

- (Social Science Research Council, New York, 1960), p.311.
- 79 See, for example, Joan Davies, *African Trade Unions* (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1966), pp.40, 42, 76. Of course even a 'fairly standard' Australian model in this area would be comparatively restrictive.
- 80 The industrial relations law prohibits the organising of a strike when an award applies as one would to most urban workers. Almost all other organised urban workers would be prohibited from striking by specific legislation covering their occupation such as the Public Service Act. Except for some recent efforts in the Sepik area, rural workers remain unorganised.
- 81 *New Guinea Report 1960-61*, p.109.
- 82 R.J. Worsley, 'The Developing System of Industrial Relations in Papua New Guinea' (thesis for Bachelor of Commerce Degree, University of New South Wales, Sydney, 1966), pp.41, 60-1. See also John Paterson, 'New Guinea's Trade Unions', *New Guinea and Australia, the Pacific and South-East Asia* 4, 1, (March-April 1969), p.28.
- 83 R.J. Worsley, *op. cit.*, p.43.
- 84 R.M. Martin, 'Tribesmen into Trade Unionists: the African Experience and the Papua-New Guinea Prospect', *Journal of Industrial Relations* ii, 2 (1969), pp.159-61, and N. Seddon, 'Legal Problems facing Trade Unions in Papua New Guinea', *Melanesian Law Journal* III, 1 (April 1975), p.103.
- 85 The degree of dependence varies among different societies and takes different forms. For one of the best accounts of the present context of this dependence, see the strong but not unusual case described by Thomas G. Harding, 'Wage Labour and Cash Cropping, the Economic Adaptation of New Guinea Copra Producers', *Oceania* 41, 3 (1971).
- 86 Claude Meillassoux, 'The Social Organisation of the Peasantry: The Economic Basis of Kinship', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 1, 1 (October) 1973), p.89.
- 87 For example, that is the heading to the fifth goal of the Constitution, which goal is to achieve development primarily through the use of Papua New Guinean forms of social, political and economic organisation. Department of Labour and Industry, *Submission to the Urban Minimum Wages Board* (June 1974), part B, pp.2, 3, 5.
- 88 Department of Labour and Industry, *Submission to the Urban Minimum Wages Board* (June 1974), part B, pp.2, 3, 5.
- 89 Allowance has been made for a worker's wife in some urban areas and for a wife and one child in others and also there has been a small loading added to the single man basis of the rural minimum wage: See National Minimum Wages Board, *Reasons for Decision and Determination* (June 1976), p.15.
- 90 *Post Courier*, 8 August 1973.
- 91 The position with land administration is not covered here because it is now so complex. Very generally, government land administration remains predominantly and strongly focused on conserving the traditional base but there are strong tendencies toward individualisation of rural land tenure and these tendencies are aided by government extension and lending agencies.
- 92 There is currently a government Bill before the legislature which would do away with the vagrancy offence but the Bill is being continually delayed.
- 93 There are numerous instances in the literature. For minimum wage standards see, for example, T.S. Epstein, *Capitalism, Primitive and Modern: Some Aspects of Tolai Economic Growth* (Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1968), p.104. B.R. Finney, 'New Guinean Entrepreneurs', *New Guinea Research Bulletin No. 27* (New Guinea Research Unit, Port Moresby and Australian National University, Canberra, 1969), p.38, and Louise Morauta, *Beyond the Village: Local Politics in Madang, Papua New Guinea* (Australian National University Press, Canberra, 1974), p.55.
- 94 See footnote 24. Protective legislation here means not only minimum wage laws but all laws administered by the Department of Labour, including safety laws. The policy was slightly departed from with some recent prosecutions (which themselves had trouble getting through the system) of some Papua New Guinean and expatriate employers for failure to lodge information returns with the Department. Also the New Guinea Development Corporation on the Gazelle, a comparatively radical organisation, has been prosecuted for failure to insure its workers.

ALA
WK 6

5

CAPITALISM AND ABORIGINES: THE THEORY OF INTERNAL COLONIALISM AND ITS RIVALS

MERVYN HARTWIG

The comparative history of race and ethnic relations in situations brought about by the expansion of capitalism, is increasingly coming to be written within the framework of a Marxist or neo-Marxist model of the development of capitalism and its articulation with other modes of production.

Mervyn Hartwig

IN A RECENT critique of the literature on internal colonialism and an impressive attempt to render the concept more rigorous and explore its usefulness for a Marxist analysis of South African society, Harold Wolpe left open the question 'Whether the notion of "internal colonialism" has any proper application in conditions of racial discrimination where . . . the internal relations within the society are overwhelmingly capitalist in nature, that is, where non-capitalist modes of production, if they exist at all, are marginal'.¹ Australia is a clear example of one such society. This essay argues that the theory as elaborated by Wolpe, with some modification, does have proper application to many of the conditions of racial discrimination that have obtained within it in respect of Aborigines. It explores the usefulness of the theory for an historical understanding of those conditions, and suggests that it has significant advantages over its chief 'rivals' in the field of race and ethnic relations — structural-functionalist theory and the theory of plural society. It is argued in a preliminary way that, for much of the period and for many of the conditions obtaining since 1788, the theory

1. best helps to explain the specific terms in which ideological and political domination over Aborigines have been expressed, by

I wish to thank Rachel Sharp for reading an earlier versions of this paper and making some very helpful comments and suggestions.

relating them to specific modes of exploitation of Aboriginal societies;²

2. offers an adequate theoretical framework for an analysis of the intersection of class with race and ethnicity and of the profound duality—class/nation, integration/separation—that has characterized Aboriginal aspirations;
3. provides the best theoretical perspective for locating the history of Aboriginal-White relations in the comparative history of race and ethnic relations in situations brought about by the expansion of capitalism.

The essay offers no new data but seeks rather to commence the task of re-interpreting existing data within a more adequate theoretical framework. It proceeds largely by way of summarizing Wolpe's argument,³ elaborating at certain points and indicating theoretical limitations in the Australian literature; offering a critique and refinement of it; and indicating some of the general lines along which the revised theory might provide the basis for a thoroughgoing structural analysis of the history of Aboriginal-White relations.

The Theory of Internal Colonialism—A Critique

The concept of 'internal colonialism', as Wolpe points out, has its origin in 'the view that there are close parallels between the *external* relationships established by colonial powers over colonized peoples' in the era of capitalist expansion, and the relationships between dominant and subordinate racial and ethnic groups 'within some Latin American societies, the United States, [Canada], and South Africa'. While 'internal' is to be distinguished from 'normal' colonialism, in that in the former the colonizing racial or ethnic group 'occupies the same territory as the colonized people', and in the latter 'the colony is a distinct territorial entity, spatially detached from its imperial metropolis',

In all other important respects, the implication is, the components of the 'normal' imperial-colonial relation are to be found within the borders of a single state to an extent which justifies the view that it constitutes an internal colonialism. In particular, it is argued in this approach, that the 'underdeveloped' (and 'underdeveloping') condition of subordinate ethnic and racial groups and the geographical areas they occupy within the boundaries of the state, is produced and maintained by the same mechanisms of cultural domination, political oppression, and economic exploitation which, at the international level, produce the development of the advanced capitalist states through the imperialist underdevelopment of the colonial satellites.⁴

Two main characteristics are ascribed to the colonial relation in the literature. First, it occurs between total populations (e.g. Westerners and Third World peoples), nations (e.g. the United States and any Latin American country), geographical areas (e.g. the North and the South in the U.S.) or racial and ethnic groups (e.g. English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians, Ladinos and Indians in Latin America, whites and

blacks in South Africa). Second, it is said to involve, in a general way, political domination, cultural oppression, and economic exploitation.⁵

While no-one has employed the theory of internal colonialism in relation to the history of Aboriginal-White relations in Australia, one writer has resorted to the colonial *analogy* extensively—C.D. Rowley in his three volumes on *Aboriginal Policy and Practice*,⁶ and we might note here that he nevertheless takes essentially the same view as that just indicated. For convenience of analysis he divides Australia into two regions, which he refers to as 'colonial' and 'settled', the former comprising the desert and sparsely settled northern and central areas, the latter the remainder of the continent. It is important to note that this is for purposes of contemporary, synchronic analysis, and not for historical analysis: he stresses that colonial relations once obtained also in most areas of 'settled' Australia. The following passages indicate the specific characteristics he ascribes to the colonial relationship:

In applying the term 'colonial Australia' . . . I have it in mind that in these northern and central regions the social relationships between the indigenous and settler populations represent *an earlier phase* of changes brought by European settlement, and that there are many aspects remaining in the relations between the races which are typical of industrial colonialism. Aborigines of the full descent form the majority of non-Europeans in this region. Here, also, Aboriginal culture retains, to varying degrees, its significance for conduct and as a determinant of the Aboriginal 'world view' and value system. Significant also is the relationship of white settler to coloured labour; of white missionary to coloured mission community; and of white public servants engaged in 'native' administration, to those who come under the legislation . . .

