Few have attacked censorship with such power and brilliance as John Anderson in his essay "Censorship" in his 1970 collection "The New Machiavelles." In this essay, Anderson argues that censorship is a fundamental aspect of modern life, and that it is essential to the preservation of free speech and the protection of individual rights.

Anderson states that "censorship is the greatest enemy of freedom, and the greatest friend of tyranny." He argues that censorship is a form of control, and that it is used by those in power to suppress ideas and information that they do not want people to know.

The essay is a critical examination of the nature of censorship, and its impact on society. Anderson argues that censorship is not just about controlling information, but also about controlling people's thoughts and beliefs. He states that censorship is a form of control, and that it is used by those in power to suppress ideas and information that they do not want people to know.

Anderson's essay is a powerful critique of censorship, and it remains relevant today. It is a reminder of the importance of free speech and the need to protect individual rights.

The essay is available online at [this link](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2306750).
Lecture for car Lovers

Honda Scamp is unashamedly the sexiest car on the market

$1397

Only $50 deposit gives you four wheel freedom.

Note these features: Looking great cap — keeps that tire under control. Heated/Windowed — keeps things up. Through flow ventilation — clears the air quickly. Seat belts — strap you in for the getaway. Rear seat folds down — need we say more? Proven reliability — gets you home at any hour.

In case you have to justify the purchase of a new car to the old man — Honda Scamps are low priced, do 60 MPH, 60 plus to the gallon — that’ll get him!

WHERE IS THE NEW LEFT?

Four years ago radioactivity barely existed on Adelaide campus; now it consists of an ALL-Faculty opposition to the Vietnam war. The prominent spokesmen were academics and they, like the students, opposed disarmament elements of our society (war, racism, etc.) and made no attempt to project this opposition into a comprehensive radical analysis of existing society.

Today students are considerably more radical and by their actions, particularly in opposition to the Vietnam war and their demand for democracy within the University have displaced the traditional professors. But although there is a large number of radical and revolutionary students on campus, the same piecemeal analysis of society prevails. There is an urgent need to synthesize the political, economic and cultural dispositions of power in Australia, to locate the exact sources of our oppression under advanced capitalism and to devise a strategy for change.

Only a Marxist analysis can effectively accommodate the multitude of factors which combine to create the economic exploitation, the cultural oppression and the alienation of human relationships characteristics of a technologically advanced nation. The task of analysing Australian society and devising ways to change it, will be attempted at a series of NEW LEFT SEMINARS to be held every Thursday at 1:10 in the Lady Bonython Library. These seminars are open to all students and staff of all faculties.

PUB OF THE WEEK

Creaking oars, crashing waves, cool sand, sunlight flashing on helmets and sword blades, wine drunk from the horns of oxen, willing maidens... these are the scenes depicted in the murals on the walls of the Viking Bar.

The Hotel Australia's Viking Bar must be one of the most congenial bars in Adelaide — it caters for all types, and the patrons are a friendly mixed bunch.

And so, if you want smooth relaxed entertainment with maybe a chance of reliving the good old lusty Viking days, drink in the Viking bar.

AN HOUR OF NOSTALGIA WITH CHARLES CHAPLIN

CHARLIE CHAPLIN FILM FESTIVAL

UNION HALL

THURSDAY, 19th JUNE

1 p.m. - 2 p.m.

20c ADMISSION

BEATLES MAGICAL MYSTERY TOUR

STUDENT CONCESSIONS

NEXT FRI SAT SUN ONLY

LIMITED EXCLUSIVE SEASON 8 p.m. NIGHTLY, SAT, SUN MATINEE 2 p.m.

FLICKER

CORNER MILNER ST. & PORT ROAD, HINDMARSH

PROSHituation

RAG MEETING THURSD. 18

GENERAL MEETING NEXT TUES.

MED/ENGINEERS TUG-OF-WAR

SURVEYORS Complete equipment in perfect order at reasonable prices.

WEDNESDAY 20th 1,10

UNI FOORBRIDGE

RING 35 138
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Economics—Sterile Discipline?

