was opposed to bureaucratic centralism; his views on state as opposed to private education are difficult to establish (see 1832:9; 1834:328, 283-4).

Regardless of his reservations about the means, universal education can be seen as an important part of Wakefield's scheme, even though he only

refers to it fleetingly. Universal education is the fulfilment of Wakefield's civilizational mission and of the progressive content of his thought - the desire to bring the working class within the pale and to spread civilization and culture throughout all ranks of society.

The failure of voluntaryism and the breakdown of the direct relation between religion and education created the opening for state-funded and state-controlled education. The state was called on to step in and save civilization, to fulfil the mission which self-help had found too difficult. As Hirst argues, there were a whole range of factors which facilitated what was a radical step in terms of conventional laissez faire ideology - the tradition of central control, the very close relation between Adelaide and country South Australia and the absence of any significant regional identifications, the lack of trust in the competence of the "lower orders" to run their own affairs, the financial advantages of centralization for big pastoralists and landowners, and the prosperity of the early 1870's which allowed the government to provide centralized services without any form of taxation (see pp.104-7 above).

A whole series of contingent factors modified and changed the course of Wakefield's dream, so that while it was realized in some ways, the means used were so different from Wakefield's preferences that the resulting situation is hard to reconcile with Wakefield's utopia. The combination of "English" self-reliance and bureaucratic centralism was achieved in South Australia, despite Wakefield's claims about their incompatibility (see above, pp.102-4).

Nonetheless Wakefield's ideas provide some important insights into the broader significance of compulsory education. His plan of systematic colonization was intended to provide an orderly economic structure, with

opportunities for everyone to advance to a respectable position. On the basis of this economic infrastructure, Wakefield wished to spread education and culture through all ranks of society. His stress on the need for greater government intervention and regulation in the colonies to achieve this orderly economic structure prefigured the large degree of state intervention in the field of education and other areas which characterized the Australian colonies in the nineteenth century (although not necessarily present-day Australia - see Castles, 1985). Universal education was an important long-term objective for Wakefield. He would probably not have approved of a state-directed system as the way to achieve this aim, but his general stress on government intervention as compared with earlier political economists helped to pave the way for this step.

Wakefield can be seen as an advocate of micropower - power which ideally gives everyone a meaningful stake in the social order and hence provides an internalized motive for upholding and defending that order. Instead of obedience to authoritarian and morally binding dictates, Wakefield wished to create a society in which compliance would be guaranteed through the private pursuit of self-interest.

Wakefield envisaged three sources of such micropower - firstly, the free competition between multiple, equivalent economic units, both in the labour market and in the rivalry between capitalist enterprises; secondly, a locally-based polity founded on cultured and respectable gentlemen, in direct contact with their constituents and exercising a restraining and civilizing influence over them; and thirdly, the family, within which men would be civilized by their wives and by the responsibilities of raising and educating their children. His plan of systematic colonization was intended to provide the necessary conditions which would allow these micropowers to take hold.

These conditions would need to be established and regulated by appropriate government action.

Regardless of the extent to which these hopes were realized in South Australia, they provide evidence of the kinds of motives which impelled many nineteenth century social reformers to advocate universal education. As argued above (p.11), nineteenth century reform (particularly in Britain) can be characterized as a trade-off between political liberalization and social normalization. The growing demands by the working and middle classes for political and trade union rights were to be met, but only in a gradual way and only at the cost of greater incorporation into the emerging capitalist order. Education was a vital part of this trade-off. It was hoped that if workers were properly educated, they could be trusted to use their political rights "responsibly" - i.e. to vote for bourgeois or safe working class candidates who would respect the rights of property.

One could characterize this strategy in terms of "social control", but it is a form of control which operates through the incitement of a particular form of self-interest rather than through a simple process of repression. Universal compulsory education, as I will show in detail in Part B of the thesis in relation to South Australia, contributed very significantly to the deployment of this normalized individualism, and hence to the production of bourgeois hegemony through the private pursuit of self-interest.

PART B: THE SOCIAL CULTURE OF CHILDHOOD

INTRODUCTION

In Part B, which constitutes the remainder of the thesis, I examine the emergence and consolidation of what I regard as a new culture of childhood in South Australia over the last one hundred years or so. In terms of recent tendencies within the history of childhood, my argument stresses the importance of relatively recent changes, which I see as effecting quite a radical transformation in the meaning and significance of childhood in liberal capitalist societies. My thesis is congruent with the work of Zelizer (1985) on the changing economic value of children in late nineteenth and twentieth century America, as expressed, for example, in the calculation of payments in compensation for the wrongful death of a child. On the other hand, Pollock (1983) in her general survey of childhood in Western society from 1500 to 1900 tends to stress the continuities in child-rearing practices. She is influenced partly by her sociobiological perspective, partly by her association with Laslett, who argues that the nuclear family, in terms of household size and composition, has been with us since the sixteenth century at least (see pp.59-60 above).

I do not have time to properly address this larger intellectual context. I leave it to the reader to judge whether the changes which I describe do in fact constitute a major transformation in the culture of childhood.

Although my work has important implications for these debates in the history of childhood, I am also seeking to address a range of issues concerning the nature of bourgeois hegemony. In Part A, I have used Foucault

and Donzelot to develop a set of arguments around this question, and have applied these arguments in a very general way to understand the basic significance of compulsory education within the political culture of nineteenth century South Australia. Part B further explores and elaborates these arguments in relation to childhood and adolescence in South Australia. I focus on the introduction of compulsory primary education in 1875 and the growth of mass secondary education after World War II as major constitutive events in the current meaning of childhood and adolescence. In line with Foucault, my aim is to understand this current situation rather than to recreate the past. I have searched for major discontinuities in the history of childhood, and then used a before/after contrast to highlight what is particular about present-day definitions of childhood and adolescence.

I have used Donzelot (1979a) extensively to elucidate the specificity of these definitions. As in Part A, I am selectively drawing out and emphasizing certain aspects of Donzelot's argument. I will treat compulsory education as establishing a meritocratic framework which promotes individualistic notions of success and failure. More generally this meritocracy valorizes the private pursuit of self-interest at the expense of collective questions of political right. Donzelot's analysis of contract and tutelage, and the two corresponding models of childhood, protected liberation and supervised freedom, will be used to elucidate the dynamics of this meritocracy.

CHAPTER 4. FATHERS, MASTERS AND CHILDREN

This chapter takes up a number of themes introduced in Chapter 3 and develops them in a more particular context. The last chapter discussed the yeoman ethic, with its valorization of agricultural smallholders and the associated values of thrift, independence and improvisation. I now examine this ethic at greater length through a number of individual biographies from late nineteenth century South Australia. I relate the yeoman ethic to a practical/experiential model of youth socialization into the adult world, and oppose this to a formal-educational model, empirically represented by the introduction of state compulsory education in 1875. The change from an experiential model of child/youth labour to increasingly long periods of formal education is the empirical benchmark of Part B of the thesis.

The yeoman ethic provides the guiding thread for analyzing the particularities of this process in the South Australian case. I demonstrate the rural basis of the ethic from the case-study material and other sources. I move on to argue that during the twentieth century, its rural essence ensured its relegation to mythological status, after it lost its force as a real expression and model of social ambitions for large sections of the population. In the process of being dislocated and attenuated, however, the yeoman ethic has been transmuted into a generalised free enterprise ethic of the pragmatic, improvising, "great Aussie battler". This ethic survives (among other ways) as a cynical/oppositional attitude to formal schooling, in spite of the ready acceptance of increasingly long periods of formal education at the political level. Thus the importance of the yeoman ethic is not limited to rural South Australia. The generalised ethic enters into the particular shape of the educational experience in South Australia, for both urban and rural youth. Dislocated from its rural base, the yeoman ethic became available as a

descriptive account of the essential qualities of all Australian youth. The chapter is structured by this analytical intent - I am not trying to present a representative view of child/youth labour in 19th century South Australia.

The yeoman ideal stressed independence, individualism, improvisation and initiative. Upward social mobility and (ideally) being your own master was seen as a realistic possibility for everyone, provided you were prepared to "have a go". In fact upward mobility was a normative requirement - something which had to be done to make your life worthwhile. As an ethical injunction, it was compatible not merely with free enterprise individualism but also with the religious voluntaryism of the "paradise of dissent".

In relation to youth, the yeoman ethic stressed practical, pragmatic, experiential induction into adult life, as opposed to bookish, theoretical, intellectual formal education. The dream of being your own master meant that this model of youth socialization devalued wage labour. This reinforced the opposition to formal education in so far as the latter was linked to preparation for wage labour - a link which was explicitly proclaimed, particularly in relation to state education in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (see Chapters 5 and 6). The transmuted yeoman ethic (which might now best be termed the battler ethic), retaining a strong injunction to better oneself, proposed to all youth that practical training and experience led to independence, the indispensable condition of social mobility. It opposed itself to the model which educational reform proposed, a dependency model of social improvement where formal schooling led to wage labour.

However, as we have seen with Wakefield's conceptualization, wage labour was an integral part of the yeoman ideal. The practice of

individuals/families working their blocks solely with their own labour was seen as very undesirable by Wakefield. Economic efficiency would only be gained through the use of hired labour; and so existing yeomen needed a pool of wage labourers. For Wakefield, this pool would be supplied by immigration. These immigrant labourers, if they worked hard and lived frugally, would soon be able to purchase their own land. The purchase money would be used to bring further labourers from Britain to replace those who had moved up to yeoman status.

A period of wage labour was necessary to achieve yeoman status, but Wakefield was able to reconcile this with his dream of universal social mobility by assuming a continuous stream of fresh immigrants to act as labourers. Wakefield never envisaged that some people would be permanent members of the working class, except for a small minority of lazy or thriftless n'er-do-wells. The grazier gentry of South Australia, on the other hand, wanted a permanently-available labour force with an explicit status hierarchy separating the classes, mitigated perhaps by a small trickle of social mobility.

In practice, some reconciliation was possible between the two views because of the seasonal nature of agricultural and pastoral activities. Each employer only wanted a small core of permanent employees (the smaller agriculturalists none at all), supplemented by a much larger number of seasonal or casual workers at times of peak labour demand (seeding, harvesting, shearing, etc.). A compromise eventuated, with smallholders working their own blocks part-time and supplementing their income by wage labour on other properties, hoping eventually to pay off their own land and become self-sufficient.

A period of wage labour was consistent with the yeoman ideal, both as a prelude and as a supplement to owning your own land. Temporary wage

labour could even be a useful induction into farming (or other occupations). This wage labour induction was congruent with the practical/experiential model of socialization, as was the other possibility of familial induction.

This points to a central aspect of the argument, one which flows directly from the more general argument presented by Donzelot in the French context - the homology between the authority of fathers over their wives and children and that of masters over their servants.

Taking familial induction first, child and youth labour, as we shall see, was a normal experience across large sections of the social scale in nineteenth century South Australia. This often involved helping out in the family farm, trade, business or household. In this situation parental and particularly patriarchal authority still involved direct control over the labour of family members for economic purposes, i.e. private (familial) and public (economic-productive) spheres were to some extent conflated, as in Donzelot's analysis of the Ancien Régime. Fathers took on some of the attributes of masters in their control over the deployment of the labour of their family members.

Furthermore, in relation to wage labour induction, there was a homology between a son working on his father's farm and working for wages on another property; and similarly with a daughter working in the family household or working elsewhere as a domestic servant. These two situations represent the "family economy" and the "family wage economy" respectively (Scott and Tilley, 1978). In both cases it is likely that the children were contributing to a family economy, either directly in the form of labour or indirectly in the form of wages received from elsewhere. Moreover the wage labour situation was often accompanied by living-in with the employer, reinforcing the homology between father and master. Obviously live-in servants/labourers were not treated in the same fashion as one's own

children, but nonetheless they lived and worked in the same place (although male labourers might be relegated to a barn or outhouse) and they were both subject to the same person. The homology was reinforced by the relatively strict nature of patriarchal authority at this time, so that as just argued wives and children were to some extent treated as labourers by the father.

There is a third term in this homology, again suggested by the work of Donzelot, namely that of community leader, often associated with religious expertise or exemplary religious behaviour. This will become particularly evident in the case of Sam and his father discussed below. The correlation between the three terms expresses the relative lack of separation between public and private spheres in 19th century South Australia. People's value as family members and as workers was subject to a much greater degree of community evaluation than is the case today. There was an explicit ranking of families and individuals in both their private and public lives by the same relatively small group of people (rural town, Adelaide neighbourhood or suburb).

Donzelot's time-scale is broader than mine, and the French context is obviously quite different from the Australian one (Catholic and highly unitary centralist state, versus liberal, largely Protestant, federal one). Nonetheless I believe that it is possible to use certain elements of his argument in relation to nineteenth and twentieth century South Australia. For my purposes, however, the argument is not as clear-cut as it is for Donzelot. Given the timing and nature of the South Australian settlement, one cannot argue that first, there was a complete homology between master and father, and second, a complete breakdown of this homology. In Britain, even before the foundation of South Australia, there was already an emerging separation between public and private spheres, or, to put it another way, a disengagement of the family from direct involvement in economic and

political life ("economic" in this context referring primarily to production). I will briefly document this assertion by looking at two developments, concerning country and city respectively.

(1) In the 1790's, during the French Wars, the social ties between farmers and labourers were breaking down, for economic and other reasons. Before the wars, it was much more common for farm labourers to lodge with their employers; and even day labourers had a much closer social relationship with the farmer. In the Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1837-8 (British Parliamentary Papers, vols. XVII-XIX), Edward Butt, a farmer of Petworth in West Sussex, recalls this closeness:

"Question 2764: (Mr.Harvey) Were you personally occupied in farming pursuits in and before the year 1794? - Yes, all my lifetime; I have never been out of it.

"Question 2765: From your recollection, can you state what was the condition of the labouring poor at that period? - Why, yes, very plainly. My father was a farmer, and I was always with them, and go out to work with them, and the people of the house used to have their fat pork, and such things, to live upon in the house.

"Question 2766: Was it the practice of the farmer at that time to have his labourers in the farmhouse? - They used to come in at their meal-time, at dinnertime, and bring their bit of bread and pork in their hand - I never saw them without at that time - and sit down by the fire and take their small beer."

(See further Hobsbawm and Rude, 1969; and Wigman, 1980:59-62).

A contractual model based purely on money wages replaced the earlier paternalistic system involving living-in and payment in kind. The farmer's household stopped performing "family-like" functions for its labourers, and the labourers increasingly lived in their own households, or with their family of origin. The public, impersonal, contractual sphere of work was more and more separated from the private domestic sphere.

(2) Smelser (1959) can be used to construct a similar argument in relation to factory workers. Prior to 1770, the spinning and weaving of cotton were both organised on a domestic basis, with men, women and children all contributing. Fathers instructed their sons in the trade. There was a fusion of the economic, childrearing and "tension-management" functions of the family. From 1770 to 1790, water-frame mills drew labour away from the home. Even in the mills, however, families were often hired together, preserving some features of the domestic system. Masters often hired the father for road-making, bridge-building or plant construction while employing his wife and children in the mill (1959:184-6). Between 1790 and 1820, new spindles were attached to steam-powered mules in larger factories run entirely by "free" (i.e. unapprenticed) labour. The shift from rural water-powered mills to urban factories created a drift of population into the towns. There was a growing demand for child labour in the steam-powered mills to replace the vanishing apprentices. "All these trends threatened to disperse the family through the factories at the cost of its tradition and its solidarity" (1959:188). But even in this situation the family integrity of the production process was maintained to a certain extent. Witnesses before parliamentary committees of 1816-9 testified that masters allowed the operative spinners to hire their own assistants (piecers, scavengers, etc.). Spinners chose their wives, children, near-relatives or relatives of the proprietors. Some children at least were trained by their fathers to be future spinners. Wages for assistants were generally paid by the spinner. The latter continued to exercise moral authority in the factory over younger assistants, whether their own children or not - curbing indecent language or ribald behaviour. The new factory system had not yet done away with family or community influence over the production process (1959:193). This only happened from the mid-1820's onwards under the impact of industrial centralisation, concentration of population and further changes in technology. By the 1840's, spinners' unions had lost their exclusive character

and had begun to include other factory operatives. Decisions were now made as union members rather than by virtue of spinners' traditional authority in the factory (1959:338). At the same time the unions' interest in apprenticeship/child labour began to decline, as they sought other means of raising wages and improving conditions (1959:339-40). Smelser concludes that by the 1840's "...the family economy was approaching a new level of differentiation of the nuclear family unit in which the major economic significance of young children had been removed from the family" (1959:387).

This excursion has been necessary to situate my own analysis more precisely. I am not running some kind of general argument contrasting "traditional" and "modern" societies, or feudalism and capitalism, or some other vague and overgeneralized pair of concepts. My argument relates to the transformation from one particular family form present in mid- to late-19th century South Australia to another specific form found in 20th century South Australia, taking as my benchmark the introduction and extension of compulsory education from 1875 onwards.

The "structural differentiation" noted by Smelser in mid-19th century England is not as prominent in 19th century South Australia. The presence of many small farms and other small businesses operated wholly or largely with the labour of family members is one reason for this, as is the absence of any large-scale industrialization until the 1920's at least. The limits of agricultural settlement expanded rapidly in the 1870's. Many families settled on small blocks in pioneering conditions, and were heavily reliant on their children's labour inputs. Even with the introduction of compulsory education between the ages of 7 and 13 in 1875, flexibility in school attendance requirements still allowed children to combine school with paid or unpaid labour. Work for adolescents (rather than younger children) was normal for most segments of

the population until the massive expansion of secondary education in the 1950's and 1960's.

Under these circumstances the family often still functioned as a unit of production, whether in farming, shops or other retail ventures, or trades such as tanning and brickmaking. Parents' authority over their children continued to involve direct control over their labour for economic purposes. Even when the children were working for someone else, they generally still contributed to the "family wage economy" and hence were still under the economic authority of their parents.

Moreover, living-in with the (non-parental) employer reinforced the parallel between father and master. There were a number of significant instances of this in nineteenth century South Australia:- (1) domestic servants; (2) farm labourers; (3) apprentices or assistants in trades and shops. Two other parallel instances may also be mentioned: - (4) boys boarding at the leading private colleges; (5) state wards living and working with their guardians/foster parents. In all these cases the employer or guardian stood in loco parentis to his charges.

The separation of children from the world of work (paid or unpaid) was a leading aspect of the breakdown of the homology between father and master. Compulsory education was the vehicle of this separation. Children were henceforth segregated from the now-adult world of work, and a culturally and historically specific private sphere of domestic familial relations was created, centred around the educative and hygienic needs of children, these relations being defined in opposition to the bad old days of child labour. In conjunction with compulsory education, this new form of familialism defined childhood in terms of a formal, graded sequence of developmental stages, a definition which was quite opposed to the

practical/experiential induction into adult life of the yeoman ideal. This yeoman or battler ideal survived in transmuted form as a cynical and/or oppositional attitude to formal education, and can be related to the cultural form of "mateship" which has been extensively discussed in the literature (for example, Ward, 1958; Oxley, 1978).

I now move on to a number of biographies which will give substance to these points.

The 1870's witnessed a massive northward expansion of agricultural settlement. The story of William Stagg will be considered as an exemplar of this expansion and of the fate of the yeoman ethic. His diaries for the period 1885 to 1887 have been published by Robinson (1973). *Staggs 134-143*

William's father (also William) migrated from England to South Australia in 1851 and six years later married Harriett Rayner. They lived for a while at Noarlunga, then moved to Yanyarrie in the far north. In 1876 they moved south to Tarcowie, between Jamestown and Orroroo (Robinson, 1973:8). The first land sales in the hundred of Tarcowie were in 1872 (Robinson, 1971:95), so the Staggs were among the early settlers in the region.

William was born in March 1867. When he began his diary in January 1885 he was 18 years old; the published section of the diaries ends with his 20th birthday in March 1887. In March 1885 a new sister was born into the family. According to William, this made 7 sisters and 1 brother alive at the time (1973:23). William's younger brother Tom was born in 1877.

The Stagg farm at Tarcowie initially comprised 199 acres; another 79 acres was added to the holding in 1877. Like most farmers of the period in South Australia, they relied almost exclusively on wheat as their cash crop. Until 1878 there was no school at Tarcowie, and Robinson surmises that

William never had any formal schooling. She thinks that William learnt the rudiments of the three R's by candlelight from his mother (1973:9-11). William also claims at one point that he had taught himself to read and write (1973:119). William was probably engaged in farm work from an early age. At the time of the published extracts he was engaged in ploughing, reaping, grubbing out stumps, carting goods and people. He often worked with his father or did equivalent work by himself.

William had three elder sisters alive at the time - Elizabeth, Ellen and Harriett. Robinson only gives the year of birth for Harriett (1864), but Elizabeth must have been born roughly in 1860 and Ellen in 1862 (on the basis of 1973:8). We are not told much about Ellen other than that she normally lives at Semaphore (1973:19). In another book, Robinson refers briefly to the fact that Ellen helped to quarry stones for the Tarcowie Methodist Church (1971:144 - the Staggs had a small stone quarry on their property which provided occasional income). In September 1885 she was married (the first of the family) to a second cousin and in October 1886 she gave birth to a son (1973:92). From 1885 at least Ellen never lived permanently with her parents.

Elizabeth worked as a domestic servant in a nearby household under Mrs. Ninnes, and lived there on a full-time basis. In August 1885 Elizabeth spent some time at home to nurse her sick father, and extended this stay when her mother went down to Adelaide for sister Ellen's wedding. On 1/9/85 William remarks:

"Me and Lizzie went down to Mrs. Ninness's the place where she has been working for so many years. She went down to let them know that she would come back again after Mother comes home from down country. Mrs. Ninnes was greatly pleased" (1973:45).

There is no precise indication of how long Elizabeth was working at Ninnes', but this passage suggests it was quite a long time. The last remark indicates

that she was a highly-valued servant. The passage also suggests a fairly easygoing relationship - Lizzie "went down to let them know", rather than going to ask permission.

The Ninnes' were among the earliest settlers in the Tarcowie district, and like the Staggs were Methodists (1971:215). Mr. Ninnes seems to be one of the larger and more prosperous landowners in the area. Nonetheless the social distance between the Ninnes' and the poor but respectable Staggs is not very great. The Staggs borrowed an earth scoop for cleaning out their dam from the Ninnes' (1973:62). Soon after William notes that he had to go down to "Ninnes' springs" to get a tank of water for the pigs and fowls (1973:63). Elizabeth seems to have no trouble getting leave for various purposes (1973:19, 23-6, 42-6), and William mentions a number of times when either various Staggs visited Elizabeth at Ninnes' or Elizabeth came home to visit her family (1973:16, 28, 34, 59, 60, 67). Elizabeth married an old friend, Dan Butterick, on 7/7/86 (1973:74; cf. 20, 28), and presumably set up her own household soon afterwards.

William's third elder sister was Harriett or Hattie, born in 1864. She is mentioned a couple of times in 1885 as helping William and Father around the farm (1973:16, 53). Her main task was probably in looking after her younger sisters and in general domestic work. Her first recorded outside employment was in January 1886:

"Hattie has got a place with the banker's wife. It is an easy place as compared with places at farmers. She will get six shillings a week, and will walk there in the morning, to start at seven o'clock and back at night before sundown" (1973:56).

Unlike Elizabeth, Hattie continued to live with her parents while going out to service each day. On 24/7/86 William notes that the bank is changing

managers, but Mr. L., the new manager, will keep Hattie on (1973:76). A few days later we learn:

"Hattie dont get home half days now that she has a new master and mistress" (ibid).

On 16/8/86 Harriett left her place because Mrs. L. was "a selfish woman" (1973:85). By 12/9/86 she had found another position:

"Albert Whaite came after Hattie today. She is going to service at Mrs. Whaite's" (1973:87).

This time Harriett had to live in with her mistress, as Whaite's was about seven miles away (1973:85). At first Harriett "liked the place very well" (1973:88), but a few months later in January 1887 "she got the sack for being cheeky" (1973:103).

Although Harriett's career (at this early stage) was not as stable as Elizabeth's, the fact that she worked in the households of two bankers suggests again that the Staggs were regarded as respectable and hardworking people. The Staggs were Methodists (1971:144; Wesleyan? - 1973:38) and were very religious. William went to Sunday School every week and later on in the diaries took a class of his own (for the first occasion, see 1973:29). He attended monthly Blue Ribbon Army meetings (temperance - 1973:24, 33) and on several occasions he expressed his disapproval of drink:

"Most people were still in bed, having been to the Ball over at the Pub, a thing which I have never been brought up to do" (1973:34, 30/6/85; cf. 51).

William was also very upset whenever he lost his temper or used bad language (1973:43, 87, 112). This religious element may have been important in William's sisters getting employment as well as in the general social position of the family. Many of the local people were Methodist, some were

Church of England (1973:66, 67, 89). Sectarianism does not seem to have been very rife under the pioneering conditions of closer settlement. In June 1885 William records:

"XX was up here while we was at Chapel. He came up to see my sister, but she dont want him. When he saw Tom's horse in the yard he got raging mad. The ass, he is only 18 years old, besides he does not go to our chapel" (1973:33).

While the odds were obviously stacked against XX, his religious affiliations do not seem to be an insurmountable obstacle in William's eyes - his sister's own feelings and XX's age are mentioned before the question of religion, which is almost an afterthought. The difficulties of clearing and farming land in a new and not very well-watered region threw people together and created a common bond between them (Robinson, 1971:113, 229). Nevertheless Methodism was still important in creating informal networks and reciprocities. As noted above the Nинnes family were Methodists and they employed Elizabeth Stagg for many years as a domestic servant, as well as providing work for the Stagg males when the family was in financial difficulties. At this time the Staggs also had a meeting of their creditors. The biggest one was Mr. Evans, a Methodist storekeeper, whom William describes as "very lenient" (1973:105). Evans was involved with Williams' Sunday School class (1973:24), and his sister Mary was the first organist of the Tarcowie Methodist Church (1971:215). Mary Evans' daughter eventually married one of the Nинnes family (*ibid*).

The virtues espoused by Methodism - temperance, thrift, hard work - made the practitioners of these virtues very attractive to potential masters, particularly since there was often a sharing of world view between master and servant. William expresses these virtues in a number of places:

"I have money to the amount of 5/3d on which I mean to lay the foundation of my future proceedings in money matters. I am determined to get on and I think I can with economy and perseverance" (1973:36).

By way of contrast we have William's opinion of Mr.M.:

"Mr. M. is getting out on the road again. I wonder whether he will lay anything by for a rainy day this time. He is a thriftless fellow. When he got married he was in debt, only think and his father-in-law had to pay all the marriage affairs" (1973:40).

The Staggs tried to sell their farm early in 1887 but could not get any takers (1973:102-4). William at this time started working on the roads (1973:94, 102-6) - something his father had been doing off and on for some years. The two men also became increasingly involved with contract work for their neighbours - fencing, splitting redgum for posts, grubbing out stumps (1973:112-4). In May 1887, after much deliberation, William determined to "try my fortunes elsewhere" (1973:112). He found work with a neighbour for 12/- a week. In June he walked to Yongala, caught the train to Adelaide, and then walked to McLaren Vale to see his grandparents (*ibid*). While in McLaren Vale, he was offered work planting vines for Mr.Hardy, but declined believing "it wrong to have anything to do with the wine industry" (1973:112-3). Not able to find alternative work, he decided to return to Tarcowie.

While in Adelaide on the way back, he went into the Land Office to apply for two blocks near his father's. Back at Tarcowie, William found work with a neighbour for 10/- a week. He was bitterly disappointed when word came that the blocks for which he had applied had gone to someone else. In October, however, William was allotted his own ten-acre block on a rental basis - presumably a "workingman's block" (see below, p.309) (1973:113). William sank a well, sowed his first crop, put up fences, and built himself a tiny stone hut (1973:114).

Both William and his father were still restless, and in 1889 William began to doubt his religious beliefs. Robinson notes:

"This period of doubting and indecision possibly came later in his life than to most of his counterparts today, but his geographical and financial isolation could have deferred the onslaught" (*ibid*).

In 1909 William married Emily Horton at Tarcowie. William eventually farmed a property a few miles north of his parents' farm. The latter passed to his younger brother Tom (1973:115).

As the eldest son in a family with 7 sisters and a young brother (Tom was still only 10 at the end of the published diaries), William saw himself as one of the chief breadwinners alongside his father. On 21/1/1887, after his father had sold the yearly wheat crop for £80, William commented:

"You men who cant live on £1-10-0 a week, just think that less than £80 is all that resulted from a year's labour of two hardworking men, with a farm to try to pay for, and nine mouths to feed" (1973:102).

An important element of this breadwinner role was handling the farm machinery. On 5/3/1885 William records:

"Father will take the double plough for the season and I will take the single plough" (1973:21).

Taking charge of the reaping machine became an important status marker for William:

"We was reaping today, finished North side of the house. I have to drive the two front horses which I don't like, thinking that I am too old. I should have a machine of my own" (1973:16).

William had his wish next season:

"We began reaping today. I drove the machine for the first time. You may think that I am old before I steered - it is so but I am not among the strongest youths" (1973:53-4).

William's small stature and his perceived lack of strength (possibly related to a chest complaint) were a constant source of anxiety.(1973:24, 31, 34, 47, 62, 98, 108, 113). On his 18th birthday he notes:

"I aint very big for my age - have not a sign of whiskers or mustache so I'm a boy still" (1973:24).

On his 19th birthday William was still only 5 feet tall (1973:62). On his 20th, he had grown to 5 feet 3 inches, but he notes despairingly that his moustache is still not growing and that "I has never carried a bag of wheat yet" (1973:108).

William's position as one of only two male "breadwinners", plus his small stature, probably tied him to his parents' farm longer than he would have liked. Cousin Tom, whose father had a farm to the south at Mannanarie, visited the Staggs several times looking for work (1973:16, 17, 20, 40, 76). After one of these visits he found a job with Mr.Catford, a friend and neighbour of the Staggs (1973:20). William also mentions Cousin Charlie in this connection - he seems to have come from the same family (1973:102, 103, 104). The last time we hear from Cousin Tom (1973:76) he is looking for work because his father cannot afford to keep him at home.

Much of the available work would have been of a seasonal or casual nature, so that periods of dependence on the family household would alternate with periods of relative independence while on the track looking for work (Kett, 1977:29, 42). William's experience was probably atypical in this respect. He was closely dependent on his parents' farm until at least the age of 20. Combined with his religious outlook, his social isolation, and his small stature, this dependence resulted in a late arrival at manhood for William. His

cousins and other age-mates would probably have had a much more varied experience, with at least some periods of working away from home.

For girls, there was a greater congruence between childhood and adult status. Whether helping out at home or working in another household, girls would have been doing much the same tasks and would have been in a similarly close dependence upon their parents or mistresses. There was not the same period of semi-dependence during adolescence as was common for boys. Girls were "girls" until married, and girlhood was basically on-the-job training for the future roles of wife and mother.

While William's mother was away in August/September 1885 (see p.135 above), Elizabeth took leave from her mistress and spent some time at home, nursing her sick father but no doubt also assuming the role of mother to the rest of the household as well. William notes that she gave the house a good cleanout, whitewashed all the walls, and (with William's help) painted all the doors and windows (1973:46).

For both boys and girls in the Stagg family, there was a direct practical induction into adulthood, either in the family household or elsewhere. William's ability to use various pieces of farm machinery was an important aspect of this induction. William and his father were both engaged in wage labour at various times to supplement the family income. William's cousins were perhaps more mobile; they may have regarded wage labour as a stepping stone to yeoman status (in terms of experience and perhaps also as a means of saving money), rather than as a supplement to the familial income. William was obviously attracted by the yeoman ethic, and was eventually able to achieve this ambition. The passage quoted above (p.140) indicates his moral evaluation of yeomanry versus wage labour: "You men who cant live on £1-10-0 a week....". The closeness of the local community and the mutual

moral evaluation are evident from the material presented. This militates against a strict separation of public and private spheres. There is not a great deal of evidence in the diaries concerning William's relationship with his father, and hence on the parallel between father and master. I consider what information there is below (pp.152-4), in comparison with one of the other case studies.

Ross 143

The Staggs farmed a relatively dry and unproductive piece of land. In contrast the Ross family farmed land in the vicinity of Williamstown, on a par with the best land in South Australia:

"Robert Ross (1855-1930) came to South Australia as a boy with his family on the Orient in 1862. His father, also named Robert, paid his own passage without government assistance, but was not rich. He settled on land owned by his wife's widowed sister, and there the boy began earning a living at the age of 12" (Ross, 1973:47).

The younger Robert began his education in a village school near Edinburgh, followed by the Normal School in Edinburgh till he migrated to South Australia at the age of 7. From then until the age of 12 Robert attended the Williamstown School, he and his sister lodging with "old Mrs. Bain" who lived close to the school. In April 1867 Ross senior in conjunction with "Aunt Margaret" bought 560 ewes to graze on the latter's property, Glen Gullen. Robert junior left school at 12 to look after the sheep, which he continued to do for some years (Ross, 1973:48-9). Later another boy was hired to shepherd, and Robert had to look after him, "also plough for hay, sow with the hand, and mow with Scythe." He also helped with the shearing (1973:50).

When he was 17 years old, he went to St.Peter's College where he boarded for a year and a half (January 1872 to September 1873):

"I got togged out in Adelaide and went with my father to the College we were introduced to the Head and money paid for a quarter term. There were many of the lads as old as I myself" (ibid).

Apart from having the cash, Ross senior had been in the British Army "practically all his time" (1973:48,49), which may have helped to get his son admitted to St.Peter's. Robert's time at the College seems to fall into the category of "finishing school", because he knew from the start that he would not be there for very long (1973:50).

From about 1880 onwards, Robert junior began acquiring his own property. He purchased two sections on credit selection (1973:51), then bought another adjoining section from Mr.Samuel Hill for £500:

"The old man did not want to buy and never did buy land. I had some money in the Savings Bank, I drew £50 the first deposit; the rest was paid on the 1st March following.".....

"My father and I began running the business in the Joint names, R. & R. Ross, but I had the sole management, as before, and did the work chiefly. My Mother had become owner of the Old Glen through my Aunt's will, so I kept putting piece by pieces together...." (1973:52).

Ross junior eventually became a large landowner and Chairman of the District Council of Mt.Crawford for a number of years (1973:47).

Though not privileged or rich, Ross' background was considerably better than William Stagg's. Nonetheless his schooling was limited and most of his adolescent years were spent working on the family farm, as with Stagg. Ross' case suggests that in the 1870's at least there was a certain similarity in the male teenage experience across a wide spectrum of the social scale. Except for the highest ranks of society, young males were expected to work for a living from the age of 12 or 13. Full-time schooling throughout the teenage years was very much the exception. The fact that Ross spent five years working during his early teens and yet was still able to attend the prestigious

St. Peter's College afterwards emphasises the extent to which adolescent labour was a very general phenomenon. Ross' work experience did not automatically disqualify him from mixing with his social superiors at St. Peter's. It also illustrates the fluidity of youth experience at this time, with formal education being interspersed with periods of labour.

Verco

Joseph Verco illustrates the pattern of full-time schooling throughout childhood and adolescence. Born on 1/8/1851 at Fullarton, Verco attended Miss Tilney's "Young Ladies' Seminary" from mid-1858 to July 1859 (Verco, 1963:61, 64). Most girls' schools until the end of the 19th century accepted small boys in the lower classes (Jones, 1980:123, 128). From July 1859, till June 1863, Verco attended Francis Haire's boys' school with his brother (Verco, 1963:66). From here he moved in July 1863 to J.L. Young's "Adelaide Educational Institution", where he stayed until December 1867, achieving great success in his studies (1963:83ff). Verco worked for a short time in the office of the South Australian Railways, but then decided to study medicine. He attended St.Peter's College to matriculate and went on to London where in 1876 he was admitted to the degree of Doctor of Medicine. He returned to Adelaide where he eventually became Dean of the Faculty of Medicine at Adelaide University. In 1919 he was knighted for his services to medicine (1963:61).

Girls from well-to-do families generally spent less time at school than boys, and tended to be educated at home, with perhaps a year of finishing school at 17 or 18. Dorothy Gilbert (1885-1973) was born into a family who owned large tracts of land at Pewsey Vale near Williamstown. They mixed with the best circles of "Society" - a visit from the Governor being quite a normal event. There were many children and a large household staff, including nurse, nursemaid, governess, cook, parlour maid, house maid, and kitchen maid (Gilbert, 1973:57-60). There was also Miss Molero, who helped

Mrs. Gilbert with the babies, nursed the sick, and supervised the household when "mother was out of action" (1973:58). Children progressed from mother, to Miss Molero, to the nursery, and then to education under a governess.

As with similar families in Victorian England, young children were largely segregated from the rest of the household in a separate nursery (Gorham, 1982:162). Gilbert refers to "the nursery wing", which was run by the nurse, assisted for a time by an "undernurse" or "nursery housemaid" (1973:58). Dorothy notes that by 1893 she "had advanced to a governess", the first one hired by the family (*ibid*). When she first arrived, the governess was 16 years old and was in charge of Joe (7), Dorothy (6) and Bill (5) (*ibid*). A later governess was in charge of "a batch of children ranging from 6 to 11 years" (1973:59). Gilbert distinguishes between Miss Molero, the nurses and the governesses on the one hand, and the "household staff" of cook, parlour maid, etc. on the other (1973:57-60). The former were all involved with the nursing and education of the children, and enjoyed a higher status than the latter (the first governess was a granddaughter of Bishop Augustus Short - 1973:58).

In spite of or perhaps because of these status distinctions, the whole household did come together on certain occasions. Miss Molero conducted a choir practice which involved the household maids as well as the older children (*ibid*). Every morning before breakfast, at 8 o'clock, Father led the whole household in "Family Prayers" (1973:62, 69). Breakfast followed, with the governess and the older children eating with the parents in the dining room, while the younger children were dispatched to the nursery with their nurses (1973:62-3). The maids had a separate breakfast at 7 o'clock (presumably in the kitchen) (1973:68). After breakfast all the children would assemble at 9 o'clock in the schoolroom. Most of the schoolwork was done in the morning, with only an hour after lunch devoted to study, followed by

walking or riding with the governess (1973:69). All the children had a "nursery tea" at 5 o'clock, followed by the "children's hour" in the drawing room (sewing, cards, singing, piano, garden in summer - 1973:70).

Dorothy went for a finishing year at school when she was 17 (ibid). Her younger sisters, Kitty and Emmie, went to an "Adelaide finishing school" when they reached a similar age (1973:59). In contrast, Dorothy's older brother Harry left home at 9 to live with a family in Semaphore who boarded and tutored boys in preparation for St.Peter's. He went on to St.Peter's at ten and Melbourne University at 16. Dorothy notes that "we really only knew him in holidays" (ibid). As was the case in many 19th century private schools (see p.145 above) girls and boys were educated together for the first few years, the boys later going off to their own specialized schools. A largely undifferentiated childhood was followed by the boys leaving home at 8 or 9 for further schooling, with the girls staying behind to prepare themselves for marriage and their future roles as mothers and housekeepers. Male children achieved a degree of independence at an early age; female children were tied to the home till married - paid work was seen as demeaning for girls at this end of the social scale.

There is a greater contrast here between male and female. For the majority, both boys and girls were expected to work from an early age. Girls as well as boys would often be placed out in other households or businesses during their teenage years. Boys probably still had greater mobility and greater independence, but both were exposed to long hours of manual labour. For families like the Gilberts, this common denominator was missing. While boys went to school rather than to work, this still involved routine contact with the world outside the family household. Girls on the other hand were sheltered and protected from this world to a much greater extent. Until the end of the 19th century, they spent less time at school than their brothers

(often being educated at home instead) and their social status prevented them from accepting paid employment. These girls lived in a specifically designed environment separated from the pressures of the workaday world. In this sense they illustrate Kett's claim that girls were the first adolescents (Kett, 1977:137-41), although these girls cannot simply be equated with their twentieth century counterparts.

The Gilbert household also illustrates the intermingling of children and servants and hence the relative lack of separation between private and public spheres. Obviously the two categories were distinguished from each other as well as internally; nonetheless they all lived in the same household and were subject ultimately to the same person, the father. An interesting characteristic is the numerical dominance of females, both children and servants. Male children were sent off to school at an early age, unlike the girls, and all the live-in servants were female. There is mention of an overseer, a coachman (1973:62) and a "stable-cum-house boy" (1973:69), but we are not told about their living arrangements. Possibly they lived in separate quarters, as a "men's kitchen" is mentioned (1973:64). As with domestic servants in general, the mother of the household was the immediate superior, with Miss Molero in this case acting as an intermediary (there is no mention of a butler who might otherwise have been in charge of the household servants).

The story of Christopher and Sam (Faull, 1980) provides a very explicit example of the homology between the authority of fathers, masters and community leaders. Christopher rose from humble origins as a copper miner in Cornwall to become a Captain at the Moonta Mines in South Australia in the 1880's. His strong evangelical Methodism was an important ingredient in his success at becoming a mine Captain - something he could hardly have hoped for in Cornwall. There was a very direct connection between involvement with the local Wesleyan church and prominence at the mines.

Leaders of the local class meetings held weekly by each congregation for Bible readings and discussion tended to be captains or other mine officials. These class leaders were often also local preachers who shared the preaching duties of the circuit with the two ordained ministers (1980:28-31, 52). Christopher became closely involved with class meetings and eventually with preaching also.

In 1867 Christopher married Susan Jane Berryman, daughter of a mining captain in Cornwall (1980:43-4). Their first child Sam was born on 7/6/1868 (1980:49). Sam went to Sunday School as soon as he could walk. In February 1876 he joined Mary Holman's school at Moonta Mines, and in 1878 he switched to the newly opened Moonta Mines state school. He left school in 1881 and obtained a position in the mechanical shops at the mines as a fitter and turner, with his father's help and encouragement (1980:74-5, 84-5). Faull notes that:

"At 15 Sam was basically most things that his father wanted. He attended church and Sunday School willingly, he was a member of the temperance group the Band of Hope, he was polite, well-spoken and was well liked by his workmates" (1980:85).

In the 1880's Methodism started to lose its appeal on the mines, especially the emotional "heart religion" of Cornwall, embodied by Christopher. Few young people came forward as lay preachers or class leaders, these positions staying in the hands of the ageing Cornish captains. The decline in religion was matched by the rise of Australian Rules Football, first played in the district in 1874. At Moonta Mines the young miners formed a team called the "Young Turks". Football was encouraged at the Moonta Mines School, with the blessing of the mine superintendent, Captain Hancock. Christopher was very antagonistic. When Sam first learnt how to play while at the Moonta Mines School, Christopher would not permit him to play on weekends. Sam caught up at the mechanical shops where he and his

fellow workers played enthusiastically during breaks. In 1885 he was chosen to play for the Young Turks, and in 1888 he was elected to the general committee of the newly formed Yorke's Peninsular Football Association. It was in sporting administration rather than in playing that he was to make his mark, and in his late teens this interest took over from his involvement in church affairs (1980:87-9).

Other things also came between Sam and his father. A branch of the Amalgamated Miners' Association was formed at Moonta Mines in 1889. The miners wanted the abolition of the contract system for underground work and better wages for the surface workers. Sam was closely involved with the meetings and the agitation right from the start. He had also been introduced to beer drinking through the football club, something he kept secret from his parents. In May 1889 after attending a rowdy union meeting Sam came home in a mildly intoxicated state. This was the first indication Christopher had had about his son's drinking, and an enormous argument ensued. Sam, almost 21 years old, lashed out at his father in defence of his own lifestyle, and launched an attack on the management personnel of the mines. The evening ended with Sam packing his bags and leaving home to go and live with a workmate. The two men were reunited a couple of months later when Christopher was implicated in the death of a workman under his charge, but Sam did not return to live with his parents. In May 1890, with his parents' blessing, he found work with Martin's foundry at Gawler (1980:94-7, 106-7).

Moonta Mines was an impressive example of the old-fashioned, closely-knit, paternalistic mining settlement. There was a strong fit between the authority structure of the mines and that of the settlement generally, mediated by Wesleyan Methodism (adherents of the other two forms of Methodism - Primitive Methodism and Bible Christians - tended to be poor miners who were excluded from positions of authority and responsibility -

1980:28-9, 52). Christopher was proud of his position as captain, and always insisted on people calling him by this title (1980:6, 83). Long after he had severed his connections with the Mines, he still insisted on this (1980:135), unlike Henry Lipson Hancock, the second "Cap'n 'Ancock", who recognized that the title was anachronistic and discouraged its use (H.L. Hancock succeeded his father H.R. Hancock in 1898 - S.A.Dept. of Mines, 1964).

When Christopher was appointed captain in 1883, he felt it would be very beneficial to his children:

"The other children were much younger than Sam, and Christopher was anxious that his older boy would, firstly, respect his father, and, secondly, that he would develop a good moral character and be a fine example for his younger brothers and sisters. Because to Christopher a 'good moral character' included respect for authority, and implicit in this was respect for mine Captains, he was well pleased that he could present himself to his son as one of the elite Captains at Moonta Mines" (1980:84).

Christopher's fiery temper was feared both by the mine workers (1980:66, 79, 92) and by his family (1980:6, 115, 140). As a prominent Methodist as well as a mine captain and the head of a large family, Christopher's authority was all-embracing, as can be seen by his anti-larrikin campaign.

In the early 1880's there was much concern at Moonta Mines about "chapel door larrikinism". These larrikins congregated outside the chapels during services and made loud and obscene noises. Christopher used all the means at his disposal to stop these youths from disrupting his preaching:

"During the singing of hymns he would quietly slip outside the chapel by the side or back door. Then he would hurry around to the front and invariably he would descend upon an unsuspecting group in the midst of planning some form of disruption. As the group scattered he calmly wrote the names of those he knew into a small black book. If any of them worked at the Moonta Mines he would hunt them out during the week and, with the aid of his short temper, and his enormous voice he usually gave his victims a tongue-lashing that was never forgotten. If the boys did not work at the mines he was prepared

to go further and to hunt them out in their homes, where, before their parents, he delivered similar tongue-lashings in the family parlour.

"In 1881 when a particularly unpleasant group of boys persisted in disturbing the Yelta church, despite several altercations with Christopher, he pursued the matter as far as the civil courts in Moonta. Six of them were charged with disturbing the peace, found guilty, and they were each fined two shillings and sixpence" (1980:80).

As a result fewer and fewer larrikins disturbed Christopher's preaching appointments, and the Captain built a reputation as someone who could handle the young men of the district (1980:81).

Christopher's all-embracing authority and his conservative attitudes were already somewhat anachronistic in his day. For example, his negative attitude to football was not shared by Captain Hancock nor by some of the other captains (1980:88, 89, 106). In the last years of his life at Mt. Barker (he died in 1926), he was regarded as an "old fashioned Methody". He preached in the fiery, emotional style, he clung to his title of captain, and wore the traditional captain's clothing of black suit with tails and bell topper hat (1980:140-1). His grandchildren remembered him as "a Bible bashing Methodist" (1980:5).

The particular nature of the Cornish copper mining community no doubt contributed to the very strong fit between Christopher's authority as father, captain and community leader. Nonetheless in the Stagg case also there are hints of the parallel between father and master and of the strict nature of patriarchal authority in the late nineteenth century.

Sam's contemporary, William Stagg, lived in a much more remote part of the colony and probably had a much more limited social life. He played cricket for the Second Eleven (1973:53, 58, 59, 75) and went to the annual Sports Days and similar functions (1973:16, 56, 94, 98). He also played

football, although not on an organised basis (1973:66, 67, 84). In August 1886 a club was started:

"We have a football club started in Tarcowie and now of course footballing is the rage" (1973:84).

Unlike Sam, William does not seem to have encountered any opposition from his father over his sporting activities. William was a serious and very devout youth who rarely argued or got into any sort of trouble. There are only vague hints in the diaries of any sort of open disagreement with his father. William was an avid reader ("I must confess I am lost without a paper" - 1973:82) and was very critical of his father's farming techniques, especially his shallow ploughing and his reliance on wheat as the only cash crop. The only hint of open disagreement comes in August 1886, on the topic of shallow ploughing - "I am tired of saying anything against it" (1973:88).

The other sensitive point in the relationship was William's oft-repeated desire to leave home and establish his own farm. On 15/4/85 his entry reads:

"Ploughing. I long to travel. They say life is short but why not make the best of it and for all that I see not the reason why one should not enjoy it or better themselves when opportunities present themselves. At least I mean to, so there is the end of it" (1973:27)

The next entry, for 16/4/85, reads:

"Sowed three bags. It harrowed very well. Mr.White came to see Father. He has sore eyes. He said if I went away from home I should die" (*ibid*).

The second passage suggests that William had raised the topic with his father and that the latter had been upset by his proposal and had mentioned it to Mr.White. In May there are more complaints about the hardness of the ground and his father's inadequate "scratching" with the plough (1973:29);

William also says a couple of times that he is waiting for an opportunity to go to America (*ibid*). On 1/6/85, William notes:

"I was digging holes for the almond trees when our new minister came along. He had a yarn to me about my thinking of going to the goldfields and America. After he was gone I resolved to give up the gold scheme. Ah, but not my going to America. Oh no. America for me is my motto" (1973:31).

Like the passage quoted above, this again suggests that William's parents were concerned about his plans and had spoken to the minister about it. In May 1886 the topic was the goldfields:

"Tonight, whilst speaking about going to the diggings, Father said I could go, but I would soon be back" (1973:67).

By June, William had managed to get his father's consent to leave home (although we are not told what William had in mind - probably the trip mentioned on p.139 above):

"I got leave from father for to go away from home for four months." (1973:72).

He delayed his departure for some time, because he was still musing over his decision in September:

"I decided today to stay home until after the harvest, though I do so wish to go some time early in the future" (1973:86).

William's relationship with his father was obviously more relaxed than Sam's. Nonetheless the fact that at 19 he has to ask his father's permission to leave the farm suggests that he still felt himself to be directly under his father's authority.

The nature of patriarchal authority in this period is difficult to elucidate in any systematic fashion. For my purposes, the key point is the existence of child and adolescent labour as such. By definition, this establishes

a homology between father and master, as compared with today when children are separated almost totally from involvement in productive labour. This does not imply that children were treated harshly or with indifference, or that children and servants living in the same household were treated in identical fashion (cf. Pollock, 1983). It means simply that the nature of childhood and adolescence is quite different when it involves productive labour (paid or unpaid) on the one hand, as it routinely did in nineteenth century South Australia, and when it revolves around formal schooling on the other. The introduction and extension of compulsory education, starting in 1875, was the crucial vehicle for curbing child labour and hence for breaking the nexus between father and master, a process considered in the next chapter. For now, I wish to focus on some of the general characteristics of child and adolescent labour in nineteenth century South Australia.

The seasonal and casual nature of the nineteenth century rural workforce had always been a problem for farmers and politicians:

"In England land was dear and labour cheap; in South Australia the reverse was true. The result was that intensive cultivation was at a discount and the farmer aimed to acquire as much land and employ as little labour as possible" (Hirst, 1973:52).

The result was a male-segregated seasonal and casual workforce, with many workers coming up from Adelaide:

"In a typical year, the beginning of the hay harvest in October drained off unemployed labourers from Adelaide, and government relief works were closed. If the harvest was good, Adelaide mechanics gained steady employment and were able to demand higher wages. But the government immediately set out to overcome the relative shortage of labour by immigration" (Miller, 1980:127).

Hirst notes that there was a prejudice against employing married men in the country:

"Regular employees on sheep stations were not encouraged to marry, and most itinerants were single. If an itinerant pastoral worker had a wife she did not travel with him. On the farms cottages were seldom provided for labourers, who lived in, which generally meant they were given a rough bed in a barn or shed" (1973:6).

Men, and especially single men, were found disproportionately in the country (Hirst, 1973:6-7, 229-30). Many were itinerants who worked on government relief works or at shearing when not employed in seeding or harvesting grain. As Hirst argues, farmers were reluctant to employ labourers all the year round and to provide them with cottages and other amenities. This annoyed the more substantial farmers and pastoralists who did employ men all the year round, because they had to pay higher wages at seeding and harvest times to retain these men (Hirst, 1973:6).

It also annoyed writers on agricultural economy and many of Adelaide's landowners, businessmen and professional people (Hirst, 1973:7, 51). In the last quarter of the nineteenth century the metropolitan press was filled with criticisms of and advice to farmers. The farmers' exclusive reliance on wheat and the soil exhaustion this produced were the most common complaints. Farmers were urged to try different crops, to grow their own fruit and vegetables (which very few did) and to experiment with animal husbandry.

As we have seen above (p.153), William Stagg (an avid newspaper reader) was much influenced by these ideas. Apart from his concern over his father's shallow ploughing and his over-reliance on wheat, William also experimented with various alternative crops - tomatoes, sorghum, tobacco, maize, capsicum, date palms (Robinson, 1973:22); while on his trip to McLaren Vale (see p.139 above) he also picked up some briar and olive cuttings from an Adelaide nursery (1973:113).

Hirst points out that the leading property owners were interested in agricultural reform because new crops would stabilize the economy and increase the value of land:

"Such, no doubt, were the motives which kept men of property interested in agricultural reform, even if they were not willing to risk too much on experiments with new crops. However, it is plain from their propaganda that the critics were not merely concerned for the colony's economic well-being; they were also emotionally unable to accept the way in which the country was developing. Their ideal was the closely worked fields of England and Europe, so South Australia's country did not look like real country" (Hirst, 1973:52).

Throughout the 19th century there were constant complaints of the shortage of farm labourers and domestic servants, and related to this the unwillingness of immigrants to leave Adelaide for the country. In the 1850's, following the massive exodus of people to the Victorian goldfields, the newly-formed South Australian government offered free passages for immigrants who were willing to sign a two-year pledge to work as shepherds, agricultural labourers, or domestic servants (Robinson, 1971:46). As late as 1911, assisted immigration was resumed in an effort to recruit agricultural labourers from Britain, and in 1913 a scheme was introduced to lure British boys into apprenticeships with farmers (Hirst, 1973:3).

Hirst argues that there was no shortage of men wanting to be farmers - the real shortage was in the amount of land available:

"From the mid-eighties there was a steady exodus of farmers and their sons to the other colonies because they could not acquire sufficient land in South Australia" (1973:58; cf. p.2).

Presumably these men wanted to own their own farms rather than work as agricultural labourers. The perceived shortage of labour was related to the seasonal and casual nature of the workforce. Small farmers did not want to employ men all the year round. At times of peak demand they were willing to

pay high wages for casual workers because of the supreme importance of timing in agricultural pursuits. As noted above (pp.155-6) this annoyed larger landowners who had to pay higher wages at these times to retain their men, and agricultural reformers who wanted a more settled and more orderly country life on the English model.

Two contrasting views can be found in the Register newspaper for 1884. The first comes from Mr. J.C. Wilkinson speaking at the Annual Dinner of the Barossa Farmers' Union. He was talking on the importance of manufacturing to South Australia:

"It was all very well to talk about agricultural and pastoral interests, but if they brought people here they must have something for them to do. Probably greater judgment might have been displayed in the selection that had been made of those who had been sent here, and he did not believe altogether in the cry of the unemployed, for a great many of them might be employed if they would go out of Adelaide. (Hear,hear)" (Register, 7/7/84, p.6).

The second passage comes from a meeting of the Beautiful Valley Farmers' Association:

"The Chairman said that a great drawback to the labour market was the fact that so few of the farmers kept their men on all the year round. They only wanted them for two or three months, and as far as the farmers were concerned the men might be idle, so that he thought the men should not have all the blame" (Register, 8/7/84, p.3) (see further 2/7/84, p.6; 4/7/84, p.4; 11/7/84, p.6; 19/7/84 [supplement] p.2).

In the depression decades from 1884 to 1904, farmers usually had no difficulty in obtaining what little labour they needed (Hirst, 1973:2). Robinson notes that in 1886 farm labourers' wages in the northern highland region were reduced from 20/- to 17/- a week, while domestic servants went from 10/- to 6/- a week (1971:222). William Stagg worked for neighbours in 1887 at 12/- and then at 10/- per week (1973:112-3). He was 20 at this stage but his small

stature may have counted against him. A friend of his in September 1886 was more choosy about his wages:

"Willie C. has no work. He was offered a job at Steicke's for seven shillings a week and his tucker but he would not take it. He said he'd rather starve first, and his mother upheld him. They are beggarly proud. A person ought to take any thing that is honest these bad times" (1973:86).