It seems to me that settler and employer attitudes to 'natives' in this northern region . . . range . . . broadly from the benevolently paternal to the crudely exploitative of the coloured 'unit of labour'; and that certain common factors in the historical background of northern and central Australia and of New Guinea (and the colonial areas generally) have made this inevitable . . . The history [of labour relations in the region] has involved much heavier impact from what is commonly referred to as 'colonial exploitation' than one can find in the background of many admittedly colonial situations, like that of New Guinea, for instance.⁷

It is apparent from these passages (and from others scattered throughout the three volumes) that Rowley's concept of 'colonialism' is essentially similar to the concept employed in the general literature on 'internal colonialism'. There is the suggestion that most aspects of a 'normal' colonialism are present in northern and central Australia, and were once present in 'settled' Australia, and the colonial relationship is clearly held to occur between two peoples of different colour and culture and to involve political domination, cultural oppression, and economic exploitation.

It might also be noted here, since the question will become pertinent later, that Rowley's distinction between 'colonial' and 'settled' Australia is (on his own confession) somewhat arbitrary. *When* did relations

between Whites and Aborigines in any one part of 'settled' Australia cease to be 'colonial'? The question is never directly confronted. The answer implicit in the passages cited (and elsewhere),⁸ is that the colonial relation ceased when the destruction of Aboriginal society had proceeded to a point where Aborigines of the full descent, with a recognizably 'traditional' Aboriginal culture, no longer outnumbered part-Aborigines, whose culture was now "not something independent of general [Australian] culture" but at most "a distorted development, or a pathological condition, of general [Australian] culture"⁹ or were no longer a numerically significant element in the local population. This is a distinction that Rowley fails to maintain with any consistency, however. We are told in volume 3, for example:

So long as the indigenous people within a nation state are not charmed into participation in a new way of living or somehow included to the point where they wish to lose themselves in the settler society or find some basis for self-contained adjustment within it, they are in a situation broadly comparable with that of the 'natives' in the tropical or other colony of exploitation. That such people may form a small racial and cultural minority, trapped, as it were, within the European state will, so long as they retain any determination to resist an administration which appears to them alien, tend to maintain or exacerbate the responses which have resulted in the colonial revolts.¹⁰

However, this would seem to hold good in respect of many Aborigines in 'settled' Australia today, and indeed, in the succeeding paragraph we are told that 'the intransigence of Aborigines, whether part-Aboriginal or of the full descent, in the southern regions, in fringe dwellings, on Government Aboriginal stations and reserves, and more recently in the central areas of the metropolitan cities, has a *direct* relationship to the intransigence of the colonial rebel'.¹¹ Such are the hazards of operating with a loose analogy rather than within the framework of a rigorously elaborated theory.

The difficulty arises in part from Rowley's failure to tie the colonial relation to an adequate notion of exploitation. Indeed, what seems most problematic in the literature on internal colonialism in general is the notion of 'colonial exploitation'. How does such 'exploitation' differ from class exploitation in capitalist societies? And 'what is the relationship between the system of class exploitation and domination and the relations of racial [and] ethnic . . . exploitation and domination characteristic of internal colonialism?'.¹²

Wolpe identifies three variants of the theory of internal colonialism. One version, as elaborated by American sociologists in particular,¹³ sidesteps these questions in that it asserts that race and ethnicity are independent dynamic forces not ultimately reducible to other causal determinants. These theorists are consequently unable to conceptualize the relationship of race and ethnicity to the total social structure. We are left, therefore, 'with racial and ethnic groups abstracted out of the social formation'.¹⁴

Two other versions do not assert the independence and irreducibility of race and ethnicity, but nevertheless do not succeed in taking the analysis beyond that of the first version. In one of these, 'the contrast is implicitly drawn between capitalist societies which are culturally, ethnically, and racially homogeneous, and in which relations of class exploitation are dominant, and those societies in which both capitalist exploitation and internal colonial relations exist side by side'.¹⁵ This version fails to identify, however, any specific mode of colonial exploitation and domination which might be held to distinguish it from class exploitation and domination.

Instead, there is a general reference to exploitation, used in a descriptive sense, and to undefined states of racial or ethnic oppression and these are in no way linked to the system of class exploitation. The consequence . . . is that, [as in the first version], internal colonial relations are not only left obscure but are said to hold between racial, ethnic, and cultural groups which are analysed as if they are autonomous of the total social structure.¹⁶

A third version of the theory arrives at the same result by *assimilating* class relations to race relations. In the programme of the South African Communist Party, for example, "'White South Africa" is identified with the "capitalist state" and the capitalist system, while "non-White South Africa" is identified with "the colony". From this point on the analysis of class relations gives way to the description of White domination and exploitation of Blacks in terms of the internal colonial analogy'.¹⁷

Thus the second and third versions of the theory, while purporting to rest on an analysis of class relations of exploitation, fail 'to relate classes *within* racial or ethnic groups to the class structure of society as a whole', and the consequence is that, as in the first version, 'racial or ethnic entities are treated abstractly and as if their internal class structures are irrelevant to their existence as groups and to their political and ideological practices'.¹⁸ The same failing is evident in Rowley's work. While it is a weakness that characterizes his analysis in general,¹⁹ a single example must serve to make the point here. 'A whole system of production', he writes with reference to the Northern Territory pastoral industry,

has been based on the use of 'fit adult males' of a subordinate community as 'units of labour', in a system of production where the gap between work force and management has corresponded to the cultural gap, and has been reinforced by the assumption that all Europeans are of 'managerial', and all 'natives' of labouring rank . . . Nothing indicates more clearly the 'colonial' nature of the society in the north than such arrangements for production.²⁰

Not *all* 'fit adult males', let alone all members of the 'subordinate community' are 'units of labour', nor are all Europeans 'managerial'. We are not told how Aborigines who are not 'units of labour' are exploited,²¹ nor is any analysis presented in class terms concerning who exploits them. Here, as elsewhere in Rowley's analysis, Aborigines and Europeans stand in a vaguely defined relationship of 'colonial' domination and exploitation. Their internal class relations, and class relations *between* them, are left

largely unanalysed. The analysis of their ideological and political practices consequently also proceeds with little reference to the class relations in the social formation as a whole.

The Theory of Internal Colonialism and its Rivals

Wolpe demonstrates that

the unexplained autonomy of racial, ethnic, and cultural groups and the obscurity of the relationships between them which [are] the outcome of the theory of internal colonialism, brings this theory within a conceptual framework which is similar to that of the theory of plural society. Despite the very different origins of these theories they suffer from identical analytical limitations.²²

While there are no examples of a systematic application of a plural society model to the Australian situation,²³ it constitutes the dominant approach to the study of race relations in situations brought about by the expansion of capitalism. We might therefore expect an example to materialize and it might be well to point out its limitations in advance.