Philip McCloskey, an Economics graduate, investigates the study at this University of the orthodox economics tradition and evaluates the function of orthodox economics in contemporary capitalist society.

The most significant feature of the economics course at this University is that students acquire virtually no perspective on the history and ideology of economic theory. What the substance of the teaching presents is prevailing orthodox economic theories, which do in fact have acknowledged historical and ideological roots.

The significance of this is based on two primary questions to be asked of the economics discipline as a university course:

1. Is the intellectual rationale for teaching only orthodox economics — and if it is that economics is "scientific" — how scientific is it?
2. Whether economics is scientific or not, how useful can it be as a social science, while it tolerates itself from political and social variables?

This paper will attempt to examine these questions.

MARKET SOCIETY

By confining its examination of society to the level of the market, orthodox economics conveniently ignores the essential social and cultural nature of capitalist society. The notion of the market society enables the economist to assume he can neglect the quantitative differences that are measurable in monetary terms and the qualitative differences that are not. Hence labour becomes a commodity, and the economist abstracts himself from relations between people, allowing the economic exploitation of humans and human groups to go unnoticed. The market concept is the first step towards dematerialisation of societal relations.

The economist might claim that his function is merely to understand the workings of the market economy, and hence to streamline its functioning for the benefit of everyone, or to use the economics maxim, "to maximise satisfaction." Interestingly enough, the very concept of "economic" in a historical sense such that it is removed to the nineteenth century is unhelpful to economists, since their rationality forbids the use of "emotive" terms. However, capitalism has retained its basic extremes of poverty and wealth, both nationally and internationally, which indicates the persistence of economic rationality. Consequently, it seems that the economist, rather than being merely an "economic" assumption, such as "exploitation" or "poverty," indeed rationalises how he sees them, for example in our own Aboriginal societies and Neo-Locking.

For ever there was a discipline that was incapacitated by its own rhetoric, it is economics. And it is important for the student of economics to recognise this, before he is bought off by the mystifying convoluted wisdom thus propagated in the Economics Department.

MISTIFICATION

The mystification process aways from two sources.

In the first place, the economics course never acknowledges the importance of the historical and sociological roots of the analysis it employs. For instance, the Department advertises its courses as dealing with 'the theory of value’ or 'the theory of the trade cycle,’ etc. Respectively, in one aspect there is no one theory of value or of the trade cycle — they are several, and they differ. In the general course, the classical labour theory of value, which is the orthodox theory of value, is the one that approaches the subject of economic exploitation. In itself, this is not a doubt because it questions the structure of our economic system, and hence orthodox economics descants its validity as a "scientific" instrument of analysis.

Secondly, the modern theoretical refinements of century-old orthodox analysis monopolise attention, and divert it from the real question of the use of economics as a social science. Preoccupation with theory abounds at the expense of whether it is providing any real analysis of the problems of contemporary society. "The theory of the firm" is studied, but there is no real attempt to utilise the insights it can provide for specific regions of the economy of the practice of the firm, and of its modern equivalent, the corporation.

KEYNESIANISM

The economics course is chiefly concerned with Keynesian economics. Keynesian economists, short-run macro-economics (the total economy) analyse periods of the business cycle.

It is only in the last year that the student becomes fully aware of Keynes’s reconstruction of the "classical tradition" of economics.

One of Keynes’s important contributions to macro-economics was to argue forcefully that state intervention was necessary to regulate the level of economic activity adequate to assure a high level of employment. Instead of assuming that one of the prime tasks of the automaticity of the capitalist society in restoring full-employment equilibrium after its successive recessions, the Keynesian economists can be divided here the neo-Keynesian argument for public expenditure has in fact led to a wholly different definition between government finance and private capital, where the state’s role in economic stimulation becomes one of ensuring profitable investment opportunities for the powerful corporations.

Hence students spend a good deal of their time employing Keynesian techniques to construct an under-founded economy with artificial public-private division. They become an instrument of mathematical riddles. Economists become theoretical numbers game, to paint a veneer of science, on the emerging and significant of Keynesian economics.