Obviously wages were very flexible, especially for youths. Board and lodging could be substituted for cash, producing further savings for the master. The smaller farmers were obliged to take whatever work they could get from larger or more prosperous neighbours. In the depression years, those who still had money could get their labour on the cheap, and perhaps buy out those farmers who could not hang on:

"Some of the more successful farmers gradually increased their holdings during the 80's and 90's, mostly through buying neighbouring small properties abandoned by the less successful. By 1895 the Cummings family owned more than 5,000 acres and the Bradtke's and Leahys more than 3,000 acres each. Within the Hundreds of Belalie, Caltowie, Mannanarie and Tarcowie ten other family units each had more than 2,000 acres, and thirty families more than a thousand each. The original square-mile-per-family * concept was fast becoming the exception rather than the rule" (Robinson, 1971:200).

(* 1 square mile = 640 acres - AW).

Although these distinctions began to creep in between the bigger and smaller farmers, in William Stagg's day there was very little social distance between highest and lowest. Very few if any of the early settlers in the northern agricultural districts came from privileged backgrounds. Their common experiences in trying to farm a new and harsh environment created strong bonds of solidarity, especially when reinforced by attendance at the same chapel. Wages and working conditions could be adjusted to meet individual circumstances, and the relation between master and servant was

very close. This relation was subject only to a very informal constraint based on local community standards and opinions (as in the case of Willie C. above).

For adolescents working as farm labourers or domestic servants, there was not much difference between helping out on the parental farm or working for very small wages on a nearby property. In both cases they would have been subject to close supervision and a strict patriarchal model of authority. There was a strong parallel between patriarchal authority on the one hand and the relation between master and servant on the other, expressed for example in the term "gaffer" used by William Stagg at the start of his diaries. This term is an abbreviation of grandfather but is also commonly used to describe a foreman or overseer, as noted by Robinson (1973:16).

Some idea of the range of youth occupations can be gained from the South Australian census of 1891. The following tabulation is derived from Tables XIV and XV on pp.592-3 of the census. The age-categories for under-21's are: (1) under 5; (2) 5-14; and (3) 15-20 (these categories are inclusive), of which I have only used the second and third. The list of occupations is given exactly as published in the census (although for convenience I have put the full version underneath the table). I have calculated the percentage figures myself.

TABLE I: OCCUPATIONS OF 5-14 AND 15-20 YEAR-OLDS, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 1891

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>MALE 5-14</u>	<u>MALE 15-20</u>	<u>FEMALE 5-14</u>	<u>FEMALE 15-20</u>
SECTION A: BREADWINNERS				
<u>Professional</u> (%)	58 0.1	486 2.6	29 0.1	533 2.9
<u>Domestic</u> (%)	110 0.3	502 2.8	924 2.3	4344 23.3
Commercial (A to D)				
<u>A:Property and Finance</u> (%)	2 0.0	141 0.8	-	4 0.0
<u>B:Trade</u> (%)	635 1.6	2420 13.2	48 0.1	426 2.3
<u>C:Storage</u> (%)	7 0.0	61 0.3	-	-
<u>D:Transport and Communication</u> (%)	447 1.1	1457 7.9	2 0.0	23 0.1
<u>Industrial</u> (%)	1026 2.5	5358 29.2	273 0.7	2340 12.5
<u>Primary Producers</u> (%)	1641 4.0	6573 35.9	200 0.5	893 4.8
<u>Indefinite</u> (%)	1 0.0	13 0.1	-	8 0.0
SECTION B:NONBREADWINNERS				
<u>Dependants</u> (%)	36456 90.0	997 5.4	37138 93.1	9866 52.9
<u>Occupation Not Stated</u> (%)	598 1.5	343 1.9	1285 3.2	231 1.2
TOTAL	40981	18351	39899	18668

Source: Census of South Australia, 1891, pp.592-3, in SAPP, 1894, vol.2, part 2, no.74.

Table I: Description of Occupations

(1) Professional: Embracing persons not otherwise classed, engaged in the government and defence of the country, in maintaining law and order, and in satisfying the moral, intellectual, and social wants of its inhabitants.

(2) Domestic: Embracing persons engaged in the supply of board and lodging, and in rendering personal services for which payment is usually made.

(3) Commercial: Embracing persons engaged in pursuits connected with the purchase, sale, exchange, hire, custody, and security of money, land, and goods; and with the conveyance, distribution, and delivery of passengers, goods, and communications.

(4) Industrial: Embracing persons not otherwise classed, engaged in works or specialities connected with the construction, modification, or alteration of materials, so as to render them more available for the use of man.

(5) Primary Producers: Embracing persons mainly engaged in the cultivation or acquisition of food products, and in obtaining other raw materials from natural sources.

(6) Indefinite: Embracing persons living on incomes awarded for services rendered at some previous period, or upon incomes the source of which is not perfectly defined.

(7) Dependents: Embracing wives, relatives, and others employed (if employed at all) in household or other pursuits for which payment is not usually made; also children and others being educated, and persons supported by public or private charity or detained in penal institutions.

The figures show that a significant number of 5 to 14 year olds were engaged in some kind of occupation - a total of 9.52% of the males and 3.70% of the females. Most of these were presumably 13 or 14 year olds (the school leaving age at the time was 13 years; total numbers of 13 and 14 year olds were: M: 7529; F: 7341 - Table II, p.85, SAPP, no.74, 1891, vol.3, part 2). Male 15 to 20 year olds are concentrated in primary production, industry, trade and transport/communication. The figures for 15 to 20 year old females are very problematic because of the ambiguous meaning of "dependant". Most of these women were probably engaged in domestic duties in their parents' household, but the genteel aspirations of many families may have led to the omission or concealment of the part time or casual employment of their daughters. Even without this factor, the synchronic picture presented by the census probably understates the percentage of females engaged in paid work at some period of their lives. Additionally we do not know what percentage of daughters actually lived up to the genteel ideal of a life of leisure, although the figure was probably quite low.

In Table XXII on p.609 of the census, there is a breakdown of those males involved in agricultural pursuits according to whether (1) they are sons or relatives assisting without receiving wages; or (2) they are farm servants, labourers or ploughmen working for wages (the figures only refer to farmers and market gardeners - not to those engaged in the pastoral industry, fishing, mining, logging, etc.). In category (1), there were 864 boys aged 5-14 and 3,451 youths aged 15-20. In category (2), there were 345 and 1,924 respectively (totals: 1,349 and 5,375).

It is interesting to note that those in category (1) are counted as "breadwinners" even though not receiving wages, unlike their sisters (probably) engaged in unpaid domestic duties. The figures show that many more were engaged in assisting than in paid work. This may reflect the

depressed economic situation of the time; it may also be a legacy of the northern expansion of the 1870's, with its large number of small owner/producers. In any case this category covers 18.8% of the total 15 to 20 year old male population (and 2.1% of 5 to 14 year olds).

As noted above, the census figures for 15 to 20 year old females are not very useful because of the ambiguity of the category "dependant". It seems a reasonable guess that most of these young women were involved in domestic duties around the house, perhaps supplemented by part-time or casual employment. Their brothers were overwhelmingly involved in some form of paid or unpaid work.

In 1892 a Royal Commission was established to look into the working conditions of women and children in shops and factories. The commissioners visited over 20 factories in the course of their investigations and briefly interviewed a number of juvenile workers. The school leaving age at this time was 13 years and quite a few of the workers interviewed were 13 or 14. Out of 21 cases where the information was supplied (16 males and 5 females), only 3 males and 1 female had obtained their compulsory certificates (signifying the successful completion of the full primary course). Three boys and two girls had left school before turning 13, without their certificates (students with their certificates were permitted to leave school before reaching 13). Only one of these had obtained official permission to do this; he had to leave school to help his mother. The two other boys both stated that their fathers were dead (Minutes of Evidence of Shops and Factories Commission, pp.206-26, SAPP, 1892, vol.2, part 2, no.37; further references are to question numbers).

The commissioners were obviously on the lookout for young workers, but nonetheless their factory visits and the evidence they took from various witnesses suggest that many children in Adelaide left school at 13 to enter the

workforce. Most of the employers interviewed thought that children should go straight into the workforce at the school leaving age of 13 (e.g. questions 537, 545, 1302, 1366, 1378-9, 1492, 3543, 3649 - *ibid*). Boys of 13 or 14 were no longer children, according to some witnesses - e.g. q.3649:

"Of course, in the case of children, you would make the forty-eight hours a week absolute? - I do not exactly call boys of 14 children" (*ibid*).

The union representatives interviewed had a much more negative view of "boy labour". They felt that "boy labour" was used excessively by employers and that this contributed to the unemployment of adult males. In the bootmaking industry, where voluntary arbitration had been introduced, the union had managed to regulate the proportion of boys to men (q.3579); other unions had tried to implement similar schemes (e.g. qs. 12863-12915 for tobacco manufacture; qs. 13647-13735 for saddlery).

Union representatives were also concerned about the "boarding-in" system, whereby workers lived and slept on their masters' premises. This practice was adopted particularly in butchers', bakers', and cook shops (q.32). W.G. Coombs, secretary of the Journeymen Butchers' Association, provides the most detailed complaints. He argues that the men's sleeping places are deficient from both a sanitary and a moral point of view:

(q.2841) "How are they deficient? - There are places which the men have to sleep in - galvanized iron rooms over galvanized iron stables in which horses are kept. Some have to sleep in places where immediately underneath them are smoke rooms for smoking summer goods, and adjacent to them on the same floor are rendering down machines, which are kept going in some cases all day long, and the atmosphere varies from 150° to 200°, on account of the steam. The steam rises right in the places where these men have to sleep.

(q.2842) "Then you consider that, in connection with the boarding-in system, there are great evils as regards their sanitary condition? - Yes. Then with regard to the men and boys, they have to live together, which is most undesirable. They have to sleep in the same room, which is really their living room,

because they have their meals away from there. The employes are not allowed to sit in the kitchen at night, and they at night have either to go up stairs and gamble or go outside on to the street. The furniture in most places consists of beds, but no washing utensils, and they have to wash outside in the yard. This, certainly, is a thing that should be looked into."

This kind of medical-cum-moral reform movement will be a major theme of the next chapter. For the moment it is sufficient to note that living-in was a bugbear for trade unions because of the flexibility and discretion it left in the hands of the employer. The cost of accommodation was generally taken out of the men's wages (q.2839), and the men were always on hand if there was extra work to be done. This made it difficult to regulate wages and working conditions. Employers could over-value the cost of accommodation (and perhaps food also in other cases). Their close connection with all aspects of the men's lives would make it difficult for the latter to refuse special requests without alienating the master. As Coombs remarks: "it lengthens hours and reduces wages. It is a curse" (q.3363).

For Adelaide males, boarding-in was already something of an anachronism in 1892, possibly limited to the smaller and more competitive businesses. A draper's assistant contrasts the situation in South Australia with his recollection of the customs in English drapery stores:

(q.2035) "Were the hours worked in England as long or longer than those worked in Adelaide? - My longest hours in England were from 8.30 in the morning till 7 at night, but we used to have our tea. There the customs are different. The bulk of the assistants live together in the house in which they work. They live and sleep together."

Living-in was still accepted for country males (although reformers did criticise the standard of accommodation - see pp.155-6 above) and for females working as domestic servants. Both farming and domestic service were characterized by long and unregulated hours, poor wages and lack of unionization. In both cases abandoning living-in would have meant a drastic

alteration in the whole status and meaning of these occupations. Farm labourers often had no choice but to sleep in a barn or outhouse because of the long distances involved in the countryside, which made it impracticable to return home each night (presuming they lived in the district at all). Domestic servants were often in a similar situation, and even if they were not, the long hours involved would have made living-in a more attractive option than travelling to and from their parents' household every day. There was also the problem of young women having to walk home by themselves, often in the dark.

Organizing unions of domestic servants was difficult because of their isolation (Kingston, 1975:54) - most households only employed one or maybe two domestics, and so the basis of organization at the workplace was absent. Unionization of farm labourers in South Australia only took place after the federal election of 1910 when a new Arbitration Act extended the jurisdiction of the Court to the agricultural industry; previously the Legislative Council in South Australia had refused to allow wages boards to exercise jurisdiction in the country (Hirst, 1973:205).

Trade unionism and the Labor Party were important vehicles in redefining the relation of master and servant. Defining standard hours, conditions and wages and organizing workers to enforce them cut into the discretionary powers of the master and the paternalism that went with it - a paternalism which could be very good or very bad depending on the individual master. Barbalet gives an indication of the different types of relation between mistress and domestic servant in South Australia - ranging from the mistress who accepted her domestic as one of the family and treated her like she treated her own family, to the mistress who thought of her domestic as nothing more than a drudge (for positive examples, see Barbalet, 1983: 6, 30, 32-3, 35, 36, 37, 49, 140, 149, 154; for negative cases, see 1983: 18,

39-40, 138, 140, 145). Domestic service remained a stronghold of paternalism because of the failure of unionization.

But here as with farm labouring other factors were also at work in the decline of paternalism. By the turn of the century adolescents themselves were trying to escape the long hours, the drudgery, the isolation and the lack of regulation involved in these occupations. The office and the factory were becoming increasingly important as alternative avenues of employment and were much preferred because of the fixed hours and the possibility of returning home each day rather than living-in (for domestic servants wishing to escape, see Barbalet, 1983:23-5, 63, 134, 144, 151, 153, 211-1; Judd, 1979:28-9; Kingston, 1975: 57-73; for farm labourers, see Hirst, 1973: 2-3, 61-4).

Unionism and the availability of alternative employment were starting to weaken the hold of farm labouring and domestic service, occupations for young people which were characterised by living-in and hence by the homology between father and master. At the same time, compulsory education was having a similar effect where children worked directly under parental authority. There was an emerging emphasis on the special nature of childhood as a period of life set apart from the adult concerns of work. This emphasis was opposed to living away from home during adolescence and more generally to child and adolescent labour as such.

These trends worked against the homology between master and father. Somewhat later, with improved communications, greater mobility of employment and residence, and increasing urbanisation, the connection of both of these categories with that of community leader also began to weaken. The breakdown of these homologies tended to weaken the practical/experiential induction into adult life associated in South Australia with the yeoman ethic. Trade union regulation and specification formalised

this induction process in the workplace, as well as directly limiting child and adolescent labour. The decline of live-in servants/labourers also limited the control of the master and hence the possibilities for informal on-the-job socialisation into adult life. Most significantly, compulsory schooling helped to create a new definition of childhood in which education or socialisation came to mean a formal sequence of graded developmental stages, with the child's progress being assessed in terms of universalistic bureaucratic rules. In the next chapter, I begin to address this process, as well as considering its impact on the yeoman/battler ideal.

CHAPTER 5. COMPULSORY EDUCATION AND THE SOCIAL

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter documented the prevalence of child/adolescent labour in late nineteenth century South Australia and its connection with a yeoman/battler ideal of informal on-the-job socialization. I argued that there was a homology at that time between fathers and masters, and looked at unionization and new forms of employment for young people as factors which tended to break down this homology, as well as the related ethic of informal socialization into the workforce. In this chapter I focus on state compulsory education as a further and very important factor which had the same effect.

With the increasing definition of childhood as a special phase of life devoted to formal schooling - both in terms of the length of education and its centrality in the child's activities - the parents' and particularly the father's role came to be seen more-and-more as a guiding, educative, "social" one, rather than one of authoritarian command. This social definition of parent-child relations is central to the private domestic sphere of present-day South Australian society, and it is my contention that state compulsory education was of great importance in establishing this definition.

This chapter examines the emergence and consolidation of state compulsory education in South Australia and relates it to Donzelot's two models of childhood - protected liberation and supervised freedom. These have been discussed in general terms in Chapter 2 above (pp.80-2).

The first, bourgeois model was based on liberation from what was seen as harsh, arbitrary patriarchal control over children's destiny - their

education, their occupations, their choice of spouses, their share of the patrimony. This liberation was to take place within a carefully insulated and discreetly supervised environment, within which the child's "natural" abilities were to be elicited and encouraged.

The second model of supervised freedom involved not liberation from obsolescent forms of authority, but rather the imposition of new forms to curtail what was seen as a dangerous lack of control in the lives of working class children. This lack of control was summed up for social reformers in typifications of "street children", often referred to more colourfully as "arabs", "gypsies", etc. These typifications expressed the reformers' fears that working class children were being exposed to all manner of bad habits and vices through being on the streets - alcohol, crime, prostitution, etc. A related idea in the South Australian context was "precocity" - that working class children were growing up too quickly, and were being prematurely exposed to what should be adult concerns and temptations. Hence new forms of control were needed to stem this precocity, with its attendant physical and moral dangers.

This bipolar contrast - corresponding to but not necessarily coincident with the bourgeois/working class division - forms the major theme of this chapter. Both poles involved the curtailment of child and adolescent labour in favour of longer periods of schooling, and both involved a critique of strict patriarchal authority. But the social reforms which emerged out of these apparently similar concerns had very different effects for working class as compared to bourgeois children.

Focusing on the introduction and consolidation of compulsory education in South Australia from 1875, Chapter 5 examines this differential significance. After describing the broad outlines of educational change, I will focus on the "New Education" of the early twentieth century as an exemplar

of the bourgeois model of childhood. I will then discuss the "child-saving" movement of the late nineteenth century, with its practice of removing children from "problem" families and boarding them out in foster homes. This sets the scene for my treatment of the street children campaign of 1890-1915, which resulted in the tightening up of school attendance regulations. This child-saving movement and its educational ramifications forms the basis of my discussion of the working class model of childhood.

I will briefly discuss early state initiatives in education in South Australia before moving on in the next section to discuss the introduction of compulsory education in 1875.

Education was a major controversy that remained unresolved after the separation of Church and State in 1851 (Pike, 1967:388, 423, 434-7):

"Were schools to be controlled by church or state? Could secular and religious instruction be properly separated? How could schools be subsidised without offence to voluntaryists?" (Pike, 1967:487).

In 1846 Governor Robe introduced state aid for religion and education, insisting that the two were inseparable. Denominational trustees were free to decide how to use their grants. In 1847 religious and educational grants were separated. The latter were now based on capitation allowances to teachers of more than twenty children. There was no attempt to specify curriculum, whether religious or secular. A Board of Commissioners was chosen from different sects, but there were no inspectors. Assisted schools were meant to hold an annual examination, open to the public. Pike asserts that many teachers were no more than baby-sitters, and some were ignorant. Very few country teachers could qualify for a grant because of scattered settlement and seasonal demand for child labour. According to the census of January 1851, 40% of boys and 25% of girls between 7 and 14 were in subsidised schools,

75% of which were within ten miles of Adelaide. Most schools were non-sectarian, with the only religious instruction being daily reading of the scriptures (Pike, 1967:363-72, 488-9).

A major exception was the St. Peter's Collegiate School, an Anglican scheme started in 1847, "providing religious worship and teaching in accord with formularies and liturgy of the Church of England" (from St. Peter's College Private Act, 1849; quoted in Pike, 1967:489). This was to become the leading private school in the state, and remains so today. A group of dissenters opened a rival South Australian High School in 1850 (1967:489-90). ^{- who says so??}

Dissatisfaction with the quality of schools led to the appointment of an inspector in 1850. His unfavourable report on the workings of the education ordinance led to the establishment of a Central Board of Education in 1851. No ministers of religion were allowed to sit on the Board, further divorcing the connection between education and religion. Teachers were to read a chapter from the Old and New Testaments each day, keep attendance books, and watch children's morals, punctuality and cleanliness. No fees were prescribed, but limited building subsidies and fixed stipends were offered to teachers in licensed schools instead of capitation grants (1967:490-1).

After the gold rush, schools spread to the country. By 1875, 85% of them were outside Adelaide; 52% of boys and 42% of girls between 7 and 14 were attending licensed schools. Sunday schools had more than double the enrolments of licensed schools, with girls outnumbering boys. Most of the able dissenting schoolmasters left for Victoria during the gold rush, including the staff of the South Australian High School. An assistant master, J.L. Young, returned to re-open it as the Adelaide Educational Institution (see Verco, 1963, for an account of this school by one of its students). The school reached

its peak in 1869, when the Wesleyan Prince Alfred College was opened and took over as the leading competitor of St. Peter's (1967:491-2).

The old Education Act was replaced in 1875, with responsibility passing from the Board to a Council under the presidency of a salaried official. In 1876, Adelaide University was opened, as well as a training college for teachers.

SECTION II: STATE COMPULSORY EDUCATION, 1871-1900

Compulsory state education was introduced in South Australia in 1875. In this section I will discuss the 1875 Act and the early history of the Education Department. The main point I wish to establish is the explicitness of the class basis of education at this time, despite the universalizing implications of compulsory education. Secondary education was regarded largely as the prerogative of the wealthy, or at least the well-off. Primary education was explicitly directed at the "lower orders" of society - children of the higher orders studied at home under a governess or were sent to small preparatory schools to prepare them for their college education (cf. pp.145-8 above). Length and type of education provided a very explicit status marker - more so than today when secondary education is universal and compulsory. Before 1875, many children probably received little or no formal education at all, especially in remote and/or frontier regions. The 1875 Act started a long process of change in this respect. A lengthy period of schooling came more and more to be regarded as an indispensable feature of childhood - indeed its defining feature. State-provided compulsory education was the vehicle of this universalization, which redefined the whole field of child-rearing and educational discourse/practice.

Under the Central Board of Education established in 1851, the government's subsidy for the construction of "vested schools" was limited to £200, which was fine for small country schools but not enough for schools in Adelaide or in the larger towns. It was the special needs of the metropolis and the larger towns which provided the impetus for reform. Although there were no vested schools in Adelaide, the Board did license and pay the salaries of private teachers of whom it approved. But even this form of assistance to the larger towns was always under threat in a parliament dominated by rural interests (Hirst, 1973:135-8). Thiele argues that the problems created by this situation led to a public scandal:

"Between 1861 and 1873 the number of licensed schools in Adelaide dropped from thirty-two to twelve, and the number of enrolled children fell by half. Large numbers of untaught children roaming the streets scandalized respectable citizens who saw the whole sorry scene as a breeding ground for larrikins and criminals. It was time for something to be done" (Thiele, 1975:2).

There were three attempts to give South Australia a new education system - in 1871, 1873 and 1875. The 1871 bill did not propose a comprehensive scheme. It was aimed specifically at providing education for poor children in the larger towns, who could not afford private schooling. There were to be fees of 1d. a week; the Central Board was not to be able to enforce compulsion upon the remaining vested schools. The "Register" newspaper and others criticized the bill for not enforcing compulsion, and also suggested that money should be raised by a local education rate. They wanted good schools established quickly in every part of the colony. The government was loath to introduce any direct taxes on land or income, and in 1871 their financial situation did not permit a centrally-funded comprehensive system. But this situation changed rapidly after 1871. A return to prosperity saw revenue from customs double between 1871 and 1876; and receipts from land sales rose rapidly as huge new areas were taken up under

the Selection Acts in the early 1870's. This allowed the government to introduce a centralised, comprehensive and compulsory scheme in 1875 (the 1871 bill lapsed because of a dissolution; the 1873 bill was defeated in the Legislative Council).

The Education Act of 1875 stipulated compulsory education between the ages of 7 and 13 years, with a minimum attendance of 70 days per half-year. Attendance was not compulsory on every school day. There were fees of 6d. a week, with exemptions for poverty. The old Board of Education was abolished and control passed to a Council of Education under a salaried president, John Anderson Hartley (previously headmaster of Prince Alfred College, the leading Wesleyan school in South Australia). In 1878 the Council was in turn abolished, and Hartley became the Inspector-General of the Education Department, directly responsible to the minister. Teachers were paid by a combination of fees, bonuses on results at annual examinations, and a salary paid by the government. State schools were to be strictly secular, although teachers were permitted to read the Bible to voluntary classes for fifteen minutes each day before the start of lessons.

Originally there were four grades, with a compulsory certificate being awarded at the end of Grade IV to signify a successful passage through the school system. From 1879, examinations were set for fifth class students. In 1893, all schools with more than 100 pupils and in 1898 all those with attendance of over 40 pupils were obliged to establish fifth grade classes; in 1901 a similar provision was made for the setting up of sixth grade classes. Infant classes were set up in some schools for children below the age of seven. It was not until 1892 that education was made free (Thiele, 1975:11-16; Miller, 1980:142, 150-3, 249; Pike, 1967:492).

The 1875 Act represents a great increase in central control and direction. As Miller puts it:

"Under the new bill, teachers lost the power to determine curricula, teaching methods, the progress of their pupils, and even the administrative routines of their schools. Parents lost the power to select and recommend teachers for appointment. The ownership and control of vested schoolhouses was transferred to the Central Council of Education and the power of local bodies to decide on educational matters was drastically curtailed. Children were now not only compelled to attend school but were subject to a much more rigid and thorough discipline" (1980:142; cf. 1986:51).

The only concession to local control was the creation of Boards of Advice, local bodies which were charged with visiting and reporting on conditions in the schools in their districts, and also with assisting the central authority in enforcing the compulsory clauses. The 1873 bill had at least provided for the election of Boards of Advice, but the Act of 1875 stipulated that they were to be appointed by the Governor in Council (Hirst, 1973:141-3). From 1878, with the abolition of the Council of Education and the consolidation of Hartley's power in his new position as Inspector-General, the influence of the Boards of Advice declined further. Hartley appointed seven school visitors under Superintendent H. Vockins who took over the enforcement of the compulsory clauses in many school districts, thus removing one of the main functions of the Boards of Advice (Thiele, 1975:29-30).

Prior to 1875, the local community had been directly involved in schooling in a number of ways, particularly in the annual examination day. Assessment was by way of an oral examination given to the pupils by prominent local men, often ministers of religion or district councillors. Examination day was a major event in the local social calendar, and the serious business was followed by various entertainments. Gibbs presents an account from a school at Princetown, Inman Valley, in 1871:

"A large number of the parents and friends of the children were present. The children, numbering 41.....were examined in the usual branches of an English education, viz. reading, writing, arithmetic, history, grammar, geography etc. Songs, rounds, and recitations were given at intervals during the examination, which was very satisfactory to all present.....The National Anthem closed the afternoon exercises. The children then adjointed to a large tent where an excellent spread of good things was provided by the parents and friends. After the children had satisfied themselves, the parents and friends to the number of 140, right heartily followed their example. The school-room was tastefully decorated with banners bearing devices suitable to the occasion, the handiwork of the senior scholars, with flowers, evergreens, and bush foliage. After tea, and an hour spent in various games, the company reassembled at an evening's entertainment of singings, readings and recitations" (*The South Australian Chronicle and Weekly Mail*, 25/11/1871, quoted in Gibbs, 1969:175-6; cf. also Hirst, 1973:137-8, 143).

This local participation, accompanied by quite considerable local decision-making capability, was abolished by the 1875 Act, a decision whose ramifications extend right down to the present day. With one or two notable exceptions, which we will come across later in this chapter, the Boards of Advice did not prove very active or effective. They were replaced by school committees of parents and friends in a new Education Act of 1915. Although these committees often provided valuable services to their schools in the way of fund-raising, organizing fetes and other special occasions, working bees, etc., their power over the important questions of staffing, curriculum, assessment, etc., was virtually nil. Decisions on these matters were handed down by the central authority (see e.g. Butler, 1979:93-5).

The new system was inaugurated with very little opposition, but criticism did develop over a number of points - concern over alleged cramming, over the payment-by-results system which was seen as linked to this cramming, and over the almost dictatorial power of Hartley, who managed to run the affairs of the whole department single-handedly, down to what would be considered today as trivial details for such an important

official. A Select Committee and then a Royal Commission on education took evidence from 1881 to 1883, during which these criticisms surfaced.

There are two different ways in which this controversy over cramming can be read. Firstly, it can be read objectively in terms of good educational practice and theory - whether students were pushed too hard, whether they were able to digest all the material they were presented with, whether such cramming is or is not desirable. That by today's standards a great deal of cramming did occur seems very likely, although Hartley and his policies emerged from the Royal Commission virtually unscathed (Thiele, 1975:43).

I wish to suggest a second reading of this controversy which is more fruitful for my purposes. This is a cultural reading based on a general intensification of educational expectations following the 1875 Act. Working class and lower middle class children whose schooling had previously been short and erratic, if they had any at all, were now exposed to a much longer and more intensive period of schooling, a change almost certain to lead to feelings that these children were being crammed. Regardless of whether educationists would share this opinion, the debate over cramming can be read as an indicator of the radical transformation of childhood brought about by state compulsory education.

Education and the associated notions of childhood are not natural or inevitable. It is not, as so many writers argue, that the "needs" of childhood were suddenly "discovered", leading to a new humanitarian era of educational development. It is a question of a specific historical transformation brought about by particular social groupings in a specific context of possibilities and constraints. This transformation did not just happen, it had to be worked at, justified, sold, evoking resistances along the way. For transient labourers, for trades with large seasonal variations in

labour demands, and for the poorest elements of the working class who depended on their children's labour power and could not afford fees (and who resented the degradation of having to apply for exemption), compulsory education had to be imposed (see Wimshurst, 1979:164-184; Miller, 1980:153, 171-8, 193, 278; Corrigan, 1979:29-44). For many others, even though they were in favour of education in the abstract, it came into their lives as an alien presence, as a set of cultural expectations of dress, hygiene, time discipline, behaviour, etc., quite different from their own.

The debates over cramming reflect this intrusion of alien standards and expectations into the lives of children and families coming from a different cultural tradition where formal education was of little relevance or importance. I will use the Progress Report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on Education, 1881 (S.A.P.P., 1881, vol.4, no.122) to elaborate this point and to demonstrate the explicitly class-based nature of education at this time.

The first point concerns the division between primary and secondary education, which represented much more of a yawning gap then than it does now. In the nineteenth century, the only state secondary schools were the Advanced School for Girls (founded in 1879) and an Agricultural School (1897). Secondary education was seen as the province of private colleges, of whom the two most important were the Anglican St. Peter's and the Wesleyan Prince Alfred. Both of these were exclusively male, and it was the absence of private secondary education for girls which prompted the establishment of the Advanced School for Girls (see next chapter for this school and for secondary education in general). State education was seen as primary education. This was all that was considered necessary for the average citizen. Higher education for the masses was seen by many people as dangerous because it educated people out of their proper station in life.

The evidence of Inspector-General Hartley before the Select Committee of 1881 brings out the class basis of secondary vs. primary education:

Question 52 (Cooke) "You think the schools should be divided into two classes, and that a definition such as would guide the visitor should be made? - (Hartley) I do. I think all schools charging a weekly fee should be considered as primary schools, and those that charge a quarterly fee of more than, say, 13s., which just comes to 1s. a week, should be considered secondary schools for the purposes of the Act. I know this is not a scientific classification, but it is as good as I can suggest" (op. cit., Minutes of Evidence, p.4).

Here we have a direct linkage between income (as represented by capacity to pay fees) and type of education. Another criterion mentioned by Hartley in defining secondary education is the kind of subjects taught. Hartley is answering a question about the inefficiency of small private schools (not the major colleges):

"I do not refer to secondary schools - by which I mean schools at which Latin, Greek, mathematics, etc., are taught - but to primary schools in which the fee charged is low, say 1s. per week, and which are attended chiefly by the children of the labouring classes" (op. cit., p.1, q.11).

These small private schools, acting in competition with the state schools, are one of the most common topics of the Select Committee's minutes of evidence. It was argued by many witnesses that these schools were inefficient and lacking in discipline, and that parents of the "labouring classes" sent their children to these schools because it was easier to avoid the compulsory attendance clauses at these schools than at the state schools (cf. Miller, 1980:198; 1986:64).¹

1. Miller presents another reason for the popularity of these small private schools: "the parents' desire for safe child minding frequently conflicted with the program of centralising state schools. The public school might have been better or cheaper than the private school around the corner, but many young children would have had to walk long distances or cross busy roads or the railway line to get to it" (1986:64; 1980:199-200).

This meant that the children were always available for paid or unpaid labour should the need or the opportunity arise. These schools were not subject to any inspection or certification. Private schools could request to be declared efficient, but only two in the whole state had so requested (p.1, qq.10-14). It was felt by almost all of the witnesses called that the existence of these schools represented a grave threat to the workings of the compulsory clauses and of the Education Act in general:

"(Hartley - answer to q.19, p.2) "When we come to smaller schools, where the fees are 6d. or 1s. per week, it is not certain that the class of people who send their children to such establishments have such a regard for the welfare of their offspring as to see whether the instruction given is reasonably efficient. It is to schools of that class that children go who might be expected to come to the government schools - in fact it was for them that the State provided the means of education that now exist; and to make the working of the Education Act efficient I think this class of schools ought to be certified as efficient. I would not interfere with them if they do their work well, but I think the State ought to ascertain whether their teaching is or is not satisfactory."

The aim of state education comes out clearly here. It was intended for children of the labouring classes - it was not meant to be a universal system. This aim was also reflected in the unsuccessful 1871 education bill (see above, p.175), which was directed specifically at poor children in the larger towns.

Not only was it aimed at the working class, the state in many cases had to impose this supposed benefit on them, as evidenced by the popularity of the small private schools. This imposition was phrased in terms of the duties of parents to provide for "the welfare of their offspring". Parents and families were affected by compulsory education as much as their children. Working class families following what had been their normal cultural pattern of behaviour were now definable as negligent and immoral for not attending to their children's education.

Extending Donzelot's argument, the advent of compulsory education sets up a new basis for marking the status boundaries between classes in terms of the "quality" of the educational practices of families, mediated by a new relation between families and the state. It was not simply a question of fulfilling a demand, of providing a benefit - the working class had to be compelled to send its children to school, and the state was equipped with new and radical powers to enforce this compulsion, powers which were in sharp contradiction with the original free enterprise philosophy of the bourgeoisie.

This will become clearer when we look at further extracts from the 1881 inquiry, concerning the small private schools:

(Hartley replying to q.22, p.2) "The Inspector never visits these schools, and the children go to them because the discipline is less strict than at the public schools, and very greatly because the children are not so liable to be looked up by the school visitors. These schools are really even helped by the action of the visitors, as the parents do not care for the trouble, and send the children where inquiries will not be so closely made. This naturally causes the attendance at the inferior schools to be better."

(William Young, head master of Hindmarsh Public School, in reply to q.2208, p.98) "They are also anxious to exact labour from the children instead of sending them to school. Hindmarsh being a manufacturing district, the children are valuable to their parents in the household. They, therefore, send them to the small private schools for a week or so, and when the school visitor calls, they say they have been sent to school. Immediately afterwards they leave, and there is no check upon them till the next return is made out."

(ibid, q.2215) "...the marking of the attendance at these schools only shows what children pay the school money. If they have paid, no notice is taken if they do not attend during the week, and it is cheaper for the parents to pay sixpence or fourpence a week than have the children compelled to attend the public schools."

Compulsory education was about curtailing child labour as much as it was about education itself. While not wishing to take a moral stance - either positive or negative - about child labour, and while not wishing to romanticize working class life, one must recognize the alien nature of

compulsory education to many of the "labouring classes" and their quite understandable resistance to this intrusion, a resistance based on established patterns of familial cooperation in economic activity.

As many writers on the subject have recognized (e.g. Wimshurst, 1979:180), the education system has often been enlisted in attempts to solve all manner of perceived social problems, problems which may have little to do with education as such. The curtailment of child labour is one such attempt, but not the only one:

(ibid, q.2217) "They are allowed to attend school when they please, and are not compelled to keep clean, and no habits of cleanliness, neatness, or propriety of conduct are inculcated. There is no discipline carried out. I see the children running in the street for half an hour at a time after those at the public school are in."

It was not just the three R's which middle-class educational reformers wished to teach - it was a whole middle class lifestyle involving cleanliness, style of dress, a particular way of speaking, the disciplined use of time, a whole code of behaviour. The eradication or at least the close supervision of the small private schools was seen as necessary for this task. Many witnesses spoke in favour of free education precisely for this reason:

(Inspector Stanton replying to Parsons, q.386) "Are you in favour of free education? - I think free education would soften several difficulties which are in the way at present, particularly the existence of some of these private schools which I have spoken of, as I do not think they would be able to survive in case State education were given free" (cf. Miller, 1980:205).

A distinct hierarchy of education emerges from the minutes of evidence of this inquiry. There are three layers, with large gaps in between each layer - the private colleges at the top, then the state schools, then the small private schools. The language of class used to describe the quality of the education provided in these different types of schools powerfully suggests

notions of social class, emphasizing the unashamed, explicit, status-marking function of education. E.g.:

(q.53, p.5, by Cooke, referring to the colleges) "In any place where the high class system is adopted....."

(q.306, p.18, by Dixon) Question concerning the desirability of establishing a "middle class" school for "advanced boys" coming out of the state schools (i.e. a state secondary school).

(q.22, p.2, by Parsons) "I observe in your report you refer to these particular schools as inferior private schools. By that you mean little better than dames' schools?"

Obviously this kind of differentiation of types of school according to social class clientele can still be seen today, but it no longer has the same meaning. The whole context of education and of childhood has changed dramatically since the 1880's. The status-conferring function is now imbricated within a universal discourse. Education is now seen as a universal and necessary part of personal growth and development for all children. It is seen as a preparation for adult life, in terms of providing job-related skills, general literacy and numeracy, personality growth, living skills, etc.

Education is also seen as a vital part of "national efficiency" or "social efficiency" (Searle, 1971), turn-of-the-century phrases used in Britain and subsequently in Australia, having reference to technological change, imperialistic sentiments, competition with Germany, and more generally a lay structural-functional view of society as a harmonious network of interlocking parts all contributing to the efficiency of the nation-state.

This universalization of education - begun in 1875 but not fully developed until the advent of state secondary education in 1907 and its subsequent expansion - forms the next major link in the argument.

As we have seen, state education was originally targeted at the working class and was distinguished in many ways from the education

provided by the private colleges. It took some time for the state system to lose these signs of its humble origins. This point will be discussed more fully in the next chapter which addresses the nature of state secondary education. For now I wish to look at a development which preceded the introduction of state high schools but which also expresses a universalizing trend, the so-called "New Education" which became popular in the South Australian Education Department around 1900 (Miller, 1980:180-2).

The New Education can be seen as a reaction against the cramming and rote learning criticised by many of the witnesses before the inquiry of 1881-3. As already noted, Hartley emerged relatively unscathed from this inquiry. Payment-by-results was abolished in 1885 following the report of the Royal Commission, and Hartley also introduced a new course in that year (Thiele, 1975:31-43). But the charges of cramming as well as the direct criticisms of Hartley did not lead to any immediate action.

Hartley was killed in a traffic accident in 1896. When the New Education came into vogue, respect for the founding father sometimes led people to regard Hartley as the progenitor of this innovation and 1885 as the important turning point. For example, the Board of Inspectors (a triumvirate appointed in place of Hartley) made the following comments in 1901:

"It is now recognized in England and elsewhere that the soundest educational work is done by leading children to discover truths and facts for themselves. What is termed the heuristic method is gaining ground daily, but this is just the method that is laid down in our course of instruction, and which has been followed since 1885, when it was introduced by that advanced educationist, the late Inspector-General of Schools, John Anderson Hartley" (Education Gazette, 1901:122; emphasis in original).

Regardless of Hartley's own opinions, perusal of the relevant issues of the Education Gazette and of the histories of individual state schools (e.g. Butler, 1979) suggests that the annual examinations (now conducted by an

Inspector) still exerted an overbearing influence even after payment-by-results was abolished. Coupled with this was a narrow concentration on examinable topics, and often very heavy-handed and unimaginative teaching methods.

Miller notes that in the late nineteenth century, writing tests involved the faithful imitation of the authorized copy book, rather than testing the ability to write a legible hand. She reproduces a photograph of a drawing lesson at the Observation School in Currie Street (Adelaide) in 1909. This shows a large class all copying the same picture from the blackboard. She also reproduces part of the instructions for the annual examination in reading in 1893 (Education Gazette, 1893, p.25): "all vulgarisms will be counted as mistakes e.g. - git for get, sor for saw, gettn' for getting, singin' for singing, nothink for nothing"; further "omission of the aspirate will always count as a mistake". One error in pronunciation was enough to fail the examination (Miller, 1986:41-4).

This rigidity does not reflect Hartley's own opinions, which were quite progressive (Turney, 1972a, 1972b; Saunders, 1972). Many teachers before 1900 received very little training, so that the personnel to introduce a "heuristic" system were not available, even if Hartley did try to introduce such a system. During most of his period of office, he was forced to economize because of the limited funds available for education, particularly from 1884 when a long period of depression set in in South Australia. The dispersion of settlement in the colony also created problems:

"He was faced with the difficulty of improving the quality of instruction in the hands of poorly qualified teachers in widely scattered schools. Such personnel, he reasoned, required the direction of systematic courses to aid them in their teaching and the examination of these prescribed courses by inspectors to ensure pupils were brought up to standard" (Turney, 1972a:7).

On balance, state education right through the nineteenth century, and probably for longer, was characterized by rote-learning and heavy-handed discipline. The 1875 Act thus marked an increase in the density of disciplinary and rote practices as juniors responded to seniors' demands within a newly-established central-bureaucratic educational structure - in Foucault's terms, there was a greater penetration of power into the social body. This was associated with the emergence of teaching as a secular profession, and more particularly with the system of payment-by-results. These characteristics of nineteenth century state schools were directly attacked by the New Education.

The New Education will be taken as an exemplar of the middle class model of childhood, which Donzelot calls "protected liberation". I will then consider other aspects of state compulsory education as well as the history of the State Children's Council in the light of Donzelot' characterization of the working class model of "supervised freedom". At all times, however, the necessary interrelation of these polar categories should be kept in mind. The meaning of one pole can only be appreciated in terms of its relation to the other pole.

SECTION III: THE NEW EDUCATION, 1900-1920

The New Education was a diffuse but influential movement originating in England in about 1870 and adopted by Australian educational reformers round about the turn of the century. In England it developed against the "instrumentary education" introduced by the Revised Code of 1862. This code produced a very uniform system of education based on the three R's and associated with payment-by-results. According to Selleck (1968:40) the trend of its methodology was very much towards rote-learning.

Selleck identifies six different strands within the New Education, united more by their opposition to the instrumental education than by any common theories or suggestions. I will focus my attention on the rhetoric of "interest", which can be associated with the "naturalist" school described by Selleck and in particular with the names of Pestalozzi and Froebel (1968:179-217). Selleck identifies five main features of this approach: (1) education was a matter of developing the powers of the child; (2) the child must have freedom to develop these powers; (3) the teacher should interfere as little as possible; (4) the child should be an active participant; (5) the need to respect childhood as a special period of life, rather than treating children as miniature adults (1968:212-6).

My discussion of the New Education has three aims: (1) to characterize the rhetoric of interest in early twentieth century South Australia; (2) to consider how it was embedded in certain institutional developments in the South Australian education system so as to show the importance of this rhetoric; (3) to interpret both the rhetoric and the institutional changes in terms of an emerging middle class model of childhood.

The New Education reflects a liberalized model of the family, which dilutes patriarchal authority in favour of women and children and at the same time redistributes this authority towards the state. This dilution and redistribution of patriarchal authority is further associated with attempts to curb child labour, to improve the health and morals of the working class, to instil patriotic virtues, and more generally, to effect a new functionality of the family under liberal democratic regimes where the family could no longer be used to explicitly shore up positions of wealth or power.

This functionality takes two quite different forms or "registers" as Donzelot calls them - a contractual form for the middle class, and a tutelary

form for the working class. The rhetoric of interest reflects the middle class model of childhood which Donzelot calls "protected liberation" (1979a:45-7). Within a sheltered and protected space - the school and the family as a hybrid combination - the middle class child was to be nurtured and encouraged to develop as rapidly as possible, free from what were seen as the harsh and arbitrary dictates of patriarchal authority. The problem that social reformers saw with the working class child, in contrast, was not one of liberalization, but rather of putting a stop to what were seen as the excessive freedoms which already existed - an attitude summed up in the Australian context by the word "precocity", with its implications of premature exposure to the morally corrupting adult world of work and sex. For the moment I will concentrate on features of the middle class model of protected liberation. However the wider theoretical context should also be kept in mind.

An early and important exponent of the New Education was the South Australian teacher and educational writer, W. Catton Grasby, who published a stinging critique of Hartley's rigid and autocratic regime in 1891 ("Our Public Schools"):

"Untramelled by departmental restrictions and refusing to be subdued by economic realities, Grasby probably did more than any other Australian to criticize the outmoded arrangements of the old educational regime and to chart the way for reform according to his version of the New Education" (Turney, 1972b:193).

Grasby criticized the pupil teacher system (see below, pp.193-4), the examination system and its use in assessing teachers, the narrow course of study, and the inadequacies of school buildings and furniture (Turney, 1972b:205-7).

As a teacher in the Education Department in the 1880's as well as in his later activities, Grasby campaigned for the widening of the primary school

curriculum, and particularly for the inclusion of manual training and nature study. At Oakbank School in 1885 he established a museum of natural history, to which the children were encouraged to contribute specimens. At Payneham School in 1887, he founded the Boys' Field Club, which aimed to encourage "the practical study of natural science" and invited boys from both the public schools and the colleges to participate in meetings, camps and excursions (Turney, 1972b:196-7).

According to Miller, the New Education became popular in the South Australian Education Department around 1900 (1980:180-2). At the 1901 conference of the S.A. Public School Teachers Union there was an "inspiring address" by Frank Tate, Director of Education in Victoria and a friend of Grasby's. Tate emphasized the dangers of the "overcrowded syllabus". In his view there must be no divorce between "school interests" and "life interests". Education is not merely preparation for life - it is life itself:

"....intellectual education would not be genuinely given until aesthetic interests and intellectual interests were both appealed to, and until children were taken on their own ground, from their environments, and led out from that" (Education Gazette, 1901:144).

In 1903 teachers were instructed as follows in regard to the forthcoming examination:

"With fair teaching and average children it should not take more than six months to learn the reading sheets, and about the same time for the Second Primer. This will not be done by repeating the lesson over and over again till the children are sick of it, but by first giving them the power to make out the words for themselves by combining sounds, and then by reading" (Education Gazette, 1903:45-6).

In the same year the Education Gazette reproduced a paper by Professor J.M.D. Meiklejohn, read before the College of Preceptors, entitled

"The Teaching of History". This is strongly critical of the overcrowded history syllabus and its emphasis on the rote learning of names, dates and places:

"This kind of thing is just like a series of dissolving views: before the first picture has had time to impress itself on your memory, another and another appears, and the different sets of scenery and personages become inextricably mixed and jumbled up in your brain. Moreover, it leads us to this ridiculous and even farcical conclusion and result: that the age - the age of childhood and youth - which wants and needs interest in the highest degree gets it least, and is fobbed off with sawdust pie when it requires the most nourishing food. Consider, too, how bad it is for the memory, which can grow and gain strength only on what is clear, complete, and firmly held" (Education Gazette, 1903:55; emphasis in original).

The question of interest is discussed in a more formal way in a paper by G.H. Knibbs, State Commissioner of Education in New South Wales, entitled "Some Aspects of Child Study". This paper was read by Andrew Scott at the annual conference of the South Australian Public School Teachers Union of 1903:

"It is well known, however, that psychical interest tremendously modifies the sense of fatigue. This is so for animals as well as men, and for children. Here we come face to face with one of the most interesting problems that offers itself for solution. 'How can interest reduce the painful consciousness of physical and mental fatigue?' That there is a very real reduction of weariness in certain cases is quite beyond dispute" (Education Gazette, 1903:108; emphasis in original).

One vehicle recommended by Knibbs for attracting children's interest is the "importance of initiative in play":

"All impulse towards initiative, towards self-direction, should be very carefully encouraged, not inhibited. And thus we see why intelligent kindergarten can never be formal. To serve its purpose it must be as free as possible, every encouragement being given to the little ones to express their own individualities, in all ways consistent with respect for the individualities of others" (Education Gazette, 1903:109; emphasis in original).

Interest is one of the key words for the New Education - arousing children's interest so as to make them active participants in their own education, leading them to discover things for themselves rather than being passive agents simply absorbing verbatim whatever the teacher says. Before considering the implications of this, I will look briefly at some institutional changes which are relevant to the New Education.

Firstly, in 1903 it was reported by R.T. Burnard in his Presidential Address to the South Australian Public School Teachers Union that certain schools had recently been exempted from detailed examination by the inspectors (Education Gazette, 1903:95). This suggests a slight loosening of the stranglehold of the exam system and a greater freedom for individual schools and teachers to pursue their own teaching methods. Another more significant change mentioned in the same address was the offer by the University of Adelaide in January 1900 to take over - free of charge - the responsibility for teacher training. Previously teachers had been recruited directly from among the pupils. Promising students from among the Fifth Class were recruited as pupil teachers. These began an immediate apprenticeship under the teacher, simultaneously teaching and studying for special exams. After four years some were then admitted to the Training College in Grote Street, Adelaide, for a one year (later two year) course (Thiele, 1975:48-9, 63). This pupil teacher system had been introduced by Hartley both at Prince Alfred College and in the state system. Hartley had once been a pupil teacher at Woodhouse Grove School in England - a school exclusively for the sons of Wesleyan ministers (Thiele, 1975:16-7).

Under this system, pupils who displayed a mastery of the simpler aspects of a subject were immediately set to work to teach the same to their fellow pupils. This would have been conducive to the kind of rote learning criticized by the New Education, since pupil teachers were likely to have a

less well developed grasp of the subject than their masters, and would probably have been employed only on the simpler aspects anyway. In his address, Burnard stresses another disadvantage of this system:

"Now, you will remember that under our former regime - the old pupil teacher system - much attention was given to the power to teach and manage a class of children, and the weakness was in the lack of culture in the young teachers. A bright promising candidate who showed capability for control, entered at once on a course of four years' training" (Education Gazette, 1903:95).

From 1900 a six year training period was in force - two at Grote Street, which now became a Pupil Teachers' School; two at ordinary schools, practical teaching; and two years at the University (Thiele, 1975:63). From this time the pupil teacher system went into rapid decline. The Grote Street School became part of the Adelaide High School in January 1908, to be replaced by an Observation and Practising School in Currie Street. From 1920 students were admitted to college straight from the newly established high schools, virtually eliminating the pupil teacher system (Thiele, 1975:84, 85, 143).

Another point relevant to the New Education is the increasing importance of Montessori and similar methods in the lower grades. In 1906 Misses Longmore and Claxton were sent to Melbourne Teachers' College to gain the Victorian Infant Teachers' Certificate. They returned to South Australia to pioneer the new methods there - singing, dancing, miming, drawing and others (Thiele, 1975:79-81). These soon became standard in most Infant Departments. Miss Longmore was the special inspector for infant schools in the 1920's (Education Gazette, 1924:134; 1926:80-1). In 1907 the Kindergarten Union started up, although this was quite separate from the Education Department (Jones, 1980:116).

These Montessori methods were introduced during the reign of Alfred Williams as Director of Education. In 1905 Labor man Tom Price was elected

Premier. He took over the education portfolio, appointed Williams as Director, and introduced sweeping changes. Williams came from poor Cornish mining stock. He had spent four years as a pupil teacher, one year at training college, and had taught with distinction at a number of schools (Thiele, 1975:74-7). The most important feature of the Price/Williams regime was the introduction of state secondary education from 1908. This followed an overseas trip by Williams in 1907 in which he visited England, the Continent and the U.S.A. (Thiele, 1975:83). His report of that trip is full of the psychology of adolescence, which he uses to support the introduction of state secondary education.

He was particularly influenced by the ideas of the American writer on adolescence, G. Stanley Hall. Hall belonged to the child study movement, a different strand of the New Education, although related to the naturalist strand. Hall urged the prolongation of adolescence and the removal of pressures for adult-like behaviour (Kett, 1977:217). He argued against the harsh treatment of adolescents. According to his doctrine of recapitulation, each stage in the life-cycle of the individual corresponded to a period in the history of the race. Adolescence corresponded to a period of migrations, upheaval and traumas (Kett, 1977:218). This history was recapitulated in the life-cycle of the individual, in the form of inexorable commands from the past:

"Hall argued that adolescent faults - even serious ones like running away from home or breaking and entering - were the outgrowths of instinctive urges, and that a regimen of repression would only cause recrudescences later on in a more menacing form" (Kett, 1977:217).

Hall's theories can be seen as an umbrella of overarching theory which both inspired and protected the emerging model of protected liberation. He wished to create a sheltered and segregated environment for adolescents within which they could develop their special selves, and he was opposed to

harsh punishment. Adolescents were to be gently coaxed, guided and directed, instead of being summarily told what to do and summarily punished for not doing it (Hall's theories are discussed extensively in the next chapter, in relation to the development of secondary education in South Australia).

More generally, my argument is that the New Education provides an exemplar of the new attitudes to childhood characteristic of "the social", attitudes which were willingly adopted and propagated by the middle class, but which remained problematic for the working class. Within a sanitized and protected environment (the family, the school or the youth group) children were to be liberated from the constraints of strict patriarchal authority. Under a more discreet and less authoritarian adult supervision, they were to be encouraged to show initiative, to develop their native faculties and to grow and develop in a rational manner rather than being constrained by arbitrary parental authority. Instead of a more-or-less direct transition from infancy to adulthood, with its exposure to a morally corrupting world where ages, genders and classes were all mixed together, children were now to be segregated into their own special world.

My thesis is that there is a parallel between rote learning and strict patriarchal authority. Both involve obedience to all-powerful commands, without discussion or argument. Both assume that children should be carbon copies of their masters; that a child's mind is a tabula rasa which should be completely filled out, completely constituted, by the command of the master. Both involve "on-the-job training" - you become a teacher by pupil teaching, you become an adult by being an adult (through labour in particular) - there is no period of preparation which partakes of a wholly separate character.

The kind of model represented by the New Education was very different from all this. Children should not be subject to harsh and arbitrary authority. They should be active participants in their own education, their own socialization. Children should understand the reasons behind an instruction or a lesson - they should be led out from their own special childlike experience and guided towards the truth, so they can actively and meaningfully grasp this truth for themselves. Education/socialization should be relevant to this special experience, should be interesting to the children, rather than being simply imposed from without.

This liberation of children was to be accompanied by the creation of a special domestic sphere supervised by women where the new educative tasks were to be conducted. A new dignity and importance was attached to the previously servile tasks of housekeeping and childrearing, and women were recognized as being specially suitable for certain paid occupations such as teaching, nursing and social work.

As Donzelot argues, the creation of new spheres of activity for women coincides with the liberation of children from patriarchal authority. Women's liberation in the nineteenth century was predicated on the importance of their hygienic, moral and educative tasks. This helps to explain the apparently contradictory nature of feminist organizations such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), which expanded the sphere of women but did so in terms of spreading distinctly feminine qualities throughout society (see below, pp.220-5). In the aims of the WCTU we can see the double genesis of the social - a hybridization in which the private sphere created by the nineteenth century bourgeois family is redefined in terms of a publicly-sanctioned group of educative and hygienic norms, and the public sphere (or at least certain segments of it) begins to take on some of the characteristics ideally associated with the bourgeois family - in education, in juvenile justice

and in social work, the twentieth century has witnessed a liberalization of authority and an increasing emphasis on relational technologies.

Donzelot defines the social in terms of a specialized sphere of activity embracing social work, social security, juvenile justice, etc. - all areas in which the family becomes an object of state intervention and regulation. But the social also redefines the nature of the public and private spheres and their interrelation. Donzelot's argument is not simply one of an octopus-like state gradually encroaching on more and more aspects of civil society. At the tutelary pole, something like this might be observed, but Donzelot's discussion involves much more than this. Publicly-provided education in South Australia expresses very well the hybridization of public and private spheres which is the most central and most original concept in Donzelot's book.

Education was made compulsory in South Australia in 1875 - parents were no longer to have the right to employ their children on the family farm or to send them out as wage labourers; they were no longer to have the right to decide on the quantity and quality of the child's education (or indeed whether their children should receive any education at all). State education can be seen as providing greater educational opportunities for ordinary people, but it also represents an attack on patriarchal authority and a redefinition of the role of the family. This is most evident in those cases where compulsory education was actually disadvantageous economically to the poor family in depriving them of income from child labour. From 1875 - but particularly from 1915 when attendance requirements were tightened up in South Australia - the state insisted that the business of childhood was to be schooled, in a phrase popular at the time (Wimshurst, 1979:59). The family had to be reorganized socially and economically to lend support to this objective, so that ideally a partnership between home and school was created

centred on the newly-valorized educative tasks. Home and school were both to be liberalized and humanized in the process, with women being seen as the privileged agents.