The intellectual context against which the theory of plural society emerged, was pervaded by structural-functionalist theory, as elaborated by Talcott Parsons in particular. As David Lockwood has pointed out, Parsons is in agreement with those Marxist theorists who subsume race relations to class relations insofar as he defines

the problem of the Negro American as one of 'lower class status' and [perceives] the solution of this problem as being inextricably bound up with the fate of the whole of the lower class of American society. Parsons, of course, sees the solution in essentially Durkheimian terms: the Negro can be brought into full membership of the societal community through a planned process of 'inclusion' analogous to that which has been achieved more or less spontaneously by other immigrant groups. The key mechanism of such a process of inclusion is the implementation of the 'social' rights of citizenship, which, together with civil and political rights, may be regarded as the substantive conditions of what Durkheim meant by 'organic solidarity'. By making possible their *de facto* rather than simply formal legal opportunity of participation in the larger community, American Negroes will become included within the existing socio-economic system without losing that sense of group identity and cultural distinctiveness which is part of the American pluralistic tradition. Such a change, however, is only part of a wider civic incorporation which is necessary in order to bring 'not only the Negro but the whole lower class into the societal community'.²⁴

Thus, problems of inequality in general are resolved, and conflict kept at a minimum, through a process of inclusion in a consensually based social structure. Not surprisingly, this has been implicitly or explicitly the dominant approach in the literature on Aboriginal-White relations for some time.²⁵

It is not intended to present a thoroughgoing critique of this approach here, but its basic limitations and the directions in which these lead it,

when problems of inequality appear to threaten the stability of the system, might at least be noted. The limitations are, ultimately, ideological in origin. That is to say, the approach, while purporting to offer an explanation of inequality and an analysis of how it can be significantly reduced, actually incorporates a notion of the inevitability and functionality of stratification. Discrepancies in power, status, and economic rewards are seen as important structural devices to enable common goals to be achieved. The notion of 'equality of opportunity' thus becomes, in reality, *a notion of equality of opportunity to become unequal*. A tendency towards meritocracy is predicated, since industrial societies are held to require maximization of individual talent, but it is postulated that pre-industrial modes of allocating roles in the structure have not finally been eradicated. However, this 'cultural lag' theory is not always adequate to the task of explaining the continuation of inequality, co-existing with an ideological commitment to formal equality. This being so, a social and individual pathology model of socially disadvantaged groups is introduced; these are seen as inadequately socialized into the dominant value system. Terms such as 'deprivation', 'cultural deficit', 'cultural difference', 'culture of poverty', are used. Middle-class values, furthermore, are assumed to constitute the consensual value system on which the social order depends. This is done without any examination of the structure of that value system in relation to the power of the hegemonic class, and its ability to manufacture consensus, and mobilize bias, through its control over the means of ideological reproduction. This ultimately rests on its monopoly of the means of coercion. Coercion and power are treated as residual categories not fully integrated into the theoretical structure. *In short, the approach serves to rationalise the status quo.*²⁶

When inequality appears to threaten the status quo, as in America in the 1960s, increasing resort is made to deterministic theories of the position of 'disadvantaged' groups, i.e., their position is seen as basically unchangeable. In a recent withering critique of the 'equality debate' which has been raging in the 'West' since the 1960s, and in America in particular, Charles A. and Bettylou Valentine demonstrate that the controversy 'masks an underlying agreement in support of the status quo'.²⁷ All major parties to the debate share the key ideas, that the position of oppressed groups stems from their own weaknesses, and that these alleged deficiencies, whether sociocultural or biosocial in origin (commonly both), are not eradicable in the foreseeable future. 'A consensus has been developing that low status groups suffer from organic damage and dysfunction of the central nervous system',²⁸ as a result both of malnutrition and of socio-psychological deprivation. Socio-cultural determinism, 'represented by such . . . phrasings as "cultural disadvantage" leading to a "cycle of poverty", a "self-perpetuating culture of poverty", and the like',²⁹ is thus being assimilated to neo-determinism of a biological kind. Meanwhile, 'a pair of obvious answers' to questions of inequality continue to be expertly avoided—that parity among human groups cannot be expected without a radical restructuring of the system

of intergroup relations and that such restructuring will require revolutionary change in all major aspects of society, from control over productive sources to ideology and value patterns'.³⁰ Similar trends are only too evident in the Australian literature.³¹

Thus, structural-functionalist theory, while it does not make the mistake, unlike the versions of the theory of internal colonialism so far reviewed, of asserting or implying the independence and irreducibility of race and ethnicity, *nevertheless fails to relate racial and ethnic inequality to an analysis of class relations of exploitation and domination*. Plural society theory arrives at much the same result.

The theory of plural society is sometimes held to have been 'worked out in explicit opposition to theories that postulate consensus on common values as a prerequisite of social integration'.³² In one respect at least, this seems doubtful. As Wolpe points out, while it was initially claimed that structural-functionalism constituted a *general* sociological theory, it soon became apparent that it could be regarded only as a *specific* model appropriate to those societies—Western Europe and the United States in particular—which were thought to be integrated around a common value system.

By contrast colonial and former colonial societies were seen by Furnivall and later by Smith to be characterized by conflicts, cultural heterogeneity and an absence of common values. Not consensus, but domination is said to be the basis of social order and cohesion in such societies. If consent is the basis of social solidarity in Western societies, then clearly a different 'model' had to be devised for societies held together largely by coercion. At this point 'conflict theorists' enter the stage with various 'theories' of plural society.

... the construction of two quite different models of society in this way [does not imply, however] that some societies are totally free of conflict and bound together solely by consensus, while others are racked with conflict and bound together only by coercion... Thus as Lockwood has pointed out in relation to Parsons: 'The presence of a normative order, or common value system, does not mean that conflict has disappeared, or been resolved in some way. Instead, the very existence of a normative order mirrors the potentiality of conflict'.³³

Some of the major theorists of plural society take the same view. Van den Berghe, for example, does not

believe that much is to be gained by distinguishing plural societies (characterized by political domination of a cultural minority) from societies with plural features and from heterogeneous societies (e.g. those based on class stratification). I prefer to regard pluralism as a variable, and to include cases of stratification based on 'race', caste, estate, or class (class in the corporate sense as distinct from strata) as instances of pluralism, even though the constituent groups share the same general culture. To the extent that classes are corporate groups, they will develop subcultural differences and some class-specific institutional structures (e.g. labour unions and political parties).³⁴

Thus, at one level, the theory of plural society is part of a general attempt to reconcile conflict with consensual models of society, by incorporating a conflict model into structural-functionalist theory.³⁵

Since all societies are characterized by consensus and conflict and 'plural' groups,³⁶ a difficulty immediately arises, however, in deciding to which societies a plural model might be held to be relevant; to those societies with some *degree* of conflict along racial, class, etc. lines? The judgement here can only be an *ad hoc* empiricist one which is not based on any conceptual distinction arising from the theory.³⁷ Some theorists attempt to get around this difficulty by arguing that plural societies represent a different kind of society from those to which a consensualist thesis might properly apply.³⁸ The *salient* groups in plural societies, it is argued, 'are racial, cultural, religious, national but *not* classes or strata',³⁹ but this is simply to beg the question of how and why such groups come to exist and come into conflict with each other; 'to base an analysis on the criteria (race, religion, etc.) by which groups define themselves and the conflict between them is to take as given precisely what requires explanation'.⁴⁰ Or perhaps one can decide to which societies a plural model is appropriate by defining the *nature* of plural groups more rigorously? Such an attempt has led to a conceptualization of a plural society as a society 'segmented into corporate groups' which are incorporated around 'non-complementary but distinguishable sets of institutions'.⁴¹ But this is to assert that the 'institutions, and therefore the groups, operate *independently* of other groups and institutions in the society',⁴² and the question then arises as to the basis on which such groups and institutions might be deemed to constitute a society. Some theorists answer, in effect, that they are held together as a society by the political domination of one of the groups,⁴³ others that they are held together both by political domination and by economic interdependence.⁴⁴ But on what basis can it be maintained that the polity holds them together whereas the economy does not?

Again, once it is argued that the political and the economic institutions do hold the society together despite the plurality of the institutions, how can it be maintained that the other institutional orders remain autonomous? The assertion of institutional 'segregation' and autonomy presses plural theory to its logical conclusion and emphasizes the abstractness of its formulation. This is so since we are asked to understand institutions independently of any relationship outside of their own 'boundaries'.