Even Professor Paul Samuelson, esteemed American neo-Keynesian, remarks: "We have found that, contrary to what I said to the good student ... we will remain in a dilemma, that is to say, in a situation in which instead of thinking about President Nixon’s problem of curtailing inflation or Prime Minister Wilson’s problem of getting Britain’s productivity up.”

IMPOTENCE

Samuelson, sounding a very valid warning, which highlights the abstracted, mechanised nature of the economics discipline. But he is also unwittingly pointing out the impotence of orthodox economics.

For persistent abstraction prevents economics from posing the fundamental questions of CAUSATION of the intrinsically national and international capitalism.

These symptoms, or irrationalities of production facing us today include: the existence of unemployment and technological unemployment, over-inflation in the "Third World,” rising social costs of production, growing unremunerated and substantial desire for waste production and production destined for destructive purposes, the danger of irreversible ecological damage, and gross economic imbalances, which allow the so-called and frighteningly obvious economic and political power only in large corporations.

Orthodox economic theory, operating in its refined state of elaborate models, is not concerned, and cannot concern itself with those basic questions of causation. It may go so far as to ask: "WHAT causes WHAT, or WHAT causes UNDER-DEVELOPMENT in the Third World?” and provide its model economic answers, but it steers clear of the real questions of "WHO causes ..." and "what is the historical nature of capitalist development that throws up these irrationalities?”

Orthodox economics lies important here for two reasons:

(1) It cannot ask these questions:
(2) It will not ask these questions.

SCIENTIFIC?

(1) Modern orthodox economics sees itself as an essentially free from political and sociological variables, as exposed to the political economy of Smith, Malthus and Marx, Political economy was put aside in the mid-nineteenth century by marginal economics, propagated by the neo-classical school. This school concentrated on individual consumption, rather than social production, which had been the starting point of the classical economics. And if the neo-classics’ objective function was, (no doubt), purely apologist — to justify capitalist order as more of less inevitable, to justify wars, prices and profits as that result of exchanges executed on an equal footing in the market. The rapid expansion of capitalism of the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century, was the reason for the sufficient argument in favour of capitalism. Hence, there was seemingly no need for a trend of economic thought other than the apologetic school.

Consequently, the firm ascendant of the neo-classical school consolidated the assumption of equilibrium theory to be the governing law of the market. Equilibrium theory is a model that identifies a private enterprise market economy, working conditions of perfect competition where prices and economic decisions are determined by the interacting forces of supply and demand in a free market. And as the course of the economies, pursuit of the mystical equilibrium state (both in the macro-use of the total economy, and in the micro-use of historical entities in the consumer market and the relation of the firm or industry to the market) has never been able to deflect from the far more important notion of economic dynamics to significance, and excising itself on the grounds of academic convenience.

As Joan Robinson remarks in her "Economic Philosophy": "The oscillating harmonies of equilibrium supported ‘daiser-faire’ logic that the argument kept us all too busy to have any time for dangerous questions.

Preoccupation with equilibrium theory places monoplas and oligopolistic practices on a special plane as aberrations from the norm of perfect competition. The competitive model not only precludes the very notion of a planned economy but it also diverts analysis from the immediate realities of our modern corporate structures. Never did we approach the social and political implications of the phenomenon of industrial and financial concentration in the national and international economy, in the economies course.

I also remember to my horror answering a question in the economics I, "what does the model of perfect competition accomplish?" It was too much attention from economists”, the only answer possible after a year’s study being the one of academic convenience, vacuity, and the subtilization of orthodox method and assumption in economic analysis.