The secularization of education (see pp.172-3 and p.176 above) was another important aspect of the breakdown of patriarchy, the latter having previously been sanctioned by age-old religious traditions, particularly those deriving from the Old Testament. Not only was the teacher becoming more important in the socialization of children at the expense of the parents, but the teacher's role was not sanctioned by religious authority. This point can be related to the breakdown of the homologies discussed in Chapter 4 (see especially the story of Christopher and Sam, pp.148-52). Instead of an all-encompassing patriarchal authority, homologous across a wide range of contexts - father-family, master-servant, religious leader-community - the twentieth century has witnessed a greater differentiation of these contexts into separate spheres, each with its own specialized authority structures.²

Although state education was originally aimed at the working class, its ramifications extend well beyond this. Bourgeois schools were also remoulded in reaction to developments in the state system. Private schools in South Australia in the nineteenth century did not accept boys below the age of 10 or 11. Boys usually went to small private preparatory schools before enrolling at college. Boys could also enrol at a later age, and there was not the degree of age-grading that was to develop later. Soon after the introduction of state high schools in 1908, this situation was radically altered. The leading private schools (St. Peter's in 1910 and Prince Alfred in 1911) established their own preparatory schools for younger pupils (Ward, 1951:114-5; Nicholas, 1953:53; Gibbs, 1984:46, 94, 148-9). This suggests a desire to streamline the

2. The role of secularization in the breakdown of patriarchal authority is not addressed by Donzelot, even though it is very germane to his work.

colleges in the face of competition from state high schools, and specifically a greater concern with age-grading. Other indications of this desire could be the introduction of a House System at Prince Alfred College in 1920, with points for work in school as well as in games (Ward, 1951:148; Gibbs, 1984:184-6; a similar system was also introduced at St. Peter's at about the same time - Gibbs, 1984:199-200); the expansion of the Old Collegians' Association from 1906 to 1910 and the development of a yearly round of social and sporting events between Prince Alfred and St. Peter's (Ward, 1951:125; Gibbs, 1984:143); and the development of freemasonry at both institutions at the same time (Ward, 1951:130; Gibbs, 1984:200). I suggest that the private schools had to streamline their activities and put more stress on academic and other forms of achievement, in response to changes in the state education system.

Control of working class children was one of the motives impelling the introduction of state education, but the effects of the latter were more wide-ranging than this. The creation of the social involves a whole new set of tasks and duties for parents and children of widely different backgrounds. It involves a new alignment of public and private and a new political constellation surrounding the family which emphasized its importance as an educative milieu. Working class families which fail to demonstrate their ability to live up to the new educative and hygienic norms risk coming under tutelary supervision; but middle and upper class families also face sanctions, if less severe, in that they may disadvantage the educational and career prospects of their children. In this way school and family - public and private - are hybridized around the question of the education of children.

SECTION IV: CONTRACT AND TUTELAGE

I will now turn more directly to the working class model of childhood, which Donzelot characterizes as "supervised freedom" (1979a:45-7). In contrast with the contractual model of the bourgeoisie, with its positive embracing of new educative, hygienic and family-relational norms, the working class model of childhood and of the family generally is analyzed by Donzelot in terms of tutelage (1979a:xiii-xiv, xxi, 90-3 and *passim*). Here families which resist the new norms and which have difficulty in providing for their needs become the objects of tutelary intervention by the state, resulting in a severe loss of rights. This may only happen to a small percentage of families, but the threat of such intervention hangs over many working class families and operates to tie these families to the (originally) bourgeois norms. Tutelage provides the push factor in the success of the liberalized or "autonomised" (1979a:xx, 48-52, 57, 69, 91-2) family. Contract provides the pull factor, saying in effect, observe these norms and you will not only escape tutelage but you will also benefit socially and economically.

The two concepts of contract and tutelage should not be seen as referring to fixed empirical categories (middle class and working class). Rather they are polar opposites, the tension between which sets up the dynamics of the liberalized family. It is the relation which is important rather than the categories themselves. Only a small percentage of working class families may be directly subject to tutelage, but nonetheless their whole economic, social and historical position renders them as more-or-less reluctant participants in the contractual pursuit of the good life. They are caught between the two poles - always at a disadvantage compared with the "higher orders" in the pursuit of good jobs, good education and relational fulfilment, and yet always in danger of falling into the tutelary register if they refuse to participate in this unequal contest.

The stabilization or hegemonization of the liberalized family depends on tying working class families into this game:

"It is not hard to see how the tutelage mechanism put into operation at the end of the last century could serve to support and systematize the transition, in the working classes, from the 'clannish' family to the family reorganized according to the canons of domestic hygiene - the withdrawal to interior space, the rearing and supervision of children. Similarly, the devices of savings, educational prompting, and relational counseling became operative by connecting the moralized and normalized working class family to the bourgeois family. Between the powerlessness of the former and the blossoming of the latter, they wove an obsessive web of social promotion which was to furnish the petty bourgeoisie with its characteristic traits, its overinvestment of family life, its sense of economy, its fascination with education, its frantic pursuit of everything that might make it into a good 'environment'" (1979a:93).

We are a long way here from models of social control, whether structural-functional, Marxist, or feminist. Rather than a theory about the diffusion of middle class values or ideologies, Donzelot points to the differential mechanisms of contract and tutelage as the focus for analysis. It is these mechanisms of diffusion that are important rather than the existence or content of a unitary set of bourgeois (or other) ideologies. The differential form of relation to these ideologies is the vital point - either positive, embracing and enthusiastic (contract), or else grudging and recalcitrant (tutelage).

Whether or not the working class accepts bourgeois ideology is not the key question for Donzelot. Rather it is the existence of the whole field of opportunities and constraints represented by contract and tutelage, which leads to certain consequences depending on displays of acceptance/rejection in particular contexts. What is involved, in other words, is a game which bourgeoisie and working class both adapt to pragmatically and which both accept as a game. Whether or not anyone ultimately believes in this game - whether, e.g., the working class are mystified by it - becomes a rather

pointless question in this context. What are important are the mechanisms of power/knowledge which lock people into this game, either positively or negatively. In the Foucault/Donzelot tradition, these mechanisms can be discussed without any reference to concepts such as ideology, false consciousness, mystification, etc.

The discussion will now turn to the history of the Destitute Board in nineteenth century South Australia, and its offshoot the State Children's Council (established in 1887 with full responsibility for all state wards). These two bodies were the ancestors of today's state Department for Community Welfare. They are the most visible expression in nineteenth century South Australia of the tutelary supervision of families. Their histories are examined for this reason, but additionally because the State Children's Council was one of the main players in the "street children campaign" of 1890-1915 (Wimshurst, 1979), which resulted in 1915 in the tightening up of school attendance requirements. I also include a discussion of the WCTU, one of the chief organized expressions of nineteenth century feminism in South Australia. The street children campaign is discussed below in Section VII (pp.232-48), where I argue that it reflected a three-fold alliance between feminism, organized labour and philanthropy.

SECTION V: THE SOCIAL QUESTION - POVERTY AND RELIEF

"Drink seems to be the primary cause of nine-tenths of the present distress, and the means resorted to to procure it are ingenious and manifold. No person can form the least idea of the amount of drunkenness, crime, cruelty, wife-desertion, prostitution, incest, and villainy to be met with by those who are so sufficiently interested in the cause of the poor, unfortunate, and depraved as to sacrifice their time and every energy they can command towards practically assisting them in their misery."

"Those men who can work and will not because they prefer to impose upon charity and drink every penny the wife and

children earn, should be compelled to work, their earnings being taken from them to keep the families who are dependent upon the charity that is ever ready to help all who deserve it, but certainly hesitates to fill the publicans' tills.

"The one question that no one appears able to solve is - What can be done to rescue the poor, helpless, suffering children? To give anything to drunken, dissipated parents is offering a premium to vice; but there are hundreds of children whose parents have applied for relief from the Distress Committee whose only bed is an old mattress or sacks and old clothes, laid upon a damp floor. Some cases of cruelty have come under notice that deserve the severest possible censure. Truly the work arising out of the discoveries made by the voluntary inspectors is amazing.

"Unfortunately the law does not permit any interference with parental control, or the poor children might be rescued."

(Extracts from a letter by "Excelsior", Register, Adelaide, 14/7/1884, p.7).

Excelsior's long and interesting letter refers to the work of Alderman Kither's soup kitchen, which distributed free soup and bread to the needy in the economic downturn which began in South Australia in 1884. Associated with this scheme was a group of voluntary inspectors who visited the houses of recipients of relief to guard against imposture. Special help such as clothing and blankets was given in certain cases, and employment was found for some - mostly married men with large families (Register, 1/7/84, p.5; 3/7/84, p.5; 11/7/84, p.6). Great care was taken not to give relief to "drunken, dissipated parents". In an article of 2/7/84 (p.5), The Register noted that clothing had been given away in some cases, but not where there was a danger they might be exchanged for drink. An article of 11/7/84 (p.6) noted that new tickets were being issued:

"Each applicant is now required to state his full name and address, his trade and occupation, number of children, the cause of the distress, whether he has Board rations supplied or not, and any other information which might be of use to the committee. Every application has to be signed, either by the Chairman of district, Mayor, or Justice of the Peace, or minister of religion."

Excelsior was not alone in attributing most of the distress of 1884 to drink and improvidence. The article just quoted from also refers to comments by Mr. T. Stephens, the Honorary Inspector, who had visited the houses of 120 applicants for relief:

"The further he went into the matter the more thoroughly was he convinced of the existence of real distress, nearly all caused by drink and improvidence."

The Honorary Secretary of the Port Adelaide Strangers' Benevolent Society at their monthly meeting on 14/7/84 "reported that the subcommittee appointed by the last meeting had enquired into the character of the ~~destitution~~ prevailing in the Port, and while they found a good deal existing, it was mostly attributable to improvidence and vice" (Register, 15/7/84, p.5). A correspondent to the Register of 23/7/84 (p.7) blamed "drink and consequent degradation" for the present distress.

On 7/7/84 the Register (p.2) reported the formation of a provisional committee of the Charity Organization Society. Among its principles was no. 4:

"Poverty induced by drink, vice and crime not to be considered deserving, and must, therefore, be left to the State, except where the circumstances of the case point to the likelihood of permanent reclamation."

The members of the provisional committee included three of the members of the first State Children's Council, appointed in 1887 (Mrs. Colton, Miss Spence and Miss Howard).

The Charity Organization Society was a colonial offshoot of an English society and represented the culmination of nineteenth century philanthropy. As stated in the above article, its main object was the coordination of all charitable activities to prevent overlapping and imposition and to "abolish

indiscriminate giving". This expresses the major difference between charity and philanthropy (Donzelot, 1979a:58-70). Philanthropy saw the act of giving as only one small part of charitable (or "social") activities. Together with material aid the philanthropist must investigate the details of family life and on the basis of this investigation offer advice and recommendations to the recipients of aid on how to avoid in future the situation in which they were currently placed. The philanthropists hoped to break out of the vicious circle of dependence which they saw as produced by indiscriminate charity, which tended to pauperize the recipients of relief rather than helping them to stand on their own two feet. Economic failure, resulting in a request for assistance, was systematically linked to moral failure:

"Supplying relief to those whose poverty did not conceal any ruse was not enough. This relief must also serve some purpose; it must also contribute to a rehabilitation of the family. This was why, in every request for aid, one had to locate and bring to light the moral fault that more or less directly determined it: that portion of neglectfulness, laziness, and dissolution that every instance of misery contained. In this new policy, morality was systematically linked to the economic factor, involving a continuous surveillance of the family, a full penetration into the details of family life" (Donzelot, 1979a:69; emphasis in original).

Aid should not be given if there was no chance of rehabilitation. Philanthropy was more selective than state welfare agencies such as the Destitute Board.

In England the Charity Organization Society first arose when it became apparent that the workhouse system introduced by the New Poor Law in 1834 had not succeeded in eliminating pauperism. The "principles of 1834" stipulated that relief was never to be given to an able-bodied person except in the deterrent conditions of the workhouse - outdoor relief to the able-bodied was to be completely abolished. Never fully put into operation, this principle nevertheless exerted a considerable influence throughout the nineteenth century. In the 1870's, inspectors of the Local Government Board waged a vigorous campaign to revive "the principles of 1834". By the 1880's it had

become apparent that even the workhouse did not prevent certain classes of able-bodied men from becoming dependent on public relief. Pauperism had not been eliminated by the deterrent effect of the workhouse. Some argued (brutally, but with some accuracy) that this deterrence had never been thoroughly or properly administered; others took the line that deterrence was only appropriate for "hard-core" paupers, and that different non-deterrent forms of relief had to be provided for honest workmen who fell into difficulties through sickness, unemployment due to economic downturns, etc. (Wigman, 1980).

This latter view provided the philosophy of the Charity Organization Society. Undeserving paupers whose condition was obviously the result of their own vice were to be left to the State (the Poor Laws, or, in South Australia, the Destitute Board); deserving cases were to be relieved by private charity, which would only come into play after a thorough investigation of the applicant's circumstances. In practice, as Donzelot argues, philanthropists almost always found some measure of intemperance, laziness, thriftlessness or vice in the people who came to them for relief. A request for assistance always led to an investigation - not only to prevent overlapping, imposition, and double-dipping, but also to uncover the moral failings which always played some part in destitution and which with proper advice and supervision could be corrected.

In South Australia the administration of relief in the nineteenth century was organized quite differently from the English system. Instead of hundreds of local poor law authorities maintaining a high degree of independence, the Destitute Board always exercised a highly centralized control. Nonetheless the South Australian authorities liked to see themselves as adhering to the principles of 1834:

"Outdoor relief, when the applicants are in necessitous circumstances, is granted to widows, deserted wives and other women left with children, to the infirm and the sick, and occasionally to the families of men out of work. Rations are not granted to able-bodied men and women, or to an able-bodied woman with only one child; but where there are two or more children half a ration is granted for each child" (Second and Final Report of Commission Appointed to Report on the Destitute Act, 1881, SAPP, 1885, vol.IV, no.228, p.xviii).

As in the original English Royal Commission of 1834, there is ambiguity here over the meaning of "able-bodied woman". We have the bald statement of the principles of 1834 ("Rations are not granted to able-bodied men and women...."), but the rest of the passage suggests that a woman with more than one child is ipso facto not able-bodied.

In practice widows and deserted wives with children loomed very large in the relief policies of both the Destitute Board and the State Children's Council:

"Nearly 1/7th of the cases of outdoor relief are those in which rations are granted to the wives and children of men who have deserted their families" (*ibid*, p.xxiv).

The Chairman of the Destitute Board, Thomas Reed, described wife-desertion as "the greatest abuse in our present system of destitution" (*ibid*, p.xxv). Not only was it an affront to middle class notions of domesticity, it also left a lot of room for misunderstanding and for complicity between husband and wife:

"We are informed by Mr. Turner, S.M., that men are sometimes arrested for wife desertion when they are actually looking for work, and in other cases under a colorable complaint by the wife for the purpose of getting a cheap return trip for her husband from a great distance" (*ibid*, p.xxvi).

Widows with children accounted for over 1/4 of all outdoor rations issued in the 1880's (Annual Reports of the Destitute Board, 1882-5). Table II

lists the outdoor rations issued to various categories of recipient for the year ended 30th June 1882.

TABLE II. OUTDOOR RATIONS ISSUED TO VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF RECIPIENT, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1882

Widows	569.5
Families whose natural protectors are unable to support them through sickness	548
Families deserted	225
Parents in gaol	109.5
Single women with children	7
Families of laboring men out of employment	51.5
Aged, infirm, or otherwise incapacitated	<u>657.5</u>
TOTAL	<u>2,168.0</u>

(First Annual Report of the Destitute Board, 1882, p.16).

The classification used by the Destitute Board shows how it tried to fit its practices into the principles of 1834. Sick or unemployed men are not relieved, but rather their families. The first six categories are all construed around relief to women and/or children whose "natural protectors" are either missing or unable to support them. The last category is a residual one for those cases who are obviously not able-bodied.

The strategy of the Destitute Board was based on (1) finding the "natural protector" of the family if possible; (2) if this was not possible, the Destitute Board would itself take over the role of father in a surrogate form.

Some of the problems involved in this strategy can be seen from the Minutes of the Destitute Board (Government Records Group, South Australian Archives; now held in the Public Records Office of South Australia):

"The Board decided in view of the numerous applications for relief from the wives of men employed by the Government at

Hergott Springs³ (in the absence of any remittance from their husbands) to ask the Government to make arrangements to keep back part of the wages due to these men in order that provisions may be made for its appropriation to the maintenance of their families in Adelaide" (Minutes of the Destitute Board, #802, 1/12/1884).

Offers of work on the railways and other public works projects were used by the government as a means of dealing with unemployment. But as the above quotation shows, this strategy had its drawbacks, since the men often had to go well into the interior to take up the work. The solution proposed in the above minute does not seem to have been adopted, for several months later we find the following:

"It was also suggested to the Chief Secretary as advisable to arrange for the transmission to Hergott of a number of the wives and families of the men proposed to be sent up, which suggestion would be considered by the Government" (#817, 13/2/1885).

In reply, the Chief Secretary reported the opinion of the resident Engineer at Hergott Springs, that it would be "inexpedient" to send the families of working men to Hergott (#818, 24/2/1885). Soon after the Chief Secretary "stated that employment had been provided by the Government at Petersburgh⁴ to which any able-bodied men would be sent if recommended by the Board" (#821, 10/3/1885).

The same problems arose at Petersburgh as at Hergott. In July the Chairman of the Destitute Board spoke to the Chief Secretary about the great increase of relief granted to the wives and families of men sent by the Government to Petersburgh, again suggesting that a stop should be put on the men's wages for the maintenance of their families (Minutes of the Destitute Board, #836, 6/7/1885; see also #832, 2/6/1885).

3. A town in the far north of South Australia now known as Marree.

4. A town in the upper north of South Australia anglicized to Peterborough during World War I.

The economic difficulties of 1884 (which were peculiar to South Australia) sent many men interstate. In minute #836 of 6/7/1885 the Chairman spoke of the number of men who had left for New South Wales, leaving their families behind. In December he noted the receipt of a "kind letter" from Walker and Swan in New South Wales promising to forward a list of the names of South Australian labourers in their employ, plus remittances for their families (#855, 21/12/1885). A few months earlier, another stratagem had been tried by the Board:

"Chairman suggested the desirableness in future of advertising the cases of wives who have been deserted and left without maintenance for upwards of three months. The particulars of such advertisement being submitted to the Board before the insertion.

Approved"

(#829, 5/5/1885).

The full significance of the Destitute Board's strategy has to be carefully elucidated. The "traditional" nature of their appeal to familialism has to be balanced against the radical implications of their interventions in family life in terms of family/state relations and consequently in the whole meaning of twentieth century familialism.

The error in not doing so is apparent in the South Australian social historical literature. Quoting Platt (1969:78), Barbalet argues that social reformers such as Caroline Emily Clark and Catharine Helen Spence "vigorously defended the virtue of traditional family life and emphasised the dependence of the social order on the proper socialisation of children" (Barbalet, 1983:198). She links this with her contention that boarding out of state children in foster homes was not a women's movement because men wielded the real power in the State Children's Council and elsewhere (1983:197). Clark and Spence were founders of the Boarding Out Committee

and of the State Children's Council, discussed presently. They were very critical of the Destitute Board, but insofar as they also advocated tutelary intervention in working class families, the following comments apply to them as well as to the Destitute Board.

Both of Barbalet's arguments are problematic and both obscure the specific transformations being wrought by agencies such as the Destitute Board and the State Children's Council. The first statement is rather vague, especially as regards the meaning of "traditional" in a society which had already undergone a half-century of rapid change; moreover the use of this word obscures the transformative impact of the child-saving movement on the relations between families and the state and on the genesis of modern social work. The second statement underestimates the significance of nineteenth century feminism in the transformations mentioned - a significance which goes beyond control over formal agencies such as the State Children's Council or the Destitute Board. As we will see in the history of the WCTU, nineteenth century feminism could and did have a major impact on South Australian society. The redefinition of family life (not its simple reinforcement) was a crucial part of this impact, and this impact has to be seen in class terms.

The starting point of a more adequate interpretation must be the recognition that it was working class family life which became the target of middle class social reformers. The reformers wished to project their own bourgeois model of the family (which was emergent at this time and as part of the same set of transformations) onto the working class. But their wishes are only a part of the actual resultant state of affairs. Following Donzelot, the important questions concern not to what extent the reformers were successful in their imposition: he assumes that the working class family has always had its own dynamics and can not necessarily be treated as part of the same

institution as the bourgeois family. Rather we should look for the kind of network of class and gender relations set up by this tutelary relation between middle class (often female) reformers and working class families. Tutelage has to be seen as an ongoing functional part of twentieth century capitalism, not as a once-and-for-all imposition of bourgeois values which either is or is not successful. It is an ongoing part of class relations and of the structures of authority in and around families.

The setting up of this mechanism in most industrial capitalist societies at the end of the nineteenth century is an event of major importance for the whole meaning of modern familialism. It went hand-in-hand with a softening of patriarchal authority in favour of women, or (where the husband/family proved too recalcitrant) in favour of the state. It went hand-in-hand with a revalorization of women's domestic role - not a simple reinforcement of a pre-existing and essentially unchanging structure, but rather quite a novel transformation involving the transition under particular circumstances from one cultural form to another quite different one.

If we are sensitive, as Foucault demands we should be, to discontinuity as much as to evolutionary and gradualist change, then it is clear that the consumerist and child-caring functions of the liberalized family are in their particular form quite unique to the twentieth century. These domestic activities were given a new status in the twentieth century: previously they had been performed by domestic servants; or if they were performed by the mistress of the household, then this person and her family were seen as necessarily of low status. There is still a high status attached to having servants perform menial tasks today, but the converse no longer holds: families are no longer seen as degraded because they have no servants. Paradoxically (as we shall see further below) women's liberation in the nineteenth century proceeded largely on the basis of affirming the status and

importance of this domestic sphere, which is seen by many present-day feminists as itself a source of oppression.

This valorization of women's domestic role was a feminist movement to the extent that women's power within families was increased (and protected by legislative enactment) and to the extent that women were given widened access to paid employment and increased influence on "social" questions in the public arena - all these things being closely interconnected.

The particular nature of the child-saving movement in South Australia has to be related to the conditions of work and habitation already discussed above in relation to the Destitute Board (as well as in Ch.4 more generally). Much of the workforce was transient, one of the main ingredients in the fabled Australian male exclusivist culture of mateship. Shearers, harvest hands, labourers on railways, roads, and other public works projects, carters, miners, prospectors - these and many others were involved in a migratory pattern which often took them away from home for lengthy periods and which contributed to the particular form of Australian working class maleness - with its hard physical work in remote areas, its drinking, its anti-authoritarianism, its sexual bravado, its fear of settling down and of the quiet family life. The discourses of the WCTU, the State Children's Council and the Destitute Board have to be seen in relation to this already entrenched male exclusivist culture and its denigration of women and the family. An alliance of feminism with the state was able to put at least some curbs on this culture through normalizing state intervention: curtailment of child labour, six o'clock closing, controls on child abuse and neglect, legal, property and franchise rights for women, etc. Another aspect of this process was the shift in emphasis of relief policies from men to women.

In contrast with the principles of 1834, which were oriented around deterrent relief for able-bodied males, the practice of the Destitute Board and the State Children's Council in nineteenth century South Australia was very much oriented towards relief to women and children. Donzelot argues that this emphasis is related to the reforming zeal of philanthropy, which looked beyond mere charity to a wholesale transformation of society, based on a more settled economic life and a newly-valorized domestic sphere:

"In general, philanthropy differed from charity in the choice of its objects, based on this concern for pragmatism: advice instead of gifts, because it cost nothing; assistance to children rather than to old people and to women rather than men, because such a policy would pay off, in the long run at least, by averting a future expense" (1979a:66).

As with the relief policies of the Destitute Board, the State Children's Council was heavily involved with single parent families. Over the period 1887-1892, out of 1,107 children committed as state wards by the State Children's Council, 428 or 38.7% had one but not both parents absent or institutionalised (figures calculated from the table in Barbalet, 1983:xiii - based on State Children's Council annual reports). It is very important to relate this emphasis not only to the low wages for women and hence to the poverty of one-parent families, as Barbalet does (1983:xii), but also to the State Children's Council's concern with "disorganized" families and to what was seen as an inevitable lack of parental control in such families:

"The children must necessarily be neglected by the fact of their father for whose arrest a warrant is now in existence for having deserted them is still at large, the maintenance of her children depends upon whatever she can earn by washing which is nothing short of a miserable existence" (Correspondence of State Children's Department, - 1891/184, 11/2/1891, quoted in Barbalet, 1983:xii)

This is from a letter written by the North Adelaide Police to the State Children's Council in 1891. The key word in this passage for my purposes is

"necessarily". The case brings together a number of diacritical features for social welfare agencies - poverty, leading to requests for financial assistance, absence of the chief authority figure in the family and hence presumed inadequate socialization of the children, male untrustworthiness and marginality. With the father absent and the mother having to attend to wage labour, there is an obvious implication of lack of control over the children. As noted above, there were also more pragmatic reasons why the Destitute Board and the State Children's Council should be interested in such families, since the welfare authorities might be relieving the wife and children in Adelaide while the husband was earning good money in the country.

It is these rarely stated assumptions which lie behind the word "necessarily" in the above passage. A whole series of conditions which were more or less normal for large sections of the working class became for the State Children's Council evidence of disorganization and depravity. Lack of money is certainly one of these conditions, leading to requests for state assistance. A second is the importance of child labour in this period, as a form of social security if nothing else. A third is the seasonal and casual nature of much of the workforce in nineteenth century South Australia, often leading to the prolonged absence of the father. A fourth is the absence in many working class families of "modern" practices of health and hygiene.

This all adds up to a distinctively working class pattern of economic and cultural organization, a pattern which is not necessarily pathological. In the eyes of philanthropic reformers, however, this working class lifestyle was interpreted in terms of defective family life, lack of hygiene, and moral depravity. Households which for whatever reason came to the attention of the State Children's Council almost always displayed one or more of the features listed above, and were consequently under threat of destruction through removal of the children.

In the 1930's removal of children from "defective" families declined rapidly, to be replaced by a system of probation whereby children were placed in their own families on a conditional basis (Barbalet, 1983:200). But these families, like those which received payments under the Maintenance Act of 1926 (see below, pp.218-9), were still liable to be visited by Departmental officers and the children treated like "children boarded out" (Barbalet, 1983:xviii, 200, 224-5). Such families came under the kind of direct tutelage relation discussed by Donzelot. However tutelage was also a threat hanging over much broader sections of the working class, even if only a small percentage were involved at any one time.

There is no implication here or in Donzelot that the new norms of education, child-rearing, hygiene, etc. were simply imposed on the working class either by the state or by the bourgeoisie. This could only be said to occur where families faced direct tutelary intervention. But the meaning of tutelage has to be seen in relation to the meaning of contract. The overall process of transformation has to be seen in the context of new positive rights and benefits granted to the working class, and especially to its women and children. Donzelot argues quite explicitly that philanthropy was not successful because of a "brutal imposition". He continues:

"If the discourse on the morality of saving was able to function, this was not primarily because workers were compelled to deposit a portion of their meager resources in savings accounts (even if this was the case in some paternalistic firms) but because this saving enabled them to achieve a greater family autonomy in relation to the blocks of dependence or networks of solidarity that continued to exist after a fashion. If the hygienist norms pertaining to the rearing, labor, and education of children were able to take effect, this was because they offered children, and correlatively women, the possibility of increased autonomy within the family in opposition to patriarchal authority" (Donzelot, 1979a:57-8; emphasis in original)

Donzelot pinpoints the functional networks created by modern familialism, networks which do offer limited possibilities for economic

autonomy and even upward social mobility for working class families, as well as for rebalancing the husband/wife relation. The introduction of modern familialism has to seen in relation to this two-fold process of exchange: (1) the granting of political, industrial and welfare rights to the working class - in South Australia and Australia a number of such measures were enacted in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries - legal recognition of trade unions, conciliation and arbitration, the basic wage, and old age pensions; (2) women's and children's (partial) liberation from patriarchal authority, accompanied by political, property and welfare rights for women, new educative and hygienic facilities provided by the state, and a greater range of paid employment for women.

There were a number of legislative enactments in late nineteenth century South Australia which supported the improved status of women. In 1884, a Married Women's Property Act was passed, which allowed married women to own property in their own right (Miller, 1986:8; Magarey, 1985:175; Jones, 1986). The Married Women's Protection Act of 1896 enabled women to apply for a court's protection if their husbands had subjected them to cruelty, adultery, desertion or neglect (Magarey, 1985:190). Women's suffrage was introduced in 1894 (see below, pp.220-2).

Barbalet mentions a number of facilities and benefits provided for women in early twentieth century South Australia. In 1902 a maternity hospital, Queen's Home, was opened; in 1909 the first infant welfare centres opened in Adelaide (precursors of the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association); in 1914 McBride's Hospital for unmarried mothers opened in Medindie; between 1915 and 1917 the movement began which led to the opening of Mareeba Hospital for infants and young children at Woodville; in 1928 the Northcote Home for Mothers and Babies opened near Grange (Barbalet, 1983:199-200). In 1912 the Commonwealth Government established

a Maternity Grant (1983:199); and in 1926 the State Government established maintenance payments which went directly to needy mothers with children (1983:224-5).

In return for these two-fold concessions, state-backed or state-initiated philanthropy demanded a greater penetration into working class families and at least a limited acceptance by the latter of the validity of philanthropic moralization/normalization. The working class at the turn of the twentieth century was able to carve out a more secure and more legitimate stake within the social order, based on a new alignment of public and private, a new model of familialism. But the price of being within the pale was adherence to the state-sponsored norms of thrift, temperance, education and hygiene, enforced by the tutelary relation of the state to the working class. The requests for assistance by poor families and the complaints of women and children against the arbitrariness of patriarchal authority both opened up points of intervention for tutelary agencies (Donzelot, 1979a:87-8).

The following passage was written by a husband to the State Children's Council in 1890, and illustrates how dissension within the family provides a point of entry for tutelary agencies:

"I am a poor man often have to go to work from home and then the poor children suffer. I have known them to go a fortnight without being undressed and if I bring anything home for her to make for them she only destroyes it and they go about like blackfellows" (Correspondence of the State Children's Department, 1890/957, 4/11/1890; quoted in Barbalet, 1983:xiv).

The appeal by the husband rather than by the wife is somewhat unusual, but nonetheless it illustrates the general point. It is not a question of simple state imposition of norms. The state establishes certain institutions and procedures which may then be called into play for various reasons, often by private individuals or groups, acting in terms of their own private disputes

and animosities. These disputes may be intra-familial, but they may also involve neighbours, police, local moral guardians, personal enemies, etc.

SECTION VI: FEMINISM, CHILD-SAVING AND BOARDING-OUT

The Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) was founded in the United States of America in 1874 (Wiles, 1978:1; Kett, 1977:192). It began in South Australia in April 1886 at the instigation of the American WCTU missionary, Mrs. Mary Clement Leavitt, and received a further boost in 1889 with the visit of another WCTU apostle, Miss Jessie Ackermann (Wiles, 1978:1). Although temperance was their main concern, the WCTU was also involved with a host of other issues:

"The declaration of principles of the WCTU of SA included the concept of a minimum wage, the eight hour day, industrial arbitration, as well as the more prominent concerns with religious and temperance ideals. The Union assumed that increased leisure through shorter working hours would help to protect the sanctity of the home" (Wiles, 1978:19).

There are strong parallels here with the programme of the United Labour Party (ULP). In her presidential address for 1894, Mrs. E.W. Nicholls commented:

"I have very often had to reply to the charge that our Union is allied with the Labor Party or the Single Tax League" (McCorkindale, 1949:80)

Conversely the ULP had a strong temperance element - Tom Price, Labor Premier from 1905 to 1909, was an honorary member of the WCTU (Wiles, 1978:51).

The WCTU was heavily involved in the campaign for female suffrage in South Australia. Membership went from 75 in 1888 to a peak of 1,832 in 1892, two years before the granting of female suffrage by the Liberal/Labour

coalition under C.C. Kingston in 1894. Suffrage was seen as a way of increasing women's participation in the public sphere and of implementing the WCTU's programme of reform (Whitelock, 1977:218-9; Wiles, 1978:23-7; McCorkindale, 1949:24-49).

Another high point for the WCTU came in 1915, when a referendum decided by a small majority on six o'clock closing of hotel bars. From 1916 to 1967 the "six o'clock swill" remained a feature of South Australian drinking habits (the other Australian states soon followed the South Australian example - see Phillips, 1980:250-266). In 1938 the government considered the repeal of six o'clock closing, but were dissuaded by a 4,000-strong march organized by the WCTU (Whitelock, 1977:217-9).

While being explicitly feminist, the WCTU's idea of a wider sphere for women revolved around the notion of extending the motherly influence of the home into the public sphere. Their feminism stopped short at the basic definition of gender roles and the implications of these roles for the women's movement (Levine, 1984:11-19). A leading WCTU figure in South Australia noted in 1949:

"The mother spirit in womanhood naturally accepted the challenge to share in the responsibility for the welfare of future generations, thus giving birth to the woman's movement" (McCorkindale, 1949:25-6).

In a report to the 1891 convention, Mrs. Lake noted:

"The aim of our work is to wake both men and women up to the injustice and absurdity of a national life in which the mother influence has no acknowledged authority or legal recognition" (quoted in McCorkindale, 1949:40).

Women's sphere was to be widened so as to give women a greater say in public affairs, but their participation in the public arena was seen in terms of motherly influence, the particular virtues possessed by women which were

taken for granted at the time as natural features of womanhood. Feminism was not seen as incompatible with this gender-specific role. For example, in a tribute to Mrs. E.W. Nicholls by Mrs. Helen Edwards, we are told that:

"In all the years of her public life Mrs. Nicholls never neglected her family or her church" (quoted in McCorkindale, 1949:20).

Similar sentiments were expressed more pithily by Mrs. Nicholls herself in her Presidential Address to the Australian WCTU in 1897, the "new departure" referring to the introduction of female suffrage in South Australia in 1894:

"We have not heard of any domestic quarrels or any neglected children as a result of the new departure, and dinner was cooked on election day much the same as usual" (ibid, 1949:46).

The notion of motherly influence as the appropriate mode of women's participation in the public arena applied not only to political activity but also to the kind of paid employment which was becoming available to them at the time, most notably teaching, nursing and (somewhat later) social work. All three can be related to the emerging gender-specific role of women as caregivers and educators within the domestic context - as the privileged agents of a newly-valorized private sphere one of whose main functions was the rearing of children within a sheltered and protected environment. A new dignity and importance was attached to the previously servile activities of childrearing and housework. Coupled with this was the provision of a limited amount of paid employment for women in tasks seen as consonant with this domestic role. This gender typing of occupations also had the advantage of reducing competition for jobs with males (Donzelot, 1979a:39-40). Competition was also reduced by limiting (formally or otherwise) paid employment to certain categories of women. Paid employment was seen as appropriate for single women, widows and deserted wives. It was much more

problematic for married women; it was seen as supplementary to their main domestic role and only approved of if it did not interfere with this role.

The WCTU was proud of its successes in getting women appointed to responsible positions. In the 1890's Mrs. Zadow was appointed as a Factory Inspector, and Miss Spence as a member of the Hospital Commission. At the 1896 Convention, two Union members were reported as having achieved personal victories - Miss George had qualified as a Wesleyan lay preacher, and Miss Flint of Mt. Gambier had gained the necessary competence to practise as a chemist (Wiles, 1978:42-3). In July 1915, the way was opened for the appointment of women justices; Mrs. Nicholls was one of the first four women to be made J.P.'s (McCorkindale, 1949:19).

Members of the WCTU scored victories in expanding employment opportunities for women, and in getting women appointed to unpaid but influential positions where they could influence the course of "social" questions. But these jobs and positions were very much of a middle class nature, as was the membership of the WCTU itself (Wiles, 1978:19). Their approach to employment for working class women was less successful. The WCTU urged girls to go into domestic service rather than into factories, which is unlikely to have made them popular with working class girls (see above, pp.166-9). In 1900 the WCTU Convention expressed its solidarity with the South Australian Anti-Sweating League:

"The Union's proposed answer to the problem was the increase of opportunities for employment in domestic service, a perhaps somewhat inappropriate response given the renowned democratic and egalitarian Australian sentiment. The Household Helpers department of the WCTU sought to improve the conditions and status of service, so as to render factory employment less attractive" (Wiles, 1978:57; see also McCorkindale, 1949:86).

This espousal of domestic service will become a familiar theme when we consider the early history of state secondary education in the next chapter. Again there is an opposition here between a middle class contractual pole and a working class tutelary pole in the provision of employment for girls and women.

The WCTU was by no means the only representative of nineteenth-century feminism in South Australia. Their assumption of the natural differences between men and women was not shared, for example, by Catherine Helen Spence, who regarded these differences as socially constructed (Magarey, 1985:181). Nonetheless, from my reading of the South Australian case as well of other literature (e.g. Sklar, 1973; Cott, 1977; Leach, 1980; Levine, 1984), the kind of feminism represented by the WCTU was the most widespread and successful form, possibly because it could be coopted with relative ease by an embattled but still dominant patriarchal order. Even Spence's activities (some of which we will soon discuss) can in practice be fitted in to this kind of feminism, despite her more progressive ideological stance.

Summing up, nineteenth century feminism - in South Australia as elsewhere - was characterized by a struggle to increase women's power and public participation. It sought to rebalance the husband/wife domestic relation in favour of the latter through revalorizing women's domestic role and providing legislative checks on the authority of the husband. It sought to expand women's employment opportunities and their ability to participate in public affairs, in ways which were seen as consonant with their domestic role as nurturers and care-givers.

In both respects, nineteenth century feminism was instrumental in bringing about the current definition of gender roles with its particular form

of differentiation between public and private spheres, a differentiation which, paradoxically, is under attack from many present-day feminists. Nineteenth-century feminism was constitutive of the liberalized family, rather than being its radical antithesis (see also Ch.2 and Conclusion).

Feminist espousal of the family as a sheltered haven characterized by loving and caring egalitarian relationships among its members, brought into sharper focus the "deficiencies" of the working class family which lacked moral and hygienic insulation from the outside world, whose members engaged in inappropriate labour (women in factories rather than at home or in domestic service, children working rather than at school), and whose internal relationships were patriarchal and authoritarian. Apparently similar concerns about the preservation and welfare of children led in practice to very different results when these concerns were transferred from the middle class to the working class family. The decline of patriarchal authority in working class households was matched by new forms of state/philanthropic intervention. The liberation of women and children takes on a completely different meaning in this context - it is a conditional liberation, dependent on the observance of state-sponsored medical and moral norms. This tutelary complex can be seen most explicitly and most dramatically in the South Australian context in the breaking up of deficient families by the State Children's Council (and, incidentally, by the Protector of Aborigines), a practice to which I now turn.

The child-saving movement of the late nineteenth century started from a belief in the innocence and the malleability of children. While working class parents who were seen as irresponsible could be dismissed as "paupers" who were totally degraded, their children were held to be innocent victims who should not be held responsible for their parents' sins. The logical outcome of this line of thought, if families were too pauperized and disorganized, was the

removal of the children from this dangerous environment and their placement (under state auspices) within a respectable home situation - usually referred to as boarding out. Barbalet quotes the views of English social reformer Frances Power Cobbe:

"As a matter of right, no child ought to bear the stigma of pauperism; and as a matter of public interest for the future of the community every dependent child ought to be separated and removed as far as by any means may be possible from pauper moral influences and pauper physical and social degradation." (Fraser's Magazine, 1864, quoted in Barbalet, 1983:190).

Boarding out also has to be seen as a reaction against the placement of children in large institutions or "barracks" (Barbalet, 1983:187) - in the South Australian case, the Industrial School and Reformatory at Magill (now a suburb of Adelaide) being the prime example. These institutions were seen as breeding grounds for criminality, vice, and pauperism, in common with prisons and the "general mixed workhouse" of England. Boarding out the children in respectable homes was seen as removing them from this dangerous environment and instilling in them instead habits of morality, thrift and industry.

The boarding out movement in South Australia is related to the philanthropic empire of the Hill family:

"The sisters Florence and Rosamund Hill, enterprising British social reformers and Unitarians, studied the tentative efforts of Mr. Greig of Edinburgh in the 1840's and became active proponents of this system of child care. It was partly because of their activities that the English Poor Law Board decided in 1870 to permit the boarding-out of children in the unions under its control. These developments were being closely followed by those concerned with social reform in Australia, particularly by a cousin of the Hill sisters, Caroline Clark, and her friend and ally Catherine Helen Spence, both staunch members of the South Australian Unitarian Church. In 1872 South Australia began the system by boarding out six children....." (Barbalet, 1983:190; cf. Dickey, 1986:54).

This was under the auspices of the Destitute Board and its parsimonious Chairman, Thomas Reed, who was faced with rapidly rising numbers and enormous discipline problems at the Magill Asylum (Dickey, 1986:69). But Caroline Emily Clark was the real founder of boarding out in South Australia (Dickey, 1986:67-9), and in 1872 she formed the Boarding Out Committee with Catherine Helen Spence (Barbalet, 1983:190).

Volunteer lady inspectors were assigned by this committee to conduct regular inquiries into the domestic situation of state wards boarded out into private households. The Committee seems to have kept a low profile, with little criticism of the Destitute Board or of Reed (Barbalet, 1983:204). In 1885, however, there was a Royal Commission into the Destitute Board arising out of two alleged cases of proselytism. Other alleged maltreatment of state wards also surfaced. As a result, a new and separate body was created in 1887, the State Children's Council, with full responsibility for the care of state children (the Destitute Board continued to exercise its other relief functions). The Council was an honorary body of ladies and gentlemen (six and two respectively in 1887) overseeing the operations of a new government department, the State Children's Department (Barbalet, 1983:202, 230). Many women were involved with the State Children's Council and Department, but men tended to occupy the key positions, especially that of secretary to the Council (1983:197).

Although Thomas Reed was heavily criticized in the Royal Commission of 1883-5, he was not retired until 1889. Barbalet argues that despite the creation of the State Children's Council, the State Children's Act of 1886 did not begin "a new epoch in South Australia for children needing care and protection" (1983:205). Part of this stemmed from the Council's failure to obtain more adequate funding from the government (*ibid.*), but part of it also reflected the curious blend of old paternalism and new feminism in the State

Children's Council. Barbalet argues that even after 1886 boarding out could easily degenerate into a system of juvenile servitude, and that South Australia's experiments in this direction were not as compassionate nor as innovative as contemporaries liked to think (1983:193-6, 202-12). Especially with regard to girls, Destitute Board and State Children's Council policy represents a blend of compassion and expediency:

"Domestic service for state girls was the crowning achievement of the nineteenth century reformers' dream: to eliminate pauperism and at the same time not make dependent children a drain on the public purse. Girls would not be supported by the state and yet in effect they would be supervised by a deputy parent responsible to the state....." (1983:212).

Council members could congratulate themselves in 1907 on "how much the State Children's Council has done to relieve the PAINFUL DEARTH OF DOMESTIC SERVANTS" (quoted in 1983:194; emphasis in original).

Boarding out continued to be the standard method of dealing with state wards well into the twentieth century. Although probation was permitted in South Australia from 1887 it was little used until the twentieth century. With probation came the practice of placing out children with their own families, instead of removing them to another home (1983:200). I will now briefly discuss boarding out as it was practised in the late nineteenth century.

There were four categories of children among state wards - truant, destitute, neglected and convicted (Barbalet, 1983:238). Having become a ward of the state, a child had little hope of release until age 16 for boys, 18 for girls (Wimshurst, 1979:26). As a rule at this period, children were meant to be removed forever from their parental family - all contact was strongly discouraged (Barbalet, 1983:198). Most state wards were initially housed in

the Industrial School (boys and girls), from where they were boarded out; a smaller number ended up in the Boys' or Girls' Reformatory.

In theory there were four different ways of being placed out - adoption, apprenticeship, licensed to service, and boarding out with a government subsidy. It was the last one which was the original recommended form of boarding out, but this was the exception rather than the rule. In 1883, for example, 96 children were boarded out with a subsidy, as against 259 "adopted", 29 apprenticed, and 66 licensed to service (Second Annual Report of Destitute Board, 1883, p,18). Thomas Reed angered Caroline Clark and her colleagues with his practice of transferring boarded-out children from good homes when he found people willing to take them for nothing (Barbalet, 1983:204). So-called adoption and boarding out were intended for children under 13; state wards 13 and over were placed in service homes, usually as domestic servants or farm labourers:

"In theory there was a clear distinction between foster homes and service homes, the former being for the state child under thirteen, and the latter being the home and place of employment for children over thirteen. But in reality there was often very little distinction, the qualities which were looked for in one being the standard for both" (Barbalet, 1983:198-9)

In accordance with the standards of the day, these qualities related to the children's usefulness. Barbalet quotes the following extract from an 1878 half-yearly report of the Destitute Board ("school" refers to the Industrial School at Magill):

".....it happens rather unfortunately that the tender ages of the children in the school, and their consequent inability to be of any service to those who might otherwise adopt them is a stumbling block in the way of getting them homes" (S.A. Government Gazette, 31/12/1878; Barbalet, 1983:207).

Children thirteen and over were overwhelmingly placed out as domestic servants if female, farmhands if male. In 1883, 95 children were

either apprenticed or licensed to service. Of these 41 are recorded as employed in "farming", 42 in "household duties", and only 12 in various other occupations (Second Annual Report of the Destitute Board, 1883, p.18; cf Barbalet, 1983:203).

Apart from the ready availability of such positions as compared with other occupations, farming and domestic service offered the advantage of living-in. This was normal with domestic service; in farming, much of the work was casual and "living-in" usually meant a barn or outhouse. But state wards would have received better accommodation and would have been expected (both by the master and by the Department) to stay on as more or less permanent workers. Hence living-in under the constant supervision of their foster-parents/employers was a common experience for both girls and boys. This was a big plus for these occupations in the eyes of the authorities as compared with factory or office work. The lives of state wards represent the lack of differentiation between family-authority and work-authority which I have examined elsewhere in a more general context (see Ch.4). The emphasis of the Destitute Board and the State Children's Council on domestic service and farm-labouring continued until the 1930's at least (Barbalet, 1983:205-12).

While the State Children's Council had links with the Christian Socialism of the WCTU, with its reforming and philanthropic zeal, it did not envisage boarding out as a form of social mobility. It was intended that children should be placed out with respectable families of their own rank in society - "such people as probably their own parents would have been: the honest industrious and independent poor" (Final Report of the Destitute Commission, SAPP, 1885, vol.4, no.228, p.LXIII; quoted in Barbalet, 1983:195). Foster-parents/employers were meant to provide the kind of clean and respectable environment which the State Children's Council regarded as a basic human right - an environment lacking because of the death or absence

of one or both parents, or through their bad habits - their dirtiness, their loose morals, their drinking, their lack of thrift.

Barbalet's book is incomplete in my opinion because of the absence of any detailed consideration of the kind of households from which state wards were drawn, and the mechanisms through which such households came under notice and came to be identified as problem households. There is a good table on p.xiii showing the "parental circumstances of all children committed by the State Children's Council 1887-92", but these data are not treated as a topic for detailed enquiry. Barbalet implies that committal was an automatic reflex of "the harsh realities of poverty and dependence in nineteenth century South Australia" (1983:xii), rendered even more acute in single parent families where the mother had to work to support her children. No doubt this is very important in view of the disparity (roughly 2:1) between male and female wages. But there is virtually no discussion throughout the book of how the child-saving philosophy of the State Children's Council was translated into practice, in terms of which particular families came to the attention of the Council, how this happened or how the Council's philosophy affected their perception of these families and of the possible solutions to their problems. Barbalet only discusses "the forgotten world of state wards" (subtitle) in terms of what happened to them after committal. This is very problematic in a book which attempts to recreate the lived experience of state wards. The meaning of their new lives as state wards would have been heavily structured in comparison or contrast with their earlier experiences, and also by the mode of rupture with their family of origin.⁵

5. This may reflect the lack of such information in the sources and problems of confidentiality. Nonetheless Barbalet does not even seem to recognize the importance of these issues.

SECTION VII: THE STREET CHILDREN CAMPAIGN, 1890-1915

The stage has now been set for a discussion of the "street children campaign" of 1890-1915, which resulted in the tightening up of school attendance requirements in South Australia. This is a crucial episode in the shift from child labour to compulsory education and hence in the emergence of the liberalized family with its dual pathways of contract and tutelage.

More particularly, this episode illustrates the working class model of childhood which Donzelot calls supervised freedom (1979a:47), and should be considered in relation to the middle class model of protected liberation discussed above (pp.188-200) in connection with the New Education. Instead of liberation from patriarchal authority in a sheltered environment, the problem that reformers saw with working class childhood was the lack of parental control and a precocious exposure to the adult world of work and sex. Working class families were seen as lacking in the moral and hygienic insulation from the outside world which was seen as necessary for the proper upbringing of children: they were improperly privatized. Compulsory education was a way of breaking the vicious circle of improper working class socialization practices and of introducing new norms of hygiene and education. Resistance to this familializing strategy could result in the total loss of family autonomy in favour of state supervision.

I have not had time to conduct my own first-hand investigation of this campaign, and consequently I have relied heavily on the wealth of material presented by Wimshurst (1979; cf. 1978, 1981, 1983; and Davey, 1982, 1985, 1986). My interpretation of this campaign, however, differs significantly from Wimshurst's, and I am also seeking to place it within a broader and more explicit theoretical framework. In particular, I point to the significance of feminism as a major force in nineteenth century child-saving movements, and

the implications of this fact for the analysis of the twentieth century liberalized family, factors which Wimshurst does not bring out. I argue that the street children campaign can be seen as the product of a three-fold alliance between feminism, organized labour and philanthropy. My discussion analyses this alliance and its significance at a more explicit level than Wimshurst does.

"There are boys playing all day long in the lanes and streets, and down by the banks of the Torrens, who ought to be at school. And there are little girls kept at work or sent out as nursegirls who should be receiving an education."

"Too many parents indulge in the habit of keeping their children away from school on trifling pretexts, and it would not be by any means an evil if the streets were cleared of children during school hours" (editorial on "The Compulsory Clauses and the Schools", in the Register, 15/7/1884, p.4).

The child saving philosophy of the late nineteenth century rested heavily on middle class typifications of "street children". These typifications bring together a whole set of middle class interpretations of working class lifestyles. Street children were seen as exclusively an urban phenomenon; as the product of poverty-stricken and disorganized households; as a reflection of lack of parental control among working class families; and as demonstrating an unnatural precocity in working class children. Lying behind all of these factors were rarely expressed fears about children's involvement in thieving, drinking, gambling, prostitution, and other illegal or immoral activities - fears which, although not without foundation, were probably exaggerated. The failure of working class families to live up to bourgeois standards of restraint and respectability (a failure linked to their cultural/political circumstances) was stigmatized as an indication of pauperism, vice and immorality.

The corrupting and degrading tendencies of city life was a central component of the street children typification, as of the notion of pauperism in general:

"The tendency of pauperism to develop faster in town than in the country is also strikingly illustrated by the foregoing figures [of number of cases of outdoor relief, 1881-5 - AW]. During the last five years the cases of outdoor relief have more than doubled in Adelaide and the suburbs, and they have increased nearly 50 per cent in the last two years" (Report of Commission on Destitute Act, SAPP, 1885, vol.IV, no.228, p.xxi).

The pioneering spirit of the outback was held to be inimical to the development of pauperism. In the first Annual Report of the Destitute Board, for example, it is stated that the pauper element is rarely found in small outlying or newly-settled districts (year ended 30/6/1882, p.10). Truancy was also seen as an urban problem, e.g., by the Minister of Education speaking to a deputation from the Adelaide School Board of Advice in July 1884 (Register, 15/7/1884, p.6).

The genesis of state schooling itself can be placed in this context of concern for the degrading effects of the urban environment, as we have already seen (p.175). Even after the introduction of compulsory state schooling in 1875, complaints still surfaced about street children and child labour. This was related to a number of factors:- (1) the existence of small private schools which did not police children's attendance as thoroughly as the state schools (see above, pp.181-5); (2) the differential enforcement of the compulsory clauses in the city as compared with the country (cf. Wimshurst, 1979:101); (3) the attendance regulations themselves, which only specified a minimum attendance of 70 days per half-year (35 days per quarter from 1878); attendance was not compulsory on every school day, and hence children could still combine school with significant amounts of paid or unpaid labour.

According to Wimshurst (1979:17) the State Children's Council was one of the foremost pressure groups for the reform of school attendance requirements in the period 1886-1905. Initially the Council's attention was directed at "uncontrollable" truant children admitted to the Industrial School. These children established the characteristics that the Council would associate with irregular school attendance. "In particular, irregular attendance was seen as an urban problem and largely the product of poor and disorganized households" (Wimshurst, 1979:24).

The Council's campaign gained momentum during the period 1897-9, after the Police Commissioner (a kindred spirit) had reported a "rising tide of juvenile depravity" in 1897, which the Council linked with truancy (1979:28-9). This period saw several pieces of child protection legislation. In 1895 the State Children's Act was passed; the central feature was the enlargement of the definition of "neglected child" (1979:38). The Gaming Act (1897) and the Marine Stores Act (1898) sought to limit child casual work; the former seeking to limit the selling of newspapers, matches, racecards, etc., at racecourses, the latter dealing with the practice of collecting bottles, scrap metal and other articles for marine store dealers and second hand merchants (1979:52, 153). In 1899 the Children's Protection Act was passed. This provided for a curfew between 8pm and 5am (9pm to 5am in summer) for children under thirteen. It also sought the licensing of child casual work by municipal corporations (1979:53, 59).

A number of other legislative enactments should be mentioned in this context. In 1893 a Shops and Factories Bill was passed following the Royal Commission mentioned in Ch.4 (pp.164-6). This prohibited the employment of children under thirteen in shops or factories, and limited the hours of work for women and for children of 13 to 16 years to 48 hours per week. Amendments to this bill in committee virtually limited it to the metropolitan

area (Hirst, 1973:169-70). The State Children's Amendment Act of 1900 extended compulsory privacy to all child matters brought before the courts; it also gave the Council the power to proceed against incorrigible children when the parents would not do so (Dickey, 1986:162-3). Another Act of 1909 greatly extended the Council's power:

"It gave specific power to deal with children found in brothels, whether or not supervised by their parents (a clause specifically rejected in 1886); it included as neglected children those under fourteen who habitually frequented public places in the evening, or, if under sixteen, who were found in liquor outlets; it extended privacy to affiliation cases and, even more startling, provided for the compulsion of males to give evidence and for the court to accept hearsay evidence in such cases; it extended the supervision of foster mothers and the children in their care (usually illegitimate) till the children were seven years old; the Council's officers were to have power to enter premises in search of neglected children, to impose corporal punishment, to have guardians fined for neglect of children, and to authorize formal non-subsidized adoption of state children" (Dickey, 1986:167).

Wimshurst notes that the Council's 1890's legislation came under increasing criticism for violation of civil liberties, which was one reason why the Council concentrated its efforts on the reform of compulsory school attendance requirements (1979:35). After 1905 the Council was more concerned with defending itself against criticisms, especially from Thomas Ryan, Chairman of the Royal Commission into State Education from 1910-13. But by 1905 education authorities and Labor Party elements had joined in the crusade against street children (1979:18, 46-7, 86-7).

The South Australian Public School Teachers Union was formed in 1896, and from 1900 they entered the campaign for the reform of school attendance requirements (1979:61). As will be argued below, the emergence of teachers as a recognized public/professional voice is critically related to the three-fold alliance of feminism, organized labour and philanthropy which I see as responsible for the consolidation of compulsory education. The increase

in professional standing of teachers from the late nineteenth century and the massive changes wrought by the growth of a state-funded education system are important results of this alliance. With the emergence of the Public School Teachers Union, teachers themselves became a part of this alliance.