One result of this is that there is no way in which it can be meaningfully asked (let alone be answered) within this 'theory': how can the development and maintenance of distinguishable institutional practices be explained?⁴⁵

Plural society 'theory' can thus lay little claim to be regarded as anything other than a static schema for the classification of societies along various dimensions.⁴⁶

The discussion in this section of the essay may be summarized as follows: to the extent that the theory of internal colonialism views society

as a composite of class relations and race and ethnic relations, it provides a more satisfactory framework for the analysis of the relationships between racial and ethnic groups than structural-functionalist theory, in that it does not rule out the importance of relations of class exploitation and domination; and provides a more satisfactory framework than the theory of plural society, in that it does not accord racial and ethnic groups sole salience. In that it is unable to explain the relationship between class relations and racial and ethnic relations, however, and consequently tends to treat racial and ethnic groups as if they were autonomous and isolated from class relations, it converges with plural society theory and suffers from the same analytical limitations.⁴⁷ It remains to be seen whether the theory as elaborated and refined by Wolpe overcomes these limitations by providing 'the foundation for an adequate analysis of the internal structure and development of certain social formations'.⁴⁸

The Articulation of Capitalist and Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production

Wolpe attempts to provide such a foundation by locating the concept of internal colonialism within the framework of Marxist theory of the articulation of modes of production. He argues, first, that the notion of exploitation in the literature on internal colonialism is necessarily obscure because exploitation can have only a vague, descriptive meaning with reference to such entities as countries or racial and ethnic groups. If it is to have a rigorous and explicit meaning, it can only express a *production relation*—production of surplus labour and expropriation of this by a social *class*. 'In order to avoid the abstraction involved in treating racial and ethnic groups as undifferentiated and homogeneous', he concludes,

we must think of each group as having a 'specific structure, in particular because of the existence of classes with contradictory interests'. It follows that the concrete social totality is constituted by the complex articulation of class relations within racial or ethnic groups, as well as the relations of classes across these groups, together, we may add, with the ideological and political practices which 'fit' these relationships.⁴⁹

In the second place, he points out:

the concept of colonialism upon which the internal colonial thesis is based is [also] extremely vague and unspecific. In part, this is due to the failure to distinguish between forms of colonial, political, ideological, and cultural domination and modes of imperialist exploitation. In turn this conflation stems from the failure to distinguish differing modes of imperialist economic exploitation with the result that the different forms of colonial domination cannot be explicitly related to different modes of exploitation.⁵⁰

In the literature on imperialism and underdevelopment generally, there has been a tendency until recently to assume

that in the era of capitalist imperialism, exploitation everywhere takes place according to a single invariant mode. There are two variants of this argu-

ment but both contend that capitalist relations have, as Laclau puts it, 'effectively and completely penetrated even the most apparently isolated sectors of the underdeveloped world'.⁵¹

'In fact', Wolpe argues, 'the relationship of capitalist to non- or pre-capitalist modes of production may vary in a number of ways and for different reasons'. It may revolve around:

1. The extraction of commodities in different ways.
2. The extraction, not of the product, but of labour-power. In both these instances the associated political policy is likely to turn on the domination and *conservation* of the non-capitalist societies.
3. In other instances the particular mode of economic exploitation may be accompanied by a policy aimed at or having the effect of *destroying* the non-capitalist societies, such that the producers are 'freed' of the means of production.⁵²

Wolpe attempts to clarify the relevance of this to a discussion of internal colonialism in the following way:

In the course of its development, the capitalist mode of production enters into relationships with other, non-capitalist, systems of production—the very origins of capitalism in the interstices of feudalism testifies to this. Relations with other modes of production first occur within the boundaries of the nation state. First with trade and later with the development of monopoly capitalism and the export of capital, capital increasingly enters into new relationships with other, non-capitalist, modes of production, beyond the borders of the nation-state. These relations, which are exploitative in the strict sense of the term—they involve directly or indirectly the extraction of the surplus from the direct producers—characterize, in general, the period of capitalist imperialism. These relations of imperialism are constituted within a particular context of political domination and are sustained and supported by a mode of ideological and political practice which varies with the mode of exploitation. But, as Lenin pointed out, both imperialism and colonialism undergo historical changes:

Colonial policy and imperialism existed before the latest stage of capitalism, even before capitalism. Rome, founded on slavery, pursued a colonial policy and practised imperialism. But "general" disquisitions on imperialism which ignore, or put into the background, the fundamental differences between socio-economic formations, inevitably turn into the most vapid banality. . . . Even the capitalist colonial policy of previous stages of capitalism is essentially different from the colonial policy of finance capital.

In certain conditions of imperialist development, ideological and political domination tend to be expressed not in terms of the relations of class exploitation which they must sustain but in racial, ethnic, national, etc., terms and, in all cases, this is related to the fact that the specific mode of exploitation involves the conservation, in some form, of the non-capitalist modes of production and social organization, the existence of which provides the foundation of that exploitation. Indeed, it is in part the very attempt to conserve and *control* the non-capitalist societies in the face of the tendency of capitalist development to disintegrate them and thereby

cl. Dev
→ 1975
of 1975
1975

to undermine the basis of exploitation, that accounts for political policies and ideologies which centre on culture, ethnic, national and racial characteristics.

In certain circumstances capitalism may, within the boundaries of a single state, develop predominantly by means of its relationship to non-capitalist modes of production. When that occurs, the mode of political domination and the content of legitimating ideologies assumes racial and ethnic and cultural forms and for the same reason as in the case of imperialism. In this case, political domination takes on a colonial form, the precise or specific nature of which has to be related to the specific mode of exploitation of the non-capitalist society.⁵³

He then proceeds to illustrate these points with reference to the South African social formation. There, the relationship of capital to the non-capitalist modes of production has revolved around the extraction of labour-power at a cost below its cost of reproduction, and there, consequently:

the tendency of capital accumulation to dissolve the very relationship . . . which makes that accumulation possible [has been] blocked by the contradictory tendency of capital to conserve the relationship and with it the non-capitalist economies, albeit in a restricted form . . .

The political expression of this imperialist-type relationship [consequently] takes on a colonial form . . . the conservation of the non-capitalist modes of production necessarily requires the development of ideologies and political policies which revolve around the segregation, and preservation and control of African 'tribal' societies. The ideological focus . . . is always necessarily on the 'racial' or 'tribal' or 'national' elements, *precisely because of the 'tribal' nature of what is being preserved and controlled*. So, too, the policies pursued and the laws passed must have the same focus.⁵⁴ [Emphasis added]

The South African social formation, in the period of capitalism, thus constitutes a 'true' internal colonialism in that there is embodied 'within a single nation-state a relationship characteristic of the external relationship between imperialist states and their colonies (or neo-colonies)'.⁵⁵

Wolpe's argument suffers from a number of deficiencies and requires elaboration at certain points.

1. It must be insisted that ideological and political domination are 'never expressed in terms of the relation of class exploitation which they must sustain'. It is the function of ideology rather to mask such relations and in so doing to 'sustain' them.⁵⁶ This masking function may be performed for capital, either by conventional bourgeois juridico-political ideology, or by an ideology focussing on race and ethnicity, or by a combination of both.
2. If the chief defining characteristic of an internal colonialism is that the exploitative articulation of the capitalist mode of production with non-capitalist modes, within the boundaries of a single state, is masked by an ideology focussing on race and ethnicity; then there is no reason why, for internal colonial relations to obtain, capitalism should develop 'predominantly'

by means of its relationship to non-capitalist modes (except in the obvious sense that procurement of much of the land through expropriation or otherwise is necessary for its development). This is a question, as noted earlier, that Wolpe left 'open'. In terms of his own analysis all that is required for internal colonial relations to obtain, is that there *be* an exploitative articulation between capitalist and non-capitalist modes (however marginal or insignificant the latter might be) within a single state which is masked by an ideology focussing on race and ethnicity. Thus there is nothing in his theory which would suggest that it does not have proper application to cases such as the Australian or Canadian or American (Indian-White relations), where non-capitalist modes of production are clearly marginal.