POLICY

Orthodox economic theory, underpinned by market equilibrium theory and marginalist theory, does not incorporate, and so cannot comprehend, production transcendence, and hence is unable to develop appropriate policy. For instance, marginalist’s fundamental categories are individual categories of consumer and firm; while production itself is social. And so economics is incapable of developing a theory of production and social needs.
Similarly micro-theory has never developed a theory of the causes of state spending — only a hypothesis of the effects of state spending. Any interrelationships between public and private expenditure are seen in general as unalleviated, leaving a vital omission where government and private business links (neo-capitalism) should be recognised and the importance of further, Keynesian theory fails to disaggregate the economy, and thus is unable to examine the problem of disproportionalities between economic sectors. For, as a result, disaggregation would demonstrate that government expenditure, leading to an increase in the corporate sector of the economy, causes the decline of the small business, and specifically, causes the further concentration of capital, leading to a number of such things as urban renewal and military investment.

VALUE JUDGEMENTS

A pervasive feature of the economics course is that "value judgements" are stilled — for two reasons.

(a) orthodox economics claims to be objective and, scientifically, value judgements are dangerous and should be avoided;

(b) if a student feels that the economics he is being taught does not correspond with his experience, that the manipulation of social reality is unable to relate the two, and value judgements become irrelevant. His text-book language and its "other things being equal" abstraction, abstracts him from reality, and leaves him confused. He lacks confidence to observe simply that the manipulation of its captive market by corporate power is the rule, that the consumer has no sovereignty and therefore no choice in "consumer preference" is totally irrelevant. When tutorial time comes, unless he has a market economy problem, he finds he is unable to participate himself. Alienation is rife in the economics tutorials.

Discourse of "value judgements" is both the weakness and the supreme paradox of economics. No economy is an ideological abstraction in that the real problems of economic society cannot even be approached, but it is also built on its very elements of values, that underlies ideologically notions of laissez-faire, the market economy and the market value of human capital.

But the paradox goes further as we see the market economy theory belied by concentration of corporate power, enabling corporations to remove price and profit from the vagaries of the free market. As Karl Marx remarks in "ACCaENTuRY CE lect*: "some of the elements of the capitalist collectivism, then are the concentration of economic power, the concentration ability to "administer" prices to an economy rather than to the market, the supply and demand, the utilisation of profit targets and planning techniques, the stabilisation of investments (theoretically) into economic research and development, and the abolition of risk in the money market."

The rationalisation — collectivisation of production require the rationalisation and collectivisation of taste; and as Harrington comments, "It is the role of advertising to make the misallocation of resources characteristic of corporate collectivism appear as the free choices of society.

One might ask how orthodox economics can exist in the face of such facts. It may be said that bourgeois economics is far removed from the real world of economic possibility, so its existence is separate and irrelevant to the political dynamics and irrationalities of the system. Further one can suggest that the reason why modern economics offers no qualitive solutions is that Keynesian precautions has preempted the available resources of economists, and thus has eliminated the economic possibilities.

Finally it may be necessary to extend Joan Robinson's penetrating statement about economics, that "all along it has been striving to escape from sentiment and to win for itself the status of a science." In a society obsessed with measuring value, and where value is the basis of production, it is clear that value is a product of a metaphysical foundation, and therefore neither can economic theory. And whilst departmentalisation of knowledge exceeds the limits of the science which isolates itself from political, historical and socialological factors, is worthless.

RATIONALITY

(2) Orthodox economics, by its very nature, will now present no questions of causation, and will therefore never recognised economic exploitation. This is a result of the orthodoxy was developed by economists with vested interests in economic society during a post period of capitalist expansion. They have shaped the economy by rationalising the value and profit system and stressing the notion of free market processes in their analysis, despite the real phenomenon of monopoly capitalism. Simply production has always been directed by a ruling economy to maximise its power it must develop a rationale — bourgeois economics.