The involvement of teachers in the street children campaign can be related to their drive for increased professional status as well as to more pragmatic considerations. Irregular attendance was a headache for teachers. It caused disruption to class schedules; irregular scholars were not prepared for the final examination and might have to be withdrawn. In the Education Gazette for March 1901, Inspector Smyth discusses the problem as follows:

"Irregular scholars give continual worry and disappointment to their teachers, who are anxious to get them on, but find it an impossibility to keep them up with the other members of their class.....in the case of many schools in the districts, if pupils attended with greater regularity, the improved attendance would so raise the average that a higher classification would be granted to the school, and a larger teaching staff allowed" (1901:53; cf. Wimshurst, 1979:100; Miller, 1980:193).

Not only teachers individually, but also the head teacher and the school as a collective unit were very concerned about irregular attendance. To promote their professional status, teachers adopted a very wide-ranging view of their role - a view which can be related to feminist and philanthropic concerns, as well as to the programme of the United Labor Party. Moral uplift, character building, training for citizenship - these and other concerns implied a high degree of regulation of the child's activity. This regulation was difficult to achieve if pupils could pick and choose when they would attend school and when they would not. To improve their status, teachers needed to have a more highly ordered curriculum and greater regularity of attendance so they could implement it. In this way, pragmatic considerations regarding exam results were joined with moral exhortations about the dangers of street life.

The United Labor Party was also becoming increasingly interested in child welfare at this time. Five out of the seven M.P.'s who had served on the State Children's Council by 1905 were Labor men, including luminaries Tom Price and T.H. Smeaton (Wimshurst, 1979:18, 46-7, 61).

The Labor Party at this time was heavily influenced by notions of "national efficiency" or "social efficiency". This was a nebulous idea related to imperial sentiments and British competition with Germany. Education was seen as directly fitting people to perform their particular functions in society, and a direct link was assumed between education and economic progress (Wimshurst, 1979:75-6, 88; Miller, 1980:227, 1986:133-7; Searle, 1971). Imperialistic and militaristic ideas were a major part of Labor Party thinking at this time, and these ideas were to cause much dissension within the Party. The 1912 Conference of the United Labor Party of South Australia supported compulsory military training of teenage boys for home defence by the narrow margin of 52 votes to 42. In 1917, the Party split wide open over the conscription issue (Dickey, 1975:268, 273-6). In 1905 these disputes had not yet surfaced. The Party was able to support compulsory education because of its socialist commitment to improving the lot of the working man and to ending the exploitation of child labour - which as well as its inherent evil could also be used in competition with adult labour. But it also supported compulsory education because of nationalist and imperialist notions of social efficiency.

Tom Price became Labor Premier of South Australia in July 1905, and also took on the education portfolio (Thiele, 1975:74). Price had been a stonemason and had once worked on the construction of Parliament House (Gibbs, 1969:181n). He was also a Methodist local preacher (Hirst, 1973:195). In both respects he was typical of the earlier, pre-1917 Labor Party, which was largely confined to skilled tradesmen in the metropolitan area (Hirst, 1973:193-4). Many changes to the education system took place during Price's

term of office, the most important being the introduction of state high schools (discussed in the next chapter). In 1906 Price appointed Alfred Williams as the first Director of Education in South Australia. Williams had been secretary and then president of the Public School Teachers Union (Wimshurst, 1979:61). The Price/Williams regime emphasized the close cooperation of education authorities and Labor Party elements in the street children campaign.

In November 1905, a new education bill was introduced to the parliament. It sought to raise the school leaving age from 13 to 15 years and to increase the attendance requirements. Exemptions were to be made for 13 to 15 year olds who had a "lawful and useful occupation" involving continuous, not casual, employment. All students, however, were required to pass the Class IV compulsory standard.

The leaving age clause was defeated in the Legislative Council. Other amendments to the bill also occurred. The minimum attendance for urban children was increased to four out of five days every school week, but rural schools were exempted. Both the Labor Party sponsors of the bill and their conservative opposition tacitly approved of casual work for country children, partly because of their obvious usefulness at times of peak labour demand but also because of a general belief in the healthiness of country life and the dangers of the gaslit urban environment (Wimshurst, 1979:45-6, 70, 81-2). The conservatives accused the Labor Party and the Public School Teachers Union of conspiracy because of their close agreement over regular school attendance. There was also talk of the vested interests of professional child-savers (1979:78-80).

The final victory for the progressives came in 1915, following the Royal Commission of 1910-13. This time compulsory attendance on every school day passed through the legislature with relative ease. The school leaving age

was raised from 13 to 14, and the Education Department was reorganized into three divisions - primary, secondary and technical (Wimshurst, 1979:81, 104, 180; Miller, 1980:311, 1986:149-50). This Act is the definitive statement about the separation of children from the now-adult world of work - "hence in the minds of the progressives the world of work was increasingly seen as divorced from the experience of childhood. A common assertion between 1905-15 was that the 'business of children was to be schooled'" (Wimshurst, 1979:59).

The street children campaign was a concerted attempt to extend educational compulsion in the service of moral reform and national efficiency. It was an attempt to extend the period of childhood dependency (Wimshurst, 1979:43), to demarcate more forcibly the distinction between childhood and adult life, and to establish a particular model of familialism. Although aimed primarily at the working class, the effects of this intervention went beyond this class to encompass a wide-ranging transformation of both education and familialism (as argued above, pp.198-200). As in many comparable cases, measures originally instituted to deal with a marginal or troublesome group (uncontrollable truant children) later become generalized to cover whole populations.

The street children campaign is full of typifications which show little sympathy with the realities of working class life (Wimshurst, 1979:161). The lifestyles of certain sections of the working class (not always the poorest) were interpreted in terms of the precocity of their children and the lack of parental control exercised over them. City life (unlike rural) was seen as full of corrupting influences from which children should be protected till age 18 or 21. Children on the streets by themselves were the focus of these typifications.

These interpretive schemes ignore the cultural/economic realities of working class life. The kind of work engaged in by many children necessarily involved them being on the streets. In 1905 there was public outrage over baggage boys and their "idle loafing" around the Railway Station. The Adelaide City Council, the State Children's Council and the Boys' Brigade all expressed their disapproval. But of course this loafing was a necessary part of the boys' work. The same can be said about another object of concern, messenger boys "haunting" the rear entrances of business establishments (Wimshurst, 1979:154-5). It was the very existence of street children which was seen as a threat to social order, rather than what they were actually doing there (1979:161).

A central aspect of the street children campaign was the urban/rural dichotomy and the vast differences seen as stemming from this. Wimshurst argues that this contrast was overdrawn and that child casual labour showed similar variations in both city and country. He uses a case study of the Angaston Board of Advice to bring this out. The Board was responsible for eleven primary schools in the Barossa Valley at the turn of the century. There was a special meeting each quarter to examine cases of non-compliance with attendance regulations. Wimshurst uses a sample of 162 cases (some of them involving the same people more than once), representing all the cases heard in 1896-7, 1900-1 and 1904-5. Farming or related activities accounted for 65% of the parents' occupations that were traced, with 18-20% being tradesmen living in the towns. There were 94 boys and 66 girls in the sample, a difference which Wimshurst attributes to the sexual division of labour rather than to the activities of the authorities. Boys tended to be absent for 2 or 3 weeks at harvest time; girls usually spread their absenteeism over the whole quarter - particularly on Mondays or near the beginning of the week on washing day or house cleaning day. The first quarter of the year accounted

for 51% of cases, the second and fourth 19% each, and the third quarter 11%. The most common age was twelve years, although the median for the whole sample was eleven. Attendance of children outside of peak periods was generally good - 73% of the cases had fulfilled their requirements for the preceding quarter. Parents tried to accumulate as much school attendance as possible for their children during off-peak periods (Wimshurst, 1979:130-5).

Wimshurst argues that it was incidental factors rather than casual work per se that often led to non-compliance:

"These incidental factors included illness and accident within the family; bouts of poverty and hardness; prolonged absence of the father in search of work which resulted in the mother's extra reliance on her child's casual work and earnings; fear of epidemics spreading through school contact; and occasionally upsets within the school situation, such as dissatisfaction with a local teacher" (1979:136).

Child casual work in the city showed a similar seasonal variation and a similar pattern of exigencies. Around the turn of the century there were still many open paddocks separating the city and the various "suburbs". Rural pursuits such as almond-picking and bringing animals to stock markets every Wednesday played a part in child casual work. Attendance at urban schools showed a similar seasonal variation to that in rural schools, with the lowest attendances during spring and summer months:

"The semi-rural pursuits of some children would account for part of the seasonal pattern. More importantly, spring saw the revival each year of business, trade and tourism which provided increased opportunities for child casual work. More people in the streets in these months meant greater demand for flower, fruit, match and newspaper sellers, and the revival of business provided renewed opportunities for messenger boys" (1979:157).

The Royal Show in September provided work for baggage boys as country people flocked to Adelaide, as well as casual jobs at the Show itself (1979:155-7).

In Hindmarsh (now a suburb of Adelaide), seasonal fluctuations in the building and other trades may also have increased family dependence on child labour. Two established trades in Hindmarsh, tanning and brickmaking, were often still organized as small family concerns at the turn of the century. Some work processes in these trades could still be done at home, and children would have been generally useful for fetching and carrying tasks (1979:170-1).

Another factor was the mobility involved in many skilled trades, where skilled workers followed opportunities in their trade rather than taking a job in the same area but with different skills. This transiency often led to poor school attendance. Wimshurst studied the school attendance records of 434 boys enrolled at Hindmarsh School during 1898-1900. He found that "street children" accounted for 36.1% of transient children but only 28.8% of permanent children (permanent children were those who had spent the whole of their primary school careers at Hindmarsh - 50% of the 434 boys moved out of the area within a couple of years of enrolment) (1979:167-75). Working class transiency was regarded as somewhat disreputable by the more settled fractions of the working class. "In turn the transient experience probably diminished any sense of rigid social stratification between skilled and unskilled workers within the mobile working class - transient workers shared similar problems and the school attendance of their children was one such problem" (1979:175). Transiency applied not only to unskilled workers but also to petit bourgeois elements and most particularly to certain skilled tradesmen (1979:173). Similarly with street children, who were not (as the progressives argued) purely a product of the disorganized families of poor unskilled labourers; e.g. shopkeepers would keep sons at home at busy times to help in the store (1979:168-9).

These complexities were ignored by the progressives. Notions of disorganization and lack of parental control were called in as explanatory

devices, while the economic imperatives and the distinctive lifestyle of the working class were played down or ignored. The importance of child casual work and earnings was rarely appreciated. Letters to the Advertiser newspaper by working class parents during the debate over Conybeer's education bill in 1911 show that even if they did not normally make demands on their children's labour, the flexibility of the attendance requirements offered them some security in case of misfortune (1979:164-6).

SECTION VIII: CONCLUSION

As I have already intimated, the street children campaign and its attempt to familiarize the working class was the product of a three-fold alliance between feminism, organized labour and philanthropy.

Feminism was represented by Caroline Emily Clark and Catherine Helen Spence, founders and promoters of the boarding out movement in South Australia, stalwarts of the State Children's Council, and prominent in many other activities. More broadly it was represented by the WCTU, with its opposition to the male exclusivist culture of drink, gambling, transience, prostitution, etc., and its attempt to undermine this culture through rebalancing power relations between husband and wife. Feminism wished to upgrade the status of domestic work and to increase women's domestic power in general. It also sought limited opportunities for women to engage in paid employment, in areas seen as consistent with their domestic role, most notably teaching in this context. Women's domestic role of caring, loving and guiding was to be reproduced in the public context through teaching, nursing and social work. The private context of the family and the public context of (e.g) the school - women's domestic place as well as their participation in paid employment - have both to be seen as part of the same familiarizing strategy,

rather than as contradictory opposites (see also Ch.2; these issues are taken up in the Conclusion).

I have already noted the close connections between the Labor Party and the State Children's Council on the one hand (pp.238-9), and the Labor Party and the WCTU on the other (pp.220). The Labor Party wished to end the exploitation of child labour because of the possible competition with adult male labour, and the negative effect of a reserve of unskilled casual labour upon all wage rates. It wished to codify and systematize the conditions of this adult male labour through the basic wage, conciliation and arbitration, legal recognition of trade unions and strikes, political representation, etc. It was also attracted to a familializing strategy because of the withdrawal of children from work attendant on this strategy; and because it wished to base its pay claims on a bourgeois model of the family, with the man's wages being sufficient to look after a dependent wife and children (realized in the Harvester judgement of 1907 and subsequent rulings, in which a basic wage was set for all Australian workers, sufficient to support a wife and three children as well as the breadwinner himself - Miller, 1980:262).

Donzelot argues that the critique of social inequality gradually dissociated itself from the socialist critique of the family represented by Engels and others. The family became the point of support for demands for greater social equality, instead of being a prime obstacle to socialist transformation. Demands slowly came to be based on the defence and improvement of the family living conditions of the "disadvantaged" (Donzelot, 1979a:53).

The Labor Party in South Australia endorsed this strategy, but it was also imbued with the same philanthropic impulses as the other members of the alliance. The upgrading and familializing of the working class was only

one part of the transition to a new era of prosperity and national greatness. Nationalist and technocratic visions were as important to organized labour and its political representatives as their interest in improving the living conditions of the working class.

Thus philanthropy is an important aspect of both feminism and the Labor Party, as well as being a particular element within the alliance. The latter is best represented by the Adelaide School Board of Advice and two of its prominent members, Sir Langdon Bonython and Thomas Rhodes. This board was one of the most active and influential ones, and was imbued with the same child-saving philosophy as the State Children's Council. It advocated truant schools, and it had close connections with the State Children's Council in the 1890's. Thomas Rhodes was a member of both institutions (Wimshurst, 1979:33). Rhodes was also a superintendent of the important Kent Town Methodist Church Sunday School and had been a member of the YMCA from its inception (Dickey, 1986:150). Sir Langdon Bonython was Chairman of the Adelaide Board between 1883 and 1901. He was proprietor of the Advertiser newspaper, and his wife was a member of the State Children's Council (Wimshurst, 1979:33; see also pp.276-7 below).

Both individuals had a long history of philanthropic activity in relation to the moral and social improvement of children and youths in the colony. This was not simply a matter of having a trained and disciplined workforce ready to oil the needs of industry - as we will see in detail in the next chapter in relation to the debate over state secondary education in the 1930's, there was considerable division of opinion in the "higher orders" regarding the desirability of child labour. Wimshurst notes, for example, that boards of advice consisted mostly of local businessmen, who tended to be very lenient on irregular attendance for fear of alienating local residents (1979:101). There were also many who argued that too much education was detrimental for

working class people because it raised their aspirations and made them discontented with their lot. So we are dealing with a particular fraction of progressive, philanthropic bourgeois, with a wide-ranging vision of the reform of society and the elevation of the working class out of their drunkenness, vice, immorality, spendthrift habits and violence. This view was quite compatible with the ideas of organized labour (pre-1917) and feminism, as can be seen most readily in the composition of the State Children's Council, with all three elements well represented.

Teachers and the Public School Teachers Union could be regarded as a fourth element, but in some ways they were an emergent product of this alliance. State school teaching set new standards of training and performance supervised by an impersonal bureaucratic agency. State compulsory education was thus a crucial force in the increased professional status of teachers from the late nineteenth century onwards. To the extent that the Education Department employed women (males largely monopolized the administrative and senior grades) the emergence of state school teaching can be regarded as a feminist achievement. To the extent that these teachers (via the Public School Teachers' Union) became a recognized industrial and political force, able to defend their conditions of employment, state school teaching can be regarded as a victory for organized labour. Finally, state education can be regarded as a giant philanthropic enterprise because of the transformative ambitions already referred to. Compulsory state education (and the role of teachers therein) was not simply a matter of education as we use that term today. It was concerned with the wholesale transformation of large sections of the working class in the direction of greater sobriety, thrift and morality, a transformation which rested upon the establishment of a new political culture of the family.

Following Donzelot (1979a, 1979b), the analysis presented in this chapter casts doubts on conventional political classifications in terms of labour vs. capital, or patriarchy vs. women's liberation. The alliance of forces in the street children campaign cuts across both of these boundaries and points to the critical significance of familialism as a hegemonizing factor in liberal capitalist societies. This factor defuses the nineteenth century debates between laissez-faire and statism via a new hybridization of these apparent opposites - the bipolarity of contract and tutelage, linked together in a functional circuit rather than standing in opposition. In this way a variety of state-provided services and state interventions became possible without undermining the liberal watchdog (or minimalist) definition of the state.

As discussed above in Ch.3, this hybridization was effected particularly easily in South Australia because of the colonial tradition of central control and because of the particular economic and political situation of the 1870's, when this central control was greatly extended in the fields of education, health, and transport. State intervention was accepted pragmatically and without great ideological debate.

South Australia is a particularly well-developed example of the hybridization of public and private represented by the social, in terms of its progressive social legislation and massive state presence in everyday life. In this sense, Donzelot's analysis of the social can be transferred directly from France to South Australia. Obviously, however, there must also be differences, given that France is a Catholic, highly centralist state, while Australia is a largely Protestant, federal one. In the remainder of this chapter, I will highlight some of the particularities of the South Australian and Australian context, and use Castles (1985) to place Australian social welfare development within a comparative perspective. A direct, in-depth

comparison between France and (South) Australia is beyond my competence, and is not essential for the purposes of this thesis.

The radical break with British society involved in the setting up of the colony of South Australia offers parallels to the rupture in French society effected by the revolution of 1789. In both cases, a society was built up on new and radical principles, involving a large amount of foresight, planning, and state intervention. If we take South Australia rather than Australia as the unit of comparison, then the contrast with France is not so great, particularly in terms of the large degree of centralized state intervention and control in both cases.

This significance of this state intervention, however, is quite different in the South Australian context. Whitelock (1977:218) argues that there is a general paradox in Adelaide society - its combination of political radicalism and social conservatism. Its politically and religiously dissenting founders started a long tradition of progressivism in political thought, but its strong Protestant and evangelical leanings combined with its bourgeois values of prudence and diligence have tended to produce a conservative civil society, at least until the Dunstan era of the 1970's.

Even the long period of conservative Liberal and Country League rule from 1933 to 1965 does not invalidate the argument about political radicalism. Playford, Premier for most of this period, was responsible for a range of measures involving increased state funding and control. In 1946, the Playford government took control of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, the public company which supplied all of Adelaide's electricity. The move was opposed as "socialistic" by some of Playford's own LCL members in the Legislative Council, but was passed after a lengthy battle (Gibbs, 1969:242). During the 1950's in particular, South Australia competed with the other states to attract

corporate investment by generous provision of infrastructural elements. The establishment of a new model town at Elizabeth north of Adelaide was a major success for Playford (Connell and Irving, 1980:305).

Whitelock's argument can be related to certain ideas in Pike (1967) and Hirst (1973).

Pike argues that after South Australia was granted its own constitution in 1857, a certain smugness set in. The very fact that significant political and religious liberties were built into South Australian society from an early date led to an unwillingness to consider reforms which might radically transform this society. Pike argues that with the constitution in place, the leading "old colonists" felt they had achieved their goals:-

"They had the pick of the land; they had cheap docile labour; they had their own government. The main goals of civil and religious liberty had been reached. Church and state were separated. Manhood suffrage and ballot were won. Ties with Downing Street were cut. The province controlled its own land and immigration.....Their popular rights were secure against despotism from without. From any tyrant majority within, their property was protected by a constitution which was, like any other law, unalterable without the consent of an upper house elected by the owners of property themselves" (1967:480; cf. 499-503).

This smugness was no doubt nurtured by the generally high level of material affluence vis-a-vis comparable countries, as well as by notions of respectability derived from South Australia's Dissenting, convict-free origins. Pike argues that respectability was the single social qualification, and that it was a distinctively local phenomenon not determined solely by wealth, status or manners. It was seldom accorded to "unenterprising wage-earners", but neither was it monopolized by men of wealth and property:-

"Aspirations judged 'sound' by local and subtle tests meant more, provided that the aspirations were pursued with diligence and energy. A man was judged respectable not by the destination he had arrived at, but according to the road he

travelled; and the five roads to respectability in Adelaide were early arrival, thrift, temperance....., piety, and the ownership of land" (1967:510).

The stress on these bourgeois values casts doubt on the Hartz thesis of Australia as a radical, working class "fragment" (Hartz, ed., 1964), at least in relation to South Australia. I would argue that South Australia can be seen as a fragment of early nineteenth century British liberalism. In Britain, at precisely the same time that Wakefield and others were planning the colonization of South Australia, an alliance of liberal bourgeoisie and working class were pushing through the Reform Act of 1832. Hartz' fragment thesis could still be used to explain the unfolding of this liberal (or perhaps liberal-working class) fragment. Transplanted to South Australia and allowed free rein in the absence of a landed aristocracy, this liberalism escaped the confrontation with the working class represented in Britain by Chartism and related movements. It was thus able to develop in a more consensual way than would have been possible in Britain, where the liberal/working class alliance soon collapsed and where the aristocracy remained an important political force.

Hirst (1973:45-6) can be used to support this argument. He points out that South Australia in the second half of the nineteenth century can be distinguished from New South Wales and Victoria by its more consensual politics. Wealthy South Australian families - old and new - continued to be active in public affairs throughout the century (they did not withdraw until the advent of party politics in the 1890's - 1973:49-50). In the other states, the old wealthy families felt themselves rebuffed by the new democracy and tended to retreat from public and parliamentary life. Hirst presents four broad reasons for this:-

(1) The social composition of South Australia - no convicts, fewer Irish, no gold rushes or diggers - all of whom may have harboured resentment against the well-to-do. South Australia benefited economically from the gold rushes, but its prosperity was mainly associated with the expansion of agriculture and an increase in the number of yeoman farmers. Unlike Victoria, the social order was not radically transformed by the gold rushes but rather confirmed in its previous pattern.

(2) In the critical decade of the 1850's, the wealthy in South Australia were less defensive in their politics. They had the most liberal constitution in Australia and no privileged position to lose in relation to the land. The more settled South Australian community also inspired them with fewer fears of social disorder.

(3) The Crown never yielded its right to resume the squatter's lease at any time, which meant that there was little impediment to agricultural expansion. There was nothing in South Australia to compare with the popular land reform movements which emerged in New South Wales and Victoria in the late 50's and early 60's.

(4) The concentration of the wealthy in Adelaide reduced the possibility that they would isolate themselves from the community and increased their opportunities for active participation in public affairs.

The work of Pike and Hirst lends support to Whitelock's description of Adelaide society as combining political radicalism and social conservatism. For a number of reasons related to the origins of South Australia as well as to later peculiarities of its development, state intervention and centralized state control of a type which would have been considered radical elsewhere was accepted pragmatically and without great debate. Thus the forces responsible for the emergence of the social sphere in South Australia, as well as its

political and cultural significance, are quite different from those described by Donzelot for France, where there were intense struggles between socialists, Christian political economists, and social economists, the last named gaining acceptance for their proposals (1979a:62-3).

To further the discussion, it is necessary to look at Australian society as a whole, and to place its social welfare development within a comparative framework.

Castles (1985) argues that welfare provision in Australia (and in New Zealand - I will refer simply to "Australia") has taken a peculiar path. He distinguishes two broad models of social policy development in capitalist countries. Firstly, there is a residual model, characterized by an unreflective acceptance of market induced inequality, and the provision of means-tested relief to those who are unable for socially legitimated reasons to derive a bare minimum of subsistence from the labour market or from prior savings. Social welfare in the United States approaches this model, although the more affluent sections of the working class have access to social insurance benefits (1985:77). Secondly, there is an institutional model, which guarantees all citizens a minimum level of need-fulfilment, whether the individual is old, sick, disabled, unemployed, belongs to a large family, or is inadequately recompensed from employment. This model underlies the welfare state settlement in Britain in the period of the post-1945 Labour Government, as well as in other European countries (Castles also distinguishes a third, structural model applicable to Scandinavia, which removes whole areas of distribution from the influence of the market - 1985:77-9).

Castles argues that Australia, as a result of a historic class compromise worked out at the turn of the century, has developed its own unique strategy, which he calls the wage-earners' welfare state (1985:102-9, et passim). Rather

than universal benefits based on citizenship and funded through state redistributive activities, the Australian strategy was based on ensuring an adequate level of wages through direct state intervention in the labour process. This was accomplished through minimum wage legislation, compulsory arbitration and statutory wage control, while the labour movement pressed for immigration controls to guarantee full employment. Manufacturers (and later, small farmers) were protected from outside competition through tariff walls or import quotas, so that they would be able to pay the relatively high wages demanded by the workers - a trade-off explicitly recognized in the early twentieth century New Protection. The criterion of inclusion in this welfare state was status as a wage-earner rather than status as a citizen. Social welfare benefits provided through state redistribution have always been highly selectivist, means-tested, and not very generous compared with Europe. The existence of statutory wage regulation provided a national minimum level of needs-fulfilment for wage-earners, distinguishing the Australian model from the residual one of the United States; but the negative side of this system was a large gap, compared with Europe, between those in wage employment and those who did not have access to the labour market (1985:82-8, 102-9).

From a contemporary perspective, as Castles argues, all this has decidedly sexist implications, in suggesting that the only legitimate object of concern for social policy was the remuneration of the male head of household. The Harvester Judgement of 1907 quite explicitly assumed that a "fair and reasonable" wage was one which would support a wife and three children (1985:88-9).

The arguments presented by Castles using a political economy approach can be supplemented here by considering cultural forms such as mateship and the yeoman/battler ethic. These cultural forms stress qualities

of hard work, independence, individualism, and the "natural" bonds which arise between persons possessed of such virtues. All of these qualities are primarily regarded as pertaining to males, and tend to devalue men's involvement with family life and with women in general. Although such statements are difficult to substantiate, this may have been one factor leading to a strong emotional reserve among Australian males, accentuating pragmatic and dutiful attitudes to their spouses, rather than the more effusive expressions of love and tenderness found in societies such as the United States, where a similar historical path has been followed.

The emphasis in Australia on maintaining a high level of wages, and the legislative and statutory measures supporting this objective, also goes some way towards explaining the low participation rates of Australian youth in secondary education. Given the at least partial success of this strategy, secondary education as a means of guaranteeing a good future income has not been highly prized.

This argument is further considered in the next chapter, which is concerned with the development and significance of state secondary education in South Australia. This represents a further and very important aspect of the development of a universal model of childhood and adolescence - the idea that all children should pass through the same kind of formal educational experiences, regardless of class or status. I will examine the implications of this universalizing process, and in particular how it helps to establish the private pursuit of self-interest as an important hegemonizing factor in South Australian culture.

CHAPTER 6: SECONDARY EDUCATION AND THE NATURALIZATION OF ADOLESCENCE

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the development of state secondary education in South Australia. This development will be analyzed in terms of the framework established in the previous chapter of the liberalization of patriarchal authority and the corresponding emergence of "the social", representing a new form of the relation between families and the state and a new technology of power relations in twentieth century liberal capitalist societies. State secondary education, like the Education Act of 1875, is a critical element in the deployment of this technology, a technology which proclaims a universal norm of childhood and youth, but which at the same time differentiates between families on the basis of their willingness and/or ability to live up to this norm.

The historical context of this development was the extension of a framework of power relations in which formal, deferential status relations were devalued in favour of an ideology of the rights of all citizens to equality of opportunity. An important effect of this general deployment was to neutralize questions of political right framed in terms of class, gender or other major collectivities, and to transmute them into questions of the private pursuit of well-being. Failure to realize such goals became linked to individual or familial deviation from the norm rather than to questions of power and domination. As Donzelot says of the dual mechanism of tutelage and contract characteristic of the liberalized family:-

"A wonderful mechanism, since it enables the social body to deal with marginality through a near-total dispossession of private rights, and to encourage positive integration, the renunciation of the question of political right, through the private pursuit of well-being" (1979a:94).

State secondary education, with its promise of equal opportunity for all, provides a crucial legitimization for this privatized and individualized pursuit of self-interest.

A major mechanism of the new education, and coinciding with its early establishment, was an educational psychology which could provide an analytic view of the pupil, or more properly of his/her desires and capacities. Therefore a major element of the chapter is the work of the turn-of-the-century American psychologist and educationist, G.Stanley Hall, whose book "Adolescence....", published in 1904, was one of the earliest and most influential discussions of adolescence and secondary education from the viewpoint of modern psychology. Hall was also the leading light of the Child Study Movement of the 1890's, an important element of the "New Education" which stressed the scientific study of children and their learning processes (Ross, 1972:279-308; see also pp.195-6 above).

My treatment of Hall will be analogous to the treatment of Wakefield in Chapter 3. Although there is no direct connection between Hall and South Australia, Hall provides a wide-ranging and well-elaborated account which in many ways represents the general dynamics of adolescence in liberal capitalist societies. Hall's theories provide a useful scaffolding for examining both the general dynamics of this form as well as its particular working-out in the South Australian context. As with Wakefield, I will devote some time to examining Hall's ideas as such, but I will also use these ideas as a framework for examining the particularities of the South Australian context.

The reader is referred to pp.39-42 for a discussion of Foucault's distinction between law and norm. Recapitulating the latter part of this discussion, twentieth century adolescence illustrates the double natural-juridical reference of the norm. Juvenile justice, school attendance laws, child protection and custody laws, military/political/economic qualifications and disqualifications situate adolescence within a formal juridical framework of laws and regulations. But adolescence is also defined in terms of a whole range of "natural" processes of biological and psychological development. The various "sciences" of adolescence provide elaborate accounts of the observable variations of physical, emotional, moral, sexual, educational development, and hence allow a fine-grained mapping of the juridical onto the natural grid.

Unlike the mechanisms of the older law, with its binary operations of law-abiding vs. criminal, or normal vs. deviant, this normalizing judgement pays much closer attention to the particular biographies involved: to the exact shape of the family situation, to different possible futures and to specialized assistance for problem cases. Instead of authoritarian dictates and harsh penal solutions, juvenile justice has been liberalized, and now offers a whole range of corrective techniques and situations, with penal detention being reserved only as the ultimate sanction for incorrigible cases. As argued in a more general context in the first part of the thesis, this liberalization has to be seen as part of a new modality of power relations which facilitates a greater penetration of power into the social body, a more effective regulation of the population.

One of the chief vehicles for this in the case of adolescence is universal state secondary education. With the development of this institution, adolescence becomes a universal norm which applies to everyone regardless of social class, gender, ethnicity, etc. At the same time, secondary education allows a very fine-grained differentiation of adolescents in terms of their

abilities and aptitudes, so that participation in and success at secondary education becomes a crucial indicator of a person's "worth" and a major determinant of their future life-situations, helping to direct them into the occupations or roles in which they will be most "useful".

In this way, universal state secondary education links economic and political imperatives with individual and familial desires for social mobility. Secondary education homogenizes through the legal requirements of school attendance; it differentiates through the ranking of "natural" abilities and aptitudes. It holds out the promise of material security and/or social mobility and hence generates positive integration into the social order through the private pursuit of well-being; at the same time it "cools out" (Goffman) those who are less successful in this process by convincing them that they do not have the intelligence or the aptitude to do any better; finally problems at school may provide the rationale for corrective intervention by the state and hence a means of dealing with marginal or troublesome elements of the population. One result of this is that failure tends to become attributed to personal shortcomings rather than to systemic features of the social order.

SECTION II: G. STANLEY HALL

I will now turn to the work of Stanley Hall to elaborate and give substance to this analysis, focusing on his doctrine of recapitulation. This doctrine is particularly significant in that it provides a natural-scientific justification for Hall's views on the proper treatment of adolescents. I will argue that Hall's theory was important in the "naturalization" of adolescence, even though this particular theory has long been discredited.

Through the Child Study Movement of the 1890's, Hall managed to involve educationists, teachers, parents and many others in his concerns. At a

vital juncture, Hall was instrumental in spreading the gospel of the scientific psychology and pedagogy of adolescence and legitimating the emerging institutional arrangements for young people. In spite of his later fall from grace, he also helped to establish some of the major contours of this field of discourse/practice. Adolescence for him was part of a culture of choice: choosing your own spouse, your own career, your own lifestyle, rather than obeying authoritarian dictates from your parents or masters. In espousing this liberalization, Hall was very much in line with emerging trends in our culture. My account of Hall is a sociology of knowledge, but knowledge not only in terms of a specialized academic discipline. I am also concerned with the way in which modified versions of this specialist knowledge enter into everyday understandings and provide legitimation for them.

According to Hall, each stage in the life-cycle of the individual corresponded to a period in the history of the race. Adolescence corresponded to a period of migrations, upheaval and trauma (Kett, 1977:218). This history was recapitulated in the life-cycle of the individual in the form of instinctive urges - urges which it was dangerous and harmful to suppress. Hall provided a scientific justification for the liberalization of parental authority and for a more tolerant attitude to adolescent faults. He argued that adolescents must be allowed to have their fling, even if this involved them in a certain amount of wrongdoing and disobedience. Referring to a boy of ten, he said:

"Morally he should have been through many if not most forms of what parents and teachers commonly call badness and Professor Yoder even calls meanness. He should have fought, whipped and been whipped, used language offensive to the prude and to the prim precisian, been in some scrapes, had something to do with bad, if more with good associates, and been exposed to and already recovering from as many forms of ethical mumps and measles as, by having in mild form now he can be rendered immune to later when they become far more dangerous, because his moral and religious as well as his rational nature is normally rudimentary. He is not depraved but only in a savage or half-animal stage...." (Hall, 1904, II:452).

Conversely, Hall thought it dangerous if these natural adolescent urges were not allowed to express themselves:

"The more we know of boyhood the more narrow and often selfish do adult ideals of it appear. Something is amiss with the lad of ten who is very good, studious, industrious, thoughtful, altruistic, quiet, polite, respectful, obedient, gentlemanly, orderly, always in good toilet, docile to reason, who turns away from stories that reek with gore, prefers adult companionship to that of his mates, refuses all low associates, speaks standard English, or is pious and deeply in love with religious services as the typical maiden teacher or the a la mode parent wishes. Such a boy is either under-vitalized and anemic and precocious by nature, a repressed, overtrained, conventionalized manikin, a hypocrite, as some can become under pressure thus early in life, or else, a genius of some kind with a little of all these" (1904, II:453).

Hall argued for the prolongation of adolescence as a special, childlike period of life, and urged the removal of pressures for adultlike behaviour. Adolescence had its own special features, derived from the ancestral experiences of the race. Virtually all forms of adolescent exuberance, larrikinism, wrongdoing or disobedience were explained by Hall in terms of his notion of recapitulation:

"His racial forebears at the stage he represents were rollicking, fighting, hunting, courting, as they roved with wild freedom in the open in quest of adventure" (1904, II:428).

Truancy was the expression of a roving instinct derived from an earlier stage of evolution before the development of permanent settlements, and also reflected what Hall regarded as the earlier age of independence from the parental home in primitive tropical cultures:

"The infant impulse to follow or to be off may be a survival of an age when primitive clans were on the move and the gregarious instincts of the child were expressed in toddling after the mother as tribes moved about seeking food or flying from enemies before a sessile status was reached. The prepubescent reductives of this instinct may stand for the evolution of permanent habitation, and the rise of the curve again in or before the first teens suggests a past age of earlier tropical independence" (1904, II:382; cf. I:45, 348, 349; II:376, 377, 509).

Fighting and even the joy of inflicting punishment are natural and proper at adolescence:

"Burk enumerates from his empirical data a long list of modes by which the tormentor expresses his joy at the suffering of his victim, and suggests that these aggressions into the rights of other personalities may be broken neurological fragments or parts of old chains of activity involved in the pursuit, combat, torture, and killing of men and enemies" (1904, I:359; cf. I:217-8)

"Fencing [unlike boxing - AW], while an art susceptible of high development and valuable for both pose and poise and requiring great quickness of eye, arm, and wrist, is unilateral and robbed of the zest of inflicting real pain on an antagonist" (I:219)

Similarly, thieving relates back to a stage of tribal organization when all goods were held in common (I:363-4); incendiarism reflects "ancient experiences of plunder, devastation, nightly foray" (I:367); prostitution suggests ancient polyandrous forms of society (I:372); nighttime adventures recall "the need of watchfulness, the custom of predatory adventures or amatory excursions of ancient courtships by night" (I:264); the eccentricities of juvenile appetites and other time-irregularities reflect the irregularities of savage life, and in particular the earlier age of maturity among primitive tropical youth, when adolescents set up house by themselves before they were fully skilled in the arts of providing and preparing food (II:11, 14); finally, hitting with a club can be related to hunting and fighting instincts: "This makes, for instance, baseball racially familiar, because it represents activities that were once and for a long time necessary for survival" (I:206).

Hall provided a natural scientific justification for the liberalization of parental authority. Adolescent faults should not only be tolerated, it was actually harmful to try and repress them. Through the doctrine of recapitulation, Hall argued that adolescence was the natural time for the expression of various impulses which were potentially anti-social and destructive. Such impulses must be allowed this expression, for only in this

way would young people be able to develop proper control over these instincts: "Here as everywhere the rule holds that powers themselves must be unfolded before the ability to check or even to use them can develop" (1904, I:161). Parents and teachers must allow adolescents their exuberance, even if it means tolerating a certain amount of wrongdoing. At the same time, they must provide a suitable environment where the venting of these instincts will do the least possible harm, and where they can be diverted to higher and more noble purposes - "protected liberation", as Donzelot describes it. Adolescents must be liberated from harsh and arbitrary authority and allowed to develop their special individual selves, but this liberation must take place in a specially designed and discreetly supervised environment.

Hall's evolutionary assumptions further buttressed his scientific justification of adolescence as an extended period of dependency. As already noted, he believed that among "primitive races" adolescence was regarded as the normal period of maturity, of breaking with parents and setting up your own household. Adolescents were initiated to nubility "with almost no interval after the first physical signs of puberty, for the slow processes of maturation of body and soul. The progressive increase of this interval is another index of the degree of civilization" (1904, II:232; cf. I:315, 321, 453, 456; II:140, 280, 304). Civilization demands a longer period of apprenticeship, as does nature itself according to Hall's doctrines. This double reference is summed up in the dangers of precocity.

Hall gives this concept a directly physiological and genetic significance:

"The apex of individuation must be attained before genesis, but only for the sake of the latter, to which it is subordinate. This means the postponement of every nubile function till as near the end of the growth period as possible, so that maturity may realize as far as practicable the ideal of Sir Galahad, who had the strength of ten because his heart was pure. The most rigid

chastity of fancy, heart, and body is physiologically and psychologically as well as ethically imperative till maturity is complete on into the twenties, nor is it hard if continence is inward, for nature in all healthful bodies brings normal relief; while the most morbid symptom of decadence and degeneration of both the individual and his stock or line is the concession to the excuses and justification now often current even among academic youth for the indulgences of passion. Restraint is now true manhood and makes races ascendent and not descendent, while from the plant world up, prematurity, that goes too early to seed, means caducity. The perfected adolescent will now have systematized his ideals" (1904, II:120-1; cf. I:50, 205, 225, 307, 421, 436, 438; and II:124).

As well as these directly physiological dangers, there are cultural/historical ones as well:

"Among the chief external causes of the diseases of this age are all those influences which tend to precocity, e.g., city life with its earlier puberty, higher death rate, wider range and greater superficiality of knowledge, observations of vice and enhanced temptation, lessened repose, incessant distraction, more impure air, greater liability to contagion, and absence of the sanitizing influences and repose of nature in country life.".... "Civilization with all its accumulated mass of cultures and skills, its artefacts, its necessity of longer and severer apprenticeship and specialization, is ever harder on adolescents" (1904, I:321).

Precocity has many other meanings for Hall apart from the sexual one. Hall talks of the rage for "precociously assuming adult burdens, airs, indocilities, and callousness" (1904, II:152). He criticises the education system for over-emphasising book knowledge and for the formalistic methods of teaching:

".....for the complete apprenticeship to life, youth needs repose, leisure, art, legends, romance, idealization, and in a word humanism, if it is to enter the kingdom of man well equipped for man's highest work in the world. In education our very kindergartens, which outnumber those of any other land, by dogma and hyper-sophistication tend to exterminate the naive that is the glory of childhood" (1904, I:xvii; cf. I:385; II:150, 229).

Precocity also refers to the improper development of muscles - basal or fundamental muscles must be developed before accessory ones (those

requiring great precision or exactness). Adolescence is the age of the basal muscles:

"....hill-climbing muscles, of leg and back and shoulder work, and of the yet more fundamental heart, lung, and chest muscles. Now again the study of a book, under the usual conditions of sitting in a closed space and using pen, tongue, and eye combined, has a tendency to overestimate the accessory muscles" (1904, I:165; cf. I:111, 144, 156, 157, 164).

Here precocity again has a directly physiological referent.

The concept of precocity implies that adolescents should linger in a childlike world as long as possible, and not try to behave like adults or be subject to adult standards of evaluation. Only through this prolonged and gradual development would the individual and the race attain its optimum possible condition. Only thus could the diseases of precocity be avoided (see further 1904, I:viii, xi, xvi, 322, 382; II:152, 330, 333).

Along with many other authors (particularly during the 1970's), Kett interprets the notion of precocity and adolescence as a whole chiefly in terms of a social control argument (1977:111, 194, 210-1, 217, 242-3). As compared with an early nineteenth century pattern of semidependence, involving alternating periods of freedom and subordination (1977:29, 42, 111), the late nineteenth and twentieth century pattern was of a more thorough and continuous control of the lives of adolescents. Kett provides many useful and important insights, and I broadly agree with most of his work, but he does not systematically consider the changes in patriarchal authority involved in the notion of adolescence. He does briefly consider the liberating elements of this new pattern (1977:45-6, 217, 245), but does not link them to his control thesis, which remains the chief argument.

Foucault and Donzelot provide a more sophisticated control thesis. It is through the liberalization of patriarchal authority that modern forms of

control in relation to children and adolescents are able to take hold. Conventional theories of social control tend to miss this connection, if not the whole process of liberalization itself. The drive against precocity is read in terms of the imposition of middle class values on working class school children, one of these values being the lengthening of the period of childhood dependency - a process seen as essentially repressive.

Both of these statements contain important insights, but left to stand by themselves they can be very misleading. Rather than being general characterizations, they refer more to the tutelary pole of modern familialism, and need to be complemented by an analysis of the contractual pole. This pole is characterised by the liberation of children, enticing them to bring forth their own unique selves, rather than by a process of repression. Hall's tolerant attitude to adolescent wrongdoing is a powerful expression of this liberalization of patriarchal authority, a liberalization which is not simply a sham, even if it is connected with a new modality of power relations. The prolongation of childhood dependency was not simply the prolongation of an undifferentiated adult control; it also involved the creation of a new world for children and adolescents, a world in which they were to be encouraged to develop their own unique childlike selves, a world in which the meaning and significance of parental authority was radically altered. This process could even lead to parental authority being radically called into question, as in the various post-World War II youth subcultures.

The problems of a straight social control theory can be seen by considering Hall's attitude towards sexuality. This was by no means one of simple repression of the sexual impulse. Hall did urge the prolongation of adolescence and hence of chastity into the 20's at least (1904, II:120-1). But at the same time he advocated a much greater openness in discussion about sexuality at all levels: "It is, therefore, one of the cardinal sins against youth to

repress healthy thoughts of sex at the proper age" (1904, II:109). Hall discussed masturbation at length and with great frankness, and urged frankness with young people, although he still regarded it as an unnatural phenomenon (Ross, 1972:328). His book alienated many teachers and pedagogues because of the length and frankness of his discussions about sexuality; it was quickly banned from some libraries (Ross, 1972:344).

Hall can be seen as participating in what Foucault calls the "deployment of sexuality", and more particularly in the "pedagogization of children's sex" (Foucault, 1981:104). Independently of Freud, Hall was a major figure in creating a particular field of discourse about youthful sexuality (after an initial period of enthusiasm, Hall eventually distanced himself from Freud - see chapter 18 of Ross, 1972). Even though he may have shared many of the contemporary "old fashioned" views about the need for chastity, his willingness to discuss the issue of sexuality at all represents a major departure and places him as a leading "deployer" of adolescent sexuality.

Hall's attitudes to coeducation and the education of young women were conservative. Hall argued that women were more "generic" than men and "closer to the race" (1904, II:122): "Woman's body and soul is phyletically older and more primitive , while man is more modern, variable, and less conservative. Women are always more inclined to preserve old customs and ways of thinking" (1904, II:194; cf. II:222, 497, 561). Woman never outgrows adolescence as man does, but rather "lingers in, magnifies and glorifies this culminating stage of life" (II:624).

With regard to higher education at least, Hall advocated a differential education for young men and women, because of what he saw as their very different natures. Part of this relates to a common viewpoint at the time that higher education was medically dangerous for women in various respects

(1904, vol.II, chapter XVII); e.g., Hall placed great stress on what he saw as the problems associated with menstruation, urging that women's "education should be regulated throughout with reference to monthly changes" (II:569). He even recommended the seclusion of women during their menstrual periods, as practised among "savages" (I:510-2). Moreover "nature decrees that with advancing civilization the sexes shall not approximate, but differentiate, and we shall probably be obliged to carry sex distinctions, at least of method, into many if not most of the topics of the higher education" (II:617). Coeducation should cease with adolescence, according to Hall, and higher education for women should be different and specialised, focusing on education for motherhood (II:614, 635). Careers for unwed women were fine, but woman's main responsibility was "the altruism of home and of posterity" (II:589, 611-2). In common with many of his contemporaries, Hall saw women as having a civilizing influence through their domestic activities (II:116, 125, 372, 376).

Hall was very ambiguous about higher education for women. His whole psychology of adolescence is biased towards the characteristics and requirements of males rather than females. Nonetheless he did urge the prolongation of adolescence for both girls and boys, including a period of secondary education; in this general sense his psychology was relevant to both. Moreover the widespread feelings about the necessity of protecting the honour and chastity of young women made them prime candidates for the kind of sheltered environment associated with Hall's notion of adolescence; Kett in fact argues that girls were the first adolescents (1977:137-141). Despite Hall's obvious male bias, his psychology of adolescence does have a general significance.

Hall also clung to other conservative views. He approved of corporal punishment, regarded childhood (as opposed to infancy and adolescence) as a

period of intensive drill, and disliked the complete democratization of public education (Ross, 1972:342). For these reasons, and because of the general rejection of his recapitulation theory, his ideas fell into disrepute in the twentieth century. Nonetheless Hall was one of the key figures in developing the "sciences" of childhood and youth, even if his particular theories were soon abandoned. Ross provides a sympathetic but very balanced appraisal of Hall's significance:

"The imprint of Hall's own effort was most deeply felt in the brief tie he was able to effect between the educational, psychological, and to some extent, medical professions around the center of child study. It took Hall's voracious appetite for experience, and his enormous desire to unify the divergent elements of that experience, to bring together for a time the variety of needs and viewpoints involved. The tie was clearly doomed, and yet it was the most important and fruitful of Hall's creations. From it came central, formative impulses of progressive education, child development, educational psychology, clinical psychology, school hygiene, and mental testing" (1972:366-7).

There is one criticism I wish to make of Ross' meticulous and otherwise excellent biography. This is the idea expressed in her subtitle and elsewhere that Hall can be seen as a "prophet" of adolescence. She suggests that Hall may have been influenced "by the social fact of adolescence itself" - a social fact which following Demos and Kett she suggests had already started to emerge by the end of the nineteenth century - but then goes on to argue instead that it was Hall's own biography and psychological condition which led to his fascination with adolescence.

Regardless of the strength that this argument possesses, the implication Ross draws from this that Hall was a prophet of a social change occurring elsewhere and for other reasons downplays Hall's own central significance in the creation of the modern concept and institution of adolescence. Hall did not simply reflect or prophesy social changes occurring elsewhere - he was deeply involved in these social changes. To a greater extent than Ross, I see

twentieth century adolescence as being defined through specific social and cultural factors, rather than through universal biological and psychological ones. The various discourses of adolescence, within which Hall was a central figure, enter into the very construction of adolescence in its particular twentieth century form.

As with Wakefield, it was the constitution of a field of discourse that was crucial, rather than the direct influence of a particular set of ideas. The particular balance between control and liberalization advocated by Hall no longer finds many adherents today, and has not for a long time. But Hall provided at a critical juncture a scientific legitimation of the liberalization of patriarchal authority in relation to children and adolescents. He was a key figure in establishing the modern institution of adolescence as a "natural" phenomenon, as something which is taken-for-granted as a universal biologically and psychologically determined phase of life. Hence the "naturalization of adolescence" (from my chapter title) has a double meaning - to render it as commonsense, but also to constitute it as a phenomenon susceptible to investigation from a natural-scientific perspective.

Following Foucault and Donzelot, this liberalized situation is no longer characterized by the authoritarian dictates of the law, but rather by the flexibility and adaptability of the norm. As Donzelot says, the liberalized family is distinguished by the flotation of traditional family values and new social norms, leaving families and individuals free - within limits - to find their own balance between the two. In this light, Hall's particular combination is not as important as the role he played in establishing the principle of flotation and the field of discourse associated with it.

SECTION III: STATE SECONDARY EDUCATION AND MERITOCRACY

State secondary education is a critical element of this field of discourse. In pre-World War II South Australia, adolescence as a specific period of life set apart from the adult world was still limited to a small percentage of relatively privileged juveniles. Paid or unpaid work was still the norm for most children past the school leaving age of 13 (14 from 1915), and even for many children who had not yet reached this age (see Chapter 4 above, and Tables III and IV below, pp.317-9). In the sense used here, adolescence did not exist for the vast majority. State secondary education was the avenue for the development of adolescence as a universal stage of extended dependency marked off from the adult world. As such, it was also an important aspect of the liberalized family. The dilution of patriarchal authority through the granting of property, welfare and suffrage rights to women, and corresponding state intervention on behalf of children, implied that the state should bear an increased responsibility in deciding the fate of children. This can be seen in the stock contemporary phrase, "children of the state", which referred explicitly to state wards, but which also implied some degree of state responsibility for "normal" children. In a formally democratic system, patriarchal and more generally familial authority was no longer acceptable as the source and arbiter of children's destiny. People had to prove themselves worthy of a high station in life through a free and open competition.

The change from master/servant to employer/employee and associated political changes carried with it the assumption that in the twentieth century all classes possessed status equality and that bright and ambitious people would always be able to rise in the world regardless of lowly birth. I use the word meritocracy as a shorthand way to describe this set of assumptions concerning status equality. The term was originally used in the nineteenth century by advocates of the British working class in the

struggle against aristocratic privilege (Young, 1958). It is particularly appropriate in the context of late nineteenth and early twentieth century Australia because of the increasing importance of organized labour and its political representatives in this period. Aristocratic privilege and the old-style familial system of power associated with it was particularly obnoxious from this meritocratic perspective. The latter implied a homogenization of educational experiences so that everyone would be given the chance to participate in a free and open competition, regardless of class, gender, or ethnicity. Only within this homogenized system could a fair competition and a fair distribution of rewards take place. Differentiation would still take place, of course; but it would be differentiation on the basis of natural abilities, of real talent and aptitude, rather than on the basis of aristocratic privilege or other arbitrary factors. To repeat a passage from Foucault already quoted:

"In a sense, the power of normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialities and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another. It is easy to understand how the power of the norm functions within a system of formal equality, since within a homogeneity that is the rule, the norm introduces, as a useful imperative and as a result of measurement, all the shading of individual differences" (1979:184).

The meritocratic possibilities of state secondary education are a political analogue of the liberalization of patriarchal authority. The opening up of educational chances for underprivileged groups is a direct analogue as well as a necessary support of the tolerance Hall advocated as the proper parental attitude to adolescents. Adolescents were to be given a voice both in relation to their parents and in relation to the political and economic structure of society. The empowering of working class and lower middle class youths through state secondary education was vital to the universalization of adolescence and hence to the establishment of the liberalized family with its (ideally) tolerant attitudes to children.

So also was the establishment of secondary and higher education for women, in line with the relatively mild form of feminism discussed in the previous chapter. This kind of feminism recognized a limited role for paid employment for women - as a social and financial prelude to marriage, as a necessity for unmarried women and widows, and for married women as a supplement to the main familial income supplied by the male breadwinner. Ideally these jobs should be of a "social" character, preparing for or reinforcing women's primary domestic role. This recognition implied the necessity of at least a limited amount of secondary and higher education for women, a necessity reinforced by the increasing demand that women needed to be trained for the domestic role itself.

This progressive meritocratic viewpoint did not of course triumph without many battles and setbacks. These, as much as its central ideological thrust, shaped its eventual dominant position within South Australian education, making necessary an analysis of these battles. In pre-World War II South Australia, the following questions were the terrain of struggle:- (1) should secondary education be universal and compulsory, or should it be limited to certain groups? (2) what kind and degree of differentiation of courses should take place? (3) should state secondary education be free?

I will begin with a brief historical sketch, and then move on to the debates over state secondary education generated by the financial stringencies of the Great Depression. All of these debates can be related to the twin theme of homogenization and differentiation discussed by Foucault in relation to his distinction between law and norm - what should be the form and limits of educational homogenization, and how should students be ranked or differentiated within this homogenized system?

SECTION IV: WOMEN'S EDUCATION IN THE LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY

The first state secondary school in South Australia was the Advanced School for Girls, established in 1879 in Franklin Street, Adelaide (Jones, 1980:69, 83; see also Jones, 1985; and MacKinnon, 1980, 1984a). It was meant to provide the kind of higher education for girls that private schools like St. Peter's and Prince Alfred Colleges provided for boys (Thiele, 1975:25).

Private girls' schools before this date were generally small "governess-style" ventures which aimed to produce genteel, cultured and marriageable ladies (Jones, 1980:123-5). For example, a new Catholic school advertised "a thorough middle-class education" in the Southern Cross of 20-1-1868, with lessons in music, German and drawing (Nicholas, 1953:116). A "Ladies Seminary" (also Catholic) opened at Robe Street, Port Adelaide, in 1870, with lessons in ancient and modern languages and music (1953:117). Miss Linser in 1884 advertised morning classes for pupils under 14 in English, Music, French, German and Drawing (Register, 7-7-1884, p.1).

By way of contrast, the Sisters of Mercy opened their first "House of Mercy" in 1880 for girls of "the domestic class":

"At this institution ladies will find good servants, and girls of unblemished reputation will find a comfortable home. The protection of such girls is one of the chief works of the Sisters of Mercy in all parts of the world" (advertisement quoted in Nicholas, 1953:128-9).

Up until 1879, then, girls were educated in languages, music and drawing if they had any aspirations as young ladies. A genteel life of leisure for their daughters was a status symbol for middle class families: "Possession of an educated daughter became a sort of prestige symbol, a crude form of conspicuous consumption" (Kett, 1977:138). "Domestic science" had no place

in the curriculum of young ladies at this time - it was still a sign of servile status.

The Advanced School for Girls did not have any needlework or cookery classes (Jones, 1980:93-4). The subjects taught in the first years included English, French, German and Drawing; in the upper classes, Latin, Algebra, Euclid and Physiology were taught (1980:87). The parents were mainly middle class - business, professional, civil servants, clergymen, shopkeepers, school teachers, skilled craftsmen and farmers. More girls came from private than from public schools. Ages ranged from 11 to 20 years, and most students were beyond the age and standard of compulsion (1980:90, 96). In 1884 Andrew Scott came to the school to teach mathematics. Private schools did not give a sound knowledge of maths, while girls from public schools had been deprived of at least half a day of arithmetic each week in favour of needlework (1980:93-4).

The Advanced School for Girls was oriented to success in public examinations and to providing middle class women with new job opportunities. Conspicuous success in exams and ability to show a profit (fees were £3-3-0 per quarter - Jones, 1980:84) ensured the acceptance of the Advanced School for Girls for 30 years (1980:114). Advanced Schools for Girls students went on to private schools as teachers and helped to change the status of girls' education in these schools. Public examinations came to be demanded by more and more parents (1980:109). There were only two major criticisms - competition with private schools; and the over-emphasis on exams, which were seen as too stressful for girls (1980:97-8; cf. Thiele, 1975:41). There were no comparable private schools till 1898, when Tormore House School opened; the Methodist Ladies College followed soon after in 1902 (1980:97). The Advanced School for Girls' record enrolment of 183 girls came in 1892 (1980:100). From 1901 numbers fell steadily because of

competition from the two new schools just mentioned, the growing demand for commercial education (supplied by business colleges), and moves towards free state secondary education.