3. The masking, at the ideological and political level, of exploitative relations chiefly in terms of race or ethnicity, is arguably *not* in all cases related to the fact that the specific mode of exploitation involves *conservation* of non-capitalist societies. While it is true that *where* the specific mode of exploitation requires conservation, 'the ideological focus is always necessarily on the "racial" or "tribal" or "national" elements precisely because of the "tribal" etc. nature of what is being preserved or controlled',⁵⁷ it might equally be true that where the specific mode of exploitation requires the *dissolution* of non-capitalist modes of production the ideological focus is sometimes on the 'racial' or 'tribal' etc. *precisely because of the 'tribal' nature of what is being changed and (in the meantime) controlled*. Exploitation of non-capitalist modes of production in an internal colonial situation will tend to require their dissolution, where they do not produce on any scale suitable products for exchange (as commodities or labour-power) that are directly transferable to the capitalist circuit of production in usable form. Where this is the case, there will be an associated policy of destroying them, and of *resocialising* their agents for entry as sellers of labour-power, into capitalist relations of production. To the extent that this is successful, colonial relationships will tend to dissolve. But while it lasts or where it fails, the ideological focus will be *on that which attempts are being made to change*—the 'racial', 'tribal', etc.—the more so because any resistance to such a programme will be expressed in terms of "withdrawal" into the security of the "racial" or "tribal" group, or in terms of "nationalism", while failure will be construed as a sign of racial inferiority.
4. Wolpe tells us nothing explicitly about the crucial question raised earlier, concerning when internal colonial relations might be deemed to have ceased. Since an internal colonialism cannot exist unless the capitalist mode of production is in an exploitative articulation with another, it is necessary to ask at what stage **the non-capitalist mode may be deemed to have dissolved**. We

preserve /
exploit /
control /
tribal /
national /
internal colonialism

many of
underdevelopment
to be domestic
scale?

are not dealing with the 'mode of production' in the narrower economic meaning Marx gave the concept—material relations of production—but in the broader meaning he assigned to it of a complex structure of various levels or instances (economic, political, ideological) in a specific combination in which the economic is dominant only in the last instance.⁵⁸ Hence the process of dissolution is by no means necessarily complete when the 'economy' has been destroyed, or its land-base appropriated, although in the long run the eradication of the economic base creates the preconditions for dissolution of the non-capitalist mode. If the ideological and political instances survive, albeit in a modified form, if the partly dissolved mode of production is still exploitatively articulated with the capitalist mode we still have a case of internal colonialism. (Where we do not, the analysis would proceed in terms of the formation and development of social classes, albeit with a more or less profound racial and ethnic dimension, within the capitalist model).⁵⁹

Internal Colonialism in Australia

What follows is a very preliminary attempt to suggest some of the general lines along which the theory of internal colonialism, thus revised, might provide the basis for a throughgoing structural analysis of the history of Aboriginal-White relations. Particular attention is paid to an explanation of the terms in which the ideological and political domination of Aborigines have been expressed.

Since Aborigines, as hunter/gatherers, produced only a very limited surplus, exploitation could not proceed by extraction of commodities with an associated policy of conservation. With few exceptions, the only commodities Aborigines had to sell were labour-power and the sexual services of women. It is not the case, however, that, as Rowley states, the developing capitalist mode of production required the land and *only* the land.⁶⁰ There was a labour shortage in the capitalist sector virtually throughout the period when the land was expropriated from most Aborigines.⁶¹

The point is that Aboriginal labour-power was not directly transferable to most sectors of the rapidly developing economy. Because of their profoundly different socialization—labour in the primitive communal mode of production was expended predominantly in extracting the means of subsistence directly from the land for immediate use (not exchange)—

Aborigines found all but pastoral work, and some forms of work associated with maritime extractive industries, uncongenial.⁶² Exploitation could proceed, therefore, only through the dissolution of the Aboriginal mode of production and the resocialization of its agents for entry into capitalist production relations. (We might note that appropriation of accumulated labour in the form, among others, of pastures created by Aborigines through the use of fire was involved in expropriation of the land—the land was as Aborigines made it, not as God made it.⁶³) The dominant ideological and political practice of the state has therefore aimed

at this effect—resocialization.

To the extent that retraining was successful, or believed likely to succeed (broadly speaking down to the 1830s), ideological and political domination, at least at the official level, was expressed less in terms of 'race' and 'ethnicity' than in terms of conventional bourgeois juridico-political ideology. The dominance of such an ideology was necessary, chiefly because it was only in this way that expropriation of the land could be justified, if it had been officially recognized that Aborigines had their own systems of law and government that would have implied that they had some form of title to the land. Since they did not, in the Lockean view of the colonists, improve the land by their labour, they were not entitled to it and should be encouraged to become productive members of society as soon as possible. The main function of bourgeois ideology in this case was to mask, not exploitative relations of production, but the enormity of the expropriation of the Aboriginal means of subsistence—the land. And since, after retraining, Aboriginal labour-power would be exploited in the same way as any other, an elaborate ideology centering on race and ethnicity, which would perform the role of masking super-exploitation of Aborigines *qua* Aborigines was not required (as it was, for example, in South Africa or, to some extent, the Australian pastoral industry at a later date). Of course, had a different mode of exploitation been possible, had labour-power physically produced in the Aboriginal mode been capable of introduction into the capitalist production process in quantity, things might have been very different (as in South Africa, though the smallness of the Aboriginal population would have meant that things would have been different on a smaller scale). In the circumstances, it was simply held that the traditional rights of Aborigines had been superseded; they were British subjects and as such should become 'useful' members of 'society', as labourers, of course, or at most as petty commodity producers.⁶⁴

At first it was thought that Aborigines would voluntarily or 'automatically' enter into production relations. As they failed to do so, except in isolated individual cases, training schemes in institutions of various kinds were initiated. By the 1840s most of these schemes had failed resoundingly. The chief reason seems to have been simply that stated by Marx himself in his discussion of primitive accumulation in Europe: 'these men, suddenly dragged from their wonted mode of life, could not as suddenly adapt themselves to the discipline of their new condition'.⁶⁵ Resocialization of the agents of any mode of production is likely to involve more than the first generation, especially where the process is as radical as that involved in resocializing hunter/gatherers as wage-labourers or petty commodity producers⁶⁶ and where the attempt at resocialization has been preceded by conquest and dispossession. The effects of conquest were in any case so far-reaching that many of the schemes failed for want of an Aboriginal population *to* resocialize.

As Aborigines failed to enter into production relations, and retraining scheme after retraining scheme was abandoned (including Governor

Phillip's attempts to retrain Bennelong) there was a growing conviction among the settler community that Aborigines were an inferior people, incapable of 'improvement', and doomed to die out. This conclusion was underlined by the objective process of Aboriginal depopulation and could be supported, if necessary, by appeal to theories of social development, and later of biological evolution, which dovetailed neatly with economic liberalism.⁶⁷ By the 1850s there was a consensus in the colonies that Aborigines were hopelessly inferior and incompetent. This is another way of saying that, since it was no longer believed that Aboriginal labour-power was exploitable through retraining, settler domination had come to be expressed predominantly in terms of 'race'. The liberal political ideology which became hegemonic in the 1850s, was simply held not to apply to Aborigines; an inferior people beyond the pale of liberal society, they could be relied upon to fade away and so not contradict its ideals in any way.⁶⁸

A new tendency in the ideology is noticeable when Aborigines in the southern settled areas began to prove they were not going to fade away. They began to increase (speaking very generally) in the late nineteenth century. As they increased, they were gathered up into reserves and institutions partly for reasons of social control, and partly for yet further attempts at retraining. There was, therefore, a profound ambivalence in the terms in which their ideological and political subordination was expressed. To the extent that it was believed that retraining would succeed, it tended not to be expressed in 'racial' or 'racist' terms; but there was a profound pessimism which tended to vary according to the degree of 'white blood' which the trainees had. A thoroughgoing analysis would discuss the self-perpetuating aspect of social control and training in multi-purpose institutions.⁶⁹ It would also relate the worst periods of such racist pessimism—the 1890s, 1930s, and late 1970s—to structural crises in world capitalism. But suffice it to suggest that the situation did have the characteristics of an internal colonialism. Though ambivalent, the policies pursued and the laws passed to effect control and training, necessarily had a 'racial' and 'ethnic' focus because of the 'racial' and 'ethnic' nature of what was being controlled and changed; people of half or more Aboriginal descent were subject to increasingly rigid and restrictive legislation (until the late 1930s). And one purpose of control and training was that trainees should, ultimately at any rate, become regular sellers of labour-power in the general society. Meanwhile, they performed some of the functions of a colonial migrant-labour force on a casual basis. On some stations or reserves, the following situation obtained:

Work either without wages or for a payment which would fluctuate with the amount available in the station budget inevitably conditioned those who worked 'outside', whilst living on the stations, to accept low wages. Thus on a small scale, even in the settled areas, the station served the purpose of the village or tribal lands in a colony, as a place from which labour could be obtained as required, to which it could be returned when not, and payment for which might make no provision for maintenance of dependants.⁷⁰