Marx has made a steady assault on the dynamic of the money relation, all the inconsistent contradictions of bourgeois society appear extinguished, and that is why bourgeois
democrats take refuge with them, to justify the existing economic relationship. In truth, so long as a commodity is seen only as an exchange-value, and the relations between them are used only as exchange-relations, as equilibriums of these exchangevalues, then the individuals, the subjects between whom this process takes place, are merely partners in exchange. There is absolutely no formal difference between them. Thus, as subjects of exchange, their relationship is one of equality... the commodities which they exchange, exchange-values, equivalents; or at least count as equivalents. (There could at most be subjective error in their reciprocal separation, and so in so far as one individual gained an advantage over another, this would not be in the nature of the social function which brings them together, for this function is identical for both, and within it they are equal. It would rather be the result of natural differences, persuasion, etc., in short, a result of the purely individual superiority of one individual over another...) Thus if one individual accumulates wealth and the other does not, neither is doing it at the expense of the other... if one becomes poorer and the other richer, it is, of their own free will, and proceeds in no way out of the economic relation, the economic situation in which they meet." (My emphasis).

Bourgeois economics will not change its mode of analysis in order to comprehend the irrationalities, because to do so would undermine the ideological basis of corporate rule in society. In other words bourgeois economic analysis would, for example, overlook the concept of the primacy of profits over the use, and the primacy of individual atomisation and competition over co-operation. And economic exploitation would have to be recognised — how else can the economist justify the low wages of women, for instance, without recognising women as one of the exploited groups in society?

And these are the reasons that the economics student is bound to accept — primacy of profits in all economic decisions, the desirability for 2%-3% unemployment to restrain inflationary forces, economic "growth" rather than resource allocation principles based on the economy rather than quality the economic virtues of large-scale production (social and political implications?), and further quantitative assumptions.

Taking one example where growth is the criterion of success, one must seek out its most profitable channels to achieve this — allocation of resources to public use (e.g. slum clearance, hospitals, education, transport rationalisation, etc.), always take second place, as bourgeois economics also stresses the primacy of profits over use — is poverty an aberration?

Because most academics accept orthodox economics as scientific, or because they have an affinity for ruling class economics by the nature of their university position, or because this is what business wants, they see no need to study the Marxist economic tradition. One senior lecturer in Economics I claimed last year that Hobson and Marx were "way-out economists." Graduate economics departments place more emphasis on theoretical analysis (academic masturbation) by compelling the student to master orthodox theory and quantitative metoc. And the business world's substitution and belief in the "values" (paradoxical as they are) of orthodox economics allows the hegemony of corporate society embraces the economics course, at the expense of critical study and intellectual integrity. To the degree the teaching of economics becomes totalitarian. Philip McMichael.

The role of the Dopeusher

In a Primitive Society

Dave Crocker: Aria

Recently, in Sydney, a young man was guiled into trying a few smoking Indian hemp. This was the natural sequel of this for one of Australia's law-abiding, freedom-loving states. If the police are down on dope, they are certainly down on the pushers, and in fact, these are the people who supposedly cause all the trouble. Somehow drug abuse is related to the pusher who supplies the stuff, especially as he seems to be-concentrating on naive youth.

The pusher is the primary villain of the drug plot, but he does his job for the greater community even his business is in opposition to the law, Wootwoths and the AMA. He washes his hands and hard-working, and without his persistence many a simply pot-pusher would have been hung up ages ago.

Who is the pusher and what is his motive.

The pusher is really a pretty bright boy. He goes to university for a degree in Economics, a knowledge of the physiology and anatomy of the brain, nerve centres, a detailed knowledge of Jekyll and Doolittle, contacts within the hierarchy of law, order and disorder, a bird with a knowledge of all regulations and the drug trade.

The pusher must at all times be friendly, charming, polished and conversant with elementary pharmacology. He must know what is cooked and what is jargon, and what has become increasingly important, in an age of Freud, he should have some knowledge of phychology. The demand these days has to be satisfied, the pusher generally requires Diplomas of psychiatry which are freely available from the Med School.

So the pusher is not all dope. Neither is he an unscrupulous person, or a violent, the life-stream of humanity. He is largely the common denominator, the usual the victim to pass out over the counter. He is no worse than the drug user who has performed abortions illegally because he believes it to be necessary.

The pusher has a place in our little community, despite his exhibitions by the AMA, the benevolent, altruistic speeches by Qantas, and the progressive smoking of the police department. From these sources the good news is a myth. There is no doubt that there is a social problem. The illegal drug business is illegal and has been associated with the decline of another problem which is the antinomical pill-taking habits of most Australians.