The Advanced School for Girls represented a departure from the previous model of female education which was concerned with cultivating female "accomplishments" and hence improving marriageability. The contrast should not be overdrawn, however. Nineteenth century feminism saw women's major role as a domestic one - indeed, as argued in the last chapter, it was one of the main forces in defining the nature of this role. Paid employment was consistent with this model, but was essentially ancillary to women's domestic duties. The success of the Advanced School for Girls may still have been linked - if more indirectly than before - with improving the marriageability of its students. A period of secondary education, possibly followed by a short period of employment, may well have made these women more attractive as marriage partners to well-educated bourgeois men. In addition, it may have helped to fill the vacuum in the lives of young women created by the nineteenth century cult of domesticity with its largely ornamental status for bourgeois women.

Another element in the emerging definition of gender roles was the upgrading of domestic duties from its servile status. These duties were increasingly sanctified as women's specific contribution to King and Country, rather than being seen as demeaning chores best left to low-status domestic servants. Again state schooling played a major role here. The first move towards the teaching of domestic economy in schools (except needlework) came in 1885. The Adelaide School Board of Advice wrote to the Minister of Education suggesting the desirability of cookery classes (Jones, 1980:28).

The Adelaide Board of Advice had close connections with the State Children's Council in the 1890's and was imbued with a similar child-saving philosophy (see p.246 above). Thomas Rhodes was a member of both institutions. Sir Langdon Bonython, proprietor of the Advertiser, was Chairman of the Adelaide Board from 1883 to 1901, while his wife was a member of the State Children's Council (Wimshurst, 1979:33).

Sir Langdon was appointed to the Enquiry into Technical Education in 1886. This led to the formation of the South Australian School of Mines and Industry in 1888. Among the first classes were cookery and dressmaking (Jones, 1980:28-9). In 1890 the regulations issued by the Education Department suggested at least two "special lessons" per week in practical subjects. Cookery was suggested for girls; carpentry, gardening or farming for boys (Jones, 1980:29; Miller, 1980:296-7). In December 1900, Mrs. Hills, the second female inspector in the Education Department, established a "Domestic Economy School" in Grote Street, Adelaide. Girls from state schools spent two hours per week sewing and three hours at domestic economy at this school (Jones, 1980:36-9; cf. Education Gazette, 1901:122). Jones notes that students were not trained in housecleaning, the main task of the domestic servant, and concludes: "There is no evidence to link the planning of domestic economy classes with preparation for domestic service" (1980:66). This perhaps suggests a concentration on the less demeaning aspects of housework, in an attempt to raise the status of this occupation.

SECTION V: THE EARLY YEARS OF STATE HIGH SCHOOLS

The first steps in the public provision of secondary education for boys and girls were taken in 1906. In August Labor Premier Tom Price announced a "Sixth Class" institution in Adelaide and advanced classes in selected

country schools. These classes, also known as "continuation classes", were intended as the first year of secondary education. In March 1908, the Advanced School for Girls amalgamated with the adjoining Continuation School and in September 1908 this combined school changed its name to Adelaide High School (Jones, 1980:111-2; Thiele, 1975:82-4). As in the larger primary schools (especially the city Model Schools) and in the later secondary schools, the girls continued to be taught in a separate section from the boys (Jones, 1980:70, 112).

The establishment of state high schools was largely the responsibility of Alfred Williams, Director of Education from 1906 to 1913. Williams was heavily influenced by the new psychology of adolescence. In April 1907, Williams and Frank Tate, his opposite number in Victoria, attended an Education Conference in London (Thiele, 1975:83). Williams went on to a number of other countries in Europe and to the United States of America. His report of that trip is full of the new psychology, which he uses to argue for the introduction of state secondary education:

".....the significance of adolescence is coming to be more clearly understood, and it is realized that at this critical period of life the boy or girl needs suitable occupation, wise guidance and help more than at any other period of life" (Williams, 1908:7).

Immediately following this passage is a short quote from "Dr. Stanley Hall". Then comes a long quote from Dr. Paton of Great Britain, which begins as follows:

"Education is not for labour only, but for life; and the years between 13 and 17 are the critical and formative years for every human being. Then the physical energies of the body, as in a spring tide, thrill out in every limb and organ. Then the callow brood of instinctive desires, both intellectual and social, are agape, and young native faculties shoot out in rapid, random growth. Then, if ever, is the need for education to guide, restrain, and inspire" (1908:7-8).

Williams organizes his plea for state secondary education under six headings: "(1) It is needed to prevent waste"; "(2) It is needed give the brightest children of poor parents an opportunity to fill the niche in life that their natural endowment fits them for"; "(3) It is rendered necessary by modern industrial competition"; "(4) It is necessary if we are to maintain a stable form of government - a true and not a false democracy"; "(6) We need higher education because of diminishing restraint upon young people, their greater freedom, and their out-door life" (1908:8-14).

Williams' arguments overlap with the ideas expressed about younger children in the street children campaign - e.g. in the following passage from his report, where he recommends evening continuation schools for boys already at work:

"Well-conducted schools of this type would do much to counteract the pernicious influence of the streets, and to train boys to make the most of their powers instead of allowing themselves to drift with the current of natural desires" (1908:67; cf. also Inspector Whitham, 1903, and the Advertiser, 1905, both quoted in Miller, 1980:279, 303).

Again it is important to point out not only the obvious theme of social control in these passages, but also the liberalized attitudes to adolescents, expressed in the kind of terminology used - guiding, restraining, helping, inspiring. There is also the promise of greater democracy and greater equality of opportunity. Williams, himself of working class background (see pp.194-5 above) and appointed by South Australia's first Labor Premier, obviously saw state secondary education as part of a new democratic era.

In 1908, after Alfred Williams' overseas trip, the Adelaide Continuation School was established, which became the Adelaide High School in September 1908 under W.J. Adey. This was an amalgamation of the previous post-primary activities in the city, and combined the Pupil Teachers' School

and the Advanced School for Girls with nature study and laboratory work in physics. In 1909, continuation classes in Gawler, Gladstone, Kapunda, Moonta, Mt. Gambier, Petersburgh, Quorn and Wallaroo Mines became "District High Schools", together with new institutions at Naracoorte, Blumberg (Birdwood) and Port Pirie (Thiele, 1975:82-4). By 1911 there were 18 District High Schools, but the average country enrolment was rarely more than 30 or 40 students. In 1910 high schools were opened at Norwood, Unley, Hindmarsh, and Le Fevre's Peninsula (all in the metropolitan area). The last two were amalgamated to form Woodville High School, leaving the "Big Four" to dominate state secondary education for more than a generation, until the advent of Brighton High School after World War II. From 1920, Higher Primary Schools were established to provide advanced instruction in areas not serviced by a high school (Thiele, 1975:84-5, 143).

In his 1910 Report, Williams elaborated a three-tiered system of post-primary education. The first tier was night continuation schools for those leaving school at age 14 or earlier and working by day (for boys only). The second tier catered for those staying at school till age 16 and then entering skilled trades or other work requiring special training; this group would go to higher primary schools, high schools, agricultural high schools, and trade schools for apprentices. The third tier was for the elite who would go on to the University or take advanced courses at the School of Mines or the Agricultural College (SAPP, 1911-12, no.44, p.39; Miller, 1980:310).

Miller argues (*ibid*) that an almost identical scheme was eventually embodied in the Labor Government's 1915 Education Act (see pp.239-40 above). The scheme was never implemented in its totality. Evening continuation schools were tried but attracted few clients. In 1923 Charles Fenner (Superintendent of Technical Education) advocated compulsory attendance at these classes for 2 to 4 hours a week for all boys and girls not

attending a day school, up to age 17 or 18. This idea does not seem to have been implemented (Miller, 1980:317-8). Presumably working class children resented the discipline and the loss of their leisure time involved in this plan.

In January 1925 another type of secondary education was introduced, catering for non-academic pursuits. These were the "Central Schools" attached to certain large primary schools in the metropolitan area - viz. Croydon, Goodwood, Hindmarsh, Le Fevre's, Nailsworth, Norwood, Port Adelaide, Thebarton and Unley. These schools combined three kinds of courses - Junior Technical, Commercial, and Home-making, all of two years duration. Students in the first two courses at least could transfer to the third year at a High School or at Thebarton Technical School. This latter school was started in 1919, but was not fully available to students until 1924, because it was initially used to accommodate apprentices. It provided a wide range of courses up to four years in length, and students could sit for the Intermediate and Leaving certificates of the Public Examinations Board (Thiele, 1975:154-6).

Trethewey (1977:5-9) and Miller (1980:305-18) both argue in terms of a "liberal" vs. a "technicist" attitude to secondary education. Liberals advocated a common education for all children until about age 15, with occupationally-related subjects added in the later years to a common curriculum. Technicists advocated early differentiation at the secondary level and a closer linkage with probable future occupations (Miller, 1980:300-1, 305). The Director of Education in South Australia from 1919 to 1929 was W.T. McCoy. He was responsible for the introduction of Central Schools (Thiele, 1975:154-5). Trethewey (1980:5) argues that he sided with the liberal view, unlike Charles Fenner (Superintendent of Technical Education, 1916-39):

"Consequent upon acceptance of the tenets of the Hadow Report (published in England in 1926) which recommended a general secondary education for all modified by a vocational bias, McCoy implemented a variety of courses in central schools to cater for individual differences in ability, interests and occupational needs" (Trethewey, 1977:8).

Technical education in Victoria and New South Wales was of a more technicist nature (1977:8-9). Miller adopts a very similar position:

"Instead of 'separate types of schools', William McCoy, the new Director of Education, started implementing a scheme of differentiated education within common institutions" (1980:315).

While there may be some truth in these arguments (especially as regards the possibility of transferring from a Central School to a High School) the contrast seems rather overdrawn. Even though Central Schools provided "differentiated education within common institutions", all three courses were notably non-academic in orientation. This was little different from the situation in the other states. The fact that commercial and technical courses were taught side-by-side perhaps reflects a degree of middle class/working class miscegenation, in line with the liberal ideal; but enrolments in the commercial course were negligible as compared with the technical or home-making courses (Trethewey, appendix A; students wishing a commercial education presumably went to private business colleges).

The argument perhaps carries more weight in relation to Thebarton Technical School, which Thiele (1975:156) describes as "a forerunner of the comprehensive secondary school". The higher status of this school is reflected in the fact that unlike Central Schools it was necessary to obtain a Qualifying Certificate before entry (as of course with the high schools) (Quinn-Young, 1982:30).

Dissatisfaction with the second-rate nature of the Central Schools soon became apparent:

"In response to criticisms that central schools had not gone far enough in extending genuine secondary education to all, the decade following their establishment witnessed attempts to raise their status by lengthening the initial two year course to three years; supplementing internal assessment leading to the award of a Central School Certificate with the opportunity to sit for the P.E.B. Intermediate Certificate examination, and strengthening cultural subjects" (Trethewey, 1977:178).

To further illustrate these debates over the form and limits of educational homogenization, I will quote some extracts from a booklet published by the Education Department in 1934. Large parts of this are virtually reprinted from the Education Gazette of 1924-5. The booklet consists mainly of descriptions of the various jobs open to young people and the qualifications necessary for each. In the "Special Articles" at the front is included "A Letter from the Director of Education - to the parents of a BOY about to complete his primary schooling", and ditto for a GIRL. These letters contain recommendations about the secondary schools appropriate for a particular vocation. The choices are limited by the student's success in the Qualifying Certificate exam at the end of primary school:

"If your son is successful at the Qualifying Examination for which he has entered, you may decide to choose a school of higher grade which is likely to provide teaching best suited to his future needs. A boy attending a metropolitan school who obtains less than 450 marks at the Qualifying Certificate Examination would, in most cases, receive a more suitable education by taking one of the Craft Courses at a Central School than by enrolling at a high school" (1934:15).

The description begins with the Thebarton Junior Technical School, providing 2, 3, or 4 year courses:

"The full course is designed to provide the necessary preliminary training for those who desire to become architects, technical teachers, mechanical engineers, draughtsmen, surveyors, civil or hydraulic engineers, etc., while the shorter courses prepare boys for entry to the skilled branches of industry, etc." (1934:15-6).

Next come the Junior Technical Schools (2 to 3 year course - part of Central Schools):

"This course is designed to improve the general education of, and give the necessary vocational bias to, a boy who desires to become a skilled mechanic" (1934:16).

With the high schools (3 to 5 years) there is some overlap with Thebarton (architects, surveyors, engineers), illustrating the high status of the latter, but generally the list of occupations has a much more middle class feeling than in the technical schools:

"If, however, you desire that your son should remain at school for a period longer than two years beyond the Primary stage, or if you wish him to enter the Banking or the Public Service, to become a surveyor, a lawyer, an architect, a doctor, a chemist, a dentist, a teacher, a mining or civil engineer, or a student at the University, or if you are willing that he should remain for not less than two years in order to obtain a commercial education, he should enter a High School" (1934:16-7).

The High School is also the place "for those who wish to have a liberal education" (1934:17) - a claim which indicates a desire to connect state high schools with the broader educational ambitions of the major private schools.

In country towns are the Higher Primary Schools (2 years):

"Their purpose is to afford opportunities for advanced instruction for two years to country pupils who are unable to attend a High School or a Central School. English, history, geography, arithmetic, singing, and physical training are taught, and in addition, the Head Teacher selects from two to four optional subjects from a list containing mathematics, science, drawing, book-keeping, business correspondence, shorthand, agriculture, and woodwork, being guided in his selection to a large extent by the probable future needs of the pupils" (1934:17).

Finally come the Supplementary Courses for schools situated more than 10 miles from a High School or Higher Primary School.

The letter to the parents of a girl is very similar to the above, the main difference being that Home-Making Schools (or Girls' Central Schools) replace Junior Technical Schools:

"The Course of Study extends over three years, and aims at qualifying girls for the skilful performance of home duties, whilst continuing their general education. It also provides suitable training for those who wish to become dressmakers, milliners, art students, etc., besides giving them valuable preparation for their future duties as wives and mothers" (1934:19).

These schools also provide courses in elementary business correspondence, typewriting and shorthand.

For the High Schools there is a shortened list of occupations as compared with the boys - surveyor, architect, mining or civil engineer are missing, otherwise the list is the same. Girls also have Domestic Art Centres attached to most High Schools. In the Higher Primary Schools the list of subjects is the same up to and including "shorthand"; then, instead of "agriculture and woodwork", girls have "domestic arts" (1934:19-20).

This booklet clearly illustrates the debates over educational homogenization during the early period of state secondary education, and the very partial nature of this homogenization. There is a very clear distinction between education for males and females, with the latter being primarily trained for home duties; and also between education for different classes, with a clear difference between high schools and central or technical schools, complicated somewhat by the high status of Thebarton Junior Technical School. There was assumed to be a direct linkage between a particular type of education and the probable future destination of the student, and streaming into different kinds of secondary education occurred at an early age. This was no doubt related to more widespread trends, but also reflected the relatively simple nature of the South Australian economy during this period, which was

still largely agricultural. This simplicity would have given credence to the kind of direct relation between education and occupation seen as the ideal.

SECTION VI: NORMALIZATION AND THE COLLEGES

"It is interesting to speculate upon the various openings available for our boys and girls leaving school. It is obvious that the school children of one generation become the active citizens of the State in the following generation. Under our social and economic conditions, there is no position in the State that is not open to ambitious and capable men and women" (Education Department, 1934:7).

This quotation illustrates the meritocratic ideology of progressive educationists. Such an ideology is potentially in conflict with the aims of the leading private schools because of its levelling and homogenizing tendencies. State education was originally intended for children of the "lower orders", as we saw in the last chapter. Primary education was considered sufficient for most of these, except for a small minority who went on to secondary education via an extremely selective scholarship system. The introduction of free state secondary education posed much more of a threat to the big private schools, which had concentrated mainly on secondary education. The relation between state and private schools has, in many different guises, been the source of many debates around the issue of educational normalization - of the proper balance between homogenization and differentiation.

Private schools were obviously concerned about cheap or free state secondary education (see, e.g., Gibbs, 1984:147-152 for Prince Alfred College), but on the whole their opposition was not very strong. The introduction of state primary education in 1875 does not seem to have affected the private schools very much either. Nicholas (1953:36-41) produces statistics to show that private schools in South Australia maintained or even increased their enrolments in the 1880's and 1890's. At Prince Alfred College, there was a

decline in numbers after the opening of state high schools, but this trend was reversed after WWI. Former headmaster Ward argues that the high schools eventually bolstered the demand for secondary education:

"As High Schools spread over the country districts as well as the city, they created among most people of the State an appetite for secondary education; and as the number of people desiring further schooling for their boys increased, so the tide turned again, and more and more boys found their way to schools such as Prince Alfred.....It must be admitted that in the early 1920's times were very good; but, even so, there is no doubt that the big increase in the school was fundamentally due to the increased desire for secondary education" (Ward, 1951:113).

If Ward is correct, then secondary education was coming to be increasingly seen as the general pattern - not at this stage for everyone, but for everyone with any pretensions to middle class or respectable status. But rather than speaking simply of a general appetite, it could still be the case that well-to-do parents felt threatened by state high schools and consequently put greater pressure on their children to succeed in their scholastic careers.

In 1927-8, IQ tests were introduced for all high school entrants (Thiele, 1975:154). The 1920's also witnessed an increasing concern with age-grading in state schools (Wimshurst, 1979:100; Miller, 1980:193). Both of these developments reflected a biological/bureaucratic notion of age and implied a fixed sequence of intellectual development. Children from well-to-do families could no longer assume as a birthright that they would gravitate to the best occupations and positions. They were now required to demonstrate their merit for these positions in a formally open competition with an expanded range of candidates. Age-grading and "objective" measurement of intelligence focused attention on dull or lazy children of the well-to-do, who could no longer count on stumbling through their education in haphazard fashion. I will briefly consider age-grading and related developments in the state schools.

Inspector's reports over the period 1924 to 1926 indicate a greater willingness to promote pupils, and a heightened concern with the age structure of classes. In the Education Gazette (E.G.) of 1924, Inspector S.H. Warren notes that:

"The promotion and classification of children is increasingly satisfactory; the teachers are now understanding more fully that it is not necessary for a child to 'pass' in every subject in order to go up into the next grade; they are learning to take a broader view and one more in accordance with the true welfare of their pupils. It is true, though, that their judgment is not always sound, for, sometimes children are promoted too freely, while at others, pupils are found in classes for which they are too old" (E.G., 1924:112).

In 1926, Inspector L.H. Jeffries commented that:

"The teachers are to be commended for the discretion they have exercised in making promotions. If an error occurs at all, it is usually on the side of being too liberal. Where children have been at a disadvantage because of lack of early facilities, teachers are usually most zealous in their endeavours to push them on to a grade as near as possible to that in which, according to their age, they should be" (E.G., 1926:98; see also 1924:111, 132-4; 1925:92, 97-8; 1926:80, 95-100).

Special attention was paid to age-grading in the Infant Schools. Inspector Longmore reported in 1926 that:

"The admission of children whose age is above the average for the Grade, and who frequently come from private schools, still presents difficulty. The Infant Mistress gives these children special attention to try to fit them for promotion. Many double promotions of bright children are made" (E.G., 1926:80; cf. 1924:132, 134).

At the other end of primary school, there seems to be a tendency to exclude the older scholars. In a circular to teachers found in the Education Gazette for 1924 (p.2), it is advised that children under the age of 13 who have obtained their Qualifying Certificate may re-enrol in Grade VII if they do not wish to enter a High School or Higher Primary School. Children over 13 but under the school leaving age of 14 could only do so with the special

permission of the Director. In 1925 such exemption was no longer possible (the Education Act of 1915 had made it compulsory for children who had obtained their certificate to continue with their schooling until the school leaving age of 14 was reached - Quinn-Young, 1982:15). In a comparable circular, we find:

"Special Note.- In future, no child in the metropolitan area, who, on the 1st day of January was 13 years of age, or more, and who has passed the Qualifying Certificate, is to be enrolled at a Primary School" (E.G., 1925:266).

Pupils between 13 and 14 were now required to attend a high school if they were within a three mile radius (*ibid*). Another indication of concern with older scholars is the increasing percentage of candidates who passed the Qualifying Certificate examination. In 1921 it was 78%; it went up to 80% in 1922; to 83% in 1923; to 88% in 1924; and then down to 86% in 1925 (E.G., 1925:44; 1926:55).

Closely related to the above developments was the appointment of Constance Davey in 1924 as the first psychologist in the Education Department:

"Her field was a daunting one covering retarded, difficult, delinquent and supernormal children, the organization of appropriate classes for them, the training of teachers in these areas, testing and vocational guidance, experimental work, and the development of after-care services" (Thiele, 1975:154).

"Opportunity classes" for slow learners were started by Davey in 1925 (E.G., 1925:239; News, 15/12/31; see Colwell, 1975:44-54, for a fictional account of a class of "Oppos" in 1930's Adelaide). This move is obviously connected with the increasing homogeneity of classes. Over-age or subnormal pupils were banished, allowing teachers to more easily implement a common curriculum, and to link this curriculum more closely to the needs of a

particular age-group. Inspector Warren expressed his concern about subnormal pupils in 1924:

"There are few schools of any size in which children who are subnormal are not met. Usually they are not fit cases for Minda*, yet they are not doing much good where they are. Everyone looks forward to the time when special schools for such defectives will be available, but, in the meantime, they are a source of great worry to many teachers and of some little mind-searching to the Inspector" (E.G., 1924:124).

*(home for intellectually retarded children in Adelaide)

As with irregular attenders (see p.237 above), subnormal or delinquent children interfered with the rest of the class and prevented the teacher from implementing the curriculum. Teachers' desires for increased professional status required a homogeneous class, with all pupils at a similar level of development, and all with at least some interest in the lessons. Only in this way could teachers moderate their emphasis on discipline, and present lessons which could be tackled by the whole class. Hiving off problematic cases allowed a more effective ranking and differentiation among the remaining homogenized students.

There are a number of developments in the private schools which perhaps represent a response to the emerging meritocratic system of the state schools.

One is the development of preparatory schools. In the nineteenth century, the leading private schools (St. Peter's and Prince Alfred's being the foremost) only accepted boys at about age 10 or 11. Boys usually went to small, private preparatory schools before enrolling at College. For example, Harold Gilbert left home at 9 to live with a family at Semaphore who prepared boys for St. Peter's (Gilbert, 1973:59; see pp.145-8 above), to which he progressed at age 10. Mrs. Jacobs advertised a "Preparatory Class for the Sons of Gentlemen" in the Register, 19/7/1884, (p.1), in North Adelaide: "Mrs.

Louis Jacob receives a limited number of little Boys to thoroughly ground in English, Latin, etc.". At Prince Alfred College, J.A.Hartley (head from 1871-5, before he became Inspector-General of the Education Department) was keen on introducing a Preparatory School: "During his first year he suggested that the school should begin a Preparatory School and not restrict itself, as it had till then, to boys of late Primary and Secondary stages" (Ward, 1951:32-3). He proposed to take boys at about 7 years of age (*ibid*). In 1872 Preparatory Classes were introduced, although Ward does not indicate whether they were compulsory or how comprehensive they were (1951:33). It was only in 1911 that a separate Preparatory School was established for 7 to 11 year olds, with its own Master-in-charge (1951:114-5). In 1910 St. Peter's College had also established a Preparatory School (Nicholas, 1953:53).

The timing of these two developments - coming just a few years after the opening of Adelaide High School in 1908 - strongly suggests an element of concern about competition from the state educational system, and a desire to streamline and improve the colleges in the face of this competition.

Another indication of this concern is the rapid expansion of the Old Collegians' Association at Prince Alfred in the years 1906-10: "It was in these years.... that the Association became a large body, and that most of its yearly round of social functions and contests in games with St. Peter's old boys was developed" (Ward, 1951:125). Membership rose from 623 at the end of 1906, to 900 in 1907, 1,042 in 1908, and 1,200+ in 1910 (*ibid*). In 1907 30 old boys who were members of the Order of Freemasons founded the Prince Alfred Collegians' Lodge - the first College lodge. They were quickly followed by St. Peter's, and in 1910 the two lodges joined together in a United Collegians' Chapter (1951:130). These old boy networks can be read as responses to the levelling tendencies of state secondary education. They could be used to provide employment opportunities or other benefits for the less successful

students. More importantly they fostered esprit de corps, a sense of belonging to an exclusive and selected group, even when not involved in formal studies.

At school, extracurricular activities provided alternative sources of esteem as well as general feelings of solidarity. A House System was introduced at Prince Alfred in 1920: "In 1920 the House System was introduced as a means of ensuring that a larger proportion of the boys in the school would take part in school games....It should be noted that the House Competition included points for work in school as well as in games" (Ward, 1951:148). This could be read in terms of a heightened competitive ethos throughout the school, in both scholastic and extracurricular activities. It should be noted, however, that "Muscular Christianity" in the reformed English tradition of Thomas Arnold of Rugby was an essential ingredient of South Australia's colleges right from the start (Daly, 1982:71-3).

As argued above (pp.198-200) in a more general context, state education not only acts as a form of social control over working class children, it redefines the whole nature of education, affecting bourgeois children as well. Private schools were forced to react in various ways to the introduction of state secondary education, and in the process lost some of their distinctiveness. Some state schools - especially Adelaide High School - have at times developed reputations to rival the leading private colleges. Writing in 1964, Beare noted that Adelaide High School soon claimed equal status with the colleges in sport and in academic results. "Until recently" it was the only high school with rowing (introduced in 1910 - Adelaide High School, 1983:9); it was the only state school that competed with the colleges in the Combined Schools Sports (the colleges' annual athletics carnival); its first football team played in an afternoon association against the bigger colleges; and its senior staff were admitted to the Public Schools Club - "a quiet preserve of the private schools" (1964:363; cf. Miller, 1986:137-9).

The colleges themselves have never quite measured up to the proud traditions of the English public schools to which they have often aspired. At Prince Alfred around the turn of the century, for example, the boarders saw themselves as quite different from the day-boys; in fact they regarded themselves as the school. But less than a quarter of the students were boarders. Headmaster Chapple lamented that "It is a pity to think how few boys in South Australia are living the life that in days gone by had made Englishmen leaders of the world" (quoted in Gibbs, 1984:99). There were initiations for new boarders, but these were not as rigorous or as brutal as those in English public schools (1984:107). Boarders declined in significance after World War II, their numbers dropping from 138 in 1951 to 125 in 1981 (1984:349). All in all, there has never been the same yawning gap between "public" and state schools in South Australia as there is in Britain. There has been a far greater continuity across the whole educational spectrum.

Nonetheless, in the pre-World War II situation, secondary education of any sort remained the preserve of a small minority. Schemes for the universalization of secondary education/adolescence still revolved heavily around the social and political control of working class children, rather than being based on positive integration via a homogeneous meritocratic system. It was assumed that primary education provided sufficient opportunities for bright working class children to demonstrate their talents, so that they could go on to an academic secondary education at the state high schools. For the majority of the age-group, education stopped at the primary level. Some went on to the specifically working class secondary education of the Central Schools, but progressive educationists had great difficulty in persuading working class families that secondary education was a universal necessity (as we saw above with night continuation classes - pp.280-1). At this time, secondary education would not have been necessary for the kinds of jobs

available to working class teenagers, and hence there was no incentive for these people to participate in it.

SECTION VII: THE LIMITS OF HOMOGENIZATION

The Great Depression helped to bring out these assumptions underlying state secondary education, and in fact threw its whole structure and purpose back into the melting pot. I now turn to the debates which emerged during this period.

The Great Depression began early in South Australia. Unemployment among trade unionists rose from a relatively low average of 5.2% in 1926, to 7.2% in 1927, 15.0% in 1928, 15.7% in 1929, 23.3% in 1930, and 32.5% in 1931; it peaked at 34.0% in 1932 (Broomhill, 1978:12). From 1928 to 1934, South Australia did considerably worse than the other Australian states (in terms of trade union figures) (1978:13).

Budgetary stringency soon focused attention on the Education Department as a possible source of cutbacks in government expenditure. In 1929, the Vice-President of the Chamber of Commerce launched a critique of free state secondary education. He saw no reason why high school resources should be wasted on boys who were going to be labourers (Thiele, 1975:168; see also the President of the Taxpayers' Association in the Advertiser, 1/8/31). In December 1930 Labor Premier Lionel Hill announced a committee of enquiry into education (Advertiser, 23/12/30). A vigorous debate in the press and elsewhere ensued over the next few years.

I have gratefully used the newspaper clipping books of the S.A. Education Department for studying this debate. These have been published as Murray Park Sources in the History of South Australian Education, no.4 (5

vols., 1926-41). My references are only to the original newspaper articles. I have distinguished between three positions - conservative, middle class progressive, and Labor Party progressive. I begin with the conservatives.

The main conservative argument was about the appropriateness of secondary education. High schools were accused of fostering clerical rather than manual skills; providing an academic rather than a commercial education; encouraging urban clerical or business work rather than rural pursuits; and educating girls in the wrong skills. Underlying all these arguments was the view that primary education was sufficient for the vast majority of people, and that secondary education would only engender unrealisable expectations if opened to this majority:

"I dare say that secondary education is a sheer waste of time for three out of four children. At 14, say, a boy desires to go out and get a job. He has a liking for some particular work - but no, he must be sent to school for another three years. At the end of that time he emerges with little more than a distaste for the honest job for which he was best suited" (Professor E.H. Davies, in News, 12/1/32).

State education was also seen as interfering with free enterprise and the natural duties of parents:

"Is it necessary to carry all young people past the primary standard at the public expense to discover intellectual geniuses? The survival of the fittest is a natural law in the life of man. If there are signs of outstanding ability in any boy or girl, why should the State be called upon to shoulder the cost and responsibility of developments which are the sole responsibility of the parent? Why should the State pay the cost of children learning to cook and sew? That is the function of the mothers" (Chas. Hedger, Prospect, in the Advertiser, 2/5/33).

Perhaps the most interesting letters relate to the tendency of high schools to check initiative:

"Apart from the costs, it savours too much of spoonfeeding, of which our youth have hitherto had far too much, as it tends to check incentive and destroy personal ambition and grit.....Real

education begins not on entering, but on leaving school, and is lifelong" (Stephen Parsons - one of many letters - Advertiser, 16/5/31).

"Now that there is a likelihood of free education being abolished we may get something from the masses, in the line of solid, hard work, and get back some of our lost ground....(too much education is bad - AW)....What false ideas it creates in the minds of these children, and what a race of discontents" (Mrs. K. Ryan, Balaklava, Advertiser, 12/9/33).

One correspondent drew a direct comparison between free high schools and pensions or doles. Free high schools were a luxury. The pioneers had not needed them - their greatest asset was commonsense: "They scorned public or Government relief, such as pensions or doles" (Miss D. O'Connor, Sussex St., North Adelaide, in Advertiser, 29/8/33). A number of correspondents argued that the masses are not intellectually equipped to take advantage of high schools. "V.G.H." of Westbourne Park complained of too many men "of only average ability" entering the professions - "These men would be more suitable as skilled tradesmen and clerical workers" (Advertiser, 22/2/32). Similarly the Rev. W.H. Irwin of St. Peters favoured the "selective ladder of the scholarship system"; there was an oversupply of professionally trained people "of fair average quality" (Advertiser, 23/6/33).

Finally I have found at least one letter which argues against free high schools from a working class point of view:

"Is it preferable to retrench railway workers so that the children of the higher paid civil servants and others similarly placed may continue to attend high schools at public expense?" (J.M. Drew, Adelaide News, 10/7/31).

The conservative viewpoint saw little need for state high schools at all. Secondary education would simply engender false aspirations and train people beyond their proper station in life. Given that secondary education was not necessary for most jobs, this position was more realistic than the progressive viewpoint, whatever one may think about the politics involved.

The progressive viewpoint in favour of free high schools included people of widely different political persuasions. I do not wish to go too deeply into the political situation which was very complex. The Labor Party in particular was torn by factional disputes and eventually disintegrated in 1933 when Premier Lionel Hill and his few remaining supporters were replaced by the Butler LCL government (see Hopgood, 1970; Pettman, 1975; Lonie, 1976). I will simplify matters by referring to the Labor Party viewpoint, even though there were several competing Labor Parties at the time.

Lionel Hill remained a strong supporter of free high schools and of the stance of the South Australian Public School Teachers' Union (SAPSTU) on the issue - e.g. at the annual SAPSTU conference of 1931, after Hill had given the opening address, the President described him as the greatest friend of education in South Australia today (News, 24/8/31). For present purposes, then, there seems to be a strong connection between the Labor Party and the SAPSTU, as noted before in relation to an earlier period (see pp.238-9).

The progressive arguments included the following: most parents cannot afford fees for high schools; applications for exemption on grounds of poverty would be humiliating; education is directly linked to economic progress; employers are demanding high school certificates; keeping teenagers at school relieves youth unemployment; high schools are needed to protect young children during the dangerous years of adolescence and to keep them off the streets; high schools provide training in citizenship, duty, culture, etc. I will illustrate these arguments with a few quotations:

"The period of adolescence which is viewed by educationists as critical, appears to be, in the view of the critics, the only time for which the State should make no provision except perhaps on the lines of technical training..... Many who are not bright enough, or do not remain long enough at school to gain much academic distinction, do gain at a high school or college something which they could not gain elsewhere - broader outlook, habits of concentration, improved power of judgement, and stability of

character" (extracts from SAPSTU statement, "In Defence of High Schools", Advertiser, 6/7/31).

"Education to the top of the primary schools is not enough for our progress and safety. For the welfare and existence of our nation, it is imperative that the masses shall not be ignorant.....The brain today plays a more important part in work than ever before, and tasks requiring muscle and little thought are few. Highly educated leaders directing ignorant employees cannot succeed" (P.A. Corry, President of SAPSTU, Advertiser, 24/8/31).

"It would be a disaster at the present time to even think of throwing additional children on to the streets, taking away from them the education which helps them retain their ideals and saves them from corruption. It would indeed be false economy to save on education and to spend the savings upon additional police protection and prisons" (M.R. Painter, Unley, News, 10/5/33).

As can be seen from this last quotation the progressive viewpoint tended to merge with an emphasis on the dangers of street life and the threat to law and order entailed in this. Particularly with the political polarisation and instability of the Depression, secondary education as already argued was very much linked to social control rather than to voluntary positive integration through the private pursuit of self-interest. This kind of argument was attractive to political conservatives as well as to Labor Party supporters:

"How the Communists must be chuckling over this discussion on education. Nothing could suit them better. By the abolition of secondary education Communism will not only gain a strong weapon to use against Capitalism, but will also gain thousands of receptive young minds as fresh material to work upon" ("Anti-Communist", West Croydon, Advertiser, 27/6/31).

"These adolescents, left without that supervision which is needful until right thought and action become a habit, would easily fall victims to social and political charlatans, and in a few years there would be an army of Red revolutionists menacing our country's peace" (Advertiser, 18/9/31).

These latter views can be associated with the lower middle class progressive view (as opposed to the Labor Party progressive view), which crystallized as the Young People's Employment Council (YPEC). This body was connected with the Citizen's League, a right-wing "nonpolitical" group

started in October 1930 and drawing on lower middle class and small farmer support (Lonie, 1981:147-8). The Citizen's League's main aim was to oppose the "class politics" of the Labor Party (there were Labor governments in both Adelaide and Canberra at the time), but it also proved a thorn in the side of the Liberal Federation for a time, threatening to take over as the main anti-Labor party (1981:147, 149).

In May 1931 they called a conference of people interested in encouraging civic pride and respect for property among youth:

"We believe that it is the moral effect of idleness on those who are on the threshold of industrial life, even more than the necessity of providing them with a livelihood, which has moved the Citizen's League to summon representatives of all the organizations interested in the welfare of the rising generation...." (Advertiser, 28/5/31)

This movement also seems to have been connected with the Rotary Club (Advertiser, 16/5/31, 18/5/31, 2/6/31, 26/6/31). In an earlier article referring to the same meeting we find:

"The community service committee of the Rotary Club has decided to arrange a conference on June 1 to deal further with the question of checking by special educational classes the tendency of children towards vandalism" (Advertiser, 16/5/31).

The organizations participating in this conference included very diverse government, educational, religious, business and welfare groups (see lists in Advertiser, 2/6/31 and 26/6/31).

The first mention of the YPEC I have found is in June 1931, in a short draft prepared by W.R. Birks, Principal of Roseworthy Agricultural College, concerning the "suggested procedure in the formation and functioning of local committees." (South Australian Archives, A644 B8). I have no conclusive evidence that the YPEC resulted from the meeting on June 1 just discussed, but the timing of Birks' proposal and the general nature of YPEC activities

suggests that this was the case. The connection of the YPEC with the Education Department (discussed below) would also suggest this. That the YPEC was connected with the Citizen's League is suggested by the fact that the leader of this latter body was in 1934 Vice-President of the YPEC (E.D.A. Bagot - Advertiser, 4/1/34).

This same set of connections can also be seen in the N.S.W. context, where a network of "Young Citizen's Associations" was started in August 1931 at the behest of the Sydney Rotary Club. These YCA's were also connected with Peter Board (Director of Education in NSW, 1905-22), and with the All For Australia League, a right-wing middle class group reminiscent of the Citizen's League (Shields, 1982:151, 159). Groups similar to the YPEC also appeared in Victoria, WA and Tasmania (Shields, 1982:151).

The precise attitude of the YPEC towards free high schools is hard to ascertain. They do not seem to have made any official pronouncements during the public debate on the subject. They were certainly concerned about the dangerous years of adolescence and the need for adult supervision and guidance during this period, but their main interest was in placing youths in jobs or in educational classes dealing with practical, work-oriented skills. The fact that Mrs. Hill, wife of the Premier, was Honorary Treasurer of the YPEC (Birks, 1931 - South Australian Archives) perhaps indicates some sympathy with free high schools, as does the YPEC's cooperation with the Education Department (Premier Hill was a strong supporter of free high schools - see p.297 above).

In February 1932 the YPEC called a meeting to discuss the problem of unemployed youth. A correspondent of the News claimed that he had attended this meeting, and had suggested raising the school leaving age, but that he had not been given the chance to discuss the question:

"I exercised my right as a citizen to move - 'That this meeting of citizens urge the Government to take immediate steps to raise the compulsory school attendance age from 14 to 16 years.' This was received by applause by 75 per cent of those present. The chairman then closed the meeting by calling on the organist to play the National Anthem" (Jas. L. Cavanagh, Brompton, News, 19/2/32).

Presumably Cavanagh would have been opposed to high school fees if he favoured raising the school leaving age.

The Chairman of the YPEC was Rev. Samuel Forsyth (Methodist minister and founder of the Kuitpo farm colony for the unemployed), who seems to have opposed this view. In August 1932 he is reported as agreeing with the comments of Dr. Thomas, Bishop of Willochra. Among other things, Dr. Thomas had argued that some children would be better off leaving school after the primary stage (News, 25/8/32). In 1934, G.D. Haigh, secretary of the YPEC, advocated raising the school leaving age from 14 to 15 (News, 21/12/34). A resolution to gradually raise the school leaving age to 16 years maximum was also on the agenda at a conference called by the YPEC in 1935 to discuss youth unemployment (Advertiser, 26/11/35; News, 22/11/35)

The evidence is not very conclusive, but there seems to be a division of opinion within the YPEC on the question of high school fees. The official silence of the YPEC on this issue is perhaps related to the delicate balancing act they were engaged in. Many different organizations were affiliated with the YPEC (see Birks, 1931 - South Australian Archives). The Citizen's League was in a similar position, being basically middle class and right of centre politically, but also trying to draw supporters from the faction-ridden Labor Party (Lonie, 1981).

The Citizen's League was co-opted by the Liberal Federation in 1931, under the guise of an umbrella organization, the Emergency Committee of South Australia (Lonie, 1981). After the defeat of the Federal Labor

Government in the same year, the Citizen's League quickly faded from view (Lonie, 1981). At the state elections of 1933, Lionel Hill's Parliamentary Labor Party was routed by the newly-formed Liberal and Country League. The LCL government introduced fees for all high school students in 1934 (they were abolished in 1943 - Thiele, 1975:204).

The YPEC illustrates the ambiguity of the progressive viewpoint. Universal secondary education could very easily slide into social and political control of the working class. As we saw in the last chapter in relation to primary education, many working class people were very dubious about this supposed benefit, and saw it as an alien imposition by the bourgeoisie and their friends among organised labour. The YPEC provides clear illustrations of this social control motive. Its main areas of interest were farmwork for boys, and domestic service for girls. These were the same occupations recommended for state wards at this time (see pp.229-30 above), both being characterised by living-in and hence by close and constant supervision. In the financial difficulties of the Depression, these occupations were obviously seen as suitable forms of "secondary education" for working class teenagers.

A "Women's Auxiliary" of the YPEC was formed and advocated a "House Cadet Scheme". This involved trying to upgrade the status of domestic service through a formal on-the-job training period of 2 years or more, with however fixed and very low wages. This scheme was supported by a range of influential women - Lady Hore-Ruthven (wife of the Governor), Inspector Miethke of the Education Department (whose services were made available to the YPEC on an official basis), and Dr. Ethel Hillier, of the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association (Advertiser, 20/10/31, 18/11/31, 1/12/31, 19/2/32; News, 8/3/32, 18/11/31, 20/11/31). The whole idea was very backward-looking, but it has to be set within the hardships of the 1930's:

"The Young People's Employment Council feels earnestly that the encouragement of work such as that offered by the house cadet scheme will help the girls without lessening the opportunities for men and boys" (News, 20/11/31).

The scheme initially caused quite a deal of controversy. Some women objected strongly to the idea:

"Mrs. A. Radford said the scheme was not going to solve the question of unemployment at all. The right place for such girls to be taught was in the schools in which some subjects could be deleted and domestic arts substituted" (Advertiser, 20/10/31; see also *ibid*, 3/12/31).

At a "stormy meeting" on 17/11/31, Mrs. M.V. Couche, president of the Labor Women's Central Organising Committee, was accused of trying to disrupt the meeting. Her views were the same as Mrs. Radford - central schools should be used for training girls; they should cut out some subjects and concentrate on domestic arts; employers could come to the school to engage girls (News, 18/11/31, 20/11/31; Advertiser, 22/12/31).

Mrs. Couche was also concerned about living-in:

"I contend that a girl of 17 is still a child, and that if she is employed in domestic work she should be allowed to go home to her parents at night" (News, 18/11/31; cf. Advertiser, 20/11/31).

Both Couche and Radford were concerned about the low wages suggested by the YPEC. Living-in also created opportunities for exploitation and payment-in-kind, which was anathema to the whole labour movement (cf. pp.165-9 above).

Further meetings followed concerning the house cadet scheme (News, 8/3/32, 18/4/32, 19/4/32; Advertiser, 6/4/32, 10/5/32). In June 1932, it was reported that the committee had arranged the lease of the Young Men's Hostel in South Terrace, Adelaide, to commence the "home school"

(Advertiser, 1/6/32). In August, Mrs. Broad voiced her approval of the idea (Advertiser, 22/8/32) - she had written a book in 1911 "to arouse the public to the need of a feminine education" ("The Sex Problem"). This is the last reference (apart from Advertiser, 8/11/32) I have been able to find to the scheme, even though there are quite a few further references to the YPEC. This suggests that the scheme never got off the ground, although further research is warranted.

Domestic service had by this time become very unpopular with most working class girls (see pp.166-8 above), although some may have been forced into it by the hardships of the Depression (Judd, 1979). The debates over a live-in House Cadet Scheme versus training at Central Schools are particularly significant in that living-in with its close supervision by bourgeois families was probably the chief attraction of domestic service to the more conservative members of the YPEC. This round-the-clock supervision was one of the major drawbacks from the point of view of the girls, as compared with factory or office work. The whole notion of training is also rather incongruous, given the practical, learning-by-doing emphasis of domestic service, an emphasis quite at odds with formal education.

The other main area of interest of the YPEC was in farming and other rural pursuits. One of its first moves was to appeal for the use of vacant blocks of land in the suburbs where unemployed youths could grow vegetables or raise livestock (Birks, 1931 - South Australian Archives). The Advertiser reported a "gratifying response" to this appeal on 3/8/31, but there is not much further evidence in the newspaper reports. Another related subject which is mentioned is the idea of a training farm. In May 1932 the YPEC had a conference with the government: "The council suggests the establishment of a training farm and of group settlements and the subsidising

of youth employed on small holdings." They also suggested training 600 girls in domestic service (News, 19/5/32).

In December, secretary Haigh advocated the "development of a rural consciousness". Apart from the training farm, Haigh also spoke of an arts and crafts workshop where boys and girls could manufacture articles to be sold on a cooperative basis; and of a scheme to absorb girls as temporary domestic helps during the Christmas rush and to help with jam-making (Mail, 17/12/32).

In January 1934 another meeting with the government was held. The YPEC claimed that the Employment Promotion Council (an officially recognized body - see below, p.308) was obsessed with adults and that not enough was being done for youths. The council again suggested a training farm - they submitted a proposal for a farm of 400 to 500 acres at Barmera (on the River Murray) where 50 youths could be trained in farm work. They also wanted the YPEC to be officially recognized and funded (Advertiser, 4/1/34). In February the YPEC gave its support to the suggestion that the money raised by the new high school fees should be used to assist unemployed youth. Training farms were mentioned again:

"This scheme had always been one of the council's main objectives. Areas of suitable land would be acquired and the boys trained. Eventually the land would be cut into blocks and each boy given one on which to settle" (News, 19/2/34).

There was also mention of poultry farms and of an industrial institute for girls; at this latter institute girls could manufacture certain articles that would not interfere with existing industries (*ibid*). As with the House Cadet Scheme, the evidence considered suggests that these schemes never really got off the ground.

The YPEC was perhaps of importance in pushing the government in a similar direction, if it needed to be pushed. An article in the Mail of 27/12/30 proclaimed in large letters "GO ON THE LAND, YOUNG MAN". The article referred to school project clubs, intended to give young minds an interest in rural pursuits. These had been going on for several years in primary schools. Director of Education Adey had "this week" outlined the scheme. High schools were just taking up the idea, although agricultural education had been going on for 18 years at Murray Bridge High School. The headmaster of this school had visited the United States in 1929 under a Carnegie Corporation fellowship to study agricultural education there. He had now returned to Murray Bridge and was also coordinating efforts in other schools. Seven high schools had adopted the scheme, and 140 boys were enrolled (Mail, 27/12/30; see also Mail, 29/7/33; News, 24/5/33).

Urrbrae Agricultural High School in suburban Adelaide was opened in 1932 (Thiele, 1975:176). In the same year the government - in reply to criticism of its inactivity by the YPEC - referred to the liaison it had established with the YPEC. The services of Inspectors Edquist and Miethke and of Mr. B.J. Gates (Headmaster, Unley High School) had been made available to the YPEC by the Education Department (Advertiser, 19/2/32). The Department also had (since 1929) a vocational guidance scheme for all those who had completed two years or more of super-primary education (for the first, see Thiele, 1975:156; News, 20/8/31; Advertiser, 19/2/32; News, 22/10/32 and 23/1/34; for the latter, see Advertiser, 19/2/32; News, 12/7/32).

Inspector Edquist, along with Birks and the YPEC, also recommended a lot garden system for unemployed boys and girls (Advertiser, 6/6/31 and 10/7/31). Mr. G.T. Polson in his Presidential address to SAPSTU in 1933 argued that "youth should be made land-minded" (News, 14/9/33). There

was a broad basis of support for this rural emphasis in the Hill government and in the Education Department.

As with domestic service, the YPEC's emphasis on farm labouring was at odds with the preferences of the mainly urban youth it was aiming at. The vagaries of the yeoman ethic and its opposition to a formal education/wage labouring ethic have been discussed above in Ch.4. It was argued that the yeoman ethic has become transmuted into a generalized liberal free enterprise ethic of the pragmatic, independent, improvising "great Aussie battler". In the process, however, its rural emphasis has been relegated to mythological status, rather than being a real focus of ambition. It is in this context that the YPEC's farm training schemes have to be seen. The YPEC's interest in these schemes reflects the general mythology of the battler ethic, since the turn of the century linked to conservative free enterprise discourse; as well as the widespread belief in the wholesomeness of country life. This battler ethic may have been shared by many sections of urban youth, e.g., in the image of the streetwise hustler searching out various forms of casual work and other money-making opportunities. The rural emphasis, however, would have been quite disagreeable to most of these youths. Moreover, as with domestic service, the idea of training was very incongruous. A key element of the yeoman/battler ideal was independence and pragmatic improvisation, which put it at odds with formal education and training. To be trained into the yeoman ideal was a contradiction in terms. The YPEC's farm training schemes have to be seen as a substitute for a social control model of secondary education.

I will now briefly consider some of the official unemployment relief schemes to further my analysis of the fate of the yeoman ideal in the 1930's. Two bodies were officially recognized as dealing with unemployment relief - the Unemployment Relief Council (URC) and the Employment Promotion

Council (EPC). The URC was started by the Hill Labor government soon after its election in March 1930 (Broomhill, 1978:80). Its main responsibility was issuing rations to the unemployed, which was now done more liberally than before. But the URC also assumed responsibility for a number of employment projects. They had a number of schemes for employing jobless single men - rabbit trapping, the Farm Wage Subsidy, and land clearance projects (Dyer, 1976:31; cf. Broomhill, 1979:158). They also administered five rural settlements of unemployed married men. Three of these settlements were initiated by groups of unemployed people themselves before being endorsed by the URC; the other two were initiated by the URC. Four of these settlements were in well-watered scrub country to the south of Adelaide, one was on the River Murray near Barmera (Dyer, 1976:30-1).

The EPC was set up by Hill in 1932 to raise funds for the promotion of employment. They established four poultry farming settlements (Dyer, 1976:31; News, 29/12/33).

The URC settlements were expected to become mixed farming ventures dependent on dairy produce and poultry. Both the EPC and the URC gave preference to married men with children from the city or suburbs (Dyer, 1976:32, 31). The URC hoped that its settlements would become "the basis of a much larger scheme of closer settlement....whereby several hundreds of families would become self-supporting in a few years" (URC, 31/3/31, quoted in Dyer, 1976:30).

The dream of closer settlement lingered on into the 1930's spurred on as before by a belief in the wholesomeness of country life, particularly for children: "It was believed, too, that children would benefit when removed from the city in this way, and reared in the country in happy and healthy conditions" (Dyer, 1976:31).

In the depression of the 1890's, similar experiments had been tried. In 1894-5, a number of "village settlements" were set up, mostly along the River Murray. The government provided easy selection under perpetual lease and small monetary assistance for the first few years. A proposed settlement had to have at least 20 people of 18 years of age or older, and affairs were to be managed upon principles of cooperation and equitable division (Kerr, 1951:9, 23-4, 36; see also Gilmour, 1965).

The other scheme resulted from an Act of 1885, whereby the Commissioner of Lands could have town and suburban land or government reserve surveyed into areas of up to 20 acres, to be offered as "workingmen's blocks". There was a 21 year lease, with the right of renewal for a further 21 years. The lessee had to reside on the block for at least 9 months each year (Hirst, 1963:4). These blocks were intended to assist those in irregular employment. While not working casually or seasonally on other people's farms, they could devote their energies to their own blocks.

Both of these schemes were supported by the United Labor Party, who in the 1890's were more concerned with land reform and settlement than with progress in industry and manufacture (Hirst, 1963:15, 53; Kerr, 1951:11). The village settlements were explicitly based on communal, socialist principles, even though these were soon watered down.

Shields, following Hirst (1978), argues that during the 1920's and the 1930's "closer settlement" lost its radical and populist overtones:

"In the wake of the Great War, the idealised vision of a return to a national economy in Australia had been relieved of much of its earlier agrarian populist and anti-industrial romantic overlay.....It took the onset of a general economic crisis, however, to make these reactionary undertones ring loud and clear, and not until the early 1930's did the 'pioneer legend', stripped at last of its residual radical populism, enter fully into the mainstream of right-wing political consciousness" (Shields, 1982:164).

Although perhaps culminating in the 1930's, this process was already under way around the turn of the century. In Ch.3 (pp.113-4) I noted how the United Labor Party dissociated itself from the yeoman interest after 1904 with the growth of unionism among agricultural and pastoral workers and the consequent identification of farmers as employers rather than as fellow producers. Hence the working class themselves participated in this process of stripping the pioneer legend of its populist overtones.

Following a rowdy demonstration on 9/1/31, known as the Beef Riot, the government moved to close down the camps of single unemployed men at the Exhibition Building in Adelaide. The URC established isolated work camps in the country to which the single unemployed were sent. By November 1931 the Exhibition Building camps were closed and the former occupants were debarred from receiving further rations unless they registered at the work camps (Broomhill, 1978:176-9). These camps did little to relieve unemployment, but they did provide a useful dumping ground for troublemakers: "Those who were most likely to cause 'trouble' were dispatched to isolated work camps where they could be kept under close supervision or more often themselves decided to head for the country or the eastern states" (1978:179).

Faith in the land as saviour extended across what appears as a wide range of the political spectrum - from Hill's Parliamentary Labor Party (PLP) to the petty bourgeois Citizen's League, to the Liberal Federation. The political situation was quite unique, however. The Labor Party was split into at least three groups - Hill's PLP, a Trades' Hall "official" ALP, and a Lang Labor faction. The PLP and the Langites were expelled from the ALP in August 1931 (Lonie, 1976:23). Hill's PLP continued as a minority government with the blessing of the Liberal Federation, who had no desire to call an early election (1976:26). They continued to implement the deflationary Premier's

Plan, and Hill in particular seems to have sought advice from the Liberals rather than from the ALP (1976:16-18). The Citizen's League tried to act as an intermediary, seeking to form a "National Government" on "nonparty" lines with both the PLP and the Liberals (1976:25-7). The agreement soon collapsed because of Hill's move to bring in a bill to redistribute electoral boundaries (1976:27).

The Citizen's League was eventually absorbed in the newly-formed LCL (Lonie, 1981:153-8). This party won office in 1933, and held it continuously until 1965 (Lonie, 1976:14). The Labor Party in its various forms was decimated in 1933 and consigned to the wilderness. The close cooperation between the Hill government, the Education Department, SAPSTU, and the YPEC on the issue of agricultural education has to be seen against this background. At first sight this nexus seems similar to the alliance between the State Children's Council (SCC), the SAPSTU and the Labor Party noted earlier in relation to the street children campaign (see Ch.5 above). But Hill's PLP was a Labor government in name only and had lost the support of most of the rank and file.

The SCC by this time had also been abolished. The council had come under severe criticism from Labor MP A.A. Edwards during the Royal Commission on Law Reform (1923-27). He argued that children were often institutionalized on trifling pretexts, that state wards were not visited often enough, and that they had little chance of communicating their grievances to the council. Edwards and the Labor Party were also instrumental in the Maintenance Act of 1926, which made direct payments to needy mothers with children. An earlier bill to this effect had also been linked with a proposal to replace the Destitute Board and the SCC with a smaller, more workable body (Barbalet, 1983:221-5). The bill was rejected by the Legislative Council. As Barbalet says, "there was much criticism of the rejection of philanthropy

implied in the proposed abolition of the Council" (1983:225). The Destitute Board and SCC were replaced in 1926 by a new board overseeing the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department (*ibid*), although many of Edwards' suggested reforms were deleted by the Legislative Council.

Hence by the 1920's a split had developed between the Labor Party and the paternalistic form of philanthropy represented by the SCC. The Maintenance Act in effect recognized that economic and social circumstances were often at the root of poverty, child labor, family disorganization, etc.: giving advice on thrift and warnings about alcoholism, vice, etc. was not a way to solve poverty. The only way to do this was through a redistribution of income (however modest it was) towards poor families, rather than breaking them up because of their presumed failure.

The YPEC in some ways represented a continuation of the philanthropic tradition. It was mainly middle class in origin but it aimed to encourage "civic pride" among the working class and to keep working class children off the streets. But unlike the SCC, it no longer had the support of organised labour (taking the Trades Hall faction as the most authentic representative of this tradition). As noted above (pp.303-4) the YPEC's House Cadet Scheme was strongly opposed by Mrs. Couche of the Labor Women's Central Organising Committee. It is unlikely that its ideas on training farms would have been accepted by Trades Hall either. The economic hardships and political polarisation of the Depression widened the already present split between the Labor Party and the old paternalistic style of philanthropy.