84
157
? there is a case...
half-caste
work
not about indirect

While in the southern areas of the continent the development of the capitalist mode of production was accompanied by a policy aimed at *destroying* Aboriginal society, in the northern and central areas it often went hand in hand with a policy of *conservation/segregation*. This was so because in these regions Aboriginal labour-power was exploitable without any extensive retraining. In the more marginal pastoral areas of the Northern Territory, South Australia and Western Australia, conquest and stocking of the land destroyed the basis of the Aboriginal mode of production, but not all important features of Aboriginal social organization as such. Aborigines were forced to enter into an unequal exploitative symbiosis with the pastoralists.⁷¹ In return for labour and the sexual services of women, the 'restructured' communities received most of their means of subsistence; otherwise they were typically left largely to their own resources. In Queensland a different general pattern prevailed. There, Aborigines as defined in legislation, were rounded up and moved to reserves under the control of police protectors, or to missions, and a system of migrant labour with the contract of service and the single-man's wage was evolved.

really look it down

What is important to note is that in both cases, whether labour was migrant or resident, *employers were relieved of paying a portion of the necessary means of subsistence, and hence acquired labour-power at a cost below its value.*⁷² While the employer, where labour was resident, provided most of the immediate sustenance not only of employees but also of the community as a whole, this was more than offset by the fact that Aborigines were excluded from pastoral awards until 1965/8,⁷³ that the community continued to provide some of its sustenance by traditional methods, and that, until recently, neither the employer nor the state paid any 'indirect' wages (unemployment payments, family allowances, education, health, etc.); nearly all 'social security' functions were performed by the Aboriginal communities themselves. In Queensland, such functions were performed by the state, but paid for largely by Aborigines who received 'single' wages and paid income tax like everyone else:

The Aboriginal wage [in the pastoral and pearling industries or on settlements, which was considerably lower than the award wage] was subject to income taxation. In addition, there were, until 1965, contributions made compulsorily from *gross* earnings to the Welfare Fund, for their own welfare and relief... Aborigines received savings bank rates of interest. Additional proceeds from investment seem to have been paid into the Welfare Fund, along with the proceeds of trade stores operated by the Department on the settlements, proceeds from the sale of produce from settlements and reserves and fines.⁷⁴

of... Don't play Bill Baker - not paid the money out

It is Rowley's opinion that Aborigines were *better* provided for under this system than in the Northern Territory (where there was a lower minimum wage) and than in Western Australia and South Australia (where there was none).

As in South Africa, the political expression of these kinds of production relations necessarily took on a colonial form—ideology and political

policies necessarily revolved around the segregation, preservation and control ('protection') of Aboriginal 'tribal', 'racial', groups.⁷⁵

The shift to the policy of 'assimilation' in the 1930s (in reality the 1950s, since little was effected in practice until then) was not a radical one so far as the southern areas were concerned, where training for enjoyment of 'equal rights' was supposed to have been going on since the late nineteenth century, but it was radical with respect to the northern and central areas. That is to say, what was really new was that the policy of retraining (now supposed to go forward at greater speed) was extended to these areas. Nevertheless, it was probably related to post-war labour shortages and to the increasing manpower requirements of Australian capitalism in the period of secondary industrialization; it is scarcely an accident that the change coincided with the beginnings of the federal government's massive post-war immigration programme. Rowley himself provides an example of the kind of thinking probably involved:

'Northern development' requires efficient use of manpower . . . here is a potential economic asset, of workers who do not require special living allowances to attract them there and whose increased welfare and sophistication can provide an increasing supply of manpower, not only for the areas of the north and centre, but to swell the labour force of the whole country. In doing this they would serve the same national economic purposes as the European migrant but they were potentially more adaptable in the short term.⁷⁶

The pastoral industry and its spokesmen in the Country Party were not strong enough to resist the new initiatives. In any case, the labour policies of the pastoralists had been extremely wasteful. The cost of a system under which Aboriginal communities themselves provided most 'social security' services, had been appalling health and mortality, especially in South Australia, the Northern Territory and Western Australia; exploitation of cheap Aboriginal labour, in spite of reservation of land and other measures aimed at conservation, had tended to undermine the conditions for the reproduction of labour-power.⁷⁷ Rather than assume the burden of indirect wages themselves, pastoralists thought it best that the public at large should do so, even though this would eventually mean payment of award wages to Aborigines in the industry. It was no accident that the leader of the Country Party himself took the initiative in formulating the new policy.⁷⁸ The general strategy of the state arguably remains much the same today.

The comparative history of race and ethnic relations in situations brought about by the expansion of capitalism, is increasingly coming to be written within the framework of a Marxist or neo-Marxist model of the development of capitalism and its articulation with other modes of production. This essay has attempted to locate the history of Aboriginal-White relations within that perspective. This last section, in particular, has necessarily been tentative, and many of the generalizations need to be elaborated in greater detail with reference to the empirical data. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that, while there has recently been an upsurge

of work in the field, most of this has been conducted within an empiricist paradigm. The history of Aboriginal-White relations has lacked a coherent theoretical approach. (It has often *implicitly* employed a structural-functionalist model, in that its guiding assumptions have been ultimately integrationist, but the inadequacies of this approach have been indicated.)⁷⁹ This is not to argue against the need for empirical studies, but to stress that empirical work needs to be guided by an overall theoretical orientation, which it is suggested the theory of internal colonialism adequately provides. Using such a perspective, it is suggested that it would be particularly pertinent to explore the following areas or problems:

1. The analysis provided in this essay might appear to be too mechanistic in that it has not considered sufficiently the Aboriginal response to conditions of exploitation, and the class and ethnic struggles within the Aboriginal community. Further elaboration ought to take into account the strategies of the state in relation to these struggles, in terms of the general theoretical approach suggested.
2. Further analysis of the intersection of class with race and ethnicity, especially at the local and period level, is required. At this level it should be conducted within a comparative perspective, i.e. it should examine the articulation of the modes of production in relation to the different types of capitalist development, and the ideological and political concomitants of this.
3. It is important to examine ideology in relationship not simply to the state, as this last section of the essay has tended to do, but in relationship to different classes affected by the articulation of the modes of production, since while the state may be serving the interests of the capitalist class as a whole, the class interests, struggles and consciousness may reveal interesting variations *vis-à-vis* their relationship with the Aboriginal community.
4. There is a need for comparative structural studies of the role of Aborigines and immigrants in the development of Australian capitalism.
5. There is a need for comparative studies of 'internal' and 'normal' colonialisms, particularly in relation to the historically and regionally different requirements of capital. What is specific about an internal colonialism, particularly now, given the internationalization of capital and the eclipse of the nation-state as a unit of analysis?

Conclusion

It has been argued that the theory of internal colonialism helps to explain, better than the prevailing functionalist mode of assimilation or integration, or than the theory of plural society, the specific terms in which ideological and political domination over Aborigines have been expressed, by relating them to specific modes of exploitation of Aboriginal societies. It also offers the best framework for an analysis of the inter-

why

The biggest problem
→ too much

11

maybe too
too need
to be
collapsed
in back
other no
in the case
in SC?

section of class with race and ethnicity. The assimilationist model reflects the objective long-term tendency of the relationship between the capitalist and primitive communal modes of production, the dissolution of the non-capitalist mode and the subsuming of its agents into capitalist production relations; precisely for this reason it is unable to account for Aboriginal resistance to the tendency, or, except in descriptive and idealist terms, to account for white policies and practices that run counter to it. Unlike the assimilationist model, the theory of internal colonialism offers a satisfactory explanation of the profound duality—class/nation, integration/separation—that has characterised Aboriginal aspirations,⁸⁰ and it locates the history of Aboriginal-White relations adequately in the comparative history of race and ethnic relations.