It seems that the problem of drug taking itself lies in the hands of the people who authorise the drugs. I find it hard to believe that a society will of its own accord accept pills for every psychical and physical disability imaginable. Pill-control can easily be handled by the doctor and the chemist. These are the people who inspect and encourage preventative medicines, and these are the people who must accept the burden of the sub-culture that has risen from it.

So the pusher, if he doesn't already work in conjunction with some doctor, chemist or drug company, owes his very existence to preventive medicine and the preservation of the life. He is an offshoot of scientific research, and in opposition to it.

But the pusher must accept the fact that he is to be regarded as a social outcast at least until the drugs are legalised. He has only to wait, in South Australia, until 1975 when Elliot Johnson comes to power.
Pop goes on a graphic trip and discovers spaced-age art

The examples produced above and below are part of a new Graphic artform that is becoming increasingly popular in the United States. The cartoon-sequence was created by Rick Griffin, along with similar, though often more obscure sequences, and cartoons by other artists of quasi-political or quasi-pornographic nature, Griffin's work appears in several American comic books which are present receiving considerable curiosity in America.

Under titles such as ' Zap!' and 'Blackie Komix', and 'approved by Hells Angels, Los Angeles', or by the 'United Geek of America', samples such as appear in our POP pages are part of an ever-growing counter-culture in the comic-world. Turning on and Freaking out are phenomena underlying themes in the work of Griffin and Muroo (see below). More down-to-earth cartoons of a style popular in the sixties and forties deal with blues, 'Mr. Natural', Hashers, Marshallles, Trackers ('Freaking, trucking down the line') and other American Institutions. Three cartoons are drawn by B. Gumis.

Both Griffin and Muroo have unleashed their talents on record covers (Remember Janis Joplin's first album with Big Brother?), while Griffin has drawn several startlingly intricate and weird-looking posters for BHP Graham's Fillmore Auditoriums.

Foolishly obviously directly connected with hallucinogenic experiences, Griffin's spaced-out art eliminates in most cases any meaningful dialogue, and the continuity of the cartoon departs largely on the pictorial sequence. In some of the sequences the shapes and 'characters' undergo a strange kind of 'transition' from frame to frame. In the example above, there is at least some vestige of dialogue ('How's your weather?'). In the example below, however, by Muroo, a variation of shape takes place from frame to frame almost as if these are cartoons 'still' from a full-length animation involving constantly changing and merging ideas and objects. For example, the remaining deck-like shape disintegrates over the last three frames in frozen animation.

The motif (left) is similar to those appearing on Fillmore posters.

When studied carefully, the motif appears extremely intricate in concept, and a certain theme or interpretation can be made about its significance. One such interpretation would run like this:

The child has been formed by the conjunction of the space eagerly making the way on which the childalfa. From the instant of birth, the mind of the child is narrowed by the brain by a thorn of enigmatic will, the will mind-revealing society which conditions the child. A sphere of death, a sphere of space, direct or indirect all-seeing eyes and skulls emphasize the evil state of the diagram's section. However, the letters AMAA, being detached from the center, can ray above the sun in the way the sun behind them rises swiftly over the earth beneath the baby from winter life (in the form of pure life). The continuity of the central sun demonstrates the image. There is an image of the skull, a sphere whose point is the mouth of another sphere, perch on the skull's center, while the sun's suns form the lower limbs of the lower face. By looking carefully into it, one can discover the other faces within the central complexity.

Griffin prefers a kind of symmetry, not just passively, but in his choice of words: for example, OMO, OXO, ALOHAHIRO-A and so on. His symbols occur again and again in the theme of future society where the seeble, bulbous shapes, skulls, and rising suns as well as obscure syncretistic words inextricably build up a pattern. His art, intriguing, abusive, distinctly affords perspective and reality. In more ways than one it is a cartoon analogy of a hallucinogenic trip: spaced-age art for the spaced-age generation.