In 1934 a new set of "Youth Occupational Committees" were set up, following a "stirring address" by Governor Hore-Ruthven at a Rotary Club luncheon (*News*, 9/1/34). The scheme was "designed to safeguard the physical, mental and moral well-being of the unemployed youth of the

country" (Davey, 1956:119). Committees were formed in many suburban and country districts (see Advertiser, 16/2/34, 10/2/34, 22/5/34, 17/7/34, 8/8/34; Mail, 17/2/34; News, 2/11/34, 29/10/35). The scheme seems to have generated more interest than the YPEC's ideas. According to Davey, 1600 youths were enrolled very quickly for instruction in educational subjects, arts and crafts, and sporting activities (1956:119). Newspaper reports (as above) mention woodworking, wool-sorting, ticket-writing, drawing. After some dissension, the Education Department agreed to provide facilities for the scheme (Advertiser, 22/5/34, 17/7/34). The popularity of this scheme as compared with those of the YPEC perhaps reflects a less paternalistic attitude and more interesting subjects. There is no mention of those two favourites of the YPEC, domestic service and farm labouring, even though the social control motivations of the scheme are obvious enough.

Donzelot asks "How did we pass from a usage of 'the social' understood as the problem of poverty, the problem of others, to its current definition in terms of a general solidarity and the production of a lifestyle...?" (1979a:xxvii). So far in this chapter, I have tried to demonstrate that, in spite of the liberalizing and meritocratic rhetoric of progressive reformers, state secondary education in South Australia before World War II was still tied in with the problem of "the poor", "the others". The meritocratic dream of positive integration into the social order through the private pursuit of self-interest only applied to a small percentage of the adolescent age-group. For the rest, state secondary education - if it was accepted at all - was more a matter of ensuring their economic usefulness in their allotted stations in life and their political docility. The creation of adolescence as a universal category had to wait until the massive expansion of secondary education in the late 1950's and 1960's, to which I turn in the next section. Secondary education and education in general remained an alien middle class phenomenon to

many working class people in the 1920's and 1930's, to a much greater extent than today:

"Mike was born across the street from the pug-hole where his grandfather started work when he was nine years old.

"Mike's grandfather couldn't read or write.

"You didn't have to be able to read or write to carry pug for brickmaking when Mike's grandfather was a boy.

"But in 1930, when Mike was nine years old, almost everyone thought you had to be able to read and write.

"Mike didn't think so, and sometimes his grandfather agreed with him, but by that time the old man was supposed to be as deaf as a post and no one bothered to ask him about unimportant things like reading and writing."

(Colwell, 1975:7 - novel about growing up in Adelaide in the 1930's).

Although state schooling did provide new opportunities for a small minority, it also involved the sacrifice of large elements of what was an accepted working class lifestyle. Those who refused to play the game were likely to be disciplined by truant officers or other welfare authorities:

"Those children who attracted the attention of the Compulsory Branch were from large, urban working class families. They had failed repeatedly in the junior-primary school grades and had little chance of leaving school with even the Qualifying Certificate, the elementary qualification. For the poor working class family this failure of their child was just another confirmation of their inferior social standing. Schooling for these families did not promote social mobility and in some cases compulsory attendance actually undermined the economic security of the family. Against this background there was always the possibility of a clash between the demands of school attendance and the chance of work.....

"The significance of this short background account of the children who truanted is that it points to truancy not as some form of delinquent or erratic behaviour but as a characteristic response made by working class children to a school system which had labelled them as failures" (Cashen, 1982:23).

SECTION VIII: MASS SECONDARY EDUCATION

After World War II, there was a great expansion of educational services in South Australia, with population increase, immigration and a prospering economy. At first this was concentrated in the primary schools. Since World War II, the school system in South Australia has been structured around seven years of primary schooling, followed by a possible five years of secondary education. The externally assessed Qualifying Certificate Examination at the end of primary school was replaced by an internal Progress Certificate Examination in 1943. Until 1968, there remained three external examinations at the secondary level - Intermediate at the end of Year 10, Leaving at Year 11, and Leaving Honours (now Matriculation) at Year 12 ("Education and Change in South Australia. Final Report, Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia", Adelaide, 1982:181; known as the Keeves Report; hereinafter referred to as Keeves, 1982).

South Australia was sluggish in introducing state secondary education (New South Wales and Tasmania were the forerunners): "The agricultural character of South Australia discouraged state secondary schooling in rural districts, while in urban areas the middle and upper classes favoured private schools" (Barcan, 1972:188).

From the late 1950's secondary education began to expand rapidly. Total full-time state secondary students in South Australia rose from 21,868 in 1956, to 24,497 in 1957, 28,288 in 1958, 33,192 in 1959, 38,068 in 1960, and 42,096 in 1961, with a high rate of increase persisting throughout the 1960's (SAPP, no.44, 1977-8).

The school leaving age had been raised from 14 to 15 in 1946, but the proclamation of this measure was delayed until 1963, when there were enough teachers and schools to implement it (Thiele, 1975:211, 220). The

number of students who reached age 15 before leaving school rose from less than 50% in 1955, to 60% in 1958, and to 82% in 1963 (*ibid*:220). A more detailed picture is presented in Tables III and IV on the following pages (see also Table V below, p.340).

TABLE III. TOTAL FULL-TIME SECONDARY STUDENTS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 1944-1987, GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>GOVERNMENT</u>	<u>NON-GOVERNMENT</u>
1944	11,908	7,903
1945	11,319	8,137
1946	11,680	7,671
1947	11,529	7,968
1948	11,360	8,424
1949	11,766	8,573
1950	12,566	8,684
1951	13,733	9,288
1952	14,957	10,046
1953	16,761	10,212
1954	17,788	10,774
1955	19,247	11,074
1956	21,868	12,211
1957	24,497	13,345
1958	28,288	14,176
1959	33,192	14,602
1960	38,068	15,581
1961	42,096	15,432
1962	46,847	11,440
1963	50,300	12,354
1964	54,830	12,890
1965	58,758	13,007
1966	61,958	12,999
1967	66,877	13,469
1968	70,325	13,599
1969	73,398	14,203
1970	73,919	14,624
1971	77,198	15,018
1972	78,518	15,233
1973	80,435	15,806
1974	83,540	16,494
1975	86,677	16,818
1976	86,580	17,122
1977	85,398	17,085
1978	84,857	17,088
1979	82,389	17,381
1980	80,023	17,769
1981	78,158	18,583
1982	78,259	19,952
1983	80,475	21,087
1984	81,889	21,957
1985	82,401	23,116
1986	79,656	24,112
1987	77,358	24,893

SOURCES: See next page.

TABLE III. SOURCES

Government Schools

1944-56 (inclusive): SAPP, 1957, vol.II, no.44, p.27.

1957-66: SAPP, 1967, vol.II, no.44, p.32.

1967-76: SAPP, 1977-8, vol.II, no.44, p.50.

1977-84: SAPP, 1986, vol.I, no.44, p.53.

1985-87: Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, South Australia, 1987, p.45.

Until 1971, the figures include students in the Northern Territory - they are excluded from that year on. From 1944 to 1984, the figures refer to net numbers of full-time students instructed (except for 1970 - based on enrolments), and exclude students in Special Schools or in the Correspondence School. From 1985, the figures are for full-time equivalent enrolments, and include secondary students in Special Schools and in the Correspondence School.

Non-Government Schools

1944-74 (inclusive): Miller, 1986:375 (primary sources: Statistical Register of South Australia - till 1969 - and then South Australian Year Books).

1975-76: Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, South Australia, 1985, p.73.

1977-87: Ibid, 1987, p.45.

TABLE IV. PERCENTAGE OF AGE GROUP AT SCHOOL AT CENSUS DATES 1911-81. SOUTH AUSTRALIA

YEAR	AGE 15		AGE 16		AGE 17	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
1911	14.0	15.3	7.5	10.2	5.2	5.9
1921	20.2	20.9	11.9	13.8	8.2	8.5
1933	30.4	24.0	17.7	13.4	8.9	6.0
1947	--	--	--	--	--	--
1954	45.6	38.8	24.4	18.5	7.9	6.4
1961	69.6	58.4	40.5	26.7	15.8	7.2
1966	82.0	75.1	54.3	41.1	21.4	11.1
1971	88.3	84.1	66.1	52.6	31.9	19.7
1976	87.0	84.7	58.8	58.8	27.4	23.5
1981	88.2	88.9	57.5	59.5	21.8	20.6

Source: Miller, 1986:376 (computed from census documents).

With this expansion, adolescence as a social category came to be a universal experience. This expansion represents a further deployment of the liberalized family. Not only childhood, but the teenage years also were increasingly defined in terms of formal education, in terms of a specific age-graded environment separated from the adult world of work, responsibility, and independence. This further lessens the importance of the contribution of children to the family wage economy and of the significance of the family as an economically productive unit (in the conventional sense).

Labour for young children had been seen as undesirable in the Anglo-Saxon world since the excesses of the Industrial Revolution. From World War II, work for teenagers also became increasingly problematic from a moral and political point of view. Instead of work, education within the confines of a hybrid combination of school and family was held up as the ideal. Children's relationship with their families was to be defined purely in terms of social togetherness, with an educative component shared with formal schooling.

The private sphere of the family was to be completely separated from the harsh realities of the political/economic public sphere. Ideally it was to be a "haven in a heartless world" (Lasch, 1977) - a sheltered refuge based on love, togetherness, personal values, and unconditional acceptance.

As argued throughout the thesis, the extension of compulsory schooling as well as other "external interventions" in the family do not act in contradiction to the liberalized model of the family. Rather these two things are part of the same process - occurring simultaneously, promoted by the same people, and united in the same logic of the social. The breaking of the direct economic nexus between parents and children through compulsory education is a necessary concomitant of the liberalized definition of the family as the locus of disinterested, diffuse social togetherness

This perspective enables an interpretation of the growth of mass secondary education which is quite different from prevailing accounts. I will focus on one of the best and most influential recent works on education in Australia, Connell et. al. (1982a). While critical of some aspects of their work, I am essentially building on and elaborating their brief discussion of this issue (1982a:18-24). My perspective is similar in certain key respects. It tries to relate education to other features of Australian society, rather than analyzing it as a given, bounded entity; and it involves a critical orientation which is sensitive to issues of class and gender.

Connell et. al.'s account will be used as a starting point for elaborating a perspective based on Denzelot (1979a). I will then discuss the recent history of mass secondary education in South Australia in greater detail.

Connell et.al. present a number of factors responsible for the growth of mass secondary education. Small "l" liberals linked education with social uplift; critics of the class system wanted to eliminate inequality by extending

education; advocates of economic growth believed that more education would mean a more efficient workforce. But, "above all, there was popular support" (1982a:19). With memories of the depression still fresh, people saw education as one aspect of a better and more equal postwar world. Connell et.al. argue that this was not a matter of the working class entertaining large ambitions:

"Rather, Depression memories saw education as a protection against unemployment. With full employment, massive immigration and economic expansion in the 1950's, it was more a case of getting left behind if you didn't join in" (1982a:19).

All of this is very important, especially the legacy of the depression and of World War II. There are two areas I wish to critically examine in order to extend Connell et. al.'s account.

The first is the tendency of Connell et.al. to contrast the "cooperative coping" of the working class with the "competitiveness" of the ruling class. Immediately following the passage just quoted we find:

"This was the lesson Dave and Judy Roberts learnt. They aren't pushing Wilma to become a professional; they do want her to stay at school longer than most of her schoolmates, so she can avoid getting the jobs that most of them get, in factories and shops" (*ibid*).

I find this passage very perplexing. This situation suggests to me that the working class are interested in getting "tickets into the middle class" (1982a:19). Dave and Judy (both of working class background - 1982a:16) obviously want their daughter to have a good job - maybe not professional, but certainly something out of the normal working class line. They are interested in at least a limited form of upward social mobility for Wilma.

While not wishing to reject Connell et. al.'s distinction out of hand, I feel that it does not adequately consider the complexities of class differences

in Australian society. I pursue this critique in a more general context below (pp.351-5).

The second and more important area I wish to examine is the changing nature of familialism and of the school-family connection. This is something which is not really considered by Connell et. al. in relation to the growth of mass secondary education, although it is an important element of their work more generally. They refer simply to generalized "popular support" (1982a:19) and "social pressure" (1982a:20).

I believe that it is possible to offer a more specific and more highly contextualized account of this new appetite for secondary education, based on Donzelot's discussion of the "advanced liberal family". This will necessitate a presentation of some additional features of Donzelot's argument (following on from Ch.2).

Donzelot argues that the transition in France from the Ancien Régime to the nineteenth century was marked by a separation of two previously homologous power structures, the family and the state. Under the ancien régime, "The dependence in which family members found themselves with respect to their head was not substantially different from that of the family with respect to the men or agencies above it" (1979a:xx). This position of the family would break down in the nineteenth century with the advance of the so-called bourgeois order. There was a propagation within the family of medical, educative, and relational norms aimed at the protection and preservation of children. This propagation took place via two different channels. At the contractual pole, the new norms were willingly adopted, resulting in an educative model of "protected liberation". At the tutelary pole, families had to be goaded, enticed or simply coerced into adopting the new norms, resulting in a model of "supervised freedom" (1979a:xx-xxi).

Monolithic patriarchal authority was replaced by a dual alternative - tutelage or contract:

"The former is for social categories that combine a difficulty in supplying their own needs with resistances to the new medical and educative norms. In essence, tutelage means that these families will be stripped of all effective rights and brought into a relation of dependence vis-à-vis welfare and educative agents. The contractual system - for the others - corresponds to an accelerated liberalization of relations, both within and outside the family" (1979a:xxi).

The family (middle class or working class) was given the option of using the new medical and educative norms to ensure or possibly advance its economic position, its autonomy, or else to risk falling into a tutelary relationship.

Donzelot speaks of a flotation between old familial values and new educative and hygienic norms.

The former revolved around the maintenance or improvement of the family's political and economic situation through marriage alliances and careful disposal of the patrimony. This necessitated strict control over children - guarding the virtue of daughters to ensure their marriageability and to protect family honour; allowing sons freedom to try and blot the honour of other families, but still exercising strict control over them through the patrimony.

The new educative and hygienic norms stress the quality of social relations within the family, both wife-husband and parent-child. As part of this, children should be allowed to make their own decisions re spouses and careers. The family is seen as a protective and educative environment for the children, ensuring their balanced emotional and sexual development, and preparing them for conjugal life.

The old values have not entirely disappeared. Rather they have lost some of their traditional authority - they have been floated or relativized, made a matter of individual choice (within limits) rather than of authoritarian edict (cf. Foucault's distinction between law and norm discussed above, pp.39-42).

There are no longer authoritarian dispensations regarding either values or norms, neither one dictates to the other, rather - through psychoanalysis or the "psy-complex" more generally - they are left to find their own level in relation to one another, even to the point of breaking up the family altogether in the search for a better relational life (1979a:xxiv, 8, 211, 217).

Donzelot argues that there is an intensification of family life at the same time as the real power and significance of the family is in decline (1979a:226-7). Political and economic power becomes increasingly independent from familial power, in a situation (since 1789) of formal levelling of social differences. The advanced liberal family provided a political solution (in states run along the lines of parliamentary democracy) to the choice between clinging to an increasingly unsatisfactory patrimonial organization of the family or seeing the family abolished altogether in a socialist revolution, leading to state-sponsored reproduction and a direct relation between individuals and the state (1979a:52-3, 177-81, 220-3).

In this context Donzelot argues that investment in family life was a compensatory mechanism, seeking to find a specific qualifying power of the family in an era characterized by levelling of differences:

"It was not for nothing that the family shifted its interest from the exterior toward the interior, that it recentered itself on the refinement of internal ways of adjusting the parent-child and man-woman relationships. It was a question of rediscovering, on this private terrain, a specific power of the family, a vital hold on its members, a capacity for qualifying its children that it was in the process of losing on the public terrain. This was a

compensatory and tactical stance that was bound to generate an overinvestment" (1979a:226; emphasis in original).

The key role, the way in which the old authority structures could be dismantled without sweeping the family away altogether, was the relation between family and schooling. State-backed compulsory education provided the ideal meritocratic apparatus, formally open to all, but offering bonuses to families already suffused with the new norms:

"Hence it was not a matter of opposing the schools in a reactive way; on the contrary, one should go along with them, but in a way that would augment the family's role instead of diminishing it. Thus one would be able to re-create, parallel with the schools, with their horizontality, a vertical dimension of familial behaviour where moral values, higher cultural proficiencies, and emotional assets might reclaim their rightful place. This meant making the family into a missionary field that exploited educational requirements in order to make the most of the familial register" (1979a:207; cf. 205, 216-7).

Donzelot argues that this sets in train an upward spiral. The new educative norms provide a reference point for those families wishing to rise in the world, or to see their children rise. They bring into play both familial ambition in relation to other families and the conflicts and divisions that exist inside the family (1979a:xxi; cf. 90-3, 228).

The liberalization of the family - its more flexible internal relations, the possibility of divorce, the contractualization of its relations with social or "psy" agencies, the possibilities for advancement no longer tied to the old patrimonial pattern - these things made the liberal, bourgeois family the best surface of reception for the new educative norms, as it tried to recapture the power it was losing in the public domain through an intensification of its internal relations. This compensatory strategy led to a spiral movement, whereby the bourgeois family continually raised the normative stakes - length of education, stricter attendance regulations, number of grades passed; parental interest in and support of school and school authorities; cleanliness,

clothing, deportment of children; toys, sporting activity, organized leisure activities; etc.

The working class family was drawn into the process partly by enticement, partly by coercion. The upward spiral set in motion by the bourgeois family continually raised the threshold below which working class families risked coming under tutelary supervision. On the other hand, adherence to the new norms did hold out the possibility of tangible benefits, if only for a small minority of gifted or lucky or determined students. The poor or disreputable or transient working class family found itself always falling behind this normalizing movement, but the pressure from working class families as a whole was enough to convince the bourgeoisie to put another twist to the spiral, thereby starting the cycle anew.

Connell et. al. (1982a) provide an important basis for a critical analysis of education, sensitive to issues of class and gender. Their discussion of the emergence of mass secondary education is very brief and is obviously not meant to be comprehensive. A perspective informed by the work of Donzelot can be used to extend their argument. Rather than "popular support", a concept which is essentially question begging, Donzelot's analysis suggests a more specific context and a more specific mechanism at work in the spread of mass secondary education. It certainly suggests some degree of "competitiveness" in the working class, at least in the sense of keeping up with the Joneses. The important role of the Labor Party in South Australia in the street children campaign of 1895-1915 (see Ch.5) as well as in other moves which resulted in tighter attendance regulations and longer periods of schooling suggests that from the late nineteenth century at least certain sections of the working class in South Australia were attached to the meritocratic programme of state education. Organized labour at that time was also connected with temperance, control of prostitution, raising the status of

women, and with Methodism. All of these factors suggest a distinction in the South Australian context between respectable and disrespectable sections of the working class. Working class competitiveness could then be seen not necessarily in terms of a scramble for middle class status as more a question of maintaining respectability in a period of normative inflation.

The spread of mass secondary education has to be seen as closely related to the liberalization and intensification of family life. This recentering of the family on itself, at the same time as its real power and significance was declining (exclusion from direct economic and political power, decreasing importance of the lineage, women's and children's liberation) produced a compensatory overinvestment by the bourgeoisie in relational life. This investment led to demands for more and more state-supplied education by lower middle class and respectable working class families, so as to keep up with this normative spiral.

There are a number of other more specific factors in 1950's South Australia which fed this spiral. Following the immediate post-war austerity, there was a period of unparalleled economic prosperity in the 1950's and 1960's, with a great expansion of manufacturing industry. This prosperity contrasted sharply with the dark times of the depression and of World War II. The depression witnessed not simply hard times for broad sections of the population, but also downward social mobility for many middle class and skilled working class people, and/or their children. Having to take "any" job was established as a deep-rooted fear, leading to a strong positive valorization of education which cut across the boundaries between classes and class fractions. During the war there were many promises by the federal Labor government of rewards for the working man and greater equality for all as compensation for wartime sacrifices. These rewards were at least partly realized during the war and just after in the form of various social security

measures (M.A. Jones, 1980:34-9). Child and adolescent labour (especially when it involved living in with the employer) was now abhorred in favour of an intensified family life.

All of these factors resulted in a quantum leap in the normative stakes, expressed in a demand for more state-supplied secondary education. The category of the dependent teenager or adolescent, no longer required or encouraged to work, emerges as a far more pervasive and generalized figure.

Alongside this institutional development, there emerged a universalistic psychology of adolescence, discussed in general terms at the start of the chapter in relation to the work of G. Stanley Hall (see pp.259-70). This psychology of adolescence was used by Alfred Williams as a justification for the introduction of state secondary education in South Australia in 1908. It became much more salient in the post-World War II situation, when its institutional concomitants were realized on a universal basis. Adolescence could then be fully "naturalized" (in the double sense discussed on p.270 above) as an objective, psycho-physical stage of life, something obvious and taken-for-granted, which only the ignorance and exploitation of previous generations had prevented people from recognizing.

I will now turn to the dynamics of this universalization and naturalization of adolescence through mass secondary education in South Australia.

SECTION IX: THE COMPREHENSIVE, COEDUCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

Apart from the actual growth of mass secondary education, there are a number of other developments which contributed to the universalization of adolescence. The most important ones are connected with the emergence of the comprehensive, coeducational high school from 1971.

Prior to 1971 secondary education had been divided into high schools and technical high schools (there were also Area and other all-age schools in sparsely populated regions). In February 1970, there were 63 high schools (29 metropolitan and 34 country) and 33 technical high schools (only 4 in the country), accounting for 65.2% and 27.6% respectively of the student population in government secondary schools ("Education in South Australia - Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia", Adelaide, 1971:181; known as the Karmel Report; hereinafter referred to as Karmel, 1971). Of these all the high schools except two were coeducational, whereas all but three technical high schools in the city as well as the four country ones were single-sex schools (Karmel, 1971:186). The coeducational high schools, however, generally had sex-segregated classes in the junior secondary years (Karmel, 1971:196). The technical high schools were the successors of the Central Schools created in the 1920's in association with large primary schools in the metropolitan area (see above, pp.281-3). Separate junior technical schools were created in 1941-2; these became technical high schools in 1955. Technical high schools emphasized practical and prevocational activities, although they also offered courses leading to Public Examinations Board (PEB) examinations (Karmel, 1971:181-2).

Following the recommendations of the Karmel Report (1971:196-7), coeducational comprehensive high schools replaced the earlier dual system. Croydon Girls and Croydon Boys Technical High Schools were amalgamated

under one administration and staff as the coeducational Croydon Technical High School from the start of 1971 (Annual Report of the Minister of Education, South Australia, 1971:12). From 1972, technical high schools were converted into coeducational high schools (Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, South Australia, 1972:56; cf. Annual Reports, 1973:10, 1974:14, and 1976:17; hereinafter the reports of both the Minister and - from 1972 - the Director-General are referred to simply as "Annual Report" followed by the year).

Related developments were already under way prior to the Karmel Report. From 1968 the High School and Technical High School Branches of the Education Department were amalgamated into a single Secondary Schools Division, a process completed in 1970 (Karmel, 1971:182; Annual Report, 1970:7). From the end of 1968, the Intermediate Certificate Examination conducted by the PEB at the end of Year 10 was abandoned, and replaced by internal school-based assessment. This was accompanied by the creation of more flexible subject syllabuses in junior secondary classes, and a move away from the rigid streaming of students into different ability groups (Annual Reports, 1968:22, 1971:16, 1973:55).

From 1969, a Secondary School Certificate (SSC) has been offered as an alternative to the PEB Matriculation Certificate. SSC courses are internally assessed and are moderated by the Education Department. They were originally intended for students who did not wish to proceed to tertiary education, although some subjects have since gained recognition for tertiary entrance purposes. The first fifth year non-Matriculation class was established on a pilot basis at Mitcham Girls Technical High School in 1967 (Annual Report 1968:21; see further 1968:23, 1969:15, 1971:18, 1980:28, 1982:33, 1983:36, 1984:21, 1985:46).

The PEB Leaving Certificate Examination (at the end of Year 11) was scrapped in 1974, leaving Matriculation as the only external examination, at the end of Year 12 (Keeves, 1982:181). The PEB itself has undergone radical transformation. In 1969 it ceased to be a University of Adelaide institution, staffed exclusively by academics. The new PEB was autonomous and included representation from all parties with a major interest in secondary education (Annual Report, 1969:7). In 1984, the PEB was replaced by the Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia, the latter body having a much broader charter (Annual Report, 1984:21).

The abandonment of external examinations at Year 10 and Year 11 levels, together with the growth of school-assessed Year 12 subjects, has been accompanied by greater freedom on the part of individual schools to pursue their own forms of curriculum organization, teaching methods, and assessment. This freedom was stimulated by a famous memorandum to principals of all state schools from A.W. Jones, Director-General of Education, in 1970, titled "Freedom and Authority in the Schools" (reproduced in Annual Report, 1970:2-3). The most important section was as follows:

"Within the broad framework of the Education Act, the general curriculum advised by the curriculum boards and approved by me as Director-General of Education, and the general policy set by the Director of your Division and communicated to you by circular, you have the widest liberty to vary courses, to alter the timetable, to decide the organization of the school and government within the school, to experiment with teaching methods, assessment of student achievement and in extra-curricular activities" (*ibid*, p.2).

As the Keeves Report argues, there were problems with this approach, since teachers did not have the time or the resources to engage effectively in school-based curriculum development (1982:26,98). Another problem which has been increasingly highlighted since the late 1970's is that the deregulation

of the education system has led to a universal emphasis on academically-oriented courses:

"Where once in South Australia, technical high schools existed such schools have been converted into comprehensive type schools which have gradually assumed a largely academic orientation" (Keeves, 1982:8).

"At the present time secondary schools in South Australia are able to identify the requirements of the students in the district they serve, and provide an appropriate range of courses to meet the needs of the students they attract. There is, however, the likelihood that schools offering highly academically oriented courses will enjoy a higher status among parents and within the community than a school that provides programs more appropriate for the needs and interests of its less able students" (Keeves, 1982:98; cf. 1982:xxviii, 96-7, 123, 142-3).

The emphasis of educational reformers in the 1980's is on "the needs of the whole age group" - on making education more interesting to students, more relevant to their future roles in life (whatever these might be), and less tied to academically oriented courses leading to tertiary entrance. This discourse bears a remarkable similarity to that of the New Education in vogue at the turn of the twentieth century and to progressive educational thought in general. A key document of this discourse is the Commonwealth Schools Commission publication, "Schooling for 15 and 16 Year-Olds" (Canberra, 1980). At the South Australian level, similar ideas can be found in the Keeves Report, the booklet "Transition Education: the Basis" (Department of Education, South Australia, 1980), and in the important policy statement "Our Schools and Their Purposes: Into the 80's" (*ibid*, 1981). "Our Schools and Their Purposes" or "OSTP" has become a kind of clarion call for the South Australian Education Department in the 1980's (see recent Annual Reports). "Schooling for 15 and 16 Year-Olds" has achieved similar status nationally. I will quote extensively from this latter document as it provides a well-elaborated account.

The Commission argues that secondary schools are too highly oriented towards academic, pre-tertiary studies, rather than to the "needs of the whole age group":

"The characteristics and needs of the approximately half a million 15 and 16 year-olds must be considered afresh, if only because three-quarters of them are in their final years of schooling. In terms of years of schooling, nearly 50 per cent of all students entering secondary school leave at or before the end of Year 10" (1980:3).

"Schools endeavouring to respond to the challenge are faced with the fact that ability displayed in bookish ways remains the most seriously valued activity in schools. Students not successful in achieving tertiary entrance define themselves and are defined by others as failures, irrespective of their strengths in other community valued talents. The Commission strongly supports the view that the compulsory years should be regarded as a basic phase in its own right unassociated with selection for post-compulsory options. The community should see this phase for what it is - largely a substitute for the informal ways in which young people in pre-industrial societies located themselves in society and culture and came to understand and participate in adult activities. To achieve these sorts of goals, as much emphasis should be placed on such basic attributes of resourcefulness, co-operation, problem-solving and independence, as on numeracy and literacy" (1980:6).

Progressive educationists hope to provide all children with an equal chance of competing for scarce resources in a time of recession and high youth unemployment (e.g. Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:9, 35; Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts, 1981:3, 7, 30). This implies a commitment to equality of educational opportunity for all, but increasingly also to the notion of education which is useful, practical and appropriate, given the range of different, status-graded employment opportunities which are available to school leavers.

Non-matriculating Year 12 and other SSC courses are part of this notion, as are work experience programmes and transition education. Work experience courses started in South Australia around 1973, and involved spending one day per week in a local workplace over a certain period

(Annual Report, 1973:55). A major expansion was reported in 1977 (Annual Report, 1977:34). The Transition Education Unit was formed in 1979 and has been much concerned with the problem of early school leavers. For example, in 1979 it conducted a major enquiry at Elizabeth West High School to discover the reasons for the large number of students leaving at the end of Year 10 (Annual Report, 1979:13). One of the six aims of transition education in 1980 was "trying to identify early school leavers, and providing particular opportunities to minimise the risks facing them" (Department of Education [S.A.], 1980:9; cf. 14, 19).

The focus on early school leavers is characteristic of this discourse (see for example Karmel, 1979:12; Senate..., op. cit., 1981:33, 35; Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:7, 15). Comparisons are continually made by educationists and politicians between Australia and other OECD countries in terms of Australian youth's low rate of participation in secondary and higher education (e.g. Keeves, 1982:125-6; Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:4). It has been assumed very unproblematically that Australia should try to catch up with these other countries, and that a full secondary education for everyone till Year 12 is a good thing, demanded by an increasingly complex technological society, the drying up of many employment opportunities for young people, and the need to provide pastoral care and assistance for youth. The education system has in effect been called upon to "solve" problems stemming from the labour market and the persistently high levels of youth unemployment, compounded by the tendency of employers to look for Matriculation or Year 12 certificates.

The phrase "early school leavers" directly implies this extension of adolescence beyond the compulsory years of schooling, suggesting that the proper course of action is for all students to remain at school till Year 12, regardless of their probable future destination. In the 1980's, not only

universal secondary education, but universal education till Year 12 has become the ideal, and as we shall see some progress has recently been made towards this objective. This represents a further naturalization and universalization of adolescence, justified in terms of the rhetoric of the "New Education".

A key term of this rhetoric is "underachievers". The duty of parents/teachers is to develop each child's potential to the full, this potential being conceived of in universal terms. Each child should be equipped with a basic set of skills - intellectual, social, practical, decision-making. These skills should be appropriate and relevant to students' probable adult destinations, but everyone should get their quota - not only the academically oriented students. This equal but different philosophy provides a rationale for keeping children at school beyond the age of compulsion, even if they are not interested in /not successful at the academic curriculum:

"....it has been estimated that about one-third of all secondary school students, for varying reasons, are disillusioned and dissatisfied with their secondary school education. This dissatisfaction has given rise to negative learning attitudes in students as well as problems for schools in the maintenance of good discipline. An additional problem requiring a restructured curriculum is that 15-20 per cent of students leave school prior to year 10. These early school leavers usually come from the lower socio-economic groups in society. They are usually low achievers who lack basic skills and who have virtually nothing to offer an employer. Their hopes of finding employment on the present highly competitive job market are minimal. Thus for each of the school years 9, 10, 11 and 12 the education programme fails in many cases to retain the interest of a significant proportion of students. This is a major reason why large numbers drop out at year 11 or fail to complete year 12" (Senate...., 1981:33).

"We are of the opinion that secondary education should be restructured to cater for the needs and aspirations of all without any particular bias towards white or blue collar careers" (ibid:35).

(cf. also Senate...., 1981:x, 7, 11, 19, 28, 29, 30, 32; Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:1, 6, 20-5, 41, 45, 57).

The universal psychology of adolescence sets developmental tasks for all students to achieve, regardless of their academic ability. Problem students no longer fail the one set course - rather they are failing to live up to their potential, not making the most of their abilities, whether these abilities are intellectual, practical or social. This discourse individualizes notions of success and failure. The underachiever is not only letting down his family, his school, his country, etc. Most importantly he is letting himself down. In this schema, development is seen very much as an individual state of mind, divorced from social and economic realities. Or rather, these realities are seen as external variables with which the individual has to cope. The individual is seen as a self-contained, autonomous, bounded entity. There is an assumed distance, a gap, between the individual and the world, so that the focus is on the psychological relation or reaction to the world (the inadequacies of this position from an anthropological point of view are discussed in the next chapter, in relation to perceptions of youth unemployment).

This relation to the world can be right or wrong, rational or irrational, healthy or unhealthy. No matter what the individual's situation, rich or poor, male or female, there is a right way to go about things and a wrong way. The working class child may be educationally disadvantaged (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:4; Senate...., 1981:28), but he still needs help in finding a job, in acquiring necessary technological, social and financial skills, and in learning how to cope with an independent adult existence. Education will give him an equal chance to compete in the academic stakes; if he is unsuited to this course, education will still provide him with appropriate skills to handle his transition to adulthood in the best manner possible under the circumstances.

The logical culmination of this tendency is to extend the period of dependency for everyone in the teenage bracket, preferably by keeping them

in school, but otherwise by involving them in training schemes, or by starting them off on a career (casual or dead-end jobs are to be avoided - a constant in progressive educational thought). This leads on to recent ideas concerning comprehensive youth schemes, and the campaign - now achieving some success - of improving the retention rates till Year 12 of secondary education.

In 1979 Peter Karmel suggested the need for a "Comprehensive Youth Policy", offering a range of education, training, and employment options for all persons aged 15 to 19 years, supplemented by pastoral care and counselling (Karmel, 1979). This would involve rationalization of financial assistance schemes and greater coordination all round between education and training schemes, employers, unions, etc. The aim was to provide all young people with an alternative to idleness and unemployment. The West German approach was held up as a desirable model during this period:

"The West German approach involves strong and coordinated action by governments, employers and unions. It seeks to help young people and at the same time strengthen the nation by the prevention of idleness and discontent among youth, which it sees as likely to lead to support for extremist (communist or fascist) views. The German policy envisages that every youth will leave the education system with a vocational qualification and will get early successful experience of working life" (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:47; cf. generally pp.46-8).

The Commonwealth School to Work Transition Program was intended as an aspect of this coordinated approach to youth policy, in which "ultimately all young people in the 15-19 age group would be provided with options in education, training and employment, or any combination of these, either part-time or full-time so that unemployment becomes the least acceptable alternative" (Senator Carrick, Minister for Education, in the Senate, 22/11/1979; quoted in Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:45). The intention of the program was to assist the "50,000 young people who now leave school each year with poor employment prospects" and "to provide

appropriate education and training courses for them and also tackle the problem of those in schools who are likely to be in similar difficulties when it comes their turn to leave" (*ibid*).

As with the notion of early school leavers, that of underachievement also illustrates the universal and meritocratic aims of compulsory education. Education up to age 17 or 18 is a must for everyone - those who drop out earlier are probably underachievers who lack necessary social and employment skills, and whose negative attitude to formal education must be broken down by "relating knowledge to life" (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:11-18). Instead of simply allowing the underachievers to drop out when they reach the school leaving age, educationists are now concerned that all students should stay at school till year 12 and beyond:

"Historically the concept of secondary schooling for an academically oriented minority has been modified to an acceptance that at least three years of secondary schooling is the right of every child. The next step is to accept that five or six years of secondary education should be available to all students" (Annual Report, 1982:16; see also Annual Report, 1984:21; Keeves, 1982:121, 154-5; as well as the other references quoted above).

In South Australia, a Senior Secondary School Students (4S) Project commenced in 1983:

"The 4S Project aims to encourage:

- * the development of appropriate educational programmes which will foster the continuing and positive involvement of young people in education in all the years of secondary school, and particularly the post compulsory years

- * potential early school leavers to continue their education or to be involved in related training

- * currently unemployed 15-17 year olds to re-enter secondary schools, where this is the most appropriate alternative."

(Annual Report, 1983:15-6).

The 4S Project closely parallels the Commonwealth Schools Commission Participation and Equity Programme (PEP), inaugurated in 1984. The aims of the PEP are essentially the same as the 4S Project (for a summary, see Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1987).

Recently there has been some progress towards these objectives. Table V below shows apparent retention rates to Year 12 in South Australian state schools from 1949 to 1987, for boys and girls.

**TABLE V. APPARENT RETENTION RATES TO YEAR 12 IN SOUTH
AUSTRALIAN STATE SCHOOLS, 1949-87. MALES AND FEMALES**

YEAR	MALES	FEMALES
1949	4.2	2.4
1950	4.0	2.3
1951	5.6	2.9
1952	3.8	2.3
1953	5.1	3.0
1954	5.9	2.4
1955	5.5	3.2
1956	7.0	2.6
1957	7.4	3.1
1958	9.6	3.2
1959	10.4	4.4
1960	12.1	5.2
1961	11.3	5.0
1962	12.7	5.4
1963	14.1	7.1
1964	15.2	7.1
1965	14.6	8.6
1966	19.8	8.7
1967	18.1	11.0
1968	20.9	13.2
1969	23.2	15.8
1970	25.2	17.7
1971	29.1	20.4
1972	32.6	22.4
1973	31.2	24.0
1974	28.5	24.8
1975	31.7	29.0
1976	31.6	30.8
1977	28.7	30.6
1978	28.5	32.1
1979	29.1	32.8
1980	31.2	34.4
1981	30.4	35.7
1982	31.1	38.0
1983	37.6	43.8
1984	40.3	46.4
1985	41.5	47.2
1986	45.1	51.1
1987	49.0	58.3

INFORMATION AND SOURCES: SEE NEXT PAGE

TABLE V: INFORMATION AND SOURCES

The figures beside each year give the percentage of the original Year 8 cohort retained to Year 12 in the year specified. No account is taken of the effects of migration, deaths, repeating of classes or transfers between government and non-government schools. Northern Territory students, and students in Special Schools, Centres for Hearing Impaired Children, Special Classes and the Correspondence School, are included until 1965. In 1980 the census date was changed from 1 August to 1 July. The basis of calculation was slightly amended as from February 1977.

SOURCES

1949-84 (inclusive): Miller, 1986:383-4 (primary sources - SAPP, 1970, no.44, p.56; Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, South Australia, 1984, p.58).

1985-87: Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, South Australia, 1987.

The table shows that male retention rates were much higher than female until the mid-1970's. The female rate overtook the male one in 1977 and has remained higher ever since. The male rate peaked in 1972, then stalled until 1982, actually decreasing in some years; there have been major rises from that year onwards. The female rate has risen throughout, except between 1976 and 1977; there have been dramatic rises since 1981.

These changes are paralleled by national trends. Overall retention rates to Year 12 nationally were 34.1% in 1975, 34.8% in 1981, and 48.7% in 1986 (Schools Commission, 1987:19). The Schools Commission is now seeking to build on these increases. In a recent report, it has set a "national target" of a

65% retention rate to Year 12 by 1992, which is considerably ahead of projections based on current trends (1987:19).

Considerable progress has been made in the last few years towards the realization of education to Year 12 for everyone. This represents another major step in the naturalization and universalization of adolescence. Education to Year 12 is becoming increasingly normal, while early school leaving is becoming more and more disreputable if not deviant - such people are "underachievers" who are irrationally rejecting the help offered to them by a benevolent state. Adolescence becomes more and more "naturally" defined in terms of formal education in a high school, which correlatively implies increased familial responsibility, in both a moral/educative and a financial sense.

The other trends discussed in this chapter can be linked to the same analysis. The stress on the needs of the whole age group, with some movement away from the competitive academic model, has homogenized secondary education and helped to affirm adolescence as a universal phase of life shared by all, regardless of gender, social class, or ethnicity. In the South Australian context, the development since the 1970's of the comprehensive, coeducational high school is the chief institutional manifestation of this trend.

This homogenization, though it remains partial for reasons to do with the nature of the education system as well as of the wider society, nonetheless affirms the theorem of fair and open competition by everyone for the good things of life. In Donzelot's terms, it represents a move away from the definition of the hybrid public/private sphere of the social as the problem of poverty, the problem of others, and towards its definition in terms of a general solidarity, a generally shared lifestyle (1979a:xxvii). It strengthens the

meritocratic dream of positive integration into the social order on the basis of the private pursuit of self-interest.

CHAPTER 7. YOUTH SUBCULTURES AND SUBTERRANEAN VALUES

In this chapter I move from considering adolescence or youth as an ascribed category, something which is defined from the outside, to looking at it in terms of the orientations of young people themselves, particularly as expressed in various post-World War II subcultures. I will extend the argument on compulsory education in the last chapter to modern youth subcultures. These subcultures will be treated as constitutive features of modern familialism, rather than as phenomena which stand opposed to the family and which threaten its integrity.

The category of youth in our culture derives to a large extent from mass secondary education and all that goes with it, as already analyzed in previous chapters. It is secondary education which throws young people together into special age-graded institutions, and gives them a particular role and status; it is secondary education which creates the potential for a solidary definition of young people in opposition to the parental generation. The category of youth as currently understood derives from nineteenth century moralizing and normalizing philanthropy, in alliance with (first-wave) feminism and organized labour (as argued in chapter 5). This category was given scientific legitimation in the early twentieth century through the work of G. Stanley Hall and many other psychologists and educationists.

Since World War II in particular, large commercial industries have grown up around mass-organized youth subcultures, an important element in defining the nature of these cultural forms. My focus, however, will be on the connections between subcultures, education and familialism - I will not pay much attention to the influence of commercialization.

With the development of universal secondary education, and the involvement of young people from all kinds of background, with widely varying degrees of commitment to formal education, "youth" comes to be positively celebrated not only in formal terms, but also in terms of subterranean values involving distancing from and/or rejection of formal values (Matza and Sykes, 1961). Previous chapters have focused on the emergence of the formal model, as defined by social reformers, educationists and other concerned adults. This chapter will focus on the subterranean understandings of young people themselves - their self-definition - and on the relation between formal and subterranean values.

Analytically the chapter will try to steer between three approaches which I have already criticized earlier in the thesis:-

(1) The first is the idea that the family in the twentieth century has broken down, that parents have lost all authority, that external interventions have destroyed the autonomy and the power which the family once possessed. This view is held in various guises by members of the Frankfurt School (especially Horkheimer and Adorno), and by Lasch; and aspects of it are espoused in the Australian context by Reiger (1985). Outside of the academic context, it is also a widespread commonsense view, and is often championed by right-wing political parties and fundamentalist Christian groups. This view has already been discussed in chapter 2 above (pp.73-8).

(2) The second approach is the Marxist or Marxist-influenced theory of social control, often referred to as the revisionist theory of childhood and adolescence. This focuses on the extension of childhood dependency associated with increased state intervention in education, and argues that this represents an increased control over young people, particularly working class

young people. This approach has been discussed at various points above (pp.13-7, 199-200, 217-8, 265-7).

(3) The third approach is closely related to the second, and will be the main focus of attention in this chapter. It is also Marxist-influenced, and tends to start from a position similar to the revisionists. Theorists of this persuasion argue that youth subcultures are a form of resistance to the social control discussed by the revisionists, and more generally to capitalism as a whole. The chief representatives of this tradition are or were associated with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), Birmingham. The work of Connell and his associates may be seen at least in part as an Australian variant of this tradition, and will be discussed in these terms.

The reader is referred to the appropriate chapters for discussions of the first two positions. I will not repeat these discussions here, although much of the chapter represents a critique of these theories. It is the third viewpoint which will be the main focus of attention here.

The most influential recent work on youth cultures or subcultures (I share Connell et.al.'s reservations about this concept - 1982a:163 - but I shall continue to use the terms) is that done by the CCCS, especially "Resistance Through Rituals" (Hall and Jefferson, eds., 1976). There are variations and tensions between the work of the different people involved, but I will concentrate on one of their most common themes, the magical recovery of community. Clarke expresses it as follows:

"We may see these three interrelated elements of territoriality, collective solidarity and 'masculinity' as being the way in which the Skinheads attempted to recreate the inherited imagery of the community in a period in which the experiences of increasing oppression demanded forms of mutual organization and defence. And we might finally see the intensive violence connected with the style as evidence of the 'recreation of the community' being indeed a 'magical' or 'imaginary' one, in that it was created without the material and organisational basis of

that community and consequently was less subject to the informal mechanisms of social control characteristic of such communities. In the skinhead style we can see both the elements of continuity (in terms of the style's content), and discontinuity (in terms of its form), between parent culture and youth subculture" (Clarke, 1976:102; see also Clarke et. al., 1976:32; Jefferson, 1976:81; Hebdige, 1979:74, 77, 79; Robins and Cohen, 1978:73, 84-5).

Lying behind the work of these and other authors is the notion of the breakdown since the second world war of the "traditional" working class community, in favour of a more privatized existence. This is often seen in terms of alienation or anomie. Additionally there is the notion that the working class has been split up or disorganized by consumerism or by mass culture, thus accounting for the relatively consensual nature of working class politics since WWII.

I am certainly not trying to deny that important changes in working class lifestyle have taken place in recent years. What I wish to question is whether these changes can be adequately analyzed in terms of the "breakdown of community", and following on from this, whether the CCCS analysis of youth subcultures can be sustained in the light of this critique. There are four points I will raise.

(1) If we take a longer perspective, from the late 19th century onwards, then we are dealing with not only a breakdown of working class community but also a breakdown of direct master/servant relations and the system of status differentiation associated with them. This point is recognized by Donzelot when he speaks of both "networks of solidarity" and "blocks of dependence" among the working class (1979a:48). In South Australia, the 20th century has witnessed a sharp decline in live-in servants of various kinds - domestic servants, farm labourers, apprentices, etc. It has also witnessed the repudiation of the whole notion of master and servant (embodied in various

statutes) in favour of the more neutral employer/employee, now mediated by arbitration and other formally impartial institutions.

This breakdown can be seen in other guises too. Daly notes how in the late 19th century, the South Australian upper class ceased to hold its own special sporting events in public - sports such as polo and fox-hunting moved from the parklands to private playing fields or to the country respectively (1982:142). During the same period, it became increasingly difficult for a wealthy Adelaide man to gain a seat in the Legislative Assembly - something previously almost routine. The second government of Sir John Downer (1892-3) was the last to be formed by a member of the elite Adelaide Club (Hirst, 1973:49-50). Another point mentioned by Hirst is the abandonment by the children of the wealthy of the big mansions built in the 1860's and 1870's by their fathers in favour of smaller and more manageable houses (partly because of the shortage of servants - 1973:50). All this points not to a breakdown of working class community but rather to a breakdown of direct, deferential relations between master and servant, between gentry and commoners. This point is central to any discussion of 20th century capitalism, because it points to a transformation in the culture of the ruling class. It also leads on to the next point.

(2) From the late 19th century onwards in South Australia (and Britain also) the working class was able to mount a more effective opposition against their employers through newly-formed or expanded trade unions (for South Australia, see Dickey, 1975:263; Hirst, 1973:194), especially in South Australia state-wide unions of unskilled workers (Australian Workers' Union and United Labourers' Union). This is one element of the breakdown of master/servant relations just discussed. Even if we accept the CCCS thesis of a breakdown of working class community, we should be very cautious about associating this with the fragmentation or disorganization of the working

class in general. The 20th century has witnessed a general trend towards more effective and more highly institutionalized working class combination against employers. This combination may have been largely reformist in orientation, but nonetheless it sits very uneasily with claims about working class fragmentation or breakdown.

(3) There is a tendency in the CCCS thesis to romanticize the past in terms of a golden age of working class togetherness. This leads to discussions of the post-WWII situation in terms of anomie, alienation or loss of meaning. In relation to the first point, one should recognize that community often involves severe tensions, animosities and hatreds; and "the communal" may be composed largely by fragile systems for mediating these. In relation to the second point, the contrast between community and anomie tends to obscure the specific nature of social relations in the post-WWII context. To talk of breakdown of relations leads one away from looking at what is specific and particular about the present day situation. Working class and other people still relate to one another - the question is what is different about these relations in the modern day. The CCCS thesis descends very easily into generalized notions of alienation or anomie which say very little about the specific dynamics of capitalist society in the 20th century. Following Donzelot, one could see the privatization or recentering of the working class family in terms of a particular set of strategies operating in a context of particular constraints and inducements - strategies of autonomization in relation to old dependencies via a concern with new educative and hygienic norms, failing which working class families risked coming under a new form of powerful intervention - state-sponsored tutelage.

(4) The CCCS (and this may be true more generally of other Marxist writers) tend to have an overpoliticized view of the working class. Because class struggle is the motor of history, any pre-socialist society is by definition

characterised by conflict and contradiction lying beneath the apparent calm of everyday life. Were it not for the fragmenting effect of bourgeois ideology, the working class would realize its historical mission and overthrow the capitalist system. The ongoing existence of capitalism means that for Marxists, social relations among the working class must necessarily be seen as negative and repressive - as papering over the fundamental contradictions engendered by capitalist society.

There are a number of problems with this. It tends to portray the working class as being fooled by bourgeois ideology - as mystified and subject to false consciousness (cf. Donzelot, 1979a:52). It assumes as an a priori that the working class - were it not for this mystification - are on the brink of revolutionary socialism. This leads to an analysis of crime, deviance, subcultures, etc. in overpoliticized terms. For example, the title of the 1976 CCCS collection on youth subcultures is "Resistance Through Rituals". Carrying on in the same vein, Hebdige (1979) also reads directly political connotations into subcultural style (e.g. 1979:15-19; to be fair, Hebdige does acknowledge a tendency to romanticism in his own work - 1979:138).

I would argue that this kind of reading is incomplete at best, and may in fact be seriously misleading. Subcultural style in particular has much more to do with sexuality than with any directly political meanings (I return to this point below). More generally, the working class in the 20th century is incorporated into capitalist society - is in fact a major power bloc within that society - in a way quite different from that suggested by many versions of Marxism. Working class acquiescence has to be seen in relation to the real benefits of affluence, even if this affluence is very unevenly distributed and constantly under threat. In line with the analysis presented in the last chapter, twentieth century capitalism is characterized by the effective mobilization of individual self-interest as a major integrating factor, regardless of the limited

scope of this self-interest for most people. In this sense, working class acquiescence is part of a process of exchange, rather than a result of bourgeois imposition (by force or by stealth).

Notions of crisis and contradiction can be very misleading. Social order is always problematic, but this order is *sui generis* - it is not created in response to some underlying pristine reality. The latter view suggests that social order is always a fake, a cover-up, a negative and repressive consequence of something which lies outside its domain. Following Donzelot, we should look at the positive, enabling and transformative aspects of particular actions in particular contexts, rather than using "sieve-like concepts" such as crisis and contradiction (1979a:8, 52-3). Thus the notion of breakdown of community may not be wrong as such, but taken by itself and used in the ways discussed it can lead to some very problematic conclusions.

I will now look at Connell et. al. (1982a) in the light of this general critique. I will argue that they adhere to at least some of the views I have criticized, and that this leads to significant omissions in their work. As in the last chapter, I am not so much rejecting their analyses as pointing to certain problematic or unexplored areas.

Connell is not explicitly Marxist, and in fact is critical of certain kinds of Marxism. Nonetheless his work parallels some of the major themes of the CCCS. Connell et.al. appear to endorse at least some aspects of the breakdown thesis. They speak of the postwar working class in terms of a wide spread of incomes and of ethnic diversification (1982a:170). They also see state high schools as "class disorganizers" (1982a:169-73), as opposed to "ruling class" schools which are seen as "class organizers" (1982a:149-54). The hegemony of the academic curriculum in working class schools downgrades

knowledge derived from working class experience and the competition built into this curriculum creates divisions and conflicts within the working class:

"Few may be upwardly mobile, but many are afraid of being downwardly mobile. Where the means offered to prevent it is a form of individual competition, we have division and distrust being built into working-class experience at a very basic level. Competition is always divisive, always opposed to the sense of solidarity, of common fate, and the need for collective response, that is basic to the self-organization of oppressed or exploited groups" (1982a:172; emphasis in original; cf. 126, 159).

The school disorganizes the working class through academic competition. The curious thing is that the possible disruptive effects of competition in the ruling class school are not even considered. The ruling class school, on the contrary, is seen as producing unity and hegemony among the diverse fractions of the ruling class (1982a:149-54). Presumably competition is more intense in the latter situation and the students more attached to the hegemonic curriculum. This suggests that these students would be much more upset by failure and that consequently there would be a much bigger problem of "cooling out" the losers and controlling possible disruptive effects. Yet this possibility does not arise for Connell et.al. (a check of the index entries for "ruling class" and "competition" will confirm this).

Connell et.al. do make the point that in the working class, competition in schools involves a rupture with the "cooperative coping" which they find practised in working class families; whereas in the ruling class this competition is homologous with the competitive practices which they see as characteristic of its domestic and communal culture (1982a:142-3). This suggests the possibility of tensions between schools and the working class, or between working class parents and their children, which may be absent in the ruling class. But it does not explain why competition is disruptive of the entire working class, whereas in the ruling class competition produces hegemony: these statements seem to have a very general connotation.

More basically I would question the whole contrast between the competitiveness of the ruling class (1982a:63-4, 123-6) and the cooperative coping of the working class (1982a:39-42, 122-3, 142). Competition is basic to working class existence in many ways - through the labour market (a market demands "the attitude of calculative appraisal" - 1982a:135), through consumerism (keeping up with the Joneses - whole streets buying colour TV sets in a matter of weeks, whereas prior to this they may have shunned the whole idea), through sexuality (number and attractiveness of partners), through sport, etc. Conversely, as Connell et.al. argue when discussing the ruling class school (1982a:149-54). there are networks and solidarities among the ruling class as well as among the working class. This should caution us about making general contrasts between classes in terms of competitiveness and cooperation. There certainly may be differences, but these have to be conceptualized in more rigorous and specific terms.

The same criticism can be levelled at Connell et.al.'s treatment of resistance to school and the related issue of youth subcultures. In line with the CCCS tradition and other British work, Connell et.al. argue that both of these activities are mainly working class and that both may express "class anger": "Our evidence, then, does offer some support to the view that has come out of English research, that school resistance is a consequence, even in some respects a form, of class struggle" (1982a:87). The phrasing of this statement clearly indicates some hesitation on the part of Connell et.al. I have already indicated my own dissatisfaction with the CCCS view. This view becomes even more problematic when applied to the very different Australian context, with its less distinct class boundaries and more consensual politics.

To argue that because resistance to school is mainly a working class phenomenon therefore it is a form of class struggle does not follow. A stronger and more detailed analysis is required to establish this point, but this

is not provided by Connell et.al. (nor do they refer to any other literature). Although I do not wish to lump together the different works I have referred to, I feel that they all suffer from an overpoliticized view of the working class. It is this which allows Connell et.al. to lend their admittedly qualified support to the CCCS thesis.

In a different context, Connell et.al. do point to something which is more significant in explaining working class resistance. This is the observation by a couple of their students that state schools are "slack" (1982a:86, 150-1): "If anything, the private schools are tauter, as Chris Legrange observed; when he came to compare private with state schools, he voiced the universal opinion among those of our sample who talked about the issue, that the state schools are 'slacker', the teachers more relaxed, the discipline less insistent" (1982a:86).

This suggests that what may be involved may be not so much resistance as simply boredom and frustration with an institution which is often seen by the working class as having little real significance for them, as being basically a child-minding centre for adolescents who are striving to define themselves as adults. To see this as resistance or class struggle is another matter. The age component is recognized by Connell et.al. (p.85) but this does not affect their interpretations of working class resistance. Mucking about in school may be nothing more than a pleasant game played by adolescents trying to break the monotony imposed on them by a meaningless curriculum. As Connell et.al. say in reference to one of their "ruling class" resisters: "Chris Legrangeis more sceptical; he would rather be in a slack old state school and enjoy himself" (1982a:151).

Of course I am not denying that there is a class component in so-called resistance to schooling. What I am saying is that Connell et.al. have not

established their case, and that there may be more mundane reasons behind school resistance, reflecting the fact that in general working class children have less reason to be attached to their schools. Resistance to schooling may reflect the class situation, but this is not the same as saying that it represents class anger or class struggle.