NOTES

- 1 Harold Wolpe, 'The Theory of Internal Colonialism—the South African Case', in Ivar Oxaal et al. (edd.), *Beyond the Sociology of Development: Economy and Society in Latin America and Africa* (London, 1975), p.252.
- 2 Cf. *ibid.*, pp.244, 250.
- 3 The summary is extensive, but this seemed preferable to assuming that readers are familiar with the argument.
- 4 *ibid.*, p.229. The literature on internal colonialism is extensive. See, e.g., Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle toward Liberation* (San Francisco, 1972); Robert Allen, *Black Awakening in Capitalist America* (New York, 1969); Mario Barrera et al., 'The Barrio as Internal Colony', in Harlan Hahn (ed.), *Urban Affairs Annual Review* 6 (1972); Ronald Bailey, 'Economic Aspects of the Black Internal Colony', in Frank Bonilla & Robert Girling (edd.), *Structures of Dependency* (Stanford, 1973); Robert Blauner, *Racial Oppression in America* (New York, 1972); Stokely Carmichael & Charles V. Hamilton, *Black Power* (Harmondsworth, 1969); G.M. Carter et al., *South Africa's Transkei: The Politics of Domestic Colonialism* (London, 1967); Pablo Gonzalez Casanova, 'Internal Colonialism and National Development', in Irving L. Horowitz et al. (edd.), *Latin American Radicalism* (New York, 1969); Julio Cotler, 'The Mechanics of Internal Domination and Social Change in Peru', in Irving L. Horowitz (ed.), *Masses in Latin America* (New York, 1970); Guillermo V. Flores & Robert Bailey, 'Internal Colonialism and Racial Minorities in the U.S.: An Overview', in Bonilla & Girling (edd.), *op. cit.*; Guillermo V. Flores, 'Race and Culture in the Internal Colony: Keeping the Chicano in his Place', in *ibid.*; Eugene Havens & William Film (edd.), *Internal Colonialism and Structural Change in Colombia* (New York, 1970); Michael Hechter, *Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966* (London, 1974); D.L. Johnson, 'On Oppressed Classes', in J.D. Cockcroft et al. (edd.), *Dependence and Underdevelopment* (New York, 1972); Joan W. Moore, 'Colonialism: The Case of the Mexican Americans', *Social Problems* 17 (Spring 1970), pp.463-72; J.H. O'Dell, 'Colonialism and the Negro American Experience', *Freedomways* 6 (Fall 1966), pp.296-308, and 'A Special Variety of Colonialism', *ibid.* 7 (Winter 1967), pp.7-14; E. Palma Patterson, *The Canadian Indian: A History Since 1500* (Don Mills, Ontario, 1972); H.J. & R.G. Simons, *Class and Colour in South Africa, 1850-1950*; South African Communist Party, *The Road to South African Freedom* (London, n.d.); Rodolfo Stavenhagen, 'Classes, Colonialism, and Acculturation', in Horowitz (ed.), *Masses in Latin America*; William K. Tabb, *The Political Economy of the Black Ghetto* (New York, 1970).
- 5 Harold Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, pp.230-1.
- 6 C.D. Rowley, *Aboriginal Policy and Practice*, Vol. I, *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society* (Canberra, 1970); Vol. II, *Outcasts in White Australia* (Canberra, 1971); Vol. III, *The Remote Aborigines* (Canberra, 1971). The references Rowley supplies suggest that he was not aware, at the time of writing, of the literature on internal colonialism. While much of the literature is recent, it is possible that he ignored what was available because of his particular ideological stance, which is ultimately integrationist. His work may well be regarded as the Australian counterpart, in important respects, of Gunnar Myrdal's *An American Dilemma*. A detailed analysis and critique of the theoretical assumptions underlying it would constitute a valuable piece of research.

- 7 *Remote Aborigines*, pp.1-3, 14. (Emphasis added).
- 8 See especially *Destruction of Aboriginal Society*, pp.375-6.
- 9 *Outcasts in White Australia*, p.234, citing Myrdal, *An American Dilemma*. The full sentence reads: 'If one might be allowed to adapt to this situation the words of Myrdal about Negro culture in the United States, "In practically all its divergences [Australian part-Aboriginal] culture is not something independent of general [Australian] culture. It is a distorted development, or a pathological condition, of the general [Australian] culture".'
- 10 *Remote Aborigines*, p.5.
- 11 *ibid.*
- 12 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.233.
- 13 E.g. Blauner, *op. cit.*; Jeffrey Prager, 'White Racial Privilege: An Examination of Theories of Racism', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 17 (1972/3), pp.117-50.
- 14 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.232.
- 15 *ibid.*, p.233.
- 16 *ibid.*, p.234.
- 17 *ibid.*
- 18 *ibid.*, p.235.
- 19 Ann Curthoys has made a similar point in 'Destruction of Aboriginal Society', *Arena* 27 (1971).
- 20 *Remote Aborigines*, pp.221-2.
- 21 Rowley correctly thinks that they are (indirectly) exploited, in that they bear the cost of the worker's 'old age or illness, of his family, and of the next generation of workers', but he regards this as a question of 'justice', the meaning of which 'will differ according to circumstances [and] point of view'. (*ibid.*, p.222). The law of value is foreign to Rowley's whole approach.
- 22 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.235.
- 23 Some notion of 'plural society', 'pluralism', 'cultural pluralism', etc. is common in the Australian literature but almost invariably in the functionalist sense of 'pluralism as democracy'—an assumption is made of equilibrium and consensus about ultimate values. For an example of how plural society theorists distinguish their theory from 'pluralism as democracy', see Pierre L. van den Berghe, *Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective* (New York, 1967), pp.145-7.
- 24 David Lockwood, 'Race, Conflict, and Plural Society', in Sami Zubaida (ed.), *Race and Racism* (London, 1970), p.60, citing Talcott Parsons, 'Full Citizenship for the Negro American', *Daedalus* 94 (1965). For a good Australasian example of the application of the Parsonian concept of 'inclusion' see Erik Schwimmer, 'The Aspirations of the Contemporary Maori', in Schwimmer (ed.), *The Maori People in the 1960s* (Auckland, 1968).
- 25 It was given one of its most explicit expressions in 1951 in A.P. Elkin, 'Reaction and Interaction: A Food Gathering People and European Settlement in Australia', *American Anthropologist* 53 (1951), 164-86. See the literature generally since then.
- 26 See generally P. Bachrach & M. Baratz, *Power and Poverty* (New York, 1970); H. Blumer, 'Industrialisation and Race Relations', in Guy Hunter (ed.), *Industrialisation and Race Relations* (London, 1965); Ralph Dahrendorf, *Essays in the Theory of Society* (London, 1968), Chapter 4, 'Out of Utopia: Towards a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis'; A. Davis & W.E. Moore, 'Some Principles of Stratification', *American Sociological Review* 10, 2 (1945), pp.242-9; Anthony Giddens, "'Power" in the Recent Writing of Talcott Parsons', *Sociology* 2 (1968), pp.257-70; John Horton, 'Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems', *American Journal of Sociology* 71 (1966), pp.701-13; David Lockwood, 'Some Remarks on "The Social System"', *British Journal of Sociology* 7, 2 (1956), pp.134-46, and 'Social Integration and System Integration', in George K. Zollschan & Walter Hirsch (edd.), *Explorations in Social Change* (London, 1964); Charles A. Valentine, *Culture and Poverty* (Chicago and London, 1968); Dennis H. Wrong 'The Over-Socialized Concept of Man in Modern Sociology', *American Sociological Review* 26 (1961), pp.184-93.
- 27 'Brain Damage and the Intellectual Defense of Inequality', *Current Anthropology* 16, 1 (1975), p.118. (Emphasis added).
- 28 *ibid.*, p.138.
- 29 *ibid.*, p.131.
- 30 *ibid.*, p.137.
- 31 E.g. J.E. Cawte, *Cruel, Poor and Brutal Nations: The Assessment of Mental Health in an Australian Aboriginal Community by Short-Stay Psychiatric Methods* (Honolulu, 1972) and 'Psychological Adjustment to Cultural Change: The Case of the Australian Abori-