The evidence regarding youth subcultures is similarly ambivalent. Connell et.al. assert that "oppositional peer life" is mainly a working class phenomenon (1982a:164), but present little evidence or reasoning to back this up. They quote Annie Ellis concerning hairstyles, shoes, leg shaving, and TV, but none of this amounts to a distinctive subculture (1982a:165). There is no consideration of middle class groups such as beats, hippies, orange people, etc. (nor bodgies and widgies - see below). There is no real attempt to analyse changes in the family which are connected with the growth of subcultures - only a brief reference to the extended transition from child to adult in the post-WWII context and the weakening of parents' authority (1982a:21-2).

These lacunae in Connell et. al. (1982a) are related to the problems discussed above, problems tied in at the most general level with the negative and repressive view of power as described by Foucault (1979:23, 27-8, 194, 217, 308; 1981:81-102). Rather than seeing youth subcultures as a voice of resistance to repressive power, as a form of liberation from this power, I will use Donzelot to construct an alternative account which sees these subcultures as being positively constituted within a particular framework of familialism and family/school relations; in other words, I will analyse them as being part and parcel of this framework and of our culture, rather than as movements which stand outside of and reject this framework.

I will first look briefly at the bodgie and widgie cult in 1950's Adelaide to give some grounding to this analysis. My information is based on

newspaper accounts and on a collection of articles published about 1958 and edited by Adelaide journalist Dick Wordley, entitled "The Gap: a Book to Bridge the Dangerous Years".

According to this latter publication, the height of the bodgie and widgie "menace" was in 1955 (Wordley, 1958:13). The cult was characterised by strange clothes, hairdos, and dancing. In a newspaper report they are described as follows:

"A bodgie usually wears his hair long, a long, draped coat and stovepipe trousers which end around his ankles.

"He is set off by a long chain dangling from his trousers" (direct quote from Inspector Finn).

"Widgies, said Inspector Finn, had their hair cut short and in their tight-fitting skirts imagined themselves film stars or dignified young ladies".

(Advertiser, 18/2/55, p.5; cf. 3/3/55, p.2; and Wordley, ed., 1958:48).

The cult was associated with jitterbugging (Advertiser, 3/3/55, p.2; 14/3/55, p.3), an acrobatic dance performed to swing or jazz music.

Reactions in Adelaide were strong. An "anti-larrikin patrol" was formed in "March of last year" (1957?). Police took names and other information concerning teenagers found in the street between 6 pm and 2 am:

"What's your name? What's your address? Do you live with your parents? Do your parents know you are here tonight? Where are you going? What time do you intend to get home? How many nights a week do you usually go out?" (Brigadier McKinna - South Australian Police Commissioner - in Wordley, ed., 1958:10).

When a youth's name had been taken three times, police visited his or her parents: "And the parents are told, frankly and openly, what the police know of their child." (ibid). McKinna also stated that the names of more than 2,000

teenagers had been taken by the patrol in its first two months of operation (*ibid*).

An incident in 1955 illustrates the element of "moral panic" engendered by the cult. On a Saturday night, 30 bodgies and widgies were ejected from a dance at Goodwood Stadium by the police for "behaving offensively".

Constables

"....considered that many of the widgies were improperly dressed, and ordered them to put on their coats.

"The bodgies and widgies are said to have persistently harassed the master of ceremonies when he refused to change a dance that was not to their liking.

"They shuffled tightly together during a barn dance, and gave an acrobatic jitterbug performance during a quickstep, the widgies making the most of their very full skirts.

"The constables ejected the entire group from the stadium about 11.45 p.m. and took many of their names" (*Advertiser*, 14/3/55, p.3).

According to police officers writing in "The Gap", bodgies and widgies mostly came from respectable, middle class homes - "at homes where we had always thought tomorrow's leaders would be raised" (Wordley, ed., 1958:49; also pp.9-10, 31, 47). The evidence is hardly conclusive, but I can see no good reason to distrust it. In regard to Adelaide at least, we need to leave open the question of whether bodgies and widgies were basically a working class phenomenon.

Another interesting point raised by these police officers is that much of the menace concerned teenage sexuality, at least initially:

"In Sydney and Melbourne the cult had been responsible for outbreaks of violence with gangs beating up people but in Adelaide its early form of attack was sexual and our sexual record became very bad" (*ibid*, p.48).

Young couples were seen performing sexual acts in public and orgies were reported at suburban homes while the parents were away. The police decided to attack the "girl problem first because at their parties we heard they had sexual orgies" (*ibid*). Over 300 girls between 13 and 17 years old appeared before the Juvenile Court, charged with being uncontrolled.

Two further stages are reported:

"A second stage was to commence. And that was perversion. It was of all manner and kind and I do not intend to describe it except to say it was depraved....

"Some say this new phase of depravity began in the cult to avoid pregnancy. Others say it was to defeat the purpose of the doctor's examination which police made their parents have done" (*ibid*, p.50).

The third stage switched to vandalism - stealing and smashing up motor cars, breaking and entering shops (*ibid*).

The significance of all this can easily be missed until it is placed in the specific post-1945 context. As with secondary education (see pp.322-8 above), youth subcultures can be more clearly understood by looking at specific transformations of familialism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Normative inflation - peaking after the second world war - coupled with the new configuration of childhood discussed throughout the thesis combined to produce the "advanced liberal family". Before discussing this in more detail, it will be useful to glance at some of the very significant demographic changes that have occurred in Australia since WWII.

The average issue of married women aged 45-49 years has declined from 6.36 in 1881 to 2.87 in 1973 (National Population Inquiry - NPI - 1975:46; cf. 86). It dropped from 2.77 in 1947, to 2.43 in 1954, then recovered to 2.50 in 1961, 2.66 in 1966, and 2.87 in 1973 (*ibid*).

The percentage of people ever married has increased since 1891, levelling out since 1954, as shown in Table VI.

**TABLE VI. PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE EVER MARRIED. AUSTRALIA.
1891-1971**

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
1891	47.1	62.0
1921	57.3	64.2
1933	58.0	65.0
1947	67.0	73.6
1954	70.2	78.5
1961	70.2	78.9
1966	69.5	78.0
1971	70.7	79.3

(NPI, 1975:59; from Table II.13).

There is a major jump for both males and females after WWII, contributing to what the NPI called a "marriage revolution" (1975:58-62). Not only was the percentage of ever-married people increasing, people were also getting married at a younger age (*ibid*). Again there was a major jump after World War II.¹

The growth of mass youth subcultures after 1945 coincided with earlier and more universal marriage. This is somewhat puzzling if we accept the view that subcultures represent some kind of struggle against the family (e.g. Connell et.al., 1982a:88, 164-5). But following Donzelot, the success of the post-1945 family is based on a liberalization of bonds between family members and a separation of conjugality from the family as such (1979a:xii, 39, 91, 173-4, 197, 217).

1. Both of these trends have reversed more recently. I have not had time to assess these recent developments, or to address the relevant literature which has started to appear. These reversals, I believe, do not threaten the arguments presented in this thesis.

Donzelot does not talk much about youth or adolescence, but youth subcultures can be related to this general argument. The separation of familial from political/economic power leads to the definition of family life in terms of the quality of relations between its members. This search for quality may involve dissolving unsatisfactory marriages and leads to a new attitude to conjugal life. No longer directly tied to patrimonial considerations, conjugal life becomes a matter of the free interplay of sensibilities. The search for a satisfactory relational life is stripped of its patrimonial limitations. Young people become increasingly free to make their own choice of spouses, not so tightly constrained by their parents, and selecting from a wider range of candidates (improved communications, cars, coeducation, prosperity, abandonment of face-to-face deference based on status considerations, etc.).

The prosperity of the post-WWII period provided the preconditions for the growth in this pattern of conjugal life. The growth of youth subcultures can be related in part at least to this liberalization of the family and the associated concern with relational quality. With the decline of formal status differentiation in the 20th century and the rupture between public and familial power, young people are free to invent their own semiotics in the search for relational quality. It is this semiotic inventiveness associated with changes in familialism and oriented around the display of sexuality which I believe is a major factor in the emergence of youth subcultures, rather than resistance to capitalism or any other directly political process.

Moreover the intensification of family life is coincidental with its destabilization (Donzelot, 1979a:224-6). The rise of "the social" - of conjugal life, of relational feverishness - coincides with an effective loss of power for the family. This makes it harder for the family to retain a hold over its members. Donzelot argues that psychoanalysis (and more generally the "psy-complex") provides a way of balancing traditional family values with the new relational

norms - allowing a certain liberality, a margin for "playing the individual game", while still asserting the validity of the family in general (1979a:226-7 et passim). The modern family has a dual tendency, simultaneously centrifugal and centripetal (1979a:229). Relational feverishness points to the family as the ultimate horizon, but at the same time exposes its members to the temptations of the outside, in the effort to find more harmonious combinations (1979a:227-30).

This provides clues to the simultaneous growth of conjugal and of youth subcultures in the post-WWII context. The overinvestment in family life (compared to the real power and significance of the family) tends to push the children outwards, but the family still remains "as a means of individual attainment, as a place where ambitions are inscribed, a real origin of failures and a virtual horizon of successes" (1979a:231).

Youth subcultures can thus be seen as an integral part of the liberalized family. There are two other related senses in which they can be seen as integral to our culture, rather than as movements which stand outside of and radically reject that culture:-

(1) These subcultures are in many ways a caricature of the formal model of adolescence, but a caricature which shares many features with it. Adolescence as a period of license contrasts with the mundane realities of work and family responsibilities. As I will argue in detail below, youth subcultures are an expression of subterranean values which are widespread throughout our culture, not only amongst youth. Moreover, as argued above in relation to G. Stanley Hall, adolescence is a culturally sanctioned time for the expression of these subterranean values. In fact, someone who is totally subservient to the formal values of adolescence is likely to be regarded as socially deficient; conversely, someone who embraces subterranean values

too enthusiastically may be subject to labelling as deviant (cf. the quotes from Hall above, pp.260-1).

(2) Adolescence has tended to spread outwards from its particular age-setting and has become almost a general lifestyle, or at least a lifestyle that everyone aspires to. Ariès raised this issue some years ago:-

"From that point [WWI - AW] adolescence expanded: it encroached upon childhood in one direction, maturity in the other. Henceforth marriage, which had ceased to be a 'settling down', would not put an end to it: the married adolescent was to become one of the most prominent types of our time, dictating its values, its appetites and its customs. Thus our society has passed from a period which was ignorant of adolescence to a period in which adolescence is the favourite age. We now want to come to it early and linger in it as long as possible" (1962:30).

The ideal adolescent lifestyle - parties, nightclubs, the search for excitement and kicks, changing sexual partners, licit and illicit drugs - has become a very pervasive model. Older people often aspire to and sometimes realize such a lifestyle. I am not saying that this lifestyle is equivalent to any of the various youth subcultures, but there is continuity between the two and some overlap in terms of the adherence to subterranean values.

I will now turn to youth unemployment and how this issue has been constructed in the Australian context. Youth unemployment has been (especially in the 1970's) a critical site for the deployment of various discourses relating to adolescence and to the interconnections between family, school and work. It is thus a fruitful topic through which to further my analysis.

Since the economic recession of 1974 there has been increasing concern about the "changing values of youth" and in particular young people's adherence to the work ethic, in the face of unemployment benefits, the counter-culture, etc. (see e.g. Windschuttle, 1980:52-5). This concern was

fuelled in the later 1970's by the "dole bludger" campaign, discussed presently.

A number of psychological studies of unemployment emerged out of this concern:- Turtle et.al. (1978), O'Brien and Kabanoff (1979), Commonwealth Employment Service (1979), Gurney (1980), Tiggemann and Winefield (1980), Dowling and O'Brien (1981). Discussions of the psychological effects of unemployment can also be found in Henderson (ed. - 1977:D5, G6-7), Hubbert (1980:65-72, 159-60, 178-81, 186-90), Windschuttle (1980:43-72, 113-7), Dept.of Employment and Youth Affairs (1982:10).

Throughout all these studies runs the notion of unemployment as disrupting self-esteem and threatening the allegiance of the unemployed to the work ethic. The latter is conceived of as an individual state of mind which is built up with proper socialization:

"As children, we are all socialized into seeing ourselves as normal, fitting reasonably closely into the lifestyle of our parents and peers. Everyone eventually expects to work for a living, even it is only for a part of adult life. This expectation is a cornerstone of our definition of normality. Unemployment denies young people the opportunity to accomplish what they have been brought up to expect to be the norm. Little wonder, then, that young people who cannot find jobs come to regard themselves as failures and freaks" (Windschuttle, 1980:57-8).

Here I would like to further discuss a notion developed by Donzelot in relation to the liberalized family (see also pp.64, 322-6, 359-61) - the flotation of old moral rules and new social norms made possible through psychoanalysis, and more generally through the "psy-complex", which establishes a process of circularity between the two practices of expertise and confession:

"When you go to a psychotherapist or marital counselor, the principle of diagnosis is maintained as a preliminary (it can be used to eliminate cases that are too 'heavy'), but it is also formally nullified at the outset, treated as a provisory and,

above all, nonpreferred, nonrecorded appearance. This is a crucial suspension, in that it removes the handicap of an a priori judgment, creating an opening where the confessional account will be lodged, the discourse of avowal out of which, precisely, there can issue an a posteriori revaluation based on the 'work' of the subject in his discourse, which is no longer expected to serve exclusively to verify an a priori. This circular displacement eliminates worries about manipulation, since every formulation of a social judgment is associated with its possible calling back into question through the subject's participation. The individual's resistance to norms, like that of the family, is thus no longer anything but an internal resistance to a process whose outcome can be a greater well-being for him and for it. The resistance to norms becomes a resistance to analysis, a purely negative and blind blockage in the way of one's own welfare. The strength of relational technology lies precisely in the fact that it does not impose anything - neither new social norms nor old moral rules. On the contrary, it allows them to float in relation to one another until they find their equilibrium" (1979a:210-1; emphasis in original).

Psychoanalysis does not blame anyone in particular. It ascribes problems to unconscious mental images, which create blockages and communication gaps in the family. By improving communication, by holding these images up to the light and examining them, relational difficulties will be smoothed over: "By designating a poor regulation of images as the root cause of scholastic failure, the 'psy' technique does not point the finger at any particular person or wrong behaviour; it places the blame, rather, on the relations that obtain within the family and on the unconscious mental representations of its members" (Donzelot, 1979a:214).

I would like to extend this analysis to psychological theories of youth unemployment. Ideas from a wide variety of sources (some of them discussed in the previous chapter) stress that young unemployed people need to be given social and practical skills to improve their employability and to keep up their motivation. As with psychoanalysis, this developmental psychology holds out the possibility of a cure through apparently neutral and rational educative practices. Resistance to these practices is simply irrational and self-destructive - e.g. the underachiever who refuses the help offered him by the

education system, and consequently goes out into the world with inadequate skills, inadequate preparation. Psychology does not blame anyone for being unemployed - many of the studies I listed above explicitly take their cue from opposition to the "dole bludger" complex. Rather than simply consigning the unemployed to the lowest rung of the status hierarchy, psychology offers the possibility of help if the unemployed improve their self-image.

These psychological theories always act in terms of a gap between the expectations built up through appropriate socialization and the reality of unemployment or failure. The model of socialization used , e.g. by Windschuttle above, posits a disjunction between individual and society. The individual and society are considered in effect as two separate entities. The individual picks up images or perceptions from society, which are then added to the individual's store, producing a positive or negative reaction. This disjunction often ignores the real social processes going on, and displaces these processes into the individual's "regulation of images". A quote from a British study illustrates the point:

"The reality here, that is whether there is evidence that people change their behaviour in relation to a person because of his or her changed status, is less important than the fact that the unemployed perceive this change to have taken place. It is, after all, on the basis of their perceptions that people form views and opinions of others and of themselves, whether or not these perceptions are realistic or not" (Hayes and Nutman, 1981:95-6).

Wadel (1973) has demonstrated in his case study of unemployment in rural Newfoundland that the unemployed do in fact have very real problems in maintaining their former, employed status. This is not simply a question of perceptions, but of real social processes in which unemployed people are subject to suspicion and surveillance by others in the community.

I am not trying to deny that sometimes there may be false perceptions. Sometimes people may remain unemployed when opportunities do in fact

exist, because of their low self-esteem, lack of confidence, poor information, surrender, etc. But to suggest that the very real social processes of status mobility are "less important" than the unemployed's perceptions is quite inadequate. The individual from an anthropological perspective is constituted through social processes: there is no radical disjunction between the individual and society. We are social beings through and through, and our self-images are sustained by ongoing participation (or lack of participation) in the social world, and are modifiable on the basis of this participation. Instead of seeing society as something "out there", as external to the individual, we should see it as created by everyday social processes and inseparable from these processes.

The psychology of adolescence assumes that early school leaving is a purely negative and irrational response to a benevolent educative intention. Quite apart from the availability of jobs, underachievers and early school leavers need to improve their skills and attitudes to make them more employable. Working class children may be educationally disadvantaged, but with appropriate help and guidance they can improve their competitive chances in the game of life. Apart from the dubious models of socialization employed by this psychology, it also tends to be over-optimistic about the possibilities for social integration or upward social mobility. I would argue that children learn class, gender, status, hierarchy, etc. from an early age through all kinds of informal and formal means, and that this learning will crucially affect their participation in schooling. Their lack of interest in school may be (though not always) a quite accurate appreciation of their class situation and consequently their probable future destinations, rather than an irrational resistance to public benevolence.

Many jobs are very boring and require very little specialized knowledge or training. I will juxtapose two accounts to illustrate the gap

between developmental psychology and the realities of the workplace. The first is a list of some of the benefits which all students should derive from schooling, drawn up by the Schools Commission in the document previously referred to :

- "(a) an excitement about and the confidence to undertake a commitment to some activity which they want to continue to pursue;
- (b) confidence in their power to influence events affecting their lives, whether at individual or societal level;
- (c) the experience of having been regarded as a valuable person and of valuing others;
- (d) skills and knowledge which qualify them to be eligible for what they consider to be appropriate paid employment, and/or to enter further education or training;" (1980:5).

The second is from O'Neil and Bosio (1982):

"A recent study on work attitudes and job satisfaction of 140 young workers in a major retail store supports the view, that the world of marginal, insecure, transitory work for the very young, may contribute to the development of negative attitudes about future work patterns, in your workers. The experience of the organization of work that this group of respondents (shop assistants, check-out operators, labourers) received in the retail sector led young people to conclude that:

- management was not easily approachable (70%)
- employment security was minimal (81%).
- future advancement in this industry sector was non-existent (94%).
- there was little opportunity to use the skills they had acquired elsewhere (58%).
- there was seldom any opportunity to exercise control over their job (65%)
- there was little improvement of skills over time in this employment (94%).

These young workers were frustrated by their jobs, learnt no skills, did not enjoy their work and felt exploited" (1980:37).

Other evidence regarding job satisfaction can be found in the "Report of the Survey of Training Needs in Industry, Commerce, and Government in

South Australia, 1972" (Department of Labour and Industry/Department of Further Education, South Australia, Government Printer, 1973). There were high turnover rates in many industries, resulting from a number of factors, but no doubt including employee dissatisfaction in many cases:

"In all the main divisions of the food industry there is an increasing trend to employ narrowly-skilled process workers such as beef or mutton boners and slicing workers in meat works or single-operation bread, biscuit and fruit packers. In many cases job satisfaction is extremely low because of the repetitive nature of the work. High turnovers result but retraining is essential before these persons can take up work in other companies" (1973, II:29).

In volume engineering:

"Although production workers are traditionally regarded as mobile (many of them remain for only short periods in the one company) the monotonous and repetitive nature of the work also contributes to the labour turnover situation. For their part companies vary the size of their work forces to keep them attuned to fluctuations in local and overseas markets and other peaks and troughs in demand" (1973, II:67).

Connell et.al. (1982a) argue that "school resistance" is basically a working class phenomenon and expresses the latter's opposition to capitalism (see above, pp.353-5). As I argued above, their account is overpoliticized and does not consider the changing nature of familialism. Working class children in general certainly have less to gain from schooling and therefore less reason to be committed to it. School is still basically a place where children are put into a confined and dependent situation - the classroom - which can often seem fairly irksome. But this feeling is by no means restricted to the working class, as is often stated or (more usually) implied. Middle class children also sense this, as can be seen from the largely middle class counterculture or "hippie" complex of the late 1960's. The widespread impact of this subculture, mostly derived from relatively privileged youth, presents a severe problem for many prevailing accounts of youth subcultures. The argument of the

CCCS, Connell and others that youth subcultures are a form of working class resistance to capitalism becomes very difficult to sustain when confronted by such a widespread and pervasive middle class youth subculture.

Of course dropping out for middle class youth is not as final and irrevocable as the early school leaving of the working class. There are many differences between middle class and working class youth subcultures. But both do express a certain centrifugal tendency of the advanced liberal family (Donzelot, 1979a:227-231). The desire of parents for the educational success of their children, in a situation where the real power of the family is declining, leads to an overinvestment (in middle class and normalized working class families) in techniques of relational togetherness. To compensate for the decreasing importance of the lineage and the patrimony, parents concentrate on making the home a suitable educative environment for the children, a hothouse of educational achievement.

Thus the school and the home both take on the character of normalizing, disciplinary institutions, which in the absence of reliable controls/benefits (disposal of the patrimony, juridical power of fathers over their children) tends to push the children outwards to their own peer groups. The old familial values - patriarchal authority, family honour, the glory of the lineage - no longer carry the same force of imposition. Yet these values have not disappeared. Rather they have been floated in relation to new hygienic and educative norms. Each individual and each family must find its own balance between the two - how far to push the children in search of scholastic success, whether or not to continue with a marriage that is proving difficult, whether to assert parental authority over troublesome adolescents. Because of the emphasis on relational quality, the family remains as the chief agency of personal fulfilment. But although justified in theory, it is always suspect in

practice - suspected either of pressing too heavily on its members or of not pressing heavily enough.

Resistance to schooling is a class-related phenomenon, but simply to leave it at that can be very misleading. Because of its usage in the normalizing contexts of home and school, the psychology of adolescence comes up against the problem of adolescents striving to define themselves as adults in opposition to the subservient, tutelary role allotted to them in school and home. This involves class differences but cannot be reduced to them. Both middle class and working class families have been imbued with educative norms, if through different means (ranging between the poles of contract and tutelage). Youth subcultures in my reading of the literature as well as in my own experience are not limited to the working class. The "alienation" of youth is a more general phenomenon, with class variations but not explicable purely in class terms.

It is wrong therefore to talk of compulsory schooling and other normalizing practices as simply a middle class imposition on the working class. Although operating through different, class-based channels, normalization involves wholesale transformation of families at all levels of the social hierarchy.

To further the discussion of youth subcultures and their connection with modern familialism, I have found it useful to borrow the distinction between formal and subterranean values employed by Matza and Sykes (1961). This distinction has also been used by Jock Young (1971:124-138).

Matza and Sykes argue that not only are there differences in values between middle class and working class, but also that within each of these categories it is wrong to speak of a unified, stable value system:

"Not only do different social classes differ in their values, but there are also significant variations within a class based on ethnic origins, upward and downward mobility, region, age, etc. Perhaps even more important, however, is the existence of subterranean values - values, that is to say, which are in conflict or in competition with other deeply held values but which are still recognized and accepted by many. It is crucial to note that these contradictions in values are not necessarily the opposing viewpoints of two different groups. They may also exist within a single individual and give rise to profound feelings of ambivalence in many areas of life. In this sense, subterranean values are akin to private as opposed to public morality. They are values that the individual holds to and believes in but that are also recognized as being not quite *comme il faut*" (1961:716).

This distinction thus cuts across class lines. Formal values are "functional for the maintenance of diligent, consistent work and the realization of long-term productive goals" (Young, 1971:126). They stress predictability, conformity to bureaucratic rules, deferred gratification, and the virtues of hard work. Subterranean values stress hedonism, spontaneity, expressivity, excitement and disdain for work.

Matza and Sykes argue that subterranean values are related to the values of a leisure class. They note that Thorstein Veblen made a passing reference to the similarity between delinquents and the leisured elite:

"The ideal pecuniary man is like the ideal delinquent in his unscrupulous conversion of goods and services to his own ends, and in a callous disregard for the feelings and wishes of others and of the remoter effects of his actions" (Veblen, "The Theory of the Leisure Class", 1934:237-8; quoted in Matza and Sykes, 1961:715).

Subterranean values are not in themselves deviant - they have in fact become incorporated into the everyday existence of "straight" society. They exist side-by-side with the routine virtues of the workaday world, and have their own institutionalized moments of expression - sports, recreation, holidays, gambling, a night on the town, office parties, etc. Subterranean values are subordinated to formal values most of the time by most people, but this does not mean they are deviant or unimportant:

"The search for adventure, excitement, and thrills, then, is a subterranean value that now often exists side by side with the values of security, routinization, and the rest. It is not a deviant value, in any full sense, but it must be held in abeyance until the proper moment and circumstances for its expression arrive" (Matza and Sykes, 1961:716).

There are two caveats I wish to make in relation to this distinction: (1) my use of this distinction does not imply any psychological theory (whether Freudian or other) of conscious versus unconscious - e.g. the repressive superego and the libidinal id. The values I refer to are socially recognizable codes rather than innate psychological conditions; (2) following Mills (1940) and various strands of phenomenological theorizing, I see values as resources for use in particular situations rather than as fixed and stable entities which more-or-less determine social action from the outside. Values are constructed and used creatively in each new social context rather than simply reproducing themselves through the agency of human action. I am opposed to the kind of mechanistic theory which sees values as being implanted into people's heads and then determining their behaviour. This is a commonsense view which often crops up in academic discussions of many different kinds.

The psychology of adolescence used by educationists and others revolves almost exclusively around formal values, whereas the values espoused by adolescents themselves tend towards the subterranean - whether these latter are regarded as delinquent or whether they are simply dismissed as the products of youthful exuberance.

The formal model of adolescence which I have discussed in the previous chapter sees adolescence as a period of training and preparation for adult status. Adolescence is seen as a kind of halfway house during which adolescents are gradually inducted to the adult concerns of work and sexuality. This induction takes place through a series of carefully graded developmental tasks which each teenager must fulfil. The whole process

occurs in special age-graded institutions, where officially sexuality has no place, and premature exposure to work is considered to be undesirable (early school leavers, underachievers, etc. - those who do not complete the full course of preparation).

Subterranean understandings of adolescence stress hedonism, the search for kicks, experimentation with sex and drugs, the desire for full adult status immediately. These understandings are pre-eminently expressed by adolescents themselves, in the various youth subcultures, but they are not restricted to adolescents (nor are formal values restricted to adults - see Matza and Sykes' discussion of the delinquent's "techniques of neutralization" - e.g. the definition of injury as rightful revenge - 1961:712-3; elaborated by Matza, 1964). Adults also have standardised ways for excusing youthful misbehaviour; in fact the whole notion of adolescence as developed by G.S.Hall and as embodied in juvenile justice revolves heavily around the decriminalization of juvenile delinquency - the opportunity for reformation, for a second chance, for growing out of the delinquent phase (see pp.260-3 above).

It is these subterranean values that form the content of youth subcultures and resistance to schooling, rather than simply working class resistance to capitalism. Because of their general social and economic position, working class teenagers are more likely to embrace or to drift into subterranean values, but these values cut across class divisions and are also part and parcel of middle class existence, if in more subdued and more institutionalized ways. The hippie subculture was a direct expression of these subterranean values.

The distinction between formal and subterranean values provides an interesting way of looking at the dole bludger syndrome of the 1970's. This has been well documented by Windschuttle (1980:155-179).

The mass media campaign started in 1972 with the election of the Whitlam Federal Labor government, and continued on throughout the 1970's, perhaps peaking in 1975 just before the Federal election in December of that year. Newspapers at the time carried headlines such as: "Weed Out the Dole Cheats!" (Daily Mirror, Sydney, 23/9/75); "Dole Cheats' Cheques Stopped" (Daily Telegraph, Sydney, 23/9/75); "The Dole Cheats: Where Your Money Goes" (Sun, Sydney, 29/9/75); "Govt. to Crack Down on Dole Rip-Off" (Daily Telegraph, Sydney, 9/10/75); "Govt Admits to Giant Fraud by Dole Cheats" (Australian, 9/10/75).

On 7/12/75 a "dole dollies" story was featured on the front page of several Murdoch-owned papers (Sunday Telegraph, Sydney; Sunday Sun, Brisbane; and Sunday Mail, Adelaide; see Windschuttle, 1980:166-7). A picture of six bikini-clad "dollies" sitting next to a swimming pool was featured (5 in the Sunday Mail). The headline on the Sunday Telegraph was: "Luxury Life on the Dole: Two Homes, a Car and Private Pool". This luxury was supposedly the product of pooling their dole cheques, although according to Windschuttle (*ibid*) three of the women had jobs and one did not even live at the house.

The Sunday Mail story, which covered almost the entire front page, was titled "Dole Dollies - Pool Cheques for High Life" (7/12/75, p.1; continued on p.166). The following week (14/12/75, p.104) the Sunday Mail published a letter reacting to this story which illustrates the philosophy involved. The letter was titled "The 100-hour per week 'capitalists'" and read:

"Sir - As an employer I find it extremely difficult in these times of so-called rampant unemployment to attain semi-skilled casual staff at \$4 per hour.

"Your story titled 'Dole Dollies' (Sunday Mail 7/12/75) sickened me to the pit of my stomach.

"When casual staff do accept employment it is only on the proviso that work does not interfere with their golfing, tennis, barbecue and other assorted social activities.

"My wife and I work an average of 100 hours each a week.

"As such we are labelled 'Capitalists' and penalised with heavy taxation.

"Just where is this once great country of ours headed when the hard-working individual is not encouraged or rewarded but 'kicked in the guts' and the bludger is rewarded for his non-efforts with handsome dole dividends?"

Windschuttle analyzes the dole bludger campaign in terms of a dual response of "fascination/repulsion" (1980:169). The reader of these items is fascinated by the concept of breaking the rules, but on the other hand he feels that such breaches are not possible for him and he reacts in terms of moral indignation towards the life of leisure associated with the dole bludger. This is an important start, but Windschuttle does not really develop his analysis. At other times, he appears to ignore the social basis for the appeal of the dole bludger syndrome. He writes: "Before the surveys, [initiated in 1973 by Minister of Social Security Hayden - AW] the dole bludger phenomenon was nothing more than an impression or a prejudice coming from employers and some politicians" (1980:162). Later, he refers to the fading of the dole bludger image in the media by mid-1978, "which will be followed by a much slower, lingering fade within popular consciousness" (1980:179).

These remarks suggest a somewhat mechanistic theory in which employers and conservative politicians are able to use the mass media to implant ideas into people's heads. Without this mass media input, the image of the dole bludger will gradually fade. This ignores the cultural basis of the

dole bludger - the work ethic which forms the basis for people's interpretation of these mass media images. This work ethic is a crucial component in the lives of both middle class and working class people. The self-image of both of these groups - but especially the working class - is based on their opposition to the idle rich, the kind of aristocratic elite who are born rich and who have done nothing to justify their wealth (Willmott and Young, 1973:10-11).

Following Berger and Luckmann (1964) and B.Berger (1963), Young (1971:127) argues that the Protestant work ethic has entered into a remarkable decline, outside the liberal professions. Work is no longer the main vehicle for realizing identity; it is no longer religiously ordained as a natural duty to God, King and Country. Instead work is regarded instrumentally by nearly all sections of society: "You work hard in order to earn money, which you spend in the pursuit of leisure, and it is in his 'free' time that a man really develops his sense of identity and purpose" (*ibid*).

It is this work/leisure ethic which forms the basis for the "fascination/repulsion" felt towards the dole bludger. The dole bludger is not deviant simply because of his espousal of subterranean values - rather it is the way he accentuates these values to the exclusion of the formal values. There is nothing wrong with enjoying yourself, with living for the present, with getting drunk or stoned. What is wrong is when these values are embraced too literally, when the pursuit of these values leads people to question the formal values, when they interfere with a person's productivity in the world of work. The dole bludger is dangerous because he threatens the precarious balance between formal and subterranean values. He holds up the promise of enjoyment without work, of gratification without sacrifice. He threatens the identity of the "straight" who has sacrificed himself his whole life on the altar of productivity.

On the one hand, the worker is fascinated by the idea of a life full of unrestrained pleasure and indulgence. On the other hand, he is repulsed by the thought that here is someone who is apparently doing things which the worker has always dreamt of, but doing so without going through the sacrifices that the worker has had to make (cf. Sennett and Cobb, 1973:137-8; quoted in Windschuttle, 1980:169).

I have argued throughout the thesis that success and failure have been defined in individualistic terms in twentieth century capitalist societies, through the influence of meritocratic education and the liberalized family. Arguably this individualistic attribution is particularly well developed in Australia because of the wage regulation strategy discussed by Castles (1985 - see pp.253-5 above):-

"....the assumption that such a strategy could be successful had the perverse effect of relegating all other social needs to the category of the unusual or emergency, to be catered for by helping those least able to help themselves as and when the state recognised such needs existed. If wages were fair and reasonable, it would only be the improvident and those unusually circumstanced who would require help" (1985:99).

The "dole bludger", as someone reliant on social welfare, may have become particularly salient in Australian culture because of such assumptions.

I would argue further that the dole bludger campaign is closely related to the counterculture or "hippie" complex of the late 1960's and early 1970's. This involved rejection of formal educational and career paths, experimentation with various illicit drugs, a willingness to use unemployment benefit as a long-term means of support, and rejection of the bureaucratic routines of school and work in favour of an emphasis on creativity, expressivity, and relational quality ("free love") (Young, 1971:148-168). The timing and general nature of the dole bludger campaign strongly suggests this connection, which is not discussed by Windschuttle.

Another factor feeding in to this campaign may be the middle class nature of the hippie movement. Working class delinquency can be easily accepted by many people as natural, and working class parents may in any case not be in a position to air their concerns. But when young people from respectable middle class families go off the rails, one would expect a correspondingly greater moral panic. The dole bludger campaign could thus be seen as an adult reaction to (especially middle class) youth's embracing of subterranean values. More generally, there is a tension between the formal values of school, family, and work on the one hand, and the subterranean values of youth peer groups on the other.

Young distinguishes between three kinds of youth subcultures. Firstly there is conformist youth culture (the vast majority) which accepts their low status at work or study. They have an instrumental attitude to study or apprenticeship, but this is based on future benefits rather than present gain. Their sense of status is derived from leisure-time activities - athletics, dancing, clothes, cars, physical prowess, etc. Subterranean values are accentuated as compared with adults but still kept within bounds. Deviation - sex, alcohol, marijuana, etc. - occurs but is kept hidden, the prime example being the teenage party while the parents are away (Young, 1971:142-4).

Secondly, there is delinquent youth culture, usually lower working class. Here school is seen as largely unrelated to the unskilled manual job they will take, and work itself is seen as fairly alienating and without much promise of material rewards. The result is a much more intensive involvement with leisure, and a readiness to engage openly in illicit activities, without fear of jeopardizing their future (non-existent) careers. The delinquent culture centres around the search for kicks - especially displays of bravado involving the possibility of serious bodily harm (1971:144-7). It is this

group which much of the recent literature focuses on, to the exclusion of the other two in my opinion.

Thirdly, there is bohemian youth culture. Here the youth's disengagement from school and work results from a conscious choice, for initially at least he is capable of leading a materially successful life. His focus on a life of leisure is of an articulate and ideological nature (the "counter culture"). Drug use is exalted to a paramount position (1971:147; 148-68).

Though there are important differences between these various peer groups, Young's analysis also suggests that there is a potential source of tension in all three between formal and subterranean values. The psychology of adolescence - institutionalized as secondary education - could thus be seen as a means for orienting youth towards the formal values of work, routinization, conformity to rules, etc., in opposition to the subterranean values of the peer group. Schooling, Young argues, has more to do with inculcating the virtues of work than with training in specific skills or knowledge:

"It can be argued that the notion of our society being more 'complex' than 'primitive' societies is something of a misconception: the skills that many tribal peoples learn, both technological and social, are often formidable. Further, whilst the notion that adolescence is a physiological stage in between childhood and adulthood may be true as regards puberty itself, it hardly justifies its extension up to the late teens and early twenties. The body of information that the educational system, which perpetuates and concretizes this social definition of adolescence, conveys to its students is very largely vocationally and socially irrelevant to their future adult lives. Education has, as Musgrove indicates, largely a 'ritual function': a place where pupils diligently mark time, where pseudo-productive tasks are engaged in, and where the work ethic is firmly ingrained into at least the more educationally 'fortunate' youngsters" (Young, 1971:142).

It is employers who usually express this attitude most clearly - e.g. the following passage from a submission to the Commonwealth Working Party

on the transition from secondary education to employment; the author was commenting on the virtues of transition education:

"Making him/her aware of the conventions of work which do not operate consistently in home or school - punctuality, the 40-hour week, constraints on behaviour, emotional responses, language, observance of the 'pecking order', etc." (Dept. of Education [Commonwealth], 1976a:131; emphasis in original).

Employers interviewed in a South Australian study in 1972 expressed similar feelings:

"Others again are unhappy about the demeanour and attitude to work shown by those school leavers of whom they have had experience. They expressed the view that the focus of activity during secondary education on the development of a critical capacity and expression of self stands in the way of the acceptance by school leavers of the direction and supervision which is an indispensable part of the world of work" (Dept. of Labour and Industry/Dept. of Further Education [SA], 1973:1:11)

These statements are framed as complaints about the inadequacy of secondary schools, but I would argue that they reflect general community expectations, not only among employers but also among parents and students. These expectations exercise a strong constraining effect on the education system, in spite of the efforts of progressive or radical educationists. The Senate document I have previously referred to provides further evidence of these expectations:

"We also gained the distinct impression that employers in general lacked an understanding of what the schools were trying to achieve. We concluded that the employer problem with the school leaver might not be so closely related to literacy and numeracy deficiencies as first suspected but more to attitudinal factors linked to the general demeanour of school leavers and their approach to work. We also concluded that this could explain, at least in part, why employers ask for unnecessarily high qualifications. For instance, an industry survey by the N.S.W. Institute of Public Affairs on the collective views of employers on the quality of young recruits, indicate that employers associate desirable attitudes and values such as reliability, high moral value and self-discipline with high educational attainment.

"It therefore would appear that employers ask for high academic qualifications in the belief that associated with these qualifications are the attitudes and values they seek in recruits" (Senate, op.cit., 1981:9).

Rather than specific skills and knowledges, the most important thing that students learn at school is the principles of bureaucratic organization - hierarchy; grading by age and seniority; the concept of a career as a fixed sequence of steps, each separated by tests or exams; the disciplined and routinized use of time; the theorem of fair and open competition, presided over by impartial judges using explicit and rational procedures. Of course students may have very different attitudes to this, ranging from positive commitment, to instrumentalism, to complete rejection. The important thing is that positive rewards and benefits are seen as flowing to those who play the game, who are willing and/or able to subsume the subterranean values of the peer group under the ethos of productivity.

The psychology of adolescence has evolved in a manner congruent with its institutional ramifications. It proclaims the necessity for a fixed sequence of development for all students. Premature expressions of adulthood ("precocity"), such as involvement with sex, alcohol, drugs, etc., are taken as an indicator of immaturity and low social status, and call into play remedial measures. Willingness to remain in the ambiguous state of adolescence becomes, paradoxically, a sign of maturity; a sign that the student is willing to accept the help of teachers and parents in completing the necessary developmental tasks of adolescence.

School could thus be described as an institutionalized means for maintaining or improving your social status through the strategy of "playing" the dependent. This way of looking at it points to the importance of the school/family connection in the class system of liberal capitalist societies. Both school and family are structures of power or means of status

differentiation. Accepting a dependent situation at school also means accepting the same at home, i.e. accepting the norms of sociality and proper parent/child relationships. E.g.:

"The process of early learning is facilitated by parents talking to their children, reading to them and doing things with them that both parents and children enjoy. The Committee was told that when parents do take this kind of interest in their children and then later advise them about careers, the resulting learning skill and motivation of the children justifies the efforts the parents have made" (Senate, op.cit., 1981:28).

"It is of no use to artificially divide the child into a 'school child' and 'a member of a family'. He is both of these things, certainly, but he is still the one human personality with the same fears, hopes, needs, joys, sorrows and satisfactions both at home and at school. We are concerned with the whole child, and we must realize that school experiences will affect home life and that the influences of home will affect school life. Parents and teachers need to work together, in a partnership of mutual concern, assisting the child in both these sides of his life" (Hall et. al., 1983:2-3).

In general, the working class child has less reason to be attached to the formal values of home, school and work. He is more likely to embrace the subterranean values of the peer group, with its precocious interest in sex, drugs, cars, physical prowess, etc. His self-definition as adult creates problems for both teachers and parents. Parents find it harder to live up to the relational norms of the liberalized family - not shouting at other family members, giving children reasons for all decisions instead of simply laying down the law, doing things together as a family, talking to each other on a day-to-day basis, etc. In this way relational norms themselves become a means of status differentiation. The working class family whose children are turned off by schooling; the family which fails to control its adolescent children and lets them roam the streets; the "disorganized" family characterized by arguments and lack of togetherness - all these things become signs to teachers, neighbours, welfare workers and other concerned

individuals that this family is on the verge of breakdown and is in need of remedial intervention.

The concern with underachievers and early school leavers is not only a question of education - there is a whole politics of the family involved. Both home and school are characterized by a concern with relational quality, relational technology. They have become linked to that peculiar hybrid sector, the social. The social has become a new form of status differentiation and political regulation. Instead of relations of dependence, the social sector introduces claims-making procedures or relations of promotion (Donzelot, 1979a:4, 94, 222-3) - the family as a locus of saving and as a support for children's scholastic success; the school as an impartial gauge of children's potential, as a pointer to their probable future destinations; the family as a basis from which to launch demands for greater equality (the "living wage", taking into account the needs of dependent wife and children; child endowment; free medical and educational services, etc.).

This substitution produces an entirely new definition of success and failure. Failure in the 19th century was linked to disobedience - in the direct sense of unruly servants not obeying their masters; more indirectly in failing to heed the advice of their social superiors, in a situation in which access to employment, charitable aid and other benefits was linked to the person's moral and religious status in the local community (cf. the diaries of William Stagg discussed in Ch.4; also Donzelot, 1979a:167).

The dual public/private nature of the family - the family as a locus of saving and arena of consumption, leisure, relational fulfilment on the one hand, and the family as an agency for the diffusion of state-sponsored medical and hygienic norms on the other - produces in combination with meritocratic schooling a situation in which failure becomes linked to the

observance of norms defined as rational and impartial, rather than to obedience to authoritarian dictates, with their high rates of resistance, disaffection, and manipulation.

Resistance to these norms becomes not a matter of politics or of socioeconomic justice, but rather a sign of irrationality and psychological disturbance, thus calling for increased educative measures. In relation to secondary schooling, the quite easily understandable resistance of many working class children - their desire to get out as soon as possible - only proves their need of that which they reject, setting up a self-perpetuating spiral. Their underachieving demonstrates that they are immature and unprepared for the adult world. Therefore they must be made to stay longer at school so they can fulfil the necessary developmental tasks of adolescence. Hence we have alternative education, the desire to have all students stay till year 12, comprehensive youth schemes, etc. This lengthening of adolescent dependence, however, only increases the danger of resistance and disaffection; it lengthens the period of ambiguity during which adolescents are striving to define themselves as adults in opposition to school and family. Adolescents' lack of appreciation of these new opportunities again proves their psychological shortcomings, thus calling into play further remedial measures.....

This oppositional/remedial spiral is fed by a number of other factors: (1) changes in technology which reduce labour force requirements; (2) the desire of middle class or upper working class parents and/or children for upward social mobility; this feeds the demand for increased periods of secondary education for everyone, and also continually raises the threshold below which working class families are considered to be neglecting their duties (in terms of length of education of their children); (3) employers' need to get people with the same dedication in a period of increasing participation

rates, usually referred to as credentialism: "It may lead to employers specifying higher standards of education for some jobs, either because the supply of applicants is greater or to get people from the same ability strand of the population as they did when participation rates were lower" (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1980:28; cf. the passage already quoted from the Senate document of 1981 - above, pp.380-1); (4) politicians' desire to be seen as doing something about youth unemployment; keeping young people at school for longer periods can be presented as a "solution" to youth unemployment.

Lying behind all of these factors is the ready acceptance of adolescence as a natural and universal stage of life, grounded in scientifically-validated biological and psychological realities. This facilitates the extension and universalization of secondary education as the necessary content of this stage of life. In the particular context of Australia in the 1970's and 1980's, this process in effect means the acceptance of youth unemployment, and the redefinition of young people as childlike beings who should not be prematurely exposed to the rigours of the labour market.

As argued by the revisionist school (see above, pp.13-5, 265-7), the twentieth century has witnessed an extension of the period of childhood dependency. This argument contrasts with that of O'Loughlin and Sinclair (1982).

Basing themselves on a study of age of leaving school and entering a job, age at first marriage, and age at birth of first child for three Australian cohorts (1896, 1918, and 1946), O'Loughlin and Sinclair argue that the transition to adult status has become briefer:

"Has the transition to adulthood become more prolonged today or has it in fact become briefer? On the balance of evidence, it would be safe to say that, for the 1946 cohort, the process of

growing-up as measured here was accomplished in a shorter space of time, at a younger age, by a greater proportion of the cohort than in either the 1896 or 1918 cohort" (1982:168).

They base their definitions mainly on the length of time elapsing between age at leaving school and age at marriage (1982:164). On its own terms the argument is difficult to fault. However, I would argue that a more meaningful index of length of transition is simply length of education as such (or alternatively age at first entering the work force), in which case one obviously comes up with the opposite conclusion to O'Loughlin and Sinclair.

Following Kett, Gillis, and (locally) Wimshurst, Miller and others, I would argue that the twentieth century has witnessed an extension of the period of childhood dependency, even if people are marrying and having children at an earlier age. Kett describes a period of "semidependence" among nineteenth century American youth, with periods of comparative freedom while working alternating with periods of total dependence on the familial household. Instead of the gradual and fairly uniform transition we find today, youth was exposed to a jarring mixture of autonomy and dependence (1977:29).

This analysis also seems relevant to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Australian context. Children left school at or before the school leaving age to engage in casual work of various kinds or alternatively to help out in the family household or business (see especially Wimshurst, 1979). Girls often left home at an early age to work as domestic servants. Middle class reformers spoke of the precocity of working class children - their streetwise habits, their skill in finding work, their illicit knowledge of sex and other adult concerns. Even before the school leaving age, many children would have been directly familiar with the disciplines of work.

With the decline of child labour and the corresponding increase of compulsory education, children in the twentieth century have been shielded from this adult world and segregated into special age-graded institutions. Instead of a concern with limiting child labour and the attendant "unnatural precocity" of the street hustler, we now have transition education, work experience, "relevant" education, etc., whose aim is to ease the transition into the workforce. Children no longer make the transition to adulthood through direct practical experience, but from the safety of special age-graded institutions. The very existence of these institutions is premised on the idea of youth as a special non-adult age category. Youth is denied adult status (work in particular) in the very process of learning to be adult. The segregation of youth into high schools and other educational, training and support schemes itself works against an easy transition to adulthood, given the continuing importance of work as an avenue to adult status. In the last chapter I documented the recent tendency in Australia for this period of dependency to increase. All in all, it makes much more sense to me to speak of an increase in the period of childhood dependency in twentieth century Australia.

At the same time, departing from the revisionist school, the nature of this dependency has itself changed. Paradoxically it is through the discourse of liberation from patriarchal and other forms of authority that this new form of dependency takes hold. The more subtle but by the same token more effective mechanisms of the norm replace the cruder strategies of the law (see pp.39-42 above). Individual self-interest, as expressed through the formally open competition of universal secondary education, itself becomes a means of positive integration into the social order. The scope of this self-interest, however, remains very limited for the majority.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have examined the emergence and institutionalization of a particular model of childhood and adolescence in South Australia, one based on a combination of compulsory formal education in school and involvement in a private familial setting. Each context, I showed, could usefully be conceptualized in terms of the hybridized public/private sphere of the social. I have explored the major changes in the meaning and significance of childhood occurring in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and have argued that these changes involved a realignment of the network of power relations operating in and through families. A process that could be termed liberalization occurred both within the family and in the relations between families and the state or other external organizations.

Within the family, the juridically absolute power of the father was softened in favour of the mother and children. The aspect of this process with which I have been chiefly concerned is the shift from what Zelizer (1985) calls the economically useful child to the economically useless but emotionally priceless one, empirically marked in my case by the introduction and extension of compulsory education. Instead of children working for their fathers, either directly or through contributing wages to the family economy, the father-child relation was stripped of any direct master-servant connotations and redefined as a purely educative and social one. The status of the mother and in particular her child-rearing role was invested with a new dignity and importance at the same time as the father's role was softened. Noting that the mother is the preferred lead-off witness in American court proceedings claiming compensation for the wrongful death of a child, Zelizer says:

"While the economically useful child was legally 'owned' by the father, the 'priceless' child is considered the mother's sentimental asset" (1985:159-60).

The liberalization of relations within the family involved the withdrawal of children from the now-adult world of work and the consequent redefinition of parent-child relations as purely social. This liberalization sharpened the differentiation between public and private spheres, but at the same time, through compulsory education which was one of main vehicles for this process, established a circuit between them, so that families who came under notice for failing to observe state-sponsored norms of education, thrift and hygiene risked losing their autonomy and falling into the tutelary register.

In terms of its external relations, the family was also liberalized. This involved a number of aspects - the possibility or increasing availability of divorce, the creation of a specialized system of juvenile justice with its more lenient approach to youthful wrongdoing, the availability of various forms of social security, and state secondary education which - along with changes in the nature of the job market - created at least the formal framework for the impartial, meritocratic judging of the relative worth of different youths and their access to valued occupations.

I have examined the extension of this model of childhood in the post-World War II period with the emergence and increasing comprehensiveness of mass secondary education, and have critically analyzed the rationales presented for this movement. I argue that what is in reality a culturally and historically specific model has been given scientific legitimization as a natural, inevitable and universal institution, which glosses over the need to critically examine the changes described and their imbrication within a particular set of power relations.

I now wish to compare my account with selected competing formulations to bring out the specificities of my approach and how it differs from these others.

I have tried to deconstruct the family both synchronically and diachronically, rather than regarding the family as a self-evident, unitary and unproblematic entity. Synchronically, I have followed Donzelot in arguing that there are two pathways or registers of the twentieth century liberalized family, contract and tutelage, closely tied in with the distinction between middle class and working class. Diachronically, I have argued for the significance of relatively recent changes in familialism and in parent-child relations, in opposition, for example, to the work of Pollock (1985).

The thesis raises questions about a number of common assumptions regarding the family. Various tendencies which are usually seen as in contradiction with the family or as aspects of its decline I see as constitutive of it - in particular, state intervention and feminism (youth subcultures can also be considered in this light, but this has been covered in Ch.7 and will not be recapitulated here). I will examine this contrast using the work of Reiger (1985) and Magarey (1985).

Reiger (1985; see also 1986, 1987) argues that there is a contradiction between the idea that women's domestic role is a natural, ingrained feature of womanhood, and the reality of increasing expert advice to mothers and expert intervention in family life:

"....the 'experts' on home and family, while ostensibly promoting the separation of sexual spheres and the privacy of the home, were invading it at every point, demanding that women learn and apply the principles of the capitalist industrial world. Such principles, however, flatly contradicted notions of the naturalness of women's maternity and housewifery" (1985:55; cf. Miller, 1986:87-8).

The assumption behind her argument is that first, there was the private family unit; secondly, this unit was undermined by expert intervention:

"....the bourgeois model of womanhood and the family was profoundly undermined by the discourse and practice of the rationalizing technical experts" (1985:20).

In the early twentieth century there was an alliance of philanthropists with emerging professional experts in public health, housing and the management of the family and household (1985:33) which was responsible for this undermining. Reiger talks of expert rather than state intervention, but the two are obviously very closely linked.

In contrast with her view, I see state and expert intervention as a crucial aspect of the creation of the twentieth century liberalized family with its particular sacralization of motherhood and childhood. State intervention does not act in contradiction with the definition of the family as a private, autonomous haven, rather both these things are part of the same process and act in concert with each other.

State compulsory education was a crucial aspect of the separation of children from the world of work and hence of the sharper differentiation of public and private spheres, the latter now being defined purely in social terms. Medical, psychological and sociological theories of various kinds (of which I have used Stanley Hall as an archetype - see Ch.6) provided legitimations for this shift and naturalized the resulting models of childhood and adolescence.

Not only was state intervention crucial in the establishment of the liberalized family, compulsory education provides an ongoing and automatic check on the allegiance of families to state-sponsored educative and hygienic norms, most obviously in relation to truancy but also in connection with other

problems in the school situation which may justify remedial intervention in the family.

Rather than contradiction, there is a functional circuit between the two poles of contract and tutelage. The state and its experts in effect offer families an alternative between these two poles.

(1) The contractual option - preserve your economic autonomy through thrift so that you do not need to come to us with requests for financial aid; observe the hygienic, educative and social norms we have taught you to avoid sickness and relational difficulties; if these difficulties still occur, consult with your own private doctors, psychiatrists, marital counsellors, etc. to sort them out; in short, observe all these norms and your autonomy and privacy will be guaranteed, and with luck your material and relational condition may even improve.

(2) If you fail to observe these norms, on the other hand, you are obviously damaging your own lives as well as creating problems for others; hence we are justified in intervening in your lives to rectify the situation, since these norms have been scientifically and objectively established as the best way to ensure the health of both individuals and nations; we will provide you with the neutral, expert help you need to overcome your problems, although it may involve some loss of personal liberty.

As argued in Ch.6 above, the observance of state-sponsored norms provides a means of positive integration into the social order - a way for individuals and families to simultaneously pursue their own self-interest as well as (in the prevailing ideology) serving the overall well-being of the nation, rendering unnecessary the costly and inefficient methods associated with older, more coercive systems of social control. The private pursuit of well-being through the voluntary observance of state-sponsored norms will

guarantee and possibly even augment the autonomy of the family. Those who are unwilling or incapable of observing these norms risk falling into the tutelary register.

In the contractual register, expert advice (privately and voluntarily solicited) augments the autonomy of the family; only in the tutelary register is there a conflict between state/expert intervention and the privacy of the family. Reiger fails to make this crucial distinction (as well as many others - see, for example, my discussion of Lasch on pp.73-5 above).

A parallel critique can be made of Magarey's treatment of feminism, in her study of Catherine Helen Spence (1985). Magarey assumes that prior to the emergence of feminism there was a clear dividing line between the public and private spheres, a line which was subverted as women gained access to previously male occupations and sought to make their voices heard in the political sphere. An opposition is assumed between the family and the public/private split on the one hand, and feminism on the other:

"Just as changes in the economic order of South Australian society were, by the 1890's, polarising labour and capital and giving rise to the formation of political parties to contest the interests of each, so changes in the patriarchal social order were altering the boundary between the separate spheres of women and men and leading to the formation of organizations to protect and promote the rights of women" (1985:168).

First, there is patriarchy with its separation of public and private spheres, then there is feminism which seeks to break down this separation.

Given the importance of compulsory education in helping to constitute the split between public and private spheres (at least among working class and lower middle class families), my thesis casts doubts on Magarey's interpretation. Feminism was heavily involved in the street children campaign in turn-of-the-century South Australia, a campaign focused on the

curtailment of child labour and the extension of compulsory education and its associated model of childhood dependence. I argue that this model of childhood is a necessary and constitutive feature of the public/private split in its twentieth century form, and consequently that nineteenth century feminism itself is constitutive of this split. The difference between Magarey's position and my own can be seen partly in the larger degree of effectivity which I attribute to first wave feminism.

Nineteenth century feminism with its stress on women's special innate qualities as the vehicles for increasing women's participation in the public sphere actually sharpened the distinction between the public and the private. Women's paid employment in "social" areas such as teaching, nursing and social work (given that this employment was only regarded as appropriate for single women), as well as their political involvement in similar areas, helped to constitute their twentieth century role as the "natural" care-givers, homemakers, etc., rather than to undermine it.