- gines', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 3 (1969); G.E. Kearney *et al.* (edd.), *The Psychology of the Australian Aborigines* (Sydney, 1973); Keith R. McConnochie, *Realities of Race: An Analysis of the Concepts of Race and Racism and their Relevance to Australian Society* (Sydney, 1973), e.g. pp.130-1 (note the central position assigned to BRAIN DAMAGE in the diagram); Peter M. Moodie, *Aboriginal Health* (Canberra, 1973); B. Nurcombe, 'Deprivation: An Essay in Definition with Special Consideration of the Australian Aboriginal', *Medical Journal of Australia*, 11 July 1970.
- 32 Lockwood, 'Race, Conflict, and Plural Society', *loc. cit.*, p.62. Cf. Malcolm Cross, 'On Conflict, Race Relations, and the Theory of Plural Society', *Race* 12, 4 (1971), pp.477-94.
- 33 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.236.
- 34 Pierre L. van den Berghe, 'Pluralism and the Polity', in L. Kuper & M.G. Smith (edd.), *Pluralism in Africa* (Berkeley, 1969), p.68. Cited in part in Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.237.
- 35 This has been one of the main endeavours of van den Berghe. See especially his paper 'Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis', *American Sociological Review* 28, 5 (1963), and *Race and Ethnicity* (New York, 1970). See also Leo Kuper & M.G. Smith (edd.), *Pluralism in Africa* (Los Angeles, 1969); Leo Kuper, *Race, Class and Power* (Liverpool, 1974). Perhaps the most ambitious attempt to date is R.A. Schermerhorn's *Comparative Ethnic Relations* (New York, 1970).
- 36 Van den Berghe (*Race and Racism*) distinguishes plural societies from segmentary, undifferentiated societies and from societies with a high degree of functional differentiation in their institutional structure, but the former have everywhere been incorporated into what he would define as plural societies and he fails to give any examples of the latter that do not exhibit 'instances of pluralism', for the good reason that there are none.
- 37 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.237. Cf. van den Berghe, 'Pluralism and the Polity', *loc. cit.*, p.69: 'Of course, in extending the meaning of pluralism, and in failing to distinguish between "pluralism" and "plural societies" there is a risk of stripping the concept of all its analytical power'.
- 38 See especially M.G. Smith, 'Social and Cultural Pluralism', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 83, 5 (1960), and 'Institutional and Political Conditions of Pluralism', in Kuper & Smith (edd.), *op. cit.*
- 39 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.237.
- 40 *ibid.*, p.238.
- 41 *ibid.*, citing van den Berghe, *Race and Racism*, p.67.
- 42 *ibid.* (Emphasis added.)
- 43 E.g. M.G. Smith.
- 44 E.g. van den Berghe.
- 45 Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, p.239.
- 46 Cf. Malcolm Cross, *loc. cit.* The main motor of change—industrialisation and urbanisation—which the theorists themselves adduce in analysing race relations situations is extraneous to the theory. Since racist ideology and politics are held to be ultimately independent dynamic forces, this produces some curious results. Thus van den Berghe, e.g., is led to the fantastic conclusion that apartheid in South Africa is 'anachronistic', 'a living political dinosaur'—'it is basically an old-fashioned colonial regime coerced through the dynamics of industrialization into modernizing its repressive apparatus' (*Race and Racism*, p.109).
- 47 Cf. Wolpe, *loc. cit.*, pp.230, 240.
- 48 *ibid.*, p.230.
- 49 *ibid.*, p.241, citing C. Bettelheim, 'Theoretical Comments', in A. Emmanuel, *Unequal Exchange* (London, 1972). See also Geoffrey Kay, *Development and Underdevelopment: A Marxist Analysis* (London, 1975).
- 50 *ibid.*
- 51 *ibid.*, citing E. Laclau, 'Feudalism and Capitalism in Latin America', *New Left Review* 67 (1971).
- 52 *ibid.*, pp.243, 250. Cf. John Clammer, 'Economic Anthropology and the Sociology of Development: "Liberal" Anthropology and its French Critics', in Ivaar Oxaal *et al.* (edd.), *Beyond the Sociology of Development...*
- 53 *ibid.*, pp.243-4, citing V.I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*.
- 54 *ibid.*, p.249. See also his 'Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power in South Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid', *Economy and Society* 1, 4 (1972). For an argument that the restructuring of pre-capitalist modes of production in South Africa entailed their destruction, see M. Williams, 'An Analysis of South African Capitalism', *Bulletin of Socialist Economics* (1975). Cf. David Rosenberg, 'Underdeveloped Sociology' (review article), *Sociology* 10, 2 (1975).

- 55 Wolpe, 'Theory of Internal Colonialism', *loc. cit.*, p.248.
- 56 See N. Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes* (London, 1973), Part III.
- 57 Wolpe, 'Theory of Internal Colonialism', *loc. cit.*, p.249.
- 58 See Louis Althusser & Etienne Balibar, *Reading Capital* (London, 1970), Part III, Chapter 1; Maurice Godelier, *Rationality and Irrationality in Economics* (London, 1972).
- 59 Cf. Eugene D. Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made* (London, 1969).
- 60 Rowley, *Destruction of Aboriginal Society*, p.16.
- 61 See, e.g., E.L. Wheelwright & K. Buckley (edd.), *Essays in the Political Economy of Australian Capitalism* (Sydney, 1975), vol. 1.
- 62 Rapid conquest and depopulation also inhibited Aboriginal employment in the southern areas.
- 63 See especially Sylvia J. Hallam, *Fire and Hearth: A Study of Aboriginal Usage and European Usurpation in South-Western Australia* (Canberra, 1975), Preamble and *passim*.
- 64 See especially Rowley, *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society*, and Ann Curthoys, *Race and Ethnicity: A Study of the Response of British Colonists to Aborigines, Chinese and non-British Europeans in New South Wales, 1856-1881* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, 1973), chapter 1.
- 65 K. Marx, *Capital* (Moscow, 1959), vol. I, p.734.
- 66 Evidence from the Americas in particular suggests that (a) hunter/gatherers adapted less readily to wage-labour or to any kind of regular work than agriculturalists, and (b) the agents of pre-capitalist modes of production were more readily incorporated into feudal than into capitalist social structures.
- 67 See, e.g., M.C. Hartwig, 'Aborigines and Racism: An Historical Perspective', in F.S. Stevens (ed.), *Racism: The Australian Experience*, Vol. 2 *Black versus White* (Sydney, 1972), pp.15-18.
- 68 See especially Ann Curthoys, *Race and Ethnicity*, chapters 1 & 2. Liberal democracy in Australia, as in most other 'new' capitalist societies, was *Herrenvolk* democracy at its inception. Cf. Louis Hartz (ed.), *The Founding of New Societies* (New York, 1964); Pierre L. van den Berghe, *Race and Racism*; George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (New York, 1971).
- 69 On this, see especially Rowley, *op. cit.*
- 70 Rowley, *Outcasts in White Australia*, pp.65-6.
- 71 Hartwig, *loc. cit.*, p.13.
- 72 For elaboration of the concepts involved here, see K. Marx, *op. cit.*, Part III; C. Meillassoux, 'From Reproduction to Production', *Economy and Society* 1, 1 (1972); H. Wolpe, 'Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power', *loc. cit.*
- 73 No cash wage was stipulated at all until the twentieth century when small minimum wages were fixed in Queensland and the Northern Territory. No minimum wage was stipulated in South Australia and Western Australia.
- 74 Rowley, *Outcasts in White Australia*, p.115.
- 75 For a good account of protection/segregation policies, see e.g. C.M. Tatz, 'Commonwealth Aboriginal Policy', *Australian Quarterly* 36, 4 (1964); and 'Queensland's Aborigines; Natural Justice and the Rule of Law', *Australian Quarterly* 35, 3 (1963).
- 76 *The Remote Aborigines*, p.218.
- 77 See e.g. R.M. & C.H. Berndt, *A Northern Territory Problem: Aboriginal Labour in a Pastoral Area* (unpublished manuscript).
- 78 See e.g. A.P. Elkin, 'Aboriginal Policy 1930-1950; Some Personal Associations', *Quadrant* 1, 4 (1957); Rowley, *Destruction of Aboriginal Society*, pp.328-32, *Outcasts in White Australia*, pp.31, 84, *Remote Aborigines*, p.204.
- 79 My own previous work in the field—Hartwig, *loc. cit.*, and especially *The Progress of White Settlement in the Alice Springs District and its Effects upon the Aboriginal Inhabitants, 1860-1894* (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Adelaide, 1965)—suffers from the same limitations.
- 80 This seems to be common to most racial and ethnic minorities in capitalist societies. For a brilliant exposition of the duality involved, see Eugene D. Genovese, *In Red and Black* (London, 1971), chapter 3, 'Class and Nationality in Black America'.