These trends, as well as the outpourings of expert advice and increasing state concern, are part of what might be called the deployment of domesticity, in line with Foucault's discussion of the deployment of sexuality (1981). I argue that it is only from the late nineteenth century, particularly with the advent of compulsory education, that this deployment takes place.

There was a similar valorization of motherhood/childhood before this, but only in a small minority of privileged bourgeois families. Domesticity would not have had the same meaning here, since these households were well supplied with domestic servants who not only did the cooking, cleaning, etc., but also cared for and often educated the children (see the reminiscences of Dorothy Gilbert above, pp.145-8). The presence of servants also has implications for the nature of the public/private split. Even though there may

have been a rigid role differentiation between the master and mistress of the household, with the mistress (and the daughters) being debarred from working and having a role devoted to the display of taste and cultural uplift, such households are obviously not private in the same sense as households constituted solely of family members.

If this reading is correct, then first-wave feminism was contemporaneous with the emergence of domesticity and the public/private split in their current forms, and indeed constitutive of these changes, given the nature of the most influential strands within it. This position finds support in the work of American scholars such as Sklar (1973), Leach (1980), and Zelizer (1985). Rather than a black-and white opposition between patriarchy and feminism, this perspective suggests a more complex relationship in which a certain form of feminism is a constitutive feature of our culture.

The same could be said for the opposition between laissez faire and state intervention, which is often seen in similarly stark terms by supporters of one or the other. Rather than a relation of contradiction, or the Marxist view which tends to relegate the state to superstructural status, I have argued throughout the thesis that state intervention and regulation is a necessary and vitally important part of capitalism, at least in its South Australian form. In Ch.3, I used the writings of Wakefield to bring out the paradox of a laissez faire society constructed according to an explicit blueprint.

I also argued that, in contrast to aristocratic arbitrariness, bourgeois society is characterized by a more rule-governed framework. This argument is derived from two sources: from Foucault's discussion of disciplinary society, and the greater penetration of power into the social body as compared with the Ancien Régime; and from Weber's discussion of capitalism as not simply unrestrained greed, but rather as a calculated and regulated system of

exploitation, in which the very existence of juridical limits to exploitation (personal liberty outside of the work context, the basic wage, etc.) shores up the long-term viability of the system - in other words, a restrained but ongoing and stable form of exploitation.

Following Foucault, this is not simply a question of the state as a particular institution or collective subject. Beyond the question of state intervention as such lies the more general problem of the collective management of bodies and populations in so-called laissez-faire capitalism, which Foucault analyzes in terms of discipline and (more broadly) biopower.

Discipline constitutes a network of power relations in and around bodies, a network which may be appropriated by the state but which is not reducible to state power - in fact discipline is the infrastructure which makes possible the characteristic forms of state regulation in our culture. Discipline is a microphysics of power which can be applied to a wide range of purposes - its effectivity lies at this micro-level rather than at the level of institutions:

"'Discipline' may be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus; it is a type of power, a modality for its exercise, comprising a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, targets; it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (1979:215; cf. 26).

Discipline is an efficient means of dealing with multiplicities - factory workers, soldiers, schoolchildren, patients, beggars - rendering them simultaneously obedient and useful (cf. pp.37-42 above). Discipline uses four basic techniques - it draws up tables, it prescribes movements, it imposes exercises, and it arranges "tactics":

"Tactics, the art of constructing, with located bodies, coded activities and trained aptitudes, mechanisms in which the product of the various forces is increased by their calculated combination are no doubt the highest form of disciplinary practice" (1979:167).

In Britain at the time of the Industrial Revolution, factory production constituted the take-off point for our current mode of production. Instead of the earlier putting-out system, production was organized under one roof, which enabled the breakdown of the production process into specialized and interlocking operations, and the close observation and supervision of all the workers, not simply to ensure that they were working but also to compare their relative skill or speed, to allocate individuals to the tasks they were best suited for, to develop new and more efficient methods, etc. As compared with the isolated and unsupervised putting-out system, the factory introduced a means of managing a large multiplicity of workers, simultaneously increasing the degree of control exercised by the master and increasing the productivity of the workers - the multiplicity is more useful than the sum of its parts (Foucault, 1979:220).¹ Discipline makes bodies more useful and more docile in one and the same operation.

Capitalism is an efficient means of managing large multiplicities of people as much as it is a culture of individualism. Beneath the formally egalitarian and individualistic juridical framework of our culture lie the non-egalitarian and asymmetrical techniques of the disciplines:

"The general juridical form that guaranteed a system of rights that were egalitarian in principle was supported by these tiny, everyday, physical mechanisms, by all those systems of micro-power that are essentially non-egalitarian and asymmetrical that we call the disciplines" (1979:222; cf. 184).

1. There is an intriguing parallel here with Durkheim's conscience collective. To me, this indicates that structural-functionalism is not simply a sociological theory, it is a constitutive element of our culture at a very basic level. Foucault himself seems to make a very oblique reference to this in the following passage: "hence the affirmation that [the disciplines] are at the very foundation of society, and an element in its equilibrium, whereas they are a series of mechanisms for unbalancing power relations definitively and everywhere; hence the persistence in regarding them as the humble, but concrete form of every morality, whereas they are a set of physico-political techniques" (1979:223). Compare Dreyfus and Rabinow's very similar comments on structuralism (1983:155).

This is not simply a contradiction between an ideology of individualism and a disciplinary practice. Individualism is an integral part of disciplinary power, is produced by this form of power: "The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an 'ideological' representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called 'discipline' (1979:194; cf. 170, 181, 184, 217). Discipline grades, sifts, classifies bodies, and allocates particular functions to them on the basis of this sorting. Discipline distributes bodies along a normative scale - it is a procedure of normalizing individualization (see above, pp.39-42).

Twentieth century education is a good example of this. It sets up norms of literacy, numeracy, written and oral expression, cleanliness, hygiene, and many others. In this sense it homogenizes, it normalizes, it sets limits beyond which it is not permissible to go. But education also ranks and classifies people in relation to these norms - it individualizes them along scales of intelligence, obedience, dexterity, creativity, etc. These classifications are used in various ways to direct people into particular occupations, roles, or categories. They help to fix people's station in life, their particular individuality, in their own eyes as well as in that of others.

In the South Australian context, I have argued that to understand the formal model of socialization associated with compulsory education and the reactions to it by different categories of youth, we need to contrast this model with another one also present in the culture: practical, experiential and informal induction into adult life through active participation. This latter model can be related to the yeoman ethic which has been a prominent part of South Australian life and which continues in a transmogrified form as a cynical and/or oppositional attitude to formal education. This contrast ties in with the general dynamics of twentieth century adolescence with its opposition between formal and subterranean values.

I have no intention of making an either/or judgement about the relative merits of these two models of socialization; I am certainly not suggesting that we should try to set the clock back and return to the nineteenth century situation where child and adolescent labour was normal for the majority. It does seem to me that recent debates about schooling and in particular proposals to increase the retention rate of young people in secondary education have taken place on the basis of dubious assumptions about the naturalness and universality of a culturally and historically specific model of adolescence. The rationales for this extension of adolescent dependency are in my opinion not well thought out nor supported by convincing evidence.

In fact, this current extension of adolescent dependency is largely a reaction to trends in the youth labour market. In allowing extended schooling to substitute for paid employment, we are allowing the big corporations and their friends to dictate to us the type and level of employment available to us as a nation, supporting our stance with dubious arguments about the economic benefits of increased secondary education or young people's need for this extended period of dependency.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Government departments are all listed under "Department", in alphabetical order. Dates in square brackets indicate year of original publication.

ABBREVIATIONS

AGPS: Australian Government Publishing Service.

ANZHES: Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society.

ANZJS: Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology.

PART A. ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Minutes of the Destitute Board of South Australia, 1849-1926. Government Records Group, South Australian Archives. Now held in the Public Records Office of South Australia.

Young People's Employment Council - Suggested Procedure in the Formation and Functioning of Local Committees. Drafted by Walter Richard Birks, Principal of Roseworthy Agricultural College, June 1931. South Australian Archives, reference number A644 B8.

Youth Education Committee - Final Report, 7/1/1941. South Australian Archives, reference number A1054.

PART B. NEWSPAPERS (ADELAIDE)

The South Australian Register (The Register from 1901).

The Advertiser.

The News.

The Sunday Mail.

PART C. OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS. SOUTH AUSTRALIA.
RECURRENT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Education, 1875-1971, South Australian Parliamentary Papers, no.44.

Annual Report of the Director-General of Education, 1972-1986.

Annual Reports of the Destitute Board. First to fourth annual reports (1882-5) are in a booklet in the Barr Smith Library. From 1886-1926, the annual reports were published in South Australian Parliamentary Papers. Prior to 1882, six monthly reports were published in the South Australian Government Gazette.

Census. 1861-1901.

Education Gazette. Minister of Education.

Parliamentary Debates.

Statistical Register of South Australia (from 1969, South Australian Year Book).

PART D. ROYAL COMMISSIONS AND OTHER PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES. SOUTH AUSTRALIA (CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)

(Reports commonly identified by the name of the chairman, etc., e.g. "the Karmel Report", are also listed in Part E under this name.)

(PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS)

1881, vol.4, no.122: Progress Report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on Education, 1881; together with Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence.

1882, no.27: Progress Report of the Commission on the Working of the Education Acts.

1883-4, no.27a: Final Report of the Commission on the Working of the Education Acts.

1883-4, no.228: First Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Investigate the Destitute Act, 1881.

1885, vol.4, no.228: Second and Final Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Investigate the Destitute Act, 1881.

1887, no.33: First Progress Report of the Board of Enquiry into Technical Education.

1888, no.33: Report of the Board of Enquiry into Technical Education.

1892, vol.2, part 2, no.37: Report of the Shops and Factories Commission; together with Minutes of Proceedings, Evidence and Appendices.

1908, vol.3, part 2, no.65: Preliminary Report of the Director of Education upon Observations Made during an Official Visit to Europe and America, 1907.....("Williams, 1908").

1911-12, vol.2, no.27: Progress Report of the Royal Commission on Education.

1912, vol.2, part 2, no.27: Progress Report of the Royal Commission on Education.

1913, vol.3, part 2, no.75: Final Report of the Royal Commission on Education.

1916, no.59: Report on Technical Education in South Australia.

1939, vol.2, no.75: Delinquent and other Children in the Care of the State.

(PUBLISHED SEPARATELY BY GOVERNMENT PRINTER, ADELAIDE)

1949: Education Inquiry Committee, Final Report ("Bean, 1949").

1971: Education in South Australia - Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia, 1969-1970 ("Karmel, 1971").

1973: Report of the Survey of Training Needs in Industry, Commerce, and Government in South Australia 1972 (Department of Labour and Industry/Department of Further Education, South Australia).

1981: Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia - Education and Change in South Australia, First Report ("Keeves, 1981").

1982: Ibid, Final Report ("Keeves, 1982").

**PART E. MAIN LIST: PUBLISHED BOOKS AND ARTICLES;
UNPUBLISHED THESES; LISTED BY AUTHOR OR EDITOR**

ABBEY, B. AND D. ASHENDEN

1978a "Explaining Inequality", *ANZJS*, vol.14, no.1, pp.5-13.

1978b "Unequal Explanations: A Rejoinder to Toomey and Edgar", *ANZJS*, vol.14, no.2, pp.188-190.

ABERCROMBIE, N. ET. AL.

1980 "The Dominant Ideology Thesis", Allen and Unwin, London.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

1983 "Seventy-fifth Anniversary Souvenir Book", Adelaide High School Council.

ADORNO, T.W. ET. AL.

- 1950 "The Authoritarian Personality", Harper, New York.

ALTHUSSER, L.

- 1971 [1970] "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)", in "Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays", trans. B. Brewster, New Left Books, London, pp.121-73.

ANDERSON, M.

- 1980 "Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914", Macmillan, London.

ANDERSON, P.

- 1977 "The Antinomies of Antonio Gramsci", *New Left Review*, no.100, 1976/77.

ANDREW, M. AND S. CLISSOLD (EDS.)

- 1986 "The Diaries of John McConnell Black. Vol.I, 1875-1886", Investigator Press, Hawthorndene, South Australia.

ARIES, P.

- 1962 [1960] "Centuries of Childhood", translated by R. Baldick, Jonathon Cape, London.

AUSTIN, D.

- 1984 "Australian Sociologies", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

BALDOCK, C.V. AND B. CASS (EDS.)

- 1988 [1983] "Women, Social Welfare and the State", Allen and Unwin, Sydney (second edition).

BARBALET, M.

- 1974 "State Children: Theory and Practice in South Australia", M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.
- 1975 "The Adelaide Children's Hospital 1876-1976", Griffin Press, Adelaide.
- 1983 "Far from a Low Gutter Girl. The Forgotten World of State Wards: South Australia 1887-1940", Oxford University Press, Melbourne.

BARCAN, A.

- 1972 "The Transition in Australian Education 1939-69", in J. Cleverley and J. Lawry (eds.) "Australian Education in the Twentieth Century", Longman Australia, Camberwell, Victoria.

BARRETT, J.

- 1979 "Falling In: Australians and 'Boy Conscription' 1911-1915", Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney.

BARRETT, M. AND M. MCINTOSH

- 1982 "The Anti-Social Family", Verso, London.

BAUDRILLARD, J.

- 1975 "The Mirror of Production", translated and with an introduction by M. Poster, Telos Press, St. Louis.

BEAN, E.L.

- 1949 "Final Report of the Education Inquiry Committee, South Australia" (Chairman - E.L. Bean).

BEARE, H.

- 1964 "The Influence of Alfred Williams and the Price Ministry on Public Education in South Australia", M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne.

BEASLEY, C.

- 1984 "Educating Rita's Grandmother: The Social Relation of the Sexes and South Australian Curriculum Reform, 1875-1915", M.Ed. thesis, Flinders University.

- 1987 "The Patriarchy Debate: Should we Make Use of the Term 'Patriarchy' in Historical Analysis?", *History of Education Review*, vol.16, no.2, pp.13-20.

BENNETT, F. ET. AL.

- 1981 "Feminists - The Degenerates of the Social?", *Politics and Power*, no.3, pp.83-95 (a reply to P. Hirst's review of Donzelot - q.v.).

BERGER, B.

- 1963 "The Sociology of Leisure", in E.O. Smigel (ed.) "Work and Leisure".

BERGER, P.L. AND T. LUCKMANN

1964 "Social Mobility and Personal Identity", *European Journal of Sociology*, no.5.

1967 [1966] "The Social Construction of Reality", Penguin, Harmondsworth.

BESSION, B.

1972 "The Emergence of State Secondary Education", in J. Cleverley and J. Lawry (eds.) "Australian Education in the Twentieth Century", Longman, Melbourne

BITTNER, E.

1965 "The Concept of Organization", *Social Research*, no.31, pp.239-55.

BLACKETT, J.

1906 [1899] "Social Diseases and Suggested Remedies", Stockwell, London (originally published by Hussey and Gillingham, Adelaide, 1899).

BLEDSTEIN, B.

1976 "The Culture of Professionalism", W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., New York.

BOLTON, G.C.

1974 "1939-51", in F. Crowley (ed.) "A New History of Australia", Heinemann, Melbourne.

BOWLES, S. AND H. GINTIS

1976 "Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life", Basic Books, New York.

BRAKE, M.

1980 "The Sociology of Youth Culture and Youth Subcultures: Sex and Drugs and Rock'n'Roll?", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

BRICE, I., G. SHERINGTON AND B. PETERSEN

1987 "Learning to Lead: A History of Girls' and Boys' Corporate Secondary Schools in Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

BROAD, MRS. A. SCOTT

1911 "The Sex Problem", Adelaide Century Typ.

BROOMHILL, C.R.

- 1978 "Unemployed Workers: a Social History of the Great Depression in Adelaide", Queensland University Press, St. Lucia.

BURNS, A. ET. AL. (EDS.)

- 1983 "The Family in the Modern World: Australian Perspectives", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

BURSTYN, J.N.

- 1980 "Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood", Croom Helm, London.

BUTLER, R.G.

- 1979 "Lean Times and Lively Days: Hahndorf Primary School 1879-1979", Investigator Press, Hawthorndene, South Australia.

- 1981 "Birdwood High School 1931-1981", Birdwood High School, South Australia.

BUTLIN, N.G.

- 1959 "Colonial Socialism in Australia, 1860-1900", in H.G. Aitken (ed.) "The State and Economic Growth", Social Science Research Council, New York.

CALLINICOS, A.

- 1976 "Althusser's Marxism", Pluto Press, London.

CAMPBELL, C.

- 1985 "State High School. Unley. 1910-1985", published by the author, Mile End, South Australia.

CAMPBELL, S.L.

- 1975 "Women and the Law: South Australia 1836-1936", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

CASHEN, P.

- 1982 "'No You Don't Wilkie, I Know Your Game'. The Work of School Attendance Officers in South Australian Schools in the 1920s and 1930s", *ANZHES Journal*, vol.11, no.2.

- 1985 "The Truant as Delinquent: The Psychological Perspective, South Australia, 1920-1940", *Journal of Australian Studies*, no.16, pp.71-83.

CASTLES, F.G.

- 1985 "The Working Class and Welfare: Reflections on the Political Development of the Welfare State in Australia and New Zealand, 1890-1980", Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, Wellington, New Zealand.
- 1988 "Australian Public Policy and Economic Vulnerability: A Comparative and Historical Perspective", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

CLARK, C.M.H.

- 1981 "A History of Australia. Vol. V. The People Make Laws, 1888-1915", Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria.

CLARKE, J.

- 1976 "The Skinheads and the Magical Recovery of Community", in S. Hall and T. Jefferson (eds.) "Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain", Hutchinson, London, pp.99-102.

CLARKE, J. ET. AL.

- 1976 "Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical Overview", in S. Hall and T. Jefferson (eds.) "Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain", Hutchinson, London, pp.9-74.

CLOSE, S.E.

- 1961 "Social Attitudes to Liquor and Liquor Legislation in South Australia, 1876-1917", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

COHEN, S.

- 1973 [1972] "Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers", Paladin, St. Albans.

COHEN, S. AND A. SCULL (EDS. AND INTRO.)

- 1983 "Social Control and the State: Historical and Comparative Essays", Martin Robertson, Oxford.

COLE, P.R. (ED.)

- 1935 "The Education of the Adolescent in Australia", Melbourne University Press.

COLLIER, J.

- 1914 "Introduction" to E.G. Wakefield "A View of the Art of Colonization", Clarendon Press, Oxford.

COLLINS, J. (ED.)

- 1975 "Studies of the Australian Adolescent", Cassell, Sydney.

COLLINS, R.

- 1979 "The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification", Academic Press, New York.

COLWELL, M.

- 1975 "Half Days and Patched Pants", Max Colwell Publications, Adelaide.
- 1978 "Full Days and Pressed Pants", Max Colwell Publications, Adelaide.

COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

- 1979 "Psychological Components in Long-term Unemployment", Applied Psychology Section, Training Paper no.23, AGPS.

COMMONWEALTH SCHOOLS COMMISSION

- 1980 "Schooling for 15 and 16 Year-Olds", Canberra.
- 1987 "In the National Interest: Secondary Education and Youth Policy in Australia: An Overview", Canberra.

CONNELL, R.W.

- 1974 "The Causes of Educational Inequality: Further Observations", *ANZJS*, vol.10, no.3, pp.186-189.
- 1977 "Ruling Class, Ruling Culture: Studies of Conflict, Power and Hegemony in Australian Life", Cambridge U.P., Cambridge.
- 1978 "Social Class and Personal Socialisation", in F.J. Hunt (ed.) "Socialisation in Australia", Australia International Press and Publications Pty. Ltd., Melbourne; 2nd edition, pp.170-201.
- 1983 "Which Way Is Up? Essays on Class, Sex and Culture", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- 1985 "Teachers' Work", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- 1987 "Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

CONNELL, R.W. AND T.H. IRVING

- 1980 "Class Structure in Australian History", Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.

CONNELL, R.W. ET. AL.

- 1982a "Making the Difference: Schools, Families and Social Division", Allen and Unwin, Sydney. *(320)*
- 1982b "Ockers and Disco-maniacs: A Discussion of Sex, Gender and Secondary Schooling", Inner City Education Centre, Stanmore, N.S.W.; 2nd edition, revised.

CONNELL, W.F.

- 1950 "The Educational Thought and Influence of Matthew Arnold", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

CONNELL, W.F. ET. AL.

- 1957 "Growing Up in the Australian City", ACER, Melbourne.

CORRIGAN, P.

- 1979 "Schooling the Smash Street Kids", Macmillan, London.

COTT, N.F.

- 1977 "The Bonds of Womanhood: 'Woman's Sphere' in New England, 1780-1835", Yale U.P., New Haven.

COWARD, R.

- 1984 "Female Desire: Women's Sexuality Today", Paladin Books, London.

CROWLEY, F.(ED.)

- 1974 "A New History of Australia", Heinemann, Melbourne.

DALY, J.A.

- 1982 "Elysian Fields: Sport, Class and Community in Colonial South Australia 1836-1890", published by the author, Adelaide.

DALY, J.W.

- 1972 "The Adelaide Y.M.C.A. (Some Aspects of its Development 1879-1934)", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

DAVEY, C.M.

- 1956 "Children and their Lawmakers: A Social-Historical Survey of the Growth and Development from 1836 to 1950 of South Australian Laws Relating to Children", Griffin Press, Adelaide.

DAVEY, I.

- 1982 "Transitions: School and Work in the Family Economy", *Australia 1888*, bulletin no.10, pp.50-56.
- 1985 "Growing up in a Working Class Community: School and Work in Hindmarsh", in P. Grimshaw et. al. (eds.) "Families in Colonial Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney, pp.163-172.
- 1986 "Growing Up in South Australia", in E. Richards (ed.) "The Flinders History of South Australia - Social History", Wakefield Press, Netley, pp.371-402.
- 1987 "Capitalism, Patriarchy and the Origins of Mass Schooling", *History of Education Review*, vol.16, no.2, pp.1-12.

DAVIDOFF, L.

- 1974 "Mastered for Life: Servant and Wife in Victorian and Edwardian England", *Journal of Social History*, vol.7, no.4, pp.406-428.

DAVIES, B.

- 1976 "Social Control and Education", Methuen, London.

DAVIN, A.

- 1978 "Imperialism and the Cult of Motherhood", *History Workshop Journal*, Spring.

DE GARIS, B.K.

- 1974 "1890-1900" in F. Crowley (ed.) "A New History of Australia", Heinemann, Melbourne.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (COMMONWEALTH)

- 1976a "Report of the Working Party on the Transition from Secondary Education to Employment", AGPS, Canberra.
- 1976b "Educational Policy and Planning: Transition from School to Work or Further Study in Australia", OECD, Paris (prepared by the Commonwealth Department of Education for the OECD).

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)

- 1934 "Occupations for Boys and Girls: A Guide for Teachers and Parents", Vocational Guidance Committee, Education Department.
- 1980 "Transition Education: the Basis".
- 1981 "Our Schools and Their Purposes: Into the 80's".

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT AND YOUTH AFFAIRS
(COMMONWEALTH)

- 1982 "Report of the Task Force on the Review of Guidelines for the Community Youth Support Scheme", AGPS, Canberra.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR AND INDUSTRY/DEPARTMENT OF FURTHER EDUCATION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)

- 1973 "Report of the Survey of Training Needs in Industry, Commerce, and Government in South Australia, 1972"

DEPARTMENT OF MINES (SOUTH AUSTRALIA)

- 1964 "The History of Copper Mining, Wallaroo-Moonta, 1860-1923", Mineral Information Series.

DICKEY, B.

- 1975 "South Australia", in D.J. Murphy (ed.) "Labor in Politics: The State Labor Parties in Australia 1880-1920", University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia.

- 1986 "Rations, Residence, Resources: A History of Social Welfare in South Australia since 1836", Wakefield Press, Netley, South Australia.

DONZELLOT, J.

- 1979a [1977] "The Policing of Families", trans. R. Hurley, Pantheon, New York.

- 1979b "The Poverty of Political Culture", *Ideology and Consciousness*, no.5, pp.73-86; translated by Couze Venn.

DOWLING, P. AND G.E. O'BRIEN

- 1981 "The Effects of Employment, Unemployment and Further Education upon the Work Values of School Leavers", *Australian Journal of Psychology*, no.33-2, pp.185-195.

DOWNES, D.M.

- 1966 "The Delinquent Solution. A Study in Subcultural Theory", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

DREYFUS, H.L. AND P.RABINOW

- 1983 [1982] "Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics", 2nd edition, with an Afterword and an Interview with Michel Foucault, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

DUMONT, L.

- 1977 "From Mandeville to Marx: The Genesis and Triumph of Economic Ideology", University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- 1986 [1983] "Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective", University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

DWYER, P. ET. AL.

- 1984 "Confronting School and Work: Youth and Class Cultures in Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

DYER, S.W.

- 1976 "Back to the Land! Settlement Schemes for Adelaide's Unemployed, 1930-35", *Labour History*, 31, pp.30-37.

DYHOUSE, C.

- 1981 "Girls Growing Up in Late Victorian and Edwardian England", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

EDGAR, D.

- 1978 "Reply to Abbey and Ashenden's 'Explaining Inequality'", *ANZJS*, vol.14, no.1, pp.14-18.

EDWARDS, E.

- 1916 "Modern Physical Culture for Women and Girls", Lothian Book Publishing Co. P/L, Melbourne.

ELY, M.J.

- 1978 "Reality and Rhetoric: An Alternative History of Australian Education", Alternative Publishing Cooperative, in association with the NSW Teachers' Federation, Sydney.

ENCEL, S.

- 1960 "The Concept of the State in Australian Politics", *Australian Journal of Political History*, VI-1.

FAULL, J.

- 1980 "Cornish Heritage: A Miner's Story", published by the author, Highbury, South Australia.

FERRIS, W. AND D. McKIE

- 1979 "A Century of Service: A History of Schooling in the Kingston District", Education Department of South Australia.

FLANDRIN, J-L.

- 1979 [1976] "Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household and Sexuality", translated by R. Southern, Cambridge University Press.

FOUCAULT, M.

- 1972 "The Archaeology of Knowledge", trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith, Harper Colophon, New York.
- 1973 [1966] "The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences", Vintage/Random House, New York; a translation of "Les Mots et les Choses".
- 1979 [1975] "Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison", translated by A. Sheridan, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- 1981 [1976] "The History of Sexuality. Vol. I: An Introduction", translated by R. Hurley, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

FRENCH, E.L.

- 1958 "Secondary Education in the Australian Social Order, 1788-1898", Ph.D. thesis, University of Melbourne.

GIBBS, R.M.

- 1969 "A History of South Australia", Balara Books, Adelaide.
- 1984 "A History of Prince Alfred College", Peacock, Adelaide.

GILBERT, D.

- 1973 "Country Life in the Later Nineteenth Century: Reminiscences by Dorothy Gilbert", *South Australiana*, vol.12, no.2.

GILLESPIE, R.R.

- 1982 "The Early Development of the Scientific Movement in Australian Education - Child Study", *ANZHES Journal*, vol.11, no.2, pp.1-14.

GILLIS, J.R.

- 1974 "Youth and History", Academic Press, New York.

GILMOUR, E.

- 1965 "Life at Murtho Settlement, River Murray 1894-7", *South Australiana*, vol.4, no.2.

GORDON, L.

- 1977 [1976] "Woman's Body, Woman's Right: A Social History of Birth Control in America", Penguin, Harmondsworth.

GORHAM, D.

- 1982 "The Victorian Girl and the Feminine Ideal", Croom Helm, London.

GOUTTMAN, R.

- 1979 "The Relationship between Politics and Education in South Australia, 1834-1975", Ph.D. thesis, University of Adelaide.

GRAMSCI, A.

- 1971 "Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci", edited by Q. Hoare and G.N. Smith, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

GRIMSHAW, P. ET. AL.

- 1985 "Families in Colonial Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

GRUNDY, D.

- 1983 "Free Schooling and the State in South Australia, 1875-1898", in I. Palmer (ed.) "Melbourne Studies in Education, 1983", Melbourne University Press.

GURNEY, R.M.

- 1980 "Does Unemployment Affect the Self-esteem of School Leavers?", *Australian Journal of Psychology*, no.32-3, pp.175-182.

HABERMAS, J.

- 1978 [1972] "Knowledge and Human Interests", trans. J.J. Schapiro, 2nd edition, Heinemann, London.

HALL, G.S.

- 1904 "Adolescence: Its Psychology and its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education", 2 vols., Sidney Appleton, London/D. Appleton and Co., New York.

HALL, S. AND T. JEFFERSON (EDS.)

- 1976 "Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain", Hutchinson, London, in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Birmingham.

HALL, W. ET. AL.

- 1983 "Educating Your Child: A Handbook for Australian Parents", Jacaranda Press, Milton, Queensland.

HANNAFORD, B.D.

- 1982 "Case Studies in Work Experience at Marion High School", in J. Eggleston (ed.) "Work Experience in Secondary Schools", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

HARRIS, C.C.

- 1981 Review of J. Donzelot, "The Policing of Families", *Sociology*, vol.15, no.3, pp.447-9.

HARTZ, L. (ED.)

- 1964 "The Founding of New Societies", Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., New York.

HAYES, J. AND P. NUTMAN

- 1981 "Understanding the Unemployed: The Psychological Effects of Unemployment", Tavistock, London.

HEBDIGE, D.

- 1979 "Subculture: The Meaning of Style", Methuen, London.

HENDERSON, R.F. (ED.)

- 1977 "Proceedings of the Second Symposium of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia on Youth Unemployment", Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, Melbourne.

HETHERINGTON, P.

- 1982 "The Making of a Labor Politician: Family and Politics in South Australia, 1900-1980 - A Biography", published by the author.

HIGGINS, H.B.

- 1922 "A New Province for Law and Order", Constable, London.

HIRST, J.B.

- 1963 "G.W. Cotton and the Workingmen's Blocks", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

- 1973 "Adelaide and the Country 1870-1917. Their Social and Political Relationship", Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria.

HIRST, P.

- 1981 "The Genesis of the Social" (a review of J. Donzelot, "The Policing of Families"), *Politics and Power*, no.3, pp.67-82.

HOBSBAWM, E. AND G. RUDE

1969 "Captain Swing", Lawrence and Wishart, London.

HODGES, J. AND A. HUSSAIN

1979 Review of J. Donzelot, "La Police des Familles", *Ideology and Consciousness*, no.5, pp.87-123.

HOLLINGSHEAD, A.B.

1949 "Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents", John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York.

HONEY, J.R. DE SYMONS

1977 "Tom Brown's Universe: The Development of the English Public School in the Nineteenth Century", Quadrangle/The New York Times Book Co., New York.

HOPGOOD, D.

1970 "Lang Labor in South Australia", *Labour History*, no.17.

HORKHEIMER, M.

1936 "Authority and the Family", reprinted in "Critical Theory: Selected Essays", translated by M.J. O'Connell et. al., New York, 1972.

HORLICK, A.S.

1975 "Country Boys and Merchant Princes: The Social Control of Young Men in New York", Bucknell U.P., Lewisburg/Associated University Presses, London.

HUBBERT, G.D.

1980 "An Evaluation of the Education Program for Unemployed Youth", Commonwealth Department of Education, AGPS, Canberra.

HUDSON, W.J.

1974 "1951-72" in F. Crowley (ed.) "A New History of Australia", Heinemann, Melbourne.

HUNT, A.D.

1985 "This Side of Heaven: A History of Methodism in South Australia", Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide.

HYAMS, B.K.

- 1971 "The Teacher in South Australia in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century", *Australian Journal of Education*, vol.15, no.3.
- 1977a "Teacher Organization in South Australia, 1875-95", in A.D. Spaull (ed.) "Australian Teachers: From Colonial Schoolmasters to Militant Professionals", Macmillan, Melbourne.
- 1977b "The Battle of the Sexes in Teachers' Organizations: A South Australian Episode, 1937-50", *ibid*.

HYAMS, B.K. AND B. BESSANT

- 1972 "Schools for the People? - An Introduction to the History of State Education in Australia", Longman, Melbourne.

HYAMS, B.K. ET. AL.

- 1988 "Learning and Other Things: Sources for a Social History of Education in South Australia", S.A. Government Printer, Netley.

INCE, SIR G.H.

- 1937 "Report on Unemployment Insurance in Australia", Government Printer, Canberra.

JAENSCH, D. (ED.)

- 1986 "The Flinders History of South Australia - Political History", Wakefield Press, Netley.

JEFFERSON, T.

- 1976 "Cultural Responses of the Teds", in S. Hall and T. Jefferson (eds.) "Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain", Hutchinson, London, pp.81-86.

JOHNSON, R.

- 1970 "Educational Policy and Social Control in Mid-Victorian England", *Past and Present*, vol.49.

JONES, H.P.

- 1980 Women's Education in South Australia: Institutional and Social Developments, 1875-1915", Ph.D. thesis, University of Adelaide.
- 1985 "Nothing Seemed Impossible: Women's Education and Social Change in South Australia, 1875-1915", Wakefield Press, Netley.

JONES, H.P. (CONT.)

- 1986 "In Her Own Name: Women in South Australian History", Wakefield Press, Netley.

JONES, M.A.

- 1980 "The Australian Welfare State", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

JUDD, G.B.

- 1979 "Domestic Service in South Australia, 1836-1961", B.A. thesis, Flinders University.

KAPFERER, J.

- 1980 Pedagogical Perspective and Action: Teachers at Work", Ph.D. thesis, Flinders University.

KARMEL, P.H.

- 1971 "Education in South Australia - Report of the Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia, 1969-1970" (Chairman - P.H. Karmel).

- 1979 "Youth, Education and Employment", Radford Memorial Lecture, ACER, Hawthorn.

KATZ, M.

- 1968 "The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-nineteenth Century Massachusetts", Harvard U.P., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

KATZ, M. AND I. DAVEY

- 1978 "Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City", in J. Demos and S.S. Boocock (eds.) "Turning Points: Historical and Sociological Essays on the Family", Chicago.

KEEVES, J.P.

- 1981 "Committee of Enquiry into Education in South Australia - Education and Change in South Australia, First Report" (Chairman - J.P. Keeves).

- 1982 Ibid, Final Report.

KENNEDY, R.

- 1985 "Charity Warfare: The Charity Organization Society in Colonial Melbourne", Hyland House, South Yarra, Victoria.

KERR, L.A.

- 1951 "Communal Settlements in South Australia in the 1890's", M.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

- KERR, M.G.
- 1980 "Colonial Dynasty: The Chambers Family of South Australia", Rigby, Adelaide.
- KETT, J.
- 1977 "Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present", Basic Books, New York. 13
- KINGSTON, B.
- 1975 "My Wife, My Daughter, and Poor Mary Ann", Nelson, Melbourne.
- KNIGHT, T.
- 1974 "Powerlessness and the Student Role: Structural Determinants of School Status", *ANZJS*, vol.10, no.2, pp.112-117.
- LA NAUZE, J.A.
- 1940 "Some Aspects of Educational Opportunity in South Australia", in J.D.G. Medley et. al. "Australian Educational Studies" (Second Series), Educational Research Series, no.59, Melbourne University Press.
- LASCH, C.
- 1977 "Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged", Basic Books, New York.
- LASLETT, P.
- 1980 "In Loco Parentis" (review of J. Donzelot, "The Policing of Families"), *New Society*, vol.52, no.918, 19/6/1980, pp.306-7.
- LEACH, W.
- 1980 "True Love and Perfect Union: The Feminist Reform of Sex and Society", Basic Books, New York.
- LEVINE, L.
- 1984 "The Limits of Feminism", *Social Analysis*, no.15, pp.11-19.
- LONIE, J.
- 1976 "'Good Labor Men': The Hill Government of South Australia, 1930-1933", *Labour History*, 31, pp.14-29.
- 1981 "Non-Labour in South Australia", in J. Mackinolty (ed.) "The Wasted Years?", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

McBRIDE, T.M.

- 1976 "The Domestic Revolution: The Modernisation of Household Service in England and France 1820-1920", Croom Helm, London.

McCALLUM, D.

- 1980 "Naturalising Educational Inequality: An Overview of the Australian Intellectual Field, 1935-1945", *ANZJS*, vol.16, no.2, pp.32-36.
- 1983 "Eugenics, Psychology and Education in Australia", *Melbourne Working Papers No.4 1982/3*, edited by R. Teese and G. Wickham, University of Melbourne, pp.17-33.
- 1984 "The Theory of Social Differences in Early Twentieth Century Education in Victoria", *Discourse*, vol.5, no.1, pp.19-41.

McCANN, C.L.

- 1979 "Guardians of Virtue 1836-1894", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.

McCORKINDALE, I. (ED.)

- 1949 "Torchbearers: the WCTU of South Australia, 1836-1948", Adelaide.

McDONALD, P.F.

- 1975 "Marriage in Australia: Age at First Marriage and Proportions Marrying, 1860-1971", Australian Family Formation Project, Monograph no.2, Canberra.

MacKINNON, A.

- 1980 "Less for Fashion than for Substance: The Advanced School for Girls, Adelaide 1879-1908", M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide.
- 1984a "One Foot on the Ladder: Origins and Outcomes of Girls' Secondary Schooling in South Australia", University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia.
- 1984b "Women's Education", *History of Education Review*, vol.13, no.2, pp.5-14.
- 1986 "The New Women: Adelaide's Early Women Graduates", Wakefield Press, Adelaide.

MAGAREY, S.

- 1985 "Unbridling the Tongues of Women: A Biography of Catherine Helen Spence", Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney.

MARTIN, A.W.

- 1973 "Australia and the Hartz Fragment Thesis", *Australian Economic History Review*, vol.13, no.2.

MARTIN, E.

- 1983 "Amy Wheaton and the Education of Social Workers in South Australia, 1935-46", *Historical Studies*, vol.20, no.81.

MARX, K.

- 1976 [1867] "Capital", vol.1, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

MATTHEWS, J.J.

- 1984 "Good and Mad Women: The Historical Construction of Femininity in Twentieth Century Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

MATZA, D.

- 1964 "Delinquency and Drift", Wiley, New York.

MATZA, D. AND G. SYKES

- 1961 "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values", *American Sociological Review*, vol.26, no.5.

MEINIG, D.W.

- 1988 [1962] "On the Margins of the Good Earth: The South Australian Wheat Frontier, 1869-1884", South Australian Government Printer, Netley.

MICHELS, R.

- 1968 [1958] "Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracies", trans. E. and C. Paul, Free Press, New York.

MIDDLETON, M. ET. AL.

- 1986 "Making the Future: The Role of Secondary Education in Australia", discussion paper prepared for the Commonwealth Schools Commission, Canberra, 1986.

MILLER, P.

- 1980 "Schooling and Capitalism: Education and Social Change in South Australia, 1836-1925", Ph.D. thesis, University of Adelaide.

- 1986 "Long Division: State Schooling in South Australian Society", Wakefield Press, Adelaide.

115

MILLS, C.W.

- 1940 "Situated Actions and Vocabularies of Motive", *American Sociological Review*, no.6, pp.904-13.

MILLS, R.C.

- 1915 "The Colonization of Australia 1829-42 - The Wakefield Experiment in Empire Building", Sidgwick and Jackson Ltd., London. Reprinted by Dawsons of Pall Mall, London, 1968.
- 1929 "Introduction" to E.G. Wakefield "A Letter from Sydney and Other Writings", J.M. Dent and Sons, London.

MITCHELL, T.J.

- 1962 "J.W. Wainwright: the Industrialisation of South Australia 1935-40", *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, vol.8, no.1.

MODELL, J. ET. AL.

- 1976 "Social Change and Transitions to Adulthood in Historical Perspective", *Journal of Family History*, vol.1, no.1.

MORGAN, E.

- 1966 [1944] "The Puritan Family: Religion and Domestic Relations in Seventeenth Century New England", revised edition, Harper Torchbooks, New York.

MOSS, J.

- 1983 "Representatives of Discontent: History of the Communist Party in South Australia 1921-1981", Communist and Labour Movement History Group, Melbourne.
- 1985 "Sound of Trumpets: History of the Labour Movement in South Australia", Wakefield Press, Netley, South Australia.

MURRAY PARK SOURCES IN THE HISTORY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EDUCATION

- 1973 "Newspaper Clipping Books of the South Australian Department of Education", Murray Park College of Advanced Education, Magill, South Australia.

MURRAY-SMITH, S.

- 1966 "A History of Technical Education in Australia", Ph.D. thesis, University of Melbourne.

MUSGROVE, F.

- 1964 "Youth and the Social Order", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

NANCE, C.

- 1977 "The South Australian Social Experiment 1836-71", M.A. thesis, Flinders University.

NATIONAL POPULATION INQUIRY

- 1975 "Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection", 2 vols., AGPS, Canberra.

NICHOLAS, R.J.

- 1949 "The Growth and Development of State Secondary Schools in South Australia; with Special Reference to the Twentieth Century", B.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne.

- 1953 "Private and Denominational Secondary Schools of South Australia, their Growth and Development", M.Ed. thesis, University of Melbourne.

O'BRIEN, G.E. AND B. KABANOFF

- 1979 "Comparison of Unemployed and Employed Workers on Work Values, Locus of Control and Health Variables", *Australian Psychologist*, no.14-2, pp.143-154.

O'LOUGHLIN, M.A. AND K.E. SINCLAIR

- 1982 "Social Change and the Transition from Adolescence to Adulthood: A Study of Three Generations of Australians", *Australian Journal of Education*, vol.26, no.2, pp.155-170.

O'NEIL, M. AND A. BOSIO

- 1982 "School Students and Work", Youth Bureau, Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment, South Australia.

OXLEY, H.G.

- 1978 [1974] "Mateship in Local Organization", University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 2nd edition.

PALMER, I.

- 1979 "Matthew Arnold: Culture, Society and Education", Macmillan, Melbourne.

PARKIN, C.W.

- 1963 "Burke, Edmund", *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol.4, pp.431-4, William Benton, Chicago.

PARSONS, T., R.F. BALES ET. AL.

- 1955 "Family Socialization and Interaction Process", Free Press, New York.

PETTMAN, R.

- 1975 "Factionalism in the South Australian ALP - 1930-1933", *Labour History*, no.28.

PHILIPP, J.

- 1971 "A Great View of Things: Edward Gibbon Wakefield", Nelson, Melbourne.

PHILLIPS, W.

- 1980 "Six O'Clock Swill: The Introduction of Early Closing of Hotel Bars in Australia", *Historical Studies*, vol.19, no.75, pp.250-266.

PIDDINGTON, A.B.K.C.

- 1921 "The Next Step: A Family Basic Income", Macmillan, Melbourne.

PIKE, D.

- 1967 [1957] "Paradise of Dissent: South Australia 1829-1857", Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria (2nd edition).

PINCHBECK, I. AND M. HEWITT

- 1969 "Children in English Society", vol.1, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

- 1973 *Ibid*, vol.2.

PLATT, A.M.

- 1969 "The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency", Chicago University Press.

POLANYI, K.

- 1946 [1944] "Origins of Our Time" ("The Great Transformation"), Victor Gollancz Ltd., London.

POLLOCK, L.

- 1983 "Forgotten Children: Parent-Child Relations from 1500 to 1900", Cambridge U.P., Cambridge.

POLSKY, N.

- 1971 [1967] "Hustlers, Beats and Others", Penguin, Harmondsworth.

- POOLE, M.
- 1983 "Youth: Expectations and Transitions", Routledge and Kegan Paul, Melbourne.
- POSTER, M.
- 1978 "Critical Theory of the Family", Pluto Press (London)/Seabury Press (New York).
- 1981 Review of J. Donzelot, "The Policing of Families", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol.86, no.6, pp.1450-2.
- 1984 "Foucault, Marxism and History", Polity Press, London.
- QUINN-YOUNG, C.M.
- 1982 "Technical Education and Girls in South Australia in the Period between the Two World Wars: With Particular Reference to Girls and Domestic Service", M.Ed. thesis, Flinders University.
- REEVES, W.P.
- 1902 "State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand", 2 vols., Richards, London.
- REIGER, K.M.
- 1985 "The Disenchantment of the Home: Modernizing the Australian Family 1880-1940", Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- 1986 "Mothering Deskilled: Australian Child-Rearing and the Experts", *Community Health Studies*, vol.10, no.1, pp.39-46.
- 1987 "All but the Kitchen Sink: On the Significance of Domestic Science and the Silence of Social Theory", *Theory and Society*, vol.16, no.4, pp.497-526.
- RICHARDS, E. (ED.)
- 1986 "The Flinders History of South Australia - Social History", Wakefield Press, Netley.
- RICHARDS, E.S.
- 1945 [1939] "Ladies' Handbook of Home Treatment", Signs Publishing Co., Warburton, Victoria; revised and enlarged edition.
- ROBINS D., AND P. COHEN
- 1978 "Knuckle Sandwich: Growing Up in the Working Class City", Penguin, Harmondsworth.

ROBINSON, N.

- 1971 "Change on Change: A History of the Northern Highlands of South Australia", Investigator Press, Leabrook, South Australia.

ROBINSON, N. (ED.)

- 1973 "Stagg of Tarcowie: The Diaries of a Colonial Teenager", Lynton Publications Pty. Ltd., Adelaide.

ROSALDO, M.Z. AND L. LAMPHERE (EDS.)

- 1974 "Women, Culture and Society", Stanford University Press, Stanford.

ROSS, D.

- 1972 "G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet", University of Chicago Press.

ROSS, R.

- 1973 "Country Life in the Later Nineteenth Century: Reminiscences by Robert Ross", *South Australiana*, vol.12, no.2.

ROTHMAN, D.

- 1983 [1981] "Social Control: The Uses and Abuses of the Concept in the History of Incarceration", in S. Cohen and A. Scull (eds.) "Social Control and the State", Martin Robertson, Oxford, pp.106-17; first published in *Rice University Studies*, vol.67, 1981, pp.9-20.

ROWSE, T.

- 1978 "Australian Liberalism and National Character", Kibble Books, Melbourne.

RYAN, T.

- 1914 "Is It Well with the Child?" Adelaide Cooperative Printing and Publishing Company.

SCHNEIDER, D.M. AND R.T. SMITH

- 1973 "Class Differences and Sex Roles in American Kinship and Family Structure", Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

SAUNDERS, G.E.

- 1972 "J.A. Hartley and the Foundation of the Public School System in South Australia", in C. Turney (ed.) "Pioneers in Australian Education", vol.2, Sydney University Press.

SCOTT, J.W. AND L.A. TILLY

1978 "Women, Work and Family", Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

SEARLE, G.R.

1971 "The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914", Oxford.

SELLECK, R.J.W.

1968 "The New Education 1870-1914", Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd., London.

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

1981 "Preparation for the Workforce: Inquiry into the Effectiveness of Australian Schools in Preparing Young People for the Workforce with Particular Emphasis on Literacy and Numeracy", AGPS, Canberra.

SENNETT, R. AND J. COBB

1973 "The Hidden Injuries of Class", Vintage Books, New York.

SHIELDS, J.

1982 "A Dangerous Age: Bourgeois Philanthropy, the State and the Young Unemployed in NSW in the 1930's", in Sydney Labour History Group, "What Rough Beast? The State and Social Order in Australian History", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

SHORTER, E.

1976 [1975] "The Making of the Modern Family", Collins, London.

SKLAR, K.K.

1973 "Catherine Beecher", Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

SMART, B.

1983 "Foucault, Marxism and Critique", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London/Boston.

SMELSER, N.

1959 "Social Change in the Industrial Revolution", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

SMITH, K.I.

1978 "A Family Affair. The Adelaide School for Mothers, 1909-1927", B.A. thesis, Flinders University.

SPENCE, C.H.

- 1907 "State Children in Australia: A History of Boarding Out and its Developments", Vardon, Adelaide.

SPRING, J.

- 1973 [1972] "Education and the Rise of the Corporate State", Beacon Press, Boston.

SPRINGHALL, J.

- 1977 "Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883-1940", Croom Helm, London.

STAINES, J. (MRS. H.A. DOUDY)

- 1928 [1909] "Growing Towards the Light", 2nd edition, Women's Christian Temperance Union, Adelaide.

STEDMAN-JONES, G.

- 1983 [1977] "Class Expression versus Social Control? A Critique of Recent Trends in the Social History of 'Leisure'", in S. Cohen and A. Scull (eds.), "Social Control and the State", Martin Robertson, Oxford, pp.39-49; first published in *History Workshop*, vol.4, 1977, pp.162-70.

STONE, L.

- 1977 "The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800", Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London.

SUMMERS, A.

- 1975 "Damned Whores and God's Police", Penguin, Ringwood, Victoria.

THIELE, C.

- 1975 "Grains of Mustard Seed: A Narrative Outline of State Education in South Australia 1875-1975", Government Printer, Adelaide; research by R.M. Gibbs.

THOMPSON, E.P.

- 1967 "Time, Work Discipline and Industrial Capitalism", *Past and Present*, 38, pp.56-97.

TIGGEMANN, M. AND A.H. WINEFIELD

- 1980 "Some Psychological Effects of Unemployment in School Leavers", *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, no.15-4, pp.269-276.

- TOOMEY, D.
- 1974a "What Causes Educational Disadvantage?", *ANZJS*, vol.10, no.1, pp.31-37.
 - 1974b "The School Status Theory of Educational Disadvantage: A Rejoinder to Tony Knight", *ANZJS*, vol.10, no.3, pp.189-191.
 - 1978 "Two Problems of Educational Inequality"; A Reply to Abbey and Ashenden", *ANZJS*, vol.14, no.2, pp.181-187.
- TRETHEWEY, L.
- 1977 "Post-Primary Technical Education in South Australia, 1915-45", M.Ed. thesis, Flinders University.
- TROEN, S.
- 1976 "The Discovery of the Adolescent by American Educational Reformers, 1900-1920: An Economic Perspective", in L. Stone (ed.) "Schooling and Society", John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.
- TURNEY, C.
- 1972a "Introduction" to vol.2 of C. Turney (ed.), "Pioneers of Australian Education", Sydney U.P., Sydney.
 - 1972b "W. Catton Grasby: Harbinger of Reform", *ibid*.
- TURTLE, A. ET. AL.
- 1978 "Life: Not In It: A Psychological Comparison of Employed and Unemployed Sydney Youth", *Vocational Guidance Bulletin*, no.4, N.S.W. Dept. of Labour and Industry.
- TYLER, D.
- 1986 "The Case of Irene Tuckerman: Understanding Sexual Violence and the Protection of Women and Girls, Victoria 1890-1925", *History of Education Review*, vol.15, no.2, pp.52-67.
- VANDEPOL, A.
- 1982 "Dependent Children, Child Custody, and the Mothers' Pensions: The Transformation of State-Family Relations in the Early Twentieth Century", *Social Problems*, vol.29, no.3, pp.221-35.
- VERCO, J.
- 1963 "A Colonial Boyhood: Some Recollections of Sir Joseph Verco, 1858-1867", *South Australiana*, vol.2, no.2.

VERCO, P.W.

n.d. "Thomas and Elisabeth Magarey", Adelaide.

VICK, M.J.

1981 "The Central Board of Education, South Australia, 1852-1875", M.Ed. thesis, University of Adelaide.

WADEL, C.

1973 "Now, Whose Fault is That? The Struggle for Self-esteem in the Face of Chronic Unemployment", Newfoundland Social and Economic Studies no.11, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial University of Newfoundland.

WAKEFIELD, E.G.

1832 "Plan of a Company to be Established for the Purpose of Founding a Colony in Southern Australia....", Ridgway and Sons, London; Libraries Board of South Australia, Facsimile Editions, no.6. The author was not named, but is presumed to be Wakefield.

1834 [1833] "England and America: A Comparison of the Social and Political State of Both Nations", Harper and Brothers, New York. Reprinted by Augustus M. Kelley, New York, 1967.

1849 "A View of the Art of Colonization, in Letters between a Statesman and a Colonist", John W. Parker, London. Reprinted by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1914; with an introduction by James Collier.

1929 "A Letter from Sydney and Other Writings", edited and introduced by R.C. Mills, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd., London. "A Letter from Sydney" was originally published in 1829.

WALKER, E.R.

1936 "Unemployment Policy with Special Reference to Australia", Angus and Robertson, Sydney.

WANNA, J.

1981 "Defence Not Defiance: The Development of Organised Labour in South Australia", Adelaide College of Advanced Education.

WARBURTON, E.

1976 "Old Stradbroke", Lynton Publications Pty. Ltd., Blackwood, South Australia.

WARD, J.F.

1951 "Prince Alfred College: The Story of the First Eighty Years 1867-1948", Gillingham and Co., Adelaide.

- WARD, R.
- 1958 "The Australian Legend", Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- WATKINS, P.E.
- 1980 "Curriculum Change and the School-Work Interface: A Critical Analysis of Work Experience", *ANZJS*, vol.16, no.2, pp.37-44.
- WATSON, I.
- 1985 "Double Depression: Schooling, Unemployment and Family Life in the Eighties", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- WATTS, J.I.
- 1890 "Family Life in South Australia", W.K. Thomas and Co. (facsimile by Libraries Board of South Australia, 1978).
- WATTS, R.
- 1980 "The Origins of the Australian Welfare State", *Historical Studies*, vol.19, no.75.
- WHITELOCK, D.
- 1977 "Adelaide 1836 to 1976: A History of Difference", University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia.
- WIGMAN, A.
- 1980 "World View and Social Control", B.A.thesis, University of Adelaide.
- WILD, R.A.
- 1978 "Social Stratification in Australia", Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- WILES, D.
- 1978 "As High as Heaven: The Women's Christian Temperance Union in South Australia, 1886-1915", B.A. thesis, University of Adelaide.
- WILLIAMS, A.
- 1908 "Preliminary Report of the Director of Education upon Observations Made during an Official Visit to Europe and America, 1907....", South Australian Parliamentary Papers, 1908, vol.3, part 2, no.65.

WILLIAMS, E.

- 1980 "A Way of Life: the Pastoral Families of the Central Hill Country of South Australia", Adelaide University Union Press, Adelaide.

WILLIAMS, R.

- 1974 "Base and Superstructure", *New Left Review*, 82.

WILLIS, P.

- 1979 "Learning to Labour: How Working Class Lads Get Working Class Jobs", Gower, London.

WILMOTT, P.

- 1969 "Adolescent Boys of East London", Penguin, Harmondsworth, revised edition.

WILMOTT, P. AND M.D. YOUNG

- 1957 "Family and Kinship in East London", Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

- 1975 [1973] "The Symmetrical Family: A Study of Work and Leisure in the London Region", Penguin, Harmondsworth.

WILSON, A.

- 1980 "The Infancy of the History of Childhood: An Appraisal of Philippe Ariès", *History and Theory*, vol.6, no.2, pp.132-153.

WIMSHURST, K.

- 1978 "Formal Schooling and Social Structure in a Working Class Municipality", *ANZHES Journal*, vol.7, no.1.

- 1979 "Street Children and School Attendance in South Australia, 1890-1915", M.Ed. thesis, Flinders University.

- 1981 "Child Labour and School Attendance in South Australia, 1890-1915", *Historical Studies*, 19, no.76, pp.381-411.

- 1983 "Child-Saving and Urban School Reform in South Australia at the Turn of the Century", in I. Palmer (ed.) "Melbourne Studies in Education, 1983", Melbourne University Press.

WINDSCHUTTLE, K.

- 1980 [1979] "Unemployment: A Social and Political Analysis of the Economic Crisis in Australia", revised edition, Penguin, Ringwood, Victoria.

WISEMAN, R.

- 1979 "The Comprehensive High School for South Australia",
South Australian Institute of Teachers' Publications no.13.

WOODLANDS SCHOOL

- 1973 "Woodlands, 1923-1973", Rigby, Adelaide.

WORDLEY, D.(ED.)

- n.d. [1958?] "The Gap: A Book to Bridge the Dangerous Years",
Applied Journalism, Adelaide.

YEATMAN, A.(ED.)

- 1984 "Gender and Social Life", Special Issue of *Social Analysis*.

YOUNG, J.

- 1971 "The Drugtakers: The Social Meaning of Drug Use", Paladin,
London.

YOUNG, M.D.

- 1958 "Rise of the Meritocracy 1870-2033: An Essay on Education
and Equality", Thames and Hudson, London.

ZARETSKY, E.

- 1976 "Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life", Pluto Press,
London.

ZELIZER, V.A.

- 1985 "Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of
Children", Basic Books, New York.